

H. S. Congress

Appendix

Tribute to Ben H. Wooten, of Dallas, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is always pleasant to note successful achievement in any line of endeavor. This is particularly true when the achievement concerns a friend—in this case, Ben H. Wooten, president of the First National Bank in Dallas, and member of the board of directors of the Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway.

This outstanding citizen was recently named the first Texan to ever receive the Horatio Alger Award, an honor recognizing business and professional leadership resulting from determination and hard work.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that an article on Mr. Wooten's achievements, as carried in the July 1959 issue of the Santa Fe magazine, be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOARD MEMBER B. H. WOOTEN WINS HORATIO ALGER AWARD

The community of Timpson in east Texas is only 192 railroad miles from Dallas, but each of those miles represents a challenge met and won by Ben H. Wooten, president of the First National Bank in Dallas, and member of the board of directors of Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railroad.

Wooten recently was named winner of one of nine Horatio Alger Awards, the first Texan ever to receive this distinction. The awards are presented annually to successful American business and professional leaders who began life as poor boys and climbed to the top of their professions by determination and hard work.

As a youngster, Ben Wooten helped his family scratch a living from a small farm near Timpson in Shelby County. His clothes were homemade and his first pair of trousers made of new cloth were hard earned by the boy picking and selling peanuts. To get suspenders to hold up those treasured pants, young Wooten trudged 3 miles to town and sold a rooster for 15 cents.

The future civic leader chopped cotton, worked as a chairman on a pipeline surveying crew and put in long hours working his way through North Texas State College at Denton. In 1949, Wooten was named board chairman of the school's regents, a position he still holds.

After graduation from NTSC in 1917, Wooten served in the U.S. Army, was a school teacher for a brief period, then entered the banking profession as a teller of an east Texas bank. He became president of the First National Bank in Dallas in 1950.

In commenting on the 1959 Horatio Alger Award to Wooten, the Dallas Morning News wrote, "The career of Ben Wooten is not

merely one of rags to riches but is one of increasing public service."

For aspiring young people everywhere, Wooten has this comment: "There still are unlimited opportunities for success in our modern Nation."

United States Gives Lipservice to Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the monotony of repetitive declarations by America on the plight of the captive nations of Europe imply objectives which our Nation seems unable to promote. They create false hope which can fester only into bitterness in the hearts of people who have been friendly to America in these captive lands and who have expected an American policy which could in some way release them from hopeless enchainment.

The following article by Henry N. Taylor, of Scripps-Howard newspapers, aptly summarizes the futility of American policy, entitled "We Preach; Do Nothing—United States Gives Lipservice." This article appeared in the Scripps-Howard newspapers on Monday, July 27, 1959:

WE PREACH; DO NOTHING—UNITED STATES GIVES LIPSERVICE

(By Henry N. Taylor)

WASHINGTON.—Captive Nations Week is over now, observed by Americans, reviled by Russia's boss, Nikita Khrushchev; but the episode reiterates an old, embarrassing futility of U.S. foreign policy.

Namely, that we preach freedom for the millions caught behind communism's Iron Curtain, but we have done nothing, can do nothing, and will do nothing to help them get free. Loud, sincere sympathy is the best we can offer.

The Congress version of this controversial resolution was tougher than the President's proclamation. It blamed "imperialist and aggressive policies of Russian communism" for subjugating 22 specified nations "and others."

There was almost no congressional discussion. No one questioned the list of "subjugated nations," which included at least five areas (Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Cossakia, Turkestan) taken over in Czarist times, some as far back as 75 years before Nikolai Lenin.

JUST ANOTHER PROCLAMATION

No one asked how "U.S. leadership in liberation" could be claimed after our nonperformance during Hungary's freedom fight. The resolution wasn't even sent for approval to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The Judiciary Committee churned it out,

along with other casual holiday proclamations, such as National Hot Dog Month.

Could any Congressman be expected to vote against an anti-Communist resolution? Could any State Department official visibly impede it, even though it was foreseen that this might embarrass Vice President RICHARD NIXON in Moscow? There was, of course, no opposition.

But at State Department suggestion, President Eisenhower's version of the proclamation was toned down. It did not specify what nations wanted to be liberated, nor promise any U.S. role in liberating them. It merely declared "support for just aspirations for freedom."

Captive Nations Week caused little stir in America. But NIXON was warned before departure that he might hear more about it in Moscow. Even some Congressmen now concede the timing was poor.

This doesn't suggest any faltering sympathy for people who live at bayonet point under communism. But it symbolizes the policy dilemma of Washington, which can think of no way to nudge the Soviet Union back behind its own frontiers, yet doesn't want to legitimize the fruits of Russian aggression or cause its victims to give up hope.

TOO MUCH ZEAL FEARED

As for inciting real revolt behind the Iron Curtain, there is no evidence that the United States has any such ideas. Propaganda is kept deliberately unflinny. (One U.S. Ambassador, Jacob Beam in Warsaw, recently complained against excessive zeal in Western broadcasts to Poland.)

Any new, brave, futile uprisings would almost certainly prove what Hungary proved: That Russia will be ruthless—but also that America reacts to such events with nothing more substantial than kind words for the dead and blankets for the survivors.

One sentence in recent history seems to haunt American policy planning on Iron Curtain liberation, echoing back to make Captive Nations Week melancholy mockery. It is the next to last sentence on the last teletype message out of Budapest, that day in November 1956, when Russian tanks crushed the freedom fight.

"We have just heard a rumor," a Hungarian typed, "that American troops will be here in an hour or two."

Silence. The troops did not come. They could not come. They will not come the next time. This is one reason Nikita Khrushchev talks so tough to NIXON—and to the world.

Tribute to George Washington Carver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on July 12 the very able Representative from the Seventh District of Missouri, the Honorable CHARLES H. BROWN, was the principal speaker at the annual Carver Day observance, held at the

A6641

George Washington Carver National Monument, at his birthplace near Joplin, Mo.

Representative Brown reviewed the story of George Washington Carver's life from its humble beginnings as the son of a slave to the heights of success that can only be achieved through service to humanity.

The life and work of this good man, Dr. Carver, is one of the great stories of America, and should be known throughout the world.

I commend Representative Brown's address to the attention of my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN CHARLES H. BROWN AT THE ANNUAL CARVER DAY OBSERVANCE AT GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER NATIONAL MONUMENT, JULY 12, 1959

I thank each and everyone of you for inviting me here today. I have looked forward to this occasion for reasons that many of you may not realize. Back in the thirties, when I worked in Washington, I heard Dr. George Washington Carver testify before a congressional committee. They said they were going to give him 3 or 4 minutes, but they wound up giving him almost an hour. And, listening to him, I thought to myself—this man has taught them more in these 60 minutes than they have learned in the last 60 days.

He was, perhaps, the greatest Missourian who has lived to date, when you measure greatness by one's lasting contributions to humanity.

The facts about George Washington Carver's life are very brief. He started from the humblest of beginnings. He never knew exactly when he was born. He always said that it was about 1864. But, recent research into the census records indicate that it might have been, and probably was, around 1860. He never knew his father; but he knew his mother and he remembered her until he died. She was a slave.

And, Carver always knew where he was born. He was born on the Moses Carver farm near Diamond Grove, Mo. But in his early childhood, probably when he was 3 or 4 years old, border guerrillas captured his mother and George Carver and carried them off to Arkansas. In time, George was turned over to a man who offered a \$300 horse for his release. His mother was never heard of again.

George came back to southwest Missouri and, with the help of friends, grew to be a gangling boy who wanted an education so badly that he would do any chore or odd job to get one. He attended the public schools in two or three towns in Kansas. He wanted to go to college, so he worked his way through Simpson College and then on through Iowa State and got a bachelor's degree in 1894. He got a master's degree in 1896. He was a good student, one of the best they had; and, they offered him a professorship in botany.

But, he became interested in what Booker T. Washington was doing at Tuskegee Institute in Tuskegee, Ala. So, he went there and became the head of their research and experiment department.

At Tuskegee, his thirst for knowledge was so great that it was unquenchable. He sought and found new uses for such commonplace things as cornstalks, sweetpotatoes, soybeans, peanuts, trees, and that red clay

of Alabama. He turned ordinary materials into extraordinary products. He found ways to make plastics, paints, paper, plywood, cosmetics, and even imitation marble out of commonplace materials.

Whole new industries grew out of his discoveries, but George Carver never participated in the profits. Many of his formula he gave to humanity without royalty; and, most of his personal income he gave to young, eager students who wanted a college education. George Carver's students remember him as a threadbare professor who couldn't have cared less about money. He was also a great artist. One of his paintings hangs in the Luxembourg Gallery. Many of his paintings you will see at Tuskegee.

In his later years he won worldwide recognition for his talents and his work. He is one of the few Americans who ever became a member of the British Royal Society of Art. He won the Spingarn Medal in 1923. He won the Roosevelt Medal for achievements in science in 1939. He was Director of Research for the U.S. Department of Agriculture. And, he served on numerous boards and panels where research scientists were needed.

But his first love and his last love was his classroom, his students, and his laboratory at Tuskegee. There he remained as chief of research and experiment until he died in 1943 at the age of 80—or was it 83?

These are the bare facts of his life; but they don't begin to tell the whole story.

George Washington Carver was one of God's chosen children, richly endowed by the Creator with a rare and priceless talent, placed by the Creator in an environment where the only way to achieve was to struggle. No one could have faced more hardships. But, no hardship could deter him and no amount of suffering could break his indomitable spirit. Difficulties inspired him, and the suffering he endured taught him to understand, to appreciate, and have compassion for the suffering and the trials and hardships of others.

He learned how to work early in life and he never forgot it. He worked until he fell on the ice and was put in bed.

He was a man who had no fear of the unknown. He loved to experiment with new ideas. He loved to blaze new trails, find new methods and new ways of doing old jobs and scale new summits that no one had ever attempted to scale before.

Above all he never lost his sense of values. To him a better world, a happier people, the Golden Rule meant more than all the comforts and luxuries that a man could possess.

George Washington Carver was a success in the true meaning of the word; and his achievements are immortal because he left disciples—students who today are telling their students, who in turn will tell their students about George Washington Carver, what he stood for, what he thought, and what he did for mankind in his fourscore years on earth.

Jesus of Nazareth did more in less than 40 years than George Washington Carver did in 80. Moses contributed more to mankind than George Carver. Perhaps some scientists in the history of the world left a legacy equally as valuable—men like De Vinci, Galileo, Newton, and others—Einstein, perhaps; but, few men in the history of the world have done as much for mankind as did this man. For, he was one of God's chosen children, born with that keen mind and that big heart. A man whom God sent us for a purpose; and he walked with God every day of his life to fulfill that purpose nobly.

The least we can do is learn a lesson from this man's life. I feel that was a part of the purpose for which he was sent. I would

like to mention very briefly just three lessons that we sorely need to learn today.

First, George Carver proved that all things are possible if you are determined enough to do it. Why, you couldn't face any more hardships than this man faced. He didn't start from scratch. He started from behind scratch. Everywhere he turned, he met prejudice, doubt, and suspicion. But they didn't deter this man. He said he was going to do something worthwhile, and he did.

Today, the world is divided into two armed camps and the means for destroying mankind is at hand. There are those who say that war is inevitable, that nothing we can do will prevent an Armageddon.

I just don't believe that. I think we can lead this world to a new era of permanent peace—a golden era more golden than we have ever known, if we have the courage and determination that George Carver had.

Some people say mankind will never be able to cope with its population explosion, that we will be overwhelmed by our own numbers, that we can't possibly provide the highways, the schools, the homes, the necessities of life for these teeming millions. I don't believe that. I think we Americans can do anything we want to do, if we have the guts to do it. Complicated problems are hard to solve. Wise men may differ on how to solve them. But we must never stop striving for better solutions. We must never be defeated by a sense of futility.

The second lesson that George Carver, in my opinion, taught is that he proved that good men—not money or machines—make the only genuine progress in the world. He didn't have a multimillion-dollar laboratory. He didn't say you must give me this and give me that or I can't discover these things. He worked with the simplest of tools.

Sometimes, I think we get so enamored with bigness and giantism that we overlook the true value of just a good man. It wasn't a big laboratory that built the first Ford automobile. It was Henry Ford in a little lean-to garage. It wasn't the XYZ laboratory that discovered the radio. It was a man named Marconi, working in his home. It wasn't the ABC holding company that discovered the incandescent lamp. It was Thomas Edison. A man with a great mind who worked. Good men solve big problems and do big things. Money and machines are only the tools that good men use to achieve.

A third lesson that I think George Carver's life taught is that the truly successful man is one who adds something of lasting benefit to humanity. Oh, there have been a lot of men who accumulated more wealth than George Washington Carver. Thousands who have gathered unto themselves a bigger-than-average share of the world's material goods and titles. Men who have been honored and praised as successful men, big men, even called great men. But the successful man is the one who deals in true human values, the Golden Rule, the lasting benefits.

The world little notes nor remembers what we leave behind in material goods. But as we pass this way on earth, if we could help someone in his time of trouble, we will have achieved some small measure of immortality.

The rest of us were not given that great mind that George Carver had; but each of us has a heart, if we'll use it. We can all have the compassion for our fellow man that George Carver had.

George Washington Carver was a great man in the true sense of greatness. It is only right that we should do him honor on these days. And, as the years go by, I hope that this shrine will grow not only in its physical appearance, but in the number of people who will come here and learn about this man who walked with God every day of his life and fulfilled God's purpose nobly.

Dr. Dudley Jackson, Dedicated Man of Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, on July 25, 1959, the city of San Antonio, the State of Texas and the world of science sustained a severe loss in the death of Dr. Dudley Jackson of San Antonio.

Long recognized as a leader in the medical profession and in the field of medical research, Dr. Jackson rendered outstanding pioneer service in cancer research. He is mourned by all who knew him.

The following from the San Antonio Express well outlines the career and service of Dr. Jackson:

Funeral services for Dr. Dudley Jackson, Sr., 68, who died Saturday at Nix Memorial Hospital, will be at 10 a.m. Tuesday at Porter Loring Funeral Home.

The Reverend George Mauze will officiate. Jackson was recognized for many contributions to medical science. He was the holder of a Walter Reed Society award for experiments in cancer wherein he transplanted living cancer cells into his own body and removed them after study.

A graduate from the Kansas City Veterinarian College in 1913, he entered the University of Texas Medical School at Galveston at the insistence of an uncle, Dr. T. T. Jackson, a pioneer San Antonio physician.

Jackson graduated from medical school in 1917, and served as a medical corps officer with the Army Air Force in World War I. He engaged in practice with his uncle upon his return.

He engaged in extensive research at Robert B. Green Hospital in the treatment of rattlesnake bites, and evolved the suction method of treatment. This method was adopted by the Armed Forces as the best.

A former president of the Bexar County Medical Society, he served many years as chief of surgical services at the Green.

Jackson became interested in the diagnosis and treatment of cancer and allied diseases and continued as a specialist in this field. He and the late Maury Maverick, Sr., helped found the National Cancer Institute of Institute at Bethesda, Md.

He was largely instrumental in getting legislation for a hospital and tumor clinic in Texas. This was eventually located at Houston, and now operates as the M. D. Anderson Hospital and Tumor Institute.

Two years ago the American Cancer Society, Texas division, presented him a bronze plaque in recognition of his services to the organization.

He helped organize the Pan American Cancer Foundation several years ago. The group is dedicated to care of cancer patients in the Southwest and Mexico who can't afford treatment.

He was a fellow of the American College of Surgeons, International College of Surgeons and Texas Surgical Society. Jackson formerly served as consultant in surgery at Brooke Army Hospital.

Survivors include: his wife, Mrs. Martha Beal Jackson, M.D.; a son, Dr. Dudley Jackson, Jr.; a daughter, Mrs. John H. Hickman, Wichita, Kans.; and three sisters, Mrs. Joe

Lawless, Leakey; Mrs. Mable Hodges, Waco; and Mrs. Edna McClendon, Brownwood.

Burial will be by cremation.

As evidence of the esteem in which Dr. Jackson was held in his community, I include an editorial from the San Antonio Express of July 28, 1959:

OUTSTANDING RECORD LEFT BY DR. JACKSON

The death of Dr. Dudley Jackson of San Antonio, removed one of the Nation's most ardent students of cancer.

Holder of a Walter Reed Society Award for experiments in which he transplanted living cancer cells into his own body and removed them after study, Dr. Jackson ceaselessly sought answers to the most baffling disease still afflicting mankind.

He had hoped for a cancer hospital in San Antonio, but the needs for general hospital services had to come first. Perhaps some day after a State Medical School branch with a teaching hospital is established here, Dr. Jackson's dream might come true.

Dr. Jackson's medical interests were great. He sought to uncover other scientific facts which would increase man's desire to overcome disease.

His absence from this community will be greatly felt, but the ideas he left will stay as a reminder of his outstanding services.

Also attesting to Dr. Jackson's life and service is the following editorial from the San Antonio News of July 29, 1959:

DR. JACKSON'S EFFORTS WILL BE REMEMBERED

When a doctor transplants living cancer cells into his own body in order to perform more thorough study—removing them afterward—there can be no doubt he is doing his utmost to serve humanity.

In a field where dedication to a life of arduous work and great mental effort is almost taken for granted, San Antonio's Dr. Dudley Jackson excelled.

First a veterinarian, he became a physician and served in Air Corps medicine in World War I. For many years he was chief of surgical services at Robert B. Green Hospital where his research in the treatment of snake bites resulted in the suction method, adopted by the Armed Forces as the best.

When some day San Antonio builds a cancer hospital—as was Dr. Jackson's dream—his selfless efforts to find a cure for this disease will doubtless be recalled. He is dead, but he lived not in vain.

Welcome for Mexicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Mr. Virgil Pinkley, the editor and publisher of the Associated Desert Newspapers of California, and a national radio commentator of renown, has written an editorial entitled "Welcome for Mexicans," which was published in the *Indio News of Indio, Calif.*, July 13, 1959. I think this is one of the best editorials I have seen relative to the increasingly close relationship between the Mexicans and Americans along the Mexican border, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I commend it for reading by

my colleagues in the Senate. I am sure that all Senators will find much can be accomplished in the way of bettering relations between these two close and friendly nations and the people who comprise them.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELCOME FOR MEXICANS

(In view of the close ties with Mexico, and the large number of Mexican visitors to the Coachella Valley, we are reprinting the following editorial, which appeared in the *El Centro Post-Press*.)

(By Virgil Pinkley)

The Calexico Chamber of Commerce and the service clubs of the border city have a rare opportunity to further the good relations and understanding between Mexico and the United States.

This can be done by posting various signs in Spanish and English on the California side of the border. There should be welcome signs and greetings in Spanish, too.

In Mexicali there are signs in English and the distances to San Louis and San Felipe are posted in kilometers and miles as a courtesy to visiting Americans. Filling stations and motels post the words "All credit cards are good here," and "Vacancy" in English. Certainly we can and should do as well for our most welcome visitors from Mexico.

Calexico and the Imperial Valley enjoy considerable commercial exchange with Mexico. In Calexico there should be a center where Mexican citizens could secure information and assistance quickly and easily. This center should be staffed by Spanish speaking personnel who stress courtesy and helpfulness.

Certainly these are worthwhile objectives for Calexico civic groups. Such relations only carry out the theme of service clubs whose creeds include fellowship and good will. Here is a fine movement which ought to be supported by churches, too. Here is a fine opportunity to carry out missionary work "right in their front yards."

There is a growing need for even better relations between this country and our fine neighbor to the south. The best place to start such an exchange is right here at home. All this can be done without any government regulations or redtape and with little or no expense.

Much of the romance and atmosphere of our area had its origin in Mexico. We are indebted, too, to thousands of Mexican workers who come here to help harvest our rich crops.

The number of Mexicans crossing the border at Calexico grows each year. For the fiscal year just closed, 9,507,088 persons came into California through Calexico. This was an alltime high and exceeded the previous record year by 842,663. The arrivals came by automobiles and trucks, motorcycles, and airplanes, and on foot. Robert B. Poley, deputy in charge of the Calexico customs, said the count included 3,593,492 pedestrians.

An increase of \$317,752 in revenue was reported by Poley for the port of entry. Duties collected totaled \$1,549,262, representing an estimated valuation of \$50 million in imports, a total estimated about equal to exports.

So there is much to recommend a fine welcome to Mexicans coming into Calexico. In addition to the trade and business aspects, it is pleasant to be polite and helpful to visitors. We should greet them in their own language.

Before fall there should be a huge "welcome mat" prepared in Spanish by Calexico.

Direct Payments for Farmers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the suggestions currently being considered in answer to our farm problem is the direct payment plan. Mr. Julius Junod, writing in the Carolina Farmer, has offered a good discussion of the direct payment possibility.

I include Mr. Junod's article at this point in the RECORD:

WILL FARMERS GET DIRECT PAYMENTS?

(By Julius Junod)

Farm policy planning in Washington is now being stretched into what can be described as farmer-and-consumer policy. That is the meaning behind all the talk you hear about a broad new agricultural proposal known as direct payments.

Whether you farm or not, a direct-payment plan would directly affect you, and your family.

Such payments, in fact, might benefit the consumer just as much as the farmer. The idea is that farm products, whether or not they are surplus, would move right onto the market, instead of into Government storage.

Dairy products, for example, would be sold to consumers for the natural or open market price. When supplies were in excess of ready demand, market prices would go down, giving the consumer a better deal and also increasing consumption of the product.

IDEA IS POISON TO BENSON

When the market price was not high enough to give the farmer a fair return he would get a direct Government payment, a check drawn on the U.S. Treasury. Consumers would benefit from lower retail prices. The Government would save money, because it would not need to pay out billions of dollars as it does now to warehousemen and traders for handling surpluses.

That is how advocates of the plan say it would work.

The idea is supposed to be poison to U.S. Department of Agriculture Boss Benson and officials of the American Farm Bureau, but they backed a direct payment plan for wool that has been in operation some 5 years.

AN HONEST SUBSIDY

Many Democrats and some Republicans are now pushing hard for direct payments to cover practically all farm crops. It is an honest subsidy that would go to everybody, they argue, not like the present price support program where practically all the money winds up in the hands of corporate farmers and middlemen.

Payment plans vary by commodity, depending on need and circumstances. Wheat and cotton guarantees, for example might be based on two-level pricing—a world price for what is exported and a higher price for what's consumed at home.

Several direct payment bills are in the legislative hopper and have the backing of lawmakers from both farm and city areas.

Action on the legislation has been delayed thus far mainly by two things. One is the problem of working out agreement between the North and South on provisions that would result in equal treatment of crops grown in both regions of the country.

IKE SURE TO VETO

Another problem is that President Eisenhower is sure to use his veto club on a di-

rect payments bill, just as he did on the recent Humphrey price legislation that would have forced Benson to keep his hands off REA co-op loan requests.

The fact that the House failed to override the President on the REA loan issue is being taken as evidence he can make the veto stick on any bill that comes along.

For this reason the supporters of direct payments do not now plan to try and move their legislation to the White House this year. They want to conduct hearings and perhaps try for passage in the Senate, but delay a final congressional vote until about a year from now.

PUBLIC FED UP

Public dismay with the present farm program is probably the big reason the direct payment plan has gained such momentum. The idea is not really new.

It was proposed 10 years ago by former Agriculture Secretary Charles Brannan and it wasn't original with him. (The plan was rejected a decade ago because Brannan proposed skyhigh payment levels for just about everything that is edible.)

As for the farm program the Nation has now, Secretary Benson himself has condemned it incessantly. We must get rid of it, he has told thousands of audiences in the city and country.

In the process, until recently at least, Benson seemed to have much of the non-rural public convinced that he not only means well, but does well.

But the fact is that while he has trumpeted for sound substitutes to replace the present program, the Secretary has not devised a single new major program in all the 6½ years he has held office. Nor has he offered to try untried proposals that have been suggested by others.

About all Benson has asked of Congress is lower price supports, and these the lawmakers have granted. The lower price guarantees, the Secretary argued, would prompt farmers to produce less, cause surpluses to go away, and everybody would be happy.

The very opposite is what has happened, and USDA's budget is now several times the size of that in any previous administration.

Madison Capital Times Fights for Consideration for America's Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senate will soon have another opportunity to act on a vital omnibus housing bill. One of the most controversial issues before the Senate in that bill will be the proposal for a program of direct Government loans to provide low-cost housing for the elderly. Many Senators have enthusiastically favored this proposal. On the other hand, the President cited it as an example of unnecessary spending in vetoing the bill. Senator PAT McNAMARA, chairman of the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged, and others, testified before the Housing subcommittee in hearings last week on the bill, on the vital necessity for this aged program.

The Capital Times of Madison recently carried a characteristically humane, fighting editorial, calling attention to the

woeful needs of our aged, and I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times]
WHAT DICKENS COULD DO WITH THE PLIGHT OF OUR AGED

It has been said that if Charles Dickens were alive today he could create another masterpiece by describing the wretched conditions in some of the nursing homes for older Americans.

And the situation for old people generally is hardly any better. It constitutes one of the most shameful social problems confronting this Nation.

There are approximately 16 million Americans over the age of 65 and it is expected to reach about 20 million by 1970.

Arbitrary retirement laws and policies are forcing them out of work that they are equipped to do and that provide a living at minimum standards of decency. Medical progress has made it possible for people to live longer, but social stagnation makes that life a thing to be deplored.

Sixty percent of these unfortunate people received less than \$1,000 in the year 1958. Their meager pensions and social security benefits would be woeful even if inflation hadn't cut into them deeply.

They are outcasts, deprived of performing any meaningful function in their communities and denied the basic necessities of life, including adequate health care. The result is that these older people have no feeling of identification with the communities in which they live. Understandably bitter, they form a formidable voting bloc against needed community improvements.

Because they receive no encouragement to participate in the life of their communities, they go wearily off to the hospitals and mental institutions, where, if present policies are not changed, they will become an insupportable burden.

But the primary problem, as Senator McNAMARA of Michigan has pointed out, is the health problem. There can be no pride for the American people in the fact that Congress, under pressure of the American Medical Association, has killed a bill that would have broadened social security to provide for the financing of health services.

American Art Exhibit in Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I think the Members of Congress will be interested in the following article by Mr. Aubrey H. Sherwood, editor of the De Smet News, relative to the American art exhibit in Moscow. The article appeared in the July 30 issue of the De Smet, S. Dak., paper, and includes some interesting editorial comment by Fred Christopherson, editor of the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader:

HISTORICAL PAINTINGS OF PIONEERING PROPOSED FOR EXHIBIT IN MOSCOW

The attention drawn to the exhibit of American art to be made at Moscow that has resulted from criticism by President Eisen-

hower and the substitution of some canvasses more to his liking has brought the further suggestion that these might well include some paintings with a South Dakota origin.

GEORGE MCGOVERN, Representative in Congress, came forth with the suggestion that a painting by Oscar Howe, celebrated Indian artist, be included, saying there is one hanging in his office in Washington he would gladly loan for the purpose.

Approving this, the editor of the Argus-Leader further suggests some of the paintings by Harvey Dunn hanging at State College should be shown in Russia.

REAL AMERICAN PAINTINGS

"The paintings are typically American and present refreshingly the early American pioneer scene," writes the Argus-Leader editor, Fred Christopherson.

He continues: "Critics have said that only experts on art should pass judgment on matters, such as this and have suggested, in effect, that we, not being an art expert, should keep our big mouth shut. Well, come what may, we have no intention of doing so. We've seen reproductions of some of the paintings selected for exhibition in Moscow and included among them are some fantastic productions that belong only in the 'beatnik' school. They are reminiscent of those being currently depicted in the Winnie Winkle comic strip. The Howe and Dunn paintings are something else. They, too, are lauded by art experts. They also are of the type that provides satisfaction for the average American viewer, and, we have a hunch, would be attractive to the average Russian viewer."

The suggestions of the Congressman and the Sioux Falls editor are worthy of consideration, if it is not too late to have paintings added to the showing for Moscow. Mr. Christopherson stated he felt sure the authorities at State College could be induced to loan one or more of the paintings for that purpose. If time and distance are a factor there are other canvasses by Harvey Dunn in the New York area that quite likely could be borrowed for the Russian exhibit.

FOLKS KNOW WHAT THEY LIKE

The editor of the Argus-Leader is to be commended for his insistence that he and other Americans with no claim to being art experts have the right to judge paintings. It was the writer's privilege to watch several thousand persons in attendance at the exhibit of Dunn paintings now at State College, when they hung here at De Smet for a summer. He overheard many comments, visited with many of them about the paintings. From a comparatively few who apparently were familiar with art and exhibits and from many who were not he heard praise for them, often beautifully and appreciatively stated.

Again, a few months ago, when the Sherwoods exhibited a few Dunn canvasses and showed slides of many more at a gathering at Madison, there was heard praise that was common that summer of 1950: "These I can understand; these mean something to me." This came from men who often had already indicated no particular interest in an exhibit of paintings.

PRaise FROM THE PEOPLE

The portrait of Fred Wright as the country printer he was, painted in a few hours by Harvey Dunn, depicting a man he had long known and admired has had the greatest praise any portrait could have as local persons, not interested in the art of the painting, have said: "Yes, that's Fred—just as natural as can be." They see on canvas the rugged, straightforward man they have known and admired.

Shown in Russia, where there are vast spaces, the records Harvey Dunn has made of breaking of the prairies of America's front-

iers of two generations ago would surely find many appreciative viewers. They can be understood without explanation—without translation.

Major Slum Clearance Program for San Antonio, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the city of San Antonio, Tex., has completed plans for a major slum-clearance program, to begin in 1960. I want to take this opportunity to note the achievement of those distinguished citizens of San Antonio who have made their city's urban-renewal program the fine example of intelligent, farsighted local planning that it is.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the San Antonio News of July 28, 1959, entitled, "At Last, Slum Clearance," appear in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AT LAST, SLUM CLEARANCE—CITY MOVES TO START DEMOLITION—URBAN RENEWAL SURVEY FILED

(By Ed Ray)

Early in 1960 the 1,541 people residing in the 66½-acre area surrounding the site for the new city-county jail will be moved to new homes paying the way for San Antonio's first urban renewal project.

By mid-1960 demolition of homes and old buildings in the area will be under way so that a new business and industrial area can rise to add value to the city's downtown in 1961.

This is the timetable of the urban renewal agency of San Antonio, directed by M. Winston Martin, who this week filed with the Fort Worth office of the Federal Housing and Home Finance Administration an eligibility and relocation survey for the project.

Bounded on the north by Dolorosa, the east by San Pedro Creek and the MKT Railroad, the south by the Federal Arsenal and the west by the Central Expressway, the urban renewal area was approved by the Federal Government last January 2.

It earmarked \$1,997,135 for the total work and sent the urban renewal agency, a part of city government \$99,014 for preliminary planning.

Since then Martin's staff has checked every residence and building in the area, for it is mandatory that people living in an urban renewal area must have places for relocation before demolition can begin.

There are 758 dwelling units in the area, 755 substandard. There are 170 vacancies there now. A total of 380 families live there, not including single persons living alone who, if added as family units, would bring the total to 547. Of the 380 families, 340 are tenants while 40 own their homes. People actually living in the area total 1,541.

The survey shows that of the families, 106 are eligible for private rental, 103 for private home ownership under FHA, and 171 for relocation in public housing units.

The Urban Renewal Agency now will make plans for the hiring of a planning firm to draw final specifications for use of the property when finally cleared.

Cost to the city theoretically is one-third of the project. But any improvements the city makes to the area, such as streets, lights, sewage disposal—and, in this particular case the building of the new police headquarters and part of the county jail—goes toward its share of the cost.

FOR INDUSTRY

"I doubt if this project will cost the taxpayers anything more than the normal improvement charges to which they are already obligated," said Martin.

Since slum and blighted homes represent more than half of the property involved, the city is free, under Federal requirements, to turn the project into an industrial and business area.

The Urban Renewal Agency hopes its second project, adjacent to the first, can be for the development of private homes.

Although housing is involved in urban renewal, it is not public housing. All redevelopment under the program is done through private enterprise—once the city clears the land and makes it available to bidders for orderly and well-planned building.

The Cure Begins at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, continuing my series of editorials and articles pointing up some of the very basic problems involved in the Federal Government's effort to help our cities solve their blight conditions, and which are so far still unsolved, I include the following thoughtful letter to the editor appearing in the Wall Street Journal of July 30, 1959:

SLUM HOUSING

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

Your editorial, "Up From the Slums" (July 21), deals with a principle that needs continuing emphasis and one which even Presidential Candidate KENNEDY seems not to understand—namely, that slums are created by people. Senator KENNEDY says that the whole urbanized East may become a gigantic slum unless the Federal Government rebuilds the blighted areas.

The Senator should know that the habits of people, wherever and whoever they are, are merely the outward physical manifestation of what is in the inside of the people themselves, just as the outbreaks on the skin of a person afflicted with measles are not the disease itself but only the evidence of it.

If the whole urbanized East becomes a gigantic slum, it will not be because Eisenhower, or any President, vetoes a housing bill now or in the future. It will come about because the whole urbanized East will be infested with slum-minded people. That being so, no amount of money or effort spent by the politicians in Washington, or elsewhere, can change the outcome one whit. If the people in these slums, or any slums, want to better their lot, they are all free to do so by practicing those virtues which have brought better housing to the rest of the Nation. The remedy for slums lies within the breast of every slum dweller and nowhere else. The liberal, socialistic philosophy which teaches that you can deslum the slum dwellers by building new houses for them to live in at the expense of the rest

of the population is morally wrong and intellectually phony. A farmer can't change the character and habits of his livestock by putting pink ribbons on their necks and housing them in his parlor. Slums will clean themselves up when each individual in them says to himself: "I will be a different and a better person" and act accordingly.

Incidentally, it might be remembered that each one of these slum dwellers who, presumably, would like to live in new houses built with your tax money have the same vote of the same weight at the polls as any reader of this letter. If you ever wonder whether our form of government can survive, don't forget to consider that fact.

W. R. YOUNGQUIST.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Farm Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, every time Congress considers a new farm program an immediate attack is made on the price-support program which guarantees our small farmers at least a minimum income. The cry goes up "It costs too much money" and "It favors only one segment of our society."

I have felt for some time, as I know some of my colleagues have, that this is erroneous reasoning. The price-support program does cost money, but it does not cost nearly what people are led to believe. In addition, there are many other segments of our society which are subsidized and to a larger extent. The opponents of the price-support program neglect to mention the Federal subsidies to airlines, maritime organizations, business reconversion, and postal services. I will not say that these are unjustified, but I do not think the small farmers of this country should be the "whipping boys" for Federal subsidization.

A recent issue of the Montana Farmer-Stockman carried an excellent editorial refuting many of the statements made about the cost of the farm subsidy program, and it was reprinted in the July 28 issue of the Lewistown Daily News. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial, entitled "What Farm Price Supports Cost," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT FARM PRICE SUPPORTS COST

No one can deny that it costs money to maintain the farm price support program. But the actual cost is far lower than the general public has been given to understand.

Misleading information continuously issued by eastern newspapers, national magazines, and radio and television commentators has convinced the average citizen that these farm programs cost billions more than is actually the case.

Typical of countless similar comments is the following from a recent issue of the Chicago Tribune:

"What industry enjoys an annual subsidy from the Federal Government of \$7 billion? * * * The answer is obvious—American agriculture."

In its regular monthly letter the First National City Bank of New York refers to a farm budget of \$5 billion and remarks "there are about 4.8 million farms in the United States, so this budget averages more than \$1,000 per farm. When divided among the approximately 2 million commercial farms * * * the proposed budget averages \$2,500."

The Senate Agriculture Committee in an effort to publicize the actual facts of the situation asked USDA for a breakdown showing how much of the 1959 budget of the Department goes to farmers and how much to the general public. In response to the committee request, USDA summarized the programs having multiple benefits and not directly chargeable to the farmer, as follows:

Programs related to foreign aid \$1,264 million; food distribution programs, school, lunch, and so forth, \$334 million; investment in REA and FHA loans to be repaid, \$555 million; programs for improvement of resources, including meat inspection, education, forest and public land management, etc., \$598 million, or a grand total of \$2,751 million.

Programs predominantly for the benefit of farmers were listed as follows:

Agricultural conservation program, \$227 million; soil bank programs, \$756 million; CCC price support and related programs, \$1,172 million; Sugar Act programs, \$75 million, or a total of \$2,230 million.

Even the total of \$2,230 million for programs for the direct benefit of farmers is much greater than the actual cost because the item covering CCC supports includes the full value of all loans made. Actually, a substantial part of this total is recovered through the sale of the surplus crops. The actual net cost to the Government for programs specifically for the benefit of farmers boils down to perhaps \$1,800 million.

This is a big sum—but it isn't \$5 billion or \$7 billion.

Alaska and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story originating at Anchorage, Alaska, as reported in the Fairbanks News-Miner of July 30, 1959. This timely article focuses attention upon the serious defense situation existing in Alaska today, with regard to which I hope the Department of Defense will soon take corrective action:

COMMANDER OF ALL ALASKA FORCES TELLS OF ATTACK DANGERS, DETAILS U.S. NEED FOR INTERMEDIATE MISSILES IN STATE

ANCHORAGE, July 30.—Two enemy bombers could put Alaskan bases out of action and leave Alaska and the west coast of the United States defenseless, Lt. Gen. Frank A. Armstrong warned last night.

"It would take only two enemy bombers to put Alaskan bases out of action and if the attack were followed up by paratroops, Alaska would be out of action," the commander of military forces in Alaska said as

he spoke informally at a banquet of the Association of Local Transport Airlines.

The banquet was the final session of ALTA's quarterly meeting in Anchorage. The group is now in Fairbanks.

"With Russians in the Fairbanks and Anchorage areas, President Eisenhower would have to decide quickly whether to bomb Alaska to save Chicago or leave the country open to close-range attack," the general added.

Alaska needs intermediate range ballistic missiles, he said. "Unless Alaska gets IRBM soon, we are going to be in one h— of a fix."

PRESENT PROTECTION

"At present, the Strategic Air Command can count on putting out of action only 8 of the 26 bases in Siberia that threaten Alaska. Alaska has two main areas which could quickly succumb to atomic attack and leave Alaska wide open to invasion."

Armstrong said Alaska doesn't need intercontinental ballistic missiles but intermediate missiles "that will allow us to nullify those 26 Red bases in Siberia."

"The Nation's thinking is northeast-oriented but the obvious and practical attack route to the United States is through Alaska. If Alaska does not get the missiles they need soon, Alaska and the west coast are through; Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, and down the coast are done," Armstrong stated.

"The Air Force in Alaska is depended on only to warn the United States of attack. Air Force fighters are expected to be able to knock down only one out of every four invading enemy aircraft."

"Alaska was built up through a series of crash programs and the next one will be when the Russians move up two squadrons of Badgers (prop-jet bombers) across the Bering Straits from Alaska," General Armstrong said.

The Value of the Federal Grant Program for Sewage Treatment Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, Mr. Hugh Patterson, mayor of Gadsden, Ala., and an official of the Alabama League of Municipalities, on Monday of this week submitted to the Flood Control, Rivers, and Harbors Subcommittee of the Senate Public Works Committee a statement entitled "The Value of the Federal Grant Program for Sewage Treatment Plants." In this statement Mayor Patterson endorses the Blatnik bill (H.R. 3610) to enlarge this Federal assistance program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this splendid statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VALUE OF THE FEDERAL GRANT PROGRAM FOR SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANTS

(Statement by Hugh Patterson, mayor of Gadsden, Ala., submitted to the Kerr subcommittee of the Senate Public Works Committee)

It is my very happy privilege to present to you this statement on behalf of my own home city as well as for the Alabama League

of Municipalities, of which I am an official. The league is composed of 255 towns and cities of our State, representing 98.7 percent of the total municipal population of Alabama.

Alabama's municipal officials deeply appreciate the unflinching support that the Congress has given to Public Law 660 for assistance from the Federal Government to the local communities for construction of sewage treatment plants. We appreciate also the fact that appropriations have been voted by Congress to make the program workable. I submit this statement today in support of the Blatnik bill (H.R. 3610), which proposes to enlarge and improve the already vital program being carried out by the cities and towns with Federal financial assistance. I hope the committee will recommend the improved legislation (H.R. 3610) and that you will send it to the floor of the Senate without delay so that it may be acted upon this year.

Each and every community has the responsibility for providing adequate sewage collection and disposal systems to protect the health of its citizens and of those residing in adjoining areas that may be affected by the discharge of improperly treated sewage from the community. Community sewage must also be treated and disposed of in a manner that will be least objectionable, will protect property values, and will permit reasonable use of waters into which it is discharged.

A community's growth and prosperity depends upon its facilities and services. There are Alabama communities in which residential expansion has been restricted by the lack of adequate sewage collection and treatment works. I also feel sure that some municipalities have been bypassed by industries seeking a location because of inadequate sewerage facilities.

COST OF MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT CONTINUALLY RISING

The cost of municipal government continues to rise, and municipal governing officials are repeatedly requested to expand services and utilities. Revenues have not kept pace with costs, and we have been forced to impose higher tax burdens or increase the utility cost to our citizens. The Federal grant program for municipal sewage works construction has made it easier for many communities to undertake improvements in sewage disposal. Many communities cannot finance construction of these improvements without help from this or other sources. These grants have also stimulated interest in providing for adequate sewage treatment works and are a definite incentive to a community.

Since July 1956, allotments of grant funds to Alabama from appropriations under Public Law 660 have been made to 21 municipalities—an average of 7 new projects per fiscal year. The total construction cost of these 21 projects is approximately \$23,700,000 of which \$3,272,000 will be from Federal grants. The high proportion of this cost borne by local government—86.2 percent—has led one of Alabama's leading daily newspapers to editorially praise the Federal grant program to municipalities. It should be recognized that the Federal Government now participates only to the extent of 30 percent of the cost of sewage treatment works with the maximum of any one grant set at \$250,000. The municipality must bear the total cost of collecting sewers, which are ineligible for Federal participation.

WILL SERVE 700,000 PERSONS

The sewage treatment facilities made available by these 21 projects will have a capacity for 700,000 persons. During the 2-year period the grant program has been in effect, 12 projects with a capacity for 42,000 persons and involving construction costs

totaling \$1,970,000 has been started without grant aid. As a comparison, 15 projects having a capacity for 230,000 persons and costing \$3,300,000 were begun during the 3 years prior to the effective date of Public Law 660. It is apparent that municipal sewage disposal problems of long standing are being corrected and public health hazards eliminated through financial assistance from the Federal Government.

While accomplishments during the first 2½ years of the aid program provided by Public Law 660 have been outstanding, we have only scratched the surface in our efforts to correct problems created by unsatisfactory sewage disposal. I am told that 105 communities in Alabama are in need of sewage disposal improvements. These 105 projects would represent an estimated expenditure of \$29 million for sewage treatment works alone and, under the present method of grant allocations, will require \$5,600,000 in Federal funds. According to the Alabama State Department of Health and the State Water Improvement Commission, these figures do not include replacement and expansion of systems that may become inadequate within the next 5 years. Replacement and expansion costs are estimated to run as high as \$2 million annually.

SMALLER COMMUNITIES SERIOUSLY AFFECTED

Among the 105 communities with pressing problems of sewage disposal are Alabama's smaller municipalities which find it more difficult—if not impossible—to finance the cost of necessary improvements without aid. In my own city of Gadsden, we are faced with the necessity for expanding our sewage collection system and replacement of overloaded and inadequate sewage treatment facilities. Our problem has been discussed with representatives of Alabama's health agencies and we have been promised financial assistance if, and when, Federal funds are available for this purpose. We know that Alabama's annual allotment for the Federal grants to municipalities has been slightly over \$1,100,000 and recognize that this amount will help only a few and must be distributed on a priority basis. Our city is not alone as I am informed that 23 other communities have requested grant aid to the extent of over \$2 million.

Although accomplishments under the grant program have been most encouraging, we are far from attaining the level of sewage works construction necessary to eliminate the many situations of sewage pollution. We must bear in mind that municipal improvements delayed during the war years left our communities with a tremendous financial burden. While the present grant program is most helpful, it is obvious that it must be expanded if we are to meet our responsibilities.

NEED FOR SUPPORT OF BROADER PROGRAM

I am confident that you recognize the importance of adequate sewage disposal and the urgent need for continuing and expanding the grant program authorized by Public Law 660. Three bills introduced in the 85th Congress, H.R. 11472 by Mr. PRICE, of Illinois; H.R. 11714 by Mr. BLATNIK, of Minnesota; and S. 3576 by Senator CHAVEZ, of New Mexico, sought to increase Federal aid to municipalities for sewage treatment works construction. These bills were supported by municipal government. Alabama's municipal officials join me in asking you to continue your support of appropriations authorized by Public Law 660 and to exercise your influence in securing passage of legislation to expand this program. The present Blatnik bill—H.R. 3610—would increase grants to the local communities and otherwise improve our present law—Public Law 660.

ABOLISHMENT OF PROGRAM IS INCONCEIVABLE

President Eisenhower earlier this year asked the Congress to bring to an end the Federal grant-in-aid program for sewage treatment facilities. This is a shocking attitude for a man considered by a majority of the Nation's voters to be capable enough to preside over the governmental affairs of the world's greatest Nation. In that connection I would like to quote from an item appearing in a recent issue of the American Municipal News, indicating that even the President's advisers differ with his viewpoint on this great program:

"Presidential advisers on water-pollution problems again have taken issue with the administration's proposal to end Federal grants to local communities for construction of sewage treatment plants.

"The nine-member Water Pollution Control Advisory Board at its December 16 meeting by unanimous vote urged that the present grants-in-aid be continued.

"Milton P. Adams, Vice Chairman of the Board, is reported to have stated, 'the President could have been better advised,' when he recommended that the Federal Government turn the program over to the States. 'He didn't ask us,' Adams told a press conference.

"Adams, who like the other members of the Board is appointed by the President, described the proposal as 'a hot potato' and pointed out that the telephone companies are lobbying for repeal of the tax which was a wartime measure.

"Board members approved a resolution stating that the budget that will be presented to Congress next month should contain at least the \$45 million that was appropriated for the program during the current year. Consideration should be given to increasing the amount available for construction, they said.

"The Federal Government now makes the grants under a 1956 law providing an incentive for communities to build sewage treatment facilities by contributing up to 30 percent of the cost. The law calls for a 10-year program and authorizes up to \$50 million a year.

"Board members estimated a need of \$70 to \$75 million each year in Federal grants to bring community participation up to a satisfactory level."

I hope you gentlemen will act favorably on the Blatnik bill—H.R. 3610—sent to you some weeks ago by the U.S. House of Representatives. It is definitely in the national interest and our Nation's people need this broadened and improved legislation which touches a subject and a problem so vital to all citizens of the towns and cities of the several States.

State Department Trades Principles for Arab Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I am pleased to submit an article from the Minneapolis Star quoting from the American Jewish World, published by L. H. Frisch, in Minneapolis, which commends the New York State Supreme Court on a recent decision affecting em-

ployment practices of Aramco—Arabian-American Oil Co.

It is well to know that there is evidence of such widespread approval of this decision. Let us hope that we can look forward to the time when such litigation will no longer be necessary.

The article follows:

STATE DEPARTMENT TRADES PRINCIPLES FOR ARAB OIL

The American Jewish World, published by L. H. Frisch, commented editorially this week on the Aramco court decision:

The New York State Supreme Court decision in the case of Aramco (Arabian-American Oil Co.) will, we trust, be but a first step in a long overdue process of taking stock to determine the moral price the American people have paid for the private profits of Aramco.

The court held that Aramco could not be exempted from obeying the law of the State of New York which bans asking job applicants about their religion, a practice which the Aramco officers followed in order to comply with Saudi Arabian barriers against Jews.

"Aramco," the New York Supreme Court ruled, "cannot defy the declared public policy of New York State and violate its statute within the State, no matter what the King of Saudi Arabia says. . . . The Constitution and laws of New York State cannot be cast aside to protect the oil profits of Aramco."

The full moral tragedy of the situation is that our own State Department has tried to bring pressure on the chairman of the New York State Commission Against Discrimination to exempt Aramco from obeying the New York law. For has not the State Department paid with the American conscience and historic principles for Arabian oil? Why should not the State of New York pay a similar price?

One has but to read the record of the U.S. Congress and of the resolutions of both major political parties in 1912 and 1913 in connection with the United States-Russian treaty, to realize what a demoralizing sellout of American principles the present State Department policy represents. At that time, urged by resolutions in both Houses of Congress, the United States abrogated its treaty with Russia because of Czarist religious discrimination against Jewish citizens of the United States visiting that country.

What price must the American people pay ultimately for the private pockets of Aramco? Has this sacrifice of American principles enhanced respect for our Government abroad? Has it inspired any peoples to greater trust in us?

It is time indeed that a congressional committee begin a study of the activities of Aramco and its ramifications in the formation of our policy in the Middle East.

Rightabout-Face

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, Mr. William R. Conlin, editor of the Sacramento Union, has emphasized a point which I think merits the attention of the Members of the Congress. In an editorial of Thursday, July 30, Mr. Conlin points out that the selection of Miss Japan as

Miss Universe has a significance which may be overlooked. He recalls the anti-Japanese sentiment during World War II days and comments on the great strides that have been made since the conclusion of the war in the interest of true democracy. As he says, "this reversal of feeling is but proof of the ultimate sanity that underlies most of the world's irrational conduct."

This action comes at a time when we have the honor of welcoming to the Congress of the United States the first Congressman of Japanese ancestry, DANIEL INOUE, the new Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Hawaii.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIGHTABOUT-FACE

The selection of Miss Japan as Miss Universe, plus the selection being made in California, where the anti-Japanese fever of World War II days reached something of fever heat, is an object lesson in the fallaciousness of fever heat judgments.

Nobody could have told a Californian during the war that this State, in 1959, would see such a complete reversal of feeling toward anybody who had anything to do with Japan.

Yet this reversal of feeling is but proof of the ultimate sanity that underlies most of the world's irrational conduct. It is this foundation of sanity that has kept the world going in spite of its insane moments.

By the same token, few in America would have predicted, during the course of our fight with Japan, that Japan today would be our principal ally in the Pacific. Yet this is so.

We salute Miss Universe of 1959. She is a beautiful and gracious lady.

My True Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to insert in the RECORD one of the winning scripts in the My True Security contest annually sponsored by the National Junior Chamber of Commerce among the high school students.

I attended the dinner at which the awards were made to the winners in this contest, and I was particularly impressed with the thoughtfulness of these young people's talks. I offer that made by John R. Williams of Central High School, Fargo, N. Dak.:

To me, security is a dirty word. I do not seek it and would not accept it were it offered me. Unlike so many of my fellows, I am searching for something better than what I presently have. Unlike many young people today, I wish to be the master of my own fate, the captain of my own soul. I cannot and will not blindly follow the herd plodding blissfully toward an uncertain goal in the comfortable rut of mediocrity which so typifies security.

Today Americans are eagerly searching for security. If and when they find it, man will be able to count the remaining days of our civilization on the fingers of his two hands. This great Nation and the way of life it has come to represent were not created by men seeking security. They were hammered and chopped and carved and dug and plowed out of the wilderness by steelhearted men who sought but one thing—opportunity.

For 7,000 years mankind groped in the darkness; then in 1776 a new nation was born, and the people of the earth knew that at last they had found the promised land. There was no security here, and everyone knew it—yet from all corners of the earth they streamed to America—the land of opportunity.

When America's early pioneers first set their eyes to the west they had only their two hands and the soil. There was no TVA out there, no social security, no minimum wage—there was only freedom, but that was enough. Some failed again and yet again to succeed, so there was poverty, too. But every man was free to rise just as high as his own feet could carry him, and because his success or failure was determined solely by his own abilities and willingness to work, he realized the only true security possible in a government of, by, and for the people. Our forefathers knew that there is no short cut to the promised land, and it is time their descendants were becoming aware of the fact also.

There is, to my way of thinking, but one hope for the preservation of civilization as we know it—that mankind learn once more the beauty and dignity of honest labor. Business men, farmers, and laborers alike must learn to solve their own economic problems instead of running, hat in hand, to Uncle Sam. They must realize that the mad merry-go-round of bread and circuses—all in the name of security—will destroy this Republic just as surely as it destroyed ancient Rome. There is very little security in a grave. It is time for Americans to realize that the best kind of security is insecurity, and that hard work is not only the best thing for them, but is in fact the hope of the world.

East Texas Editor Man of Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, outstanding ability as a newspaper editor, coupled with a deep devotion to civic, education, and religious responsibilities have brought many honors to Ellie Hopkins, vice president of the Longview News Co., and editor in chief of all Carl L. Estes publications.

The most recent of these honors was designation of this outstanding Texan and American as August Man of the Month by the East Texas Chamber of Commerce.

In recognition of this commendation, I ask unanimous consent that an article from a recent issue of the Marshall (Tex.) News-Messenger, relating to Mr. Hopkins' many achievements, be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EAST TEXAS EDITOR MAN OF THE MONTH

LONGVIEW.—"It has been my observation that a newspaper can either sleep with a town or spur it to progress by an alert and aggressive editorial policy."

This philosophy, coupled with a devotion for civic, educational and church responsibilities, has made the name of Ellie Hopkins outstanding, locally and nationally.

As vice president of Longview News Co., and editor in chief of all Carl L. Estes publications, the August Man of the Month has brought renown to himself and to the newspapers he edits.

FIVE-TIME WINNER

Five times in the past 7 years his editorial writing has won the George Washington Honor Medal of the Freedoms Foundation in national competition for distinguished contribution to better understanding of the American way of life. His editorials have won four first place Texas Press Association plaques. In 1957 he received the annual press award of the Baptist General Convention of Texas for his contribution to religious and church news writing.

REARED AT HALLSVILLE

Born in Meridian, Miss., Ellie Hopkins moved to Hallsville, at the age of 5, and was brought up there. After graduation from East Texas Baptist College at Marshall, he started his newspaper career in 1928 with the Marshall News Messenger. After a year with the Jefferson Daily Journal, he joined the Longview News-Journal in 1930. He served as general reporter, agricultural editor, oil editor, city and telegraph editor, and managing editor. He was named editor in chief in 1945 and became vice president 2 years ago.

A member of State and national press groups, Mr. Hopkins is also on the board of directors of Lone Star Steel Co. He is a member of the President's Committee on Physically Handicapped, past president of the Longview Rotary Club, charter member and two-term director of the Association of Petroleum Writers and formerly served on the Citizens Advisory Committee of Longview's City Plan Commission.

ON CHURCH BOARD

A member of the First Baptist Church's board of deacons for 12 years, he has been general superintendent of the Sunday school for 11 years. Mr. Hopkins has been a training union officer for 15 years and has sung in the choir 30 years.

Mr. and Mrs. Hopkins are the parents of two children—Mrs. James Quillen of Tulsa and Jack Hall, age 6.

Educational Television Legislation:
Alabama Points the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, of all the States in the Union, Alabama has pointed the way in taking advantage of the fresh opportunities to improve the quality of American education afforded by a statewide educational television network. Indeed, Alabama's success in this field is perhaps the best argument for the enactment of the Magnuson educational television bill, S. 12, which has already passed the other body and is now

awaiting action before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A recent UPI dispatch from Birmingham which appeared in the New York Times told the Alabama educational television story in graphic terms. I am placing this report in the RECORD today to underscore the great challenge and opportunity afforded the Congress by this legislation:

ALABAMA EXTOLLS EDUCATION BY TV—2-YEAR SYSTEM IS ALSO HELD SUCCESSFUL IN OVERCOMING SHORTAGE OF TEACHERS

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.—For less than the cost of one network spectacular, Alabama is instructing about 61,000 of its boys and girls through the medium of television.

The end of the 1958-59 school term marks the completion of 2 years of a full-schedule curriculum beamed into classrooms under authorization of the State board of education.

Supporters of the system assert that it is the best answer at present to the critical shortage of teachers.

"One person teaching via television can instruct 5,000 classrooms," said Raymond D. Hurlburt, general manager of the Alabama educational TV network, the only such statewide system in the Nation.

Educational television in Alabama was launched little more than 5 years ago with a \$500,000 grant from the State legislature. The first telecasts came a year and a half later.

Since the establishment of channel 7 as an educational TV outlet, two other channels, 2 and 10, have been added with the result that 70 percent of the State receives TV school programs.

There are three studios: in Birmingham, at the University of Alabama in Tuscaloosa and at the Alabama Polytechnic Institute in Auburn. The State has invested \$1,500,000 in capital outlay, including eight towers and relays.

The network has about seven cameras and transmits 65 hours of programming a week during the school year, 80 percent of it live.

Equipment valued at \$200,000 was donated by Storer Broadcasting. In addition, Mr. Hurlburt said, "We receive about \$100,000 a year from the Ford Foundation and \$80-\$85,000 each for programming out of Alabama and A.P.I. from the State. The ETV commission also receives \$200,000 a year.

That adds up to about \$460,000 annually—a cheap price, Mr. Hurlburt believes, for helping to alleviate the shortage of trained instructors. He would like to see the network expanded so that it could serve the entire State.

Besides partly relieving the teacher's shortage, Mr. Hurlburt said, educational television helps to meet another critical shortcoming of Alabama's schools.

"Many of our schools are unaccredited. Often this is due to the fact that such subjects as physics and chemistry are not being taught by adequately prepared teachers," he said. Educational television overcomes that lack.

A sample of a day's schedule this spring included Spanish, physics, chemistry, civics, Latin, and biology during the daytime and three college credit courses at night—advanced physics, French, and psychology.

Other subjects offered for the home viewer included farm programs, sculpture, flower arranging, public speaking, a review of Russian literature, and classical music. There was also an in-school science refresher for junior high school teachers.

REVOLUTION IN TEACHING SEEN

Mr. Hurlburt foresees a revolution in the method of school instruction by means of television.

"Almost universally, our formal education has been based on the theory that we must furnish a student's mind with a wide variety and a great number of facts on the off-chance that he may need them in later life," he said.

"Educational television can enable the student to work independently. It can widen his educational opportunities by providing courses when he feels the need for them—whether the need be to increase his efficiency, understanding or just his enjoyment of life."

The TV instruction is the best available in the State. The faculty includes:

Dr. Robert Brown, dean of chemistry at the University of Alabama, and Prof. Charlotte Ward of Alabama Polytechnic Institute, who teaches 12,000 children weekly in upper elementary science.

The network has drawn favorable comment from educators throughout Alabama and has been described as a model for other States interested in adopting television as a means of teaching their booming school populations.

The Triumph of TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the August 1, 1959, issue of the Nation carried an editorial and a news article pertaining to the Tennessee Valley Authority. The editorial pointed out that the success of the TVA experiment is incontestable and has become one of the rare unarguable facts of American politics.

The news article was written by the distinguished newspaperman, Lloyd Armour, of the Nashville Tennessean, and deserves the attention of all Members of the Congress and, indeed, the American public. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SUCCESS WE DON'T REPEAT

Is the TVA yardstick principle obsolete? The moment TVA challenged the identical bids of American manufacturers of electrical equipment by making awards to European low bidders, the industry miraculously ordered a 15-percent reduction in the prices of large turbine generators. And in other respects as well TVA has more than fulfilled its brilliant initial promise. Today the success of the TVA "experiment" is incontestable—one of the rare unarguable facts of American politics. From every quarter of the world, engineers and social planners flock to the Tennessee Valley to marvel and, ultimately, to imitate. Why, then are we so reluctant to repeat a success of this magnitude? Why has TVA remained the sole river valley authority?

To be sure, a nagging Republican opposition persists and the private power lobby is still vocal; for the last 4 years TVA has been unable to expand facilities to meet new demands. But a giant can afford to be magnanimous and a new bill offers substantial concessions to the critics of TVA. It would regularize TVA's finances by making it possible for the agency to finance new power installations by the issuance of revenue

bonds which would not be tax-exempt. No longer would Congress appropriate funds for new generating facilities. It would also limit the area to be served by the project. But even if the President signs the bill—there has been talk of a veto—it will not mean that we have at last learned the lesson of TVA. The TVA idea may be copied in Egypt but not in Oregon and Washington; TVA has spawned progeny on the Nile, the Euphrates and the Zambezi but not on the Rio Grande, the Missouri, the Colorado, or the Columbia. And for this the old-line operating agencies in Washington, such as the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, rather than the power lobby, are primarily responsible.

Under Democratic administrations as under Republican, under liberal as under conservative leadership in the Department of the Interior and other departments directly concerned, the empire builders of the old-line agencies, with their fears and vested interests and powerful connections have continued to block the river valley proposals. TVA itself cannot be handcuffed; the giant continues to work night and day and will now be permitted to expand to meet its area's new demands for power, which increase at a rate of about 12 percent each year. But those servants of the people, the bureaucrats of the old-line agencies, will not permit the same idea to be applied elsewhere. In a democracy the ultimate power is the bureaucratic.

TVA: THE UNLEARNED LESSON (By Lloyd Armour)

NASHVILLE, TENN.—Twenty-six years separate the historic legislation creating the Tennessee Valley Authority from the latest important TVA measure: a new method of financing the continuing work of the agency. In that time, a new generation has grown up without knowing what it was like in the days before TVA. And an older generation has had time to forget.

This is a fitting time, then, for a new look at the reality of a dream, at an experiment that has become a \$2 billion going concern. How does it justify its costs to its owners, the people of the United States? What has it done for the people of the Tennessee Valley? Is it creeping socialism, as some have claimed, or is it democracy on the march, as others describe it? Does the valley use the agency as a lure to uproot industry elsewhere? Does TVA steal pennies from the pockets of taxpayers elsewhere to subsidize cheap power? Does it build steamplants as an excuse for continuing its work, now that the task or developing a river is all but complete?

These are some of the questions raised by a continuing barrage of criticism against TVA. For the answers, it is necessary first to go back, briefly, beyond the TVA era to some farsighted statesmen such as Theodore Roosevelt, Gifford Pinchot and Senator George Norris. These were men who pondered long about ways of conserving and developing the nation's resources. From their thinking, and that of others, emerged the concept of total development of river valleys. In the depression years, a small band of men in Congress began a long fight for such an experiment in the Tennessee Valley.

From almost any standpoint, the choice was an excellent one. The South as a whole was underdeveloped, and it was labeled by some as the Nation's No. 1 economic problem; and in the South, no region presented a greater problem than did that valley washed by the deceptively passive Tennessee River. For each spring, this sleeping tiger awoke and became a roaring, rampaging flood. Residents fled in terror to the high ground as the water swept away crops, homes and land. Millions upon millions of

tons of topsoil vanished in hours. Businesses were wiped out, and with them sources of taxation.

The region depended upon a one-crop economy. Balance in agriculture was a phrase of the professors. There was little industry and much poverty. Malaria, tuberculosis and malnutrition left their marks upon the people and the burial places.

But the sickness that sapped the region most was one for which no doctor could prescribe. It was the sickness of fear. There was fear of the river, fear of the land that produced less and less. There was fear of the future. And in the beginning there was fear of TVA.

But the building of dams meant jobs and a flow of money. As the mighty dams took shape, hope rose. There was a new look about the land. Ears began to listen to what the experts of the fledgling TVA had to say. Eyes began to see help, as in mosquito control. There were specialists looking at the land, testing it and finding the need for fertilizers of a particular type. Since the type wasn't being produced, TVA began to make it.

Quickly, the valley learned something about the TVA: It would help, but there had to be cooperation. Soon the valley farmers, guided by their extension services and county agents, began to apply lime and phosphates to jaded land in the first of many, many thousands of farm-test demonstrations. They began to learn about soil needs, about contour plowing, about the importance of trees as windbreaks and erosion curbs. In a few seasons, the barren, soil-scaped hillsides were green, the valleys below them lush.

As research and production details were worked out and TVA-born fertilizers developed fully, the agency turned over its data and its processes to private industry—free of charge. In addition, industry got another gift—a ready-made market. Since research, introduction and promotion of any new fertilizer is costly, the industry moved slowly. But here TVA was doing the whole job with its research, demonstration plots, fertilizer schools and educational programs for the farmer.

Today, the farmer in Wyoming or New York, as well as in Tennessee, benefits by the TVA fertilizer program (which is paid for by appropriations from Congress). Minnesota farmers saved almost \$750,000 from 1949 to 1954 by using TVA-developed and promoted "4-16-16" and "5-20-20" fertilizers.

It may be noted here that a chemical paradox—the fact that nitrogen is both a life-giving plant food and an ingredient of powerful explosives—makes it possible to turn the TVA fertilizer development center from peacetime to wartime use in a day.

As TVA was helping to promote a new and more productive farm economy, it was also having an effect on commerce and navigation. The series of high dams which canalize the Tennessee created a long, deep waterway over which freight traffic moved in increasing tonnage. Tows hauled automobiles from the industrial North to the Alabama plains, saving more than \$10 a car. Ferro-alloys moved from Muscle Shoals, Ala., to Pittsburgh \$5 a ton cheaper.

What does this mean to shippers? On 12.1 million tons of traffic in 1958, they saved more than \$24 million. Deducting the annual cost of the waterway—\$4.2 million—there was a net transportation benefit of \$19.8 million. This is a 14.5 percent return on the \$136 million net investment in a navigation system which contributes to inter-regional commerce and strengthens the whole Nation.

It is axiomatic that navigation development and industrial growth go hand in hand. Since 1933, private industry has invested nearly a billion dollars in more than

130 terminals and plants along the river. All in all, more than 3,000 new industries have come to the TVA region.

This growth has promoted many critics of the agency to raise cries of "industry piracy" on the part of the valley. But the vast majority of new plants represent branches and subsidiary operations of industry which still have their headquarters elsewhere. In a recent survey by TVA, it was found that during a 19-year period only 25 plants pulled up roots elsewhere and relocated in the TVA area. During this time, nine such larger plants left the region. The 25 incoming plants represented 3,800 jobs, the 9 outgoing, 2,000: net gain for the valley, 1,800 jobs.

The truth is that while industrialization in the valley has been rapid, it has lagged behind the Nation as a whole, and the cry of "industrial piracy" is absurd.

Originally, cheap electric power was considered among the less-important objectives of TVA. It was viewed merely as a byproduct of river control that would allow for increased rural electrification and encourage a moderate expansion of industry. But with the coming of World War II, the picture changed. A secret installation known as Oak Ridge needed power in enormous quantities. Opportunities for increasing hydro-power were limited: new dams might justify their costs in power terms, but not, at the time, in other ways. Besides, a huge dam is not an overnight project. In 1940, TVA turned to a much quicker method of adding to generating capacity: the steam plant. First to be built was the Watts Bar plant, with a capacity of 240,000 kilowatts.

After World War II, and with the beginning of the Korean conflict, it became increasingly clear that more sources of quick power were needed. Not only were farms, homes, and factories demanding more current, but entirely new energy-devouring installations were entering the area: atomic-energy plants, the Arnold Engineering Development Center and the Redstone Arsenal, where the Army was building missiles.

By fiscal 1958, the atomic-energy plants and other Federal defense agencies in the area were using 51 percent of all TVA power—more than 29 billion kilowatt-hours. This is more power than was sold last year in any of the States outside the valley except four.

So TVA became a defense weapon. But it had an extra meaning for taxpayers in that it provided very large savings on the Government's electric bill. Perhaps this will show how much:

From 1953 to 1958, TVA delivered 129.8 billion kilowatt-hours of power to Oak Ridge and Paducah, Ky., atomic facilities. This cost the Government \$590 million. If there had been a 1-mill-per-kilowatt-hour increase in this cost, the bill would have been \$130 million more—the cost of the U.S. share of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Now compare the average cost of producing and marketing electric power by TVA with that of privately owned utilities. Last year, the operating cost for TVA was 5.21 mills per kilowatt-hour; the corresponding cost of privately owned utilities was about 10.09 mills. At that rate, the Government's \$590 million electric bill would have been almost doubled.

But, say the private utilities, TVA doesn't pay taxes. It's a subsidized operation. True, TVA doesn't pay taxes in name, but it makes payments to State and local governments in lieu of taxes. In 1958, these payments (from TVA and its distributors) totaled \$13,751,000. Excluding Federal agencies, about 6.3 percent of the electric bill of all TVA consumers was paid to State and local governments. Corresponding taxes of private utilities in neighboring areas ranged from 5.1 percent to 11.8 percent.

In addition, the law requires TVA to repay to the Treasury, from its power revenues, the entire investment in each power facility within 40 years. To date, payments of \$250 million put the agency well ahead of schedule. The payments exceed the entire Federal investment in the first 13 dams TVA built.

There are other money savings involved. Millions of electricity users in other parts of the Nation are paying lower electric bills because of TVA's rate policies—the so-called yardstick of power. Electric rates, according to Federal Power Commission data, are lowest in the TVA and Bonneville areas, and grow progressively higher as the distance from these public-power facilities increases. Before TVA, rates in a semicircle through parts of Texas, Oklahoma, Iowa, Michigan, and New York were \$10.08 for each 250 kilowatt-hours. In 1958, rates for the same area averaged \$7.10.

The power companies nearest the Tennessee Valley have made the greatest reductions in retail rates. Nevertheless, their earnings have increased at a rate substantially greater than the average of all the large utilities in the Nation. From 1937 to 1957, according to published Federal Power Commission figures, earnings available to the common stockholders of the larger privately owned utilities multiplied three and one-quarter times; similar earnings of companies bordering the TVA increased eight times.

So much for power. To many people, a more important objective of TVA is flood control. The Valley is now protected by ten major multiple-purpose dams providing 6 million acre-feet of storage for floodwaters.

Were there no TVA dams, a flood stage of 57.9 feet in the Tennessee River today would cause \$100 million in damage to low-lying Chattanooga. The total estimated annual average value of flood regulation by the reservoir system is \$11 million. Over 26 years, this annual sum more than equals the annual cost and total investment combined of the system's flood-control facilities.

TVA's extensive experience in mapping, advising and aiding in engineering studies of flood control is being put to work in many sections of the country. One of the agency's special interests now is the tributary watershed program—away from the rivers, back among the creeks and branches where flooding is also destructive, though less so than on the rivers. This program seeks to establish ways by which, under State leadership, communities can organize themselves, study their problems and apply solutions through their own agencies and their own resources.

Critics charge that the citizens of the valley are the helpless victims of an autocratic project. How well have these helpless victims done with the help of the TVA? In 1933, only 3.4 percent of the total Federal income tax collections came from the seven States of the TVA region. By 1958, the percentage had more than doubled. From 1933 to 1956, total collections amounted to \$21,900 million. If we assume a rate of gain based on the 1933 percentage, TVA has meant an extra \$10 billion in Federal tax revenues—almost five times the entire cost of the project.

At the same time, the valley has become a vast market for goods produced outside. From 1934 to 1958, TVA alone purchased \$1.1 billion worth of outside goods. Users of TVA power spent \$1.8 billion for electrical appliances. Still another billion has been spent on automobiles, boats, motors and other products.

These figures should not lead anyone to envision the valley as more prosperous than any other section of the Nation. It is far from that. It lags the national averages in almost all economic measurements.

Twenty-five years ago the per capita income was only 45 percent of the national average; despite a sizable gain, it is only 63 percent today.

There is a great deal yet unaccomplished. The balance between agriculture and industry is short on the industry side. Too great a portion of the region's youth leaves each year because there are not enough jobs. Farms are too small and too many. An estimated 2.7 million acres need to be reforested.

The demand for electricity is growing at a rate of 800,000 kilowatts a year. People are just naturally using more power—the air conditioner, for example, is a big sales item where it once was a rarity. Business expansions, new industry, demand more—and the valley must have these if it is to continue to progress.

So TVA must have new funds merely to keep abreast of demand. That is why its supporters have fought for a self-financing measure (a method, incidentally, first suggested by the Eisenhower administration). TVA will be lucky if the \$750 million made available by the latest TVA legislation can adequately provide for needed facilities in the Valley. The pattern of progress has been set, and there can be no slackening off without harm to the region.

The great irony of TVA is that its value is given more recognition abroad than in the United States. It is the one great American project that draws a steady stream of potentates, students, engineers, and politicians from every corner of the globe. It is the one great idea we have exported with success. Eight foreign countries now have big projects based on TVA—countries ranging from India to tiny Lebanon.

Efforts have been made to establish TVA-type authorities in the valleys of other American rivers: the Missouri, Rio Grande, Colorado. A new Columbia Valley Authority bill—the Neuberger bill—is before Congress. None of these efforts has thus far succeeded.

The TVA was an experiment at a time of national economic distress when the public was receptive to daring innovations. The electric utility interests, natural enemies of such an enterprise, were themselves in trouble. These interests, reviving, have since fought the spread of the TVA idea with a rising fear. While keeping TVA under carping attack, they have sown widely and nurtured well a confusion that restrains the people of other sections from emulating a valley program that is, nevertheless, the outstanding example of a people's ability to make the most of a natural environment.

In Support of the Taxpayers' Right To Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, during its recent consideration of the mutual security appropriation bill, this House took notice of the frequent resistance of the executive branch to compliance with requests of the committees of Congress, and of the Comptroller General, as agent of the Congress, for information necessary to a proper appraisal of the operations of programs authorized and appropriated for by the people's representatives in the Congress.

In providing funds for foreign aid operations during the current fiscal year, the House properly required that agencies and departments disbursing these funds comply within 20 days with the Comptroller General's legitimate requests for data, or suffer suspension of the appropriation provided. Action came on the amendment offered by my distinguished Virginia colleague, the Honorable PORTER HARDY, who has been performing an outstanding service to the taxpayers through his diligent and revealing work as chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs of the House Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include editorial comment on the Hardy amendment which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on July 30, 1959:

ACCOUNTING TO THE PUBLIC

In passing the foreign aid bill, the House adopted an antiseptic amendment that strikes us as very much in the public interest. The amendment will not cure, by any means, all that is wrong with the foreign aid program, but it certainly will make the sort of secrecy that has plagued aid spending unpopular even among the spenders.

The amendment accomplishes that by the simple device of saying, "speak up, or else." Where Congress or the General Accounting Office calls for records or reports on what is going on with American taxpayers' funds in Laos, say, the International Cooperation Administration will either comply or that particular aid program will cease until ICA does comply.

The amendment will be fought quite bitterly, and the battle lines are drawn; already it is being called a stumbling block to our mutual security program. That argument, it seems to us, is easily disposed of, for if there is any mutual security in the spending of dollars, itself a debatable point, certainly our security will be benefited more by seeing that there is as little waste and inefficiency as possible in the spending. And that is the aim and purpose of the amendment.

But another argument is being advanced against it, too, and that one is that the amendment is an attack on executive privilege—an asserted power of the executive branch to withhold papers from the Congress, but a power, be it noted, that has never been constitutionally tested in the Federal courts.

But whether the privilege is a constitutional right or an assumed right based on no more than the hesitancy of Congress to test the claims is beside the point; the point is that the International Cooperation Administration is a creature of the Congress, the money it spends is appropriated from the public purse by Congress, and when Congress demands an accounting from its stewards of how the money is spent, Congress has a right to that accounting.

The administrators of foreign aid have refused in the past to cooperate with Congress when it seeks information on various projects. One reason is pretty plain; nobody in ICA wants Congress or the public to know how some of the foolish projects ICA engages in turn out—such as the sawmill that couldn't be used overseas and remained parked on the beach because nobody could get it to the timber because the bridges weren't strong enough to hold it. Nobody had thought to check on the bridges before sending the sawmill out.

That is the sort of serio-comic aid that the amendment lifting the lid on foreign aid secrecy might well discourage. Indeed, to argue against the right of Congress to check

on ICA—or any of the other bureaus it has created and supports—is quite likely to become, in the public mind, an argument in support of waste and inefficiency which the secrecy hides.

It would be well, we think, for the Senators to realize that, too, when the bill comes before them. For no matter how one cares to argue, in the end the argument comes down to this: Why should anybody object to an accounting to the public where the public purse is concerned?

Texas Newspapers Expand To Handle Surge in Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is no secret that my State of Texas possesses many resources of great value. Among the most valuable is the daily press.

The value of this asset is unique in that it is truly worth more to the people of Texas than it is to the owners of the newspapers. The chief benefits of a good newspaper extend to society as a whole.

Texas newspapers are growing bigger and better. They are spending this year more than \$10 million for new and expanded plants and machinery, according to Phil North of Fort Worth, president of the Texas Daily Newspaper Association.

Details of this expansion were carried in a recent Associated Press story. I ask unanimous consent that this story be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXAS NEWSPAPERS EXPAND TO HANDLE SURGE IN BUSINESS

FORT WORTH, TEX.—Texas newspapers are pouring more than \$10 million into new and expanded plants and machinery in 1959, to handle their biggest year's business and prepare for a still larger year in 1960.

This was reported Sunday by Phil North, president of the Texas Daily Newspaper Association as the TDNA prepared to hold its annual summer convention in Fort Worth, August 2-4.

"Growth of Texas population and business, accelerated sales campaigns on both the advertising and circulation fronts and the vastly increased use of newspaper color are the factors behind the surge in current newspaper growth," North, vice president of the Fort Worth Star-Telegram said.

He added:

"To ready themselves for the quality and quantity demands of the 1960s, the daily press, through the TDNA as well as individually, have expanded their research and educational programs.

"Within the past month, newspapers and Texas job printers have created a \$75,000 scholarship trust fund for the Southwest School of Printing at Sam Houston State Teachers College at Huntsville and started a program to make it one of the three top printing schools in the Nation and the finest west of the Mississippi."

The summer conference of the TDNA at the Western Hills Hotel in August will cover all phases of the newspaper industry.

A feature of the program on August 3 will be a panel discussion of the "New Editorial Mission of Newspapers." Men on the panel will include Tommie Call of the Corpus Christi Caller-Times; Tom Simmons of the Dallas Morning News; Jack Butler of the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, and Walter Humphrey of the Fort Worth Press.

On August 4, James B. Barnett of the Wichita Falls Record-News and Times will preside at a general session at which several subjects will be discussed.

Dr. Irby B. Carruth, superintendent of Austin public schools will make a report on the "Newspaper in the Classroom" program which is sponsored by the TDNA. In this program, daily newspapers are used as a regular and continuing classroom aid in the education of schoolchildren.

Dr. Albert Frey, professor of marketing at the Tuck School of Business Administration, Hanover, N.H., a consultant to General Motors and Procter & Gamble and a nationally recognized authority on advertiser agency media relationships, will make a special report.

Another report will be given by Steve Mahoney, president of Burke, Kuiper & Mahoney, national newspaper representatives in New York City.

John Murphy, executive secretary of the TDNA, said a large attendance is expected at the Fort Worth meeting, due to the importance of the program.

Murphy said "the stability and vigor of the Texas daily newspaper industry and the importance of the daily newspaper as the No. 1 news and advertising medium for Texans is evident in the fact that since 1950 the circulation of the State's dailies has increased from 2,277,000 to 2,800,000.

"This means there are 1,192,000 more Texans reading a daily newspaper today than in 1950," Murphy said.

He pointed out that new plants for newspapers were opened this year at Lubbock, Midland, and Lufkin.

Murphy added:

"Few Texans realize the daily newspaper industry is one of the State's major employers with 10,860 men and women employees whose average annual wages are the second highest of any industry.

"Though the recently established Institute of Public Affairs Reporting at the University of Texas School of Journalism, to which Texas daily newspaper publishers have granted \$100,000, the field of writing and reporting the news and matters of government will get new attention. Through the work of the Institute, newspaper writers will have an opportunity to do research, to study government and improve their analysis and reporting of public affairs to the Texas daily newspaper audience."

Murphy said that through the Texas Daily Newspaper Association, publishers are carrying on a vigorous program of work to improve the news and advertising functions of the daily newspaper.

A continuing program of news seminars is held at the University of Texas, he said. These seminars are sponsored by the TDNA and directed by Humphrey. The TDNA also sponsors advertising sales seminars.

"The Texas-Louisiana markets and media research program, sponsored by 24 newspapers in 16 markets, now is in its 4th year," Murphy said. "Through its research, newspapers keep constant check on the size and characteristics of newspaper audiences and their motivations.

"Through this research, TDNA members feel they have convincing facts, independently researched, to prove the daily newspaper audience is the largest, the most constant and the highest quality of any mass medium."

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the body of the RECORD two papers prepared at the Library of Congress by the distinguished specialist in industrial relations, Sar A. Levitan.

Both papers are of importance to the debate on the labor which which, hopefully will come to the floor this week. They deal with "Restrictions on Organizational and Recognition Picketing" and "Hot Cargo Provisions."

The papers follow:

RESTRICTIONS ON ORGANIZATIONAL AND RECOGNITION PICKETING (S. 1555 (SEC. 708) AND H.R. 8342 (SEC. 705(a)))

(By Sar A. Levitan, specialist in industrial relations, Economics Division, July 24, 1959)

PROVISIONS OF AMENDMENT

S. 1555, as approved by the Senate, and H.R. 8342, as reported by the House Committee on Education and Labor, provide that some aspects of organizational and recognition picketing be made an unfair labor practice under the Taft-Hartley Act (sec. 8(b)).

The proposed new unfair labor practice would prohibit a union from picketing or threatening to picket an establishment for the purpose of requiring an employer to recognize or bargain with the union or requiring the employees to select the union as their representative in collective bargaining under the following conditions:

(1) The employer has already recognized another union and National Labor Relations Board regulations ban (sec. 9(c)) a new union from challenging the rights of the recognized union to represent the employees; or

(2) A valid election has been held within the preceding 9 months and the union has been rejected by the majority of the employees in the bargaining unit.

This provision puts a limited ban on organizational and recognition picketing. Organizational picketing refers, generally, to attempts by a union to persuade employees of the desirability of union representation. Recognition picketing is aimed at gaining union recognition by exercising economic pressure upon the employer without regard to the wishes of the employees. In actual practice, the line of demarcation between the two types of picketing is frequently not too clear. In most cases it is quite apparent in either type of picketing that the union does not have the support of the majority of the employees in the establishment.

PRESENT LAW

The Taft-Hartley Act requires an employer to bargain with a union representing a majority of the employees, even if the union has not been certified by the NLRB. Under present law, this does not prevent a stranger union from picketing the premises of the employer. The proposed amendment would eliminate this practice.

Employers may also be harassed by union picketing even if the union loses a representative election. The NLRB has held that picketing by a union after it had lost an election constitutes an unfair labor practice. It reasoned that continued picketing in such a case by the union was an unlawful attempt to force the employer to recognize a union

rejected by the majority of the employees. In addition, the Board also ruled that the picketing in this instance constituted an unlawful coercion of the employees who would be affected by the union action.

The Board concluded:

There can be no more direct deprivation of the employees' freedom of choice than to impose upon them a collective bargaining agent they have not chosen or have expressly rejected. (*Curtis Brothers*, 119 NLRB, No. 33 (1957)).

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia rejected the NLRB decision. The court held that a minority union cannot be held in violation of Taft-Hartley by engaging in peaceful picketing when no majority union has been certified by the Board (43 LRRM 2156 (1958)).

Pro and con arguments

Those who favor these proposals argue that the picketing ban contained in S. 1555 would protect employers and employees from continuous coercion by unions which do not represent the majority of the employees. They point out that this ban on picketing is a reasonable recognition of the employees' desire and does not represent an abridgement of freedom of speech by the union to persuade the employees to join the picketing union.

The law, this argument goes on, provides an orderly procedure under which unions can gain recognition. The prohibition on picketing would still permit the union to distribute hand bills, and directly approach employees to persuade them to join the union. If the union organizational efforts are successful, it can petition an election within 9 months or attempt to replace the recognized union in accordance with NLRB regulations when the recognized union can be challenged. Moreover, under the Taft-Hartley Act 30 percent of the employees in a collective bargaining unit may petition the Board to decertify the union recognized by the employer.

Criticism of the limited restrictions on organizational and recognition picketing contained in section 708(c) of S. 1555 and 705(a) of H.R. 8342 comes from two diverse sources. Advocates of a stronger and more inclusive ban assert that the proposed provisions do not meet the problem of blackmail picketing, a term popularized by Secretary of Labor Mitchell in his testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Labor (Feb. 4, 1959, hearings on labor-management reform legislation, pp. 267-269).

The administrator has proposed (S. 748, sec. 504) that minimum effective legislation must ban organizational and recognition picketing in the following situations:

- (1) The employer has recognized any labor organization in accordance with the act and a question concerning representation may not be raised under section 9(c) of the act.
- (2) Within the last preceding 12 months a valid election has been conducted.
- (3) The union cannot establish the existence of sufficient interest on the part of the employees in having it represent them; or
- (4) Picketing has been engaged in for a reasonable period of time and an election under 9(c) has not been conducted.

The Secretary asserted that his proposals are the minimum needed to combat the evil of picketing which has forced employees to join unions contrary to their wish and without receiving any benefits from the union. He cited cases, publicized by the McClellan committee, where unions have exacted what is tantamount to a tribute from employers and employees in the form of dues check-off. Secretary Mitchell said that the "blackmail picketing" ban which he proposed is essential to eliminate the evil practices disclosed by the McClellan committee.

Union spokesmen, on the other hand, have opposed infringements on peaceful picketing. They argue, quoting Supreme Court decisions, that peaceful picketing is "the workman's means of communication" (*Milk Wagon Drivers' Union v. Meadowmoor Dairies*, 312 U.S. 287, 293) and "an exercise of the right of free speech guaranteed by the Federal Constitution" (*Building Service Union v. Gazzam*, 339 U.S. 532, 536). Union spokesmen insist that the nonunion status of any firms is a threat to the welfare of organized labor and the unionization of such a firm is legitimate end of trade union activity.

The unions claim that the incidence of "blackmail picketing" is exaggerated. The real impact of the administration provisions to ban so-called "blackmail picketing" would make it illegal for a union to engage in peaceful picketing to persuade workers to join a union and to reap the benefits that collective bargaining brings to employees.

Specifically, the AFL-CIO has offered the following criticism to the ban on picketing proposed in S. 1555 and H.R. 8342.

(1) The language is too stringent. The mere threat to picket is classified as an unfair labor practice. In practice, the language used in labor-management relations is not always couched in precise legal terms, and categorizing a "threat" as an unfair labor practice leaves union representatives open to charges of committing unfair labor practices which may be contrary to their intentions.

(2) A union may be forced into an election before it has persuaded a majority of the employees to join the union. A loss of the election would break up a union-organizing drive by preventing picketing for 9 months.

HOT CARGO PROVISIONS (S. 1555, SEC. 707, AND H.R. 8342, SEC. 705(A))

(By Sar A. Levitan, specialist in industrial relations, Economics Division, July 27, 1959)

SECONDARY BOYCOTT CONTROVERSY

Section 8(b)(4) (a) of the Taft-Hartley Act contains a broad prohibition against secondary boycotts. The section makes it an unfair labor practice for a labor union to induce or encourage a strike or a concerted refusal * * * to perform any services, where an object thereof is * * * forcing or requiring any employer * * * to cease doing business with any other person.

The meaning of this section has been a source of controversy during the past 12 years since the enactment of Taft-Hartley. Some have claimed that the intent of Congress has been to outlaw all types of secondary boycotts—attempts to influence an employer by exerting economic or other pressures against persons who deal with the employer. Few object to the right of unions representing the majority of employees, to boycott employers with whom the union is engaged in economic conflicts. The objection is raised when a union attempts to cause economic damage to an employer, and indirectly to his employees, with whom the union is not engaged in a direct conflict.

In applying the broad prohibitions of secondary boycott contained in 8(b)(4) (a), the Supreme Court has adopted the position that this prohibition must be interpreted to harmonize "the dual congressional objectives of preserving the right of labor organizations to bring pressure to bear on offending employers in primary labor disputes and of shielding unoffending employers and others from pressure in controversies not their own" (NLRB v. *Denver Trades Council*, 341 U.S. 675, 1951).

ADMINISTRATION PROPOSALS

Advocates of a more stringent ban on secondary boycotts have argued that the present application governing secondary boycotts are inadequate because intolerable economic pressures can be applied by unions without

violating the act. Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell has asserted that the present ban on secondary boycotts is inadequate. He stated that the present law, as enforced, requires that two factors must exist in order for a secondary boycott to be illegal: (1) An objective of the union must be to compel one person to cease doing business with another. (2) The means employed to achieve this objective must be through a strike or inducement of employees to concertedly refuse to perform services.

The bill sponsored by the administration (S. 748, sec. 503) proposed the banning of secondary boycotts in the following situations:

(1) Direct coercion of employers to cease, or agree to cease, doing business with another.

(2) Inducement or encouragement of employees individually to refuse to perform services, and

(3) To include within the scope of the provisions secondary employers who do not come within the act's definition of "employer," such as railroads and municipalities. The section makes clear that those prohibitions do not extend to activities directed at secondary employers performing for a primary employer "farmed out" struck work or those engaged at a common construction site with another employer with whom a lawful labor dispute exists with respect to wages, hours, or other working conditions of employees working at that site.

In defending the proposed secondary boycott provisions before the Senate Subcommittee on Labor, Secretary Mitchell argued that they are necessary in order to curb the power of the Teamsters to coerce employers and employees and to prevent unions from forcing unreasonable demands upon employers not through the ordinary process of collective bargaining but through the use of excessive power.

The Secretary of Labor concluded:

"The effect of this type of secondary activity is no less damaging upon employers and employees and no less contrary to the public interest than is the type of secondary activity presently prohibited by the act." (Senate Subcommittee on Labor-Management Reform Legislation, Feb. 9, 1959, p. 286.)

LABOR OPPOSITION

Naturally the labor spokesmen have objected to further restrictions on secondary boycotts. The union spokesmen have argued that there is a thin line between persuasion and threat and that the administration's proposal would limit the legitimate area of union organization and collective bargaining.

"The refusal to recognize the legitimate purpose of * * * [persuasion] is based on the fiction that there is no distinction between 'good secondary boycott and bad secondary boycott.'" (Senate Subcommittee on Labor, Hearings on Labor-Management Reform Legislation 1959, p. 588.)

The unions assert that the wages and working conditions of union workers in one plant are dependent on conditions in other plants. They, therefore, justify the use of boycott against any employer who jeopardizes established union conditions. A refusal by union employees to work on goods coming from another employer because that employer has sought to avoid union wage scales and working conditions by moving to a new location or simply because he pays "substandard" wages is as legitimate as a refusal to handle struck work. They play down the argument that employers who have no dispute with their own employees should not be victimized by actions of a union with which they have no collective bargaining relations.

PRESENT LAW ON HOT CARGO

S. 1555 (sec. 707) and H.R. 8342 (sec. 705 (a) (1) and (2)) deal with one type of sec-

ondary boycotts—the hot cargo agreements practiced mostly by the Teamsters. A hot-cargo clause in a collective bargaining agreement normally provides that employees will not be required to handle material from or destined for plants where a union is conducting a strike.

National Labor Relations Board application of the Taft-Hartley ban on secondary boycott to hot-cargo clauses has undergone a radical change. A decade ago the Board held that the hot-cargo clause does not constitute a violation of 8(b)(4)(a) and, consequently, action which otherwise would be a violation of 8(b)(4)(a) is made legal by a hot-cargo clause (*Conway Express*, 87 NLRB 972 (1949)).

After a number of modifications, the NLRB in 1957 reversed the earlier decision by declaring that hot-cargo clauses cannot be used by a union as a defense to conduct which would otherwise be a violation of 8(b)(4)(a). In other words, the clause may not be used to induce employees of motor carriers to refuse to handle freight from a struck employer. (*Genuine Parts Company*, 119 NLRB 399 (1957)).

At the same time, the Interstate Commerce Commission held that a common carrier is obligated to accept and transport shipments from a struck company; the common carrier is not relieved of this obligation to provide service to a struck employer by signing a hot-cargo clause in a collective bargaining agreement (*Galveston Truck Line*, 1957, 41 LRRM 139).

The Supreme Court upheld the NLRB decision by ruling that Taft-Hartley Act does not prevent an employer and a union from entering into a hot-cargo agreement. The Court held that the union may not persuade employees to abide by the agreement, though the employer may choose voluntarily to instruct its employees not to handle struck goods. In doing so, a common carrier may be in violation of ICC requirements, but this does not constitute an unfair labor practice under the Taft-Hartley Act. (*Sand Door and Plywood*, 1958, 35 U.S. 93.)

HOT-CARGO PROVISION IN H.R. 8342 AND S. 1555

Both S. 1555 (sec. 707) and H.R. 8342 (sec. 705(a)) ban hot-cargo agreements between a common carrier, covered by the Interstate Commerce Act, and a union. But the House bill adds that this provision does not deny an employee the right to refuse to cross a picket line where an employer is engaged in a primary labor dispute and permits the common carrier and a union to agree that the refusal by the employee to cross a picket line may not cause the discharge of the employee. The application of the present law to this subject has not been sufficiently tested and the current status of the law is unclear. (*Auto Parts Co.*, 107 NLRB 242 (1952) and *Rockaway News*, 345 U.S. 71 (1953)).

Proponents of this provision aver that it will eliminate a major weakness in the present law on secondary boycotts. As long as the retaining of hot-cargo agreements remains legal, common carriers continue to abide by it, even if the unions cannot force the carrier to do so.

To allay fears that the banning of hot-cargo clauses in agreements between carriers and unions would force union members to violate picket lines and act as strikebreakers, the House provision repeats the Taft-Hartley Act provision that employees may not be required to cross picket lines. H.R. 8342 further protects workers who refuse to cross picket lines by providing that a collective bargaining agreement may require a common carrier not to discharge an employee for refusing to cross the picket line.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has charged that the House changes nullify any effect that the Senate ban on hot-cargo provisions may have had.

The Teamsters, on the other hand, have

attacked the ban as violating established union practices of protecting union standards. For example, it would prevent a union from bargaining with a common carrier that only union-made trucks and supplies shall be used or that only union contractors would build or repair terminals where they work. The hot-cargo ban, it was charged, would also preclude a union from bargaining to prevent the subcontracting of work to non-union shops. Whether these charges are correct will, of course, depend on the courts, if the ban on hot cargo becomes law.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, Sar A. Levitan, specialist in labor in the economics division at the Library of Congress, has prepared what I think is an outstanding paper on the background and provisions of the House labor bill, which I commend to the attention of all Members of Congress.

The paper follows:

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN S. 1555 AND H.R. 8342 LABOR-MANAGEMENT REPORTING AND DISCLOSURES BILLS

(By Sar A. Levitan, specialist in labor economics, July 25, 1959)

The House Committee on Education and Labor adopted 102 amendments to the Senate approved bill. Only part of the proposed changes are of a substantive nature. These deal with penalties provided for violation of the bill, powers of the Secretary of Labor in connection with enforcement, reporting requirements by employers and small unions, and amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act, including provisions dealing with secondary boycotts in the construction industry, filing of non-Communist affidavits, NLRB jurisdiction, economic strikers, definition of supervisors and ban on hot cargo.

MEMBERS' RIGHTS (TITLE I)

Both the Senate and House Committee on Education and Labor versions of the bill guarantee members' rights vis-a-vis their unions. These rights include: freedom of speech and assembly; protection against arbitrary dues, initiation fees and assessments; rights to sue a union or its officers for alleged violation of rights; and safeguards against improper disciplinary action. However, the Senate version makes violation of those rights punishable by 2 years, imprisonment and \$10,000 fine, or both (sec. 607, S. 1555). The House committee bill relies upon internal union remedies for 6 months. If remedy is not secured within the 6 months, the aggrieved member may bring a civil action suit in a district court to prevent and restrain the violation of the members' rights. No penalty is provided under the House bill for the violation of the rights guaranteed to members.

Freedom of speech and assembly (sec. 101 (a) (3))

The Senate bill makes these rights subject to the union's "established and reasonable rules." The House committee bill eliminates this limitation.

Dues, initiation fees and assessments (sec. 101 (a) (3))

The Senate bill provides that dues and initiation fees may be changed only by (1)

a majority secret vote at a general meeting; (2) majority vote in a referendum; or (3) in case of a national union by a majority vote at a convention.

The House Committee retains the above two methods as far as local unions are concerned. But in case of a labor organization other than a local union or a federation of unions, the following means for raising dues or initiation fees is provided: (1) majority vote of delegates at a convention, (2) majority vote in a referendum, (3) majority vote of the union's executive committee, if authorized by the constitution and bylaws. Dues raised by this method remains in effect until the next convention of the union.

Safeguards against improper disciplinary action (sec. 101 (a) (5))

The Senate bill provides that a union member may not be suspended, fined, or expelled unless the member has been served with specific written charges and given an opportunity to defend himself at a hearing. The House Committee bill requires only a fair hearing on written charges in accordance with the union constitution.

REPORTING (TITLE II)

Verification of reports by members (sec. 201 (c))

The Senate approved bill requires unions to make available to members copies of reports which they file under the bill and to permit members to examine the records kept to verify the reports. The bill also directs the Secretary of Labor to prescribe forms and conditions under which unions would be required to disclose financial records to members. The House Committee on Education and Labor also requires union officials to make available to members reports required under title II. This requirement is enforceable through court actions, which may also award the union member(s) attorney fees and other costs involved in filing action against the union.

Exemptions from reporting (sec. 201 (d))

The Senate bill authorized the Secretary of Labor to exempt local unions with less than 200 members or gross receipts of less than \$20,000 a year from filing annual financial reports. The House Committee version exempts such unions from filing reports, but authorizes the Secretary of Labor to withdraw the exemption after determining that the members of a union have been denied information about their local's finances.

Reports on transactions with employers (sec. 202 (a))

The Senate approved bill requires that union employees whose compensation and allowances are in excess of \$5,000 annually must report business and financial transactions with employers bargaining with the union. The House bill makes the reports mandatory of all union officers regardless of their compensation.

Employer reports (sec. 203)

The Senate bill requires employers to report to the Secretary of Labor expenditures made in connection with persuading employees to organize or bargain collectively. The House version limits employer reports to expenditures involving interference or coercion in connection with union activities.

Publication of reports (sec. 204 (a), S. 1555; 205 (a), H.R. 8342)

The Senate bill authorizes the Secretary of Labor to publish any information and data submitted by unions or employers under title II. The Secretary is also authorized to publish reports and studies based upon the data. The House bill strikes out this authorization.

Record keeping (sec. 205, S. 1555; and 206, H.R. 8342)

The Senate bill authorizes the Secretary of Labor to prescribe the information which

unions and employers must keep in order to verify the financial reports filed under the provisions of the bill. The House version requires that the needed information be kept by those who filed the information for 5 years. It does not grant the Secretary of Labor any authority in the matter.

Secretary of Labor powers to investigate violations (sec. 206(c))

The Senate bill authorizes the Secretary to report his findings to interested parties. The House committee bill does not contain this authorization.

Loans by unions (sec. 207(a), S. 1555; 503(a), H.R. 8342)

The Senate bill limits union loans to members or officers to a total of \$1,500; the House version raises the limit to \$2,500.

Paying fines or litigation costs (sec. 207(b), S. 1555; 503(b), H.R. 8342)

The Senate bill prohibits unions or companies to pay in advance fines or litigation costs of a person indicted for the violation of any provisions of the bill, though upon acquittal the expenses incurred by the official in his defense may be reimbursed by the union. The House version prohibits the payments of fines of a convicted person but not the payment of defense costs.

Criminal provisions (sec. 208(a) and (b), S. 1555; sec. 209, H.R. 8342)

The Senate bill makes the violation of regulations issued by the Secretary of Labor with reference to title II or failure to comply with the provisions of the title punishable by 1-year imprisonment or a fine of \$10,000, the same punishment as for willful violation of the provision of the title. The House version provides for punishment of willful violation only.

Commissioner of Labor reports (sec. 210, S. 1555)

The Senate version establishes the position of Commissioner of Labor and authorizes the Secretary to employ a staff to administer the provisions of the bill. The House committee bill makes no provision for these positions.

Non-Communist affidavits (sec. 212; S. 1555, sec. 201(c) H.R. 8342)

The Senate version requires union officers and employers filing petitions or complaints under NLRB to file non-Communist affidavits; the House Committee bill repeals this requirement.

TRUSTEESHIP (TITLE III)

Duration of trusteeships (sec. 304(c))

The Senate bill limits trusteeships to 12 months unless clear and convincing reasons exist for its continuance. The House Committee extends the initial time limitation upon trusteeships to 18 months.

Suits to restrain violation of trusteeships (sec. 306(a); sec. 304(a) H.R. 8342)

The Senate bill grants only the Secretary of Labor to enter suits in Federal districts courts to restrain violation of the trustee provisions. The House Committee grants the same right to union members.

ELECTIONS (TITLE IV)

Membership lists (sec. 401(b) S. 1555; sec. 401(d) H.R. 8342)

The Senate bill requires unions to distribute campaign literature of a bona fide candidate for union office—at the candidate's expense—and also guarantees candidates equal access to membership lists. The House Education and Labor Committee guarantees bona fide candidates the right to inspect and copy membership lists, when union security provisions are part of a collective bargaining agreement.

Removal of officer guilty of misconduct (sec. 401(g))

The Senate bill authorizes the Secretary of Labor to promulgate rules and regulations governing the removal of a union officer guilty of serious misconduct. Union members may remove the officer by secret ballot under the Secretary's regulations. The House Committee bill grants the power to district courts, upon a member's petition, to order a recall election.

Election irregularities (sec. 402)

Under the Senate bill a union member alleging irregularities in elections can take his complaint to the Secretary of Labor after exhausting remedies available under the union constitution. The Secretary is empowered, under the Senate bill to secure an injunction and to supervise a new election. The House version authorizes the members, after exhausting remedies under union procedures, to secure an injunction in a Federal Court. The Secretary of Labor is authorized to supervise a new election, if ordered by the court.

Persons barred from holding union office (sec. 405(a) S. 1555; 504(a) H.R. 8342)

Persons convicted of committing specified crimes including violation of Titles II or III of the bill are barred by the Senate bill from holding union office (except clerical or custodial jobs) for a period of 5 years after serving any part of a prison term. The House version would extend the prohibition to labor relations consultants or employer associations dealing with labor organizations. However, this prohibition is not applicable in cases where citizenship rights have been restored or when a U.S. Board of Parole determines that the person's holding office would not be contrary to the purposes of the bill. The House version applies the 5-year prohibition of holding office to former members of the Communist party.

CODES OF ETHICAL PRACTICES (TITLE V)

This title in the Senate bill—dropped in the House version—is an exhortation to unions and employer associations to adopt codes of ethical practices which would safeguard the rights of members.

MISCELLANEOUS (TITLE VI)

Punishment for interference with rights of members (sec. 607)

The Senate-approved bill provides the punishment of 2-years' imprisonment or a fine of \$10,000 for interfering with the rights of union members guaranteed by the bill. This provision is deleted in the House committee bill.

Fiduciary responsibility (secs. 610, S. 1555; 501(a), H.R. 8342)

The Senate bill makes union officers responsible in a fiduciary capacity for union money or other property in their trust. The House version adds that officers may expend union funds in accordance with the provisions of the union constitution and resolutions of the union governing bodies.

TAFT-HARTLEY AMENDMENT (TITLE VII)

NLRB jurisdiction and administration (sec. 701)

The Senate bill authorizes State agencies to exercise jurisdiction in labor relations cases when the NLRB has refused to act. The State agencies are required to apply Federal law in handling these cases. The House committee bill requires the NLRB to assert jurisdiction on all labor-management disputes affecting interstate commerce referred to the Board.

In addition the House committee adds the following amendments relating to the NLRB not found in the Senate bill:

1. Increases NLRB membership from 5 to 7 (sec. 701(c)).

2. Delegates determination of representation disputes to regional offices, but reserves the NLRB the authority to review the regional decisions (sec. 701(d)(1)).

3. Delegates many of the Board functions to the General Counsel (sec. 701(d)(2)).

Construction industry—Secondary boycott (sec. 702(c))

The House committee adds an amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act which declares that it is not an unfair labor practice to boycott a "secondary employer who is engaged as a joint venturer, price contractor, subcontractor, or cocontractor, together with the primary employer in a labor dispute, in a construction project. * * *

Economic strikers (sec. 703)

The Senate bill permits economic strikers to vote in accordance with regulations promulgated by the NLRB. The House bill strikes out the Taft-Hartley provisions denying economic strikers the right to vote.

Definition of supervisor (sec. 704)

The Senate bill provides that service assistants in the communications industry do not qualify as supervisors under the Taft-Hartley definition of the term. The House committee eliminates this provision.

Hot cargo agreement (sec. 707, S. 1555; 705(a), H.R. 8342)

Both the Senate and House committee bills ban hot cargo agreements. But the House version adds that this provision does not deny an employee the right to refuse to cross a picket line when the employer is engaged in a primary dispute nor is a collective bargaining contract to be invalidated because it "provides that such refusal shall not be cause for the discharge of such employee."

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DAVID S. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Sar A. Levitan, specialist in Labor in the Economics Division at the Library of Congress, has prepared what I think is an outstanding paper on the background and provisions of the House labor bill.

I regard Mr. Levitan as one of the Nation's most distinguished and accomplished authorities in the field of labor law. As the House debates this labor bill, its members should find the information in Mr. Levitan's paper very useful, and I commend it to their attention. Its chief value lies in the fact that it is both scholarly and impartial.

The paper follows:

BACKGROUND AND PROVISIONS, LABOR-MANAGEMENT REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE BILL OF 1959 (H.R. 8342, 80TH CONG.)

(By Sar A. Levitan, specialist in Labor Economics Division, July 28, 1959)

BACKGROUND OF H.R. 8342

During the past decade several congressional investigations disclosed union abuses which added impetus to long-standing proposals for Federal regulation of internal union affairs. In the 81st Congress, a sub-

committee of the House Committee on Education and Labor concentrated its investigation on violations of basic democratic procedures in the United Mine Workers Union. In the 83d and 84th Congresses, a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare disclosed abuses in the administration of union health and welfare funds. Its investigations showed that leaders of the Laundry Workers, Distillery Workers and Allied Industrial Workers (formerly Auto Workers Union, A. F. of L.) had diverted health and welfare funds for personal aggrandizement. Finally, the most thorough and publicized congressional investigation into internal union affairs was conducted by the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field (popularly known as the McClellan committee) since the beginning of 1957.

The investigations of this committee disclosed that some officials used union funds for personal gains or for questionable purposes without knowledge or consent of the members. The financial reports of these unions gave no inkling of the misuse of these funds since the expenditures incurred by the officials were recorded as part of legitimate union business or as gifts. Several officials made loans from union treasuries which did not require any formal reporting. In some cases national officers exercised prolonged trusteeships over locals, diverted union funds for their personal use and denied members their democratic rights. In several instances union members did not have the opportunity freely to elect their officials.

In March 1958, the McClellan committee recommended legislation to curb abuses uncovered by the committee investigation. These recommendations covered the following areas:

- (1) Pension and welfare funds;
- (2) Union funds;
- (3) Union democracy;
- (4) Middlemen in labor-management relations; and
- (5) "No man's land" in labor-management relations.

With reference to union funds, the committee proposed legislation requiring disclosure of union receipts and disbursements and making willful filing of false or incomplete financial statements a Federal crime punishable by imprisonment and fines. The committee also proposed that restrictions be imposed upon the use of union funds to prevent abuse of expenditures contrary to the desires of the members.

With reference to union democracy, the committee recommended the periodic secret election of union officers and the restriction of the right of unions to impose trusteeships or receiverships.

These recommendations served as the basis for hearings conducted by the Senate Subcommittee on Labor under the chairmanship of Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY. During the month of May 1958, the subcommittee held extensive hearings on union financial and administrative practices and procedures. S. 3974 (85th Cong.) was one result of these hearings. The Senate approved this bill by an 88 to 1 vote on June 17, 1958.

Despite the one-sided vote in favor of the bill, many of its provisions were highly controversial. Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY charged that employer organizations—he singled out the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the American Retail Federation—spread false and misleading information about the bill, and that this campaign of misrepresentation killed any chance for the passage of S. 3974 in the 85th Congress. Others have suggested that the opposition of some union leaders to some provisions of the bill had also contributed to the defeat of the bill in the House.

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER blamed the Democratic leadership in the House for failure to bring the bill up for a vote. He denied that the NAM and other employer organizations had the power to kill a bill. Secretary James P. Mitchell blamed the Democratic House leadership for refusing to present the House with an opportunity to act on S. 3974.

Speaker SAM RAYBURN accused the Secretary of playing politics with the bill. He explained that he withheld S. 3974 from the committee because the committee was occupied with other bills, and he awaited the discharge of the proposed welfare and pension disclosure legislation before he sent S. 3974 to the committee.

The bill was referred on July 31, 1958, to the House Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations. But, the subcommittee failed to report out the bill and an attempt to have the Committee on Education and Labor assume jurisdiction over the bill was defeated by a 22 to 7 vote.

On August 18, Speaker RAYBURN called up S. 3974 for House consideration under suspension of rules. The procedure requires a two-thirds affirmative vote to approve the bill with debate limited to 40 minutes. The motion failed even to get a majority and was rejected by a 198 to 190 vote. Sixty-one Democrats and 137 Republicans voted to reject the bill, while 149 Democrats and 41 Republicans voted for the passage of S. 3974.

The Senate Subcommittee on Labor held again extensive hearings on labor reform legislation during January-March 1959. The result was S. 1555, which the Senate approved after a prolonged debate by a 90-1 vote on April 25, 1959. The Senate considered 52 amendments to the bill reported out by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; it passed 35 amendments, rejected 15, and 2 were withdrawn.

A joint subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee held hearings on labor reform legislation in March, April, and May of 1959. The full committee considered S. 1555, as approved by the Senate, and other bills for 5 weeks. On July 23, 1959, the committee reported out H.R. 8342 by a 16-14 bipartisan vote.

PROVISIONS OF H.R. 8342

The labor-management reporting and disclosure bill (H.R. 8342) is an attempt on the part of Congress to legislate comprehensive Federal regulation of internal union affairs. It includes provisions encouraging union democracy and financial integrity in union affairs and regulations guaranteeing rights of members in relation to their union. The bill contemplates that these aims can be achieved by guaranteeing members freedom of speech and assembly and safeguarding them from arbitrary payments and improper disciplinary action by requiring disclosure of union finances and conflicts of economic interests between union officers and members, periodic secret elections of union officers; and by imposing restrictions upon the practice of union receiverships.

The bill also requires that management and its agents disclose expenditures involving interference or coercion with the rights of employees to join a union and to engage in collective bargaining with their employees.

Finally, the bill contains several amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act. The most important of these prohibit the NLRB from restricting its jurisdiction, permit strikers to vote in representation elections if no unfair practices are involved, liberalize union-shop agreements in the construction industry, impose restrictions on organizational and recognition picketing and hot-cargo agreements.

The specific provisions of H.R. 8342 can be divided into three groups:

1. Rules affecting the regulation and administration of internal union affairs;

2. Rules affecting management interference with the rights of their employees to join unions and to engage in collective bargaining; and

3. Amendments to the Labor-Management Relations Act.

I. Internal union affairs

Most of the bill deals with this subject. It includes provisions regarding the rights of union members, the disclosure of union finances, trusteeships, elections, and fiduciary responsibilities of officers.

A. Members' Rights (Title I)

1. The following rights of union members are guaranteed: Freedom of speech and assembly, protection against arbitrary dues, initiation fees and assessments, rights to sue a union or its officers for alleged violation of rights, and safeguards against improper disciplinary action. (Sec. 101, p. 10.)

2. An aggrieved member must first exhaust the remedies available under the provisions of the union constitution and bylaws. If redress is not secured within 6 months, the aggrieved member may bring a civil action in a district court to prevent and restrain the violation of his rights. No penalty is provided for the violation of the rights guaranteed to members. (Sec. 102, p. 14.)

B. Union Reports and Disclosure of Finance (Title II)

1. Every union must adopt a constitution and bylaws and file a copy with the Secretary of Labor including specific information detailing its major internal operations. (Sec. 201, p. 16.)

2. Every union, except those having less than 200 members or gross annual receipts of less than \$20,000, must file annually a comprehensive report of its financial transactions. But the Secretary of Labor is authorized to withdraw the exemption of a union not required to file financial reports after determining that the members of the union have been denied information about their local's finances. (Sec. 201(b), (c), (d), p. 18.)

3. Union officers are required to make available to members reports required under Title II. This requirement is enforceable through court actions, which may also award the union member(s) attorney fees and other costs involved in filing action against the union. (Sec. 201(c), p. 18.)

4. Union officials must report to the Secretary of Labor any activities which might involve a conflict of interest between their obligations as representatives of unions and their engagement in transactions which might be a source of personal gain contrary to the interests of the union members whom they represent. The bill lists specific activities which might constitute a conflict of interest. (Sec. 202(a), p. 21.)

5. Union officers are required to keep for a period of 5 years detailed information which may be needed to verify the financial reports filed under the provisions of Title II. (Sec. 206, p. 29.)

6. The reports filed under this title are public information. (Sec. 205(a), p. 28.)

7. The Secretary of Labor is authorized to prescribe the forms, publish the reports filed under title II and to bring action before district courts to restrain suspected violations of title II. (Secs. 208 and 210, pp. 30 and 31.)

8. Willful violation of title II, including the filing of false reports or failing to disclose information, is punishable by 1-year imprisonment and for \$10,000 fine, or both. (Sec. 209, p. 31.)

C. Trusteeships (Title III)

1. A union assuming receivership or trusteeship authority over a subordinate body must report the action within 30 days to the Secretary of Labor. The report must contain detailed information describing rea-

sons why the trusteeship was established. (Sec. 301, p. 32.)

2. During the period the trusteeship is in effect, any voting for delegates to the national convention by the trustee union must be in secret and no funds of the subordinate body, except regular per capita dues and assessment payable by nontrustered unions, may be transferred to the body exercising the trusteeship. The maximum period of a trusteeship is 18 months, unless the parent body can show good reason for its extension. (Sec. 303(a) and 304(c), p. 34 and 36.)

3. Willful violation of the above is punishable by imprisonment for 1 year, a \$10,000 fine, or both. (Sec. 303(b), p. 35.)

4. The Secretary of Labor is required to investigate complaints by members of a trustee union alleging violations of the trusteeship. If the complaint appears meritorious, the Secretary must bring civil action in a district court without disclosing the name of the complainant to secure appropriate relief. (Sec. 304(a), p. 35.) After a period of 3 years, the Secretary of Labor is required to report to Congress concerning activities under Title III. (Sec. 305, p. 37.)

D. Elections (Title IV)

1. National officers are to be elected at least every 5 years, either by secret ballot among the members or by delegates elected by secret ballot. (Sec. 401(a), p. 37.)

2. Officers of local unions are to be elected at least every 3 years by secret ballot among the members. (Sec. 401(b), p. 38.)

3. Officers of intermediate bodies are to be elected at least every 4 years, either by secret ballot among the members or by officer representatives elected by secret ballot. (Sec. 401(c), p. 38.)

4. Union funds may not be used to promote individual candidates. (Sec. 401(p), p. 40.)

5. A district court may order a recall election upon the petition of a member, if the constitution does not provide adequate procedure for the removal of an officer guilty of serious misconduct. (Sec. 401(g), p. 40.)

6. An aggrieved member alleging irregularities in elections may secure an injunction in a district court to prevent or restrain the violation, provided the member has exhausted remedies under the union constitution for a period of at least 6 months. The Secretary of Labor is authorized to supervise a new election, if ordered by the court. (Sec. 402, p. 41.)

E. Safeguards for Labor Organizations (Title V)

1. Officers and other representatives of unions are responsible in a fiduciary capacity for union money or other property in their trust. They may expend union funds only in accordance with the provisions of the union constitution, bylaws and the resolutions of the appropriate governing bodies. (Sec. 501(a), p. 44.)

2. A union member may sue a union officer or other representative to recover damages or to secure an accounting for the benefit of the union. This right is granted, if the union or its governing body fails to act. (Sec. 501(b), p. 45.)

3. An embezzlement of union funds or assets is made a felony punishable by imprisonment for 5 years or by a \$10,000 fine, or both. (Sec. 501(c), p. 46.)

4. Officers or other representatives of unions whose property and annual financial receipts exceed \$5,000 must be bonded. (Sec. 502(a), p. 47.)

5. Unions are forbidden to make loans to any officer or union employee in excess of \$2,500. (Sec. 503(a), p. 48.)

6. Unions may not pay the fine of any officer or employee convicted for any willful violation of this bill. (Sec. 503(b), p. 48.)

7. Persons convicted of committing specified crimes, including violation of titles II or

III of the bill, are barred from holding union office (except clerical or custodial jobs) for a period of 5 years after serving any part of a prison term. However, this prohibition is not applicable in cases where citizenship rights have been restored or when a U.S. Board of Parole determines that the person's holding office would not be contrary to the purposes of the bill. The same provision applies to former members of the Communist Party. (Sec. 504(a), p. 49.)

8. Willful violation of 4, 5, 6, and 7 above is punishable by 1-year imprisonment or a fine of \$16,000, or both. (Sec. 502(b), 503(c), and 504(b), pp. 47-49.)

II. Employer reports

A. Every employer must report any payment made to employees or their collective officer or any other union representative. (Sec. 203(a)(1), p. 24.)

B. Every employer must report any payments made to employees or their collective bargaining representatives for the purpose of interfering with union activities protected by the Labor Management Relations Act. The reporting requirements apply also to payments made to labor relation consultants for the same purpose. (Sec. 203(a)(2) and (3) (4) and (b), pp. 24-26.)

C. Provisions 5-8 listed under title II are also applicable to employers or their agents required to file reports.

III. Miscellaneous (title VI)

A. Powers of the Secretary of Labor

The Secretary of Labor is empowered to investigate suspected violations of the bill (except title I) and is granted a subpoena power in connection with these investigations. (Sec. 601, p. 56.)

B. "Shakedown" Picketing

Unions are prohibited from picketing for the purpose of extortion. Violation is made punishable by 20-year imprisonment or a fine of \$10,000, or both. (Sec. 602, p. 56.)

IV. Amendments to Taft-Hartley Act (title VII)

A. Jurisdiction of NLRB

National Labor Relations Board is directed to assume full jurisdiction granted to it under the Taft-Hartley Act. (Sec. 701(a), p. 60.)

B. National Labor Relations Board

The membership of the NLRB is increased to 7 (from present 5) and their term of office is extended to a period of 7 years (from present 4 years). (Sec. 701(c), p. 60.)

C. Union Shop in Building Trades

Employers and unions in the construction industry are permitted to enter into agreements before the union majority status is established. Also, such agreements may require employees to join the union 7 days after hiring, instead of the usual 30 days. (Sec. 702(a), p. 64.)

D. Construction Site Picketing

A union is permitted to picket a secondary employer who is engaged as a joint venturer with a primary employer in a labor dispute on a construction site. (Sec. 702(c), p. 65.)

E. Economic Strikers

Economic strikers are entitled to vote in a representation election. (Sec. 703, p. 67.)

F. Prehearing Election

NLRB is authorized to hold a representation election 30 days following the filing of a petition, when no substantial issues exist between the parties. (Sec. 704, p. 68.)

G. "Hot-Cargo" Agreement

"Hot-cargo" agreements between common carriers and unions are banned. However, the bill specifies that this provision does not deny an employee of a common carrier the right to refuse to cross a picket line where the employer is engaged in a primary

dispute nor is a collective bargaining contract to be invalidated because it prohibits the carrier from firing an employee refusing to cross the picket line. (Sec. 705(a), p. 68.)

H. Recognition and Organizational Picketing

A union is prohibited from picketing or threatening to picket an establishment for the purpose of requiring an employer to recognize or bargain with the union or requiring the employees to select the union as their representative in collective bargaining under the following conditions: (1) The employer has already recognized another union and National Labor Relations Board regulations ban (sec. 9(c)) a new union from challenging the rights of the recognized union to represent the employees; or (2) a valid election has been held within the preceding 9 months and the union has been rejected by the majority of the employees in the bargaining unit. (Sec. 705(a), p. 70.)

I. Bribing Employee Representatives

The Taft-Hartley Act prohibits an employer to pay or deliver anything of value to representatives of his employees. This prohibition is made applicable to agents of the employer or employer associations. (Sec. 505(a), p. 51.)

J. Improper Unloading Fees

The Taft-Hartley Act prohibits a union officer to demand or accept improper unloading fees from interstate truckers. This prohibition is extended to agents of the union representative. (Sec. 505(b), p. 52.)

K. Non-Communist Affidavits

The Taft-Hartley requirement that officers of unions that petition the Board must file non-Communist affidavits is repealed. (Sec. 201(e), p. 20.)

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLEM MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Sar A. Levitan, specialist in labor in the Economics Division at the Library of Congress, has prepared what I think is an outstanding paper on the background and provisions of the House labor bill, which I commend to the attention of all Members of Congress.

The paper follows:

CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES

(By Sar A. Levitan)

The close vote (16 to 14) by which H.R. 8342 has been reported out of the House Committee on Education and Labor indicates the controversial nature of its provisions. The bill has been attacked by diverse groups.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has referred to the bill as a "watered-down farce." The AFL-CIO has pronounced the bill as unacceptable and punitive: "under the guise of labor reform [it] does grievous harm to legitimate unions."

Two members of the committee who voted to report out the bill have since introduced a tougher measure of their own. Administration spokesmen have also found H.R. 8342 inadequate.

On the other hand, supporters of the bill on the House Committee on Education and

Labor characterized it as "a fair and effective instrument of labor-management reform."

Space permits to analyze only the major controversial issues raised by the bill. These will be divided as follows:

A. ISSUES DEALING WITH INTERNAL UNION AFFAIRS

1. Is there need for Federal legislation?
2. Members' rights.
3. Disclosure of finances.
4. Trusteeships.
5. Voting rights.
6. Non-Communist affidavits.

B. ISSUES PERTAINING TO LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATION

1. The power of unions.
2. No man's land.
3. Construction industry.
4. Right of strikers to vote.
5. Recognition and organizational picketing.
6. Hot cargo.

1. A need for Federal legislation to regulate internal union affairs

Traditionally, unions have been regarded as voluntary associations and have been treated before the law in the same manner as other voluntary organizations. This means that the administration of union internal affairs has not been considered a proper subject for legislative or judicial interference. Unions were left free to determine qualifications for admission of potential members, rules controlling expulsion and discipline, the selection of officers, and other facets of internal affairs incidental to the administration of labor organizations.

This attitude toward unions has undergone radical change with the growing pervasiveness and economic power of unions in our society over the last two decades. Under existing law, millions of workers are now required to become or remain union members as a condition of employment. According to a U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics report, two-thirds of 1,716 contracts studied in 1954, covering more than 7.4 million employees, contained union-shop provisions. "Maintenance of union membership" provisions accounted for another 14 percent of the agreements. In addition, about 4 percent of the agreements stipulated some degree of preference in hiring union members. Based on these data, it would appear that union security provisions currently apply to more than 13 million workers in the United States.

In 1957 the National Industrial Conference Board estimated that the minimum annual income of American unions from dues is approximately \$620 million, or \$33.74 per member. The study indicates that the actual amount of money which unions collect from members is appreciably higher.

Public interest in union activity, it has been suggested, is justified, not only because union membership is required as a condition of employment, but also because union activity today affects the lives of the 17 million members belonging to some 200 national unions. Under present law, union negotiations, because they extend to such matters as pensions and insurance, affect not only employees but also the lives of persons who are retired or disabled and, in some cases, their dependents as well. Through grievance procedures, provided in most collective bargaining contracts, unions are free to choose the cases in which they will initiate grievance machinery or apply union pressures.

In bargaining for their members, unions are protected by Federal law. With the aid of quasi-governmental powers, unions influence broad social and economic policies as well as the livelihood of their members.

These labor union developments since the 1930's have led many observers to question the appropriateness of continuing to treat labor unions as voluntary associations. Regardless of whether members join unions out

of free choice or because of compulsion sanctioned by Federal law, it has been argued that the power which unions wield calls for governmental regulation to assure that unions are properly administered and that the interests of union members are adequately protected. The claim that granting special privileges to unions to act as quasi-governmental agents is in the public interest in no way diminishes Federal responsibility in this area; on the contrary, it increases Federal responsibility.

Contemporary American unions, it is further argued, cannot rightfully claim the privileges and immunities that private associations have before the law. This does not necessarily indicate an indictment of the labor movement in the United States. Granted that most unions fully recognize their obligations to the memberships, the law must protect the basic economic rights of all workers. As long as even a few unions are run by corrupt leadership, it is the duty of Congress to protect the employees' interests, provided it does not hamper the legitimate activities of unions.

Ever since the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act many students of union activities have called for more stringent regulation of internal union affairs. The disclosures of the McClellan committee have added strength and impetus to the demand that "there ought to be a law" to guarantee the democratic rights of union leaders. The law, this argument runs, having guaranteed workers the right to be represented in collective bargaining by "unions of their own choosing," must also assure them the right to determine that the spokesmen of these unions are also "of their own choosing."

It has also been noted that legislation is necessary not only to safeguard the rights of union members, but also to promote the interests of society which has entrusted unions with special rights and immunities in bargaining for workers.

There has been, however, little agreement on the means that should be used to achieve this end. The basic dilemma is how to guarantee the rights of union members with a minimum of governmental interference, which will not weaken the collective bargaining functions of unions. Some suggest that the desired goal cannot be achieved achieved without paying too high a cost in terms of disrupting union activities. They note that some legislative proposals would impose burdens on a great many unions in an effort to prevent undesirable activity in relatively few, and that on balance, in terms of the interests of union membership and the public as a whole, such action is unwarranted.

Still other union spokesmen are concerned that certain legislation would inject the Government into union affairs and would sow the seeds of potential Government control of unions.

A few have found governmental interference repugnant because it would further extend Federal powers to activities which are basically local in nature and it has been suggested that the Federal Government should cede the internal regulation of unions to the States. This solution is opposed on the basis that action by the several States would impose an intolerable burden upon the activities of national unions which would then have to conform to the regulations of the 50 States and other jurisdictions. Furthermore, since the regulation of collective bargaining has already been preempted by the Federal Government, it cannot justifiably avoid the responsibility of assuring workers the right to a democratic choice of their representatives.

Union spokesmen have argued that the publicity given to the findings of the McClellan committee during the past 2½ years was out of proportion to the wrongdoings actually present in unions. They

assert that there has been less sin in unions than in other voluntary associations or in private industry. According to this view, the opponents of unionism have tried to use the McClellan disclosures to arouse antiunion sentiment and to stimulate a demand for legislation which would harass unions and would do injury to the legitimate ends of the union movement.

The AFL-CIO has officially classified H.R. 8342 in this category, though it finds the bill less objectionable than the Senate approved S. 1555. George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, has expressed particular objection to title I ("Rights of Union Members") of the bill. He indicated, however, that the AFL-CIO urges legislation which would require thorough financial disclosure, making embezzlement of union funds a Federal crime and appropriate provisions dealing with trusteeships, and election of union officials. The Federation has recognized that it cannot adequately deal with the abuses disclosed by the McClellan committee through self-regulation.

2. Members' rights

An examination of union activities shows that most unions function in a democratic manner. They have been alert in guaranteeing the rights of members and have in most cases established the necessary machinery to effectuate these rights. But in some instances, the membership has not had a free opportunity to select or replace union leaders, because entrenched officers have prevented any opportunity to develop. This union leaders usually accomplish through the control and manipulation of the union channels of communication, through patronage and by outright suppression of opposition.

In some cases unions have fallen prey to racketeering elements, who have taken over labor organizations, and in the words of Senator McClellan, then so-called labor leaders "run the union and do what they please with it." The McClellan committee has supplied a sample picture of a racketeer-dominated local:

"The operations of Local 985 of the Teamsters Union . . . represents a most disgraceful type of unionism. As it now operates it is a leech preying upon workmen and women to provide personal aggrandizement for [the leader] and his friends. Nowhere in this hearing is there to be found one scintilla of evidence that local 985 has done anything to help the wages and working conditions of its members in these industries. To the contrary, we have had testimony that members . . . had their wages drastically reduced after they became union members and their employers signed contracts with local 985." (U.S. Senate, Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field. Release April 15, 1959.)

To protect the rights of members in relations to their unions, H.R. 8342 requires that unions guarantee the following rights to members: freedom of speech and assembly; protection against arbitrary dues, initiation fees and assessments; rights to sue a union or its officers for alleged violation of rights; and safeguards against improper disciplinary action.

The AFL-CIO has charged that these provisions are unnecessary and unworkable. Union practices and democratic traditions are too diverse to adjust to a uniformly designed set of regulations and rules. The major function of unions is to improve the wages and working conditions of members through collective bargaining. The harsh struggle of the market place would make it frequently impossible for unions to act effectively and to conduct its business under the restrictions imposed by the bill, which purports to guarantee members' rights. President George Meany stated:

"A detailed, legally enforceable code of internal procedures for all unions . . . must

inevitably end up either in general terms as to be susceptible of almost any interpretation (and hence a breeding ground for litigation) or as a strait jacket which would inhibit obviously reasonable and proper union practices." (Testimony before the Joint Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, June 3, 1959.)

3. Disclosure of finance

Little opposition has been expressed in principle to the provision requiring union reporting and disclosure of financial information. Union spokesmen, however, have expressed objection to requiring all unions, regardless of size, to file reports. It was suggested that smaller unions should be relieved of this burden because of the limited amount of finances they handle and because most smaller local unions do not have the technical personnel capable of filing the necessary reports. H.R. 8342 accordingly exempts all unions with less than 200 members or with gross annual income of less than \$20,000.

A similar provision in the Kennedy-Ives bill (S. 3974, 85th Cong.) was attacked by the Secretary of Labor on the ground that it would exempt the majority of unions from disclosing their financial transactions. It was claimed that all union members, regardless of the size of their local, are entitled to information on how their contributions to the union are being used. Apparently, to overcome this objection H.R. 8342 grants the Secretary of Labor the authority to withdraw the exemption of smaller unions from filing financial reports if the members are denied information about their local's finances.

4. Trusteeships

This is one of the least studied areas of union administration. Information about the practice of receivership in unions is extremely fragmentary. There is no single authoritative study available on this subject. Nevertheless, the McClellan committee investigations have shown that at least three international unions which the committee investigated—the Teamsters, the Operating Engineers, and the Bakers—have effectively suppressed local democracy and members' rights with resulting personal gain to officials who placed the unions under trusteeships.

Objection to the regulation of receiverships is based on the concern that legislation limiting the period of trusteeship may hamper effective union administration. Union spokesmen suggested that there is not sufficient information about the practice to justify legislation. They proposed that legislation be limited to require incidents of trusteeships be reported to the Department of Labor. The Secretary of Labor would then report to Congress whether or not further legislation was needed. Specifically, the AFL-CIO has objected to subjective trustee regulation to both Federal and State courts. They favor exclusive Federal remedies.

5. Voting rights

The justification for regulating union elections and the requirement of a secret ballot is based on the fact that many union constitutions do not require secret elections of officers. The McClellan investigations showed that occasionally individual members may have reason to refrain from voting openly against incumbent officials.

Those who advocate legislation for union democracy point to the fact that our institutions are based upon democratic ideals. They believe that the Government would be justified, therefore, in demanding democracy in unions, if the unions are to act as representatives of the members under the law.

Those opposing the election provisions question whether efforts to force democracy upon unions through legislation can function desirably and effectively. They suggest that democracy is not an appropriate subject for legislative compulsion and that one

set of standards may not be equally appropriate for the many types of unions. Also, enforcement of democracy through legislation would tend to be self-defeating since it would reduce the area of self-determination. Moreover, some union spokesmen have asserted, if the right of the Government to legislate democracy is conceded, then application of such legislation should be equally appropriate to associations in business, profession and churches.

On the other hand, some have objected to the provision of H.R. 8342 which limits voting requirements to the election of officers. It has been suggested that this provision is inadequate to achieve genuine union democracy and to assure procedures which would give the members effective control over the affairs of their unions. According to this view, members also deserve a right to express their views in secret election over other vital matters which affect the lives of members. Basic among these is the right of members to express their opinions with regard to the union calling a strike and with regard to nonstrike clauses in collective bargaining agreements. Opponents of this type of legislation argue that secret strike balloting, while it might superficially strengthen the rights of members over the destinies of their unions, does not actually work out in practice. In most cases union members authorize their leaders to strike. That at least has been the experience during World War II when such a vote was required. Moreover, a strike vote may involve labor and management in a campaign for the vote of the employees and would, therefore, distract the parties from the difficult task of achieving harmonious labor-management relations.

Another attempt to strengthen union democracy is represented by the proposal which would require that union constitutions provide for initiative and referendum. Backers of this proposal have asserted that this kind of legislation is practiced in many States and strengthens democracy by encouraging the rights of minorities. Opponents argue that legislation which would require union initiative and referendum procedures would involve too much Government regulation of union affairs and that such procedures may not be suitable for union organization. It might aid employers opposing the union to encourage dissension in union ranks and thus split the union and dissipate its energies upon internal conflict rather than allowing it to work for the achievement of better wages and working conditions, which are the major purposes of the union.

6. Non-Communist affidavits

H.R. 8342 repeals the Taft-Hartley requirement (sec. 9(h)) that union officers reporting to the National Labor Relations Board must sign a non-Communist affidavit. Proponents of this amendment argue that it offers a gratuitous insult to labor leaders to compel them to sign affidavits which impugn their loyalty. They also assert that the signing of the affidavits has accomplished little in the past.

Those who would retain the non-Communist affidavit suggest that the threat of subversive influences in the United States remains, and any measure that might help ferret out Communist should not be stricken. In order to eliminate the objection that labor leaders are singled out for suspicion of loyalty, they would also require affidavits by employers.

C. ISSUES PERTAINING TO LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

7. Limitation of union power

So far the discussion has centered about the means to achieve union democracy. It has been suggested, however, that legislation which would merely assure union democracy, and guarantee the right of union members while desirable in itself, begs the question of

Government responsibility in the regulation of unions. Underlying this line of thought is the belief that union strength represents a danger to the operations of a free economy, and that union coercive tactics rob employers and employees of their basic freedoms.

According to this view, an effective labor reform bill should include the following measures:

1. Ban on all forms of blackmail picketing.
 2. Closing secondary boycott loopholes.
 3. Resolving the no man's land problem by ceding NLRB jurisdiction to the States.
 4. Bringing unions under antitrust laws.
 5. Adopting a national right-to-work law.
- The problem, according to the supporters of this type of legislation, is not that the rights of union members are properly guaranteed, but whether the institution of unionism as practiced today offers a major threat to national well-being. They conclude that the limitation of the power of unions is the primary need.

Opponents of this view assert that the assumption upon which this type of proposals are based, namely, that unions possess overwhelming power, is exaggerated. They argue that the contrary is true and that union power is generally used not only to benefit the members, but also to improve the total economic wellbeing of all groups in society.

8. No man's land

The National Labor Relations Board has the authority to remedy unfair labor practices in establishments where operations affect commerce. The Board has, however, chosen not to exercise fully the powers granted to it by Congress under the Taft-Hartley Act, as interpreted by the Supreme Court. In 1950 the Board published a series of standards, which presumably excluded essentially local business from Board jurisdiction.

Four years later the Board further reduced its jurisdiction, excluding many more employers and employees from the protection afforded by Congress under the Labor-Management Relations Act. When the NLRB restricted its jurisdiction, the Board believed that the States would be able to step into the areas which were vacated by the Board limiting its jurisdiction.

But in a series of decisions culminating in *Guss v. Utah* (353 U.S. 1, 1957), the Supreme Court declared that the States cannot exercise authority in cases affecting commerce even though the National Labor Relations Board refused to assume jurisdiction. This has created a "no-man's land" where employers and employees are left outside the jurisdiction of both State laws and the Federal agency when the latter, charged with regulation, refuses to assume the authority which it was granted by Congress.

New Hope for the Mentally Ill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we live in an age where our great salvation is hope: Hope and faith in a better and more peaceful world. But hope as we understand it—belief and trust based on the expectation of attainment—has been denied to 17 million Americans currently suffering from mental disorders; it will be denied to

300,000 new patients who will enter mental hospitals this year; one out of every 10 children being born this year will likely enter a mental hospital for treatment before concluding his life. They have lost the precious gift of hope and feel themselves abandoned by mankind.

Surely these are startling facts to which America must be alert. We must urge our wisest minds to ferret out causes and seek cures. We cannot abandon them. We must provide hope—the hope born of understanding and love by those of us who have not known this tragedy.

I would like to commend to the earnest attention of the Members of this distinguished body, a story of what it means to work and live in a mental institution. This inspiring and hope-giving article was written by a man of God who has dedicated his life's work to providing such love and understanding; who has indeed lived by the maxim: "As long as you did it for one of these, the least of My brethren, you did it for Me."

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record, an article by Rev. Paul Revere, published in the Sign magazine of May 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NEW HOPE FOR THE MENTALLY ILL
(By Rev. Paul Revere)

I am a chaplain at a mental hospital. It is a large hospital, with 2,000 beds. It is conducted by the Veterans' Administration.

Because I am a priest, people often ask me where I am stationed. When I tell them I get ready to duck. The questions come faster than Bob Turley's speedballs: How do you stand it? Isn't it depressing? Have a lot of violent cases, don't you? Hopeless, aren't they?

Now this annoys me. It annoys me because so many people have the wrong slant on the mentally ill. Far too many people today look upon the state of the mentally ill as depressing and hopeless. This defeatist attitude, based on ignorance, is most unfortunate. It is unfortunate because it keeps the mentally sick from getting the care and attention so sorely needed to help them back to normal health.

When we visit an ordinary hospital we naturally feel sorry for our sick friend. But our sorrow is sustained by hope. We seek to communicate that hope to our friend, whether he has heart trouble, tuberculosis, or any other serious affliction. This kindly optimism is a positive help to the sick in their battle for recovery.

Yet when people think of the mentally ill, there are just far too many who consider them hopeless. This lack of hope tends to dry up the fountains of love and sympathy. You cannot love for long when you abandon hope for someone. Yet, anyone working with the mentally ill will tell you that mentally sick patients positively need to know that someone cares about them. Love is something that the sickest patient easily recognizes and responds to. Hope, then, provides a ground for love and sympathy. Experienced workers, having seen so many cures, have such hope. Friends and relatives frequently need to be educated to it.

The National Association for Mental Health runs its annual campaign to alert the Nation to the seriousness of the problem of mental health. The association bombards the country, through posters, through radio, TV, and motion pictures, through lecture halls and the press, with the disturbing facts

and figures: 17 million Americans currently suffering from mental disorders; half the hospital beds in the country occupied by mental patients; this year, 300,000 new patients will enter mental hospitals; 1 out of every 10 children being born this year will likely enter a mental institution for treatment before concluding his life.

The facts are presented to begot action—to alert America to an imminent grave problem; to urge our wisest minds to ferret out causes and seek cures.

Certainly a great deal has already been accomplished and many are the patients who annually return to normal living. But while waiting for more expert knowledge of mental disease, there are some things that can be done and should be done immediately.

A major thing to be done immediately is for many people to change their attitude toward the mentally ill. The public at large still needs to be educated to the fact that a person suffering from a nervous or mental disorder is just as much a victim of sickness as a person who has a heart ailment, a kidney disease, or any other malady. Everyone should realize that many of the mentally ill are affected only in certain areas of their mental activity while remaining quite normal in all other phases of their thinking and acting. Normal communication is possible in many areas of conversation.

Above all, people should recognize the basic dignity of a mentally ill patient. He's not an animal to be stashed away in isolated confinement. He is a human being. He is made in God's image and likeness. Above all, Christians should realize that he has been purchased by the blood of Jesus Christ and is actually or potentially a member of the mystical body of Christ. "As long as you did it for one of these, the least of My brethren, you did it for Me."

Because of the staggering spread of mental disease today, each of us should be concerned about its nature, its causes and cures. It strikes indiscriminately; it is apt to pop up in any family. We all have a big stake in the cure of mental disease. And we all are, even now, able to be very helpful to those unfortunately afflicted. We can all offer sympathy, hope, and, according to our circumstances, loving care.

Inasmuch as I live on the hospital grounds, administer the sacraments of the Catholic Church, offer consolation and advice to the patients and their relatives, my interest in this disease is much more than clinical. I know with certainty that it isn't depressing nor hopeless if everyone concerned is sincerely interested and motivated by a spirit of love.

As I perform my daily duties, I am constantly amazed at the rational answers I get from patients said to be "out in left field"—from faceless men who live their lives behind locked doors. These amazing responses are often enthusiastically recognized by Catholic chaplains when called upon to administer the last rites—the sacrament of extreme unction—to critically ill patients. About a week ago, for instance, I was called to the bedside of a long-term patient who was dying from a kidney infection. He was a middle-aged man and had been catatonic (a psychotic manifestation which keeps a person from talking or communicating with anyone) for years. The first thing a priest does when administering this sacrament is to determine if the patient is conscious and able to communicate his thoughts. Even though I knew this man was catatonic, I questioned him. "Do you know who I am?" I asked.

"The priest," he answered.

"Would you like to make your confession?" I asked. "You are very sick and may not live."

He said he would like to make a good confession. He also told me he loved Almighty God and asked Jesus, Mary, and Joseph to pray for him. His confession was very rational. Two days later he died. This is definitely not depressing nor hopeless work when we consider man's eternal destiny.

I'll never forget my first day at the hospital. It was a Sunday—my real working day. I was truly a layman in disposition because the popular conception of the mentally ill haunted me as I prepared for my ministrations. I asked myself if I had been thinking rationally when I volunteered for this work. No matter how I reasoned with myself, I could not stamp out the false idea that these people were different. Very consciously I adverted to the many bizarre stories attributed to mental patients.

As I approached the altar to offer the holy sacrifice of the Mass, I had many misgivings about my ability to help these unfortunate men. To be perfectly frank, I was scared. For heaven's sake, I thought, they may come up and pull at my vestments, light a cigarette from the Mass candle, or God forbid, upset the chalice of the precious blood. My mind was active with possibilities. Soon it was time to read the Sunday Gospel and deliver the sermon. As I walked over to the pulpit, I felt limp and horribly inadequate. When I gazed out at my congregation, I did not have the slightest recollection of the sermon I had prepared. But the Holy Ghost, I now realize, was on my side because I was able to introduce myself. That settled me.

"I'm Father Paul Revere, your new chaplain," I said.

From somewhere in the depths of my new congregation a voice welcomed me: "You're in the right place, Father."

I smiled to myself. I could have kissed him. Such a welcome allayed all my fears and I shall never be frightened again. His welcome taught me that the mentally ill have a sense of humor. Good, wholesome humor helps resolve any problem.

From that day on, I have almost daily been given samples of such uninhibited behavior; for example, on Christmas and New Year's mornings, when I stood in the pulpit and wished my flock a blessed Christmas and a happy New Year, I had many responses. Some might think this is a manifestation of mental illness. I believe it is their desire to belong, to participate, to return friendship and love that has been lacking in their lives for a long time. It is a manifestation of their sincerity and childlike honesty which I so often notice. It is definitely a quality that can be worked with effectively and fruitfully.

The relationship between a priest and a Catholic layman is unique. Everyone calls us father. Because of this spiritual fatherhood, Catholics have no qualms or misgivings about approaching us without any hesitation to talk about their most perplexing and intimate problems. Patients are constantly seeking me out for all sorts of advice and help and, very often, merely to sit down for a friendly chat.

One afternoon a patient dropped into my office for some light talk as he called it. There really isn't any light talk in this business—it all adds up at the end of the day on the black side of the ledger—for talk is the device that helps, more than we know, any emotional problem. By talking to an understanding and sympathetic listener, the sick person brings to the surface things that have been suppressed and are unconsciously disturbing him.

Johnny finally got around to the sermon I preached at mass that morning. In it I spoke of the Blessed Virgin as the "hope of the hopeless." This title was not invented by me—it was given to her centuries ago. Apparently Johnny had not heard it before.

"Father," he said, "when you spoke of the hope of the hopeless this morning, I listened for the first time in 10 years—that is, really listened. I've considered myself hopeless for years. Boy, us guys really need hope. And, as you said, to whom shall we turn if not to the Mother of God?"

We are living in an age that experiences little hope. Surely, we have made great material progress. Millions of cars travel our highways, television antennas top every home, jet planes zoom across the continent in 4 hours and we are sending man-made moons streaking through the heavens. But have these wonders canceled out the miseries? We know they have not. Our daily papers give us the answer—broken homes, divorce, juvenile delinquency, alcoholism, sex offenses, and all other sorts of crime are at an unprecedented high. The middle-aged person of today has witnessed two great wars and again is hearing serious threats of another. These sores on our culture cause many souls to lose hope. Never for a moment should we forget that loss of hope breeds fear and deep-seated traumatic experiences and despair. We chaplains in mental hospitals have this spelled out every day.

The mentally sick realize they are not well and that they need help. They are looking for help. Why doesn't everyone realize it? An occasional visit from a relative or friend who comes with an encouraging smile, a pleasant word, a prayer of hope, does wonders in helping the sick person back to tranquillity.

Two years ago Pope Pius XII changed the fasting regulations for the reception of holy communion. Before the change a person wishing to go to communion had to fast from all food and drink from midnight. Since the change, one has only to fast 1 hour from liquid and 3 hours from solid foods. Here a certain middle-aged patient receives holy communion every Sunday. One Sunday morning it was obvious he had eaten eggs for breakfast—some of them were still on his white shirt. Before he began his confession I said to him, "You have already eaten, you cannot go to communion."

"Only 3 hours fast now, Father," he quickly replied.

This man has been a patient for a number of years. Because of exceptionally poor hearing he is retiring and a little shaky in his walk. One might get the impression that he is "way out in left field" but in reality this sick man is aware of much. He is aware of the requirements for receiving holy communion. With the present advance in medicine and his great confidence in the Lord, there is much hope for him.

What is this advance in medicine that offers such great hope for the mentally sick? In recent years many new drugs have been discovered. They are called tranquilizers. By themselves they do not bring about any permanent cures, but they do have a soothing effect on agitated, depressed, and anxious persons. Patients who are in states that prevent approach or reasonable conversation with their doctors can now be reached with the use of the tranquilizer. These drugs render their temperament and manner conducive to therapy.

Perhaps, someday, medication will cure a good portion of mental illness. However, an illness that is associated with the whole person must, in my opinion, have the entire person treated. The causes of mental disease often go to the depths of a man's soul, to his basic outlook upon life, his sense of right and wrong, his relation to his Creator and to his fellow men. So, regardless of what progress is made in medicine, two other things are absolutely vital in bringing about permanent cures. Our Lord taught us both—love and patience. The need for love and patience in this area of social relations was very succinctly stated by Pope Pius XII

when speaking to an international gathering of psychiatric nurses. He said, "It is not so much the external medicines that heal them (mentally ill) as it is the company of healthy, harmonious spirits, who are able to give them back a calm and friendly outlook on the world and life."

People working in the field of mental health often see manifested the antithesis of Pius' formula. I have a classical illustration of this lack of love and patience. The daughter of an elderly patient on one of her very infrequent visits asked to see me. Her father has a number of eccentricities, I'll admit, but I am fond of him. He is a pleasant little man whose appearance reminds me of Clifton Webb, the actor. He dresses neatly, is immaculately clean, and is able to carry on a brisk conversation. His daily routine is a visit to our little chapel, coffee in the canteen, a leisurely walk around the hospital grounds, and an enthusiastic reading of the New York Times. He will, on occasion, look at a television show if it promises to be above the grammar school level of entertainment.

It was immediately obvious that the daughter was bitter and perturbed over my interest in her father. After I had listened to her complaints for some time, I asked, "You do not want me to be nice to your father?"

"You understand correctly," she replied. I informed her that this request was impossible and inconsistent with my vocation in life; and, furthermore, I planned on taking her father out to dinner in the near future.

"I suppose you'll send me a bill," she snorted.

I took my friend to dinner at the rectory of a priest whom I had once assisted. This priest is pastor of a new church and school that is modern in design and severely different from the church architecture my elderly friend was used to when hospitalized some 30 years ago. During the dinner the lonely layman showed himself to be a brilliant conversationalist, able to adapt himself to the table talk of priests and intelligently discuss church design and the skyrocketing cost of production with the flare of a modern business man. His first venture into society outside the walls of a stigmatized institution was highly successful. When I dropped him off at his ward that evening, he cried as he told me how very much he enjoyed being out with me.

I was in the hospital a short time when another gentleman made himself known to me. He was a committed patient. This means he was declared legally incompetent by a judge. Such a person is given a legal guardian who administers all of his worldly possessions. Two and a half years in a mental institution had not dampened the spirit and determination that brought him up the ranks from seaman to commander, U.S. Navy, retired. The salt still bubbled in his veins and he stood with the squared deliberateness of a sailor on a bridge in a raging squall. He still walked with a swagger. At 74 years of age and with a serious bout with mental illness behind him, his mind was clear and full of a lifetime of memories and hopes.

When we met, his case was dormant. His wife was reluctant to sign him out of the hospital and it appeared as though the commander was irrevocably beached, even though he had the courage, stamina, and ability to return to duty as a useful member of society outside an institution. For some reason the social work department at the hospital was not active on the case. When I persuaded them to take up the case, they got to work immediately—searching out all the possibilities for salvaging a soul of 74. After some months they unearthed a delightful family, living in country surroundings, who were happy to have the commander live with them.

The placing of patients in private homes is called family care. This program has been used for many years, with fine results, in placing orphaned and dependent children in happy surroundings. It is new in the field of mental health, but it is proving to be an excellent help in rehabilitation. (Anyone interested might contact the social service department of any mental hospital.) After the patient has been in a situation of this kind for a period of 6 to 12 months, without any serious setbacks, his case is reviewed by a board of doctors and usually he is officially discharged from the hospital. My friend has been with the hospital for almost a year. It is only a matter of time before he will be discharged as medically and legally competent. I feel the salvation of this good soul, rich mind, and grand personality was wrought through the presence of a priest to whom a man of faith felt free to turn.

When I came to the hospital Dr. Trollinger, the manager, and Dr. Weitz, the director of professional services, told me, "We must all work as a team in order to be successful." I had heard and read much about the friction and differences of opinion that exist between religion and psychiatry. I am happy to say my skepticism is resolved. Of course there are many people here who do not hold to the principles and dogmas of the Catholic faith, but I feel safe in saying that the great majority recognizes a spiritual element in man's makeup. This spiritual element is respected and the chaplain is used to great advantage. I am free to hear confessions and administer the sacrament of penance as I see fit. I am a welcome participant in many initial and diagnostic staff meetings. I am free to question the patients, air my observations, offer my opinions.

For ages the mentally ill were considered lost and hopeless. More often than not they were shunned as one might shun the plague. Fortunately, we are overcoming such erroneous attitudes. More and more people realize that, in reality, mental patients are merely sick people with sensitive souls who know they need help. But if they are cast off by those who can help, they become immersed in the mire of despair and seldom emerge. We all must suffer to some degree. But mental suffering is by far the most intense. Our Lord demonstrated this when He sweat beads of blood the night before he was crucified. When you are privileged to come in contact with the mentally ill give them the best gift you can—show them your love.

Certainly, in many cases, mental illness remains baffling. We have only begun to scratch the surface. Many as yet are never cured. There are many relapses. Experience, however, has clearly shown that the mentally ill respond favorably to love and kindness and patience. If we are determined to continue the fight, with all of our individual resources, one day "we who inhabit the world of the healthy will learn to what great extent we are in debt to those who inhabit the world of the sick." (Pius XII.) While waiting for the perfect cure, give them your love. Only in heaven will you know how much hope you then gave to the hopeless.

The Mind and Faith of Eugene Meyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the life and work of the late Eugene Meyer, public servant and publisher of the Washing-

ton Post and Times Herald, in many ways typifies America at its best. At the memorial services held for Mr. Meyer a few days ago Chief Justice Earl Warren delivered an eloquent eulogy. I believe this profound and moving memorial address deserves a wide audience as it reveals the hidden well springs of the mind and faith of Eugene Meyer—and perhaps those of Chief Justice Warren as well. The eulogy follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 22, 1959]
CHIEF JUSTICE WARREN GIVES EUGENE MEYER SERVICE EULOGY

(This is the text of the eulogy delivered yesterday by Chief Justice Earl Warren at memorial services for Eugene Meyer, chairman of the board of the Washington Post Co.)

This assembly of the family and friends of Eugene Meyer, who until last Friday was not only of us but with us, is to enable us to conjure with his eventful life and the circumstances that brought him into such happy associations with us during his stay here. We do this because he has departed from this world and is now on his journey to that undiscovered country from which no traveler returns.

We shall miss him greatly. But we are grateful that He who guides the steps of each of us allotted him such a long and purposeful sojourn here. We are grateful that his life touched ours in such intimate fashion. And we can have confidence, as did Abraham Lincoln when he departed on an uncharted journey, that He who can go with me and remain with you and be everywhere for good will continue to guide our friend and that all will be well.

A PIONEER BY NATURE

Eugene Meyer plowed new ground in every field he entered. He was a pioneer by nature, and he came by that spirit logically. Born of pioneering parents, who had braved the rigors of the long trek to California in the Roaring Fifties, he grew to manhood there in kaleidoscopic surroundings and imbibed the atmosphere of optimism and determination to do exciting things.

Although he reversed the admonition of Horace Greeley to "Go West, young man" by going to New York, he never relaxed the spirit of optimism, his desire to make things grow, and his determination to get things done in spite of obstacles.

His life cannot be summed up in a handful of words. His spacious spirit, the paths he walked, and what he did along the way, need much more than this memorial moment if they are to be given their true worth.

Yet we cannot be silent in the manner of our farewell. There is joyful gratitude to be voiced that he lived in our midst for so long. And along with this, there is a reason to be stated why his passing brings us into the community assembly, to be of one heart and mind with his own family.

We rejoice in the memory of Eugene Meyer as much for the manner of his life, as for the legacy of solid things he leaves to us.

He was, as all of us here know, a man of many interests; many talents, and many deeds. Yet overall, he had a special cast of person which set him off from most men for a life on a plane of his own. It was, at first glance, a cast of person which united contraries; a rigorous self-discipline on the one side, and an outward flowing, radiant vitality on the other.

HIS EXACTING STANDARDS

To his self-discipline, we owe the visible form of a man who was a lonely walker, who majestically rejected all license, who ruled himself at every turn by a self-critical intelligence. In this light, he seemed to stand a bit outside himself to see if his acts con-

formed not to what the public scrolls of honor said of him, but whether they conformed to the more exacting standards he set for himself.

Here was a morally and intellectually brave man—a man born to give himself no peace, to engage in an open-end debate with himself, to accept even his own life as a provisional project shot through with doubt.

When one approached him, he seemed to breathe the conviction that the living alone is not all that exists; that good fortune never stands in one place for very long; that those who have a measure of it must fight every day to deserve it. And beyond this, he seemed to breathe the conviction that there are visions of truth which transcend time itself; that he would strive to draw near to them for a close embrace, even though he knew their elusiveness to the human grasp.

GREATEST ACCOMPLISHMENT

He put the whole of his conviction into a single sentence at the time of his 80th birthday. When he was then asked to state what he felt was the greatest accomplishment of his life, he might have followed the fashion of the world and chosen among an assortment of things for which he had often been publicly honored. He might have chosen among the great industries he helped build, the key governmental posts he held, the newspaper he recreated, the benefactions that helped many institutions to do their work of cultivating the arts and the sciences. Yet he chose none of these. Color blind, and at times a bit deaf, he was a man who made his own fashions when it came to human values.

"The greatest accomplishment," he said in answer to the question put to him, "was in the form of a discovery—the discovery early in life of the power and the glory of the truth."

This was the heart within the heart of the man speaking. And it kept speaking that way to the very last days when his consciousness was fast ebbing. Even then, there was something more he wanted to know, something more he wanted to think and talk about—the reality or the illusions of the human senses, the relationship between the one and the many, the difference between a good life and the good society.

"Keep asking questions," he whispered from his bed as he talked of these things with a friend. And to a member of his family, he added as if to complete the idea: "The important thing is to know how to listen to the truth with your heart as well as hear it with your ears."

POWER FOR COMPASSION

Now what of his outward flowing, radiant vitality? What of this vitality in which a power for strenuous combat was entwined with an equal power for compassion?

This aspect of his person, far from being at odds with his self-discipline, was an extension of it. For no man can truly give of himself to others unless he first exists in complete self-possession; unless he is first the master of his own will and passions; unless he has a clear interior vision which tells him beforehand what to give and when and how to give of himself.

What Eugene Meyer was, he gave to others—freely, generously, bravely, and with a gaiety that shone most brightly when the background was dark with the air of crisis.

In such moments, stretching from the First World War to the recent present, where others faltered we saw Eugene Meyer move to the center of hectic counsels. We saw him bite off the end of a fresh cigar—his very personal signal that he was clearing the emotional decks for action. We saw him bear himself as one who had long foreseen the gathering crisis, was not overturned by its impact, but was ready for it with a plan of action. Indeed, his very bearing seemed to say that in his view of things, the mere

emotion of shocked surprise was unworthy of the human intelligence.

His presence in any such company of men meant that many things were certain to follow. It means that hard truths others had left unspoken would be spoken by him. It meant the presence of a will to decide what should be done and an eagerness to do it. It meant a readiness to assume the responsibility for the consequence of the decision that was reached and put in motion. It meant not a piecemeal approach to the needs of the hour, but a view of those needs as a single problem.

Above all, his presence meant a source of wit and laughter that eased the prevailing tension of nerves, and then aroused the company of distracted men to shake their fists in the very face of any adverse fortune. Thus there was caught from Eugene Meyer as if by contagion, a sense that whatever the ultimate issue, men in positions of trust would be a little better and brighter if they battled adversity instead of stoically resigning themselves to it.

"All that we value in civilization," Eugene Meyer once told a Senate committee in an hour of crisis, "has come about through the agency of men who refused to allow nature to take its course—men of heroic hope who used the sovereignty of their spirit and the light of their reason to force the proof that the human person can make his own purposes prevail in the face of blind fortune."

Here I come to the transcendent object of Eugene Meyer's life—to the point where his rigorous self-discipline and his radiant vitality found their perfect unity.

In his view, merely to be an American was in itself a moral state and a full-time career. Thus he would have his country inhabited by a race of choosing people—by people who voluntarily assumed the yoke and the glory of advancing mankind's best hopes. On this account, also, the transcendent aim of his life was to help elevate the whole tone of the public mind—to help cultivate excellence in the style of public discourse.

For he believed with all his heart that the beginning is the word; that in a democracy such as American is, public discourse should be conducted in ways where words are used to draw everyone closer to the realities they are meant to express. It was his fixed aim, therefore, to uphold the integrity of words so that the public itself could make a better choice between proper and improper objects of trust or jealous suspicion, between proper and improper objects of praise or censure.

One thing was certain to bring him roaring out in full armor, ready for battle. It was the taunting spectacle of public men practicing the small arts of flattery in order to win public trusts, though the public interest might thereby be betrayed. To him by contrast, men who held the trusts of office, along with those whose station in life makes them the natural leaders of public opinion, were dutybound to honor the quality of the public mind by always appealing to its power of right, reason and to the best motives of its free will.

Where did this ruling conviction come from?

He himself gave us the answer.

As a young man, graduated from Yale and in Europe for further education at the end of the last century, he had seen the Dreyfus case unfold in France. Of the formative things in his life, few things impressed him more deeply. Here was a whole state apparatus, geared to ratify an injustice by appealing to the lowest of human passions.

Yet this, to him, was but one aspect of the event.

There was another and happier aspect of the Dreyfus case which left an equally deep mark on his thoughts. As time wore on, he saw how a handful of men in France—

no more than four to start with—armed with nothing except appeals to reason, beat down and slowly leveled the walls of a state-supported falsehood. In the end, they won freedom not only for an officer who was falsely convicted of a crime, but also won freedom for the mind of a whole nation that it might know where justice lay.

The force of this experience from another time and age, formed the point of departure and the point of return for Eugene Meyer's lifelong attitude toward the conduct proper to men in their political natures.

A NOTE OF TRIUMPH

And now Eugene Meyer has passed from among us. In accomplishments and in honors, few things were denied him. If he never allowed himself to believe it, we on our part, dare say that his life ended on a note of triumph. And saying this, we foreclose our right to wish that for his own sake he had been granted added years beyond the 83 he lived.

Yet if there is a cause for public mourning at his passing, it is mourning for ourselves and not for him; mourning that we have lost in him a distinguished mind, an artist in many matters, a rare friend, a giver of good counsel, a patriotic spirit, a source of humor, and a graphic model for how a citizen of our democracy ought to bear himself if he means to bear himself well.

If we solace ourselves, it is with the thought that his wife, his children and the grandchildren of his seed are, as we know them, worthy carriers into the limitless future of those qualities which Eugene Meyer—a great patriarch—brought to all of us for the enrichment of our lives.

Narrow Gage Train to Yesterday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the last narrow gage passenger trains still in operation in the United States makes a spectacular 47-mile trip from Durango, Colo., north to Silverton—one of the famed mining towns of western Colorado. The train makes its daily trip in the summer and early fall through some of the most spectacularly rugged mountain country in North America. Mr. Speaker, Colorado's poet laureate, the Honorable Milford E. Shields, of Durango, has written a poem commemorating this "Narrow Gage Train to Yesterday," which I should like to insert in the Record. Mr. Shields' fine poem catches the spirit of the high mountain country of southwestern Colorado in a manner that is rarely done in prose or poetry. Mr. Speaker, I should like to suggest to my colleagues, particularly those from the eastern part of the United States, that when the session adjourns they go out to the mountains of Colorado for just a little while before continuing on their hurried way. I can guarantee them they would find it a most refreshing and rewarding experience. Mr. Shields' poem follows:

NARROW GAGE TRAIN TO YESTERDAY: DURANGO TO SILVERTON

(By Milford E. Shields)

Come, board the train to yesterday
That rides the rusting, narrow rails;
It puffs and chugs upon its way
Along the misty mountain trails.

It bends into the canyon deep
And skreals to get around the rim
Where eagles nest and shadows sleep
And skies at noon grow cool and dim.

It crawls beside the river swift,
Creeps 'round the foots of mountains high
Where present problems fade and lift,
Then like the clouds go flitting by.

Into the land of dreams it goes,
The dreams of men who searched for gold,
The world of yesterday of those
Prospectors of the mountains bold.

Behold these heights of granite vast
Where rugged life was wild and free,
Where sparkling Silverton was cast,
And men mined wealth for worlds to see.

Pass in this land of yesterday,
Here breathe the first and purest air,
Become renewed in God's high way,
Then face today with courage rare.

Alabama Legislature Appeals for Aid for Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the Alabama Legislature showed its keen awareness of the problems facing the southern textile industry recently when it adopted a joint resolution appealing to the Secretary of Agriculture and the President for action.

I hope every Member of Congress will read this resolution, which I have received consent to insert in the Record at this point.

The resolution referred to follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 18

Whereas the cotton textile industry is a major Alabama industry in the employment of people, in the use of capital, and in consuming a major Alabama farm product, cotton; and

Whereas the textile industry is of immense concern to farmers, bankers, merchants, and many others not directly connected with the textile industry; and

Whereas the textile industry is now in an untenable position due to foreign advantages in the form of much cheaper cotton and also much lower wages, with the average hourly wage in foreign textile mills being about one-tenth of American wages; and

Whereas the U.S. export subsidy on American cotton will be increased to 8 cents a pound effective August 1, 1959, thereby placing American mills at a still greater disadvantage; and

Whereas section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, authorizes and directs the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the President of the United States to act when it becomes

known that any industry is placed at an unfair and destructive disadvantage; and

Whereas the manufacturers of cotton textiles are now not only at an unfair and destructive disadvantage but in a position that is both unreasonable and intolerable: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Alabama (with the concurrence of the Senate of said body), That we respectfully request the Secretary of Agriculture and the President of the United States to act immediately in assembling essential facts and then use them in proper action in behalf of the textile industry under existing laws. Unless this is done immediately untold harm and irreparable losses are inevitable in addition to severe losses already suffered. If existing laws are not adequate (we believe that they are adequate) new laws should be enacted promptly.

Resolved further, That one copy of this resolution be sent at once to the President of the United States, one to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and one to each Member of the Alabama delegation in Congress with an urgent request that they take immediate steps to cause its activation in behalf of an industry that is of tremendous importance to the welfare and the total economy of Alabama and many other States.

Adopted by the house of representatives, July 7, 1959.

Adopted and concurred in by the senate, July 10, 1959.

Approved by the Governor, July 10, 1959.

Successful Federal School Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, Public Law 874 has been an extremely useful and equitable program of Federal assistance to public schools.

A recent reevaluation of the merits and workings of this program has been made by the University of Alabama's College of Education by use of a questionnaire which was submitted to a cross section of school superintendents in the more than 3,000 school districts receiving funds under Public Law 874. The survey dealt with such significant questions as the threat to State control of school policy, the amount of red tape involved, the equity of the formula, the adequacy of the assistance, and administration of the program under the Office of Education.

Results of the survey were consolidated in an article published in the July 1959 issue of the American School Board Journal, and I recommend it as worthwhile reading for all of our colleagues interested in the issue of Federal assistance for schools. The article follows:

SHALL WE EXTEND PUBLIC LAW 874?

(By J. V. Davis and L. R. Davis, College of Education, University of Alabama)

One of the significant Federal assistance programs for public schools has been that

provided by Public Law 874. This program has made Federal funds available for current operating expenses to school districts impacted by the national defense effort. Some idea of the scope of the program can be seen in the fact that during the past year over 3,000 school districts received Federal appropriations amounting to approximately \$90 million.

The nature of the Federal impact on school districts has been primarily of two types: (1) reduction of the local tax base due to the acquisition of property by the Federal Government; and (2) the sudden influx of population into a school district because of the establishment or expansion of defense installations. Enacted by Congress in 1950, Public Law 874 has been amended a number of times, but the Federal aid policy has remained essentially unaltered.

Since the assistance program to federally affected schools is being reconsidered by Congress currently, it would seem of interest to examine the current attitude of school superintendents toward Public Law 874. The writers recently prepared a series of questions dealing with the administration of Public Law 874 and submitted these questions to 100 school superintendents in federally affected districts. These districts were selected at random from throughout the Nation. Replies were received from 89 percent of the officials to whom questionnaires were submitted.

THREAT TO STATE CONTROL

By tradition, a major consideration of school officials in any Federal aid program is the assurance that educational control will remain at the State and local levels. In answer to the question, "To what extent do you think Public Law 874 has constituted a threat to State control of education?" slightly over 93 percent of the respondents replied "None." A small number of officials, 5 percent, termed the threat "little," while 2 percent indicated that they were "undecided." It would seem significant that in no case did a school official express the belief that Public Law 874 has "greatly weakened State and local control of education."

REDAPE OF PROCEDURES

There was a somewhat greater difference of opinion among school officials regarding the procedures involved in securing Federal assistance. Twenty-one percent of the respondents described the procedures as being very complicated, and 5 percent of this group termed the procedures unnecessarily complicated. On the other hand, 15 percent of the officials thought the procedures for obtaining financial aid were easily followed, and 64 percent of the respondents considered them not too difficult.

A number of officials commented regarding the application forms required of school districts in establishing financial entitlement. These forms, many officials stated, could be simplified without impairing their value and effectiveness. Typical of the complaints was the following: Too much data required, much of which is irrelevant. The term "redtape" appeared repeatedly in the comments. A few officials, however, observed that the complexity of the procedures was probably necessary to protect Federal funds from misuse.

EQUITY OF FORMULA

Because of the many types of financial burdens imposed on school districts by Federal projects, it has been a challenging problem for Congress to devise a formula which would provide fair and equitable payments to affected schools. Judging from the replies to the questionnaire, however, it would appear that the majority of school officials are satisfied with the present formula. Of the school officials replying 91 percent expressed the opinion that the present basis for determining entitlements is reasonably fair and equitable. Seven percent considered the formula very generous, and only 2

percent of the respondents declared it unfair and inequitable.

In commenting on this question, several officials expressed the opinion that Federal funds could be more equitably distributed if the local contribution rate were not a factor. Schools in the South, according to a few of the respondents, were penalized by the formula. One official noted that in 1956 Federal payments ranged from \$154.01 per pupil in Illinois to \$67.77 per pupil in Alabama. There was, also, some criticism of the absorption clause under which communities are required to assume part of the Federal impact.

ADEQUACY OF ASSISTANCE

The majority of respondents indicated that they consider the financial aid given under Public Law 874 to be "adequate." A smaller percent of the officials found the assistance to be "more than needed"; but there were 30 percent of the respondents who thought the aid "inadequate" and 9 percent who considered it "much less than needed." The chief criticism seemed to be that Congress could not be counted upon to appropriate adequate funds to meet full school entitlements each year.

CONTINUANCE OF FEDERAL AID

Since Public Law 874 is set to expire next year, a fundamental question is whether or not there will be a continuing need for Federal assistance to schools in defense areas. Over 75 percent of the officials replying to the questionnaire stated that the assistance program should be put on a permanent basis. Many of the respondents declared that their schools could not operate without Federal aid of some kind. The following comments would seem to reflect the prevailing opinion of school officials in impacted areas:

"We would like to see it perpetuated on its present basis. We could not possibly provide the educational program now offered without the assistance provided through Public Law 874."

"Congress would do a real service to the schools if it would insist upon getting a satisfactory bill and establishing the aid on a permanent basis."

"The program should be longer than a 2-year period. This would make for more efficient planning."

OFFICE OF EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION

Despite complaints regarding application procedures and the distribution of funds, school officials would seem to be satisfied with the overall administration of Public Law 874 by the U.S. Office of Education. Sixty-six of the school officials, or 74 percent, thought the Office of Education was administering the assistance program in an "efficient" manner, and 23 percent considered the work of the Office of Education "very efficient." Only 3 percent of the respondents described the performance as "inefficient."

The comments of school officials were mostly complimentary. Typical of the remarks was this: "The representatives of the U.S. Office have been very helpful . . . (they) are experienced men who seem to know their business."

The Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial

entitled "The Highway Program," which was published in the New York Times of July 30. I also ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix, in connection with the editorial, an article on the same question, written by C. P. Trussell, and also published in the New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorial and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 30, 1959]

THE HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Reluctance of Congress to match highway construction needs with responsible financing had its logical sequel yesterday in the gravely unsatisfactory program voted out by the House Ways and Means Committee.

The 41,000-mile plan of interstate highway building will be delayed, with a stretch-out over a longer period of years. Immediate allocations to the State will be sharply cut and continue so for several years, throwing State schedules into utter confusion. A billion dollar bond issue will be authorized, breaking with the sound policy of pay as we go inaugurated when the highway plan was formulated in 1956.

All this regrettable compromise stems from Congress' refusal to accept President Eisenhower's recommendation, first made months ago and steadily reiterated that the gasoline tax be increased 1½ cents a gallon. The results will be serious, immediate, and go beyond the adverse effect on highway building.

Just a week after the President put the case for a balanced budget next year so well, and the desirability of beginning to reduce the vast public debt, and emphasized the astronomical cost of interest payments in a budget missing balance by more than \$12 billion in the most recent fiscal year, the House committee departs on this new adventure in deficit financing and inflationary spending policy. It ignores the fact that, in this most prosperous of all times, Congress has failed thus far to put the Government on a current cash basis.

An instant protest can be expected from the States, which in many cases have already been spending future money on the assurance of long-term commitments from the Government, which was one of the valuable principles established by the 1956 law, enabling the State to know what to expect year after year instead of waiting to see in each congressional session what money would be available. The new highways are needed. In fact we need today the highways of tomorrow that the Federal program promised.

It is only fair that all users of the highways should pay their way on the new roads. To use the revenues of taxes other than that on gasoline to amortize the proposed billion-dollar bond issue to the detriment of a balanced budget and a further delay in the reduction of the Federal debt is to rob Peter to pay Paul. The interest charges on the bond issue will increase the cost of the highway program, a disservice to all taxpayers including motorists.

The Ways and Means Committee has taken an unwise course damaging to the highway construction program and the Nation's economy as well. Its plan must be rejected and an ample gasoline tax increase substituted.

BILLION IN BONDS URGED FOR ROADS—HOUSE UNIT FAVORS 5-YEAR ISSUE OVER GAS TAX RISE

(By C. P. Trussell)

WASHINGTON, July 29.—The House Ways and Means Committee recommended today that the interstate highway building program be financed with a \$1 billion revenue bond issue.

It rejected President Eisenhower's call for taxing motorists 1½ cents more for a gallon of gasoline. It also called for a drastic slowing of the \$41 billion program, perhaps for

several years, until available cash could cover the operations.

The bonds, drawn against the assets of the highway trust fund, would be paid off within 5 years.

Alternatives to the White House request for increasing the Federal gasoline tax from 3 cents to 4½ cents won a vote of 15-10 at a closed session of the tax-writing panel. It was emphasized by committee spokesmen that Republicans had joined Democrats in opposing taxes on gasoline, and also on diesel fuel, tires, tubes, trucks and buses, as the President had requested.

The committee also recommended that one-fifth of the revenues from the excise levies on new automobiles, running more than \$1 billion a year, be transferred to the highway building account.

The transfer also was opposed at the White House because it would reduce funds going into the general Treasury accounts and possibly require other bond-financing programs to cover the losses.

The pattern followed by the ways and means panel was one that President Eisenhower had pronounced as being "not satisfactory." Supporters of the alternatives recommended today asserted that President Eisenhower had recommended a similar bond issue in 1955 that was rejected by the Democrats.

The administration looks upon the bond program as conflicting with the marketing of other Government securities and having an inflationary result.

As explained by Ways and Means Committee spokesmen, the 40,000-mile interstate highway program would be stretched out from completion in 1972 to completion in 1976. With this slowing of pace, the allocations of funds to States, with the Federal Government paying 90 percent of the costs, would drop drastically.

The program for the current year would continue as nearly as possible at full volume. But the allocations to States for the fiscal year starting next July 1 would be reduced from \$2,500 million to about \$600 million. The apportionment to States would fall from a planned \$2,200 million to \$1,400 million for 1962.

For 1963, allocations would be reduced from \$2,200 million to about \$1,500 million. Future allocations would be cut to conform to the postponed completion period.

Representative RICHARD M. SIMPSON, Republican, of Pennsylvania, the ranking minority member, held that the proposed interest-bearing bonds would put a further squeeze on consumers and small businesses.

The Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the issue of July 30, 1959, of the Washington Missourian, published at Washington, Mo. This paper has repeatedly received from the State press association awards of merit designating it as one of the outstanding newspapers of the State:

GIVES OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED LABOR BILL
There is no doubt that every union member in town, as well as most of the rest of

us, are interested in the proposed labor legislation now before Congress.

Many of us, except perhaps the union members, actually do not know too much about this proposed legislation. We have heard that the unions object to it strongly, and many of us have taken the position that labor simply doesn't want to be regulated.

The fact, however, is that the unions appear to have a legitimate grip. Labor's side of the bill was fully explained last week by John McDermott at the National Conference of Weekly Newspaper Editors at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. Mr. McDermott is a former union member, a former business agent for his union, who has since become thoroughly familiar with the labor movement, and is now on the university's staff. Some of his work is devoted to mediation between labor and management.

The man strikes you as a very sincere and fairminded individual. He readily admits some of the abuses on the part of big labor leaders, as well as those of management. After listening to him and asking him questions for several hours we were convinced that he was honest and sincere in his convictions, and, as we have just stated, he saw the wrong in labor, just as he did in management.

He didn't think the present session of Congress would enact any kind of labor bill, but he did think that in the years ahead a workable labor bill would be worked out.

Also, he didn't think that the present proposed bill would do a thing to correct the abuses that several of the nationally known labor leaders have been accused of.

Here are the objections to the proposed bill now before Congress as outlined by Mr. McDermott:

1. The burdensome and detailed financial accounting couldn't be carried out by the small locals.
2. It gives the Secretary of Labor such powers that he could break any union he wanted to.
3. No union funds could be used to defend a union official accused of wrongdoing.
4. It would encourage defeated candidates for union office to have the election set aside.
5. It would provide broad powers to remove union officers from office who are accused of misconduct.
6. It would provide extreme penalties for violations, including a \$10,000 fine and 2 years in jail.
7. It would bar convicted union officers from serving their unions in any capacity for 5 years.
8. The bonding required by union officers would be prohibitive for the average union officers.
9. It would prohibit certain types of peaceful picketing.
10. It would ban the hot cargo clause in some union contracts.
11. It would prohibit what is known as "racket union" picketing.
12. It would give a rowdy union member power to control union meetings.

The biggest objection Mr. McDermott had to the proposed bill was that it would not eliminate a single union abuse, and make it next to impossible for some of the smaller unions, at least, to operate because of the burdensome financial reports required by all of them, and by giving the Secretary of Labor such dictatorial powers that unions would be at his mercy.

The unions have some good arguments in their favor, and, besides, a bill that won't eliminate the abuses at the top is no good anyway. These abuses don't come from the rank and file of the union members, but from the brass at the top, at least some of whom are more interested in their own gain, than they are in the gain of the people they represent.

Donation of Thomas A. Edison Home to Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, brief ceremonies on August 3, 1959, will mark the formal transfer of Glenmont, the home of Thomas A. Edison, in West Orange, N.J., to the Federal Government.

The donation of this historic landmark by McGraw-Edison Co., will mark the final addition to what will eventually be known as the Edison National Monument. The laboratory group of buildings are already a part of the national park system.

Glenmont, where Thomas A. Edison spent 45 years of his life and where many of his 1,000-plus inventions were thought out, contains numerous mementos of appreciation presented to Thomas Edison for his many contributions to modern civilization.

As soon as administrative details are worked out, it will be open to the public.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a release from the Department of the Interior on this subject.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THOMAS A. EDISON HOME TO BE DONATED TO FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Glenmont, the home where Thomas A. Edison lived for 45 years, and where many of his 1,000-plus inventions were thought out, will become the property of the Federal Government on Monday, August 3, it was announced today by the Department of the Interior.

The multigabled house, in West Orange, N.J., is being donated by the McGraw-Edison Co., his corporate heir, as an addition to Edison Laboratory National Monument, according to Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service, which administers the monument. The laboratory group of buildings, often referred to as Edison's work bench, have been a part of the national park system since 1956. With the addition of the home, the area will eventually be renamed Edison National Monument.

Brief ceremonies at the home will mark the formal transfer of title to Glenmont. Former New Jersey Gov. Charles Edison, a son of the inventor and chairman of the board of directors, and Max McGraw, president, will be the principal representatives of the McGraw-Edison Co. Assistant Secretary Roger C. Ernst will represent the Department of the Interior and Director Wirth the National Park Service. Also attending will be other members of the Edison family and the donor company.

Situated in a beautifully landscaped 13.5-acre tract on a hill overlooking the laboratory buildings, Glenmont contains numerous mementos of appreciation presented to Thomas Edison for his many contributions to modern civilization. Adding to the historical interest of the 23-room house are tribal souvenirs presented by American Indians, primitive hunting weapons sent by Eskimos, a Russian czar's gift of statuettes

of Cossacks astride their military steeds, and many others. These and the household furnishings have been left virtually undisturbed since Mr. Edison's death in 1931.

The famous landmark was the home of his widow, Mina Miller Edison, during the 16 years she survived her husband. Since 1947, it has been maintained as a limited-use museum by the McGraw-Edison Co. and its predecessor company, Thomas A. Edison, Inc.

When the laboratory buildings were presented to the Federal Government several years ago by Thomas A. Edison, Inc., Glenmont was designated a national historic site by the Secretary of the Interior. President Eisenhower, on February 17, 1959, authorized Secretary Seaton to accept the tender-of-gift of the Edison home.

Park Service Director Wirth said that Glenmont will not be open to the public until administrative details of conditions and hours of opening are worked out with the trustees of Llewellyn Park, a semiprivate residential area surrounding the property.

What Should Trade Missions Mean to You?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article by Fred Wittner, president of Fred Wittner Co., of New York, which appeared in the July issue of *Industrial Marketing*:

WHAT SHOULD TRADE MISSIONS MEAN TO YOU?

(By Fred Wittner, president, Fred Wittner Co., New York)

Right at this moment in a number of far-flung places of the world small teams of American industrialists are spreading good will of inestimable value to their country. In concentrated 6-week periods, they are working long hours, covering vast distances, and undergoing countless travel inconveniences—all without monetary remuneration. In return they receive personal experiences, knowledge, and satisfactions which cannot be measured in money.

These private businessmen are part of a relatively unsung but tremendously significant program instituted a few years ago by President Eisenhower to encourage two-way trade between the United States and the rest of the world. The program: Trade Missions of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

The author of this article was the first industrial advertising agency man to go on such a mission (last fall, to Yugoslavia). It was a rich, unforgettable experience, during which time I was never more proud to be a part of industrial advertising. This spring Charles L. Rumrill, president, the Rumrill Co., Rochester, N.Y., was a member of the trade mission team which went to West Germany, and Robert N. D. Arndt, vice president, Arndt, Preston, Chapin, Lamb & Keen, Philadelphia, was with the team that went to Poland.

Because of the great need for industrial marketing specialists to man the teams, this article will describe the objectives of the program, its accomplishments to date, and the reasons why industry—yes, you who

read this—should support it by making men available for the purpose.

However, before I take you behind the scenes, let me say at the outset that I can conceive of no more valuable contribution by private enterprise to better long-term international relations. This partnership of industry and government in achieving person-to-person contacts between American and foreign businessmen widens our understanding of the expanding world of commerce and, even more important, corrects the existing image of America which prevails in other countries.

ILL-WILL AMBASSADORS

If you have traveled abroad at all, you know that the image of the United States needs correcting. Every year hundreds of thousands of our fellow Americans go overseas as tourists; but unfortunately, they accomplish little in building goodwill for their country. Often, for the most part unintentionally, they hinder it.

Better dressed, better fed, spending more money during their holidays than many natives acquire in their lifetimes, they create hostility instead of understanding. Welcomed for the dollars they bring, they leave little of lasting impact except envy. (Foreign aid in dollars only creates the same unwholesome impression. Nobody really likes a rich uncle. He could always give more if he really wanted to.)

Envy is the closest emotion to hate; so we as a nation must do more than merely impress other peoples with our wealth and high living standards. We must give of ourselves, share our knowledge and point the way to self-sufficiency, which peoples everywhere, regardless of their birthright, yearn to achieve.

This trade missions program is accomplishing—at an expense to taxpayers so small that it can scarcely be found in the budget report.

MISSION DESCRIBED

The best way to describe the program is to quote from the U.S. Department of Commerce's "What is a Trade Mission?" (from its "Questions and Answers for Prospective Trade Mission Members"—which you can get by writing to the Trade Missions Division, Bureau of Foreign Commerce, Washington 25, D.C.):

"The Department of Commerce considers the trade mission as the spearhead of its activities in the international field, carrying out at the grassroots level—directly with the foreign businessman—its functions to foster, promote and develop the foreign commerce of the United States: trade, investment, tourism, and general commercial relations.

"A trade mission is a group of commercial men (usually three to five private businessmen accompanied by a Department of Commerce leader) sent abroad to further the interests of the United States. For 6 or more weeks they visit the various cities in the country concerned and meet business and government executives in group meetings and individual consultations on how business is done with and in the United States. If timed to coincide with an important international trade fair, they maintain a U.S. Trade Information Center in the U.S. exhibit at the fair, where their consultation services are available to all.

"In the course of this period, and depending on the size of the business community in the country visited, they meet personally from 1,000 to 5,000 or more businessmen, including the leaders of the country."

By the end of December 1958, the Department of Commerce had organized and sponsored 63 trade missions along these lines. These missions have carried the American business story and concrete evidence of unselfish American cooperation to 38 countries

and more than 470 cities since the program began in January 1955.

DOES IT WORK?

Has the program been successful? In answer, I will draw on my own and the experiences and reactions of my associates of the 1958 Yugoslavia trade mission team. Also I want to quote Samuel P. Hull, sales manager and director, Worcester Stamped Metal Co., Worcester, Mass., who was a member of one of the first teams sent out from Washington (in 1955, to Italy):

"Our objective as a group was selling, selling on many levels. We were selling our Government's sincerity and interest in promoting two-way trade, selling our President's overall interest and sincerity of purpose in bringing a closer rapprochement between countries; selling the American way of life and the democratic philosophy of our Government.

"A terrific impression was made on the people with whom we came in contact by the fact that we were there . . . that we were willing to take several weeks away from our business, in some cases at considerable personal sacrifice, in order to discuss and attempt to solve business problems with them. It was a matter of no little importance in their minds that we were there to try to assist them. Certainly, our Government has displayed and is displaying this same interest in helping them; but governments are, of necessity, somewhat impersonal, at times very remote from the individual and his particular current problem.

"But here was an individual, better yet, five individuals—in person—keenly interested in hearing them out, in discussing all the innumerable details, and in giving direct, concrete help. It was new and wonderful. One of the first questions asked us wherever we went was, 'Is your Government going to continue this next year and the year after? Are you coming back again?'"

That was also the biggest single reaction we experienced in Yugoslavia: surprise and pleasure over our being there. In our case the United States was there for the third successive year, covering new areas of the country, meeting many businessmen who hadn't been exposed to the previous trade missions, inspecting new factories, visiting tourist resorts, answering more advanced questions.

WHAT AND WHY

Other countries, particularly those where all industry is state controlled, send out trade missions which are empowered to negotiate concrete trade agreements and to buy and sell products. U.S. trade missions, on the other hand, bring only information—information about American markets and how to reach them, American tastes and how to satisfy them, American sources of equipment and raw materials and information on how to attract more American tourists.

Why should the United States send a trade mission, at taxpayers' expense, to a Communist-controlled country such as Yugoslavia?

Here's why: Tito and his "markedly brave, tenacious, kindly and perennially hopeful people" (as the Christian Science Monitor recently described them) are noncommitted Communists. They broke with Stalin in 1948 and again with Khrushchev in 1955.

Here communism is not a monolithic structure attempting to shape all people in the same mold. The U.S. Government recognizes this difference. We have equipped the Yugoslav Army, have helped to offset their deficiencies in wheat and are helping construct hydroelectric dams and fertilizer plants.

As a result, Yugoslavia is not behind the Iron Curtain; we have an important window there from which to watch the satellite bloc; our U.S. Information Service and Voice of

America operate without restrictions; and our embassy enjoys free intercourse with Tito's government.

In other words, we are being realistic. Sending trade missions of private businessmen to Yugoslavia is an extension of this realism. It is for this same reason that we have sent trade missions to Poland during the last 2 years, why we encourage the importation of Yugoslav and Polish products into America, and why we look with favor on Americans visiting a country such as Yugoslavia—which, by the way, is one of the most beautiful in Europe, offering much to the American tourist.

TRADE MISSION AT WORK

Now let's take a look at an actual U.S. trade mission—the one the author was on—in action. Yugoslavia had suggested three areas of assistance for the 1959 U.S. trade mission:

1. Assisting Yugoslavia in its important lead, zinc, and copper industries—which constitute a substantial portion of its exports to the United States—and providing information for its growing machinery and metal fabrication industries. The businessman assigned to this phase of the mission was John D. Dewhurst, president of Arrow Tool Co., Wethersfield, Conn.

2. Helping to increase American tourism to Yugoslavia. Over 550,000 Americans visited Europe and the Mediterranean in 1957. They spent, exclusive of travel fares, \$483 million. Less than one-half of 1 percent of this money was spent in Yugoslavia. The businessman assigned was Robert C. Gordon, advertising sales manager of Time.

3. Explaining American marketing methods and techniques. Since Yugoslavia's exports to the United States have risen slowly to \$33 million annually, a greater understanding by Yugoslavia's businessmen and tourism officials of the important place of sales promotion, advertising, and public relations would enable them to communicate more effectively about their products, services and facilities. The author of this article was the businessman assigned.

Accompanying this trio were Wendell Moore of the Trade Missions Division, as team leader; Harold E. Allen of the Department of Commerce, as assistant team leader; Ross Titus of the economic section of the American Embassy; Aleksandar Ozerovic of U.S. Information Service, Belgrade, as translator; and Stefan Zec of the Yugoslavia Federal Chamber of Commerce.

The team was briefed for 4 days in Washington by Commerce and State Department officials in Washington, and for several days on arrival in Belgrade by Foreign Service and USIS officials at the American Embassy.

TOUGH SCHEDULE

Then we started crisscrossing the Yugoslav mountains with Bronka and Luka, the Ambassador's and Chargé d'Affaires' chauffeurs, in a Chevrolet limousine and a Ford station wagon.

During the succeeding 6 weeks we spent several days in each of the trade information centers of the American pavilions at the Belgrade and Zagreb Fairs, held group meetings in 10 cities of the country's 6 Republics, and visited 11 tourist resorts and 16 industrial plants.

When we returned to Belgrade at the end of September we had put 4,000 miles on the speedometers of the embassy's cars, 75 percent of this mileage being over steep mountain roads. In addition, we had flown from Belgrade to Skopje, from Lake Ohred to Belgrade, from Belgrade to Titograd and from Split to Belgrade—not to mention an overnight rail trip on the famous Orient Express from Sarajevo to Zagreb, and a cruise down the Adriatic by motorship from Rijeka to Split.

In these 6 weeks we didn't have a day off. Most mornings we were up at 5 or 6 a.m. to push on to the next meeting over

hazardous, winding roads, stopping en route to visit factories, exchange Slivovic (plum brandy, the Yugoslav's vodka) toasts with officials; partake of seven-course official luncheons and dinners; and answer innumerable questions about American industry, American markets, American tastes, American attitudes. Questions like:

"What are the major metal-fabricating markets in the United States?" At Yugoslavia's largest steel mill (Zenica, in the Republic of Bosnia—Herzegovina) we gave the managing director and commercial director a copy of Steel's marketing map of the metalworking industries. You would think we had included them in the Marshall plan.

"Where in the United States can we buy steel plate for ships—and equipment for machining it?" In the shipbuilding city of Rijeka (the former Italian city of Fiume) we left a copy of Iron Age's 1958 "Annual Review" issue. The expressions of gratitude were embarrassing.

"Which American advertising agencies, specializing in export, would like an affiliation with the leading Yugoslav advertising agency?" (Believe it or not, there are 18 American-type advertising agencies in that small country—the size of Oregon.)

BUSINESS PAPERS

How can a small team of specialists answer all these questions? The answer is the availability of American business magazines. With every trade mission, the Department of Commerce sends a commercial library, consisting of 1,000 business publications and directories, covering every category of American private industry.

This is the research department of the trade mission. The library is set up in the U.S. pavilion at the country's international trade fair. The publications enable members of the mission to answer questions quickly about conditions in a particular industry or market: where specific products can be purchased, marketing techniques, price trends, tariffs, convention dates, etc.

I said at the outset that I was never more proud of being a part of industrial marketing. When I watched Yugoslav business and government officials stand in amazement before row after row of American business, trade, and technical magazines, I knew, if I never did before, how vital our business press is.

UNFORGETTABLE

If I have stirred your interest in the trade missions programs and you feel that either you or one of the executives of your company would participate, you can get all of the details by writing to: E. Paul Hawk, Director, Trade Missions Division, Office of Trade Promotion, Bureau of Foreign Commerce, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington 25, D.C.

If you go on a trade mission, you'll never regret or forget the experience. In the words of one trade mission alumnus:

"It is the cheapest investment ever made for the best results. I personally feel that in the 7 weeks I was in that country, I contributed more to the service of my country than in the entire 4 years I was in the U.S. Army.

Milwaukee Journal Challenges Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the country forgot with deep interest the

exchange between Premier Khrushchev and Vice President Nixon; and many Americans must have been struck by the assertion of Khrushchev that "the Communist regime is not afraid of ideas, that it has broken free from such a situation." Recently the Milwaukee Journal delivered a slambang reply to this Khrushchev assertion and I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NOT AFRAID OF IDEAS, EH?

In their famous "kitchen debate," Vice President Nixon said to Nikita Khrushchev: "You must not be afraid of ideas." The Soviet Premier replied: "We tell you not to be afraid of ideas. We have no reason to be afraid. We have already broken free of such a situation."

So? Perhaps Khrushchev was not aware that almost simultaneously his people had demanded removal of more than 100 books from the American library in an adjoining section of the American exhibition. They were books of history and travel and anthologies of Russian literature. None were for sale; they were evidence of the kind of books available in libraries in this country.

There was no question about the Soviet's right to demand removal of the books. Agreements providing for the exchange exhibitions in Moscow and New York State that host governments have a veto on exhibits. As far as is known, the United States vetoed no Russian exhibit in New York. To have vetoed any books would have been ridiculous; Russian books, magazines and newspapers are freely available in this country to those who want them.

"We have no reason to be afraid," said Khrushchev. Maybe not, but someone in Moscow was afraid of a few books on display shelves. Khrushchev's words were being disproved as he said them.

If further evidence of Khrushchev's error, or dishonesty, is needed, it was provided at Geneva last week. A committee of the United Nations Economic and Social Council, after months of work, completed a declaration on freedom of information. It stated these principles, among others:

(1) Everyone has the right to seek and convey information and ideas. (2) All governments have the responsibility to pursue policies under which the free flow of information will be protected. (3) No government or public or private agency should have a monopoly on all means of disseminating news and ideas. (4) All media of information should report honestly and in good faith.

The vote for adoption was 13 to 3. Those voting "no"—Soviet Russia and its Communist stooges, Bulgaria and Poland.

Not afraid of ideas, Mr. Khrushchev?

Spending Marathon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, there has been much conversation recently regarding the fact that fiscal year 1959 ended with a deficit of \$12.5 billion. I offer the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune of July 22, 1959, the contents of which I consider very worthy of your

serious attention. When considering the foreign aid appropriation measure last week the Congress had the courage to require a particular foreign country to strictly limit its spending and indebtedness. Why do not we, and why cannot we, practice what we preach? The editorial follows:

SPENDING MARATHON

No one was very surprised Monday when the Treasury announced that the fiscal year 1959 had ended with a deficit of \$12.5 billion. Some had expected it to be even greater. The deficit was the gap between receipts of \$68.2 billion and expenses of \$80.7 billion.

When in January 1953, President Eisenhower drew up the budget for the year ending July 1, 1959, he counted on income of \$74.4 billion and expenses of \$73.9 billion. Chairman Byrd of the Senate Finance Committee called the income estimate unduly optimistic in view of business conditions, and others of both parties were equally skeptical.

Democrats emphasize the decline in tax revenue caused by the recession. Revenue was, indeed, \$6.2 billion less than anticipated, but expenses, which are under the control of the Democratic Congress, were \$6.8 billion higher.

A glance at the accompanying chart should prove the absurdity of blaming our fiscal troubles solely or largely on declining income. In 43 years since 1913, the cost of running our Government has multiplied more than 100 times; yet in the same period our population has not even doubled.

The 40 years between 1874 and 1913 likewise saw our population double, and they were years of tremendous economic growth. Yet the cost of Government rose at about the same rate as population—from \$302 million in 1874 to \$724 million in 1913.

The spenders try to place the blame on defense spending and interest on the debt, which was incurred principally to pay for wars. These two items account for \$47 billion of our \$80 billion budget. But even assuming that our wars have been unavoidable and worthwhile, the argument is invalid.

In 1913, defense spending and interest amounted to \$370 million of our \$724 million budget, or only slightly less, proportionally, than now. In 1874 the two accounted for \$179 million out of total spending of \$302 million, or well above today's proportion. The truth is that nonmilitary spending has risen faster than military spending and interest combined.

The spenders blame our troubles also on inflation. But even allowing for inflation, the Government spends 30 times more for each one of us now than it did in 1913. And, what is more, it is the spenders themselves who are largely responsible for creating this inflation through their deficits. No matter how they sidestep and doubletalk, the spenders cannot escape the blame.

It is ironic that a foreign aid program for Spain was also announced on Monday, and that one of the requirements was that Spain impose strict limits on its spending and its indebtedness. It is distressing to see the good sense we preach to others but cannot seem to practice ourselves.

Lee Alexander Auchincloss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the passing of Mrs. James C.

Auchincloss, who for so many years served as an assistant to her husband, Representative JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, has been noted with sorrow by all of us who knew her so well. Keenly interested in the problems of New Jersey's Third Congressional District, she was well-known for the sympathetic assistance she rendered to all who sought a helping hand.

I wish to extend a note of personal sympathy to Congressman AUCHINCLOSS and his family at the great loss they have sustained and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a tribute to this gracious lady published in the Asbury Park Evening Press of Saturday, August 1.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEE ALEXANDER AUCHINCLOSS

Monmouth County has lost a distinguished woman in the passing of Mrs. James C. Auchincloss.

From the date of her entrance into public life in 1942 as congressional secretary to her husband she displayed a keen and competent interest in the problems of the constituents of Representative JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS.

During 17 years amid the busy routine of the Nation's capital she won the admiration of many who had personal as well as public problems. As a result many citizens have developed a closer relationship with Government and the Third Congressional District profited because its representative in Washington had the assistance of a gracious lady.

It is no wonder that some observers on Capitol Hill favorably compared the administration of legislative matters by Mr. and Mrs. Auchincloss with that of Vice President John Nance Garner who in his many years in the Congress relied on the confidential assistance of Mrs. Garner as his secretary.

Mrs. Auchincloss' interests were not confined to Government. During her active life she was concerned with the needs of the New York Infirmary, the United Hospital Fund, the Garden Club of America of which she was a director, and in World War II with the Monmouth County USO. These activities reflected the broad view she held of the public welfare and the responsibilities which women can fulfill. The loss experienced by Representative AUCHINCLOSS and his family is shared by thousands of his constituents.

Our Incomparable Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I include for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on the superlative manner in which the Vice President handled an enormously difficult assignment during the first hours of his visit to the U.S.S.R. This editorial, which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer some days ago—on July 27—is all the more interesting because the visit is now over and Vice President Nixon has left Russia. Right up to his farewell to the Russian people, to his very last words, he showed himself to be a statesman of

great stature. The Vice President has done our Nation a great service.

The editorial follows:

NIXON RISES TO THE CHALLENGE

Vice President Nixon, in the first few days of his Soviet tour, has shown great fortitude under fire and a remarkable ability to be simultaneously firm, forthright and friendly. Confronted with the most difficult assignment in his long experience as goodwill emissary, Mr. Nixon has conducted himself thus far in a most exemplary manner.

He has answered every challenge. He has evaded nothing. He has defended the honor, prestige, and principles of the United States against hostile criticism and disparaging innuendo.

The Vice President hardly had begun his tour of the U.S. exhibition in Moscow with Mr. Khrushchev when the Soviet Premier launched a tirade of derogatory remarks and thinly veiled threats.

If Mr. Nixon had lost his temper, as perhaps the wily Khrushchev hoped, the goodwill tour would have been foredoomed to failure.

If the Vice President had taken the abuse in silence or offered only feeble response, he and the Nation he represents would have been discredited in the eyes of the entire world.

Nixon handled the situation magnificently. He neither raged nor retreated. He gave Khrushchev some poignant lessons of life in America that the Soviet boss will not soon forget.

The Vice President—speaking to newsmen Sunday night after hours of private talk with Khrushchev in a secluded villa—stated a profound truth. "Mr. Khrushchev and I," Nixon said, "both have a practice of speaking directly and not beating around the bush."

It is precisely this trait that has won Mr. Nixon deep respect among the Russian hierarchy. Here, the Soviets found, is an American who talks back, who can take it and dish it out, who refuses to absorb abuse lying down but stands up and defends himself.

The Russians had become so accustomed to kicking Americans around verbally—with only mild response from official quarters—that Mr. Nixon's fighting stance caught them quite by surprise. They haven't fully recovered yet.

Political friends and foes of Mr. Nixon will weight carefully the effects of his Soviet tour in terms of the Vice President's popularity in this country. Already there is speculation that Nixon's sharp answers to Khrushchev at the U.S. exhibition hall will be either helpful or harmful to the Vice President's political future, depending on one's point of view.

The inescapable fact of the matter is that Nixon went to Russia as an official representative of the U.S. Government, not as a politician.

In giving extemporaneous replies to Khrushchev's biting remarks, Mr. Nixon did not have time to weigh the effects of his answers on his own political future. He would not have done so in any event. The Vice President is first and foremost a statesman of the highest caliber, and he is proving himself in Moscow to be exactly that.

Mr. Nixon's plan to visit Poland, at the end of his tour of Russia and Siberia that was severely limited in scope by order of the Kremlin, is an excellent idea. Nowhere in the Soviet satellite empire is the heartbeat of freedom stronger than among the Polish people.

Vice President Nixon's historymaking tour is off to an auspicious start despite Soviet efforts to sabotage it. He no doubt will encounter many new difficulties in the days ahead. The American people wish him well, confident that he has the personal courage and the diplomatic skill to meet any situation.

Montana: Sportsmen's Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the August 1959 issue of *Field & Stream* contains an excellent, comprehensive article on big-game hunting entitled "Trophyland, U.S.A." by Erwin A. Bauer.

The author not only describes hunting but gives interesting information on the wilderness country that makes Montana famous for outdoor recreation.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TROPHYLAND, U.S.A.

(By Erwin A. Bauer)

Softly and silently the first snow of September fell in the night. By morning our tents sagged dangerously under its weight, but this early snowfall was a blessing nevertheless. Now Danaher Meadow and the slopes all around were covered with a crust of white. Maybe the game would move, making tracking possible.

We were standing in the cook tent, backed up around Chauncey Mosslander's iron stove, where bacon fried and coffee brewed. I think it was the only warm, completely dry spot in the whole vast Bob Marshall Wilderness of Montana. We were listening to the wranglers swearing and the jangling bells of their horses. Suddenly we heard another sound faintly in the distance. It was the clear, flutelike, rising-and-falling bugle of a bull elk. There's no other sound like it.

For a minute no one spoke. Then Chauncey said, "That one isn't far away. On that first high ridge just behind us, I'd judge."

"Snow must have driven him down," Pete suggested.

"Or he found those five cows you saw yesterday," Chauncey turned the bacon and added, "Other bulls will be finding them too."

"Then why are we wasting time in camp?" Pete wondered.

Four hunters and their guides never bolted breakfast any faster than we did that raw and snowy morning. It seemed that the last note of the bull elk's bugling had hardly died away when we were saddled up. Soon Pete, guide Bill Rumble and I were following a faint blazed trail toward the timbered ridge behind camp.

For 30 minutes we pushed the horses up a steep switchback slope until they were blowing hard. Then we stopped to rest, but soon we pushed on again. Perhaps an hour later the trail leveled off, emerged from a heavy stand of lodgepole pine, and turned to follow the edge of the ridge.

When we reached a point where we could scan the lonely real estate around us, we dismounted and tied the horses. From inside his poncho Bill produced a footlong length of plastic garden hose and with it blew a shrill challenge to every male elk for miles around. For several minutes nothing stirred. There was no sound to suggest that anything alive even existed in that alpine country.

Then, directly below us, an elk answered. No sound in all the wild, not even of wolves hunting or of geese in flight, is half so

stirring as the bugle of a hot bull elk. This one was hot and close and spilling for trouble. It whistled, coughed, snorted, and barked almost like a big dog. Then silence.

"That fellow's ready," Bill whispered. "He just might come here to us. So let's try waiting him out."

It seemed an eternity, but it was only 10 minutes by watch before Bill challenged again. This time the elk answered immediately. It was closer—sounded only a stone's throw away—but we couldn't see the brute anywhere. The bristles were standing on the back of my neck. We continued to watch and wait. I saw Pete open, close, and open again the safety on his .30-06. Then Bill whispered, "Watch that patch of brush at 2 o'clock."

Suddenly the bull was standing in the open, head high, testing his wind in our direction. Immediately it sensed that something was wrong, and turned away. That's when things began to happen. Pete's rifle cracked and the elk stumbled, but somehow it vanished into the timber and we could hear it crashing away. It had been hit, and Pete was on his feet, ready to follow it.

"Take it easy," Bill said. "He won't go far."

We easily located the spot where the elk had been hit, and just a hundred yards farther on we found the bull itself. It had smashed head on into a deadfall. Pete was certainly the happiest man in Montana with his magnificent 6-points-per-side bull.

Every day through the various big game seasons in Montana there are hundreds of "happiest" men, for here is a promised land for those with trophies on their minds. It's a promised land because this picturesque State on the top of America is still relatively undeveloped, a region with wide-open spaces and an amazing wealth of wildlife—the biggest herds of big game, in fact, that still remain south of the Canadian border. It's a place where virtually any sportsman can still have a crack at big targets, with good odds in his favor and without mortgaging the old homestead.

Every American is a landowner in Montana, and he owes it to himself to check on his holdings at least once in a lifetime. These holdings include more than 16 million acres in 11 national forests, plus Glacier National Park and part of Yellowstone National Park. That amounts to 54,000 square miles, more than a third of the State. Of course, there's no hunting in the parks, but almost every square foot of national forest land is open to any outdoorsman with a State hunting license in his pocket.

In addition there are several State game-management areas and thousands of square miles of privately owned land where a visiting hunter is equally welcome. But no doubt the finest hunting country of all, as well as the most magnificent scenery, exists in nine wilderness areas established by the U.S. Forest Service. Completely primitive conditions have been preserved forever in all of them.

The 990,900-acre Bob Marshall Wilderness Area is the largest and best-known in Montana. It's a matchless region of high peaks and alpine meadows along the Continental Divide, lying just south of Glacier National Park. In it is the heart of the summer ranges of three major elk herds—the Pentagon, Sun River and South Fork of Flathead herds. Mule deer, black bear and moose are abundant too. Mountain goats and several bands of bighorn sheep live in the highest sections.

Grizzlies are vanishing critters in America nowadays, and there are few places where they can be hunted with any success. But the Bob Marshall is one of them. A hunter's chances are slim, though, since the total population in the country is little more than a thousand animals, about half of them in Montana.

The Selway-Bitterroot is the largest wilderness area in America. Although most of it is in Idaho, about 291,000 acres extend into Montana, and it's in the rugged alpine formations of this portion that goats are especially numerous. But sheer cliffs and canyons make them hard to reach. Elk, which drift in and out of the State over the mountain passes, are also abundant hereabout.

The 230,000-acre Beartooth wilderness is the most lofty parcel of real estate in Montana. Just northeast of Yellowstone Park, it features Granite Peak (highest point in the State) and famous Grasshopper Glacier. It also has all the native species of big game. So does the Anaconda-Pintlar wilderness (145,000 acres), which is located on the Continental Divide along the headwaters of Rock Creek and branches of the Bitterroot and Big Hole Rivers.

One of the most completely trackless, trailless places in western Montana is the Cabinet Mountains Wild Area (90,000 acres), which lies between the Kootenai and Clarks Fork Rivers. To bag elk, which are plentiful, or a bear in these mountains is a feat that any hunter will always remember. Other wilderness areas include Spanish Peaks (50,000 acres) on the Gallatin-Madison Divide; Mission Mountains (75,000 acres) on the east slope of the Mission Range, especially good for goats and bears; Gates of the Mountains (30,000 acres), just north of Helena; and Absaroka (64,000 acres), just north of Yellowstone Park.

Several seasons ago, in mid-September, Lon and Dale Swanson and I took Lon's 1½-ton truck, left the pavements far behind, and followed a trail that would have tripped up even mountain-reared mules. We finally parked in a lonely, forgotten glade on the edge of the Absaroka Wilderness Area. We had clear running water in a spring nearby, plenty of firewood, and a vast, high-altitude hunting country all to ourselves. We were going to live in the back of the truck deep in elk country and there hunt elk until all of us scored, no matter how long it required. It seemed like a good idea at the time, and it seems better than ever today, except for one thing. We had no sooner set up camp completely than a heavy wet snow fell. What's more, the mercury hit rockbottom and prevented the snow from melting. We were marooned.

For 4 whole days all three of us hunted hard. But trudging through the deep snow was more ordeal than pleasure. We found sign aplenty, but no one even saw a bull elk within shooting distance. The fifth day Dale decided to stay in camp to do all the cooking and try to thaw himself out.

Dale, finishing the breakfast dishes, happened to glance out through a hole in the tarpaulin truck flap. He saw a big elk standing broadside about 70 feet away. Dale simply reached for his .308 and—bam!—bagged it as easy as that. An hour or so later the animal had been field dressed, and its liver was soaking in a pan of ice-cold water.

But Dale's day was just beginning. Around noon a fine, fat mule deer came along, and he bagged that, too. When the rest of us returned that evening, skunked again, Dale had his rifle handy. "Now I'm waiting for a bear," he said.

It sounds like fiction, but it really happened. Just another reason why I say this is a promised land for hunters.

The Absaroka and the region all around it is especially good bear country—for blacks, that is. They're big and abundant enough to make things interesting. On this same hunt, the snows eventually melted, and we finally bagged a second bull at the point where the timber dead-ended into a steep rock escarpment. Two days later Lon and I were passing the site of the kill. From the looks of things, a bear had been there just before us and

gorged on the entrails. We decided to watch the spot.

It wasn't a long wait. When we arrived early the next morning, a whopping big blackie was on the kill. It turned and ran the second it saw us, but Lon managed a fast shot that looked like a bull's-eye at first. The bear rolled far downhill but somehow recovered and started off. Then there began a terrible chase that neither of us will ever forget. That bear headed straight for the most formidable cover in all Montana.

First it crossed an old burned-out area in which tall pines were stacked and crisscrossed to form an almost impassable barrier. Alternately we climbed over them and crawled under them, always figuring to meet the bruin face to face. But on the far side of the burn the bear's faint blood trail crossed a crumbling rockslide, then turned downhill until it reached a soggy, spongy creek bottom. It's hard to imagine how a wounded bear could negotiate this cover, but we followed it the best part of the day. It was almost dusk when we found the blackie as dead as last year's daisies. No trophy in Lon's big trophy room is as respected as that Absaroka black bear.

Any hunter in the land can live experiences like this in Montana's unspoiled country. So far we've covered only the western half of the State, but eastern Montana is big-game territory too. It's premium mule-deer country, for example, and, next to Wyoming, a sportsman's best bet for antelope, year in and year out. A wise hunter, therefore, engages a packer or an outfitter in this country—both to get the most out of his trip and to take advantage of a bargain. Nowhere else in North America can he get so much for his money.

Outfitters—either full-time or part-time ranchers—are found in every corner of the State, and they're bound by law and license to go a good job. A typical packer into back country furnishes everything except gun, sleeping bag and personal items. He provides horses, food, tents, guides (usually one for each two hunters), cook, wrangler, and a reasonably exclusive hunting country for about \$25 a day. Some are cheaper, some more expensive. But it's a rare one who doesn't at least show a hunter enough game to fill a license.

Licenses are reasonably priced in Montana too. A nonresident big-game license costs \$100 and includes elk, deer, bear, game birds, and fishing (which is often sensational in pack-trip country). Extra charges are made if a hunter can win a permit for sheep, moose or goats in the special annual drawings. In eastern Montana there are often special antelope and two-deer hunts at only \$25 per nonresident.

You simply can't lose in this country that's made to order for big-game hunting and big-game hunters. It's your promised land—and the performance is as good as the promise.

Textile Import Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, another serious facet of the import problem faced by the American textile industry is pointed out in an editorial which recently appeared in the Sylacauga Advance.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include this editorial from this

outstanding Fourth Alabama District newspaper.

A SUBSIDY FOR OUR ENEMY

J. Craig Smith, president Avondale Mills, continues his fight for the textile industry with respect to the import problem it faces.

A facet of this problem which has received no public emphasis has been clearly spelled out by Mr. Smith in the following article which deserves careful perusal:

"Hong Kong, an island off the coast of China, is a British crown colony. During 1958, Red China shipped to Hong Kong 114 million yards of cotton cloth. During the first 3 months of 1959, Hong Kong shipped to the United States over 1,400,000 yards of cotton cloth and, in addition, garments valued in Hong Kong at over \$8 million. If this rate of shipment into this country from Hong Kong is continued for the other 9 months of this year, the 114 million yards Hong Kong purchased from Red China will be accounted for.

"The United States has never recognized Red China and the two countries do no business together. Nevertheless, we permit Hong Kong to buy 114 million yards of cloth in Red China and then ship a large part of it into this country as cloth and garments. Hong Kong tells our State Department that it doesn't do this. The figures I have just quoted speak for themselves. Even if the identical cloth that Hong Kong buys in Red China doesn't reach this country, what possible difference does that make? The end result is the same on Red China, Hong Kong, and this country. The wage rates in Hong Kong are so low that even the Japanese complain that the competition is unfair. In Red China there is no wage rate at all. The coolie slaves live in compounds and get rice for their labor, performed under the whips of the Red commissars.

"On and after August 1, 1959, every foreign country will buy American cotton at a price 25 percent under the price we must pay, and those of us who look to the textile industry for a livelihood will be taxed to provide this tremendous subsidy to our competitors.

"Great Britain has been the traditional free trade country of the world. She now limits this free trade policy to her colonies and dominions. Just recently, the British placed a quota on how much Hong Kong could ship Britain. It is certainly ironic that 10 Downing Street is willing to protect the folks in Lancashire from their own colony and our State Department is unwilling to protect our industry from Hong Kong and our mortal enemy, Red China."

Senator Morse Applauds Eisenhower-Khrushchev Exchange of Visits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I made today to the press, in regard to the proposed visit of Premier Khrushchev to the United States.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORSE APPLAUDS EISENHOWER-KHRUSHCHEV EXCHANGE OF VISITS

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat of Oregon, today issued the following statement on the Eisenhower-Khrushchev exchange of visits:

"The announcement by the White House that Premier Khrushchev will visit the United States this September and President Eisenhower will visit Russia at a later date makes a lot of sense. Khrushchev needs to learn through his own eyes and ears that the people of the United States are as much opposed to a nuclear war as are the people of Russia.

"I am sure that President Eisenhower has hopes that he will be able to make great progress in helping Khrushchev recognize, before it is too late, that both Russian and the United States have everything to lose and nothing to gain by a continuation of a nuclear armaments race.

"It is my hope that Khrushchev's visit to the United States will precede by a few days a summit conference with the heads of all other states at the United Nations' Headquarters in New York. Now is the time for the nations of the world to agree to take whatever disarmament steps are necessary jointly and through the procedures of the United Nations. Following such a summit meeting, President Eisenhower's visit to Russia will symbolize not only to the Russian people but to all humanity that world peace is attainable in our time."

A Refresher Course on Marx and Lenin a Must for Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, in Saturday's issue of the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, a significant editorial appeared, discussing Khrushchev's possible visit to the United States.

This editorial suggested that the politicians in Washington and elsewhere bone up thoroughly on Marx and Lenin prior to Khrushchev's arrival, in order to understand the absolute intent of communism to destroy us one way or another, and the absolute dedication of Khrushchev to that purpose.

This editorial deserves much consideration, and awakens latent questions. I recommend it for the serious consideration of my fellow colleagues.

[From the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, Aug. 1, 1959]

KHRUSHCHEV VISIT

A story by Bob Considine from Siberia reports that Vice President Nixon, after weighing the pros and cons, favors a visit of Premier Khrushchev here.

It is a sticky subject.

President Eisenhower, according to Washington dispatches, feels that a Khrushchev visit would be a good idea—under the right conditions. That is the key phrase.

Dr. Eisenhower, the Washington report says, believes American opinion would have to be prepared for such a visit as a precaution against demonstrations and incidents.

We don't care much for that word "prepared." A better way of putting it is that

the American people would have to be convinced that a Khrushchev visit would have potential merit for our side.

The President also feels the timing would be of paramount importance, and that the effects on our allies and the Soviet captive nations would have to be considered.

Perhaps our allies would need the assurance there would be no bilateral deal from the visit, although we are not aware the British displayed such sensitivity toward us when Khrushchev and Bulganin visited England in 1956, where, by the way, they were very coolly received.

But the captive nations definitely would need the assurance that the welcome to Khrushchev would not mean our endorsement of their captivity.

While discussing these reservations we add one of our own.

It is that our politicians in Washington and elsewhere bone up thoroughly on Marx and Lenin prior to Khrushchev's arrival, in order to understand the absolute intent of communism to destroy us one way or another, and the absolute dedication of Khrushchev to that purpose.

In fact, a refresher course in Marxism would be a good idea for some of our industrialists and big businessmen who displayed a dismal naïveté toward communism on the occasion of the recent tours of Khrushchev's deputies.

In contrast, our labor leaders have shown a harder sense of its realities.

On the other hand, if a visit here would rid Khrushchev of some of his delusions about our country and our people and make him realize that while we may quarrel and differ among ourselves, we are joined against any force that threatens freedom and security, it would be indeed a big step toward real understanding.

These are some of the considerations involved in the President's remark that a visit by Khrushchev would be a good idea—under the right conditions.

Where Help Is Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the measure adopted to provide for the creation of a billion-dollar bank to help the development of 20 Latin American nations is, in the words of the President, "a most significant step in the history of our economic relations with our Latin American neighbors."

It is sad to relate, I think, that while we have spent countless billions of dollars aiding foreign countries throughout the far corners of the earth, we have tended to overlook our closest neighbors. I am pleased to see we are now providing a remedy to this situation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial from the Trentonian of August 1, 1959, dealing with this subject.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WHERE HELP IS NEEDED

At long last Congress has come to the conclusion that we should stop discriminating against our next-door neighbors. Ac-

cordingly it adopted a measure this week providing for the creation of a billion-dollar bank to help the development of 20 Latin American nations.

President Eisenhower had requested that the program be inaugurated, hence his signature on the proposal is regarded as a certainty. As a matter of fact, the President is on record as having said that enactment of the program would be "a most significant step in the history of our economic relations with our Latin American neighbors."

Sad to relate, we have not in past years been very considerate of the interests of our neighbors to the south. We have threatened and cajoled them on many occasions, and have resorted to ill-advised armed intervention on others.

We have meddled in their internal affairs and have frequently put our official stamp of approval on the most ruthless kind of dictatorships.

We have spent countless billions of dollars aiding foreign countries throughout the far corners of the earth, all the while our Latin American neighbors were perhaps in greater need than many of the faraway nations we have been so generously trying to help.

Now that Congress and the President have decided to take cognizance of the situation, it is to be hoped that we haven't waited too long to mend our ways.

Fiscal Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, too often the technical nature of our complex economic system prevents the average citizen, and for that matter the Congressmen, from fully understanding the impact of government law on free enterprise.

Many economists write on this subject and are stout defenders of opposite viewpoints and amply support their position with a great abundance of facts and figures. We in Texas, particularly Dallas, have always admired greatly the careful thought and ability of self-expression of Dr. Arthur A. Smith who now is associated with the First National Bank in Dallas as vice president and economist.

As a sample of Dr. Smith's penetrating analysis of today's economic situation, I would like to call the attention of those interested, both in and out of Congress, to Dr. Smith's letter of July 15 which speaks for itself:

FISCAL TROUBLE

Fiscal problems at the State and local government levels are increasing noticeably—and in some instances, alarmingly. Michigan's fiscal condition has attracted most Nation-wide publicity, but attention in the Southwest has been focused on the efforts of the Texas Legislature to find enough sources of revenue to meet the State's \$2.4 billion budget (biennial).

There are many facets to the fiscal problems which confront our Federal, State, and local governments; hence there is no one clear-cut answer to all of them. Existence of dual sovereignty in this country complicates greatly the entire fiscal situation.

The Federal Government and each State hold sovereign power to tax, borrow, and spend; and the States have created thousands and thousands of political subdivisions (counties, cities, towns, school districts, road districts, drainage districts, etc.) and endowed them with similar authority to tax, borrow, and spend. (There are over 102,000 governmental units in the United States.)

Because we have been demanding more and better services of these governmental units and because inflation has increased prices to the highest level in our history, the costs of government have gone skyward.

The following figures reveal the extent of the spending increase (in billions):

	1938	1958	Increase
			Percent
Federal.....	\$7.2	\$84.0	1,065
State.....	3.9	22.0	464
Local.....	5.3	25.0	373
Total.....	16.4	131.0	699

And the tax take of the different levels of government has increased as follows (in billions):

	1938	1958	Increase
			Percent
Federal.....	\$5.9	\$76.8	1,292
State.....	3.8	16.4	332
Local.....	4.5	15.6	246
Totals.....	14.2	108.8	695

Balanced budgets have been exceptional in the past 20 years; hence the public debt has grown too (in billions):

	1938	1958	Increase
			Percent
Federal.....	\$37.2	\$276.3	643
State.....	3.3	14.7	345
Local.....	10.1	41.5	157
Total.....	50.6	332.5	488

Where and when this fiscal expansion will end, no one knows. At present there seems little prospect the trend will slacken. So firmly fixed is the trend that, when you talk with a Congressman or a legislator (some exceptions) about a balanced budget, he immediately thinks in terms of higher taxes—rarely, if ever, in terms of less spending. (And you better be careful about too much emphasis upon a balanced budget, or you will be marked as a "budget balancer," which has come to be an opprobrium to most politicians who have become masterful in the art of spending to get votes.)

One does not have to delve very far into the tax system in this country to realize that there is not much system to it. Ours is more of a tax-jungle than a tax-system. It is badly in need of overhauling—and certainly in the process of overhauling, much of the present overlapping and double-dipping should be removed. Serious thought ought to be given to confining certain taxes to the sole use of particular levels of government.

Take, for example, the income tax. At least two solid and sound reasons support the proposition that only the Federal Government should use the income tax: (1) The Federal Government can administer it far more efficiently than the States or local units. (2) Income varies directly with the level of the Nation's economic or business activity. When the economy is booming income is high; hence the income tax yield is high. When the economy is depressed income is also down; and the income tax yield is lower. Now, since we have charged the Federal Government with the overall responsibility of

stabilizing the Nation's economy (within reasonable limits), the income tax affords a strong stabilizing force. On the other hand, State and local governments with less financial strength (on the whole) than the Federal Government should rely upon taxes whose yield is less variable (less susceptible to cyclical influence) than the yield from the income tax.

So it would be highly desirable for the States and their subdivisions to forgo the use of the income tax, leaving it solely to the Federal Government. But, by the same token, the Federal Government should not use excise and sales taxes, except when there is some nationwide nonfiscal purpose to be attained by so doing.

States have proved that they can administer sales taxes effectively, and such taxes provide a reasonably steady source of revenue to support State functions.

The general property tax (sometimes called ad valorem tax, as in Texas) should not be used by the States, but should be left entirely to local units. (The Federal Government under the Constitution cannot use a property tax).

The case for restricting property taxation to local government use is a strong one, and rests primarily upon the following point: At least two functions must be kept close to the people as safeguards to our democracy. These are education and police protection. But in financing support for these, local governments must be left with a source of revenue which is dependable and will yield enough to maintain the functions without dependence upon either the State or the Federal Government, but more especially without Federal support.

While it does not have to be so, Federal support of education very probably would mean Federal control of our schools. At least, the risk of such is too great, and if we can avoid the risk we should. The same holds true of the police function. As much as possible we should avoid a Federal police. Should the Federal Government control these two functions, there would be danger that some day an American Hitler would destroy our democracy.

Much more can be said on the proposition that we need badly in this country a complete overhauling of our tax structure. The above examples relating to jurisdictional alignment of taxes are incomplete—they are only to make the point that serious consideration must be given to the appropriate use of taxes by proper jurisdictions to bring some order out of the present chaos.

We admit that the chances of such are dim, indeed. We have allowed politics to dominate fiscal policies in America—at all three levels of government—to such an extent that sound principles have little chance of being followed.

Also we have formed the habit of judging each tax as if it were the only tax in existence, instead of appraising it as a part of the whole tax system. Take, for example, the sales tax. As it stands alone, it is regressive—falls too heavily upon people of low incomes in relation to what it takes from upper income groups. On the other hand, the income tax (with steeply progressive rates) falls very heavily upon those with high incomes and relatively much less upon low income groups. Either tax alone is subject to criticism, but when both are used they together achieve a rough kind of justice not realized by either alone.

The fiscal situation in this country promises to become much worse at all levels. We have had a bad situation in Washington for many years. Now it is becoming evident that a large number of States and local governments are facing critical times.

Cause: Government is spending too much for things we don't need with money we don't have. Our tax problems would not look so bad, if we could only stop unnecessary and wasteful spending. One out of every eight persons employed in this country is on a government payroll (Federal, State, or local)—and, when you add the people who are receiving government checks for one reason or another but are not employees, the total number drawing public money becomes fantastic.

Who will lead us out of the fiscal wilderness? We can hope and pray for a Moses, but in the meantime we can give increasing support and courage to the few public officials who are fighting boldly for economic sanity in government, and against terrific odds.

HIGH INTEREST RATES INFLATIONARY?

Out of the current tight money situation has emerged the question: Are high interest rates inflationary? Since they add to costs like wage increases, they appear to be. But the question is highly debatable—and the weight of the argument supports the negative side.

Certainly we know that the record shows that most of our inflation came in a period of very low interest rates. If we are to stop inflation, or even slow it down, we must pay a price. Part of the price is higher cost of money.

Even if we could concede that higher interest is inflationary, we would have to admit that under present circumstances the creation of a supply of money sufficient to make interest rates low again would most assuredly be many times as inflationary.

Sometimes, however, economic behavior seems stranger than fiction. If, for instance, the Federal Reserve should be compelled to create a supply of money (say by again pegging Government bond prices, as before 1951) in order to force lower interest rates, and the process became obvious to an already-inflation-conscious public, the fear of cheaper money might cause the market to accept fixed-dollar obligations only at still higher yields.

ARTHUR A. SMITH.

Thaw Toward China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I have just read an excellent article in the July 25 issue of the London Economist reporting on the speech I made in the Senate on May 21 on the need for a revision of the China policy.

I regret the slight error in the first sentence of the article referring to Senator Knowland as the candidate I defeated last November whereas my opponent was the incumbent Governor, Goodwin J. Knight.

The Economist is one of the most distinguished journals in the English-speaking world and I was, of course, delighted with its objective analysis of my speech on China and with its report on the growing interest among Members of Congress in a more flexible China policy. I commend the article to the atten-

tion of my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Economist, July 25, 1959]

THAW TOWARD CHINA

When Mr. CLAIR ENGLE defeated Senator Knowland, of California, last November, the main issue in the campaign was whether the powers of trade unions should be limited, but the principal result was to remove the most influential congressional champion of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. In May Senator ENGLE completed the process by a speech which may mark the beginning of the end for that masterpiece of diplomatic immobility, the policy of the United States toward Communist China. His careful plea for gradual revision went unmentioned in the New York Times; he was even relegated to page 7 of the San Francisco Chronicle; but on the desks of informed people copies of his address were soon in evidence and, significantly, Mr. Knowland's newspaper, the Oakland Tribune, attacked his successor's dubious circumlocutions in its leader columns.

Yet Mr. ENGLE was careful not to leap from one extreme to the other; he did not advocate recognition of Communist China or its admission forthwith to the United Nations. He merely asked that American policy should cease to be completely negative, and begin to seek ways of making contact with the government of the Chinese mainland in hopes of preventing the total marriage of China and the Soviet Union . . . on the basis of Chinese necessity. He saw no easy path to friendship with China. But a less forbidding American posture "would wear off the sharp edges. It would reduce our differences, ruling out the specious, artificial, unrealistic images which many Americans hold of China and which the Chinese now hold of the United States."

Mr. ENGLE's is not the first such voice from the west coast. His colleague from the State of Washington, Senator MAGNUSON, has long advocated dropping the present total embargo on American trade with the Chinese mainland. All five members of the House of Representatives from Oregon are on record in favor of trade with China; the irrepressible Senator MORSE, also of Oregon, was one of the half dozen colleagues who rose to congratulate Mr. ENGLE on his address in the Senate. The San Francisco Chamber of Commerce has passed no formal resolution on the matter but, through its world trade department, it has taken an active part in bringing what has been described as subtle pressure to bear on Washington to explore the possibilities of trade and of opening channels of information to the Chinese mainland. The Pacific Shipper, a trade publication, has campaigned for several years on the issue, its initial interest having been sharpened by the discovery that the U.S. Government itself seemed to know very little about developments in China, and was unwilling to divulge what it did know.

Public opinion polls conducted a year ago by the Portland Oregonian and the San Francisco Chronicle showed a surprising amount of discontent with the present policy on China, even after allowances were made for their unscientific sampling methods. Only 2 percent of those who replied to the Chronicle favored retention of the present embargo. Such sentiments are no doubt strengthened by news stories of the embargo's ineffectiveness; a recent account on the front page of a local newspaper quoted the assistant collector of customs in San Francisco as admitting the difficulty of

detecting falsifications under country of origin on customs declarations.

The obvious interest of the west coast is economic. In the Northwest, particularly, prewar Chinese purchases of American lumber and flour are remembered. Mr. Harry Bridge's International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union is perhaps the loudest voice demanding a resumption of trade; bulk cargoes such as lumber or grain require much manpower, and would help to offset increasing mechanization on the docks. Yet neither the ILWU, the businessmen, nor experienced observers expect any very dramatic gains to accrue in the short run from a change of policy. Between 1935 and 1941, China's share of U.S. imports never reached 2 percent; exports to China ranged between 2.1 and 3.4 percent of the United States total. Japan and the Philippines did more trade than did China with west coast ports.

Recently Representative CHARLES PORTER, a Democrat from Oregon, called for an economic factfinding mission to China and tried hard to draw up an appetizing list of things which the United States might import, but he had to admit that in most cases the pickings were unlikely to be great. Merely to mention such things as "edible apricot kernels" is to suggest limited possibilities. Several of the mainstays of prewar Chinese trade would probably not return to prominence; shortage and embargo have produced their usual results, the discovery of substitutes and the development of domestic output. Hog bristles have yielded very largely to synthetics; tung oil is now produced in the southern United States. Canadian trade with China, through Vancouver, has not been such as to excite Seattle or Coos Bay unduly; last year Canada's leading import from China, by a wide margin, was walnuts; in 11 months her exports to China amounted to less than \$8 million, nine-tenths of this from wheat. Given the long lapse in contact, and the great changes in China, prediction is difficult; but in the short run, at least, China would probably not provide more than a useful supplement to the west coast's already thriving foreign trade.

But the short run is not the main concern of Americans who are troubled about the seemingly endless stonewalling of their Government on the question of China. West coast businessmen, watching Britain's exports to mainland China doubling in 1958 while West Germany's nearly quadrupled, fear that they will find the Chinese market preempted by the time they get there. They are increasingly impatient with official arguments against ending the embargo that consist mainly of minimizing the trading potential of China; they point out how illogical it is to permit trade, at least a limited amount of it, with the Soviet Union, which is powerful enough to constitute a military threat to the United States, while prohibiting all commercial contact with China, which is still in the early stages of industrialization.

In some cases, the real concern about China may not be so much economic as political and strategic. But people are still greatly afraid of being tarred with the pro-Communist brush if they speak up for revision of policy toward China; and the dead of Korea are not forgotten. It is convenient, therefore, to have a hardheaded economic reason for venturing to criticize the existing state of affairs. It is perhaps because this economic argument carries more conviction on the west coast than elsewhere in the country that congressional figures from the Far West are leading the way toward a more flexible policy. Although California sent three times as many tourists to the Far East in 1958 as any other State, there is little evidence of a distinctive attitude toward China on the Pacific coast. Any typical

audience of the World Affairs Council, whether in New York, St. Louis, or San Francisco, will contain substantial numbers of people, probably a majority, who want at least exploratory efforts to be made to end the Chinese impasse.

The clearest indication that a change will come with the next administration in Washington, if not before, is perhaps the care that some politicians are taking not to be caught with the old China policy in an epoch when not only Senator Knowland, but also Mr. Dulles and Mr. Walter Robertson, the former Assistant Secretary of State for the Far East, have departed from the Washington scene. The next major opportunity may arise early in the autumn, when Conlon Associates, a San Francisco firm of economic consultants, submits the Far Eastern portion of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's massive study of U.S. foreign policy. Meanwhile both Senator ENGLE and Governor Brown, of California, are planning trips to the Far East. Neither is a political neophyte, nor yet a Don Quixote.

Battle of Kings Mountain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gaffney Ledger, Gaffney, S.C., of July 28, 1959:

ACCOUNT OF BATTLE OF KINGS MOUNTAIN

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following is an account of the Battle of Kings Mountain by an anonymous writer which appeared in the June 14, 1858, issue of the Spartanburg Express, a newspaper found in 1954 among the items in the old cornerstone of the South Carolina School for the Deaf and the Blind at Cedar Spring. The Major Borders referred to in the article was the grandfather of William Borders, of Blacksburg.)

We have laid before our readers several interesting articles from the Newberry Conservative, written by someone who has been visiting the battlegrounds in this part of our State. In the last article we left the writer at the iron works, in Dearlittle Valley, admiring the beauties of nature around him. We now lay before our readers an account of his visit from that place to Kings Mountain.

For a description of the iron works, I refer the reader to the report of the State mineralogical surveyor:

"Bring forth the horse!"—such was the poetic command given when it was announced that I wished to visit the battleground of Kings Mountain. "The horse was brought," and although he was not of the Ukraine breed he looked as though the speed of thought were in his limbs.

Yet, under the rule, that the same catastrophe can result from opposite conditions or causes, I think I ran the same risk of having my neck broken, through the clumsiness of my steed as Maseppa did from the activity of his, in the famous ride to Tarry. Mine was a portly roan, with much benignity of countenance, and meekness of demeanor. Indeed, his head was bowed with such an air of resignation that I felt reluctant to mount him; the more so when I detected a trembling in his knees and found them covered with scars, as if he had

suffered from some inhuman treatment. He was bridled with a mild snaffle, and so little was the probability of his tossing his head that martingales were deemed an encumbrance. Upon his back was an old-fashioned saddle with a vast area of skirt fitting snugly against his side, and an elevated pommel, upon which the rider could rest himself when overtaken by a fit of laziness or meditation. The stirrups were of a pattern now entirely extinct. They were once very costly, and regarded as a triumph in invention. They opened with a joint and, by releasing the foot, prevented the rider from being dragged when he fell from his horse—the inventor, no doubt, proceeding upon the supposition that it would be less revolting to a jury of inquest for a man to have his brains dashed out upon the ground than to have them kicked out by an infuriated beast.

"Does this horse stumble?"

"No, sah, he don't 'ciscly stumble; he's only a moderate tippler."

Provided with a passport, which Mr. Montgomery, the obliging superintendent of the Dearlittle Iron Works, gave me, directed to Major Borders of the King's Creek Foundry, representing me as a person above suspicion, and requiring the major to procure me an intelligent guide, I mounted the roan at 9 o'clock. I had scarcely passed the gate before I was struck with the parallel between moderate drinking and moderate tipping. If the one results in confirmed drunkenness, as temperance reformers assert, the other surely ends in downright stumbling. Roan candidly displayed his gaits to me and, as his trot was too abrupt and labored, and his amble an awkward affectation, I selected his walk. He bowed his head in acknowledgement of my excellent judgment and, throwing the reins upon his back, I prepared myself for the scenery around me.

The road gradually ascended until I attained a height that commanded an extensive view on either side. Looking over the black jacks, which have taken the place of the pines converted into coal for the reduction of iron ore, I noticed, on my right, the usual broken country common to the upper districts. But the prospect, on my left, was eminently picturesque; for at a distance of 40 miles from me, the Blue Ridge swept along like a line of tossing cavalry, and penetrated a phalanx of clouds arrayed upon the northwestern horizon. Besides this blue mountain range, nothing interested me, except a round knob, some 15 miles ahead of me, appearing now and then through the vacancies in the forest. It was, however, not King's Mountain. After two hours' ride, I began to descend from the ridge and the abundance of slag with which the roadside was strewn, convinced me that I was approaching the foundry, which Major Borders supervised. Emerging from a pine thicket, I suddenly came in full view of the King's Mountain crag. I clapped my hands in ecstasy, and had got well into a train of poetic reflections, when Roan plunged into a stumble, the most prolonged and complicated that ever unsettled a rider. I was pitched over the pommel of the saddle, and caught with my hands and knees upon his neck where I sustained myself, in the posture of a crouching Indian, until the old horse righted himself, which he did with a grunt, coming so evidently from the bottom of his heart, that I forgave him, although he has undoubtedly occasioned a gap of I do not know how many pages in these recollections of my excursion to King's Mountain.

Presenting my credentials to Major Borders, whom I found a plain-spoken, kind-hearted gentleman, he said, after reading the part of my passport requiring him to provide me with "an intelligent guide."

"I don't know what I can do any better than to go with you myself."

"Nothing will delight me more, Major. I have no doubt you can tell me about the battle of King's Mountain."

"Why, sir," he said, "I was born and raised near the place, and I have many a time listened to many an old man telling about the battle—men who were in it and who settled down and died in this neighborhood after the war. I think I can give you all the information you want."

"Then Major, mount your horse and let us be going."

In a few minutes Major Borders and I were clattering over the bridge across King's Creek—he upon a freckled gray, and I—

"I see they have given you the roan to ride," said the major.

"Yes," I replied. "Are you acquainted with him?"

"Oh, very well. You see these two horses are continually passing from one forge to the other. I hope he hasn't stumbled with you."

"Why, Major, I do not know whether the word 'stumble' is exactly significant of the—a—"

"Ah, bless my soul," interrupted the major, "they should have cautioned you. Roan does very well going up a slope, but it requires some management to get him down one without accident; so while we have an ascending road, I think we had better proceed somewhat briskly."

"I am entirely at your disposal, Major."

We dashed off at the utmost speed, the freckled gray maintaining a steady sure-footed trot, while Roan made a potpourri of his gaits without any modulation between them. For 2 miles we passed through a poor, uninteresting country, my recompense for the dreary ride being the progress I made in the acquaintance of Major Borders to whom I long for an opportunity of repaying his kind attentions to me. At length, we came to an opening in the forest, and the scene suddenly changed from blackjacks and dwarf pines to a cultivated valley across which at a distance of three-fourths of a mile, stood a prominent mountain, with a spur of half its altitude setting off toward the east. Some distance to the right I saw the round knob which had several times before attracted my attention; its clear blue, when I first saw it, being now tinged with purple, from my nearer proximity to it.

"What eminence is that over yonder, Major?"

"That is Henry's Knob."

"And that down there, to the left, is King's Mountain?"

"Oh, no, sir," replied the major, "that's Browns Mountain."

"I thought we could not be so near to King's Mountain; for, from the glimpses I have caught of it, I suppose it must be 10 miles from here and I fear I will not be able to get back to Mr. Montgomery's to-night."

"Oh, that's the King's Mountain crag in North Carolina. But the battle wasn't fought there."

"On a little knob a mile the other side of Browns Mountain."

"Oh, Major, you have destroyed all the romance I have been getting up. I thought surely—"

"Well, now," continued the major, "I've heard of Napoleon Bonaparte crossing the Alps with 60,000 men, but I know he couldn't have got with as many as 500 men up to the top of what you've been catching sight of along the road. Why, there hasn't been an Injun up there yet."

"Well, Major, lead on."

The road, after passing through the valley turned to the right, in order to wind around the spur of Browns Mountain. In the rear of this eminence (that is to the north of it) we again entered the forest. Major Borders then struck into an indistinct road, leading

up an ascending ridge. This road, he said, had been called Ferguson's road, as far back as he could recollect. "One thing is certain," he continued, "it leads right to the battleground and no farther."

The ridge became every step more elevated, and the ravines on either side deeper. A half mile beyond the point where this road was gained, we found a cross ridge stretching over to Browns Mountain.

"Now," said the major, "I have shown you the route which Ferguson and his army took; we will follow this ridge to the left and take a near way to the spot we are in search of. The high ridge we are leaving runs toward the north for a quarter of a mile and then, bending around toward the west, terminates in the knob known as King's Mountain. Besides, we will approach the place in the same direction Campbell did."

Riding on, over hills and through valleys, we soon lost sight of the elevation along which Ferguson moved. Coming into a road, the major directed me to precede him, no doubt with the design of surprising me. Along the road 150 yards brought me to a small creek. I had my eyes fixed steadily ahead of me, upon a projection of rocks, and did not observe that a very steep hill was within a stone's throw of me on the right. Urging my horse forward, I was about to cross the ford of the creek when an object on the opposite bank, not 10 paces from me, met my gaze and caused me to start back as if I had seen a specter. It was a rough slab of mica slate, tottering over, after the almost mysterious manner of old grave-stones. I tied my horse to a tree, and approached the stone to examine it. There is an inscription upon both sides of it, and I am not ashamed to confess that I dropped a tear upon it, as I copied the words:

"Sacred to the memory of Maj. William Chronicle, Capt. John Mattocks, William Rabb, and John Boyde, who were killed here, fighting in defense of America on the 7th of October 1780."

And on the west side: "Colonel Ferguson, an officer belonging to his Britannic Majesty, here was defeated and killed."

"And this, then, is King's Mountain," I exclaimed.

"Yes, sir," replied Major Borders, "up there is where they fought."

I stood, for some time, regarding the hill with a feeling of awe, not from any grandeur of scenery, but from the absolute dreariness of the place. No sound, nor sight of human activity was perceptible, except, through the space in the foliage, the haziness given to the atmosphere by the coal-kilns in the surrounding valleys, or, perhaps a fancied clank at the distant iron-Forge. At Musgrove's Mill and the Cowpens, the roaring of the water, the dusty highways, and the various noises of the neighboring farms rehearse for the imagination the shout and shriek of the deadly fray; but here, at King's Mountain, where not a pine tree sighs in the breeze, the mind gathers up those still small sounds, which, though usually drowned in the din of battle, are yet the most appalling; the blow of the clubbed rifle crushing the skull, the thump of the musket's muzzle against the breastbone, announcing the home thrust of the bayonet; the dull tumble of the human body down the mountain side; the trickling of blood upon the autumn leaf, where the dying soldier has raised himself upon his elbow and with his clumsy hand has clasped his giddy brow.

There is a very incorrect notion entertained of King's Mountain. It is not a mountain or hill; but rather the abrupt termination of a lengthy and lofty ridge. I will give a sketch from nature. Standing at the ford of the creek and looking eastward, the visitor sees before him a steep eminence of, perhaps, 150 feet elevation, the rise in the ground beginning a few paces in front

of him. On his right, the southside, starting up from the bank of the creek, is steep and difficult to ascend. The front or western face is narrow and rounded. It is far from being so precipitous as the south side, and permits a footman to ascend it at a smart run. From the north face, a rolling ridge sets off, and, bending round towards the west, comes down with an easy slope to the rocks I have mentioned, where the road crosses it. A horse can be ridden at full gallop up the slope. Colonel Williams was shot upon his horse, on the top of the height, and could not have gained it any other way than by charging along this ridge. Beyond it the declivity is again steep. Between it and the prominent knob there is necessarily a small ravine. It was near the head of this that Major Chronicle and Captain Mattocks, with their companions Rabb and Boyde, fell all at the same time. They were from the same neighborhood on the south fork of the Catawba, from which circumstance they were called the Fork Boys. In the heart of the battle, during the repulse down the mountain, Major Chronicle, with defiance blazing in his eyes, cried out, "Never let it be said that a Fork Boy runs." They stood their ground and were consequently overpowered and slain.

Major Chronicle was brave to a fault. At the same time, so generous was he, so agreeable in his manners, that to know him was to love him. After the battle, a man by the name of Caldwell, undertook to lead the major's horse home to old Mr. Chronicle. But so affected was he, when he came in sight of the old gentleman's house that—although throughout the fight he had exposed his life with heroic fearlessness—he waited until night, and, in the cowardice of grief, left the dumb brute, alone, to tell of his master's fate.

John Mattocks was a hero of the noblest mold. It is the traditional impression of the people around King's Mountain, that he planned the battle in which he lost his life. It was just such a plan as a turkey hunter would propose, and John Mattocks was a hunter and knew every square yard of the wilds of King's Mountain. Certain it is, he did some service, for which he was promoted to the grade of Captain, a few hours before the battle was begun. His reply to the compliment was as noble as ever came from a Spartan hero. "I do not know," he said, "how to handle a sword, but, with my rifle, I will go ahead of as many men as will follow me." Ah, I fancy, that I can see him striding along before his men up the mountain side, tall, muscular, with the sinews of his swarthy neck strained to the utmost in his eagerness to discharge his duty. And when enveloped in the return tide of battle, and Major Chronicle's clear voice was heard forbidding the Fork Boys to run, then did John Mattocks grasp his rifle near the muzzle, and describe around his brawny shoulders a death-circle of 10 feet radius. But he fell. They dragged him to the spring, the traces of which can be seen at the foot of the ravine, and, with their powder-blackened hands, dipped up the water to his parched lips. He revived sufficiently to see his companions rushing up the mountain. As they faded away before his glazing eyes, the hiccough ceased for a moment, and he shouted "Once more—and the hill—is yours."

Honor to John Mattocks.

Hour after hour I sat upon the summit of King's Mountain listening to Major Borders. He pointed out to me the different positions of the combatants and the maneuvering of Ferguson's forces. He showed me the spot where Williams fell, and where Ferguson's tent was pitched. But the sun began to sink, and we were compelled to take to our horses. We passed along the crest of the mountain about 400 yards, when we had to ascend a somewhat abrupt elevation, upon the top of which, commenced the old

road, which I have already mentioned—known as Ferguson's road. We followed it, gradually inclining southward, until we arrived at the ridge running over to Brown's Mountain, to the top of which we ventured, and obtained a fine view of the valley of Broad River and Gilkey's Mountain. Returning to the foundry, I bade Major Borders adieu, and took my solitary way back to the iron works, where I arrived some time in the night, having walked the 3 last miles of my journey, out of compassion for the infirmities of Roan, and not, as it might be mischievously conjectured, through fear of his stumbling.

Constructive Proposals for Meeting
Challenge of Foreign Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, for anyone with eyes to see, American industry and labor are in for the strongest kind of competition from the onrushing challenge of resurgent foreign economies. One of the most constructive reactions to this challenge was that of Sylvia Porter, the financial commentator, in a recent newspaper column, and I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THREAT OF IMPORTS
(By Sylvia Porter)

Recently I went to a stimulating but disquieting dinner party. My partner was Cyrus Ching, head of the Federal Mediation Service under President Truman. We discussed not only the threat of the steel strike but also the threat of steel imports to the economy.

"The long-range problem is the rising importation of steel," said Mr. Ching. "Competition to our steel industry and to steelworkers from lower-cost foreign producers is what we must face up to. * * * It is in this sphere that U.S. industry will get a climactic test. * * *

When I got home I had a midnight snack. On the kitchen table I put a plate, a glass pitcher, a glass, and an ashtray—all purchased since June. Before I sat down, I moved from the chair a laundry basket in which there was a cap my husband had picked up a few days ago, my new bathing suit, and a silk robe. And suddenly my eyes saw something I hadn't seen before.

EVERY ITEM IMPORTED

Every product I had touched in those few minutes in the kitchen had been an import—the plate, glass and pitcher from England, the ashtray from Denmark, the basket and cap from Japan, the bathing suit from France, the robe from Italy.

After I had finished a check on what we had bought in the past 6 months, I got an even greater shock.

Over 60 percent of our recent purchases had been imported. I, living in a typically American home and buying with a typical American's attention to quality and price, had gradually become a buyer of foreign products on a scale I hadn't dreamed of.

Then Mr. Ching's warnings about steel imports came into focus.

Imports are pouring into the country. This year, the National Foreign Trade Council has estimated, imports will total a record \$15 billion, upon \$1.8 billion from 1958. And the imports are not just the obvious cars, cameras, radios, etc. Stores and factories from coast to coast are loaded with foreign goods which are well-designed, well-made, attractively priced compared with similar U.S. products.

We created this competition for ourselves in the most grandiose gesture of generosity any nation ever made. For, when World War II ended we began pouring billions into the rebuilding of the ruined or obsolete factories of Europe and Japan. With the aid of our dollars and know-how, many countries have now come back and are operating with modern factories, materials, and machines and at much lower wage scales.

"OK," I thought to myself. "What do we do about it?"

Raise tariffs and slap on quotas until we force out the competition? Hardly a satisfactory answer.

Freeze wages? Also hardly an imaginative answer.

SUGGESTIONS OFFERED

What then? In all humility, I suggest the answers must be:

(1) A much sharper, faster and a sustained rise in modernization and efficiency of production. With increased efficiency, we'll be able to turn out goods competitively priced and still raise wages.

(2) A powerful drive for new inventions and improved products—meaning greater emphasis on research. With new inventions and superior productive capacity, we can keep and expand our markets.

(3) A realization by all of us that we are into an economic war for the markets of the world—including our own. I'm not proposing an aggressive "Buy American" program, but I readily admit there'll be no more of that 80-40 ratio in purchases I make.

We won't meet the import competition by flinching from it, ignoring it, or putting up walls against it. We will meet it when we vow to lead the world in inventing, modernizing, selling. We'll meet it when we wake up.

Beyond the Headlines: A Labor Practitioner Looks at Union Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Segal which reflects the thinking of many intelligent, sincere and hard-working trade unionists.

Mr. Speaker, behind the stories which are published about organized labor by the newspapers and magazines are the day-to-day activities carried on by dedicated trade unionists and their organizations. One such dedicated man is Ben Segal, education director of the IUE, AFL-CIO.

BEYOND THE HEADLINES: A LABOR PRACTITIONER LOOKS AT UNION DEMOCRACY
(By Ben Segal, education director, International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, AFL-CIO)

"Labor monopoly endangers economy."
"Corruption permeates labor movement."

"Financial and political power of unions threatens democracy."—And on and on the barrage of essays, reviews, speeches, newspaper and magazine articles continues. As one who has worked in the trade union movement for many years, I find that much of what I read about unions bears little relationship to what I have observed on a day-to-day basis in local unions throughout the country.

In a recent New York Times book review, entitled "Friendship Gone Sour," labor reporter Abe Raskin discusses "The Public Stake in Union Power," a new series of academic essays on labor. Raskin comments:

"In the last few years a discernible shift in academic sentiment has set in. The sordid revelations of the McClellan committee on racket penetration into unions and on the abuses committed by union autocrats have been a major factor in this shift. Professors who rallied to labor's standard when they felt unions were underdogs are finding it hard to applaud the tactics of some unions in their emergent role as overdogs.

"The ideas expressed in Congress by such union foes as Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, the Arizona Republican who considers Walter Reuther a greater menace than Jimmy Hoffa, have found enthusiastic endorsement in certain sections of the Ivy League as well as in the National Association of Manufacturers."

This shift in the academic image of organized labor reflects a more general public change of attitude. Both the academic and public images result from the tendency to generalize from a few sensationalized cases; both are based on assumptions which require careful reappraisal.

On the basis of my years of work in the trade union movement, I would like to challenge some of these underlying assumptions. I do this not to challenge the need for labor legislation—such legislation as the original Kennedy-Ervin bill. Neither do I question the need to intensify efforts to achieve greater internal union democracy.

I do not subscribe to the argument that because we can cite many instances of corruption in management this changes in any way the fact that racketeering and corruption exists in some unions and that the trade union movement has the obligation to do all it can to clean house.

Perhaps the assumption that demands the greatest scrutiny is the glib assertion that unions have come of age; that labor-management relations have reached maturity; that industrial warfare is a thing of the past.

Having worked in the South for many years with the Textile Workers Union, with the national CIO, and now with the IUE, I'd like to start by citing some examples from the southern textile industry. Of 550,000 workers in southern mills, the unions claim about 70,000 members, and even this low figure is constantly being reduced because of the determined efforts of the industry to eliminate free unions from their mills.

At least five cases come to mind immediately to illustrate this point. Within this past year four beatings of union representatives have occurred in the South. The most recent was that of Frank Barker and Frank Chupka, field representatives of the Textile Workers Union. They were dragged from their motel room, knifed and severely beaten by a mob of thugs in Fitzgerald, Ga. This took place when a strike of 350 TWUA members against the Fitzgerald Mills Corp. was 3 weeks old.

The union walkout began after a deadlock over the terms of a new contract. The union had been asking a 10 cent hourly wage increase. The company offered 5 cents but insisted on eliminating the present arbitration clause and the checkoff of union dues.

The demands of the Fitzgerald Mills Corp. were strikingly similar to those made by John D. Cooper, president of Harriet-Henderson Cotton Mills, in Henderson, N.C., strikebound since November 1958.

The Harriet-Henderson Mills had been under union contract since 1944. When the contract expired in 1957, the company wouldn't budge on a renewal and for a year, the employees worked without a contract. Finally in November 1958, the TWUA local announced that it was willing to renew the old contract without wage increases or other improvements. The company, however, demanded a no-strike clause and the elimination of a standard arbitration clause which had been in the contract for 14 years.

The removal of arbitration provisions in the contract would give the company the complete freedom to handle job classifications, grievances, hire and fire, with the union virtually powerless to protect the workers.

The company shut down for 3 months and then began importing strikebreakers from Virginia and elsewhere. It was during this strike, on February 24, 1959, that Boyd Payton, TWUA vice president and regional director, was attacked and beaten by company hoodlums in Henderson.

As this is being written, 400 bayonet-armed North Carolina National Guardsmen still surround the mill to insure safe entry for the scabs. The outcome is likely to be eventual decertification of the union when a new election is held in which only the scabs will be allowed to work and vote—thanks to Taft-Hartley.

Most readers are undoubtedly familiar with the 3-year O'Sullivan heel strike in Winchester, Va., which was lost by way of Taft-Hartley and the decertification route. The International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers (IUE), lost a local union the same way in Baltimore, Md., when the Proctor Electric Co. decided it wanted to get rid of the union and after a prolonged strike, local 136 was balloted out of existence.

This bitter opposition to unions is not confined to the South. The Chemical Workers Union struck the Mastic Tile Corp., in Long Beach, Calif. The next day the company obtained an injunction imposing severe limitations on picketing. It followed this with advertising in the local press for scabs. Approximately 1,200 jobless workers applied for the openings to replace the 275 strikers. The company hired some 350 workers and is now moving to decertify the union.

This antiunionism is perhaps even more menacing when it occurs among the large employers. The International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers represents more than 100,000 workers employed by the giant General Electric Co.

Here is no small company struggling to meet the weekly payroll. This is a corporation recently cited by the Kefauver subcommittee investigating antitrust and monopoly as one of four companies which together control more than 50 percent (sometimes as high as 90 percent) of the business in 79 product lines. This is a company that made the highest profits in its history in recession year 1958 (\$247,851,871) despite reduced sales. This is a company which spends tremendous sums to convince the public and its employees that "Progress is our most important product." Yet, this corporation works around the clock in fighting the union tooth and nail.

Probably no company devotes more money, staff, and time to convince its workers in unorganized plants that they should vote against a union; or that after the union is in, that it should be decertified or at best should not be supported in its collective bargaining demands.

GE's vast propaganda machine has been in operation for a long time. Its outlets are daily employee newspapers, news bulletins in all plants, special memorandums for all employees, letters to employees, full page advertisements in newspapers wherever plants are located. In addition, GE has a mailing list of prominent members of the community in many occupations and these community leaders receive frequent letters and periodic bulletins. GE also sponsors a number of radio and TV programs which it uses for antiunion commercials.

This tactic was an extension of the policy which originated in 1950 and has become known in labor-management relations as "Boulwareism," after its author, GE Vice President Lemuel Ricketts Boulware. According to Harvard Business Prof. Benjamin M. Selekman, writing on "Cynicism and Managerial Morality," in the September-October 1958 issue of the Harvard Business Review, Boulwareism has the following principles:

1. Management knows best what should be done for its employees.
2. It should, therefore, make up its mind prior to any negotiation what should be the maximum offer.
3. It should refuse to recede from or alter this offer in any substantial way.
4. It should take a strike, if necessary, and hold out until the union capitulates.

Such an attitude on the part of a major corporation can hardly be called a mature approach to industrial relations.

With the increasing vulnerability of labor because of automation, the recession, the McClellan committee hearings, and the widely publicized "wage push" theory of inflation, the GE policy may be setting a pattern for other large corporations. Even in the steel and auto industries where observers have glibly said for so long that unions were, at least, accepted there is evidence in last year's auto negotiations and this year's steel talks of a much tougher policy.

In commenting on the Harriet-Henderson strike, Business Week, May 9, 1959, predicted:

"Bluntly, labor disputes are getting tougher. And they will continue to get tougher—reversing a trend toward fewer and milder strikes that has been underway, with some interruptions, since the early forties. For strong unions this means harder bargaining, fewer gains, longer strikes. For weak unions it can mean disaster—plants operating right through a strike, lost strikes, even broken unions. For management, the changed climate puts a premium on tough resistance to union demands."

Boyd Leedom, NLRB chairman who has been frequently criticized by union leaders for anti-labor bias, in a speech to the Florida Bar Association recently laid the blame for much union misconduct on some companies "behind-the-scenes, illusive, undeclared warfare" against union activities. Behind the facade of general acceptance of our national labor concept, great segments of employers, Leedom charged, "take every legal step possible—and many employers overreach legality—to thwart their employees' efforts to organize even when the union involved is a respectable decent union." He cited the philosophy of "avoiding dealing with a union even at the expense of going out of business."

He asserted: "Since hostility is likely to beget hostility, I raise the question as to whether this attitude may in turn be at least partly responsible for union conduct that many people regard as quite unreasonable even though lawful. It is quibbling to embrace the abstract principle of collective bargaining and then fight tooth and nail to deny it to one's own employees."

While the instability of industrial relations should not provide an excuse for whitewashing the shortcomings of unions, it gives us a clue to understanding why many unions still behave as if they were the helpless insecure underdog of the pre-Wagner Act days.

The fact is that many unions still are. Many unions still face a long slow uphill fight for basic gains, with the law on the other side—especially in the South.

In my travels to locals throughout the country, I've been impressed—or rather depressed—with the tendency to generalize from the revelations of the McClellan committee and to believe in the absence of democracy in local unions throughout the labor movement. This belief goes hand in hand with the notion that tremendous power is wielded by the international, in whose hands the local unions are merely pawns in a giant chess game with management and perhaps, with government.

This picture simply does not stack up against the realities of the situation in many local unions. On the basis of my work experience I have found in any number of local union situations internal democracy being carried on misused to the point where it has interfered with the effective collective bargaining of the union.

In the IUE, for example, the refusal of several locals in the General Electric chain to back the negotiating committee with a strike vote crippled the International's efforts at negotiating on employment security. The result was that the company broke off negotiations. One could hardly say these locals were dominated by the policies of the International; in fact, they were barely influenced by them.

In southern locals case after case arises, where the local unions violate the International Union's position in support of integration and nondiscrimination.

In Front Royal, Va., the Textile Workers' Union local is the most vocal and leading financial supporter of the private segregated school setup in defiance of the Federal court decision.

This is one of many examples where the International Union's name is being blackened because of the local union's refusal to follow the parent union's position on desegregation. Unfortunate as it may be, it can hardly be called a case of the International dominating the local union or inadequate internal union democracy.

There are local unions that devote so much time and effort in campaigning for local union office that they weaken the effectiveness of the local union in looking after the economic interests of the membership.

As one of our IUE people put it—"they spend so much time fighting each other they have no time to fight the boss—the boss just waits around and picks up the pieces."

In one local union with which I worked, when one "party" wins, the other "party" stays away from all local activities and its followers do everything possible to weaken the union, even to urging members to drop out (yes, it's in a right-to-work State) and in general sabotage the union's efforts until the next election time rolls around.

With all the headlines on labor racketeering and corruption, very little is said about positive efforts of unions to strengthen constitutional guarantees of the individual's basic rights, to prevent corruption and abuse of power by union officials, and to increase participation in the activities and decision-making functions of the union.

The contemporary record of the labor movement is filled with examples of these practices.

The IUE, for example, was one of the first unions to develop an ethical practices code. At its 1958 convention, the union incorpo-

rated the major provisions of the code into its constitution.

To cite just a few examples: The funds of the International may not be loaned, invested or dealt with in any way that results in personal benefits to the officers or employees of the union. No officer or employee of the union may (a) have personal financial interests which conflict with performing his duties; or (b) have substantial interest in a business enterprise with which the union or one of its subordinate bodies bargains collectively or which competes with such enterprise; or (c) have an interest in an enterprise dealing substantially with an employer with whom the union bargains.

In the section dealing with health and welfare funds, no rebates, retention of dividends, or payment of any kind can be accepted by union representatives and union representatives must not have any personal ties with outside agencies. Program administrators must make full disclosures to beneficiaries and union at least annually including (a) detailed statement of receipts and expenditures; (b) salaries and fees; (c) retentions, claims paid, dividends, commissions, and charges, and (d) detailed account of the manner of which funds are invested. One would be hard put to find a corporation which could match these standards of financial responsibility.

Members' rights are guaranteed in other ways: biennial conventions, election of officers, local and international, every 2 years; referendums and secret ballots, and a host of other protections. Elaborate trial procedures to protect the rights of members threatened with expulsion are set up. These include the right to have charges presented, to hear all evidence, cross-examine witnesses, right of appeal to the district council, the international executive board, and finally the convention. Barred from holding elective or appointive office in the union are persons convicted of any crime involving moral turpitude offensive to trade union morality or anyone who is commonly known to be a crook or racketeer preying on the labor movement. And determination of ineligibility is based on regular trial procedure.

The Kennedy labor reform bill, even with the McClellan so-called bill of rights amendment, would not require changing in any way any of the policies, practices, rules, constitutional provisions, or bylaws of the IUE, financial or otherwise. Its only effect would be to provide burdensome forms to be filled out with information which is already readily available to IUE members and the public.

Similar safeguards are provided in the constitutions and practices of other unions, the United Rubber Workers and the United Auto Workers, for example.

A heartening example of a union's attempt to rid itself of its corrupt elements is the story of the American Bakery and Confectionery Workers' Union (ABC).

ABC was chartered by the AFL-CIO in December 1953, after the federation expelled the old bakery union on corruption charges. The infant union has organized more than half of the members of the old bakery union. At its convention in September 1957 the ABC adopted a series of constitutional provisions, some of them unique in union history, hailed even by the Wall Street Journal as important and workable guarantees of rank-and-file control of the union.

For example, the constitution includes a new system of dealing with trusteeships. This calls for a hearing by a panel of 20 local union officers who are not on the payroll of the international. Also, the union's general executive board must always have a majority divorced from any financial connection with the international. Rank-and-file control is assured by the provision calling for the election of 10 out of a total of 18 general executive board members, who must be nominated and elected by the locals and

membership in each of 5 regions. No one of these 10 GEB members can be nominated if he is on the payroll of the international union.

The American Newspaper Guild's representative assembly is an excellent illustration of how unions are striving to increase membership participation.

Guild locals in such cities as San Francisco, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, and New York have had for almost a quarter of a century a "representative assembly" system which encourages the membership to take part in decisionmaking through their elected representatives.

It would be extremely difficult for the guild's New York local 3, for example, to have very effective and representative local union meetings. Local 3 has 8,400 members employed on some 50 different newspapers, news services, news magazines, a radio station, and miscellaneous publications scattered throughout five city boroughs, Connecticut, and New Jersey.

Local 3's representative assembly was set up when the local was born, deliberately patterned after the representative assembly idea used by Congress, and for similar reasons. Assembly delegates are elected by units; a unit is a shop division. The New York Times employees form one unit; Saturday Review of Literature employees form another. The assembly meets once a month; it elects its own chairman and vice chairman. The local executive board members have no votes in the assembly unless they are given votes by their respective units. The assembly reviews or requests board decisions; it may authorize a strike subject to unit approval. Attendance is seldom as much as 150, less than half of the assembly. This is, however, a better percentage than most locals have.

Space doesn't permit mention of the many honest efforts by other unions to increase participation in decision-making processes and other union activities and the widespread apathy on the part of the membership.

In this article I have attempted to question some of the glib assumptions made about the "maturity of labor-management relations," to indicate how different the situation looks to someone working on a daily basis within the trade union movement, and to point out a few of the many sincere efforts currently being made to strengthen internal union democracy.

At the same time, I do not want to minimize in any way the importance of exploring further possible remedial steps that might be necessary to eliminate all vestiges of union corruption and racketeering.

In considering remedial steps, however, we should remember that it is all too easy to sit back in a comfortable armchair and talk about what unions should do. A lot of thinking and studying is necessary to develop adequate safeguards and solutions.

This study should take place not within an abstract academic framework, but should be based on firsthand observations and understanding of the changing nature of the problems that confront the labor movement today.

The Last Stand of Chief Joseph and the Nez Perce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Sunday, August 2, 1959, Washington Post and Times Herald. I call to the attention of my colleagues this historically significant article which outlines one of the most momentous and stirring events in the winning of the West. I believe this American Heritage article casts a new light on the activities of the famed Chief Joseph, and I believe it is a warm and human portrayal of the problems which faced the Indians of America during those days in our history.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LAST STAND OF CHIEF JOSEPH AND THE NEZ PERCE

(By Alvin M. Josephy, Jr.)

(This story, throwing new light on a poignant event in the bloody history of whites versus Indians, is by an author who is now working on a history of the Northwest. It is condensed from the magazine American Heritage.)

In June 1877, just 1 year after the Custer debacle, a new and unexpected Indian outbreak flared in the West, an uprising by formerly peaceful Nez Percés of Oregon and Idaho.

The war, like most Indian troubles, had stemmed from a conflict over land. For centuries the Nez Percés had occupied the high, grassy lands and canyon-scarred plateau land where Washington, Oregon, and Idaho come together.

A strong and intelligent people, they had lived in peace and friendship with the whites ever since the coming of Lewis and Clark, and it was their proud boast that no member of the tribe had ever killed a white man.

In 1855, as settlers began to appear in their country, the Government called on them to cede part of their land. The Nez Percés willingly accepted the confines of a reservation, but 5 years later gold was discovered on the reserve, miners poured in, and in 1863 the Government attempted to reduce the reservation to less than one-fourth its previous size.

Those bands, whose homes already lay within the boundaries of the new reservation agreed to sign the treaty. But the other chiefs representing about two-thirds of the tribe, protested and withdrew from the council without signing.

Among the latter was a prominent old chief named Wemahotkin, father of Chief Joseph and known to the whites as Old Joseph. His band had dwelt for generations in the Wallowa Valley in the northeastern corner of Oregon.

As the years went by and Old Joseph's people continued unmolested, it seemed as if their right to the Wallowa had been accepted. But white pressure against its borders increased steadily.

The crisis came soon after Old Joseph's death. Settlers found a route into the Wallowa and moved in, claiming the Indians' land. Young Joseph protested. On June 16, 1873, President Grant formally set aside the Wallowa as a reservation for the roaming Nez Perce Indians and ordered the whites to withdraw. But the settlers, refusing to move, threatened to exterminate Joseph's people if they didn't leave the valley.

As this threat increased, a Commission was appointed to make a final settlement. Despite the fact that it was unjust, and that there was no legal basis for it the decision of the Commission was firm: Unless all the nontreaty Nez Percés voluntarily came onto the reservation, they should be placed there by force.

Twelve days before their deadline to return, they reached an ancient tribal rendezvous area just outside the border of the

reservation. Here they lingered for a last bit of freedom. It was a fatal pause.

One of the young men, whose father had been murdered by a white man, was taunted by an old warrior for having allowed the slaying to go unavenged. The next morning he stole away with two companions.

By nightfall, in an outpouring of long suppressed hatred, the youths had killed four white men along the Salmon River and wounded another. Returning to camp to raise a bigger party, they continued the raids.

Joseph tried to calm his people, but the situation had gone too far. One by one the bands departed to a hiding place farther south. But though he had vigorously opposed war, Joseph would not abandon his people; 2 days later, he joined them in their new camp at White Bird Canyon.

Back at Lapwal, headquarters of the reservation, Gen. O. O. Howard was stunned by the news of the Salmon River outbreaks because he had thought that all danger was past. At the news of the outbreaks, he hastily ordered two troops of the First Cavalry to round up the hostiles and force them onto the reservation.

Alert Indian spies warned the Nez Percés of the troops' approach. The battle, fought without plan by the Indians, lasted only a few moments. The entire cavalry command was cut into small groups, disintegrating into a fleeing rabble.

The Nez Percé successes were resulting from a combination of overconfidence and mistakes on the part of the whites, the rugged terrain which made pursuit difficult and, to a very great extent, the Indians' intense courage and patriotic determination to fight for their rights and protect their people.

The whites had no way of knowing this, and, as events continued to unfold, the legend that Nez Percé strategy was planned and executed by one man, Joseph, was spread far and wide.

Pursuing the Nez Percés, Howard opened fire on their camp on the Clearwater River. The fighting raged all day and continued in the same spot the next morning, an almost unprecedented length of time for Indians to maintain battle in one location.

But the chiefs decided that there had been enough fighting without decision. They withdrew down the bluff, escaped Howard, and after much discussion, decided to cross the mountains and join the Crows in Montana, where they could hunt the plains in peace.

Smarting under increasing criticism from Washington, Howard once more took after the Indians. It was a painful and gruelling trip across Idaho to Montana for both pursuers and pursued, but the Indian families, stumbling along over steep and rocky trails, guarded by their warriors and driving some 2,000 horses with them, managed to keep well ahead of the troops.

On their march, the Nez Percés scrupulously avoided any hostile act against white settlers. Receiving friendly treatment from Montana citizens, the Indians believed that now they were out of Idaho, the war was over and they were safe. But when they pitched camp on the Big Hole River, a surprise attack from a new Army detachment caught them unawares.

The Indians fought back desperately from their tepees. While Joseph directed the breaking of camp, the warriors remained, picking off anyone who showed himself. The soldiers ran out of water, and cries from the untended wounded filled the air. Mercifully, the warriors broke off the engagement.

The Nez Percés now quickened their retreat across southwestern Montana. Gone were illusions that the whites would let them be. In their desperation, only one haven seemed left to them. Like Sitting Bull, they would seek refuge in the country of Queen Victoria. The column headed eastward.

As they moved beyond Canyon Creek, their old allies, the Crows, now in service as scouts for the Army, began to attack them. About 30 miles short of the Canadian line, exhausted by their long flight, they paused, confident that they had outdistanced all pursuers.

Once more they were wrong, outflanked by the telegraph, and this time the pause would end in their last stand. From Fort Keogh in the east came Col. Nelson A. Miles with nearly 600 men.

When they sighted the Nez Percés close to Snake Creek on the northern edge of the Bear Paw Mountains, they attacked immediately. Most of the Indians' remaining war leaders were killed in the fighting.

His own heavy casualties deterred Miles from ordering another charge, however, and both sides dug in. Four days later Howard reached the battlefield. The appearance of their old enemy, heralding the arrival of reinforcements for Miles, took the final heart out of the suffering Nez Percés. The chiefs held a final council. Joseph mounted a horse and rode slowly up the hill from the camp and across to the Army lines.

As he reached the officers, he dismounted and handed Miles his rifle. Then, stepping back, he adjusted his blanket to leave his right arm free, and began one of the most touching and beautiful speeches of surrender ever made:

"I am tired of fighting. Our chiefs are killed. Looking Glass is dead. Toohoolool-zote is dead. The old men are all dead. It is the young men who say yes or no. He who led the young men is dead.

"It is cold and we have no blankets. The little children are freezing to death. My people, some of them, have run away to the hills, and have no blankets, no food; no one knows where they are—perhaps freezing to death.

"I want to have time to look for my children and see how many I can find. Maybe I shall find them among the dead. Hear me, my chiefs. I am tired; my heart is sick and sad. From where the sun now stands, I will fight no more forever."

The surrender speech confirmed Joseph in the public's mind as the symbol of the Nez Percés' heroic, fighting retreat. At first the Indians were shipped by flatboats and box-cars to unfamiliar, hot country in the Indian territory, where many of them sickened and died. But friendly whites and sympathetic societies in the East continued to work for them, and public sentiment finally forced approval of their return to the Northwest.

In 1885 Joseph and most of his band were sent to the Colville Reservation in Washington. Joseph made many attempts to be allowed to resettle in the Wallowa but each time was rebuffed. In 1904 he died, broken-hearted, an exile from the beautiful valley he still considered home.

What Statehood Means to Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, in the third of a series of articles in the current issue of State Government is "What Statehood Means to Hawaii," by Prof. Robert M. Kamins, director of the Legislative Reference Bureau of Hawaii and a staff member of the University of Hawaii, department of economics. Mr. Kamins elaborates on the effects of statehood on the Government of Hawaii and some of the problems it raises and

explains the implications it is having on the economic and social life of the islands.

Professor Kamins' contribution follows:

WHAT STATEHOOD MEANS TO HAWAII

(By Robert M. Kamins)

Hawaii comes into the American Union with the experience of more than a century of self-government. Since the adoption of a constitution by King Kamehameha III in 1840, followed in 1848 by a division of the land which removed the physical basis for the earlier feudal system. Hawaii has been ruled under constitutional law—as kingdom, republic, and organized territory. Long before its annexation to the United States in 1898, it had adopted the Anglo-American common law and governmental practices familiar to Americans, which culminated in the deposition of the monarchy in 1893. As a sovereign republic and as a Territory of the United States, it has financed and (except during a period of martial law during World War II) has ruled itself with a minimum of assistance and direction from the Federal Government.

The coming of statehood, then, will not basically change the structure or fabric of Government in Hawaii. Unlike Alaska, her sister novitiate, Hawaii will not suddenly face the necessity of assuming governmental burdens—for example in public health, highways, education—which had previously been borne in whole or in part by the National Government. On statehood day, no new function will have to be assumed by the Government of the new State. The schools, the highway program, the administration of justice, the revenue structure, health and welfare services and, without important exception, all the rest of the governmental program, will continue to operate as on the preceding day, and for the most part under the direction of the same people.

Acting in a community accustomed to self-government, legislatures and Governors have kept Hawaii well abreast of governmental practices elsewhere in the Nation. It would be easy to compile a long list of statutes—in the fields of public health, education, agriculture, labor, and taxation—in which Hawaii has pioneered or has been in the van of American jurisdictions.¹ It has not looked for leadership to the Interior Department or other agencies in Washington.

IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Changes there will be, of course. The first change is being experienced as this is written, months in advance of statehood. Persons aged 20 are registering for the first State elections, scheduled for June 27 and July 28, as permitted by the State constitution, under the provisions of which the elections will be conducted. (Alaska set the minimum voting age at 19; Georgia and Kentucky have set the minimum at 18; all other States at 21.)

The Senate Interior Committee favorably reported the bill, but no further action was taken. In 1953 the difficulty was compounded when, after the House had passed a Hawaii bill, the Senate passed one only after adding Alaska to it. The House Rules Committee refused to grant a conference request and thus killed the bill. The main problem for the two Territories thereafter involved the attempt to combine their bills, since this attempt joined those who opposed both bills with those who opposed one bill but not the other.

THE VICTORY WON

Thus in the 85th Congress, in which sentiment, for whatever reason, favored Alaska rather than Hawaii, Hawaii deliberately stepped aside, allowing Alaska to be considered alone. The astonishing swift passage—not unanticipated—of the Hawaii bill in the 86th Congress was a direct result of

Footnotes at end of speech.

Hawaii's part in passage of the Alaska bill and of that passage itself.

It is impossible to name here the many outstanding people in the Congress, in the forty-nine States and in Hawaii who have played special and notable parts in preparing for and helping to secure the passage of the Hawaii statehood bill. Fundamentally, no one man or group of men is responsible. Statehood is, as I have said, a victory of and for Hawaii's people, and it is they who are responsible. It is they who have made for Hawaii the distinguished record by which it so patently deserved statehood. Anything that any man from Hawaii did to help secure statehood was successful only insofar as he genuinely represented Hawaii's people, and embodied their deeds and achievements.

Just to hint at the tremendous, joint effort that made statehood possible, let me note very briefly a few things that helped secure passage in this 86th Congress. Certainly one major factor in the bill's swift passage was a prodigious letter-writing campaign that originated in Hawaii. The newspapers, radio, TV, civic and citizen groups, and the people of Hawaii generally, joined in promoting and implementing the idea that each citizen of Hawaii should write his friends in the States urging them in turn to write their Congressmen and Senators in support of Hawaiian statehood. In another significant move, the Honolulu Chamber of Commerce, with no publicity and a modesty that belied its very real effectiveness, sent businessmen to Washington to assist the Delegate in his efforts in behalf of statehood.

A NEW ERA IS OPENED

I have tried, very briefly, to suggest something of what statehood means to Hawaii's people, some of the events that occurred, and some of the factors involved, in the long effort of Hawaii's people to secure statehood. I have characterized this effort as a part of a movement from a closed, centralized scheme of things to more open, diversified, and flexible forms. Statehood, I have said, in one sense completes this movement, and in another sense gives it an opportunity really to begin. Statehood is the ground and condition for a full sense of identity on the part of Hawaii's people, a full sense of their possibilities and potentialities, and for the maximum development of these.

As a State, Hawaii is a unique and powerful asset to the United States in two chief ways. Geographically, economically, commercially, and culturally Hawaii occupies the central, preeminent position in the Pacific Ocean. To this world, therefore, and to the east—which together contain more than two-thirds of the world's population and countless other tremendous untapped resources—Hawaii is America's bridge, America's very real, tangible and practical key to friendly, profitable relations with these areas. Further, in Hawaii's people—who are thoroughly American yet understand the peoples of the Pacific and the east, and can sympathize with their problems—the United States has its best means of utilizing Hawaii's position.

Statehood is the catalyst which releases the energies of Hawaii's people and gives them the opportunity to exploit these energies. Statehood opens up, as a result, a whole new era, a whole new area of possibility, for Hawaii and for the Nation.

The 1959 elections will initiate the most consequential revision in the government of the Islands: the inauguration of an elected governor and lieutenant-governor, replacing the Governor and Territorial Secretary hitherto appointed by the President of the United States. By and large, Hawaii has been fortunate in its appointive Governor; with remarkably few exceptions they have been both competent and politically acceptable to the people of Hawaii. Given the best

of circumstances, however, they have lacked the solid basis of political authority which derives from election. Countervailing the personal popularity of the chief executive has been an inherent resentment that he had been chosen not in Hawaii but in Washington, and that turnover in the presidency might cause the replacement of a good governor by some person yet unknown.

Popular election may be expected to strengthen the office of the Governor, particularly since a "short-ballot" constitution gives the Governor authority to appoint all department heads as well as members of the State judiciary. Even though Hawaii has a well developed civil service system, patronage opportunities for the executive will be abundant. A byproduct will be the injection of additional zest to political action in Hawaii, already vigorous—with strong Democratic and Republican Parties.

If, as appears likely, the office of Governor will lie at the center of heightened political activity in this new State, the election of two National Senators and one or two Congressmen cannot but add to the enlivenment of partisan competition. Coincidentally, the adoption in 1959 of a charter for the city-county of Honolulu, which enlarges the membership of the municipal council which strengthening the position of the mayor, probably will further invigorate the striving at the polls.

DEPARTMENTAL REORGANIZATION

Statehood brings to Hawaii the occasion for reorganizing its structure of government. Borrowing an idea from the 1947 constitution of New Jersey the convention which drafted Hawaii's first State constitution incorporated a provision requiring that the various departments, commissions, bureaus, and other administrative agencies established over the decades by the territorial government, now numbering about 75, be consolidated in or under not more than 20 principal departments—this to be done in such manner as to group the same according to major purposes so far as practicable. The legislature is given 3 years in which to act, until the summer of 1962; if at that time it has not effected this consolidation, the constitution requires the Governor to take action within an additional year.

The reorganization mandated by the constitution is the most complex problem of the transition to statehood. Since 1949 the legislature has attempted departmental reorganization. Sometimes the efforts were defeated in the legislature; in 1951 and 1953 they went down under gubernatorial vetoes. Meanwhile the number of territorial agencies has continued to grow, and with it the potential resistance to change.

As a start toward restructuring the government, the last territorial legislature (adjourned this May) established an interim committee to consider how best to effectuate the constitutional requirement. The committee, consisting of eight senators and eight representatives, is to review the various proposals for reorganization which have been made over recent years, augment them with such studies as may seem necessary, prepare implementing bills, and report to the first State legislature which will meet this August or September.

Under rather remarkable constitutional relationships with the Federal Government, one department of the Hawaii government is protected against change by the State legislature. The Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920, a Federal statute, established the Hawaiian Homes Commission, a Territorial agency designed to assist Polynesian Hawaiians in maintaining their communities and creating new ones. Relatively

large areas of public land have been made available by the commission to persons of Hawaiian ancestry (of at least halfblood, in recent years) as residential sites and agricultural homesteads. Hawaiians receiving land grants are given 99-year leases, for which they pay an annual rent of \$1. Holders may also receive low-interest loans from the commission.

The State constitution adopts the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act on behalf of the State, agreeing that the spirit of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act looking to the continuance of the Hawaiian homes project for the further rehabilitation of the Hawaiian race shall be faithfully carried out. Furthermore, Congress, in the act of admission, permits the amendment (in the constitution or by statute) of administrative provisions of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act but prohibits the new State from changing the provisions relating to the commission's funds, to change the qualifications to hold land under the act, or to decrease the benefits of Hawaiian landholders, unless permitted by Congress. This last tie to the Federal apron strings Congress would not cut.

SEARCH OF THE LAWS

Attainment of statehood makes it necessary to study the statutes under which Hawaii has been governed. In Washington, the Budget Bureau is examining the Federal statutes applicable to Hawaii, to determine if statehood will change their applicability. (By way of example, in Hawaii as a Territory, business transacted has been ipso facto considered to be in interstate commerce for the purpose of some Federal laws. In Hawaii as a State, presumably the same legal tests that are used elsewhere in the United States will determine what is interstate commerce and what is not.) Under an Executive order, the Budget Bureau is to report its findings to the President.

In Honolulu, meantime, the legislature has authorized the Hawaii attorney general to consider the effect of statehood on the laws under which the State is ruled, both those enacted by Congress and those of the Hawaii Legislature.

The study is given urgency by a provision in the Admission Act which repeals within 2 years of the date of statehood all territorial laws enacted by Congress. This refers to laws the validity of which is dependent solely upon the authority of the Congress to provide for the government of Hawaii as a Territory. The provision affects, among others, those of Hawaii's land laws which are found in the Organic Act (a Federal statute) and not in the Revised Laws of Hawaii. Such statutes must be identified and enacted as State law by summer of 1961, when as Federal law they will automatically expire.

JUDICIAL REORGANIZATION

Putting the State constitution into effect changes the administration of the laws as well as their form and content. Hawaii the Territory has had a three-member supreme court, appointed by the President. Under the constitution this appellate court is expanded to five, appointed by the Governor, and it is to be served by an administrative director. The establishment of the latter position, accomplished by the last Territorial legislature in anticipation of statehood, was recommended in a 1957 survey of Hawaii's judiciary as being of primary importance to improve the administration of justice.

An unusual provision of the State constitution authorizes the creation of a commission to consider and report to the Governor whenever a member of the supreme or circuit courts appears to be incapable of performing his judicial duties; on receiving the report the Governor is to appoint a

board of three to consider the case. On its recommendation, the Governor may retire the justice or judge.

As a result of statehood, appeals from the Supreme Court of Hawaii will go directly to the Supreme Court of the United States rather than, as during Territorial status, to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in San Francisco, subject to further appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court. Severing this judicial connection between Honolulu and San Francisco should add to the prestige and authority of the Hawaii Supreme Court. It now becomes the final appellate body in most legal cases originating in Hawaii, rather than a way-station to the ninth circuit.

Salaries of the Hawaii judiciary, payable solely by the State rather than being borne largely by the Federal Government, as has been the case under Territorial status, are set by the constitution as at least \$17,500 per annum for the chief justice, \$17,000 for other members of the supreme court, and \$15,000 for circuit judges. An act of the last Territorial legislature in 1959 set these salaries, in fact, at \$22,500, \$22,000 and \$19,000, respectively.

EFFECTS IN WASHINGTON

More profound effects of statehood may stem from Hawaii's gaining votes, as well as a voice, in Congress than from changes in the local government of the islands. The sugar industry, still the largest grouping of private enterprises despite the post-war diversification of Hawaii's economy, has always been concerned about its marketing quota under the sugar acts while Hawaii remained a Territory. Now that it is a State with as many Senate votes as any other, Hawaii's quota seems more secure. If production on the shrinking acreage utilized by cane plantations should increase over a million tons—Hawaii's approximate annual allotment on the national market—perhaps the quota can be enlarged for the State of Hawaii. Producers of other local agricultural crops, notably coffee, which has recently suffered from depressed world prices, are now beginning to ask if the new Senators and Representatives cannot obtain coverage for their crops under the farm price support programs.

Statehood also promises to insure the stability of another source of mainland dollars, the largest—defense expenditures.⁴ Hawaii's economic development in recent years may be viewed as a race against possible disarmament or movement of military establishments out of Hawaii. If the islands are to be demilitarized ultimately (and from their position in the Pacific the people of Hawaii are at least as concerned as any other portion of America's population with the dangers of continued international tensions) two Senators and a Representative may be able to cushion the economic shock by obtaining federally financed public works in larger quantity than Hawaii the Territory could have expected.

Hawaii is land-hungry, and statehood may cause the release by military agencies of substantial acreages held since World War II, currently put by the United States to infrequent or marginal use.⁵ Under the Admission Act, each Federal agency having control over any property in Hawaii is required within 5 years of the date of statehood to report to the President concerning its continued need for each parcel. If the President determines that any land is no longer needed by the United States, the act provides that it shall be returned to Hawaii.

By such transfers, Hawaii would regain at least a portion of the public lands which were ceded to the United States in 1898 at the time of annexation. Hawaii's government hopes that the areas returned will be substantial, particularly on the island of Oahu, where a rapidly increasing popula-

tion is pressing hard against limited amounts of readily usable land. The land so transferred to the State government will become, under the Admission Act, a public trust for the support of the public schools, for the betterment of native Hawaiians, for development of farm and home ownership, and for similar purposes.

Furthermore, the Admission Act applies to Hawaii the Submerged Lands and Outer Continental Shelf Lands Acts of 1953. Hawaii has no offshore deposits of oil, the resource which supplied much of the motivation for passing these Federal laws. But it does have shallow tidal lands which can be filled in, now that their control is firmly vested in the State, to supply needed space for an expanding population and tourist trade. With some difficulty, Hawaii obtained congressional permission last year to fill and use a limited area extending from the shores of Waikiki. Now the littoral of any of the islands can be expanded as the need arises and resources permit.

ECONOMIC STIMULUS

Obtaining the use of more land, particularly on densely populated Oahu, constitutes the most obvious stimulation of economic growth under statehood. Other influences are less tangible but also important.

The greatest of these is the familiarity which Hawaii will gain for investors and merchants, for tourists and American migrants, as a State of the Union. During the past several decades an increasing part of the mainland population acquired some knowledge of Hawaii and its institutions, but a surprisingly large number of mainland Americans still wondered about the language, the money and the tariff system of the Territory of Hawaii. It is already apparent that the State of Hawaii is more familiar, and therefore inspires greater confidence as a place for investment or business enterprise. Without much doubt, the current flurry of economic expansion—the construction of Hawaii's first oil refinery, first steel mills, first cement plants, additional small manufactures, new hotels, shopping centers and residential areas, the commercial exploration of bauxite (the State's only known mineral resource), will be accelerated and sustained by businesses attracted to Hawaii by the spotlight of statehood.

Accelerated movement of persons to Hawaii from other parts of the United States is also to be expected—movement to a "paradise" which statehood has brought closer, in the popular image to accustomed American ways. Such an influx, when added to the established population growth of the islands, will place still greater pressure on the intensively utilized land area of Oahu, forcing an expansion of economic growth in the other seven principal islands of the chain. All of the latter are now relatively underdeveloped, with static or declining populations. The expansion will require the establishment of cheap interisland travel, now limited to plane and barge traffic, the supplying of water to arid lands, a shift of dairy and truck farming from Oahu to its neighboring islands, the growth of villages into towns and towns into cities, the expansion of commercial and governmental services in all areas—in a word, the overall enlargement of virtually every phase of Hawaiian activity.

SOCIAL ASPECTS

Those who have found pleasure in living here cannot but view with mixed feelings the prospect of a more crowded Hawaii. There is reason to believe that the changes associated with economic expansion will be gradual, but their cumulative effects will be profound.

A minority in Hawaii who have opposed statehood have feared some of these effects. Many persons of Hawaiian ancestry, justifiably proud of their Polynesian antecedents

(and sometimes idealizing the golden days before Captain Cook, before the missionaries, before the revolution which toppled the monarchy, or before the tide of migration from the mainland pulled in by World War II) have forebodings that they and their culture will be lost in the new Hawaii, pushed aside by a more aggressive commercialism. Were this to happen, and it does not yet seem imminent, statehood would not be the cause but rather the symbol of a social evolution of almost 200 years. What may rather result is a Hawaii which moves closer to mainland living patterns, yet retains in its amalgam much of the graciousness and individuality of the Hawaiian people.

Older Caucasian settlers, of families established in Hawaii for a century or more, may also wonder if their predominance in business, politics, and society will be further reduced by statehood. Since World War II, and particularly in the past decade, newer settlers from the Orient have begun to assume leadership in the community. However, members of these very families, not unanimously but in strength, have supported the long drive for statehood along with the rest of the population. A 1940 plebiscite showed almost 7 out of every 10 voters to be favorable to statehood; the 1950 constitution was approved by more than 7 out of every 10; and as this is written it is anticipated that 8 to 9 out of every 10 will vote approval, this June, of the conditions under which Hawaii will become a State.

EFFECTS ON THE UNITED STATES

Incompletely told, these are some of the effects which statehood will have on Hawaii, and some of the local reactions to the changes. There will also be important effects upon the United States as a whole.

Quantitatively, it might be thought that Hawaii is too small, measured against the rest of the country, to have much bearing on the Nation's life. The new State comprises only about three-tenths of 1 percent of the population of the United States, and two-tenths of 1 percent of its area. Yet there is good reason to believe that this small region will soon play an important part in the rounding out of America and in its international relations.

To date, because it was initially settled by migrants from Europe and Africa, the mainland United States has had little knowledge of Asia and its peoples, little ability to communicate with them or to understand firsthand their problems, fears, and desires. The admission of Hawaii to statehood demonstrates to the nations of the Orient that the racial attitudes of the United States are not what its traducers have said. Statehood also creates in Hawaii a pool of first-class Americans of Oriental ancestry, some of whom (though deplorably few) are able to speak one or more of the languages of the East, who can be called upon to represent the United States in discussions with Asian countries.

The preamble to the State constitution manifests some of the attributes of the people of Hawaii which especially qualify them to serve the United States in the conduct of international relations:

"We, the people of the State of Hawaii, grateful for divine guidance, and mindful of our Hawaiian heritage, reaffirm our belief in a government of the people, by the people and for the people, and with an understanding heart toward all the peoples of the earth, do hereby ordain and establish this constitution for the State of Hawaii.

⁴For brevity, two examples will suffice. (1) Hawaii has continuously imposed a net income tax since 1901. (Wisconsin's levy, commonly regarded as the first modern State

Footnotes at end of speech.

income tax, dates from 1911.) (2) Hawaii's laws prohibit the construction of billboards. Hawaii's Organic Act did require, however, that persons appointed as Governor or Territorial Secretary have resided in the Territory for at least 3 years. In 1933 Congress voted on a "carpetbagger" amendment to the Organic Act which would have removed this requirement, but the amendment failed of enactment.

Under the act of admission, Congress gave Hawaii a single seat in the House of Representatives. However, it appears that at the next reapportionment of Congress, Hawaii's population (585,025 civilians, as of January 1, 1959) will cause it to be apportioned 2 seats.

In the calendar year 1957, military expenditures in Hawaii approximated \$308 million. In that same year the combined gross incomes of the sugar and pineapple industries totaled about \$252 million, and gross receipts from tourism amounted to some \$80 million.

The Federal Government in 1958 held some 316,000 acres throughout the territory, inclusive of 187,000 acres in Hawaii National Park on the islands of Maui and Hawaii.

One measure: since 1955 the membership of the Hawaii Legislature has closely approximated, in proportion, the racial composition of the electorate.

sating hundreds of thousands of Jews and non-Jews for the atrocities and robberies committed against them. This policy of the Adenauer government is appreciated by the State of Israel and by the entire Jewish people.

The convention, therefore, has reason to expect that the Bonn Government will act with equal justice toward the unfortunate Rumanian Jews who were the victims of Nazi tyranny and who are now located in Israel, in the United States, and in other countries.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, following is my newsletter of August 1, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Tex., August 1, 1959)

The Federal highway construction dilemma grows. The problem is shortage of money (a) immediately, and (b) for the entire 16-year program. The reasons are: (1) Increased costs beyond original estimates, and (2) forced accelerated spending last year, allegedly as antirecession. The solution for immediate funds is to (a) raise taxes, or (b) pay out of the general Treasury. So the Ways and Means Committee proposes to do neither; instead, to borrow, hardly a new idea and not a real solution at all. My solution is to pay out of the general Treasury and cut Government spending elsewhere, in less essential areas (public works, public power developments, public housing, foreign aid, sewer building, fertilizer manufacturing, and hundreds of Federal social services and Government business operations). This solution has not and will not be considered, though it cannot be disproved. Careful study should be given the dire consequences, not evident, of last year's forced acceleration of spending, which I forecast in disapproving our action then.

The more permanent solution for the entire highway construction program is manifold. To restate the problem: (a) The Federal cost of the highway program has grown \$15 billion in 2 years (from \$38.5 billion to \$53.5 billion, including \$12 billion in the Interstate program alone); (b) the cost of highway construction rose 12 percent from mid-1954 to the end of 1956 (see House Doc. 300, January 1958). Proper corrective action by Congress can rest only on careful study of the whys to these increases. Such study should be made now, before more taxpayers' money is spent to condone, perpetuate, or bury improper contracting, wastefulness, unconscionable profit, and unintentional mistakes, if such there be. The facts will exonerate as it will permit correction. Or should we just pour more money in, taxpayers be hanged, because the people want highways. I believe the people want and deserve not only highways, but their money's worth. Taxes are too high now.

My suggestions for correction of both immediate and long term shortage of funds are these: (1) Transfer funds from the general Treasury to the highway trust fund, only enough to make good on highway contracts in force; (2) budget future expenditures after realistic study of costs to date, and stretch out the building program by (a) building only those multilanes necessary

where traffic flow exceeds 6,000 vehicles per day, and (b) build by stages, establishing correct geometrics (basic roadbed and surface, engineering, drainage, etc.) and later add the frills; (3) set budget by dollar amount, not mileage; (4) change the 90-10 Federal-State matching ratio to 75-25 percent; (5) repeal the Davis-Bacon Federal wage setting so States can set the prevailing wage as in the past; (6) repeal the utility relocation reimbursement, leaving this to States. The bond proposal of financing by borrowing is (a) abandoning the pay-as-we-go principle, (b) makes the Treasury short-term Federal debt refinancing even tougher, (c) puts highway bonds in competition for loan money with home, auto, and furniture buyers, also small merchants, and (d) with interest cost of \$168 to \$268 million on \$1 billion in bonds is too much, means less highway for the money. The highway problem is the result of the same old problem, the Federal Government is spending too much in nonessential programs, now short-changing highways. The real and only solution: Reduce Federal spending, not increase taxes or borrow and charge to the troubled future.

The foreign aid appropriation (mutual security) bill and debate was history repeating itself (newsletter June 20, 1959, Mar. 4 and May 17, 1958). The earlier \$3.5 billion authorization (reduced from \$3.9 billion request) was cut this go-round to \$3.1 billion and passed 279-136 (ALGER against). The component parts are: (1) military assistance; (2) defense support; (3) Development Loan Fund; (4) development assistance; (5) technical cooperation; (6) contingency fund.

Facts and figures from debate and hearings (1,781 pages): (1) Of 86 nations in the world the United States has given \$82 billion to 76 nations since World War II; (2) U.S. foreign aid personnel has grown from 458 in 1948 to 53,600 in 1958; (3) 67 free nations' debt is \$185 billion; the Soviet bloc has debt of \$51 billion; the U.S. debt is \$285 billion, \$48 billion more than all the rest of the world combined; (4) total money available (unexpended \$4.8 billion, this bill \$3.1 billion) is \$8 billion plus foreign currencies we own of \$1.5 billion or approximately \$9.5 billion (actually there's more); (5) yearly foreign aid includes other military expenditures than in foreign aid bill (over \$1 billion) and surplus food gifts (\$1 billion or more) approximately \$5.5 billion. Add to this the yearly interest on \$82 billion of foreign aid now part of the national debt, \$3.1 billion, makes actual yearly foreign aid \$8.5 billion; (6) over 2,000 separate projects have now been reduced to 1,450, many abandoned as impractical (9 pages, 60 specific projects documented in hearings); (7) Comptroller General of United States has audited and examined foreign aid, found it overprogrammed and mismanaged, inefficient, etc., with too much money the chief cause of the trouble.

Random examples: (a) Graft, corruption, and profit from improper distribution and sales of aid materiel by foreign businessmen and officials; (b) military vehicles delivered could not be used, shortage of drivers and maintenance; (c) ammunition and equipment ruined because not properly stored; (d) 44 tires per truck stored in 1 nation; (e) 185 years' supply of particular ammunition on hand in one country and only one carburetor for trucks for entire army; (f) over 4,000 tons excess ordnance materiel in one country's depot; (g) diversion, pilfering and thievery until military supplies were short in another country, etc.; (8) civilian projects of all kinds are financed, many types of which government cannot provide in our country (list of 113, such projects, p. 940, hearings); aid for education purposes has gone to over 50 countries, including Yugoslavia; (9) classification as secret or other security designation covers up

Plight of Rumanian Jewish Victims of Nazism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to bring to the attention of the Congress a resolution adopted at the 19th Quadrennial Convention of the Farband Labor Zionist Order in connection with the plight of the Rumanian Jewish victims of nazism. I am also bringing this matter to the attention of the Department of State as a matter for their consideration. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARBAND CONVENTION RESOLUTION: RUMANIAN JEWISH VICTIMS OF NAZISM

The 19th Quadrennial Convention of the Farband Labor Zionist Order held in Miami Beach from May 23 through May 27, notes with deep concern the refusal of the government agencies and courts of West Germany to approve the just claims of the Rumanian Jewish victims of nazism for compensation for their sufferings and for the property which was stolen from them by the Nazis.

The convention is aware of the fact that the Nazis conducted their atrocities against the Jews of Rumania with the cooperation of the Antonescu government in Rumania of that time. It is our profound belief that elementary justice demands that the Rumanian Jewish victims of the Nazi murders receive the same compensation as the Jewish victims of nazism in other countries.

The convention affirms that the West German Government under Chancellor Adenauer has acted with compassion and humanitarianism by at least partially compen-

glaring faults of the program; (10) 1,113 audit recommendations by ICA (International Cooperation Administration) and GAO (General Accounting Office) findings all show lack of planning and cost relationship; (11) military assistance, the most justifiable of the component parts, is replete with errors—(a) inadequate estimates of needs and costs; (b) inadequate relationship of cost and objectives to be achieved; (c) improper recordkeeping of total costs by country and others; (12) groups that enjoy windfalls or are vitally interested are (a) printing and publishing industry, (b) motion picture industry, (c) shipping, (d) manufacturing, (e) export and import firms, (f) commercial banks, (g) colleges and universities, (h) clergy, (i) military; (13) "loan" of Development Loan Fund is fictitious, repayable 80 percent in local currency which United States can't use; further, Congress has no control over this fund.

A few, even more than a few, instances of mistakes should not condemn such a program as foreign aid, but the almost endless examples of error, inefficiency, waste, mismanagement, overprogramming, lack of objectives, and underplanning, in many countries culminating in aiding our enemies (Yugoslavia, Poland, Indonesia, etc.) and alienating our friends proclaims there are basic faults that need correction, not acceptance and continuation. As a nation, we cannot spend ourselves rich. We cannot make ourselves secure by giving ourselves away. We cannot buy friends; they do not stay bought. The greatest fallacy is to ascribe aid as charity or "be thy brother's keeper" through foreign aid by our Government. The real Biblical meaning is the practice between individual human beings, not governments, which by nature must be impersonal and realistically self-interested. This fundamental difference and role of government needs to be studied. As I oppose big Federal spending where there is waste, fullness or contradiction of purpose, am I negative or anti as adduced in the last campaign?

Senator McCLELLAN this week answered labor's criticism that his labor bill is anti-labor this way: "Antilabor are they? Well, let us see. The provisions of these measures, the provisions that they criticize, are 'anti' some things beyond all doubt. I shall enumerate for you a few of the things they are 'anti.' They are anti-gangster, goon, racketeer, and hoodlum. They are anti-theft, embezzlement, shakedown, blackmail, and extortion. They are anti-larceny, anti-acid assault, and anti-vandalism. They are anti-fraud, dishonesty, crookedness, and corruption. They are anti-violence, bestiality, brutality, and cruelty. And they are anti-dictatorship, boss rule, oppression, and exploitation. Yes, they are 'anti' these two dozen things and more. And when summed up, they simply establish conclusively and irrefutably that Congress has undertaken to enact laws that will be effective in dealing with and in preventing crime and tyranny from being imposed and inflicted upon our workers, union members, and the public at large. How can anyone call laws that are designed to curb such activities 'antilabor'? I do not believe, and in fact I know, that the great rank-and-file of American workers both in unions and without, do not associate such practices with the true mission and purposes of honest, decent, trade unionism among freemen in a civilized society. But these things, these abhorrent abuses, have happened and they are happening here. I do believe they must be stopped if our system of government and way of life under law and order are to survive."

To this I add amen, and I shall do everything I can to help pass an effective labor law to curb the excesses of labor leaders and the monopolistic dangers of unions in the inter-

est of all our people, including union members. It's a toss-up whether Congressmen will have the courage to do what's needed now.

The Budget Bureau has listed some built-in increases to Federal expenditures under existing law, showing a possible \$26 billion increase next year. In addition, new legislation now pending in Congress totals \$16 billion. The only protection against this pent-up flood of spending is in the people themselves. The public alone can force Congress to exercise self-discipline. Will people realize this in time and tell their Congressmen how they feel?

Concerning the speculation over a summit conference, my own belief is simply that it should be called off. Russia's leaders should be told that in view of their sabotaging every meeting and all past agreements and their avowed dedication to world conquest, there is no area of agreement between us until and unless they establish one. Deeds, not words, are needed. To me such a positive statement on our part will promote peace and is the safest course.

On this "Government by veto" charge now being leveled by some of the disgruntled would-be spenders, it's interesting to note the veto records of some earlier Presidents. Cleveland, 584 vetoes; Roosevelt, 631; Truman, 250. Compare these records with the 142 bills President Eisenhower has vetoed to date. Personally, I'm happy that we have a President unafraid to wield his veto power in defense of fiscal responsibility.

Public Debt Management Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, 8 weeks of stalemate have elapsed since the President of the United States on June 8, 1959, sent a message to the Congress urging the adoption of legislation designed to facilitate economical public debt management. That stalemate has come into being because of the sit-and-wait attitude of the Democratic House leadership. That leadership has contented itself with politically motivated attacks on responsible Government officials who are commendably and patriotically performing their offices of public responsibility. I have been forced to conclude that these attacks are intended to distract public attention from the tragic failure of the Democratic House leadership to provide leadership.

Depending upon what newspaper and what edition an individual refers to, the chances of this legislation receiving consideration by the Congress are either on again or off again. When it is considered that the public confidence which is so vital to our fiscal strength and economic growth is inextricably involved in forthright legislative action on the administration's recommendation, the on again, off again indeterminateness that has been created by the sit-and-wait House Democratic leadership is intolerable. For 8 weeks this legislation has been bottled up in committee despite the

fact it must still be considered in the other body between the time of final House action and the adjournment of the current session.

On July 22 the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means addressed a letter to the Democratic House leadership pledging their unanimous support and expressing confidence that at least 140 Republican Members of the House would join in that support if the leadership would undertake to clear this legislation for floor consideration. While we have not received a reply to our letter, we have been accused in a press statement issued by that leadership of a political play.

Mr. Speaker, I assure the House membership that our Republican endeavors to break the stalemate have not been a political play, but instead those efforts have represented a sincere attempt on our part to make up for the absence of leadership in expediting this legislation through the Congress.

The crux of the stalemate centers around the so-called sense-of-Congress amendment which in essence instructs the Federal Reserve to expand the money supply by pegging the price of long-term Government securities. Financial authorities are virtually unanimous in denouncing such a proposal as being inflationary and as being an unwise limitation on the flexible authority granted by the Congress to the Federal Reserve in carrying out the Fed's primary mission of administering a sound money policy.

Mr. Speaker, as examples of informed evaluations of this sense-of-Congress amendment I will insert in the RECORD at this point three excerpts from weekly publications of Aubrey G. Lanston & Co., Inc., and an editorial from the Commercial and Financial Chronicle of New York.

[From the publication of Aubrey G. Lanston & Co., Inc., July 13, 1959]

Some things, however, are clear. The management of money, credit, and debt is an art the practice of which is replete with complexities. The means by which these arts are practiced very definitely are not matters in which Congress can afford to meddle whimsically or for purposes of advancing partisan objectives. The manner in which, and the methods by which Federal Reserve open market operations are conducted may not be subjected to black-and-white analyses. But, certainly, the national interest dictates that the choice of methods be left to the experts, and that the actual decisions with respect to these matters be left to the experts who are charged with the responsibility. Certainly, too, Federal Reserve officials know better than the House Ways and Means Committee what the Fed can and cannot do in the Government market if the public interest is to be served.

[July 20, 1959]

It seems to us that those who advocate congressional coercion of the Fed with respect to its open market operations might ponder a different side of the matter. This is: In periods of high and rising business activity and of abnormal demands for credit, Treasury debt management should seek to decrease the liquidity of banks, business corporations and others so as to prevent the development of an unsustainable rate of demand for goods and services. It happens, however, that the Government's fiscal

position has been out of tune with developments in the business situation and the Treasury, therefore, has been obliged to add to the liquidity of the economy by selling large amounts of near-dated money obligations (for cash and to refund). In such circumstances, the Federal Reserve System therefore should strive to offset such consequences and there is only one way that the Federal Reserve may do so via an enlargement in the scope of its open market operations. The appropriate enlargement—if any enlargement is truly appropriate and we firmly believe it's not—would be for the Fed to sell notes and bonds from its portfolio and to reinvest in (buy) bills. The Metcalf proposal, however, calls for the opposite of this.

[July 27, 1959]

The Metcalf amendment—what does it really mean? Apparently, this amendment is holding up (and may block) any action to permit the Treasury to sell new issues of bonds unless (as few currently expect in the near future) this becomes possible at a return to the investor of no more than 4½ percent. Therefore, it may be worth some additional comment in this letter.

We are advised that the amendment, as currently drawn reads as follows: "It is the sense of Congress that the Federal Reserve System, while pursuing its primary mission of administering a sound monetary policy, should to the maximum extent consistent therewith, utilize such means as will assist in the economical and efficient management of the public debt; and that the System, where practicable, should bring about future needed monetary expansion by purchasing U.S. securities, of varying maturities."

We also are advised that this amendment constitutes (in the eyes of some of its backers) a "directive" to the Fed that when the money supply must be expanded the Fed is to achieve this by purchasing U.S. securities (actually Treasury notes and bonds) instead of by further lowering bank reserve requirements. This is strange because only recently Congress passed a measure to amend the authorization to the Federal Reserve Board to vary the reserve requirement percentages of member banks. And, in passing this piece of legislation, the ranges of variation set by Congress allow the Fed far more leeway to lower reserve requirements than to raise them. This produces a strange situation. Having just reaffirmed the Board's authority to vary member bank reserve requirements, in its discretion, no amendment to the Second Liberty Loan Act (to remove the interest ceiling on new Treasury bond issues) is to pass unless the Fed is put on notice—by a "sense of Congress" resolution—that it should not exercise its discretion with respect to varying member bank reserve requirements, downward.

Advocates of this position rationalize their stand by saying that the Metcalf amendment simply directs the Fed to consider each purchase (made in its open market operations) on its own merits. Isn't that what the Fed has been doing? It also is claimed that the Fed should not be inhibited from purchasing Treasury notes and bonds by any doctrinaire preconceptions. Yet, some in Congress are taking the point of view that the Fed should be instructed to prefer one of the instruments available to it (open market operations) over another instrument created for it (authority to vary reserve requirements) and it further be directed how to use the first of these instruments (open market operations). The Fed is not to use its discretion in these regards—at least, it is not to use its discretion as set forth in the Federal Reserve Act as it now stands. So, we have a situation wherein the Metcalf amendment is deemed to be innocuous by some and a directive by others. If the purpose of the bill which back this amendment really is to amend

the Federal Reserve Act—why is it that they don't so label the amendment and cause it to stand on its own feet, instead of trying to make it a part of a bill to amend the Second Liberty Loan Act?

Of course, the innards of this piece of Congressional debate amount to this: Some see in the need for more flexibility in Treasury debt management an opportunity to include a provision the ostensible purpose of which is to bring about lower interest rates. Actually, the chances are high that if such an amendment were to be approved by Congress, the ultimate result would be precisely the opposite. We would have an increasing number of sellers and fewer buyers for intermediate- and longer-term Government securities. The somewhat tragic aspect of the matter is that the prolonged, somewhat acrimonious debate over a relatively simple matter is taken by people in other countries as a sign of the unwillingness of Congress as a whole to take the steps that are necessary to maintain order in the Government's financial affairs and to preserve the future value of the dollar.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Commercial and Financial Chronicle, July 30, 1959]

AS WE SEE IT

"I have been forced to the conclusion that the Federal Reserve authorities have reached a point in their thinking where they consider themselves immune to any suggestion or direction by Congress, let alone a simple expression of the sense of Congress. It appears that the fault of the suggested committee bill (for authorizing higher rates of interest on long-term Government obligations but suggesting certain changes in Federal Reserve policy) was not that the language itself was wrong, but that the Congress dared even to speak to the Federal Reserve, a creature of Congress."—SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives.)

We shall not undertake to decide whether this remarkable utterance of one of the most influential leaders in Congress represents merely an exaggerated concern for the prerogatives of Congress, a play for political popularity with his party and, perhaps, with the voters in his part of the country, or a warped notion of the functions of a central banking system and its relation to government in general. What we are certain of is that it had been much better left unsaid. What is really disturbing about it is the fact that it so neatly expresses the views and feelings of sections of the public whose ideas of a central bank are both crude and inaccurate and who are an eternal threat to a sound monetary and credit system in this country. It can hardly fail to lend aid and comfort to such elements.

CONGRESSIONAL POWERS

Lest there be some misunderstanding, let it be conceded that Congress, with the cooperation of the President, can create any sort of banking and monetary system it deems best, the limits being only the Constitution of the United States. It can, if the President agrees—and even if the President does not agree, assuming sufficient majorities—abolish the Federal Reserve System, and set up some other agency which will be as obedient to the sense of Congress as desired. Such a new agency could be given a mandate to buy any and all varieties of Treasury obligations under conditions to be set by Congress. So much for the notion of an independent Federal Reserve System if and when Congress wills otherwise and has the courage to proceed with its madness.

But Congress has as yet done no such thing, and we most earnestly hope that we shall not live to see the day when it does. What it has done or purported to do is to create a Federal Reserve System and

place it under mandate to perform the normal functions—whatever they are under present conditions and present day thinking on such matters—of a central bank. It has provided for the selection of men of experience and judgment to manage that System. There is nothing in the law and nothing in the concept of a central banking system so conceived and so organized that would require or even suggest that the specialists chosen to operate the System go to Congress or any group in Congress for assistance or guidance in the performance of their highly technical duties. It is very difficult for us to believe that all this is not well known and understood by Mr. RAYBURN.

Of course, this is a real world in which we live, and it would be naive indeed to suppose that members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System do not—along with members of the Supreme Court—read the daily newspapers or are not aware of the general political trends of the times as reflected in Congress. They are naturally well aware of the power of Congress to alter their system and their powers at any time. They must almost perforce keep alert to these things and doubtless, as unfortunate as it is, the awareness of it all has its influence upon policy. There is, however, no need whatever for Mr. RAYBURN or anyone else to make their road rougher and more stony, and the country would be much the better off if no such behavior were indulged in by members of the national legislature.

SENSE AND NONSENSE

The "sense of Congress" in such matters is, in any event, very likely to be nonsense or worse, as it was in this case. The political powers that be and two World Wars have vastly complicated the tasks of central bankers the world over. Time was when the central banking theory was relatively simple and in certain quarters well understood and expertly practiced. World War I badly upset the apperception both as respects conditions in the various countries of the world and the thinking that had governed and guided central banking. The New Deal abolished the gold standard which was one of the key forces in the management of credit in days gone by. World War II increased the national debt to astronomical proportions and left it all too largely in short-term form and in the hands of banks especially the Federal Reserve banks.

Here was a situation trying enough in all conscience, but things had meanwhile happened to popular thought—and for that matter to technical thought—that have tended not only to continue these conditions but to threaten to make them permanent. So morbidly fearful were we of a horrible postwar depression, and so vivid were memories of the depression of the thirties, that all sorts of so-called built-in stabilizers (often called that in order to cloak their real nature) were created at enormous public expense. After certain early postwar adjustments of a technical nature, the national debt began to rise and is now higher than it has ever been. Thus the problems of the Treasury tend to reinforce the demands of those who would have the Federal Reserve eternally expand.

The reformers have thrown practically all the accumulated wisdom and experience in central banking overboard. The tasks of the central banker are infinitely more difficult today than in pre-World War I. No one has seriously attempted to formulate a well-rounded coherent central banking theory under conditions such as those that exist today, but despite all the changes and notwithstanding all the newness of conditions existing today, some elementary truths are more or less self-evident. One of them is that in times such as those now existing—

we should be tempted to say under any conditions—the central banking authorities are not warranted in substituting funds of their own creation for savings which are absent or insufficient for the demands of the day. How one can possibly doubt the essential truth of this simple rule, we are at a loss to understand.

Yet this is precisely what all too many, including some Members of Congress, would have the Federal Reserve authorities do. The fact that it has not been doing it of late is precisely the reason for the expression of the "sense of Congress" in the proposed legislation which is now in dispute. When the Federal Reserve authorities cease to be at least partly immune to such a "sense of Congress," we shall have come upon evil days. Let no one doubt that for a single moment.

Mr. Speaker, the writers of those articles may not be schooled in political expediency, but they are recognized authorities in the field of public finance. It is time—it is past time, for us to take heed of the advice of these financial authorities by acting on the administration's request for legislation. It is time for us to break the stalemate and end the uncertainty caused by the small group in the House who are the militant advocates of printing press money and who are dedicated to inflation and Government regimentation of our economic way of life. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit that the Democratic House leadership has a very grave responsibility to further the progress of this legislation in the House.

New Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to my remarks in the Record on July 7, 8, 9, and 20, I include the fourth in a series of articles prepared by Mr. Alvin F. Bull, managing editor of Wallaces' Farmer, concerning the farm problem. This article appeared in the August 1, 1959, issue of Wallaces' Farmer:

NEW MARKETS—THIS IS THE ANSWER WE'D ALL LIKE TO FIND FOR THE EXCESS AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION—HOW MUCH HELP CAN WE LOGICALLY EXPECT FROM NEW MARKETS

(By Al Bull)

The happiest solution to the problem of agricultural surplus would come in the form of new markets. This has become the golden hope of many folks concerned about the future of agriculture.

Economists estimate our production exceeds demand by 5 to 10 percent. So it's easy to hope—even believe—that markets can be stretched enough to close the gap.

Possibilities of bigger markets are usually pinned to one or more of four areas. These are: (1) more food use by low income groups; (2) more advertising and promotion; (3) more nonfood uses; (4) more exports.

Economists at a number of experiment stations, often working with the Center for Agricultural Adjustment, have looked in detail at each of these possibilities. Let's look

at the results of some of these thorough studies:

Low income groups: Government programs can increase the amount of food used by these people.

Subsidies to the 9 percent of our population with lowest incomes could increase food consumption by about 2 percent.

But subsidizing food purchases up to a point where half the population received Government help would not be enough to solve the surplus problem completely.

A nationwide subsidy to reduce food prices holds little promise. Estimates show that \$5 billion a year for this purpose would increase demand by only 2 percent.

Giving everyone in the Nation an adequate diet isn't the answer, either. With everyone on a moderate-cost diet providing adequate nutrition, food consumption could drop 5 percent. Most folks are eating at a luxury level rather than one to meet nutritional needs alone.

A food stamp plan is probably the most practical move in this area. It can help low-income families improve their diets and eat more food.

But in view of its limited adjustment effect, it could be viewed partly as a welfare plan as well as a minor agricultural adjustment measure.

Advertising and promotion: Food advertising is already getting its fair share of the Nation's advertising budget. It accounts for about the same percentage of total advertising that food items get of our total disposable income.

Advertising by commodity groups is more likely to shift consumers from one product to another than to increase total food use.

Advertising might help in shifting folks from products taking few agricultural resources to those requiring more production resources. From bread and breakfast cereals to eggs and bacon, or from spaghetti to beef-steak, for example.

Karl Fox, Iowa State University economist, uses this estimate of possible gain from advertising and promotion: \$100 million spent per year for 10 years might build up food demand by 1 percent.

Limited demand growth might come from improved quality, too. Lean cuts from meat-type hogs would likely sell more pork. Such gains come slowly.

In the case of milk and eggs, most of the gain from improved quality is probably already realized.

Nonfood uses: A major technical breakthrough of some sort is required before this field shows great promise.

Agricultural products could be used more widely in industry—at a price. For example corn can be turned into alcohol. But it is much cheaper to make it from gas, air, and water. Corn price would have to sell below 50 cents a bushel to become competitive.

There is limited possibility for new crops with industrial uses. Most of these are grown outside the Corn Belt.

While research aimed at new uses for farm products is going forward, research on synthetics develops even faster. In fact, efforts to find new industrial uses for farm products are hard pressed to maintain current levels of use.

Exports: This holds the most promise of the four areas for expanding demand. But significant results must come in the face of real obstacles.

Agricultural exports have been pushed artificially high by subsidized export programs. This is a source of friction with friendly nations which share the export market. Here's why:

If Iowa hog producers raised 20 percent more hogs, hog prices in the whole Nation would suffer. Much the same thing happens in the world market when our exports are increased.

Export demand might be bolstered somewhat by careful attention to quality. And by gearing production more closely to the desires of particular foreign countries. But at best these gains will be small.

Even giving away surplus food is extremely difficult.

Other exporters argue that this replaces part of the cash export market.

Rulers of nations with people accustomed to hunger prefer not to chance short term food assistance. The shift back to hunger from adequate diets can produce riots and overthrow governments.

This thought, however, leads into one possible way to increase exports. We could tie long term food commitments to a program of economic development for hungry nations. In this way, we stand to export more food and develop stronger allies in the cold war.

Such moves are so vital in international relations and national security that the agricultural adjustment aspect becomes a minor consideration.

None of the above possibilities hold an immediate answer to our farm problem. Even combining the practical programs from each of the four areas promises to use up only about half of our annual agricultural surplus.

This does not mean that we should in any way neglect our effort at demand expansion. But it does leave one point clear:

We must turn to supply control for an early solution to the farm problem.

Variety of Entertainment Marks Oregon's Centennial Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, residents of the State of Oregon are celebrating the occasion of our State's 100th birthday with the same verve and enthusiasm which their pioneer predecessors devoted to its development. The spirit of Oregon's centennial observance was well captured by travel writer Horace Sutton in an article in the August 2, 1959, issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald entitled "A Vast Blast in Century-Old Oregon." I ask unanimous consent that this account be printed in the Appendix of the Record. I hope that Mr. Sutton's sprightly comments will stimulate Members of Congress and citizens of other States to travel to Oregon this year and join us in this gigantic birthday party.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A VAST BLAST IN CENTURY-OLD OREGON (By Horace Sutton)

PORTLAND, OREG.—They're celebrating the first 100 years of statehood with a 100-day wing ding up here in lumberland. The hangover ought to last for 3 weeks.

This is probably the biggest place anybody ever threw a party in. They're using the whole State. Up in Banks, Oreg., the celebration includes an international muzzle-loading turkey shoot and buffalo barbecue, whereas over in Fossil the citizenry is staging an international parimutuel porcupine race.

Both a 70-year-old lady and a pack of covered wagons left Independence, Mo., last April following the Oregon Trail used by the original settlers to get to the homeland. So far the lady is ahead of the wagons.

The whole town of Redmond has put up a false 1849 front and every Saturday everybody in the place dresses up in early Oregon. The effect ain't exactly new Dior.

So many Oregonians have grown centennial beards and mustaches that there has been a run on mustache wax. Some Portland stores hang out big signs when new stocks of handlebar paste come in.

Naturally, the biggest do is being done in Portland City where the burghers are staging a giant 100-day fair. On view are live Indians, live Bulgarians and a real live living room with purple carpet on the ceiling. Also performing seals, performing cowboys and the Takarazuka Ballet from Japan.

The Chicago World's Fair had Sally Rand, New York had Gypsy Rose Lee, but Portland's got a talking transparent lady. What she shows would make Sally blush. And besides, her gall bladder lights up. The lady talks, turns and comes from Cologne, Germany. She cost \$12,000, plastic transparent ladies coming a bit higher than those you can't see through.

Spread over a 65-acre layout on the edge of the Columbia River just outside Portland, the Centennial Exposition will run through September 17. Lumber being the biggest payroll in the State it is no wonder that the centerpiece of the fair is the Forest Products Pavilion. The building is seven hyperbolic paraboloids tacked together and looks like the entrance of next year's Miami Beach Hotel.

In front is a way-out kiddie's wooden playground the likes of which no square kiddie ever saw before. Inside is a free wood sculpture called the Monarch that is pretty fair out, too. Nearby, Chief Lelooska, a 300-pound Indian, is spending the summer carving a gigantic totem pole for the State. They make everything out of wood here except nickels.

The Hall of Religious History is encased in a hall of cornea-rupturing design known as a decahedron. Although it resembles a surrealist tepee, it is really a shaft of wheat in the minds of many, and has become a symbol of the exposition.

Every hour on the hour a shoot-out erupts in the frontier town, with badmen robbing trains, cowboys falling off buildings, marshals shooting hustlers and villains ending up in jail. In its more peaceful intervals the can-can girls wiggle over at the Golden Nugget. A saloon called the Pink Garter sells pink lemonade, and the Flap Jack House flips sour dough pancakes.

Umatilla Indians have set up an encampment of a score or more tepees. Bear hides stretch in the front, clotheslines are stretched in the rear and any time you can see the Indians parading around in their old tribal jeans. The Umatillas dance twice a day and there is as well a Hall of Fame of such famous Indians as Fish Hawk, Willie Wokatsle, and Poker Jim.

Many of the exhibits are on view inside an 11-acre building—the second largest barn in the country after the Pentagon. Tucked away in this preserve, which is approximately the size of Rhode Island, is a pint-sized Brussels Fair, with exhibits on hand from 23 foreign nations.

Much to the surprise of the centennial planners, they include displays from such new nations as Ghana and Morocco and from such unexpected entrants as Yugoslavia and Bulgaria. The Bulgars are showing everything from wine to soccer balls all laid out around a fountain that spritzes rose water, no less.

In case anyone is curious what the future has in store for Oregon during the next 100 years, there is a house of ideas on hand.

Pressing for Flying Saucer Inquiry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include today the first of three articles by the well known and highly respected commentator, Mr. George Todt of the North Hollywood (Calif.) Valley Times.

Mr. Todt's subject, "Flying Saucers," is one that has held public attention for several years. It has drawn the interest of many of our colleagues also. It has become a very controversial subject and reaction to it runs the emotional gauntlet through humor, fear, and a healthy desire for more information and knowledge. We are indebted to Mr. Todt for his penetrating analysis of this matter:

PRESSING FOR FLYING SAUCER INQUIRY

The drive for open hearings in Congress relative to the flying saucer mystery seems to be gathering momentum these days.

According to the June issue of the U.F.O. Investigator, publication of the National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena (NICAP, 1533 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.; Maj. Donald E. Keyhoe, director), many highly regarded solons on Capitol Hill have expressed serious desires to get to the bottom of the controversial matter.

"There is little doubt," said Senator STUART SYMINGTON, former Secretary of the Air Force, to a NICAP affiliate in New York City recently, "that the American public has sound reason for being confused about the existence and nature of these phenomena. I am certain it would be in the interest of public understanding if a current and objective evaluation of this situation were issued."

"The public should be given all information which would not adversely affect our national security. There are undoubtedly some objects observed directly and on radar-scope which are not subject to positive analysis."

Prior to this, Senator SYMINGTON had urged the Senate Space Committee, according to the U.F.O. Investigator, to make a careful study of the UFO subject. A decision on hearings is still pending.

The interesting publication also listed statements of other prominent Members of Congress made to NICAP board members, advisers, affiliates, or individual members. Here are a few samples:

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, himself a jet brigadier general in the Air Force Reserve: "Flying saucers, unidentified flying objects or whatever you call them—are real. . . . The Air Force has a project to investigate these reports, but when you ask about them they clam up."

Senator LEVERETT B. SALTONSTALL, Massachusetts: "As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, this is a problem in which I am deeply interested. . . . We must consider the genuine security necessities, as I am sure you appreciate, but I think there are many cases in which more information should be made available to the public."

Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, Florida: "The subject of flying saucers is one in which we all share a great interest."

Representative THOMAS L. ASHLEY, Ohio: "I share your concern over the secrecy that continues to shroud our intelligence activities on this subject, and I am in complete agreement with you that our greatest national need at this time is the dissemination of accurate information upon which responsible public opinion can be formulated."

Representative WILLIAM H. AYRES, Ohio: "Congressional investigations have been held and are still being held on the problems of unidentified flying objects. . . . Since most of the material presented to the committee is classified, the hearings are never printed. When conclusions are reached, they will be released, if possible." (NICAP note: This confirms our claims of official secrecy. Our goal is the holding of open congressional hearings.)

Representative DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida: "There are many areas where unrealistic policy keeps vital information from the American people. Certainly, accurate information concerning so-called unidentified flying objects, within the proper bounds of national security, should be made available immediately to the American public."

Representative FRED MARSHALL, Minnesota: "There has been growing interest in the release of military information on unidentified flying objects. . . . The subject has been discussed with appropriate committees of the Congress."

Representative WALTER H. MOELLER, Ohio: "I cannot help but feel that there may be some justification behind some of the UFO reports. . . . I have every confidence that the American people would be able to take such information without hysteria. The fear of the unknown is always greater than fear of the known."

Representative RALPH J. SCOTT, North Carolina: "I quite agree with you that the general public should be allowed information thus far known about flying objects. . . . If this information could be presented to the American public in such a way as to appeal to reason, and not to emotion, I think it would be a good thing."

One Congressman who may allow his name to be used later, stated as follows according to the U.F.O. Observer:

"The public is not getting the straight story. We (Members of Congress) are told one thing in closed-door sessions. Then the public is told something entirely different."

What is the real story behind the flying saucers, anyway?

Statement by Dr. Spencer Smith, Jr., Before the Senate Subcommittee on Flood Control and Rivers and Harbors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, one of the most able leaders of the conservationists in the United States is a professor at the University of Maryland, Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr. He is secretary of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources. Recently, he testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Flood Control and Rivers and Harbors. His testimony was so able that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY DR. SPENCER M. SMITH, JR., SECRETARY OF THE CITIZENS COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL, RIVERS AND HARBORS OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, JULY 23, 1959

Mr. Chairman, I feel privileged to appear before you on behalf of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, an organization devoted to conservation in the public interest and composed of some of the most outstanding conservationists in the country. We appreciate the opportunity of placing our views before you and members of this committee.

We should like to indicate how we feel the present Federal antipollution law would be changed by the enactment of S. 805 and H.R. 3610. Under the present measure, the Federal Government will pay 30 percent, or \$250,000, whichever is the lesser, to the individual States for the construction of sewage treatment plants. The proposed measure would increase the amount of Federal payments to \$500,000 and would allow communities to build joint projects. The effect of the latter would double the amount normally authorized per project, allocating it to each community as if there were two separate projects.

In addition to this, the present proposal would reallocate the funds which States have not used or requested. Such funds would be reallocated by the Surgeon General to other States, thus providing increased funds to those States which have a greater need for funds than their original allotments. The present legislation authorizes \$50 million per year, or a total amount of \$500 million for 10 years. The proposed legislation would double this amount, providing for \$100 million a year for 10 years, or a total of \$1 billion.

It would be foolish for us to reiterate the expert testimony showing the great need for this legislation. The logic of the situation, however, should offer sufficient testimony to the effect that a nation such as ours cannot expand its population, its industry, its general growth in almost every dimension without effecting a very great demand for water, and without polluting water as a result of such extended uses. Hydrologists and other water authorities estimate that imperfectly treated sewage has been placed in streams and rivers from cities alone in the equivalent of 15 million persons. Prior to the present Federal Water Pollution Control Act, every indication pointed to the fact that pollution was increasing at an increasing rate. The remedial efforts under present law have kept us about even during the last few years. Unfortunately, it has not been large enough to make any significant inroad on the backlog of facilities that are needed, and our present efforts will start to fall behind the new onslaughts.

Public health officials reported by a majority of 82 percent in favor of the current Federal sewage treatment plant construction but indicated that the current and sustaining need was of greater proportions. In addition to this, the President's own Water Pollution Advisory Board has approved doubling limitations on individual grants as well as the reallocation of unused funds. Further, Gen. J. S. Bragdon, the President's own adviser for public works, has stated:

"Most important of all, our rivers will have to be clean and adequate treatment facilities installed to prevent upstream pollution. To accomplish this job, we need almost 8,000 municipal plants, and in all, some 17,000 facilities, public and private, to insure that all of the potential sources of pollution are adequately controlled."

We are saddened by the fact that the administration has not seen fit to heed its own expert testimony. Even if such expert testimony were not available to the committee, the many personal contacts with groups interested in water use and water supply, recreational, industrial, municipal, agricultural—all highly interested in the preservation and utilization of water—give resounding support to an enhanced program to clean up rivers and streams.

Not within our experience of resource questions has a program come to our attention that is as universally and unanimously acclaimed among our own people as is the measure before you. It might well be said that if the program has such overwhelming approval by these groups, why has its original enactment been so difficult, and, also, why has there been such difficulty in obtaining appropriations for carrying out the most minimal program in terms of the needs?

When the matter of pollution control was before this committee in the last Congress, only two supporters of the administration came forward to oppose this legislation. They were the National Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers.

The critics of the present measure state that some cities would build plants if it had not been for Federal funds being made available to them. Hence, they claim Federal funds have, in reality, caused a slowdown in the actual building of sewage treatment plants.

Their second argument is that this problem should not come to the attention of the Federal Government, but should be a matter for the individual States and localities. The arguments supporting States rights in general is adaptable here, i.e., there is too much centralization in Washington—we must keep most of the Government close to the grassroots, etc. While these are the arguments offered in opposition to the Federal grants-in-aid to the States, it should be remembered that many of these large business organizations are heir to large tax bills. Unless it can be pointed out to them that expenditures of tax funds are going to be beneficial to them directly, they quite often oppose any such expenditure on general principles. In fact, it might be said that some have a fetish for economy which quite often overshadows any public welfare that may result from such a venture.

It is also suggested that too much financing and too much vigor on the part of the Federal Government in cleaning up streams and rivers may prove of considerable embarrassment to some of the industrial users who are doing a good bit of the polluting. Since time immemorial large industrial interests, especially those in business in many States, have always felt that they could rebut arguments to effect their control or repel local laws attempting to control them when their own activities were interstate, and this has been one of the strongest motives for large corporate enterprise in championing State rights.

The merits of the argument against the proposed changes seem hardly compelling. The Federal funds have increased the supply of sewage treatment facilities available to the public. If, as the opponents contend, the making of this money available has caused a reduction in the expenditure for these facilities, the record does not bear them out. When this committee was considering H.R. 11714 in the last Congress, a measure much like the one the committee now has before it, I placed in the record with my testimony a comment on pollution control which appeared in the Engineering News Record of August 8, 1957. It posed the question, "Had grants in aid stimulated construction?" They responded, "The States say 'Yes,' the municipalities say 'Yes,' the figures say 'Yes.'"

More recently, the contract awards of 1957 rose to \$351 million and at present are in the vicinity of about \$390 million in 1958. The 1952-56 average was about \$222 million. Additionally, at least 35 States experienced their highest treatment plant construction levels in 1957-58. It would seem that the argument that this caused a reduction in local and State moneys for construction is significantly rebutted, for the result has been quite to the contrary. Some have argued that the States would have done this anyway, and perhaps by a greater amount, but the argument is even more compelling against such logic, since they had never done so before, and it would be a little difficult to try to determine how they had planned to do it in the future.

When people contend that it is the problem of the States and municipalities alone, one has to ask the question, "How have they been doing?"—"Why haven't they solved it?" and "What assurance do we have that they will solve it in the future?" If they do not solve it in the future, are we in a position to say that this is simply their misfortune, or is the national interest in national health involved?

There are many good reasons why the States and municipalities have been doing poorly. First of all, the overwhelming economic differences between States creates a situation where pollution may be the worst in the very State that has the least economic base to support remedial measures. The contrary may also be true. The States that have the most effective economic and tax base may have minimal problems of this type. It is not enough to say, as some have, that all that is needed is a strong will, and that if people are interested in doing something about it, they will do something about it.

Unfortunately, if they do not do something about it, for whatever reason, the effect upon the public welfare is certainly adverse.

Most States are eager to effect some sort of remedial program that can effectively curb the pollution in their streams and rivers. It must be remembered that the States and municipalities have limited financial liability, hence, the competing aspects of other moneys further complicates their problem of floating loans for sewage treatment plant construction. Anyone who had been on a door to door canvass to raise money or get subscriptions for school bonds is aware of the difficulty that municipalities have, as well as the States, in obtaining sufficient bond subscriptions for any municipal capital structure.

Further, the geographic nature of the problem is one which belies the statement that this is a local or sectional problem. Many rivers and streams run through many different States, and the failure in any one of them to take action to build the necessary sewage treatment plants can very well vitiate the efforts of the others. Thus, economically, financially, geographically, there appears to be no basis whatsoever for the contention that this most pressing problem is not national in scope and should be left to the inabilities of the States. The States and municipalities have proven again and again that they cannot handle the problem, or the problem would not be in its present egregious State and would not be called to the attention of this committee. No one is able to give us any assurance that it would be handled in the future.

Certainly special or parochial cases do not argue convincingly against the measure. There is no question that some people may be able to point to successes in some States without Federal aid. The fact that some States and some municipalities can show a good record in sewage treatment construction does not mean that every other State or area is capable of it.

We are somewhat shocked to hear of the administration's attitude in this matter. We have been told in almost every state of the Union speech since the President's inauguration of the necessity of partnership between the State, local and Federal Governments, as well as between the Government and private enterprise. Certainly, the present measure meets the criteria of the President's proposal.

Thus, the program appeared to have the blessing of the administration, more particularly of the President, because of its partnership features. To learn at this late date that the Federal Government is now abandoning its efforts and retreating to a position so totally inept, is to abrogate its responsibilities in the greatest measure.

One does not have to be clairvoyant to see the possible attitudes and practices that will occur if H.R. 3610 is defeated. The catastrophic condition of our rivers and our streams, of our water supplies, of the needs of industry and others, will be brought to the Nation's attention and a crash program will be effected. Everyone knows the hazards of a crash program. One hundred dollars is spent as one dollar under such conditions. The amount that could have been expended, if properly timed, prudently planned, and expeditiously undertaken, will be far less than that expended in the sure-to-arrive emergency. H.R. 3610 represents a conservative and sober look at the problem. It provides basic remedial measures for the present circumstance. We think that anything less than H.R. 3610 will be a major setback to the entire water supply problem of the United States.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include copies of my newsletter which was released today:

K-E-E-N-O-T-E-S

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

The House has approved an appropriation bill of \$3.1 billion for the mutual security program. The amount voted by the House represented a reduction of about \$700 million below the amount requested by the President.

The President expressed disappointment over the size of the House reduction. He has even threatened to call a special session this fall if Congress refuses to vote as much money for foreign aid as he deems necessary.

There is growing dissatisfaction with the foreign aid program in Congress. Shortly before the House voted on the appropriation, reports were made to Congress which indicated that part of the foreign aid money is being spent in a slipshod, wasteful manner.

As usual, the people in charge of the program tried to scare Congress with assertions that any reduction in the amount of money voted would bring about an extension of communism. This is an old story but it failed to impress Congress this year.

Many supporters of the program believe the reductions will serve notice on the administration that wasteful practices must end. These Members believe that if less money is available, the administrators will

have to be more careful in handling the program.

I supported reductions in the program. The \$700 million which the House cut from the appropriation will go a long way in bringing the budget into balance.

COAL RESEARCH BILL PASSES

The Senate has passed a coal research bill similar to legislation passed earlier by the House. This is good news for coal areas such as West Virginia.

If the President signs the bill, we can begin a program to find new and expanded markets for coal, one of our most important basic resources. The country will be seriously affected if this great industry, employing hundreds of thousands of people, is allowed to get in serious trouble.

The industry itself is aware of the need for more research. It is spending a large sum each year in developing new uses for coal and in improving production and distribution methods. But more research is urgently needed and the coal research bill offers a sensible plan, supported by the entire industry, for achieving the type of program that will bring about beneficial results.

GAS TAX INCREASE DEFEATED

The House Ways and Means Committee has turned down efforts to increase the Federal gasoline tax by 1½ cents a gallon. Instead, the committee proposes to finance the interstate highway program by issuing \$1 billion in bonds, to be retired by earmarking a part of the taxes now paid by automobile users. This makes good sense. An increase in the Federal gasoline tax would have been a serious mistake. It is significant that more than 30 Governors opposed the increase. The committee offers a sensible plan for keeping the highway building program going.

Home Rule for the District of Columbia

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, several months ago this House passed the necessary legislation which later resulted in Hawaii becoming a State of this great Union. I voted in favor of statehood for Hawaii and I can honestly say that it was one of the most exciting and rewarding days of my life to have participated in this great body on a matter which resulted in the extension of our system of statehood to a former Territory. It was a pleasure and gratification which does not come to many persons—for that I am grateful.

However, when I look at the plight of the disenfranchised Americans who live in the District of Columbia; when I see the lack of interest in District matters on the part of some of my colleagues; when I see this great body, rightfully concern itself with affairs of the United States and of the world, having to also concern itself with the local problems of the District of Columbia, then my pleasure and gratitude on the accomplishment of statehood for Hawaii becomes somewhat diminished.

This is the Congress of the United States not the common council of the District of Columbia. It is fitting and

proper that we should concern ourselves with national and international problems and understandable that there might be a lack of interest on the part of some of us in problems of the District of Columbia. These problems would best be handled by a local District of Columbia governing body elected by and directly responsible to the inhabitants of the District of Columbia.

I can see no sound reason for failing to restore self-government to the inhabitants of the District. I can see no good reason to continue to deny to the Americans living in the District the rights and privileges of American citizens in the States. Let us put an end to this inferior status for the District of Columbia inhabitants.

My own State of Connecticut recognized the inequities which exist in the District of Columbia and our general assembly on May 28, 1959, adopted a joint resolution memorializing Congress to sign a discharge petition to bring a bill granting home rule to the floor of the House of Representatives in the event such bill be bottled up in the several committees of the House.

I urge the signing of this discharge petition now on the Speaker's desk and I urge the adoption of legislation designed to return to the citizens of the District of Columbia the right to conduct their own affairs and their own local government.

Resolutions Adopted by the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD certain resolutions adopted by the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners, 39th annual conference, Portland, Oreg., July 1, 1959:

RESOLUTION 4, U.S. FOREST SERVICE OPERATION OUTDOORS, PART II

Whereas the U.S. Forest Service Operation Outdoor program as submitted to Congress set up certain necessary annual appropriations; and

Whereas the first appropriation for the fiscal year 1957 was reduced substantially from the amount considered necessary under the proposed program with the assumption that the first year operations would not permit full program activities; and

Whereas the Bureau of the Budget for fiscal years 1959 and 1960 has not recommended to Congress, and Congress has not appropriated, funds equal to the 1957 appropriation; and

Whereas there is an unprecedented increase in the use of the national forests for recreation, thereby aiding the economy of the Nation, resulting in a great national need for appropriations under the Operation Outdoors program in excess of those

originally contemplated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners, That the Bureau of the Budget recommend to Congress increased appropriations for the fiscal year 1961 at least equivalent to those originally contemplated; be it further

Resolved, That the U.S. Forest Service request and the Bureau of the Budget approve substantial funds to initiate part II, the wildlife phase of Operation Outdoors.

RESOLUTION 5, PROTESTING THE BOTTLENECK OF LAND WITHDRAWAL UNDER THE COORDINATION ACT

Whereas the need exists to speed up the processing of land withdrawals for fish and wildlife conservation purposes; and

Whereas there is a definite obligation on the part of certain State and Federal agencies to meet the public's growing need for recreation; and

Whereas such needed withdrawals of public domain lands will not exclude grazing, but emphasize the multiple use concept; and

Whereas since there is a backlog of withdrawal applications that has piled up during the past 5 years: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners does hereby strongly urge the Department of the Interior to see that the Bureau of Land Management is given the needed adjuncts necessary to speed up the processing of all applications for withdrawals of public domain lands submitted under the Coordination Act or in accordance with the desires of the individual States concerned.

RESOLUTION 7, WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

Whereas Public Law 660 of the 84th Congress included the sewage treatment construction grants program authorized thereby, has resulted in substantial progress in the abatement of stream pollution in the United States; and

Whereas studies carried out by State and Federal agencies indicate that a doubling of the construction grants program would result in the virtual elimination of sewage pollution in this Nation within a decade: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, The Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners endorses the funds included by the Senate Committee on Appropriations for the fiscal year 1959-60 to facilitate this program and in addition H.R. 3610 as passed by the House of Representatives on June 9, 1949, urges the Senate and House to act favorably upon this legislation and requests the President to sign it into law; be it further

Resolved, This association commends the Honorable Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, upon his efficient administration of Public Law 660 and especially upon his vigorous enforcement of the provisions of the law relating to the abatement of interstate water pollution.

RESOLUTION NO. 8, FEDERAL RESERVOIR LANDS

Whereas construction agencies, including the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, are contemplating the construction of several dams on the Columbia River watershed; and

Whereas it is necessary for them to negotiate with landowners or land agencies to secure the right to flood necessary land; and

Whereas as a result of the activities of the construction agencies adjacent lands will increase in value because of the increasing demand for access to recreational areas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners, That all construction agencies be required to acquire necessary land for authorized im-

poundments in fee simple title rather than simply a flowage easement; and be it further

Resolved, That such lands adjacent to these impoundments be assigned to conservation agencies to be managed in the best interests of the public generally and fish and wildlife in particular; and, be it further

Resolved, That setting aside of tracts for summer homesites be considered of secondary importance to access and utilization in the public interest; and be it further

Resolved, That in addition where the flowage easements are insufficient to provide adequate lands for recreational use, that the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners hereby endorses H.R. 6198 which will make provision for the allocation of certain project costs for land acquisition and fish and wildlife improvements.

RESOLUTION 10, PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT AND ACCESS PROBLEMS

Whereas the public domain of the United States, including some 470 million acres in the Western States and Alaska, encompass and produce natural resources of vast economic and social value to all Americans; and

Whereas overgrazing, range trespass, soil erosion, inadequate fire protection, and other land abuses are known to persist on the public domain in many areas, to the detriment of the local economy and the public welfare; and

Whereas access for hunting, fishing, and other legitimate uses is denied the public in many places by the owners or operators of adjacent private lands, and preliminary estimates indicate as much as 14 million acres of Federal lands are so closed to the public in the Western States; and

Whereas the Bureau of Land Management is underfinanced and understaffed for its highly important task of managing and protecting the public land resources under its jurisdiction, and the Taylor Grazing Act and other laws under which the Bureau operates are believed to be outdated and deficient in other respects: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners commends and endorses the proposal by Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, that the Department of Interior prepare a comprehensive and long-range program for the conservation, rehabilitation, and development of the lands under the Bureau of Land Management, and further endorses the proposal of Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER calling for a Senate committee staff study of problems of public access to the public lands; be it further

Resolved, That this association recommends that appropriate committees of Congress initiate studies leading to the revision and strengthening of the Taylor Grazing Act and other laws relating to the conservation and multiple-use management of the public domain lands.

RESOLUTION 12, AMENDMENT TO FEDERAL POWER ACT

Whereas the Federal Power Act fails to provide adequately for the conservation of fish and wildlife and related resources in the licensing of hydroelectric dams, as evidenced by the licensing of dams on the Cowlitz River in Washington and the Deschutes River in Oregon, against the considered judgment and over the protests of Federal and State conservation agencies, and as further evidenced by the recommendation of the Federal Power Commission that a high dam be built at the Nez Perce site on the Snake River: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners endorses the principles of S. 1420 as introduced in the 86th Congress by Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER and urges the Congress to enact such legislation.

RESOLUTION 13, ELIMINATION OF ACP SUBSIDIES FOR MARSH DRAINAGE

Be it resolved, That the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners reaffirms its opposition to Federal subsidies which encourage the drainage and destruction of valuable and irreplaceable waterfowl habitat and requests the Congress to enact corrective legislation incorporating the principles of the Reuss-McGovern bill, H.R. 3909, as introduced in the 86th Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That pending the passage of such corrective legislation, this association urges the Secretary of Agriculture to revise the regulations and guidelines governing the administration of the Agricultural Conservation Program Service in such a way as to be effective in discouraging the drainage of potholes and marshes that are valuable for waterfowl production.

RESOLUTION 15, PESTICIDES RESEARCH

Whereas the use of chemical insecticides, herbicides and fungicides continues to grow in volume on public and private lands of the United States; and

Whereas a complex multiplicity of new chemical pesticides are appearing on the market and their use by public agencies and private individuals is promoted and often initiated without adequate knowledge of the immediate and long-range effects upon forms of life other than the target organisms: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners endorses and urges enactment by the Congress of H.R. 5813, by Congressman LEE METCALF, or S. 1575, by Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, proposing to amend the Pesticides Research Act of 1958 by increasing the authorization for appropriations to \$2,565,000 annually.

RESOLUTION 16, EXTENSION OF THE CONSERVATION RESERVE

Whereas the problem of burdensome agricultural surpluses continues to grow; and

Whereas the acreage of land devoted to production of surplus crops is greater than presently needed; and

Whereas the State game department programs are presently receiving benefits to wildlife from croplands being retired from cultivation under the Soil Bank Act: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners urges the Congress of the United States to pass legislation extending the Soil Bank Act program beyond 1969 and appropriate adequate funds for increasing the acreage eligible for being placed under conservation reserve contracts.

RESOLUTION 17, WILDLIFE DISEASE LABORATORY

Be it resolved, That the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners endorses the legislation proposing to establish a National Wildlife Disease Laboratory as introduced by Senator GORDON ALLOTT (S. 2086), by Congressman WAYNE N. ASPINALL (H.R. 7455), and others, and requests the Congress to act promptly and favorably upon this proposal.

RESOLUTION 18, SURPLUS FEDERAL PROPERTY FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT

Be it resolved, That the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners endorses the legislation proposing to authorize the donation of suitable personal property declared surplus by the Federal Government to the States for fish and wildlife management purposes, and urges the prompt enactment by the Congress of H.R. 7190 as introduced by Congressman LESTER R. JOHNSON, or S. 2103 by Senator ALAN BIBLE, or a similar bill to achieve this purpose.

RESOLUTION 21, ENDORSING CREATION OF ARCTIC WILDLIFE RANGE

Whereas there has been introduced in the Congress of the United States a bill calling for the creation of an Arctic Wildlife Range: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners approves Bonner's bill No. H.R. 7045, and requests its immediate passage; be it further

Resolved, That the Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER, Congressman from North Carolina, and Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton be forwarded a copy of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That the State of Alaska retain administration and regulatory control over resident game species.

the result of that was inflation. To counteract inflation we have these repeated proposals, like the present one, for some form of price-wage control even though experience suggests it is impossible to control inflation merely by trying to control some of its symptoms.

A spectacular current example of Government guidance is the farm program. No segment of the economy has been more wrapped up with Washington, and nowhere has the defiance of all reason been more bizarre.

Other countries' experience is also instructive. Britain in the postwar Socialist era suffocated under official rules, regulations, and bureaucracy; recovery began when the Socialists left power. West Germany's miraculous recovery started when the people were permitted to junk their inflated currency and wartime and occupation economic controls. Russia's economy, one of the most guided (regimented), is also the most unbalanced among industrial nations.

Surely not all of this can be coincidental. Why does government, time after time and place after place, prove such a poor guide?

When people work without this guidance they certainly can make mistakes, but the mistakes affect themselves and relatively few others. Set up a Ministry of the Economy, however, with a Bureau of Steel, a Department of Automobiles, a National Refrigerator Agency, and so on and on, and the mistakes will be colossal, for they will affect all those in an industry and all those in any way related.

Moreover, the mistakes will be inevitable. Government officials cannot run an economy well. It's not so much that they often lack experience as that they must interfere with and disrupt the marketplace; to do so is their excuse for existence. They substitute their judgment for the collective judgment of millions of individuals, and it just is no substitute.

Many of the bureaucrats' judgments will not even be economic at all but political because they are political creatures subject to political pressures. For that and other reasons, a Government-guided economy is bound to be an inflationary economy. Inflation's appeal to politicians is notorious, and quite understandable since they can almost never raise enough taxes to do all the public investment and what not they want.

Economists who clamor for Government guidance are echoing Lord Keynes' misplaced faith in officialdom; they naively assume that bureaucrats, once an economy is delivered into their hands, immediately become saints and repositories of total wisdom.

And this is also something worse than naïveté. It is not only saying they know better than Jefferson, although that is saying a good deal. It is saying they know so much they can reject the guidance of history itself.

No Room at the Inn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the July 29 Washington Post, entitled "No Room at the Inn":

No Room at the Inn

Morality, Jesus taught, is kindness to the weak. Yet in the name of morality, the well-fed and comfortable men who have been empowered to direct the affairs of the Alexandria Housing Authority have decided to throw out into the streets a child of 14 because she has become pregnant out of wedlock—because, as they no doubt like to put it, she has sinned. The irresponsible behavior of the girl's distraught father has no real bearing on the case and cannot be a valid excuse. We wonder whose sin will seem the greater in the eye of Heaven—the little girl in whose body a new life has been conceived because she was ignorant or impetuous or imprudent, or the moralists of Alexandria in whose morality there is no room left for charity or compassion.

The Moment of Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of August 3, 1959:

FROM POLAND'S HEART

Americans must be deeply moved by the incredible reception the people of Warsaw gave Vice President Nixon yesterday. In the heart of Communist-ruled Eastern Europe, in a nation with Soviet troops on its soil and with Soviet troops on its eastern and western borders, hundreds of thousands of people turned out spontaneously to cheer and throw flowers to the Vice President of the United States.

This happened in a city which but a few weeks ago gave only a tepid welcome to Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev for whose reception the Polish Government had mobilized all its resources. Once again truth has shown itself to be stranger than fiction.

No one planned it that way, but yesterday's outpouring of friendship from Poland's heart toward our country symbolized by Mr. Nixon was the most effective answer possible to Premier Khrushchev's gibes at our celebration of Captive Nations Week.

The Polish Government is a member of Moscow's Warsaw Pact. Wladyslaw Gombulka and his fellow leaders have time and again associated themselves with Khrushchev's denunciation of American "imperialism," and his threats against the West's position in Berlin. For almost a decade and a half the Polish people have been indoctrinated with Communist propaganda from almost every possible organ of education and communication. But yesterday the people of Warsaw gave Mr. Nixon what may well have been the warmest welcome an American leader has received in a foreign nation for a decade or longer. The political implications are unmistakable and will be understood by peoples and leaders wherever the facts are known.

At the end of World War II we did not use our power to compel Stalin to live up to his promises of a democratic Poland, but instead permitted him to enslave its people and destroy all public opposition. And almost 3 years ago, in October 1956, we contributed nothing but verbal encouragement to the Polish people as they defied Khrushchev's threats and set a new course, of which Gombulka was then the symbol. Nor have we done anything of crucial importance these

Certain Economists Cry for Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the July 29 Wall Street Journal.

This editorial calls attention to the panaceas proposed by several economists—panaceas for a problem which perhaps does not even exist.

The able analysis of their fallacious reasoning is worthy of keen study by all who are interested in our battle against Federal encroachment on individual rights. Such proposals are not in the spirit of America, and in my judgment are textbookish and devoid of the sense of freedom to compete and succeed—or fail:

"We reject the notion that that government governs best which governs least."

A forthright statement, at any rate. The repudiators of Jefferson are seven prominent economists, including J. K. Galbraith and Gerhard Colm, who came out with a report the other day on what should be done to fix up this rickety old country.

For, as the group sees it, the United States today "is a rudderless ship drifting on what is at the moment a rising tide of economic activity. Without a firm policy we will descend again into the trough of economic stagnation and retrogression. . . . The Federal Government is our only instrument for guiding the economic destiny of the country."

The panel offers specifics as well. Among others, proposed price and wage increases would be subject to compulsory Federal fact finding; the Government could say "No" and make it stick. Expansion of investment in the public sector; that is, lots more Federal spending. Studies designed to get away from tight money and high interest rate policies. And other Government action to try to make the economy grow 4 to 5 percent every year.

This is a program for Government guidance all right—and with a vengeance. So it is perhaps pertinent to ask just how good a guide any government is.

In this country we have by now had considerable experience with it. We had the benefit of Washington's guidance (and spending) throughout the thirties, only it didn't guide us out of the depression. We have had guidance in the form of vast public investment and cheap money, and

past 3 years, in which the concessions of the Polish October has been steadily whittled away or abolished. Yet, as Warsaw proved yesterday, the Polish people still see in us the beacon of their hopes for a better tomorrow.

The cynical may argue that nothing really important was changed yesterday. Poland's unenviable geographic position between occupied East Germany and the Soviet Union was not altered by an inch. The harsh realities of the nuclear age which make any talk of liberation by force of arms unthinkable are as terrible this morning as they were yesterday before Mr. Nixon arrived in Warsaw.

But the cynics are wrong; something of great importance was changed yesterday. By their welcome the people of Warsaw destroyed the propaganda campaign which has sought so hard to prove that Communist totalitarianism has won over the people of Eastern Europe so there can be no more talk of captive nations. In 1 hour of truth, as the Nixon caravan rode from the airport to the city, the friends of freedom and democracy gained new courage and new heart, which cannot help but affect profoundly the world political scene.

Enter, Czar Nikita

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, one cannot pick up a newspaper today or listen to a newscast without references to a visit to the United States by Nikita Khrushchev. I, personally, tend to the view that he should not be invited unless and until he has definitely demonstrated that he is willing to forsake his previous arrogant attitude and uses his influence to obtain the release of U.S. airmen and other Americans forcibly held by the Soviet Union or its satellites. I do not believe that we should dignify any visit contemplated by him.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial which appears in the August 10, 1959, issue of U.S. News & World Report, which is very apropos:

ENTER, CZAR NIKITA
(By David Lawrence)

Officially the Government of the United States cannot decline to permit any member of a foreign government to come to this country for a visit as a tourist. Nor can the Government in Washington deny our own citizens the right to say what they please to any visitor, whoever he may be. Freedom of speech is the rule in America.

If, therefore, as is being widely discussed, the Soviet Premier comes to the United States, our officials will have to be courteous. But this does not require cheers of applause from the resentful among us who see in Nikita Khrushchev the man who has ordered the murder or exile of tens of thousands of men and women in Hungary, East Germany, and the other captive nations, as well as inside the Soviet Union itself.

A convict who returns to society rehabilitated in mind may or may not be received in his community as an equal. But Nikita Khrushchev would be coming to America unrepentant, arrogant, dictatorial, and without abandoning a single one of his threats to our safety.

The hope of those Americans who favor his trip is that he will become educated about this country and its economic strength as well as its spirit of peacefulness. It is optimistically assumed that, when he gets to know America better, he will lose his misconception of our purposes and will be more flexible in negotiations.

This, however, is a fallacious theory. The leopard doesn't change his spots when he emerges from the jungle. Khrushchev is just another Hitler. He has gotten to be boss of the Soviet Union by trampling over his opposition and by distorting truth. He has threatened to bury the people of the United States under an avalanche of atomic missiles. He has issued an ultimatum to force us out of West Berlin. He has instructed his Foreign Minister to make no agreement at Geneva that substantially alters his previous position. He wants no reunification of Germany. He insists that our troops withdraw altogether from Europe and that we give up our plane and missile bases there.

Some misguided westerners think there is logic in his demands—that we ought not to encircle the Soviet Empire. But they forget that, once our forces withdraw from bases overseas, we cannot instantly get them back, whereas it would take the Soviets just a few hours to send their troops and planes to conquer Germany, France, and Britain.

It is imperative that the United States and its allies maintain their psychological as well as their military position. To yield to Khrushchev means discouragement to the peoples of the captive countries and, indeed, to the hopes of freedom-seeking peoples everywhere.

Why should we yield? To make money out of trade? Khrushchev thinks we are addicted to materialism and that the businessmen of the West place the pursuit of money above all else.

But the Soviet leader is mistaken. While the Allies in the 1930's did allow trade in strategic materials to go on almost to the time of Hitler's attack in September 1939 we shall not make that same error again.

Things have not changed too much with respect to autocratic rule in Russia over the years. In 1951 there was published a translation of a book originally written in 1839 by the Marquis de Custine entitled "Journey for Our Time." It is a journal of his travels in Russia 120 years ago. Walter Bedell Smith, former American Ambassador to Moscow, in an introduction says:

"A change in nomenclature has not altered the character of Russia's rulers or of its institutions. Whether it is Stalin or the Czar, it is still 'the little father' of the Russian people and it is still merciless despotism. . . ."

"The privileged class is today as remote from the mass of citizens as was Nicholas' court. The rank and position of the individual derives from the new Soviet Czar as surely as it did in the days of Nicholas I or in the days of Peter the Great. The ruler continues to be the most powerful and least accessible of all the world's sovereigns. . . ."

"But like his czarist predecessors, he is omnipresent, dominating the lives and thoughts of his subjects in every city, village, and hamlet across one-sixth of the world's surface. In Custine's words: 'All must strive scrupulously to obey the thought of the sovereign; his mind alone determines the destiny of all.'"

Essentially, there is little difference between the Russian Czars of yesteryears and the Soviet Premier of today. Czar Nikita's rule is just as absolute. The people live under a reign of terror, and there is no limit to his tenure. He is the Czar of all the Russias—the Soviet Empire. This now includes the neighboring countries in Eastern Europe, which are kept in a state of subjugation by the presence of Soviet troops.

Yes, if Czar Nikita wants to come to visit our shores, the U.S. Government can only say, "Welcome," in an official sense, but the American people reserve the right to say that no tyrant or murderer can ever be "welcome" in free America.

Poison in Your Water—No. 149

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Green Bay (Wis.) Press-Gazette of June 2, 1959, entitled "Chances for Solution to River Odors Slight":

CHANCES FOR SOLUTION TO RIVER ODORS SLIGHT—COMMITTEE HOLDS LITTLE HOPE FOR EAST STREAM AID

The city council's East River water pollution committee almost ran into extinction Monday night when it admitted there was no immediate solution to eliminating the pungent odors that have plagued river area businessmen and residents for the past several years.

The committee was established about a year and a half ago with the purpose of taking action to reduce the odors stemming from the river during the summer months.

Last year about \$3,000 was spent on a liquid chemical intended to counteract the odors. It was unanimously agreed by those conducting the experiment and the persons living and working along the river that the project was a failure.

NO ACTION THIS YEAR

Monday night the group met again, and after 2 hours of discussion, agreed that no action would be taken this year to improve the East River odors.

The only foreseeable improvement is expected from the action to be taken by the three paper mills which are dumping waste products into the East and Fox Rivers. They are Northern, Charmin, and Green Bay Paper & Pulp.

All three have received orders from the State water pollution committee instructing them in various phases of action which will be part of a plan to eliminate the discharge of wastes into the river.

The earliest improvement is expected from Northern, where plans have been made to discharge waste products now going into the East, to lagoons to be built on Northern's property along North Quincy Street.

FED BY PIPES

The lagoons would be fed by a 36-inch concrete pipe extending about 6,000 feet north along Quincy. It would carry the fibrous wastes from the mill to the lagoons where the wastes would settle out and clear water would be discharged directly to the bay. The remaining fibrous wastes then would be dug out and used for fill material.

Green Bay Paper & Pulp Co. has been ordered to show plans on a commercial sized reactor for atomized suspension treatment plant by December 31, 1959, and Charmin Paper Products was ordered to improve facilities for treatment of wastes by July 1, 1960.

The committee indicated no attempt would be made to treat the East River this year, although it heard a report from Karl Mohr, deputy health officer, who told of the

success achieved in other areas through treatment with sodium nitrate pellets.

COST AT \$10,000

However, he said the cost would be at least \$10,000. He noted no money has been budgeted for such a program this year.

Nic Van Roy, representative of the North-side Businessmen's Association, reported on a plan forwarded about 10 to 12 years ago to divert the East River through a 12- by 12-foot sewer into Green Bay. The line would run northward from somewhere in the area of North Baird Street.

Pat Schraufnagel, Madison, a representative of the State water pollution committee, reported that tests have shown that pollution in Fox River is down slightly over the past 10 years.

COMPLAINS ABOUT MILL

George Martin, engineer-manager of the metropolitan sewerage district, complained that one of the biggest violators of pollution control on the Fox was the Kimberly-Clark Corp. paper mill.

He noted that the mill discharges its wastes into lagoons, and when the Fox River water level is high, they're pumped directly from the lagoons to the river without any prior treatment.

The committee agreed to contact the State water pollution committee to inquire why Kimberly-Clark hasn't acted to treat the wastes before their discharge into the river.

N. L. Malcove of Northern reported that five companies along the Fox River will begin to pump oxygen into the river through their power turbines this summer. He said it is expected each plant will add one part of oxygen per million parts of water.

The plan already has been tried on an experimental basis and has proved practicable, he said.

Waste, Secrecy Out of Oversea Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland News has long advocated elimination of waste and secrecy in the expenditures of our foreign aid. It is my hope that the House conferees will stand fast and insist upon the House provisions which require elimination of secrecy and waste in the administration of foreign aid.

Under leave obtained, I insert in the Record an editorial which appeared in the Cleveland News July 31:

WASTE, SECRECY OUT OF OVERSEA AID

The House vote on President Eisenhower's foreign aid appropriation bill slashed \$700 million from his \$3.9 billion request—the largest sum since the U.S. aid program was originated—and banned secrecy on our munificent overseas spending.

It did so by means of an amendment which provides that Congress will obtain information on what funds are going to what countries, and in what form, or Congress can halt particular foreign aid.

Various Government administration agencies disbursing our foreign-aid dollars have for years wrapped a cloak of secrecy around outlays. It has been one of the most grievous aid spending plagues, infuriating even the program's defenders. Administrators of foreign aid have constantly refused to give Congress pertinent fact and figures on count-

less projects, economic and military. Considering the wastefulness, bribery, and other maladministration features which have come to light in the program, small wonder the foreign aid disbursers haven't wanted Congress, or the American public, to know the gruesome facts.

The fact that the House cut so deeply under the President's \$3.9 billion request shows that the constant instances of waste and graft revealed in the aid program finally have persuaded Members of Congress the people's money must be protected.

The Nature of the Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, we can better cope with our enemy when we understand him and what he seeks to do and the methods he uses. The New York Daily News, I believe, is rendering a very valuable public service in running a series of editorials which expose every facet of communism.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the second article in this series entitled "The Nature of the Enemy" which appeared in the August 3, 1959, issue of the Daily News:

THE NATURE OF THE ENEMY

Plowing through some of communism's vast and horribly boring so-called literature, you get the impression that Karl Marx dreamed up a highly complex philosophy, and that V. I. Lenin and Josef Stalin made it more so.

Actually, communism—the enemy discussed in this series of editorials—rests on a few simple and easily understood propositions. The pompous language the comrades use is for the purpose of impressing suckers and confusing opponents.

At the core of the Communist doctrine is the belief that government—the state—can plan and direct people's lives, down to the smallest detail, far better and more efficiently than people can plan and direct their own lives.

Admit that, and you have to admit that the people should surrender their liberties to the state, so that it may make them happy and prosperous; and that the state, in its supreme wisdom, should own and operate all industries, businesses, and farms for the good of the people.

Obviously, only a handful of persons in any country can have the super-brainpower needed to run such a gigantic machine of government. Communists everywhere freely admit that they fill this bill.

Haven't they studied the scientific teachings of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin till they know them by heart? What more do you want as mental equipment for a master class that can lead the suet-brained masses around by their collective nose for those masses' own good, while killing anyone who gets in the way?

Another basic Communist proposition is that religion—Christianity, Judaism, Mohammedanism, Buddhism, or whatever—is a complete fraud. The Communists have to maintain this atheist attitude chiefly because they cannot safely admit that there is a Supreme Being blessed with more wisdom than any Red or Red government possesses.

THE COMMUNIST MASTER CLASS

A third Communist dogma is that, until communism takes over the world, all the non-Communist nations will be infested with oppressors (capitalists, kings, nobles, sheiks, sultans, and so on) who will persistently exploit and persecute the people, or proletariat.

The Communist objective is to stir up the proletariat to rebel in every non-Communist country and put the Reds in power—after which, as we'll be seeing in this series of editorials, the proletariat, to its pained surprise, will find itself worse off than it was before.

Add to these basic principles the claim that a Communist world takeover is inevitable—the wave of the future (they say), and you can't escape it, bud, no matter how you may try—and you get a social and economic fighting machine which is bound to go places and profoundly affect human history before it cracks up.

Further, the Communist sales talk to hoped-for Red converts is cleverly worked out.

Communist agitators aim their appeals at every one of the worst human instincts and emotions—envy, avarice, conceit, laziness, gluttony, lust, selfishness, hatred, fear.

Ignorant poor people are assured that, come the revolution, they can virtually quit working and move in on the good jobs, the big houses, the best automobiles, and the prettiest women.

THEY'LL PROMISE YOU EVERYTHING

Poor intellectuals are told that they will be brainy philosopher-kings in the Communist state.

Timid wealthy people are urged to contribute to the Communist Party in hope of buying mercy from the Reds (which they won't get) when the great day comes.

Idealistic youngsters are occasionally attracted to communism as an alleged shortcut to the rubbing out of all the admitted evils and injustices in the world.

Economic, social, religious, racial, and national groups are incited by Communist agitators to hatred of one another.

If you have any resentment on any score, just bring it to a Communist agitator or propagandist, and he'll promise you a cure for your inward wound a day or two after the Reds take over.

So much for the principles and promises of communism.

In later editorials in this series, we'll outline some of the fearful and wonderful ways in which these principles and promises work out in practice after the revolution.

Kick or Be Taxed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I have already expressed my unqualified opposition to the proposal made by our Ways and Means Committee to temporarily earmark part of the automobile excise tax for the Highway Trust Fund.

Apparently, I am far from being alone in my skepticism about temporary tax laws. The Davison Index of Davison, Mich., for example—writing just before the committee came out with the excise tax transfer as an alternative to increas-

ing, "temporarily," gasoline taxes—express the same apprehension that "temporary" and "permanent" are synonymous in Government parlance. Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the perceptive editorial from the July 30, 1959, issue of the Index, which follows:

KICK OR BE TAXED

What chance has the public for protection from constant tax increases? Apparently it has almost none. A proposed increase of 1½ cents a gallon in the Federal gas tax was voted down by Congress. Within days a new proposal came up to increase the tax one-half cent a gallon for 1 or 2 years and transfer some receipts now received from present gas taxes from the general fund into the special highway trust fund, where they should have gone in the first place. Another proposal would raise the gas tax 1½ cents for a 2-year period only.

Any way you look at it, the determination is to make the public pay additional gas taxes for a crash program of highway building instead of doing the construction work as money becomes available.

If anyone is gullible enough to believe that a 1- or 2-year "special" gas tax would be dropped at the end of such periods, he should have his head examined. All one has to do is to check over the "emergency" taxes that were passed for various purposes years ago to realize that no special tax for 1 or 2 years would be dropped at the end of that period.

The tax spenders will always be exceeding their income no matter how large the taxes are. The people will never get relief until they tell Congress in no uncertain terms, that tax reductions, not tax increases, are in order.

At the end of 2 years roads will again be costing twice as much as estimated, "special" taxes will have to be retained and it is safe to say increases will be asked.

Randolph E. Myers, YMCA Head, Washington, D.C., Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent granted me so to do, I am pleased to comply with the request of many, many admirers and friends of the recent general secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association, Washington, D.C., Randolph E. Myers, who passed on while at his desk at the local YMCA at the age of 61. The following article was furnished me by his friends, it having appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Friday, June 5, 1959:

R. E. MYERS, 61, "Y" HEAD, DIES

Randolph E. Myers, general secretary of the YMCA, died yesterday at his desk of a heart attack. He was 61.

Mr. Myers was born in Loudoun County, Va., and came to the YMCA in 1918 following duty in the Marine Corps during World War I. His first job with the YMCA was as a room and information clerk at the central branch.

In his early years with the association, he also worked as program activities secretary,

membership and public relations director, and educational director.

In 1944, he became executive secretary of the central branch. Four years later, he was named assistant general secretary of the Metropolitan Washington YMCA. In 1951 he achieved the association's highest area post.

Mr. Myers represented the Washington association at the Paris convention of the World Alliances of the YMCA, in 1955.

He had served as a director of the Home Building Association and as a board member of the Federation of Churches. He was secretary of the Washington Lions Club for 15 years, later becoming vice president, then president.

Mr. Myers was a handball enthusiast, and was an area champion in his younger days. Other hobbies included fishing, gardening and music.

Surviving are his wife, Mollie, of the home address, 2643 North Rockingham St., Arlington; two daughters, Mary Valente, of Bethesda, and Betty Newlen, of Kensington; two sisters, Mae Myers, of Leesburg, Va., and Mrs. Robert L. Grubb of Hagerstown, Md.

Funeral services will be held at noon Monday at the S. H. Hines funeral home. Burial will be in Arlington Cemetery.

In addition to the foregoing newspaper comments, I am pleased to include a final tribute to him beautifully worded by one of the young men who had told me that the general secretary had been an inspiration to him—as well as to many, many hundreds more:

TRIBUTE TO RANDOLPH E. MYERS

The Congress of the United States announces with deep regret the death of Mr. Randolph E. Myers, general secretary of the Metropolitan area YMCA, Washington, D.C., which occurred on June 4, 1959. He was born in Loudoun County, Va., and completed his education in this area.

He served with the Marine Corps during World War I, and in 1918 began his professional career at the central branch YMCA in Washington as a room and information clerk. He was soon promoted to assistant membership secretary and later became membership and program secretary. In 1944 he was appointed executive secretary of the central branch and 4 years later he was named assistant general secretary.

In 1950 Mr. Myers became general secretary, the highest post in the area. He represented the Washington association at the Paris Convention of the World Alliances of the YMCA in 1955. He also served with distinction as director and vice president of the Home Building Association. Mr. Myers was secretary of the Washington Lions Club for 15 years, later becoming vice president and then president. He was selected by the local Lions club as official delegate to 13 international conventions.

Mr. Myers' constant interest in civic affairs and philanthropic activities was further emphasized by his years of service as a member of the board of the Washington Society for the Blind. He was also a leader in all United Givers Fund campaigns from the time UGF was inaugurated. He was awarded an honorary degree of doctor of laws by Southeastern University in 1952.

Throughout his 41-year career, Mr. Myers gave a special kind of dedicated devotion to his work and to the hundreds of thousands of young men associated with the YMCA. His life was characterized by sincerity and kindness and motivated by the highest standards of Christian purpose. During his impressive "Y" career, he gained international recognition. With his untimely passing, we have lost an eminent citizen and world renowned YMCA leader.

Race Incident Jolts Foreign Labor Guests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the information of those who read the Appendix of the RECORD, the following report on a racial incident involving one of our foreign guests in Kansas City, Mo.:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald]

RACE INCIDENT JOLTS FOREIGN LABOR GUESTS

KANSAS CITY, Mo., July 29.—A top Nigerian labor official touring the United States with a group of international labor leaders was told not to return to a downtown Kansas City cafeteria Monday night because of his race, it was learned today.

Alaba Kalejaiye, 42, secretary-general of the Nigerian Civil Service Union, said he was allowed to eat his food because he had already gone through the line and purchased it, but the Forum Cafeteria manager told him not to return.

"We feel quite bitter about this," said Ranajeet Majumber, vice president of the West Bengal Committee of the Indian National Trade Union Congress. "We all deeply resent the treatment of Mr. Kalejaiye and feel that this incident has spoiled our visit here."

In Washington, George C. Lodge, Assistant Secretary of Labor for International Affairs, apologized to Kalejaiye by phone. He later issued a statement in which he said he hoped the Nigerian would realize that the incident was in no sense typical of the United States.

"The overwhelming majority of the American people condemn such inhospitality," Lodge said. The Labor Department is sponsoring agency for the visit of the group.

Kalejaiye said he considers the incident "an affront to my country."

The 10 union leaders are in Kansas City this week on part of a nationwide tour of factories and industries.

I have through various sources confirmed the details of this report. It is my understanding that this incident occurred after this group had received the keys of the city from the mayor and after they had had a meeting with former President Harry Truman. It is unfortunate that the favorable impressions received up to that point were cancelled out by the prejudiced attitude of the manager of one of the Forum Cafeterias, a chain in that community. It is my understanding that the Forum Cafeteria is one of the chief offenders of civil rights in Kansas City. It is my further understanding that up to this point the city attorney for that community has ruled that proposed ordinances prohibiting discrimination in public accommodations are not permissible under the city charter. There is hope, however, that this interpretation may be reversed by more enlightened legal advice. I certainly join the Kansas City Commission on Human Relations in hoping that this remedy will be forthcoming as soon as possible. It is a sickening experience to see our effort to win and maintain the friendship of non-

white peoples in Africa, Asia, and South America damaged by the unenlightened attitudes of America's bigots.

Why is it so difficult to make people understand the effect of these incidents upon our relations with the darker peoples of the earth and the question mark it puts behind our sincerity with respect to democratic ideals? When will people realize that we no longer live in a vacuum but are exposed for the whole world to see?

It was interesting to note a few days ago, on the front page of the Jackson, Miss., Clarion Ledger, a picture of three Cuban soldiers, former members of Castro's revolutionary forces, eating in a hotel cafe in downtown Jackson with apparently no restrictions whatsoever. Yet, a foreign visitor who happens to be black and is from Nigeria which is pro-American and the largest country in Africa would not be welcomed in that restaurant or in one in Kansas City, which is supposed to be infinitely more enlightened than Jackson, Miss. And when you consider that the Internal Security Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate, headed by the senior Senator from Mississippi, recently received testimony from former commander in chief of the Cuban Air Force, Maj. Pedro Luis Diaz y Lanz—whether that testimony can be substantiated or not—that Castro and his followers are Communists and Communist sympathizers, it is difficult not to draw the conclusion that it is all right for even an avowed Communist to eat in a restaurant in Mississippi, the "anti-Communist, Bible belt" State, as long as he is white.

Let me make clear that I do not infer that Castro or his followers are either Communists or Communist sympathizers. But I do point out the monstrous insincerities and inconsistencies which is the bigot mind, of which there is too much example in American democracy.

Report on Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "One Inside Report on Castro," written by George Todt, and published in the Valley Times of July 16, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE INSIDE REPORT ON CASTRO

(By George Todt)

"The little foxes that spoil the vines."
(Song of Solomon 4: 15).

Is Fidel the Fox really Castro the Communist?

This is exactly what the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee is now being told in Washington by no less an authority than Major Pedro Luis Diaz Lanz, former chief of Castro's air force.

His story seems to ring true and he has described both of the Castro brothers—Fidel and Raul—and others high in the present Cuban Government as out-and-out Communists.

Diaz Lanz was a Cuban patriot who gave up some high-paying flying jobs to fight against the former tyrant, Batista. He joined Castro in 1956 because he thought that the latter meant to bring democracy to the people of our nearby island neighbor.

On June 30 of this year, a sadly disillusioned Major Diaz Lanz resigned his position as chief of the air force and later fled to the United States.

What he has told our Senators and intelligence chiefs may be boiled down to this: Instead of bringing liberty and freedom to Cuba, Castro has brought a Communist dictatorship.

The airman said that anyone who has heard Castro express himself privately would have no difficulty in assessing his true nature as an unblushing Red, as are other important members of his cabinet. These include both the Secretary of State and the Minister of Defense.

Furthermore, the former air chief states unequivocally that the Cuban dictator has no intention whatsoever of holding free elections for the Cuban people.

It's a pretty grim picture, this fiasco which is literally taking place at our Nation's doorstep. What's the matter with our side, anyway?

This column has been calling the signals correctly with relation to Fidel Castro for many months now. We had loads of eminent company, too. Such outstanding national publications as U.S. News & World Report, National Review and Human Events, for example; and commentator Fulton Lewis Jr.

On Capitol Hill there were at least several alert solons in both parties who also called the shots correctly with reference to Castro, the Red Fox. This bipartisan group included liberals and conservatives of varying shades and hues on both sides of the aisle, among them the following:

Senators WAYNE MORSE, Democrat of Oregon, and GEORGE SMATHERS, Democrat of Florida, and Congressmen DONALD L. JACKSON, Republican of California, ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, Republican of Wisconsin, WAYNE HAYS, Democrat of Ohio, and CLARE E. HOFFMAN, Republican of Michigan. Not to mention an astute lady Congresswoman KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, Republican of New York.

These voices crying in the wilderness where Castro was concerned are mentioned only to show that there has been no lack of an objective appreciation of his communistic tendencies by our citizens here in the United States.

And yet what action worthy of the name has been taken against this cunning Red upstart at this stage of the game?

Here we are—the most powerful nation on earth—and we are foolishly permitting ourselves to be pushed around by this Caribbean pipsqueak as though we might be the very dirt beneath his feet.

First, he threatened neurotically to murder "200,000 gringos" if we landed any Marines to protect the interests of our endangered nationals as Cuba's streets were running red with blood—much of it innocent, incidentally.

Second, he has more recently threatened to appropriate the legitimate property of American corporation in Cuba without payment, which is about par for the course. At least, for Castro.

Now, according to international law, there seems to be a substantial case for "nationalizing" the property of aliens in foreign countries upon occasion, all right—but only if they may receive a fair financial reimbursement in return and settlement. Not for free.

Castro says, in effect, of course, that he would very much like to reimburse the American "exploiters" in Cuba—if he only could. It's merely that he doesn't have any ready cash on hand. All of which is really too bad, you see. For the only way in which he might readily obtain the necessary funds would be for the rich American taxpayers to hand him large grants of money with the usual "no strings attached." (An honor, gringos.)

Then Castro the fox could have his chicken and eat it, too. Which is mighty nice work if you can get it.

Actually, our position in regards to expropriation of American properties by Castro or other close friends of Moscow ought to be summed up in these words:

"If you can't pay—don't play."

Isn't it about time for Uncle Sam to make a suitable show of force in the Western Hemisphere's "Red Sea," to wit the Caribbean? When will we put our foot down? Why wait any longer?

Outstanding New Officers of ROA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, no Member of this House needs to be told why our colleague LEROY ANDERSON of Montana, is highly qualified to be vice president—Army—for the Reserve Officers Association. LeRoy is a major general in the National Guard, a quiet, capable, and responsible man, certainly a model of a modern major general. We rejoice in his recent election as vice president—Army—of the Reserve Officers Association and congratulate the ROA on its outstanding choice.

We also think that the ROA was most fortunate to elect as president Col. John W. Richardson, Air Force Reserve, Detroit, Mich. It was my privilege to become acquainted with Colonel Richardson on a Reserve officers leaders exchange program which entailed a 2-week tour of Europe during March of this year. He is a man of energy, dedication, and resourcefulness. It is plain that he will make a notable record as President of the Reserve Officers Association.

Under a unanimous consent previously granted I am including further details about Colonel Richardson:

ROA'S NEW PRESIDENT

The Denver convention by unanimous vote chose Col. John W. Richardson as our new president for 1959-60. He got off to a quick start with conferences in Washington at national headquarters, Capitol Hill, and the Pentagon.

A long-time, hard-working, dedicated member, Colonel Richardson assumes the presidency with full knowledge of our problems and our potentialities. Under his leadership, ROA can look forward to another great year.

Colonel Richardson has just completed three terms as national vice president for Air. He also has held office in the Department of Michigan.

In private life he is manager, automotive fabric sales, F & F department, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., with headquarters in Detroit. He lives with his wife and two children in Bloomfield, Mich.

Colonel Richardson was born in Camden, S.C., July 14, 1910. He graduated from Virginia Military Institute in June 1931 with a B.S. in chemistry and a second lieutenant's commission in the Cavalry Reserve. He transferred to the Air Force in February 1942 and went overseas the following month.

After 4 years' extended active duty in World War II, 35 months of which was overseas, Colonel Richardson came home to take up an active and continuing interest in the Air Force Reserve and the ROA. For the past 3 years his mobilization assignment has been Chief of Staff, 10th Air Force, which encompasses 18 States. He has served on several Air Force committees and boards, besides his local and national offices in ROA.

Colonel Richardson is a director of Canadian Futurama Fund, Ltd., Toronto, and the Economic Club of Detroit. He also is active in other organizations including the Aero Club of Michigan, Bloomfield Hills Country Club, Detroit Athletic Club, the Recess Club, the American Ordnance Association, Bloomfield Hunt Club, Air Force Association, and National Aeronautic Association.

His decorations include the Legion of Merit, Presidential Citation, and two commendation ribbons.

Saginaw River Dredging Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Saginaw News on July 26, 1959, concerning the Saginaw River dredging project. I felt that this editorial which points out the business and shipping problems resulting from the delay in this project should be brought to the attention of the Members of this body:

"FOR WANT OF A NAIL A SHOE WAS LOST"—
OR WAS IT A SHIP?

When the Norwegian freighter *Lindenford* last week refused to enter the Saginaw River at Bay City because of the shallow channel, and so forced Bay City Shovel Co. to ship cranes to Detroit by rail for ship loading at an added expense of \$2,000, this Saginaw Valley got a better understanding of political economics in action.

The public must have gotten a good idea, too, of the potential economies to be gained through St. Lawrence Seaway shipments. Had that freighter been able to pull into dock and take aboard this cargo in a single handling, the Bay City firm could have realized an extra \$2,000 profit. As far as Bay City Shovels is concerned, that money is wasted—spent unnecessarily in delivering its equipment to the same destination.

A Bay City freight official is quoted as saying that the Norwegian freighter incident would repeat itself "again and again." And the manager of a freight forwarding concern dryly commented: "We'll be sitting on the shore watching the smoke on the horizon."

What they say certainly must be true of most deep-draught freighters whose captains will point their ships' helms away from our Tri-County seaway port until the Saginaw River is dredged deep enough to assure safe passage.

We not only have seen business in a solid dollar figure lost in this single instance: We also have been told that a \$5.9 million

Saginaw River dredging project under supervision of the Army Corps of Engineers is now dead for at least another year.

The loss of business and the delayed Federal project stem from failure to raise \$218,000 for protective alterations to two railroad bridges at Bay City which might be weakened by the deepening operation. Army engineers held that the cost of this work should be absorbed locally to free the Federal Government of any liability.

Our State waterways commission viewed this project as a proper State obligation. But the House Ways and Means Committee in late May rejected the request saying bluntly that the State of Michigan wasn't going to subsidize any benefiting industries along the Saginaw River.

There is little point in arguing that subsidy of industries was not the intent. We would be first to oppose the State's getting into the business of building up port facilities, patently a field for private enterprise. The need came as a Federal order, however, not for improvement of anything but for prevention of possible damage to existing private property.

As an apparent policy, the House Ways and Means Committee has decided to restrain the State Waterways Commission from getting into anything involving Seaway development or encouraging with State funds. This has thrown the responsibility entirely into local hands.

Our Tri-County Seaway Study Committee has been sounding out major river shippers in Saginaw, Bay City, and Midland to see whether the \$218,000 could be raised privately. Now, we note, a Bay City commissioner seeks to muster still another group of businessmen and industrialists to see what can be done toward getting the major dredging project underway.

The experience of Bay City Shovels Co. with the Norwegian freighter suffices to demonstrate that shippers have a direct and predominant interest in clearing this bottleneck to development. It is a public question, however, whether the financial burden should be solely their obligation. The port and the river constitute a public waterway of major magnitude in the economic development of this area, if not of the State.

Bay City, Midland, Saginaw, and the interior on which they hope to draw will not realize the benefits of a deep-water river and harbor until this \$218,000 "insurance" construction has been financed. A year's delay already is conceded, and the losses from that delay are now being counted.

We never have encouraged the shirking of local responsibility, just as we have deplored the handout route as the easy way to evade obligations. Our State legislature, like Congress, is deluged with appeals for undeserved assistance. The News has been quick to discourage these temptations within this Saginaw area as elsewhere in the State and Nation.

If we did not believe that the State shares a responsibility in advancing Federal waterway improvements, such as confront us in this engineering problem which has arisen in conjunction with dredging, we would not urge that the Ways and Means Committee reconsider its view. The development of public water routes is not a matter of purely local concern. If it were, the Federal Government never would have assumed its historic authority and responsibility in this area of public interest.

We cannot reconcile the Federal view which accepts this \$5.9 million waterway improvement as a public necessity with the State legislative committee's view that correction of a local impediment to the project is nothing but a subsidy of private industry.

Because of their direct benefit from a navigable waterway shippers admittedly have a greater immediate stake in the project

than anyone else. But this is an economic view point of narrowest vision. In the interest of Michigan's economic development there should be room for reconciliation of these opposing views.

Vice President Nixon Opens Wide Crack in the Iron Curtain To Steal the Show, but Rockefeller Aides Want To Push the Governor on Stage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in the August 10, 1959, issue of U.S. News & World Report, Francis B. Stevens, former Director of the U.S. State Department's Office of Eastern European Affairs, gives this appraisal of the Nixon visit to Russia:

In the 15 hours, spread over 4 days, which he (Nixon) spent with Nikita Khrushchev in Moscow, RICHARD NIXON was exposed to a favorite Soviet weapon in the cold war—diplomacy by bear baiting. He proved such an apt pupil that a world audience, at first startled, then enthralled, hung on every word of the verbal slugfest.

Mr. Stevens went on to say that through the heat came a measure on enlightenment for both Khrushchev and Nixon and the citizens of Russia and the United States as well:

This in itself is a positive step. "No high American official had said these things to Khrushchev since the summit conference of 1955, and they badly needed saying."

In view of the foregoing, I read with dismay an article from the July 30, 1959, issue of the New York Times under the heading of "Rockefeller Aids Prepare for 1960." The story indicated that Rockefeller's aids had made an analysis of current political trends purporting to demonstrate that Rockefeller would make a stronger Republican presidential candidate. Not only was there a notable absence of any statistics in the article, but the story quoted the fantastic comment that Governor Rockefeller "is a better bet to sell himself to practical conservatives than Vice President Nixon is to sell himself to liberal Republicans."

This type of thinking is not only contrary to the facts, but counters the cohesive forces of the Republican Party which have been steamrolling into action, and is a great disservice to Governor Rockefeller himself. My thoughts on this matter are best expressed in an article by Gould Lincoln which appeared in the August 1, 1959, issue of the Evening Star and under unanimous consent I request it be included at this point.

The article follows:

ROCKEFELLER FORCES ON THE MOVE

(By Gould Lincoln)

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON is gaining new laurels by his visit to Moscow, by his personal bearing there and his public and private statements. He has, indeed, added to his stature, as is admitted even by his

critics. All this is doing his chances for the 1960 Republican presidential nomination no harm.

Apparently all this favorable pro-Nixon publicity, adding to the Nixon political strength, is giving concern to the Republicans who are boosting Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller of New York for the presidential nomination. It is acknowledged that the Vice President is extremely strong with the GOP organization throughout the country. Polls of these party leaders have shown an overwhelming preference for Mr. Nixon. Now it appears his popularity with the rank and file of the voters is on the increase.

Reports from New York are that the Rockefeller supporters and advisers already have set to work to offset Nixon advances and to check any future gains. Their one hope is to prove that Governor Rockefeller has a better chance to win the presidential election next year than has Mr. Nixon. They are preparing to make this argument to Republican leaders throughout the country, but particularly in the big industrial States of the East, Middle West, and the Pacific coast. They will argue that Mr. Nixon is hated by the Democrats who, for 7 years, have conducted a campaign of vilification against him; that liberal independents look coldly upon him, and that without a considerable number of Democratic and independent votes the Republicans cannot hope to win the presidency next year. They will argue, too, that some Republicans among the rank-and-file voters do not like Mr. Nixon.

THE CASE OF TAFT

What effects such arguments will have on the Republican presidential nomination contest between Mr. Nixon and Mr. Rockefeller—for it is now admittedly a contest although neither has announced himself a candidate—is still very much a matter of guesswork. The argument that the late Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio could not have been elected President was used against the Ohioan, not once but several times. It did more than anything else to deny Senator Taft a nomination.

One thing is certain, however. If the Rockefeller forces persist in carrying on such a campaign, it is not going to make it easier for Mr. Nixon, if he becomes the presidential nominee, to win next year's election. On the contrary, it could help sink Republican chances for victory without trace. At best this seems a very negative way of winning a nomination for the New York Governor.

SHOULD SHOW HIMSELF

Another and more direct way for the Rockefeller campaign to operate is for the Governor to get out and show himself and his abilities as a campaigner to Republicans in all parts of the country. In this way, he will give them a choice between himself and Mr. Nixon without tearing down the Vice President in the minds of the voters, a poor way of doing business. Mr. Nixon, during his career in Congress and as Vice President has shown courage, ability to handle himself under most difficult circumstances, and real statesmanship. Why should another Republican attempt to belittle him? But if present reported plans of the Rockefeller camp are correct, the effort is to be made to convince the GOP leaders that Mr. Nixon could not win.

Governor Rockefeller won an amazing victory—in a so-called Democratic year—over the then Gov. Averell Harriman, Democrat, last November. He won it because of his own campaigning ability, which is admittedly great, and because the Democrats had a bitter quarrel which tore them wide open. The Governor is recognized as a progressive Republican. That does not endear him to many of the more conservative Republicans, although it strengthens him with some of the wavering Democrats and the independents.

Mr. Nixon, for his part, has certainly gone along absolutely with the progressive republicanism preached by his chief, President Eisenhower, without faltering. Despite this, the conservative Republicans like him. They insist that with Mr. Nixon as a candidate against a Democrat, the people will have a real choice to make at the polls, whereas, if Governor Rockefeller is the GOP candidate there will be no such distinction. They charge that the Governor is too "new dealish."

It is generally conceded that the GOP has in the persons of the Vice President and Governor Rockefeller two outstanding presidential possibilities—either of whom would make an able President of the United States. Mr. Nixon, however, has been brought into far greater contact with the problems which confront the country today, both at home and abroad. The knowledge he has acquired is a real asset.

The Temper of the Negro Community Everywhere Is To Fight Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an editorial, "The Temper of the Negro Community Everywhere Is To Fight Back," recently published in the Los Angeles Tribune, a Negro weekly of that city.

On May 17, this year, the anniversary of the Supreme Court school desegregation decision, I had the privilege of giving the principal address at a rally in Memphis, Tenn., and made certain statements on this same subject which have been deliberately distorted by some people. In that address, I made reference to the uprisings of peoples around the world concerned with the issue of human rights and I called attention to the fact that all Americans, regardless of race or creed, have cause to be grateful to such organizations as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People for absorbing the emotional impact of the Negro's reaction to racial prejudice, discrimination, and segregation in America. I also stated that as we approach the 100th anniversary of the emancipation in 1963, which has long been the goal of the NAACP for full attainment of equal rights for Negro citizens, if Negroes have continued to experience silence from the White House and slow motion tactics of congressional committees and stubborn resistance and injustice from local segregationist-diehards, organizations and individuals who preach meekness and nonviolence will find it exceedingly difficult to contain the fire that is smoldering within so many American Negroes.

Despite criticisms, by some persons, of comments of this kind, this editorial and my remarks simply reflect the feelings of Negroes and are realistic. I am persuaded that it is the obligation of those who are dedicated to the principles of

democracy and devoted to the welfare of this country and all its peoples who see this Nation plummeting to danger to warn and warn again until our Nation hears and heeds and heals itself, for the welfare and honor of us all.

The editorial follows:

THE TEMPER OF THE NEGRO COMMUNITY EVERYWHERE IS TO FIGHT BACK

It does no good that the NAACP has suspended Robert F. Williams, the honest spokesman of Negroes of Union County, N.C., for his statements advocating that Negroes "meet violence with violence" in the South where they "have no 14th amendment," where there is no justice for them, and even little of physical safety.

The "cat is out of the bag," as the saying goes; and it will not be long before the Negro will start suiting the deed to the word; and, we might add, like Mr. Williams, we believe that then, and only then, will terrorism against Negroes in the South end.

Williams only spoke the "temper of his community," as was testified to in New York at the NAACP hearing last week.

He only spoke the temper of the Negro anywhere, who is ready to fight, if it comes to that, who has seen the futility of giving ground, of looking to the courts, of depending on the "good white people," of turning the other cheek.

TO COME IN A NEW NEGRO ATTITUDE

It will not come, this violence, as a matter of organized technique or strategy.

We don't anticipate any guerilla combat teams being organized to take hapless Negroes out of jails or to raid white communities for a little reciprocal bloodletting.

But you are going to encounter it in a new Negro attitude, which is going to say "yes, and what of it?" * * * and, "do you want to make something out of it?" * * * and in a new Negro who is going to act to "take some of 'em with me" * * * and is going to mass to fight off lynchings, and to repulse the Ku Klux Klan, and is not going to turn the other cheek.

And this is not going to be strictly a defensive war. For the violence which the white man has made the order of the day where the Southern Negro is concerned, is unnerving. And nerves reach the breaking point. And men run amuck like the Negro man did in Louisiana the other day who killed three whites without provocation and held three others as hostages before he was finally put out of his misery by troopers' bullets.

The National Board of the NAACP need not worry. The frontrunners of this stage of the Negro's "war" for freedom from oppression will rarely be presidents of NAACP branches, or "leading citizens," or people who know anything at all about NAACP policy.

For, these kind of people are perhaps too often conservative, and conciliatory, and have too much to lose.

It is seldom that you find a president of an NAACP branch with the courage, the bluntness, the plain-spokenness, the intuitiveness, the sympathy, the righteous wrath of a Robert F. Williams.

The NAACP's hands will be clean, and the Urban League's, and the "Negro leadership's" * * * and the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. can go on preaching his fanciful philosophy of loving those who bomb my home and assault me.

The frontrunners of the Negro's "crusade," and it is a crusade, will be the poor, the ignorant, the nervous, the unstable * * * those with what psychiatrists call a low threshold of fear. These will provide the whirlwind which the white man's injustice, his callousness, his violence, his obscenity, his power-drunkenness, have planted and which he deserves to reap.

These, huddled in their huts in the South, resolved not to be no Mack Charles Parker. These started at a footstep and shooting first and asking questions later. These, the miasma of their fear, borne on sultry, southern winds to crowd their nostrils and to cause them to run amuck, cutting down all the faceless whites in their path, will free us at last, where the courts, and the conservative men, and the speeches, and the appeals to morality have failed.

THE NAACP SHOULD HAVE UNDERSTOOD

Of course, we think the NAACP should have been understanding of Robert Williams' provocation and should not have fed him to the wolves as it did.

The judge, who would have tried Mack Charles Parker had he lived, told newspaper reporters the other day in Mississippi that as Parker sat in his court at the arraignment, and he thought of what he had done (not of the crime of which he was accused) * * * he had to restrain himself, there and then, on the bench, from killing him.

No Mississippi State Bar Association jumped, that we have heard of, or are likely to hear of, to rebuke, reprimand, or suspend that judge.

NAACP executive secretary Roy Wilkins, who sat in judgment of Williams and suspended him in spite of the man's despairing statement of his provocation, in spite of his humbly stated love of his people and of justice, occupied himself in a speech denouncing a Mississippi county prosecutor who said after the lynching of Parker that it was really much ado about nothing and made no difference whether Parker was lynched before or after the trial.

For, no Negroes would have set on the jury which would have convicted Parker.

Therefore, his conviction would have been reversed.

Therefore, a mob would have taken Parker out of his jail cell and lynched him and sent his body to the Federal judge which reversed his conviction and said, "this is what you have done"; and Mississippi "justice" would have been vindicated in its own eyes and in the eyes of the white South.

Why all this haste to suspend a president of a branch of the NAACP who, in the teeth of such provocation, advocates that the Negro meet violence with violence, and stop lynching with lynching?

The first damn good advice, and the second—well, one could have counseled with the "brother" and pointed out that lynching is cannibalism, and now that the white man has civilized us, the Negro doesn't go in for cannibalism any more, and that, anyway, from a tactical point of view, white people have made Negroes allergic to lynching, and it is doubtful that you could raise a quorum in a Negro community for a "neck-tie party."

But there is absolutely nothing wrong with firing when you see the whites of their eyes, and being "ready" is about the quickest way to cut out all the Poplarville and Money, Miss., and Belzoni, nonsense known to mankind.

Self-defense is only self-respect and any philosophy of leadership which preaches anything less, is playing the Negro cheap as a man, and we don't care if the philosophy is Gandhi's or Jesus Christ's.

It is all right to use nonviolent techniques as long as they are met in kind; but a man who will not defend himself and his own deserves to remain a slave, and this consignment of the Negro's defense to the Lord is undoubtedly the reason why almost 100 years after the Emancipation Proclamation we are virtually slaves in parts of the country where we all but have the numerical advantage.

One of the most shameful acts in history, we think, was the surrender to the mob

of 14-year-old Emmett Till by his grandfather and other kin.

Does anyone wonder that lynchings continue of a people who will hand over children and women, to be murdered and raped?

There have to be terms on which life is not to be lived, and in cowardice is one of them. The principle of defense of human life, of the weak and the helpless, should be inbred in people so that it is a reflex action. Otherwise, man is not civilized, and there is no such thing as mutual security.

The Negro is victim of the most successful brainwashing in mankind's history.

He is not only divided as a group. He is divided against himself until he does not know his own interest.

And this has been cleverly done by a white man who fears him, fears his wrath, fears his righteous indignation, fears his numbers, fears the very sympathy in himself for the justice of the Negro's cause, and fears world opinion, and the Negro's cohorts in other parts of the world.

It is time we rejected the brainwashing and realized our own strength.

It is time that we decided that there are some terms on which life is not worth living.

It is time we resolved to be men and women. Then, and only then will we have interracial peace * * * peace born of equity. There is no other kind.

Union Members Call Her Lady Esther

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, Lianne Cordero, contributing writer for the Washington Post and Times Herald, has written about a gracious lady in the August 2 issue of that paper.

Mrs. Esther Johnson, national secretary-treasurer of the American Federation of Government Employees, has a cogent interest in her fellow Federal workers. She has worked hard and long to improve their lot and to educate them in their responsibilities as public employees.

I commend this article about Mrs. Johnson and include it as part of my remarks, as follows:

UNION MEMBERS CALL HER "LADY ESTHER"

(By Lianne Cordero)

"Lady Esther" may sound like an unusual title for an official in the class-conscious union world.

But that's just what members of the American Federation of Government Employees affectionately term smiling, vivacious Mrs. Esther P. Johnson.

Mrs. Johnson is the AFGE national secretary-treasurer, the only woman secretary-treasurer in the 137-member AFL-CIO. She is now serving her second two-year term of office after being unanimously reelected in 1958.

Explaining her rise in an all-male profession, Mrs. Johnson confessed, "Whenever an opportunity beckoned, I grasped it and went along. It took imagination in those days to do these things."

Mrs. Johnson had some challenging words: "Today's woman must develop every educational opportunity open to her and remove from her mind the fear of accepting

responsibility as well as the fear from having been rebuffed in the past."

One of Mrs. Johnson's major concerns is convincing women that they can perform as adequately as men in many fields. Warning women "not to let the spectre of age stop them," she said, "Women in the past have played an interesting and vital role in labor, education and health."

Mrs. Johnson has spent all but four of her working years as a Government employee. For one year she taught grades five through eight in a two-room Iowa schoolhouse. She quit because she "felt it was not for me."

She first became interested in union activities through her husband, a brakeman and railroad conductor. Although school teaching held no challenge, "educating fellow employees about their rights and privileges" became a driving concern. She called the lack of information "quite surprising."

As AFGE secretary-treasurer, Mrs. Johnson does a great deal of traveling. This and acting as official hostess for Washington visitors she calls the "highlights of my position."

In her apartment near Rock Creek Park and in her spacious office at AFGE headquarters, Mrs. Johnson frequently entertains foreign unionists sent by the Department of Labor.

Although she has little time for outside activities—"I work all day and go to meetings at night"—she is able occasionally to indulge her interests in music and movies. "Cooking? Yes, I'm a very good cook. I'm living proof of that," she said laughingly.

Peoria Journal Star Editor in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the eighth and ninth in a series of articles by Editor Charles L. Dancy appearing in the Peoria Journal Star: STUDENTS JOKE WITH REAL U.S. CAPITALIST (By Charles L. Dancy)

YALTA.—One evening in Yalta I was sitting on a bench on the esplanade with little Yuri talking and two college students joined in with a little English. They turned out to be engineering students specializing in heating and refrigeration systems.

When Yuri's bedtime came, the students and I walked the esplanade talking about education, culture, entertainment and philosophy in America and in Russia. They were wonderfully intelligent, seemingly frank, and realistic and we had a beer together.

Some young girls strolling turned and told us we were not fooling anyone trying to pretend that one of us was an American, and to quit joking. The boys asked if girls were stupid in America, too, and I replied that they apparently were the same the world over. (We had been agreeing frequently that many things are much the same anywhere anytime.)

By this time much of our conversation included joking replies, and then I spied one of the Americans I had met on the boat. He was Mr. Lushing, a rare fellow, a big homebuilder from southern California who is Jewish and has a love of trouble. He took part with the Palmach in juggling credentials to spirit Jews out of concentra-

tion camps and off to Israel, and he dodged his share of bullets in the Israel-Arab war—although not a young man.

I stopped him and introduced the two young men, both of whom were Jewish, and whose names were Vladimir and Mischa.

Lushing, a big man with a little weight on him now, gray hair, and glasses, well groomed and well dressed, stopped there in the middle of the broad esplanade overlooking the Black Sea on the Crimean peninsula, surrounded by a surging crowd of Russians, threw out his chest, and in booming voice announced: "I am a real, genuine American capitalist. I build 2,000 houses a year, and sell them with 30 years to pay. I hire thousands of workers at about \$4 an hour, and I exploit the hell out of them."

The boys stopped dead a moment, then broke into broad grins, stuck out their hands with flourishes, and Mischa said: "It is a pleasure sir to come face to face with a real, live American capitalist."

"I am it," said Lushing. "I make so much money I'm ashamed to mention the figure, but you should see the houses I build."

"How much taxes do you pay?" I stuck in.

"Eighty percent" he boomed.

"You see our system," I laughed. "We won't shoot him, and we certainly don't want to stop him. Every year we let him use his ingenuity to build more and better houses for people to live in, and then we take 80 percent of what he gains to boot. This way we don't just strip him once like you did here. We milk him over and over."

Both boys laughed, "It would be a mistake to shoot him," said Mischa.

"Especially if he manages to get so many homes built," agreed Vladimir.

But the most interesting part of this story is the sequel, for which I must jump ahead a bit so far as my travels are concerned.

I had to leave early the next morning, but I ran into Lushing again briefly in Sochi which is the last leg on the resort circuit.

He told me that the following evening he had taken the boys to dinner, and they had talked of heating and refrigeration systems and practices in the United States, of the kind of houses he builds (complete with all appliances, garage, etc.), of the status of Jews under the Communist, of capitalism, and of Israel.

They had talked until a hotel employee approached the table and spoke briefly to the students in Russian, whereupon they said they had to leave.

Lushing walked out with them onto the esplanade and asked what the man had said. Finally one of the boys remarked, "That we are talking too much."

They walked a way down the esplanade and found the policeman normally on station in front of the hotel walking one pace behind them all the way along.

"I hope I haven't gotten you two boys in trouble," said Lushing.

"Five years ago, under Stalin," said one quite openly, "it would have been very bad—especially for Jews, but now I think it is probably only a little trouble."

I hope he was right.

CARGO OF FACTS CAULKS HOLES IN PROPAGANDA

(By Charles L. Dancy)

ON THE BLACK SEA (YALTA TO SOCHI).—I sailed from Yalta on a fine big ship, the SS *Ukraine* (Ookraena) which I would describe, however, as more comfortable and less luxurious than the *Nashima* that had brought me to Yalta—and with more friendly passengers.

One other American was aboard—a man named Peoples—and we had quite a time because he was an insurance man. Everyone wants to know what you do. When Peoples would tell them, they still didn't know.

They seemed tremendously impressed and delighted by such a system as it unfolded regarding fires, storms, auto accidents, sickness, and the obviously endless list of items.

At one time we were surrounded by seven young sailors of the Black Sea fleet, and we wound up in the salon until midnight answering questions.

They want to know how much everything costs, starting from your shoes up—and then what else you have and how much it costs. This is hard to explain. The official rate of exchange is 4 rubles to the dollar. The unofficial tourist rate of exchange is actually 10 to 1 but they call 6 of the rubles a bonus. The black market offers 20 to 1 and better, I'm told. (Later, this was verified firsthand.)

So how much are things really worth in rubles? If they are obtainable at all.

These Russians insisted, after due explanation, in counting at four to one—with the result, of course, that everything was sky-high.

One gray-haired wizened-faced fellow brought me a beer, and Peoples came in and sat down. He refused the beer. Our Russian friend said to me: "He wants to live to be 100."

Peoples is 71 years old and extremely agile and youthful. When our friend learned this he shook his head. "He is 71, and he is a young man. I am 56 and I am an old man."

Then he and I joked with the waitress as to Peoples still being young enough to be interested in girls. (Note: This "youth" business popped up several times both regarding other tourists and myself. Their preoccupation with the contrast in Americans and themselves seems to stem from the Communist propaganda line that we Americans are "degenerate society" while the Communist society is young and virile—and having cast off a belief in immortality is using science and health methods to keep people young and alive longer.)

They were especially interested in my drip-and-dry shirt, and of what it was made.

One fellow piped up out of nowhere saying "5 million Amerikanyets nyet robato" (unemployed) and I replied when I left it was down to 3 million, and that the Government pays them for 26 weeks while they find new jobs. I added that most construction work is summer season work.

He popped up immediately: "5 million zemoy (winter); 3 million lyeta."

"What do you like most in Russia?" said another.

"The people," I replied.

"What do you dislike most?"

"The control over what you can read and know about the outside world."

No more questions.

Schedule of Grassroots Conferences in Third Ohio District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege and an honor to represent the people of the Third District of Ohio here in the Congress of the United States. I am deeply grateful for this opportunity to be of service, and it is my constant aim to serve my constituents in the best way possible. It has been my regular policy to keep in close contact with the people of the Third Dis-

trict so that I may know how they feel about the many important issues facing us here in Congress.

As the Representative of this great district, I have considered it my duty not only to be well informed of the opinions of my constituents, but also to be of the greatest possible service to persons having problems dealing with agencies or departments of our Federal Government.

Eight years ago I initiated the idea of holding grassroots conferences throughout our district, and I have continued this practice each year during the time Congress is in adjournment. I also have a full-time congressional service office at the U.S. Post Office Building in Dayton, where I can meet with people personally at any time that my official duties permit me to return to the district.

During the time I am in Washington attending to legislative and official duties, a competent secretary is in charge of my district service office to assist callers and to help them with requests for aid in dealing with the Federal Government so that I can be of every proper assistance to them.

In these ways I have sincerely tried to keep well informed as to the personal opinions of my constituents, and I have also tried continuously and sincerely to be of every proper service to them.

Members of Congress are constantly called upon to give careful and earnest consideration to legislation dealing with many complex national and international problems. These day-to-day decisions often affect the lives and living of every citizen in our Nation. Consequently, these personal and private conferences help me to serve all of the people in my district in a much more effective manner.

This year, during our official congressional recess, I am again taking time to hold these grassroots conferences throughout our district at convenient public buildings. I deeply appreciate the fine cooperation of the many officials who have made these meeting places available to me as an aid in rendering this public service.

This is the schedule I have arranged:

Dayton post office, room 314, September 21 and 22, 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.

Miamisburg City Building, September 24, 4 p.m. to 8 p.m.

Germantown City Building, September 25, 4 p.m. to 8 p.m.

Phillipsburg City Building, September 26, 1 p.m. to 3 p.m.

Brookville City Building, September 26, 4 p.m. to 8 p.m.

Hamilton Courthouse, September 28, 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.

Oxford Municipal Building, September 29, 4 p.m. to 8 p.m.

Middletown American Legion, October 1, 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.

Fairfield City Building, October 2, 4 p.m. to 8 p.m.

I have been greatly encouraged by the increased attendance at these conferences. It is sometimes surprising to see how much can really be accomplished when a citizen and his Congressman can sit down face to face and talk over problems of mutual concern.

Special appointments are not necessary for these conferences, and I sincerely urge individuals or groups to meet with me on the date and at the place most convenient to them. The knowledge obtained through these grassroots conferences will help me to render better service, both legislative and personal, to all of the people of our important Third District as their Representative in the Congress of the United States.

If the Southern Negro Got the Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Record the following article from the New York Times entitled "If the Southern Negro Got the Vote." The article is important in giving a succinct account of the experience of Negroes in certain areas of the South with regard to voting restrictions. However, its primary significance is in the facts it presents exploding the myth that equal rights at the voting polls would lead to Negro domination of political affairs. The contention that Negro bloc voting would run all other races out of political office is a fear-inciting fraud used by segregationists in their campaign for white supremacy. The myth, as we know, is right now being used in efforts to forestall home rule for the citizens of the Nation's Capitol.

This article, by Ralph McGill, this year's Pulitzer Prize winner for distinguished editorial writing, does an excellent and forthright job of putting the matter straight and showing that the Negro voting pattern is like the voting pattern of Americans in general. It "belongs" to no party or candidate, for reason of color. It votes in its own interest when the issue calls for it—as do farmers, laborers, schoolteachers, and so forth. It attempts to be, as Mr. McGill points out, "more American, not less; to be complete citizens, not semicitizens."

IF THE SOUTHERN NEGRO GOT THE VOTE

(By Ralph McGill)

ATLANTA.—On the night of April 25 a fast-working, disciplined mob brutally dragged Mack Charles Parker, Negro, awaiting trial on a charge of rape, from a cell in the unguarded jail at Poplarville, in Pearl River County, Miss. On May 4, his body, bearing two gunshot wounds, was found in an eddy of the nearby Pearl River.

None knows what was in the collective mind of the mob, beyond a determination to kill Parker. Yet, despite the surface incongruity of the suggestion, it is likely that the systematic denial of voting rights to Negroes was one of the motivating factors in the hate-heated heads of the murderers.

April 25 was a Saturday. Parker's trial was set for Monday. It would be a jury trial with an all-white jury. For in Pearl River County only qualified voters may serve on juries, and in that county there was not even

one Negro on the voting lists. But the Supreme Court has held that contrived exclusion of Negroes from jury duty denies a fair trial to a Negro defendant and is unconstitutional. It was common knowledge in Poplarville that Parker's defense planned to challenge the whole proceeding on this ground.

For days there had been sullen talk in the town square to the effect that, in these circumstances, it would never be possible to obtain a valid conviction. Without question, this feeling combined with the more familiar ingredients of prejudice to doom Mack Parker to death on that night when the air was soft with spring, and the young people of Poplarville were dancing happily not far from the shabby jail.

The mob, in a manner of all mobs, thus achieved something it did not intend. It focused national attention anew on the almost unbelievable restriction of the right of Negroes to participate in the choice of public officials in the Southern States, particularly those of the old cotton South.

This denial of the ballot does not occur only in isolated places like Poplarville. Nor is its meaning confined simply to inability to vote for candidates for office. The ballot is the basic civil right. Once obtained, it would be the best remedy for all civil grievances.

Any attempt to provide a picture of the status of the Negro voter in the South runs into many difficulties. Accurate registration figures are not easily obtained. Voting lists are not always kept up to date. In a surprising number of counties in most of the Southern States the lists have not been thoroughly checked in years. Names of person long dead, and those of voters who have left the county or State, often are not removed. It is not uncommon to find counties which report white registration totals exceeding the white population of voting age.

Further, Negroes have been enfranchised in the South for only 13 to 15 years. Until the mid-forties when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled the white primary unconstitutional, the Negro voter was a Deep South rarity.

The white primary—restricting the vote in Democratic primaries to white citizens—was a deliberate device of State Democratic committees to deny the Negro the right to participate in the choice of those who would govern. Since there was no opposition in the one-party South, the elections customarily found the Democratic primary nominees unopposed. The Supreme Court ruled that such a system disfranchised the Negro and was unconstitutional. (The poll tax, a second restrictive device, today is retained by only five States—Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, Texas, and Virginia. It has lost some of its deterrent effect with the movement of people from the land to the urban areas and into higher income brackets.)

When the white primary was removed there was angry resentment and a hurried putting together of heads to contrive a substitute the courts could not invalidate. While the legal minds worked out their plans for new restrictive legislation, requiring some form of literacy tests of which the registrars would be the sole judges, others resorted to the ready technique of intimidation. In some counties, following the court ruling, motorcades of masked men drove silently along the roads and through the Negro sections of the county seats. A few crosses were burned before the homes of those Negroes who were regarded as likely to encourage interest in voting. Uncle Toms—pliant Negroes—were used to carry warnings to the others.

The first so-called literacy law, supplanting the white primary, was adopted in Alabama in 1901. It required a registrant to "read, write, understand, and explain any article" in the Constitution of the United States. In 1949, a Federal district court ruled this out as hopelessly vague, and also

noted that the registrars, not being constitutional lawyers, would not themselves know whether the replies were correct.

In a 1951 law the "understand and explain" clause was therefore omitted. But a severe test was established in its place. In addition to the usual qualifications of age, residence, and lack of a criminal record, the Alabama law provides:

"The following persons . . . shall be qualified to register . . . those who can read and write any Article of the Constitution of the United States in the English language which may be submitted to them by the Board of Registrars: *Provided, however, That no person shall be entitled to register as electors except those who are of good character and who embrace the duties and obligations of citizenship under the Constitution of the United States and under the Constitution of the State of Alabama: And, provided further, That . . . each applicant shall be furnished . . . a written questionnaire . . . Such questionnaire shall be answered in writing by the applicant, in the presence of the board without assistance.*"

This with variations providing registrars with opportunities for wide discrimination, is almost a South-wide pattern. In all States the registrars have powers of discretion, actual or assumed. In rural areas white registrants are "passed" quickly while most, or all, Negroes are rejected.

In one Alabama county no standard form is used. The registrars may ask on what date the 10th amendment was adopted or on what date Oklahoma became a State. Veteran Negro college teachers have been refused registration for failing literacy tests. In still other counties the sheriff has been known to sit in a chair close by where the questioning was going on, compounding the uneasiness most rural Negroes feel in the courthouse, which to them has too often been a symbol of injustice rather than justice. Various other stratagems and forms of intimidation are used—frequent, unannounced changes of hours for registration, highly technical purges of Negro voters, gunshots in the night in the vicinity of those who are known to have talked of registering, a few persons actually killed.

As a result Negro registration in eleven Southern States—Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and Virginia—had reached a total of but 1,321,731 in 1958. This is about 25 percent of the 4,980,000 Negroes of voting age. Mississippi has the lowest rate of any State—30,000 to 35,000 out of a Negro voting-age population of about 500,000. The Southern Regional Council, a highly respected interracial research organization, has found that 80 to 85 percent of Negro voting is in the cities and larger towns of the South.

It should be added that white voter participation in the South is also below the national average. It is held down by the one-party system, low educational and income levels, the dominance of "the courthouse crowd" in most rural counties, the poll tax and the difficulties of registration—the same factors that discourage Negro voting. Booker T. Washington the illustrious Negro leader, once said that to hold the Negro in the economic ditch, the white man would have to get down there with him. This prophecy has been painfully accurate and applies, too, in the fields of politics and education.

The familiar bugaboo raised by those who oppose Negro suffrage and who create elaborately contrived legislation to restrict and discourage registration is the cry of "bloc vote," expressing fear of Negro domination through the ballot. The specter of Negro political rule is one constantly cultivated and exaggerated by those determined to maintain the status quo. Extremist demagogues make the most of it.

"You let the civil rights do-gooders have their way and you'll have a nigger mayor, nigger police, a nigger sheriff, a nigger superintendent of schools, and nigger tax collectors," wrote one of the more violent editors in a White Citizens Council pamphlet given general distribution.

Actually, in less than 20 years that the Negro may be said to have been partially enfranchised, his voting pattern has proved to be just like everyone else's. If Negroes feel that their interests are directly involved they vote in a bloc—as do farmers, union members, businessmen, or as doctors do on any issue which seems to them to involve socialized medicine. But when racial questions are not at issue, Negro voters tend to split their votes just as consistently as do the rest of the population.

For example, Dr. Rufus Clement, able Negro president of Atlanta University, twice has been elected to the city's school board. Each time he carried the white wards as well as those heavily Negro. In the last election a successful, respected Negro businessman was a candidate for another municipal position. His vote in the Negro wards was far less than that of Dr. Clement, strongly indicating that there is no bloc voting unless the Negro voters' special interests are at stake.

Naturally, once the Negro acquired the right to vote, he would use it to obtain his full civil rights. He would, in addition, become a pressure group in his community, seeking community services in exactly the way white voters have been doing all these years.

In Southern State elections the Negro voter would be a force behind expansion of schools and industry. He would provide, too, the possibility of creating a two-party system where today there is one. It is precisely this which adds to the fears of those who do not want him to vote and which causes them to try to picture the Negro voter as a dangerous factor.

The fear of bloc voting arises in its most caloric form in the few Southern counties where the Negro population is a majority of perhaps 60 or 70 percent. At least a part of it contains an element of guilt—as revealed in the assumption that if Negroes were allowed to vote they would all have reason to vote as a strong antiwhite bloc. But for many white residents the fear also takes tangible form in the visible presence of more Negroes than whites. It understandably is difficult for those so situated to apply reason to the question—and few have tried.

But there would never be a time when all the Negroes would vote. A high percentage of any Negro community—higher than in white communities—is under voting age. Many of the adults in these rural counties are illiterate, though not entirely by their own choice. They could not meet a legitimate test.

Moreover, the southern Negro population is steadily declining, nowhere more rapidly than in the old plantation cotton counties where Negro population majorities now exist. It is quite possible that the 1960 census will show that half of the Nation's Negro population is outside the Southern States.

Because of the emigration of the southern Negro, as well as that of the whites, the Bureau of the Census already has said that if the trend continues—and it is continuing—several Southern States will lose some representation in Congress in the reapportionment which will follow the 1960 census. This emigration is speeding up the decline of southern political power in Congress, a process that has already become evident during the past 3 or 4 years.

Three basic suggestions for meeting the problems raised by denial of Negro voting rights are indicated by present conditions and unmistakable trends. They are:

(1) Not even the most sincere believer in States rights, alone with his conscience, can

doubt the need for a bolstering of civil rights legislation to at least the moderate, commonsense level requested by President Eisenhower and Attorney General William Rogers. True, law alone is not enough. But history teaches that once prejudice and discrimination lack the sanction of law, both decline.

(2) The Federal Civil Rights Commission, established to look into denial of voting and other rights, may not need to be made permanent. But through the turbulent years immediately ahead, the Nation will badly need such a board.

(3) The continuing concentration of Negroes in cities offers an opportunity and an urgent need for a boldly imaginative co-operative civic job of political education by service clubs and other recognized agencies devoted to civic improvement. It should be obvious—as unhappily it is to but a few—that it is necessary and possible to provide for the Negroes (and for that matter, the whites) who leave the mechanized farms, honest instruction in the duties and responsibilities of citizenship. Most of those who come to town have little political consciousness. The average fieldhand or small Negro farmer, with little or no education, knowing that if he does not "keep his place" he may encounter violence, is not aware of the meaning of voting.

But the present pattern of southern life does not allow for real interracial cooperation in public-service schools for potential voters. Political education is left to those who are trampling out the vintage where the grapes of wrath are stored. There is rarely any mention that a moral question, as well as one of political health, is involved for the white and Negro leadership of the cities.

So far, the more progressive Negro churches have carried the burden of both inspiration and instruction. Some have achieved excellent results. But they would be the first to say they have barely scratched the surface. They must have help from a community which sees the Negro voter as an asset if he has honest leadership and example.

Negro society is as stratified as that of the white population. Its members are by no means a closely knit set bearing aloft the slogan, "All for one, one for all." The Negro knows that some of his own race have exploited him as ruthlessly and have deceived him as cruelly as have white men of like character. He knows, too, that some of his own people have provided some of the most venal examples of southern politics. Yet one of the best features of the Negro minority now seeking voting rights has been that its leadership has not sought to set it apart and ask for special privileges. It attempts to be more American, not less; to be complete citizens, not semicitizens.

Reading, Pa., City Council Urges Housing Bill Veto Be Overridden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower's ill-advised veto of the compromise housing bill has threatened the progress which many communities have made in the fight against slums and urban blight.

My own city of Reading, Pa., has made an outstanding record in this field. The

Walnut Street project has provided needed off-street parking in downtown Reading by eliminating a substandard housing area. The Cherry and Court Street projects are well along in the planning stages. A 102-unit public housing project for the aged has been approved, the first such project in the Middle-Atlantic region.

The veto of the housing bill therefore came as a setback to the long-range urban renewal plans made by the responsible local officials. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of a resolution adopted by the Reading City Council calling on Congress to override the President's veto of the housing bill and an editorial from the Reading Times, which discusses the importance to a sustained housing and redevelopment program to the future growth of our city:

RESOLUTION 219

Whereas the city of Reading has made great progress in eliminating slum areas and creating sorely needed off-street parking areas under the Federal urban renewal program; and

Whereas two redevelopment projects are now underway as a result of Federal participation; and

Whereas another important project of 102 housing units for our elderly citizens is in the planning stage and depends upon Federal assistance for its completion; and

Whereas the Federal urban renewal program offers to our city and others throughout America genuine relief from the blight and strangulation that has impeded the progress of many municipalities; and

Whereas despite this great need President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER has seen fit to veto urban renewal and housing legislation enacted by duly elected representatives of the people in Congress and thereby has jeopardized future modernization of our population centers, including Reading: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of Reading, That we call upon our representatives in Congress to override the presidential veto and thus insure continuity of planning so that our cities may continue to nourish our industrial, commercial, social, and cultural life; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Hon. JOSEPH S. CLARK and Hon. HUGH SCOTT, U.S. Senators from Pennsylvania, and Hon. GEORGE M. RHODES, Member of the House of Representatives from Reading and Berks County.

Passed council July 29, 1959.

DANIEL F. McDEVITT,
Mayor.

Attest:
SAMUEL H. ROTHERMEL,
City Clerk.

[From the Reading Times, July 31, 1959]

READING HAS A SIZABLE STAKE IN OVERRIDING HOUSING VETO

The U.S. Senate is now in the throes of a big debate. It is trying to decide whether or not to attempt to override the carryall housing bill that the Congress passed and President Eisenhower vetoed in mid-July.

Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Alabama Democrat and chairman of the Senate Housing Committee, said early this week that congressional leaders are determined to pass housing legislation this year, either by overriding the President's veto or by drafting and passing a new bill.

It is devoutly to be wished that one or another course be taken. For Congress to end its session without housing legislation would be for the Democratic-dominated Congress to admit that it is more interested in keeping

alive an issue for the 1960 elections than it is in getting houses built.

There would seem to be some chance that the Democrats in the Senate would be able to summon the two-thirds majority that is necessary, under the Constitution, to override a Presidential veto. There would seem to be substantial doubt, however, that the housing bill veto could be overridden in the House.

If it is believed that this is a remote subject for the folks of Reading, let that opinion be jettisoned. Housing legislation at this session is of great importance to all of us. On such legislation, plus appropriate appropriation bills supporting it, depends to a pretty large degree whether we go forward or slide backward in urban redevelopment.

We are informed that the failure of Congress to pass housing legislation cannot, at this point, bring to a halt the Housing Authority's plans to build low-rent housing for the aged. There is already governmental commitment on this.

We also are informed, however, that the redevelopment projects known as Court and Cherry, that would level many substandard areas in the central city, probably would stop in midstream if housing legislation is not passed by the Congress.

The Court and Cherry projects, as we understand the situation, are assured Federal money for planning but still lack Governmental commitment on the Federal Government's share of the actual razing of dwellings and other buildings and on whatever construction—parking lots or what-not—will take place after the razing. These projects are gradually changing the ancient face of downtown Reading and for them to be halted would be a shame.

But there is another consideration. For the first time in a good many years planners in many categories are beginning to look ahead in our municipal development. They are looking ahead not a year or two but 5, 10, 20 years. One of our troubles has been that we have not looked far enough ahead. Now that we are doing so, by way of municipal planning, it would be singularly unfortunate to bring the planning to a screeching halt, which obviously would happen if the Congress were not to pass a housing bill which would provide ample funds for urban renewal.

In view of these matters the people of Reading, along with those of many another American community that is affected, may hope that the Congress will either override the President's veto of the housing bill that has already been passed or rewrite the bill and hasten it on its second journey through the Federal Legislature. If, then, the President is still adamant, the people will then know at whose door to lay the blame.

Nixon Sets Khrushchev Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include three editorials from the Washington Evening Star, of Wednesday, July 29, 1959, commenting on Vice President Nixon's tour of Russia and Siberia: "He Is Doing All Right," "Changed Khrushchev Unlikely," and "Nixon Sets Khrushchev Straight":

He's DOING ALL RIGHT

Some of our amateur political experts, especially those to whom the man's very name is anathema, are taking a dim view of RICHARD M. Nixon's Russian-Polish tour. They think the Vice President is up to no good and they devoutly hope that he will fall flat on his face.

It is interesting to note, however, that the professionals take a somewhat different view. They realize that the trip can boost the Nixon political stock in this country. Most of them also think, or profess to think, however, that it may help relations between our two countries or that, in any event, it is not doing any harm in this respect. Some of these professional views appear to be colored by the individual's own stake in the game. Thus, Senator KENNEDY, a leading Democratic presidential prospect, comments rather tartly that the trip has been helpful to Nixon. Senator HUMPHREY, another Democratic hopeful, thinks the idea of the trip was very constructive, but he doubts that the Vice President should have gotten into a rough-and-tumble debate with Mr. Khrushchev. The Minnesota Senator says that Mr. Khrushchev is a tough man to handle in such a contest, and, having spent 8 hours with him, he ought to know.

Other Democrats, who are not presidential aspirants in their own right, have been surprisingly favorable in their comments, among them being such men as Senators FULBRIGHT and PROXMIRE. The Republicans, of course, with the notable exception of Governor Rockefeller, whose opinion has not been recorded, would have you believe that the Nixon trip is the answer to all our troubles, and why wasn't something of the sort done long ago.

In our judgment, without attempting to be either pro-Nixon or anti-Nixon, it seems perfectly clear that the Vice President, up to this point at least, has had a successful trip, and this is bound to improve his personal political fortunes. It does not mean, of course, that he necessarily is the best man for the presidency, or that he has either the nomination or the White House in the bag. Neither does Mr. Nixon's trip, assuming that it will be a bangup success in both Russia and Poland, bring us to the point at which the storm clouds hanging over our relations with the with the Soviet Union are about to be blown away.

The trip was not made with any such expectation and it would be childish to expect any such result. The most that it can do, again assuming its success is to help prepare ground for the cultivation of a better understanding between our two countries. This, however, is something which is important, and which should not be underestimated. Soon or late, something is going to have to give in the relationship between the United States and Russia. We hope that the break will come in the form of an easing of mutual distrust and dangerous ambitions. There is no really good reason, economic or otherwise, why this is not an attainable objective. And those among us, in both countries, who seek some petty advantage by fanning the fires of suspicion and fear should not forget that the alternative to a workable live-and-let-live arrangement will almost certainly be a mutually ruinous war. If Mr. Nixon's trip casts a little weight in favor of the former and against the latter it will have been well worthwhile.

CHANGED KHRUSHCHEV UNLIKELY—NO EFFECT ON GOAL OF U.S. SURRENDER SEEN POSSIBLE IN VISIT TO AMERICA

(By David Lawrence)

Many people who watched the boorish, arrogant Khrushchev on television a few nights ago wondered why such a dictator and bully should be humored so much by the

American Government. In view of the deliberate distortions of the Nixon-Khrushchev repartee in the officially controlled press and radio of the Soviet Union, the question that naturally arises now is what possible good could come from a summit meeting with such an irresponsible mind.

There is nothing really new being uncovered nowadays about the Khrushchev personality. He has talked for hours with various American officials and other prominent men from Western countries. He is shrewd and skillful in debate. He is used to having his own way and can't understand why the United States doesn't knuckle under at his command.

His point of view hasn't changed a bit since he first grabbed power in the Kremlin. He insists that the way to ease tensions and prevent crises in the world is for the United States to do what he says. There is no middle ground, as he sees it, between capitalism and what he inaccurately calls socialism. In the end, he is sure one will triumph, and he is confident it will be Communist imperialism rather than the system under which America and the West have thrived.

Most of Khrushchev's visitors, including perhaps Vice President Nixon, come away with the idea that maybe it would be a good thing to educate the Soviet Premier by arranging for him to come to the United States for a visit.

But this is a fallacy. Khrushchev can no more be "educated" than Hitler could have been. The two men are very much alike. There is one little difference—Khrushchev secretly orders his murders and tortures of dissenters, while the Nazi dictator did it openly and boasted about it. Khrushchev is responsible for the execution or exile of thousands of Hungarians. The present Hungarian government is his slave and captive, as also are the other neighboring countries in Eastern Europe. But Khrushchev resents any mention of "captive nations."

What Khrushchev lacks is a sense of decency and dignity and an appreciation of the other fellow's viewpoint. He is as absolute as a czar. The impression has been widely spread that he has an inferiority complex and wants to be invited to stay at the White House so as to show off to his people that he is accepted as a world leader. But even after he did this, he probably would argue just as vehemently that what America and Europe need is communism. He has an obsession on the subject of world conquest.

To accord Khrushchev the kind of invitation he wants is to give him a chance to make propaganda and belittle the very country that would be treating him as its guest. He would distort the purpose entirely on his return home and boast to his people that even America recognizes his prowess in a position of leadership in the world.

In the Soviet Union Khrushchev isn't popular with the people outside the ruling Communist group who are familiar with his personality. He needs prestige at home. One way to get it, he thinks, is to be accorded attention by the heads of other governments. He enjoys being sought after. He nevertheless plays constantly at the game of trying to divide the Western allies by appealing to their materialistic interest in trade relationships.

What should the West do about such a dictator? Domestic politics in Britain and a tendency on the part of some British Labor Party people to seek a close working arrangement with the Kremlin complicate the problem for the West. As for France, General de Gaulle declares he wouldn't come to the United States for a summit meeting and says it should be held in Europe if at all. So, even if the United States were agreeable to a meeting with Khrushchev in this country

for the summit, French objections would prevail.

Then what about a summit meeting of only President Eisenhower and Nikita Khrushchev in the United States? This would arouse suspicions among our allies. It's true that Prime Minister Macmillan went alone to Moscow, and Khrushchev showed his bad manners by insulting his guest in a public speech.

The British leader, incidentally, was busy for weeks afterward explaining that he wasn't making any separate deals. So it seems that if General de Gaulle will not come, there is no likelihood of a summit meeting in America. If one is held, it will be in Europe, and President Eisenhower would attend reluctantly and then only if "progress" has been made through the four foreign ministers toward a settlement of the Berlin problem.

Judging by the way the Soviet Premier has handled the visit of Vice President NIXON, nothing substantial would result from a summit meeting. Khrushchev doesn't understand that an American President isn't a dictator and can't make "deals." And the only kind of deal the Soviet Premier wants is of the appeasement and surrender variety. This he will never get as long as Dwight Eisenhower is in the White House.

NIXON SETS KHRUSHCHEV STRAIGHT—VICE PRESIDENT'S STRAIGHT TALK TERMED EFFORT TO AVERT RED MISCALCULATION

(By William S. White)

The so-called striped pants set, the old career diplomats, tend to tut-tut Vice President RICHARD NIXON's bare-knuckled politician's approach in Russia. But the truly responsible chiefs at the State Department—those who, under the President, actually run our foreign policy—are delighted by his performance in the first, or Moscow, phase of his mission.

Indeed, it can be stated responsibly, these controlling heads believe that if Mr. NIXON is able to wind up his trip without a major mistake he will have well done all he went to the Soviet Union to do.

Three circumstances have confused many estimates as to the effectiveness of the Vice President's trip. There is the quite unhidden fact of his fierce ambition. Of course, he wants to be President after 1960—as do some of his critics, too. There is the fact that, partly because of his past undoubted partisan savageries, he has enemies who will never credit him with doing anything well. And, most important of all, there is this: Some have never understood what his assignment really was and was not.

If the real purposes of his journey are understood, this much can be said with complete confidence: It is not necessary to be for Mr. Nixon for President, or to like him or approve him even in the smallest possible way, to demonstrate that the Moscow phase has gone very well.

It is complained that Mr. Nixon is "not a diplomat" and has not acted like one. This is absolutely correct—and absolutely irrelevant. It is complained that he has been "acting just like a politician." This is absolutely correct—and absolutely intentional. It is complained that he has been trading some tough and highly unreserved words with Nikita Khrushchev. That he has. But there was no mistake in this; quite the contrary.

For to trade such words with Khrushchev and other Soviet leaders was one of the two main reasons Mr. Nixon was sent to Moscow by the administration. His other main purpose was to set at rest, if he could, what our top people are willing to concede possibly were some honest misconceptions by Khrushchev about the United States.

The State Department was fed to the teeth with a series of easy world propaganda victories Khrushchev had scored in his pre-

vious conversations with unofficial envoys like former Gov. Averell Harriman, of New York, and Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota. State Department leaders had no criticism of the motives of such envoys. The Department felt, all the same, that they were not in position to do full justice to our side of the world argument.

And the Department wanted some person of great power—Mr. Nixon—not only to put our side to the world but also to warn the Russians against miscalculating our basic determination. The Vice President was briefed up to the neck by departmental experts on these points. He knew just what he was going to do and why. For example, his decision to come home by way of Poland was not sudden, though it looked to be. It was, in fact, a decision made here weeks ago.

For the bottom truth about the Nixon mission is simply this: The time had come when the cold war was too important to be left to the diplomats—as old Premier Clemenceau of France once said that war was too important to be left to the generals. The view of career diplomats and their followers to the contrary, it is politicians and not diplomats who in the end are controlling our system—and the Soviet system, too, if it comes to that. Secretary of State Herter, for example, is a politician, and a good one.

Diplomats, after all, are employees, if elevated ones. Politicians, however dreadful the word, still make the policy—and run the show. This they do because the Constitution gives them the right and because they represent the facts of life, which are the facts of power.

Certainly Mr. NIXON is running hard for President. But the very fact he might one day be President of the United States was the very ultimate reason why he was sent to Russia in the first place. This was done not to assist RICHARD NIXON but to assist the high policy of this country. If it all helps him politically, as well it might, everybody concerned will just have to live with that fact.

Shall Unions Be Free?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, example after example of misguided labor union control has come to attention of the House and Senate Subcommittees on Labor.

One example which has not been related in detail appears in the August 1959 issue of the Reader's Digest. Lester Velie tells the story of a rank-and-file member who tried to bring control of the local to the members, themselves. He was thwarted by powerful officers of the international union who were fully protected by watery labor laws.

Under leave to extend my remarks, hereafter appears "Attention, Congress. Consider the Death of Roy Underwood." This story poignantly illustrates privileged bosses usurping the rights of local members. This could not be done without the tacit approval of weakly drawn legislation which acts to nullify self-government efforts by the union membership—if the officers of the parent union want it that way:

On a windy hill outside Philadelphia early last April, an undertaker's assistant scattered the still-warm ashes of Roy Underwood. Thus ended in tragic martyrdom the life of a valiant union man who had merely dared to seek for his fellow workers a few basic civil rights. His tragedy is a scathing indictment of Congress, of the National Labor Relations Board, of the courts and of the good unions for their current apathy—for their failure to provide protection for the members of a few bad unions against repression by their leaders.

Roy Underwood was a spectacled man in his early fifties full-faced and ample of girth. Had he been a printer, or a plumber, or a member of some equally upright union, he would undoubtedly have been one of America's important union leaders, for he was a dedicated union man and the sort of man other men follow. But Roy Underwood, a crane operator, was fated to be a member of the Operating Engineers. And so he was doomed to make the most frustrating of all struggles: the fight against evil masked as unionism and defended by men commanding entrenched power.

The things which Underwood laid down his life to win were things all of us take for granted: the right to assemble and speak out freely; the right to elect those who will rule and tax us; the right to seek redress against injustice. In the debate now raging over labor reforms, his story becomes exhibit A in the case for urgent action to win for union citizens the rights they presumably enjoy as American citizens.

I first met Roy Underwood 5 years ago when I was piecing together the fantastic story of Joe Fay, the Operating Engineers vice president who had gone to jail for extortion but continued to rule his union empire from prison. Underwood was then the picture of the happy warrior. He was in a fight, and his round face exuded the confidence of the born leader. His international president, a crony of Joe Fay, had booted him out of his job as president of a local, and out of the union. The international president had then plunged the local into a species of union martial law known as supervision, and Underwood was suing in the Philadelphia Federal court to win reinstatement for himself, plus self-rule, and an election for the duespayers.

Underwood had come to Philadelphia in 1937 and into a topsy-turvy Operating Engineers world. In the local, as ruled by Fay—and as spelled out in McClellan committee testimony—wrong was right and right was wrong. It was right for business agents to extort 3-percent weekly assessments (over and above dues) from the members; it was wrong for the members to ask about this at meetings—thugs patrolled the aisles and beat them up. It was right for Fay to make soft conniving deals with employers; it was wrong for the members to have a voice in the kind of contracts they would work under. It was also wrong for them to elect their own officers, because the union had been under supervision as long as the oldest member could remember—and Fay was the supervisor.

Underwood formed a committee of liberation in 1945, and soon learned his first bitter lesson about trying to right wrongs inside a corrupt union.

He found that he must exhaust every means of obtaining justice within his own union before he could appeal to the courts. This meant that in the Operating Engineers he had to appeal to the men who were responsible for his plight. For it was with the connivance of Fay's crony, the international president, William Maloney, that Underwood's local remained under supervision. And, under the Operating Engineers' constitution, it was Maloney to whom petitions for relief had to be addressed.

When Underwood's committee of liberation tried to get members to sign petitions, Fay's toughs beat them up and tore up the petitions. When Underwood's men got the petitions signed, anyway—at clandestine night meetings in members' basements—Maloney ignored them.

After several months, Underwood and his followers obtained a lawyer and in 1947 sued for union self-rule in the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas. Miraculously, they got away with their suit—for a while. Maloney was in no position to fight, because Joe Fay, to whom he had entrusted the lives and fortunes of the 2,000-odd men in the Philadelphia local, was on his way to jail. Fay and his henchmen had kept no records of an estimated \$3 million collected in assessments and permit fees. Written contracts with employers had said one thing, but (as subsequent arbitration hearings proved) verbal agreements resulted in softer conditions. It was a system of built-in corruption in which the local's business agents got paid off for overlooking the contract.

To avoid airing this mess, Maloney settled with Underwood. The rank and filers could have their union back provided they didn't sue Fay and his buddies for the missing money. So in a court-supervised election Roy Underwood was elected president of the local. He proceeded to bring back clean unionism.

Underwood and his regime were living on borrowed time, however. President Maloney could no more permit free rule in Philadelphia than Khrushchev could permit freedom in Hungary. For Underwood's local was an island in a sea of union corruption—two of Maloney's locals in Chicago had been under union martial law for 23 years; the New Jersey local was still under the thumb of Joe Fay, although Fay was in prison; the Long Island local was run by one William DeKoning, Sr., who was soon to go to jail for extorting from his members.

Restive members of these locals might get ideas from Underwood's free union. Worse still was Underwood's threat to the rotten fabric of collusive-agreements between Operating Engineers officials and favored employers.

When Underwood tried to make one big contractor live up to the Philadelphia-area agreements, he got an angry call from Maloney. "Stay away from him (the contractor)," the International president ordered, according to McClellan committee testimony. "He is a friend of mine, and that is all I should have to tell you."

When bitter wrangles over the contracts Fay had left behind him exploded into a prolonged strike over wages and conditions, Maloney stepped in and took the union away from Underwood and the members. Underwood was tried by a union board controlled by Maloney and dependent on him for union jobs. Under provisions of the union constitution he was fined \$3500 and suspended from the union for 8 years. Union martial law returned.

What broke Roy Underwood's heart now was the system of union and legal custom which gave him and his men no forum in which they might hope to win justice. As rebels many of the Underwood men could no longer get work—jobs were largely controlled by the union hiring hall and by the "supervisor's" business agent. So, first, they complained to the NLRB. For a workingman who lives from paycheck to paycheck, however, justice that takes 2 or 3 years to get is no justice at all. And in the end only a handful could win their NLRB cases. How can you prove that a business agent has put pressure on a boss to keep you off a job? Where are you going to get the witnesses?

Underwood tried the Federal courts. Here there were 5 years of delay. His followers fell away. His wife had to go to work. The

other side had no such problems. From the parent union's \$15 million treasury, contributed by the members came ample money to hire lawyers. Against these, Underwood had but one lawyer, Abraham Freedman, who neglected his regular practice, gave his time free and even dug into his own pocket to defray occasional expenses.

Underwood's day in court crushed him. He listened as the judge praised the local that he, Underwood, had run, and excoriated the terrorists who had taken over. But the court would not interfere in a union's internal affairs, provided the union gave complaining members a fair trial. And Underwood, said the court, had had a fair trial.

Underwood didn't know whether to laugh or cry. Fair trial? Was it a fair trial when the union boss whom he fought—William Maloney, who, as Senator McClellan told his committee, had risen to power with gangster guns—had tried him with his own executive board? Was it a fair trial when the charges were that he had spread defamatory literature—the papers in his suit against Maloney? Even more, should Underwood have had to stand trial by his union at all—for going to court to prevent Maloney from intervening against his own members in a strike?

"It is crystal clear," the judge summed up, "that under the leadership of [Supervisor] Hunter P. Wharton . . . there will never be a chance for decent operation [of the Philadelphia local]." But the judge held: "The courts do not look with favor upon interference by the courts in the internal workings of any . . . labor organization." In effect, the judge ruled: There is a grievance, but I can't help you.

"When Roy came home from the court," his wife told me, "he looked like a licked man. 'All those years of fighting, and where do you wind up? I'll never believe there's justice in the courts,' he said."

Now, alone in his home, Underwood brooded. Evil seemed to be inheriting the earth—and legally.

Joe Fay, out of prison, had been rewarded by his old local with a lifetime pension of \$10,015 a year—after taxes. To give him additional cash, some locals also bought their limousines through him.

William Maloney had quit his presidency rather than face questions by the McClellan committee about the contents of 11 secret safe-deposit boxes. But no civil or criminal suits followed. Now he lived in happy retirement on his estates outside Chicago and in Florida.

Hunter P. Wharton, supervisor of Underwood's Philadelphia local, who had been excoriated in court and before the McClellan committee as a harbinger of terrorists, continued as the local's boss. More, he was elected secretary-treasurer of the parent union on a clean-up slate.

"Never fight the rackets as I did," Roy Underwood said to his 16-year-old son, Roy, Jr., on the morning of last April 3. "You can't win."

These were among the last words he uttered. When his son had left for school, and his wife for work, Roy Underwood methodically burned the bushels of papers, clippings, legal documents that had accumulated during his 14-year fight. He typed a note to his wife, and his hand shook so with exhaustion that he couldn't sign his name. Then, utterly defeated, he went into his garage and shot himself.

I went to Philadelphia after Roy Underwood's death and made my way, uninvited, into a meeting of his old local one night. Some 600 men had crowded into the basement auditorium of Philadelphia's Town Hall to hear the wages and conditions that the supervisor and his business agents, none of them elected, had accepted from the contractors.

There had still been no election, after 9 years, for on the rostrum was a chairman whom the supervisor had chosen, presumably for his leather-lunged ability to shout down the heckling from the floor. The same old crowd that had been involved in brutal beatings of Underwood's men still dominated the proceedings on the floor. All around me men grumbled to each other about the terms of the contract, hurling occasional four-letter epithets at the chairman. But when the time came to be counted, few stood up to indicate their opposition openly. The old fear of antagonizing men who hold your livelihood in their hands prevailed.

I talked to a remnant of Underwood's followers and found that the old pattern of discrimination against troublemakers was still making it difficult for them to get work. And a union member who had briefly held office as a business agent disclosed that the old system of built-in corruption in which employers paid off for relief from the hard provisions of a contract still flourished, too. When the ex-business agent, an honest man, sought to confer with a contractor about his labor needs on a new job, he found the contractor closeted with the local's acting supervisor, then under indictment for extortion, and now dead. Employer and acting supervisor worked out their own deal for conditions on the job.

"Don't stick your nose into things that aren't your affair," the ex-business agent was told by the acting supervisor.

It was as if Roy Underwood had never lived.

But can Americans let the Underwood story end this way?

"The International Union of Operating Engineers stands out as an ugly example of ruthless domination of workmen through violence, intimidation and other dictatorial practices," the McClellan committee reported a year and a half ago. The committee's declaration that "democracy within this union is nonexistent" and that "there has been extensive collusion between union officials and management" went to the AFL-CIO's ethical practices committee for investigation. The AFL-CIO has before it a report that has been gathering dust since August 1958.

It is this kind of apathy, delay and postponement that destroyed the hope, the fight and finally the life of Roy Underwood.

AFL-CIO leaders argue that no written guarantees are needed to protect the rights of the union man. His own union constitution—enforceable as a contract in court—protects him, they say. This the life and death of Roy Underwood contradicted.

A bill of rights for the union man is urgently needed. How long will Americans stand by without establishing this protection?

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Governor of Kansas Starts To Straighten State's Financial Woes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as Governor of Kansas, George Docking has welded together efficiency and economy in government. This achievement, focusing national attention on his Democratic administration, is reviewed in the August-September 1959, issue of the Eagle, official publication of the Fraternal Order of Eagles. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAN WITH A PLAN—KANSAS EAGLE GOVERNOR STARTS TO STRAIGHTEN STATE'S FINANCIAL WOES

Of the many Eagles who have occupied the chief executive's chair in our various States, Brother Eagle George Docking, Governor of Kansas, is unique. He is a Democrat in a traditionally Republican State.

How did he get there? His opponents say that he was elected because the Republican Party in Kansas was hopelessly split. His supporters, however, minimize such claims.

Regardless of the reason for his election, Governor Docking is a "different breed of cat" as far as a politico is concerned. He is a country banker with a grasp of finance which verges on the miraculous.

The Docking administration inherited a precarious financial situation from previous State administrations. The obvious way out of the State's financial straits was to increase the 2 percent sales tax to 3 percent. This Docking refused to do.

In Docking's solution to the State's fiscal problems lies the key to his continued popularity. Campaigning on businesslike government, the Kansas Governor is applying to the affairs of Government the same principles which made his bank successful. An austere, but efficient operation of all departments in government is the Docking approach. All of the Docking appointments have been made on the basis of individual record rather than political rank. "One good man on the job is better than two mediocre ones anytime," says the Governor.

Docking is a firm believer in the people's right to know what is going on in government. As his first act in office, Docking opened the doors of his suite to all who wish to see him there.

Governor Docking and his wife, Virginia, have two sons: Robert, who is a banker, and Richard, just starting in law practice.

A strong-minded man Docking is a believer in the strength of family ties and is respectful of the idea advanced by his wife and sons.

He's a new thing in Kansas, this banker-governor, and his approach is giving the political pros of both parties something of

a shock, but in the opinion of the citizens of Kansas, his mark will be imprinted in its future.

Alaska and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and as a followup on my remarks of yesterday on the subject of the vulnerability of our national defense because of inadequacy of missile installations in Alaska, I include a timely article from the Fairbanks News-Miner of July 31, 1959, featuring the strong reaction of Senator E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, who was for 14 years seated in this Congress as Delegate from Alaska. The situation is very serious from a national standpoint and must be given vigorous consideration and corrective action:

SENATOR BARTLETT PLANS WARNING TO NATION ON ALASKA DEFENSE

Alaska's Senator E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT said yesterday he plans to go back to Congress and sound a warning to America that Alaska has "a paper defense" which is threatening the security of the entire Nation.

Speaking to officials of 15 airlines at a meeting here of the Association of Local Transport Airlines, BARTLETT echoed an earlier warning issued by Lt. Gen. Frank A. Armstrong in Anchorage on Wednesday. He later reiterated his views over station KTVP.

In a dramatic departure from his prepared speech on Alaska aviation, Senator BARTLETT declared he was going to find out what has happened to those back in the Pentagon charged with providing defense not only for Alaska but for the entire Nation.

SENATOR SHOCKED

"It was shocking to learn that Alaska has what amounts to no defense at all after we have spent millions of dollars maintaining what we believed to be a reasonably adequate defense," BARTLETT told the airlines officials. "It's enough to frighten anybody."

BARTLETT referred repeatedly to General Armstrong's speech on Alaska's military capabilities.

He restated a number of times that he was shocked to learn of this weakness, and praised General Armstrong "for having the courage to tell the Nation about it."

"I cannot help feeling deep concern on being told the Russians could immobilize what we have here and lay waste to all the cities of the west coast. I had no notion at all that we had a paper defense in Alaska rather than an actual one."

FELT DEEP CONCERN

BARTLETT said Alaska ought to have one of the strongest defenses in the Nation.

He declared: "I intend to return to Congress and bring the attention of the entire Nation to this alarming situation from the floor of the U.S. Senate."

He pledged he would continue to work with vigor and determination for the establishment of the kind of defense Alaska and the Nation must have.

BARTLETT referred to an article by Gen. Billy Mitchell in the November, 1927, issue of the magazine Aeronautics in which Mitchell assigns a strategic and vital role to Alaska in continental air defense.

"Billy Mitchell's words become more meaningful than ever when placed in context against General Armstrong's remarks on Wednesday," the Senator said.

TELLS OF THREAT

Armstrong told the ALTA audience in Anchorage that two enemy bombers could put Alaskan bases out of commission and leave both Alaska and the west coast defenseless.

"With Russians in the Fairbanks and Anchorage areas, President Eisenhower would have to decide quickly whether to bomb Alaska to save Chicago or leave the country wide open to close-range attack," General Armstrong said.

To expand on remarks made yesterday afternoon at the airlines meeting, Senator BARTLETT appeared before a television camera last night.

He referred again to Alaska's strategic geographical position and to the warnings issued by General Armstrong.

RESTATES WARNINGS

"If the commanding general of the Alaska Command tells us that across the way there are 26 Red bases and we can knock out only eight of them, and that there should be installed in Alaska intermediate-range ballistic missiles, then we had better believe him," BARTLETT said.

He praised once more General Armstrong's willingness to bring the matter out into the open.

"I am glad General Armstrong spoke as he did," said BARTLETT. "This was in his heart. It was not easy, I suspect, for a man in uniform weighted with such tremendous responsibility to open his heart on such a matter. My feeling is that in doing so, General Armstrong performed a vital service to our country."

DRAMATIC MOMENT

BARTLETT referred to Armstrong's comments before the ALTA group in Anchorage, at which BARTLETT was present, as "one of the most dramatic situations in my life."

As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, BARTLETT was critical of the fact that the matter of Alaska defenses had not been brought before the committee.

A Job Diplomats Couldn't Do

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I never read an editorial with which I more wholeheartedly agreed than one appearing in the Bismarck Tribune, published at Bismarck, N. Dak.,

datelined July 31, 1959, and entitled "A Job Diplomats Couldn't Do."

Vice President Nixon made a most commendable contribution to world peace on his recent trip to Russia and Poland. He possesses the warm and friendly attitude of the average American citizen. Far too often career diplomats of the United States and many other great powers lack this down-to-earth approach.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A JOB DIPLOMATS COULDN'T DO

People in North Dakota like those elsewhere throughout the country have followed with great interest the course of Vice President Nixon's trip through the Soviet Union, some applauding his performance and some criticizing it.

Nixon has encountered some critical questioning from Russians but he also has been loudly cheered by the Russians, and the chances are that Soviet-American understanding will have been advanced as a result of his visit.

If history proves this to be the case, then it will also write it into the record that the cause of world peace was well served by his going to Russia.

There comes a time when it is necessary to remove the kid gloves to be understood by someone who has never learned the kid-glove soft talk of diplomacy. Khrushchev is certainly not a soft talker. Nixon is the first American to really speak to him in the blunt language he can appreciate.

William S. White, a New York Times expert on foreign affairs, discussed this in a recent column.

"The complaint has been made that Nixon is 'not a diplomat' and has not acted like one. This is absolutely correct—and absolutely irrelevant. The complaint has been made that he has been 'acting just like a politician.' This is absolutely correct—and absolutely intentional.

"To trade (some tough and highly unreserved) words with Khrushchev was one of the two main reasons Nixon was sent to Moscow by the administration. His other main purpose was to set at rest, if he could, what our top people are willing to concede were some honest misconceptions by Khrushchev about the United States."

White declares that the bottom truth of the Nixon visit was simply that the time had come when the cold war was too important to be left to the diplomats. He explains:

"The views of career diplomats and their followers to the contrary, it is 'politicians' and not diplomats who in the end control our system—and the Soviet system too. Diplomats, after all, are employees, if elevated ones. Politicians, however dreadful the word, still make policy—and run the show. Certainly Nixon is running hard for President. But the very fact he might one day be President of the United States was the very ultimate reason why he was sent to Russia in the first place."

Nixon obviously was carefully briefed before the trip. He knows what American policy is and he knew how to talk to Khrushchev. It must have been something of a shock for that individual, not accustomed to being talked back to, when Nixon gave him back as much as he handed out.

The purpose of diplomacy is to protect and advance, in peace, a country's interests. The only alternative to living in peace with Russia is war with Russia. We know of no one who is advocating total war, as war

with Russia would be. Nixon's Russian visit seems so far to have served the purposes of diplomacy better than they could have been served by any employee diplomat. It appears obvious also that a summit meeting between Khrushchev and President Eisenhower is almost inevitable. It is only to be hoped that such a meeting will come off as well as the Nixon Russian tour.

Observance of Swiss Independence Day by the Swiss Rifle Club, Altoona, Pa., August 2, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, among the many observances in the United States of the 668th anniversary of Swiss Independence Day none was more colorful and interesting than the program conducted by the Swiss Rifle Club, Altoona, Pa., August 2, 1959.

It was my privilege to deliver the principal address to the several hundred American citizens of Swiss descent who were present for the enjoyable occasion.

My address follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, FOR THE CELEBRATION OF SWISS INDEPENDENCE DAY BY THE SWISS RIFLE CLUB, ALTOONA, PA., AUGUST 2, 1959

For 668 years, August 1 has been a great day for the Swiss.

Today, we celebrate Swiss Independence Day—the anniversary of the founding of the Swiss Everlasting League for Common Defense.

On August 1, 1291, the first milestone was passed in the evolution of the modern federation of Swiss cantons.

Today in the United States, several hundred thousand Americans of Swiss origin rightfully look with pride on the achievements of their forebears almost 700 years ago.

Throughout the United States, Americans of Swiss descent have formed over 300 organizations.

Thus a widespread celebration of this great holiday throughout the United States is assured.

These organizations—such as the Swiss Rifle Club of Altoona—make invaluable contributions to the civic, cultural, social, and recreational life of their communities.

They are a splendid example of the unique capacity of the Swiss to "live the good life," in harmony with one another and with their neighbors.

On August 1, 1291, the Everlasting League was formed as a measure of self-defense against all who might attack them.

This league was the foundation of the modern Swiss Federation.

From the very beginning, the Swiss Confederates showed a willingness to fight for independence from foreign domination.

In 1313, a valiant band of Swiss Confederates completely defeated a brilliant Austrian army on the precarious slopes of Morgarten.

Two years later, representatives of the victorious Swiss Highlanders met at Lake Lucerne to reaffirm the everlasting league and to strengthen the unity of the confederation.

The league won great renown for its victory at Morgarten over the Hapsburg oppressors.

As years passed, other members were admitted to the original alliance of the three cantons.

First came Lucerne.

The ancient town of Zurich followed, after receiving aid from the four confederated cantons against the threat of an attack from Austria.

Glarus and Zug were admitted in 1352, and the next year, the famous town of Berne entered the confederation.

Thus by the end of the 14th century, the threats of invasion and foreign rule and the glories of Morgarten had impelled eight Swiss communities to join hands in collective self-defense.

While preserving their territorial integrity and independence by joint action for common defense, the Swiss confederation continued to expand.

By 1315 the confederation of Swiss States had grown into an organization of 22 cantons.

1848, when the cantons united into a federal state, was a memorable year in Swiss history.

The Constitution of 1848 added strength to the union by increasing the authority of the central government over national defense, foreign relations, internal security, customs, the postal service, and the promotion of the common welfare.

A national government with a cabinet, a federal supreme court, and a legislature was established.

Each canton retained its own legislature, executive, and judiciary for local affairs.

Thus from the formation of the everlasting league on August 1, 1291—which we are celebrating today—the Swiss people have developed into one of the world's most stable and successful governments.

America promised broader opportunities than many of the most ambitious, adventurous, and gifted sons and daughters of Switzerland could find in the crowded, narrow valleys of their Alpine homeland.

Consequently, for nearly 350 years, a small but steady stream of immigrants from Switzerland has contributed immeasurably to the development of our own Republic.

As early as the 17th century, Swiss settlers immigrated to Colonial America.

Many of these early Swiss colonists came from communities where they were not permitted to practice their religious convictions.

The Swiss Mennonites were among these victims of religious persecution.

Large numbers of Mennonites made the decision to join in the movement that resulted in the settlement in Lancaster County.

During the 18th century, religious persecution abroad and more promising economic opportunities in the New World motivated about 25,000 Swiss people to begin a new life in the American colonies.

The Swiss settlers were warmly welcomed by the New World.

From the beginning of colonization in North America, Swiss were eagerly sought as settlers because of their mountain-bred hardihood and their rare combination of agricultural and industrial skills.

For example, Swiss craftsmen were imported to provide technical assistance to the colonists in the art of woodworking and silk production, and Swiss families were brought to America because of their expert ability in raising grapes and producing wine.

The Swiss colonists, inspired by their 500 year tradition of liberty and self-government in Switzerland, made an important contribution to the movement for American independence.

Freedom-loving colonists of Swiss origin were among the earliest and strongest supporters of the Revolutionary War.

The Reverend John Zubly of Georgia was a delegate to the Continental Congress.

Judge Emanuel Zimmerman of Pennsylvania and Henry Wisner of New York rallied support for the revolution by their valuable service on the committees of safety in their respective States.

Wisner was one of the most farsighted leaders of the Revolution.

When the British embargoed the importation of ammunition into the colonies in 1774, Wisner—anticipating the inevitable outbreak of active warfare—boldly established a gunpowder mill in his home in New York State.

Elected to both the First and Second Continental Congresses, Wisner worked unceasingly for the adoption of the Declaration of Independence.

After the outbreak of the Revolution, Wisner built two more ammunition plants, and then, as a colonel in George Washington's army, he helped plan the defense of West Point and the Hudson Highlands.

Throughout the Revolutionary War, the Continental Army was supplied with shot and cannonballs from the iron works of John Jacob Friesch, a Swiss immigrant and a friend of Washington.

A Swiss gunsmith, Martin Meylin, erected the first boring mill in America—near Lancaster, Pa.—and trained other craftsmen in the making of rifles.

Meylin's long-ranged rifles were so effective against the Redcoats that the British Parliament hastily investigated what it called "these strange arms used with such deadly certainty by American regiments."

Many Swiss-Americans laid down their plows and tools of trade, picked up their rifles, and marched off to war in answer to the Continental Congress's call for volunteers in 1776.

Pennsylvania was asked to contribute six companies of sharpshooters, but so many volunteers stepped forward—especially from the frontier counties where hardy Swiss settlers were concentrated—that an entire battalion was formed.

In addition, many Swiss settlers fought in all the German-speaking units from Pennsylvania.

In addition, a Swiss fur trader, Charles Gratiot, sacrificed his personal fortune to provide supplies for the starving forces of George Rogers Clark during the perilous campaigns in the Northwest Territory.

These and other Swiss patriots of the American Revolution—like Emanuel Carpenter and George Zillcoffer—wrote their distinguished records into the glorious pages of U.S. history.

Swiss-Americans have been active in politics, too.

One of the United States' greatest political leaders was Albert Gallatin, who left his classes in Geneva to enlist as a volunteer under Lafayette.

After the war, Gallatin became a teacher at Harvard and then moved to the Pennsylvania frontier where he surveyed land, built a gun factory and a glass works, and became a naturalized citizen of the United States.

Soon Gallatin was elected to the Pennsylvania Legislature and then to Congress.

In Washington, he distinguished himself as a dynamic political leader.

For 13 years, he served as Secretary of the Treasury.

During this term, the public debt was cut in half and the internal revenue taxes were abolished.

Later, Gallatin was one of the negotiators of the treaty which terminated the War of 1812.

Afterward he served 8 years as our Minister, first, to Great Britain and, then, to France.

This durable Swiss-American lived to the ripe old age of 88.

After his retirement from active politics at age 68, Gallatin became one of the leading American historical scholars of his time.

Following in Gallatin's footsteps, many other Americans of Swiss origin have achieved fame in public life.

Swiss-Americans have served as Attorney General, Senators, U.S. Representatives, State Governor, Supreme Court Justice, and in many other important capacities.

Former President Herbert Hoover traces his ancestry back to Swiss descendants who emigrated to Pennsylvania in 1738.

Furthermore, a large number of Swiss-Americans have risen to high posts in our Armed Forces, including Adm. Edward Eberle, the World War I Chief of Naval Operations, who exploded the old joke about "Swiss admirals."

Both Gen. Robert Elcheberger, former Army Chief of Staff, and Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, are descended from early Swiss emigrants to Pennsylvania.

The resourceful Swiss farmers have made amazing accomplishments in tilling the soil of America.

In Switzerland, farmers were able to prosper on the sharply sloping and rocky fields only because of their ingenuity in developing new crops, better cattle feed, and improved methods of fertilization.

Therefore, when they came to America, the Swiss brought along with them not only their rugged tenacity and their love for the earth, but also their openminded willingness to experiment.

In South Carolina, for example, Swiss farmers converted the coastal swampland into flourishing and productive fields of rice.

In the Napa Valley of California, Swiss vine dressers made a highly successful experiment in grafting the choicest varieties of European grapes onto native American root stocks and thus succeeded in establishing large vineyards for the production of wines.

For over 100 years, Swiss families, such as the Delmonicos, have propagated the cult of fine cooking all over America.

Americans of Swiss ancestry have played major roles in the development of the chemical, textile, electrical, and automotive industries in the United States.

Many of our leading scientists, engineers, and doctors of medicine were born or educated in one of the several great universities in Switzerland.

Among the first Swiss settlers in Pennsylvania were a few skilled clock and watch-makers.

Many other practitioners of the trade followed these initial craftsmen.

Today, scattered all over America, the descendants of these superb technicians occupy major positions wherever fine watches or other precision instruments are manufactured.

How can one explain the vast current of contributions that have been made to the edification of America by so small a stream of immigration as that which has flowed from Switzerland?

Undoubtedly, individual talents and a high level of education were important.

Of far greater significance is the fact that the Swiss in the United States have come from a country where for many centuries the members of four language groups and several religious faiths have lived together in peace, harmony, and brotherhood.

In America, they encountered no problem of assimilation which they had not already met and overcome in their homeland.

Thus, to become Americans, the Swiss had merely to be themselves.

Wisconsin Museum Dedicated to the American Circus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, with everybody discussing the political implications of Nixon's visit to Russia and Khrushchev's future visit to this country—I should like to discuss a subject of much less complexity and controversy, but one that is nevertheless representative of the American tradition and way of life.

A news story from Baraboo, Wis., informs us that a new museum created to capture and preserve the color, sounds, atmosphere, and tradition of the golden age of the big top, the American circus, is off to a tremendous start. Within a few weeks of its opening, this museum has drawn more than 50,000 visitors and—as Austin Wehrwein comments in the New York Times of Sunday, August 2—an oldtime circus press agent would call that gigantic, adding perhaps, that it was a spectacle never before brought before the eyes of civilized man.

Circuses have been an important institution in American life. They brought before the people, at times in a rather garish fashion, the spectacular, the unusual, the picture of a world unknown and one to be searched for. Baraboo, Wis., was a center for many circus enterprises and more than 70 circuses sprouted and bloomed on Wisconsin soil, according to the State historical society library in Madison. The backyard of the jail at Baraboo was the site of the first Ringling Bros. show that was to grow into the greatest show on earth.

There has been a decline in the big-top shows in recent years. Many explanations have been given for this decline. Some say this was a result of the intense cutthroat competition of the many shows and their failure to organize along the lines of chain theaters. I believe that the reason may be different. I believe that the circus now-a-days has too much competition from other sources and it is quite possible that the development of science now offers our youngsters a better opportunity to dream, think, and do something about the far world of the unknown. Now it is television and science fiction that are competing for the imagination of the American youth. But what the museum at Baraboo, Wis., will manage to do is to preserve the folklore and the excitement of the circus of yesteryear.

To all our friends that have not yet visited Wisconsin this summer, I recommend that they include a trip to Baraboo in their tour of the State. According to all accounts this museum is a most unusual one, and it is probably the only bona fide educational museum in the world that sells popcorn, pink

lemonade, and welcomes their consumption on the premises.

Baraboo, if you need instructions, is in central Wisconsin about 40 miles north of Madison, between Devils Lake State Park and the Wisconsin Dells.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 2, 1959]
WISCONSIN MUSEUM DEDICATED TO THE BIG TOP

(By Austin Wehrwein)

BARABOO, Wis.—A new museum created to capture and preserve the color, sounds, atmosphere, and tradition of the golden age of the big-top American circus is off to a good start.

Within a few weeks of its July 1 opening, it had drawn more than 50,000 customers. An oldtime circus press agent would call that gigantic, adding, perhaps, that it was a spectacle never before brought before the eyes of civilized man.

It is the Circus World Museum set up here in the former winter quarters of the Ringling Bros. Circus on Water Street next to the Baraboo River.

The old quarters have been refurbished to house exhibits, but for those nostalgic for the smell, there is an adjacent menagerie tent with real, live animals, including a resident pachyderm on whose back children are given rides.

This is probably the only bona fide, educational museum in the world that sells popcorn and pink lemonade, and welcomes consumption on the premises.

The museum is dedicated to the breathtaking, stupendous, colossal spirit of all the big-top shows but it has revived memories of the days when this small town of 7,500 population was the center of the American circus world.

CIRCUS LAWYER

President of the not-for-profit corporation that established "the only museum in the world built in circus winter quarters" is John M. Kelly. Mr. Kelly was for 31 years the lawyer for the Ringling Bros. and for scores of other circus folk.

At 86 years of age he is alert, vigorous and still so much in love with the almost-vanished tradition, that when he reminisces his voice has the timber of a ringmaster or a side-show barker.

Actual administration of the museum is handled by the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, but Mr. Kelly's many contributions include the wording of the explanatory plaques on the exhibits.

Not many museums can boast display cards as colorful. His written style is as vivid as that with which he speaks, and some of Mr. Kelly's explanations are almost racy in their humor.

The usually staid researchers at the State historical society library in Madison, who discovered that more than 70 circuses sprouted and blossomed on Wisconsin soil, have caught the rhythm, too.

One of their documents described the exhibits as showing "all the color and panoply of the big top . . . all aspects . . . from animal acts to the clowns, the aerialists, the trapezes, the wonderful old parades."

Among the exhibits on view is the 18-ton steam callopie, the America. One of the few surviving "cal-eee-opes," as circus regulars pronounce the word, it began its career with the Barnum & Bailey circus, passed through several hands and was sold in 1952 by the Cole Bros. circus to the Cleaver-Brooks Co. of Milwaukee.

Appropriately enough, Cleaver-Brooks makes steam-generating equipment. The company restored the America to full-throat and donated it to the Baraboo Museum.

Also on hand is the Parson collection of circus materials; the Henry Atwell collection of 5,000 negatives taken by the official Ringling photographer over a 40-year span; and the Gollmar collection of photographs, route cards and books, tickets and programs.

There are the nursery tale floats built for Barnum and London, forerunner of Barnum and Bailey, in 1832.

Exhibits from the Chindahl collection of photographs, books and manuscripts are also on display. They were collected by the late George L. Chindahl of Maitland, Fla., who had been official historian of the Circus Fans Association of America.

TWO BANDWAGONS

Two of the larger exhibits are the Mirror and Columbia bandwagons. The Mirror was built here for the Gollmar Bros. Circus about 1905.

The astonished and bedazzled beholder can also see such things as a parade cannon and chariot, numerous costumes, early refreshment and cook tents, an ancient restored lion's cage and props for performing elephants. Another sterling attraction is the miniature circus that John E. Zweifel of Evanston, Ill., spent 16 years creating. With its 1,500 handmade figures and items of equipment, it almost fills a building adjacent to the main structure.

As the visitor approaches, he can hear strains of the vibrant old circus band music, on records, and he buys his ticket from a high ticket booth flanked by garishly painted canvases like those used for sideshows.

Mr. Kelley has rooms in his home piled high with other memorabilia. Other precious items are stored in bank vaults and warehouses. He dreams of the day when additional buildings on Water Street can be found to display the material, much of it sent to him by his old pals or the children of now-dead circus folk.

He can remember how in the days when the circus wintered here, Baraboo housewives out shopping rubbed elbows with snake charmers, sword swallowers, giants, midgets, and an acrobat from Arabia.

"I am," he said, "the only person alive in the circus world conversant with the inner life of the American circus in its prime. I saw it come to the peak of its development and I saw it decline."

Mr. Kelley ascribed the decline of the big-top shows to their intense cutthroat competition and their failure to organize along the lines of chain theaters. He thinks they missed a bet in failing to acquire permanent sites in choice locations to which they could return year after year.

The backyard of the jail at Baraboo was the site of the first Ringling Bros. show that was to grow into "the greatest show on earth," and to require a 10-acre lot to accommodate its rings.

The date of the first show was 1884, and Baraboo was the winter headquarters until the spring of 1918. The next year the show was combined with Barnum and Bailey, and the combined shows wintered in Bridgeport, Conn. In 1927 the winter quarters were moved to Sarasota, Fla.

The moving spirit in the Ringling team was Al Ringling, who picked up circus skills from one Joe Parsons, including the trick of balancing a plow on his chin. The family had various theatrical talents besides plow balancing, and before they organized their circus they gave hall shows, playing musical instruments, telling jokes and carrying on in other entertaining ways.

CIRCUS FAMILY TREE

The Ringling brothers' sister, Ida, married a railroad engineer named Henry North

and their son, John Ringling North, now heads America's largest circus. The original five, Al, Otto, Alf T., Charles, and John, was later joined by brother Henry, and for a while, by brother Gus.

Another tangible reminder of the family here is the Al Ringling Theater, which repeatedly has been praised as one of the finest in the country.

The Circus World Museum is open every day until October 31.

Baraboo is in central Wisconsin about 40 miles north of Madison, between Devil's Lake State park and the Wisconsin Dells, both well-known tourist attractions. Baraboo is easily accessible from Madison by way of U.S. 12 and State Route 113 out of Madison.

Distressed Areas Bill Deserves Better Fate From President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Harrisburg (Pa.) Evening News of Thursday, July 30, 1959, concerning the need for Federal assistance to the many distressed areas throughout the country:

President Eisenhower's fellow Pennsylvanians cannot share in his joy over the unbroken string of vetoes he boasts.

One of them—last September's pocket veto of the aid to depressed areas legislation—still rankles in the Keystone State, which continues to have more chronically depressed areas than any other State.

Gov. David L. Lawrence just has returned from a flying visit to Washington during which he tried to rally the Pennsylvania congressional delegation to virtually unanimous bipartisan support of new depressed area legislation now bottled up in the House Rules Committee. And he paid a visit to House Speaker SAM RAYBURN to try to ease the way for the bill's consideration.

It's a familiar role for a Pennsylvania Governor. George Leader fought hard for the compromise \$275 million bill that finally passed last year, only to have the Ike veto kill it. And it's a role that merits full cooperation by Pennsylvania Republicans in Congress.

Pennsylvania hasn't sat on its hands through the years doing nothing about its depressed area problem. Local efforts have been considerable. And the Commonwealth's PIDA program to bring more industry into the hard-hit areas of the State has begun to pay off. But even this hasn't been enough. An extra push is needed by the Federal Government to really get those areas started on the way back to economic health.

The Eisenhower administration can point to general economic recovery if it wishes, but the good news never can apply to the depressed areas of Pennsylvania where unemployment constantly remains over the distressed limit set by the Government.

"Giveaway" is a word that doesn't apply to this legislation either. The vast bulk of the funds involved would be in revolving loans. There would be some grants for needed public facilities.

The Senate faced three bills when it took up the subject this year:

The administration's \$53 million bill, which hardly would take adequate care of Pennsylvania's needs alone.

A full measure \$389.5 million bill, sponsored by Illinois Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS and 38 other Senators.

A compromise \$200 million bill, sponsored by Pennsylvania's Republican Senator HUGH SCOTT, who had criticized Ike's veto but wanted to come up with legislation that might sidestep further Presidential disapproval.

In March, the Senate approved the Douglas bill. On May 14, a House committee trimmed the figure to \$251 million. It remains stymied in the Rules Committee.

There is every hope that the Governor's trip and the Pennsylvania delegation's pressure will break the logjam and aid to depressed areas will pass once more.

Another veto by the President is a possibility.

But President Eisenhower must realize by now that his \$53 million program would be hopelessly inadequate, that Federal aid to be matched by States and localities is needed to give these distressed areas an economic lift and that his veto can't help but rebound against such administration programs as foreign aid.

The domestic aid program for which Pennsylvanians are fighting again is too important to be killed by the House or by another ill-advised Presidential veto this year.

Power Supply Assurance for State of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the system of Federal dams in the Columbia River Basin provides a vast supply of energy for the Pacific Northwest States. This electricity is marketed at wholesale by the Bonneville Power Administration to industry and to private and public-owned electric utilities. In dividing up the supply of power, the public-owned utilities enjoy the benefits of the clause in the Bonneville Project Act which gives them a preferred position over other wholesale customers.

It so happens that power users in my home State of Oregon are supplied largely by privately owned companies. Legislation which I have introduced in the Senate, S. 2437, seeks to reserve one-half of the power from the great John Day Dam, now under construction on the Columbia River to each of the States of Oregon and Washington. This is a measure to give a minimum assurance to our Oregon people that they will continue to share in the power created by Federal dams in our own region.

A thoughtful editorial on this subject was published in the Oregon Journal, Portland, Oreg., of July 29, 1959, and I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

JOHN DAY POWER RESERVATION

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER's proposal for a reservation of John Day Dam at-site power, divided between Oregon and Washington, did not become full blown overnight.

For a long time he has been deeply concerned over the impact on Oregon of the Bonneville Act's preference clause, giving priority claim on Federal power to public agencies. He has shared the anxiety of others that some day this will mean a siphoning away of all Federal power from this State because its distribution here is largely through private utilities.

He has never budged an inch from his belief in public power, but he has said publicly that "the residents of communities that decline to establish public utility systems should not by that fact alone be wholly foreclosed from sharing in the benefits of a regionwide power system developed with the resources and funds of all the citizens."

Early in 1958 he introduced legislation which would have modified the preference clause, giving certain priorities to industry. A year ago, he called attention to the power reservation as applied to the yet-to-be-constructed Big Bend Dam on the Missouri River between South Dakota and Nebraska, which would assure 50 percent of the output to South Dakota. In that State, as in Oregon, power is largely distributed by private utilities. Nebraska, like Washington, distributes most of its power through public agencies. In his proposed Columbia Valley corporation bill, NEUBERGER has also sought modification of the preference clause.

The Senator's latest proposal, which is without reference to the valley corporation bill, has ample precedent, as he pointed out in his Senate speech. The proposed high Hells Canyon bill would have reserved 500,000 kilowatts of that dam's 800,000 at-site kilowatts to Idaho and the Snake River Basin. At-site power from Hungry Horse Dam has been reserved for Montana. A bill proposing the Knowles-Paradise project in Montana would do the same.

While Washington does not need the protection that Oregon does in this matter, it is included as an equal beneficiary in NEUBERGER's proposal to satisfy the theory of distribution based on geographical location. This was done at least partly on the advice of Dr. William Pearl, Bonneville administrator.

This approach should not be carried to extremes, nor will it be. It cannot be made retroactive to existing projects where power reservations do not now apply. But the John Day Reservation offers a minimum protection which is amply justified on the basis of the realities of the situation and precedent.

Secretary Benson's Reply to Letter From Howard Hill, of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on July 28, I caused to be placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the text of a letter which Howard Hill, of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation, wrote to Secretary of Agricul-

ture Benson, expressing his views with respect to the current farm program and what could be done to improve it.

This letter appears on pages A6522-A6523 of the July 28 RECORD. It outlines several areas where the program could be modified to bring about a more realistic approach to the farm problem in the light of today's national economy. It is worthy of attention.

Equally worthy of attention is the reply which Secretary Benson sent to Mr. Hill. Because I feel that the extension of Mr. Hill's letter in the Appendix justifies a similar courtesy to Secretary Benson, I have asked for, and have been granted, permission to publish it as I see fit. Accordingly, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that Mr. Benson's reply to Mr. Hill appear in the Appendix.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
WASHINGTON, July 24, 1959.

Mr. E. HOWARD HILL,
President, Iowa Farm Bureau Federation,
Farm Bureau Building, Des Moines, Iowa.

DEAR MR. HILL: May I express my sincere appreciation to you for taking the time to write me regarding the problems of agriculture. The views of a farm leader such as you, who understands the problems of agriculture and its relation to other segments of this Nation are most welcome.

In speeches, in testimony before congressional committees, and in press conferences I have tried in every way possible to point out many of the very same points which you feel should be called to the attention of the public. In some instances the publicity media have misused the implications of the facts we have been trying to present to the American people.

I believe that there are certain fundamental factors which all citizens should recognize:

- (1) Farmers have done a magnificent job—outstripping industry in productivity.
- (2) The American standard of living would have been at a much lower level in the absence of the high production levels generated by farmer efficiency.
- (3) This increase in efficiency has enabled the rest of our society to eat better at lower costs.

(4) The farmers relative position in our society has been definitely injured by the impact of inflation. Both the cost-price squeeze and the increase in marketing margins are real and disturb me greatly. We cannot play fast and loose with the Federal budget without ultimately impairing the position of agriculture. We cannot have soft wage settlements and undue price rises without impairing the position of agriculture. Those who have posed as friends of agriculture while at the same time recommending policies which result in more creeping inflation are the enemies to agriculture. Those who say "a little inflation is inevitable, relax and enjoy it" are doing a tremendous disservice to our farm people.

Your letter makes several suggestions. I have examined these suggestions carefully. In reply, I should like to make the following comments.

The conservation reserve program has proved to be an effective attack on the source of the surplus problem. Under this program substantial amounts of farmland have been shifted out of production for periods of 3 to 10 years or more. This has led in many instances to a permanent shift of such land to uses for which it is better adapted. It achieves this adjustment without subjecting our farm people to further regimentation and without the necessity of

the Government having to take ownership of the farmland.

Experience under the conservation reserve program has shown that in many instances the program has resulted in speeding up some trends generally recognized as being desirable. This includes such trends as reforestation over wide areas of deteriorated lands, particularly in the Southeast, and expansion of allied industries. Another example is the nearly 5 million acres of Great Plains land that have been included in the conservation reserve program. Nearly all of that acreage has been planted to grass to the longtime benefit of the Great Plains area.

Up to this time 23 million cropland acres have been signed up in the conservation reserve. Much, if not most, of this land is of average or better productivity and has been retired at least temporarily from adding to our surplus problems and at lower cost than disposing of surpluses.

We have recommended that the conservation reserve authority should be extended.

But there is no point in pushing disposal programs and the conservation reserve on the one hand unless we tie it all in with realistic price support action on the other.

With respect to the utilization of surplus agricultural commodities, we have taken many steps to increase the effectiveness of utilization of our surpluses. As you know, we are moving forward steadily to implement the President's food for peace program.

In an effort to improve the position of agriculture we have recommended the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, Public Law 480. We feel that this program has been of great assistance in keeping agricultural exports at a high level. We have recommended an extension and will continue to do so as long as it is necessary.

We have held meetings with the principal wheat exporting countries to review operations under existing programs and to explore additional methods whereby agricultural abundance can be used constructively in the free world.

Expansion of exports of U.S. farm products is difficult. Although it may be uneconomic, many countries try to be as self-sufficient as possible in agriculture. To achieve protection they impose substantial import duties and other barriers to increased trade in farm commodities.

We have had some problems with respect to our efforts to increase exports under special Government programs. Most countries, even those lesser developed, take into account their own production while seeking assistance under concessional Government programs. On a total basis, for example, world production of wheat, rice and feed grains in 1953 reached an alltime high. Wheat production in 1953 is estimated at nearly 9 billion bushels, 12 percent above the 1956 record crop and 25 percent above the 5-year average for 1950-54. Obviously there is a relationship between world production of food and feed crops and the quantities of these commodities which we might program under title I and other programs.

Our best opportunities to increase food and fiber consumption and to export food for economic development purposes are in the less-developed countries. These countries, however, often have limited port, transportation, and storage facilities which place a physical restriction on their capacity to import commodities. I have not intended to belabor the problems encountered in maximizing U.S. agricultural exports. But in seeking ways to use our surpluses we must be realistic. We must recognize some of the limitations involved. However, we shall continue to do everything sound and feasible to maximize our exports.

In addition we have in operation a very substantial food donation program, both at home and abroad.

Over the past 7 years we have moved a total of 12 billion pounds of food out of CCC warehouses and onto the plates of schoolchildren and the needy, at home and abroad. In just this past year, over 14 million of our schoolchildren used this food. Almost one and a half million in the Nation's charitable institutions and millions of needy individuals in families have benefited from our donation programs.

We are reaching the areas of greatest need. Of 74 major labor market areas classified as "areas of substantial labor surplus" in March of this year, our donation program was operating in 72. The commodity donation program also reached a large number of distressed rural areas not officially designated as labor surplus areas. In many counties we have, month in and month out, been supplying food to better than 25 percent of the total population resident in those counties. In a few counties of severe economic distress, we have been supplying food to more than 40 percent of the county population.

I want to emphasize that participation in the domestic donation program is entirely at the option of State and local officials.

After requirements of domestic recipients have been met, the Department has exerted every effort to move available surplus foods to the needy abroad. In the past fiscal year, an estimated 60 million people in 85 countries benefited from these surplus foods.

This has been a striking record of achievement, at home and abroad. But, we are asked, why don't you do more? I would like to make the answer crystal clear.

The Commodity Credit Corporation is not a supermarket bulging with a fabulous variety of foods. I have seen articles and speeches citing the fruits and vegetables, the meats and fresh eggs we presumably have on hand. You know and I know that we have none of these items in our inventory.

Better than 85 percent of our inventory consists of the so-called basics, corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco. We are processing and distributing corn, wheat, and rice—every pound that any accredited agency anywhere in the United States says it can use for needy people without waste.

We are similarly distributing dry milk. Likewise, we have distributed butter and cheese until it became necessary to reserve remaining supplies for schools and charitable institutions. And, when it became apparent that eggs faced extreme marketing difficulties, we used section 32 funds to process eggs and distribute them in dried form.

We believe we are doing everything feasible in the field of utilization of available surplus foods in the most constructive manner possible to help those in greatest need.

We agree with you that utilization research to find industrial uses for farm products should be expanded. There have been many recommendations for crash programs which in some cases involve setting up a new agency. This would mean competing for available scientists who it is generally recognized are in relatively short supply.

During the past 6 years the budget for agricultural research has more than doubled. This is concrete evidence of our interest, and that of the Congress, in an adequate, balanced, sound research program. It is rather significant that last year our appropriation was cut below our request for utilization research. You may rest assured that such a program will have our continuing and vigorous attention with emphasis on utilization and market expansion.

With respect to the study requested regarding the European Common Market I have asked the Foreign Agricultural Service to analyze the implications.

With respect to the elimination of labor exemptions from antitrust legislation you of course recognize that this matter has been considered at some length by the Congress. You recognize it is technically outside the immediate area of the Secretary of Agriculture. I shall be glad to pass this question on to the Secretary of Labor.

In my recent testimony before the House Committee on Agriculture, I made the following statements:

"My admiration for the job farmers are doing is exceeded only by my sympathy for their problems. The cost-price squeeze and the spread in marketing margins are two economic factors in agriculture that disturb me greatly, as they do all farmers. We are trying to hold the line on inflation. Through increasing emphasis on marketing research we are constantly striving to reduce the gap between what farmers receive for their goods and what these goods sell for."

"These two fundamental problems, plus the more spectacular dilemma of the vast surplus in a few crops, are certainly not the fault of our farmers."

"They are not to blame. I make this point because as this dilemma worsens, there is a growing public tendency to point the finger of blame at the farmer. This is unfair. Farmers are not responsible for the high costs of Government involvement in agriculture."

"These excessive costs are directly traceable to war bred legislation continued too long in peacetime. The farmer's response to mandatory price supports at production-stimulating levels was what any reasonable person might expect. Naturally, not all the outlay of public moneys resulting from this overproduction finds its way back to farmers' pockets, as some mistakenly believe. Costs of storage, interest, and handling alone are now about a billion dollars a year."

This statement regarding the unjust criticism of farmers I am sure coincides with yours. I will do everything within my power to give publicity to these heartfelt sentiments. You are to be commended for your efforts on behalf of clarifying public misunderstanding of farmers.

Sincerely yours,

EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary.

You'd Hardly Know Asbury Park Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, a recent issue of the Asbury Park Evening Press contained a special supplement, "Your Invitation to Vacation Land." The pages of this supplement describe in words and pictures the invigorating climate and unequalled amusement and recreation areas that the New Jersey coast offers to vacationers.

As an example of the many fine articles in the supplement, I have chosen one, dealing with the growth of Asbury Park, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the Record.

For years, New Jersey has been proud of its broad, sandy beaches, refreshing surf, famous boardwalks and varied fa-

cilities for sports. More recently, a vast new highway system has made this holiday area even more accessible. The construction of new hotels, motels, and other guest accommodations assures the traveler of the finest in comfort and convenience.

I commend the Asbury Park Press for publishing this supplement, and I take this occasion to extend to my colleagues a warm invitation to visit the New Jersey shore soon.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOU'D HARDLY KNOW ASBURY PARK TODAY

ASBURY PARK.—This resort city is coming into its second growth 'mid a program of new buildings and improvements unparalleled here in the past 30 years.

More than \$3 million worth of public improvements, which will make this resort more attractive to visitors is being completed now.

Focal point is a modern new steel and brick bathing pavilion and store facilities on the boardwalk, which will accommodate 4,200 bathers.

CONSTRUCTION BOOMING

While public construction is booming, private building is beginning to move into an accelerated tempo also.

Another famous landmark undergoing change is the Arthur Pryor Memorial Band Pavilion, being altered to include additional seating capacity for band concerts facing the boardwalk.

The boardwalk itself, which resounds yearly to the echoed tread of millions of visitors, is being raised as protection against scouring by sands.

TWO NEW MOTELS

Two new luxury motels, with a total of some 80 units and costing an estimated \$650,000, are near completion in the beach front area. At least three others are on the drawing boards and expected to be announced shortly.

The building program, is in keeping with the changing character of Asbury Park, both as a year 'round resort which attracts some 3 million visitors annually from a wide area, and as a seasonal resort, growing in popularity each year.

NEW LIGHTING

An entire new citywide lighting system, which will increase illumination by some 400 percent is also being completed. As part of the program, municipal officials have borrowed a technique from southern France and will illuminate the colorful flowerbeds in the extensive park areas with low, flat lighting which develops a picturesque night scene.

MORE PARKING

To meet the ever-increasing parking problem, new perimeter areas are being completed and a new four-story, slope level, \$500,000 parking garage is soon to be undertaken in the heart of the downtown shopping area. Here too, new additions to existing department stores, costing several hundred thousand dollars, give answer to the competition picture presented by construction of surrounding highway shopping centers.

BEACH POLICY

Perhaps the most important new phase of the resort program here, from the visitor's viewpoint, is the new municipal bathing policy with all bathing facilities being operated by the city. This makes it much easier for guests at hotels and motels to use the ocean bathing facilities directly from their rooms.

Many of the hotels have carried out modernization programs during the past several months, and an augmented 'round-the-clock entertainment policy for all ages will be in force during the coming summer.

The Panama Canal: Red Target

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times of Monday, July 27, 1959. This editorial was sent to me by Mr. Charles J. Lewin, editor and general manager of the Standard-Times.

THE CANAL: RED TARGET

In an exclusive interview with the Standard-Times July 18, Panama's Ambassador to the United States declared "seething unrest in the Caribbean, promoted if not provoked by international communism, poses a major threat to U.S. control of the strategically and commercially vital Panama Canal."

The grim fact is, as emphasized by Ambassador Ricardo Arias and U.S. news stories since January, that violence has flamed in 13 of the 20 Latin-American Republics during the first half of 1959, and more very likely lies ahead.

Counting Fidel Castro's New Year's Day coup in Cuba, seven nations lived through revolts or invasions. Major rioting or banditry took its toll of life and property in six others.

James R. Whelan of United Press International, writing from Buenos Aires July 11, commented of these outbreaks of violence, "Nor were all in the name of freedom. According to Pravda (official Kremlin newspaper), there are 360,000 card-carrying Communists in the hemisphere. The 'Red hand' was visible in many of the disturbances."

In April, Mexico ousted two Russian diplomats for helping organize a railroad strike. Argentina, one of two nations on the South American Continent with diplomatic ties with Russia, has sent home six Iron Curtain diplomats and banned Communist-line publications and activities. Uruguay, the other nation maintaining diplomatic relations with the Reds, appears about to break off with Moscow.

The Caribbean crisis has been intensified since Castro came to power in Cuba. Following the victory of this rebel leader, who now faces mounting accusations of being Communist-influenced, unsuccessful invasion attempts were launched against the Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, and Panama.

It is totally unrealistic for American interests to dismiss such military operations as "comic opera," simply because the troops involved are numbered by dozens or hundreds, rather than thousands. In the last 20 years, from Singapore to the Suez, the world has had ample evidence of what a handful of well-trained saboteurs can accomplish—regardless of security measures—if they set out to halt traffic on land or sea. A canal, any canal, is particularly vulnerable.

The big danger in this situation is that it may be ignored or minimized. Representa-

tive Flood, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, has warned that U.S. State Department emphasis on Asia, Africa, and Western Europe may result in losing "the war in our own backyard."

Specifically, there are long-standing frictions between the United States and Panama, regarding U.S. operation and control of the waterway; no one has suggested they are insurmountable, yet real effort to solve them lags.

Meanwhile, the canal is a rallying-point for political nationalists of either right or left; it provides an excuse for anti-American propaganda, and the Communists now are urging internationalization of the waterway.

The State Department, working with the Organization of American States, would do well to give the Latin American situation—with emphasis on Panama—some high-priority attention. Otherwise, North Americans may one day find it has lost many of its good friends to the south, and that unfriendly influences, with allegiance to the Kremlin, have something to say about America's waterborne traffic between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

Wisconsin Takes Steps To Establish a Stronger Safety School Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today the country is faced with the serious challenge of finding ways and means to promote safety on the Nation's highways.

The tragic toll in death and property is a blight on our national progress. Somehow, an effective program must be designed to reduce this toll, rather than to see it climb annually.

According to reports, about 37,000 people lose their lives each year on the Nation's roadways.

In addition, there are nonfatal injuries to 1.4 million. The value of property destroyed amounts to an estimated \$1.8 billion. All costs—including medical, wages lost, insurance, and property damage, are estimated to be about \$5.4 billion.

We recognize, of course, that one of the objectives of the national highway program is to provide not only better—but also safer—roads for the Nation's travelers, either for pleasure or business.

Recently the Ways and Means Committee in the House of Representatives reached some compromise agreements on amendments to the highway trust fund, to provide funds to carry forward the highway construction program.

We realize that if this is not done, the projects for expanding and improving our Nation's roads will be seriously curtailed.

In addition, there will be adverse economic repercussions that will be felt throughout the economy.

I am hopeful, therefore, that the Congress will now find it possible to take

early action on these proposals for carrying forward the highway program.

An important feature of the new roadway system, of course, is the matter also of greater safety.

Across the country, we are aware, of course, that State and local communities are undertaking programs to promote greater safety. In addition, civic groups and other organizations are conducting similar campaigns.

Recently, the Melrose Chronicle, of Melrose, Wis., published an article outlining the constructive program designed by the State Motor Vehicle Department of Wisconsin, aimed at reducing traffic accidents.

Specifically, the program provides for expanding and improving traffic safety schools.

Representative of one of the many ways in which constructive efforts are being made to promote safety, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Melrose (Wis.) Chronicle]

WISCONSIN TAKES STEPS TO ESTABLISH A STRONGER SAFETY SCHOOL PROGRAM

Stabilizing and expanding traffic safety schools for traffic law violators is a current project which Commissioner James L. Karns of the State motor vehicle department believes will provide a strong, basic answer to the question: "What can we do to stop traffic accidents?"

The strength of the program lies in the fact that it will be reaching the right people, he points out.

"Some safety education efforts appear to be misdirected in that they fail to reach the persons who need them most," Karns commented. "This cannot be said about the safety school whose enrollees have been handicapped by the traffic judge himself, and whose past records prove they are in need of special attention."

The motor vehicle commissioner is named by statute as the State official responsible for approving these schools, and Commissioner Karns points out that procedures have been set up to guide communities in establishing schools which will meet approval standards.

"This action does not mean we are dissatisfied with the schools already in operation," he said. "In fact our procedures are based largely on practices already being used successfully in existing schools."

"In setting up these procedures, the motor vehicle department's safety division has also drawn upon many years of experience in connection with the high school driver education program in our State."

As an aid to communities seeking to set up a traffic safety school under authority granted in section 345.16, Wisconsin Statutes, the safety division has developed:

An official manual, "The Wisconsin Traffic Safety School."

An application form for approval and registration.

A list of safety materials.

A final report form.

And a certificate of attendance for presentation to students completing the course.

"We are asking for final reports to enable us to survey the effectiveness of these schools as time goes by," Karns said. "These reports, together with information contained in our central driver record files, will provide a basis for future studies."

The commissioner commended Wisconsin judges and schools of vocational and adult education already cooperating in the traffic safety school program, and invited other communities to establish schools of their own.

"This is the best way I know to impress violators that traffic court justice is concerned, not merely with punishment and fine collection, but with the rehabilitation of persons whose driving practices and social attitudes have taken a wrong turn somewhere along the way."

The Folly of Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I commend to my colleagues an article in the August 3 issue of the Wall Street Journal by William Henry Chamberlin. Mr. Chamberlin gives us a valuable and current report on the economic, political, and military situation in West Berlin.

The heart of the article is in the quotation of a refugee student when he said:

If freedom fails in West Berlin it will not live long in Germany, or in Europe; and then America itself will be in grave danger. For our sake, but also for America's, we hope America will stand firm.

How many Americans really understand this?

THE FOLLY OF BERLIN: ITS ECONOMIC AND MILITARY VULNERABILITY UNDERSCORES ONCE MORE THE GREAT U.S. ERRORS OF 1945

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

WEST BERLIN.—Spending a few days in this island of political and economic freedom makes one increasingly conscious of a monstrous folly in the history of U.S. foreign affairs.

The military and economic weaknesses inherent in West Berlin's isolated geographical position strike the eye. The garrisons maintained here by the United States, Great Britain, and France are of token strength, about 11,000 men altogether.

Their presence is most useful and necessary, however, for the double purpose of discouraging any attempt to overrun West Berlin by means of a raid organized in the Soviet zone and reminding the Russians that any attack on Berlin would provoke most serious consequences. But West Berlin is obviously indefensible against a major attack, mounted by forces such as the Soviet Union maintains in the zone.

The city is even more vulnerable economically. Its livelihood depends on free, uninterrupted routes of access to the Federal Republic, and to the West generally. About 80 percent of Berlin's output is exported to pay for the imports of food and raw materials and other goods needed by a city of 2.2 million inhabitants, the largest in Germany today. Trucks, railways, and barges account for virtually all this essential traffic; and roads, railways, and canals are under the control of the Soviet zone administration.

The more one looks at Berlin's geographical situation the more one is conscious of the folly of the political direction in Washing-

ton in the spring of 1945 in failing to urge Eisenhower to get to Berlin ahead of the Russians. This, rather than any subsequent slips in drawing up agreements for access, was the cardinal, basic mistake. For Soviet Russians will always find ways to tear up a paper agreement.

Yet West Berlin today, with the Damocles Sword of economic blockade or slow strangulation hanging over it, is demonstrably better off than it has been at any time since the end of the war. Many new buildings have gone up since the writer was last here 2 years ago, including one of the omnipresent Conrad Hilton hotels; others, including a 23-story skyscraper, highest building in Berlin, are under construction.

UNEMPLOYMENT FALLS

Unemployment, long a weak spot in the West Berlin economy, is at a record low level of 55,000, of whom 30,000, according to Mayor Willy Brandt, are unemployable—older workers and government employees and others who cannot continue working. An upsurge of new orders from the Federal Republic since Khrushchev's first threatening note of last November has put the West Berlin industry in a favorable position. The streets around the zoo section, the center of hotels, travel bureaus, movies, cafes, now that Unter den Linden and adjoining streets are in the Soviet sector, are torn up because of construction on a new subway line.

And all over the city new "Siedlungen," or housing projects, can be seen. Some already are functioning, others are under construction. Over 20,000 apartments are being built every year, and in modern style, with attention to proper sun exposure and provision of stretches of green around the apartment houses. It will still be several years before the tremendous bombing destruction wrought by the war is made up; but West Berlin remains easily ahead in the race of providing housing and other amenities with neighboring, Communist-ruled East Berlin.

Both energetic, 45-year-old Mayor Brandt and Senator Paul Herz, in charge of the city's finances and credits, emphasize that West Berlin, while hoping for the best, is prepared for the worst. The stockpile of several months supply of food, fuel, and raw materials, built up after the end of the blockade of 1949, has been expanded until Berlin is now supplied with enough reserves to last for almost a year, and at a fairly high standard of living. The city is also self-sufficient as regards gas, water, and electricity.

Americans here are probably more popular than in any other city in Europe and nothing could be in more ludicrous contradiction of the facts than the Communist line that West Berlin is suffering under the heel of alien occupation. The day of withdrawal of American and other foreign troops would be a day of mourning for the whole Berlin population, which knows very well that the presence of allied troops is the best guaranty of their freedom. Berlin has its Clay Allee, in honor of the first American commander here, whose stand during the blockade made Berliners forget some of the harsh features of early American occupation.

There is a Taylorstrasse, named after the recently retired Army Chief of Staff, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, and the city has just renamed another street after John Foster Dulles. It is interesting to note that the West Berliners, whose lives would be most directly affected by any aggressive Soviet move, seem to be unanimous in rejecting ideas of concession and appeasement. From Mayor Brandt to a recently arrived student in a refugee camp, the apprehension is not in the Western Powers will incur Khrushchev's wrath and bring on a blockade of Berlin by standing firm at Geneva. It is rather that concessions and retreats will lead

to a steady erosion of Berlin's rights and liberties, until only a shell remains.

DANGEROUS PROPOSAL

And in this attitude the Berliners are not alone. RIAS, the American broadcasting station in Berlin, which is widely heard in the Soviet Zone, receives an enormous amount of fan mail, about 250,000 letters during 1958, according to Director A. A. Killeforth. About one-third of those letters are from listeners in the zone. The predominant note in these letters ever since Khrushchev's note of November 27 has been: Stand firm. Keep Berlin free.

Many write to RIAS that they were forced to sign letters endorsing Soviet policy as a result of a government campaign; for this reason they want to express their true sentiment: That a free Berlin is an inestimable benefit to the silenced population of the Soviet Zone.

The political danger of Khrushchev's demilitarized free city proposal for Berlin has been generally spotted abroad. What is perhaps not so well understood is that, even if there were no overt attack on what would become a defenseless city, Khrushchev's proposal would mean economic ruin. This point was brought out by Dr. Heinrich Voegel, representative of the federal government in West Berlin, in the course of a talk.

"Berlin is not self-supporting," said Dr. Voegel. "It imports about \$250 million more than it exports. If one reckons all forms of aid which the Federal Government gives to Berlin, direct subsidies, tax rebates, loans for housing, guarantees for industrial deliveries, you get a figure close to \$500 million a year. Under Khrushchev's proposal this would have to stop, because he demands that all connection with the Federal Republic cease. The aid given from Bonn is almost 40 percent of the total expenditure of the Berlin city government. Take it away and Berlin's prosperity vanishes overnight. It is absurd if Khrushchev suggests that increased orders from the Soviet Union and other Communist states could make up for this loss. Do you know how much of Berlin's exports went to the Communist bloc last year? About 2 percent.

"It would be difficult, but perhaps not quite impossible, to finance a united Berlin, because East Berlin is financially and economically integrated with the Soviet bloc. But West Berlin as a 'free city' would lapse into stagnation and ruin."

"Status quo" may be a dirty word among some who like to regard themselves as advanced thinkers. But the more one studies the political and economic angles of the Berlin situation the more it seems that the maintenance of the status quo in Berlin is the only way in which the Western Powers can fulfill their obligations to maintain the freedom of West Berlin until the time, which looks very distant on the horizon now, when a united Berlin may become the capital of a united Germany.

This is why the Berliners become a little nervous whenever it seems that the status quo will be chipped away to any serious extent by the talks at Geneva. A refugee student talking fast from pent-up emotion, seemed to speak for almost all West Berliners, and for a good many Germans in the Soviet Zone also, when he said:

"If freedom falls in West Berlin it will not live long in Germany, or in Europe; and then America itself will be in grave danger. For our sake, but also for America's, we hope America will stand firm."

States Enact New Laws To Curb Drunken Driving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the most dangerous combinations in the world is alcohol and gasoline. Thousands of people die each year on our streets and highways because of drunken driving. Indeed, a special committee of the American Medical Association has announced that liquor has been involved in 50 percent of the fatal automobile accidents occurring in this country in 1958. This shocking announcement makes more imperative than ever that we have adequate laws and effective enforcement against the drunken driver. Such statutes are for the protection of us all—particularly children, who are frequently the innocent victims of these drunken drivers.

Therefore, it is encouraging to learn that various States of the Union have adopted new and rigorous laws to curb the drunken driver. Last year law-enforcement officials obtained over 86,000 such convictions, especially by State and highway police. In the New York Times for August 3, 1959, Mr. Bernard Stengren, staff reporter for that outstanding daily newspaper, has prepared an exhaustive compilation of the progress made recently in efforts to prevent people under the influence of liquor from getting behind the steering wheels of high-powered automobiles. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record Mr. Stengren's article from the New York Times, entitled "New Laws Attack Drunken Driving." I think that many of my colleagues will be interested in his information because, eventually, the Federal Government will have to cope with this problem of drunken driving if the 50 States find it beyond their means and methods to do so.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 3, 1959]
NEW LAWS ATTACK DRUNKEN DRIVING—86,000
CONVICTED IN NATION LAST YEAR—MORE
STATES PASS TOUGH MEASURES

(By Bernard Stengren)

More and more States are acting to reduce drunken driving.

An indication of the size of the problem is that the State and highway police across the country obtained 86,500 convictions last year. How many more were obtained by the police in cities was not known.

More State legislatures are adopting laws authorizing the use of chemical tests of blood, breath, urine, or saliva to determine alcohol levels. A growing number are adding

"implied consent" provisions to older statutes.

New York State's provision holds that in accepting a driving license, a person "shall be deemed to have given his consent to a chemical test." If he refuses such a request by the police, his license is automatically suspended pending a hearing for revocation for driving while under the influence of alcohol.

At the same time there is a current of opposition diminishing only slightly, to the tide of more severe treatment for drinking drivers. This has taken two principal forms: Challenges of the validity of chemical tests and the attitude on the part of some judges and juries of "there but for the grace of God go I."

SAFETY EXPERTS CONCERNED

At the root of the situation is the deep concern of police, medical, and safety experts over the role of alcohol in fatal highway accidents.

Recently a special committee of the American Medical Association estimated that alcohol had been involved in 50 percent of the fatal automobile accidents in this country last year—accounting for 15,000 deaths.

This figure is considerably higher than that of the National Safety Council, which has estimated that nearly 17 percent of the drivers involved in fatal accidents had been drinking—and that 25 percent of the adult pedestrian fatalities had been drinking.

Difficulties in getting complete, detailed statistics from 50 States and the District of Columbia, make an accurate count impossible.

What is the minimum amount of alcohol that makes a normally adequate driver an unfit one? How can it be determined when an individual has passed that threshold? What should be done with such a driver when he is discovered? These are questions that probably never will be answered definitively.

FIFTEEN ONE-HUNDREDTHS PERCENT IS STANDARD

At present in this country a person with 0.05 percent of alcohol or less by weight in the blood is considered not under the influence of alcohol. If there is between 0.05 and 0.15 percent "blood alcohol," there is a question of the degree of influence. Over 0.15 percent, the person is regarded as definitely under the influence.

These criteria are embodied in section 11-902 of the Uniform Vehicle Code, which has been adopted substantially in that form by 32 States and the District of Columbia.

Lower minimums have been adopted in Europe. Sweden, for instance, considers 0.06 percent too high. There is a considerable body of opinion here that would revise the "under the influence" level to 0.10 percent.

How much imbibing is needed to bring the blood-alcohol level to a given point varies with the individual—his weight, physical condition, drinking habits, length of time between drinks; and the amount of food eaten before or while drinking. Researchers say that, on the average, 6 ounces of whiskey or six bottles of beer taken over a period of several hours will produce a 0.15 percent level.

VARIES BY PERSONS

"This does not mean," according to Dr. Clarence W. Muehlberger, "that all persons having 0.14 percent alcohol in their blood are stone sober, nor does it imply that all having 0.15 percent are staggering drunk."

Dr. Muehlberger, a Michigan toxicologist, has studied intoxication for more than 3 decades.

Along with other experts, he holds that alcohol produces a marked deterioration of automobile-driving ability long before one reaches the stage which is ordinarily classified as drunk.

For this reason, safety and police officials hold, the social drinker who has two or three drinks before driving is a far greater menace than the so-called staggering drunk. The social drinker does not always realize his trouble.

Methods for determining when a driver is under the influence—the phrase commonly used in State laws—vary from the observation and performance type to more precise chemical tests.

In the former, a suspect is asked to do such things as walk a straight line, touch the tip of his nose, and pick up coins from the floor. This is still used in conjunction with chemical tests in most cases.

Another method finding some support—Tucson, Ariz., and Rochester, N.Y., are among the cities using it—is motion pictures of the suspect taken after he is brought to a police station.

But in the last 2 decades chemical tests or blood, urine, saliva, or breath have become the primary ones.

Although blood tests are the most accurate, they are also the most difficult for police agencies to use because a physician must take the sample, and some time is needed to make the analysis. Nonetheless in 37 States, police or highway patrols use this method.

Tests for blood alcohol using urine or saliva also are relatively cumbersome. The breath test, first devised by Dr. R. N. Harger, of the Indiana University School of Medicine, is most commonly used.

Twenty-six States and more than 150 local police departments use the "balloon" device called the drunkometer or other breath devices known as intoximeters, breatholizers, or alcometers.

Results of such tests are specifically authorized as admissible in the courts of 39 States and the District of Columbia, and 4 other States have such statutes under consideration. All 50 States, with the exception of Mississippi, Alabama, and Massachusetts, permit use of the tests, either by specific statute or under general police powers.

State police agencies administered more than 42,000 chemical tests last year to persons suspected of driving while under the influence of alcohol. Figures of cities and counties are not available, but in 1958 the New York City Police Department gave 1,502 tests and in the first 6 months of this year administered 677.

Challenges of the tests—either on constitutional grounds as alleged self-incrimination or on their scientific validity—have been almost universally rejected by appellate courts.

But to avoid litigation, nine States have now adopted, and three others have under consideration, the implied consent provision first adopted in New York in 1953.

In addition to New York, Vermont, Rhode Island, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Idaho, and Utah have the laws. In Delaware, Illinois, and Michigan, the matter is under consideration.

OPPOSITION BY AAA

A vigorous opponent of the implied consent provision is the American Automobile Association. While condemning driving while under the influence of intoxicants or narcotics as a grave menace and calling for strict enforcement through use of chemical tests, it particularly condemns the assumption that the right to drive is conditioned on implied consent.

Periodically scientific challenges to the tests' validity arise.

A recent example was a Brooklyn court case. A pathologist poured onion juice, garlic juice, acetone, and alcohol in tubes containing sulfuric acid and potassium permanganate—the chemicals used in the Drunkometer. He obtained the same action in each case, proving that any one of the four substances could register intoxicated.

But the test was designed for testing air samples, not liquids and solids. Subsequent demonstrations for the police and prosecuting officials—shaken by the defendant's acquittal—showed that any solid substance containing carbon, hydrogen, and oxygen, even paper towels, would cause identical reactions.

The pathologist was denounced by experts in the field for performing misleading tests. He was "either grossly misinformed or deliberately misrepresented facts," according to Drs. Robert B. Forney and Morton Mason of the Indiana Laboratory of Toxicology.

The defendant, although acquitted, had his license revoked by the State motor vehicle bureau after a hearing.

Punishment for convictions on driving while under the influence ranges from very severe to most lenient. In 6 States the first conviction is considered a felony—5 years is the maximum jail term in California—and 17 States regard a third conviction as a felony.

Sokolism Versus Spartakiada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following most interesting and informative article by Mr. John C. Sciranka which appeared in the Allentown (Pa.) Times on Friday, July 24, 1959. Mr. Sciranka is a writer and an editor from Passaic, N.J.:

SOKOLISM VERSUS SPARTAKIADA

(By John C. Sciranka)

While the eyes of the Slovaks of the United States and the free world are turned toward Reading, where the Slovak Catholic Sokol is completing its week-long gymnastic and athletic meet, known as the Slet and National Convention ending July 25, the Communists of Czechoslovakia, where the Sokol idea originated in 1862 are busy preparing for the Spartakiada, which is a substitute or ersatz for Sokolism.

The Sokol idea for almost a century put into action its rockribbed principle and purposes: Equality and brotherhood, as well as patriotism on Christian principles for out of those grow freedom and independence.

The word "Sokol" means "Falcon," a bird whose swiftness appealed to the early Slavonic authors and poets, and they have woven their epics and legends around this lofty bird. The Sokol members are well trained and disciplined. Equality, freedom, brotherhood, and morality are their first elements in training. They train youth to cultivate power and memory, acquire courage and skill, and have self-confidence. The Sokols are trained to transform aims into actual deeds.

That is why the Sokols were the first to organize Czechoslovak legions during World War I and fought for freedom and independence. The Sokol is an organization of Slav

nations trained to keep on guard against enemies of democracies and fight for justice and peace.

The Communists disbanded the Sokols in its mother country, Czechoslovakia, and all other satellite Slavonic countries where it was a leading organization. In its place they inaugurated Spartakiada, which will hold its meet next year in Prague. Sparta was the capital of ancient Lacedaemon in the southeast corner of Greece. The people there made the first great experiment of socialism. Each child was examined at birth, and killed if weakly. Boys and girls were educated by the state in gymnastics, boys in military drilling. The family was disregarded. All ate in common, lived plainly, and no coined money was allowed. The system produced a race of military athletes, without commerce, art, or literature, but was a barren one and failed.

Communists, unfortunately, are trying hard to replace Sokolism with Spartakiada, which has failed in the past as barren, for it has no soul.

Perhaps the proponents of Spartakiada instead of Sokolism had also in mind Spartacus, the Thracian war prisoner and gladiator. In 73 B.C. he incited a slave insurrection, armed his men, led them with consummate generalship and defeated the Roman legions. After 2 years he was killed at the head of his men. Pompey, whose genius won the final victory, crucified 6,000 captives along the road from Capua to Rome. Perhaps this sort of history of murder and brutality appeals to the present regime in Czechoslovakia and Communist countries, where Sokolism took root close to a century ago and where they disbanded it.

However, the people of the free world will continue to look upon Sokols and Sokolism as a youth fitness training organization such as President Eisenhower is advocating for the American youth. The Slovak Catholic Sokol, founded on July 4, 1905, has trained tens of thousands of American youth. Thirty years ago their 21 member delegation of gymnasts and athletes won first prizes during the All Slav Nations Slet in Prague. We are looking forward to 1962 when Sokolism will observe its centennial birthday when there will be a huge slet (meet) and Sokolism will march in the spirit of equality, freedom, brotherhood, and Christianity to a better future and peaceful world with Christian democracy and justice reigning.

In World War II the Slovak Catholic Sokol had over 5,000 men and women in service of Uncle Sam.

Of the original 43 founders of the Slovak Catholic Sokol we salute the 3 living founders, namely Stephen Bigos, of Garfield, N.J.; Andrew Klukosovsky, of Clifton, N.J., and Andrew Bekes of Little Falls, N.J.

Problems of Poultry Farming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, today I received a letter from one of my good friends and constituents, Hon. J. G. Blanchard of Evans, Ga., who is a poultry and egg farmer. Mr. Blanchard is a practical poultryman and I was so impressed by his penetrating analysis of the grave problems confronting the poul-

try and egg industry that I feel his observations and conclusions should be called to the attention of all the Members of Congress. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of Mr. Blanchard's letter to me printed in the Appendix to the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVANS, GA., August 1, 1959.

Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HERMAN: I am sure that you are aware of the extenuating conditions of the broiler and egg farmers in Georgia and the Nation. As you know, the southern theme at the recent congressional hearings on the poultry situation was that "the South never had it so good" that southern poultrymen don't suffer from low prices as other areas do. Such is not the case of the farmer.

The spokesmen for the southern poultry industry at the recent hearings, and on all other occasions, has been industry representatives. Naturally these industry people present the side of the story that is most favorable to them. Their side of the story is not the farmers side and is not in the best interest of the farmer.

While the industry is speaking, the farmer is at home, completely ignorant of the fact, working 12 hours per day, 7 days per week and hoping for some miracle which will never happen so long as industry is the farmer's spokesman.

While my teenage son is out of school for the summer, I have spent considerable time studying my farming operation of 10,000 layers and visiting other poultrymen throughout the State and discussing our (the farmer's) problem. The only happy poultrymen I have found are those just getting into business and those getting out.

The following comments are typical from the poultry farmers I visited:

1. "If the feed mills would stay in the feed business instead of getting in the egg business, things would be better."
 2. "If the feed people would help the farmers in established broiler areas make a living instead of promoting new areas, they would be helping the farmers in both areas."
 3. "If the extension service would stop publishing ridiculously low cost production figures for eggs and broilers, the feed promotion people would have less false propaganda with which to induce more people into the chicken business."
 4. "If feed and chick salesmen would stop telling southern farmers that the North and Midwest is getting out of the egg business next year and that the South will have to produce eggs for the whole Nation, so let's put in more hens."
 5. "How can we produce broilers and eggs on price supported grains and sell on a supported market?"
 6. "People will seat only so many broilers and eggs, so why produce more. This spring, when egg prices were lowest in years, per capita egg consumption continued to decline."
 7. "Stop, or correct, the misleading publicity given poultry farming. Magazines and newspapers are still publishing get-rich-quick stories about poultry farmers—thus giving a false impression of our situation."
- Also I have heard where some unscrupulous feed salesmen have resorted to sowing seeds of discord among farmers in their efforts to increase feed tonnage and boost their commission incomes. I believe, though, that farmers are at least beginning to realize that a farmer is another farmer's best friend.

My friend, J. H. Marshall, who has been vacationing in Florida, has mailed me news-

paper clippings advertising dressed and drawn broilers in Miami for 19 cents per pound and in Tampa for 15 cents per pound.

The feed and hatchery industry are trying to blame today's problems on the chain-stores. It seems that this is a mighty feeble way of trying to pass the blame.

A friend of mine in an adjoining county recently grew out 9,000 broilers under contract with a local feed company. He received 25 cents for his efforts which included furnishing the house, equipment, brooding costs and labor for 10 weeks. There are other stories all over Georgia just about as bad as this one. This is worse than sharecropping and tenant farming.

I have heard of several instances where farmers receiving soil bank money have invested this money in poultry farming—thus adding more overproduction. Some feed company people go around and find the soil bank farmers and show them a lot of misleading figures and put them to chicken farming. Is this right?

We hear much today about efficiency. Anyone knowing anything about chicken farming will tell you that a farmer with 5,000 hens can produce eggs cheaper than a farmer with 50,000 hens, or a broiler grower with 10,000 broilers can do a better job than a person with 100,000. This is a proven fact. The Extension Service would do well to avail themselves of this fact.

Industry, of which feed mills are the major part, have established volume as their creed. Their every effort is in the direction of more output. And so far, the farmer has been the one to suffer most. Industry, in nearly every case has protected their profit margin. Naturally they want to continue to expand production without Government control, as long as they can make a profit by doing so. They have no particular love for the farmer, and the farmer is beginning to see it.

The chicken farmers are fast realizing that industry is no place of mercy. And they are beginning to wonder if Benson is Secretary of Agriculture or "Secretary of Industry."

There is a great deal of unrest among the Nation's poultry farmers, Georgia poultrymen very much included. As you know, farmers are not a letterwriting and publicity-seeking group. Therefore, their feelings are not generally well known.

HERMAN, you are one of the few people in Washington who understand the farmer's language and know his problems. This letter presents the feelings of the poultry farmers throughout the State, especially the areas where I visited during the past few weeks, talking to fellow chicken farmers.

Every farmer I visited thinks that you should know the farmer's story, but none of them have written. I am writing you as much in their behalf as in my own. You may have unrestricted use of this letter. Should you desire any further information, I will be glad to furnish what I can.

Very sincerely yours,

J. G. BLANCHARD.

Lake County Citizens Committee on World Refugee Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, several months ago I spoke to our Members regarding the outstanding work which the

International Institute of Gary, Ind., Inc., has been doing in the Calumet region of Indiana during the last 40 years in behalf of new immigrants and future American citizens who come from other nations to live in our great free Republic. This organization, during and since World War II, has aided thousands of world refugees who have settled in Indiana seeking citizenship under our flag.

I am herewith submitting an article from the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune, setting out a new organization called the Lake County Citizens Committee on World Refugee Year, created to generate national interest in the world refugee problem. I wish to commend the committee for taking this much needed and necessary step not only in behalf of the refugees concerned, but in furtherance of our Government's relations with other countries.

The above-mentioned article follows:

[From the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune, July 28, 1959]

LAKE GROUP AIDS REFUGEE YEAR

The Lake County Citizens Committee on World Refugee Year has been organized to whip up interest in the world's refugee problems.

Donald Houskeeper, president of the Gary International Institute, has been elected temporary chairman of the steering committee which will focus countrywide attention on what has been described as a "human year"—utilizing the emphasis of the recently concluded scientific International Geophysical Year to spotlight refugees' problems.

Houskeeper said the committee was organized in response to President Eisenhower's request for participation of people in local communities in the United Nations World Refugee Year which was inaugurated on July 1, 1959.

The Lake County committee is representative of the community built largely by immigrants.

Members of the steering committee are:

Elizabeth N. Wilson, executive secretary of the Gary International Institute; Joseph Chulak, business representative of the Building Service Employees Union; Don F. Datisman, editorial page editor of the Gary Post-Tribune; George Hrnjak, community services representative for the United Steelworkers; the Reverend Eugene Lazar, of the Romanian Orthodox Church; Philip M. Look, executive director of the Gary Community Chest and United Fund; Rabbi Carl Miller, president of the Gary Community Welfare Council; also Rauben Olson, president of Gary Anselm Forum; James W. O'Neill, president of the Gary Chamber of Commerce; Attorney Nicholas Stepanovich, a member of the council of the U.S. Committee on Refugees; Msgr. W. Edward Sweigert, Gary diocesan resettlement director of the National Catholic Resettlement Council; the Reverend Humphrey L. Walz, First Presbyterian Church of Crown Point; the Reverend S. Allan Watson, executive director of the Lake County Council of Churches, and Houskeeper.

The steering committee will be expanded as the Lake County program is organized.

Walz and Stepanovich explained the beginning and the significance of World Refugee Year to the steering committee members. Both Lake County personalities are acquainted with international refugee problems and both have been very active on a national scale in helping seek solutions to these problems.

The United Nations has designated July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960, as World Refugee Year.

World Refugee Year has these aims:
1. To focus interest on the refugee problem and to encourage additional financial contributions from governments, voluntary agencies, and the general public for its solution.

2. To encourage additional opportunities for refugee solutions, through voluntary repatriation, resettlement or integration, on a purely humanitarian basis and in accordance with the freely expressed wishes of the refugees themselves.

The High Cost of Learning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, a striking example of the urgent need for Federal aid to education appears in an editorial from a recent issue of the Wyckoff (N.J.) News. The editorial is a concrete demonstration of the obvious inability of a local community to meet the school crisis.

The editorial shows that the construction cost of one local school ran into millions of dollars; another school has need of a large addition; and still another elementary school is needed, at an estimated cost of a million dollars. As the editorial asks, "Where is the money going to come from?"

I certainly feel that our State and local school districts have been doing a commendable job in maintaining educational facilities on the limited financial resources available to them from State and local revenues. But, clearly, with the rising population and ever-rising school costs, they can no longer be expected to cope with the problem alone.

And I note unhappily, too, that the article states that perhaps the local community should be turned into an industrial area, since—so it is reasoned—if not, the land will be used for homes, which will mean more children and more schools.

Therefore, Mr. President, the need for us to attack the school and education problems on a national basis grows ever more compelling.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN OUR OPINION—THE HIGH COST OF LEARNING

Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS told the Senate last week that New Jersey was a perfect example of the necessity of Federal aid to education. He lamented the rise in local property taxes, suggested that the burden could be better borne by the Nation as a whole than by the few residents of small communities.

Certainly our area has been struck as hard, if not harder, than any other, by the growing population and rising school costs. (Last year we're told, on a county average,

they rose another 12 percent.) The construction of Ramapo Regional High School and Midland Park High School within the last few years ran into millions of dollars. The Ramapo school already has need of a large addition. Franklin Lakes is contemplating the construction of a new elementary school at a million dollar estimate; Wyckoff seeks land for still another school. Education news and its costs fill the newspapers every day. Where is all the money going to come from?

At a recent planning board hearing, Frank Perrotta explained that Wyckoff must be marred by industrial areas. If we don't turn this land into industry, Mr. Perrotta reasoned, the land will be used for homes, which will mean more children and more schools. At the word "schools" a large segment of the audience winced. It's a scary word, any word is that can signify a million dollar increase in taxes.

Actions of the board of education today arouse more ire than the work of the township committee. School board elections are harder fought, bring out larger votes, than elections which are technically political. Towns in the area repeatedly reject their school budgets.

Why is there so much concern, so much difficulty? Surely not because school boards are peopled by rank spendthrifts. But because the strain is too great. The local pocketbook simply cannot provide all the money that is really, truly needed.

The towns of Bergen County need help. We need help. The time for that help is not, as Senator WILLIAMS chides the Congress, in a "next year that never comes." The time for that help is now.

Russia's Economic and Education Goals and Their Implications for American Civilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a very fine speech delivered by Mr. M. D. Mobley, executive secretary of the American Vocational Association, Inc.

Speaking before the association's annual advisory breakfast in Los Angeles, Calif., on May 5 of this year, Mr. Mobley clearly made a case for vocational education in America as part and parcel of meeting the Soviet challenge. The title of his address, "Russia's Economic and Education Goals and Their Implications for American Civilization," was well chosen.

Mr. Mobley's speech, I believe, offers a proper background of facts and knowledgeable observations which back up his concluding remarks that—

We should not slacken for a day our efforts to expand and improve vocational educational programs in order to increase the productivity of all our citizens. Our security and our American way of life may well depend upon our success in this important undertaking.

The address follows:

RUSSIA'S ECONOMIC AND EDUCATION GOALS AND THEIR IMPLICATION FOR AMERICAN CIVILIZATION

(Speech by M. D. Mobley, executive secretary, American Vocational Association, at the annual advisory breakfast, Los Angeles Trade-Technical Junior College, Los Angeles, Calif., May 5, 1959)

Mr. Chairman, members of advisory committees and fellow Americans, for some time I have believed that the phenomenal growth and development of vocational-technical and scientific programs of education in Russia have grave implications for American civilization. I am glad to have opportunity to share my beliefs with this distinguished group.

It has long been my firm conviction that productive workers constitute America's greatest resources. I am convinced—as I believe most thinking Americans are—that the security and economic well-being of the United States is tied inseparably to the productivity of our people.

The United States has become the most powerful and the most productive nation in the world today. Our people enjoy the highest standard of living of any people, anywhere, anytime.

As evidence of this, may I bring to your attention the fact that here in the United States we have only 6 percent of the world's population but we own 70 percent of all automobiles, 50 percent of all telephones, 45 percent of all radios, 34 percent of all railroads; we use 56 percent of all silk, 53 percent of all coffee, 51 percent of all rubber; we produce 62 percent of all the oil, 53 percent of all the corn, 50 percent of all the cotton, 34 percent of all the coal, 32 percent of all the copper, 30 percent of all the iron and 32 percent of all the manufacturing production.

America's high economy is not an accident. It has occurred because our people at the local, State and national levels have planned intelligently and have developed great education programs for both youth and adults to give them ability to produce more and thus have more.

These programs comprise both general and specialized education. They include instruction in citizenship, in the humanities, in technical, scientific, and practical education. There is no conflict in the development of general and specialized education, except in the minds of a few who lack understanding of the need for a total program of education. One is not complete without the other.

No nation can remain strong or maintain a high standard of living unless there are adequate provisions for passing on to the oncoming generations the skills and knowledge of the productive workers of today and yesterday—and in the march of progress acquire new knowledge and develop new skills. These things are just as essential to our way of life as is the teaching of citizenship and the humanities.

Today, throughout the world, there are two ideologies battling for the minds of men. In addition, there exists an armament race between Soviet-dominated countries and the free nations. These facts are generally known. They have been given much publicity. Another battle is beginning to take form—about which there has been little publicity until very recently. This is a battle of economy which involves education—the training of manpower for efficiency.

To lose the productive manpower race could eventually mean losing our lead in the production and distribution of goods and services, and in the maintenance of a high standard of living. This is a matter that

has grave implications for American civilization.

During the past 18 months, the American press has given a tremendous amount of publicity to Russia's system of education and has been very critical of the program in this country. Unfortunately much of the publicity about Russia's system has been misinformation. Some of the writers would lead us to believe that Russia's entire program of secondary education is devoted to science, mathematics, and the languages—and that America's schools should follow suit.

Some of our writers and some of our educators have become almost hysterical in their clamor for reorganization of the American secondary school program. Some of the writings became so ridiculous and so incorrect that last fall in my column that appears monthly in the American Vocational Journal, I attempted to "debunk" some of the misinformation being blandly presented in speeches, in the press, and over radio and television programs. It evidently hit upon a popular chord since I received requests for more than 2,000 copies of reprints of the column.

For the last 13 years, ever since serving on General Clay's staff in Germany in 1947, I have attempted to keep in rather close touch with economic and educational developments in Russia. About 13 years ago I began making speeches in which I warned at least a few people of the economic and educational developments in Russia and their implications to the security and well-being of this and other free nations. I stated then that one of Russia's long-time goals was to lick the United States in an economic war. In the last 18 months volumes on this subject have appeared in the American press. Today there is no question in the minds of thinking Americans as to Russia's economic goals.

Russia's Khrushchev has already made known in no uncertain terms Soviet economic plans. Not long ago he said to an American newspaper publisher, and I quote: "We declare war upon you—in the peaceful field of trade. We declare a war we will win over the United States. The threat to the United States is not the intercontinental ballistic missile, but in the field of peaceful production. We are relentless in this, and it will prove the superiority of our system."

In a more recent report made by Khrushchev on January 27, 1959, he stated among other things the following:

"The Soviet Union exceeds the United States both in the rate of increase and in the absolute annual increase in production. . . . In per capita output of industrial production the world Socialist system, taken as a whole, has already caught up with the world capitalist system. . . .

"In spite of all existing obstruction, trade between the Soviet Union and the capitalist countries of Europe and America in 1958 was almost triple that of 1950."

I do not claim Khrushchev's statements are true, but they do reveal the Soviet goals.

In October 1957 while in Karachi, Pakistan, I saw positive evidence of Russia's attempt to battle us and other free nations for the markets of the world. While there I visited the exhibit of Soviet manufactured goods being offered for sale in this foreign country. The exhibit included tractors, grain drills, pumps for irrigation, automobiles, motorcycles, machine tools, sewing machines, bicycles, scales, meat grinders, microscopes, electric percolators, cameras, watches, porcelain, and many other items. Placed on each exhibit was the name of the local concern where it could be purchased, and in some cases the prices were displayed.

The products I saw were well made. In fact many of them appeared to be carbon copies of American manufactured products and goods produced in other countries.

For example, the cameras were almost identical with the German Leica camera. The tractor for sale looked very much like the John Deere.

The thing that alarmed me was the fact that the prices were much lower than the prices of similar goods manufactured in this country. For example, the tractor on display was being offered for 5,000 rupees, which at the rate of exchange was a little more than \$1,000. The same tractor in the United States sells for well over \$2,000.

Next let's look at Russia's plans to reorganize its education system in order to help the Soviets to accomplish their economic goals. The reorganization plan, which is already well underway, calls for a greatly expanded vocational education program, somewhat similar to the program we have been developing in this country during the past 40 years.

This expansion of vocational education is underway, even though Russia has had in operation for sometime quite an extensive program of vocational training—including nearly 4,000 technicums—specialized trade schools—which turn out about 70,000 technicians per year.

The following are quotations from Khrushchev's reports which have been approved by the governing Central Committee. They were made on September 22, 1958; November 14, 1958; and January 27, 1959.

September 22, 1958: . . . "At present our 10-year secondary schools do not solve the task of preparing youth for life, but are training them only to enter higher educational establishments. . . .

"Life has shown long ago that such an idea about the tasks of secondary schools is incorrect. . . .

"Owing to the separation between the program of secondary school education and life, these youths and girls are quite unfamiliar with production, while society does not know how to make the best use of the people, who are young and full of vitality. . . .

"How can all these shortcomings be eliminated from our schools? It is essential to carry out a fundamental reorganization in the system of school education. . . .

"In my opinion, after they have finished 7 or 8 years at school, all schoolchildren without exception should take part in socially useful labor at enterprises, collective farms, and other places of work. Both in town and in the countryside, as well as at workers' settlements, all children finishing schools should go to work in production. No one must evade this stage. . . .

"With that aim it seems to be useful to divide secondary education into two stages.

"The first stage should obviously comprise the 7- or 8-year school with compulsory education for all."

He further outlined in a very involved statement that the 7- or 8-year school should be comprised largely of general education—that is teaching the tools of learning.

"The second stage of secondary education may proceed along several lines. One of them, for instance, can be as follows: In the 2 or 3 years after the 7- or 8-year schooling, schools shall lay the main stress on special vocational training for schoolchildren . . . their education. . . . must be closely linked with vocational training and help them acquire trade skills and working habits, not only an abstract knowledge of production but also practical experience. . . .

"In the countryside, the schoolchildren, after a 7- or 8-year schooling period, shall acquire practical and theoretical knowledge in agronomy, zootechnical, and other branches of agriculture, or undergo a 2- or 3-year training in some sort of trade, because the village youth as well can learn particu-

lar trades. Thus, boys and girls after leaving school will have acquired both proper education and trade and production experience, and will start their lives as prepared people."

In his report he mentioned other kinds of secondary school programs, virtually all of which would be closely linked to work experience and near the end of his report when again speaking of work experience and vocational training he stated:

"I repeat that there must be no exceptions in this matter, whatever the position of the parents in society and the posts which they may hold."

In other words Russia has already launched a program of reorganization that means work experience and vocational training for virtually all of its people.

In his statement regarding higher education he said the following:

"The system of higher education must be reorganized. . . . It must be brought closer to productive work and actually linked to it."

Khrushchev's November 14, 1958, report to the Central Communist Committee dealt with "Target Figures for the Development of the U.S.S.R. National Economy in 1959-65" and "Strengthening the Ties Between the School and Life and on the Further Development of the Public Education System in the Country." In this report he stated:

"The target figures for the development of the U.S.S.R. national economy for 1959 to 1965 are an integral and decisive part of the long-term plan for the development of U.S.S.R. for the next 15 years, during which the U.S.S.R. will take first place in the world not only in total volume of production but also in per capita industrial production. This will be a great victory of the Soviet Union in the peaceful economic competition with the most developed capitalist countries."

In an article that appeared in Nation's Business, published by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Harold C. McClellan, was asked this question: "What's behind the Soviet Union's new interest in expanding world trade?" His answer: "The Communists are challenging us in fields where we excel. This is clearly a new international game of matching economic wits. Immediately at stake are awakening millions of people in the underdeveloped areas and the vast potential markets which they represent. Russia wants these people, their trade, and their sympathy."

Allen W. Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, probably has at his finger tips more information on developments in the Soviet Union than any other man in the Federal Government. Not long ago an article by him appeared in the Washington Sunday Star in which he stated:

"The Soviet Union has become the second greatest industrial power in the world. Today the gross national production of the U.S.S.R. is slightly more than one-third that of the United States; it is about three-fourths again as large as that of the United Kingdom, which ranks in third place. We still have a great lead, but the Soviet rate of progress is rapid. . . .

"In general, this examination has led me to the conclusion that the only safe position to take is that in technical, engineering and industrial fields the Soviets can achieve any particular objective we can achieve. . . .

"Those who have assumed that we have superior technical skills, that we could produce atomic weapons, aircraft, and the like which are beyond the competence of the Soviets, have generally proved to be mistaken. Certainly in recent years I have not proceeded on any such assumption."

From these quotations, which I have presented to you—and many more that I could present if time would permit—I am sure that you will agree that without a doubt Russia is trying desperately through research and the expansion and improvement of vocational, technical and scientific education to increase production and thus place itself in a position to lick the United States in an economic war. This is one of Russia's longtime goals. It is the battle of economy that may last longer than any of us will live.

On June 16, 1916—almost 43 years ago—the late Congressman Dudley M. Hughes in a speech on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives, while the Smith-Hughes vocational education measure was under consideration, said, and I quote:

"National efficiency is the sum total of efficiency of all individual citizens, and the national wealth is the sum of their wealth-producing capacity. . . . In the markets of the world we compete, not as individuals but as a unit against other nations as units. . . ."

"This . . . unquestionably introduces a national element into vocational education."

In closing may I summarize by saying—the American people are being challenged as never before in the field of economics. Contrary to much recent publicity Russia's education program is being reorganized along vocational education lines—patterned somewhat after the program we have developed during the past 40 years. The Soviet leaders believe that their hope in winning an economic war is dependent in large measure on the skill and productivity of its people.

In light of these facts we should not slacken for a day our efforts to expand and improve vocational education programs in order to increase the productivity of all our citizens. Our security and our American way of life may well depend upon our success in this important undertaking.

Again I commend you and salute you for the important role you are playing in helping to improve a phase of education which is vital to our American way of life.

It has been good to be with you.

What Do We Need for Economic Survival?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding address entitled "What Do We Need for Economic Survival?" delivered by Mr. Lansing P. Shield, president of the Grand Union Co. of East Paterson, N.J.

Mr. Shield is one of the leading businessmen in our State and has just completed a term as president of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce. More recently, he was elected president of the International Association of Food Distribution, and served as a representative of the food industry at the Moscow Fair.

Mr. Shield has long been concerned about the position of America in the continuing international economic competition. He has led the way for other

enlightened and patriotic businessmen in recognizing the many problems which this Nation faces and has offered some concrete and logical suggestions on how we can improve our position vis-a-vis the Russians.

The address was delivered at the 11th annual New Jersey Business Conference at Rutgers University on May 14. Mr. Shield serves as a member of the board of trustees at this university and is the recipient of the Rutgers' Alumni Federation Award for distinguished service to Rutgers. I commend his talk to my colleagues in the Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT DO WE NEED FOR ECONOMIC SURVIVAL?

(An address by Lansing P. Shield)

If that wise old statesman, Winston Churchill, had prophesied in his farewell press interview last Saturday that the world would come to an end by 1970, we would all be greatly aroused. But the world could come to an end before 1970—at least the kind of a world to which we are accustomed. In the Soviet Union's determination to defeat us, our adversary is overtaking us rapidly in the field of production (and it doesn't have to worry about slowdown and strikes). The living standards of Ivan, the Russian, are rising sharply. Breakeven points in the Russian economy are constantly dropping. Ours are steadily rising. The crash program of our competitor overseas is catching up fast—he now boasts that by 1970 he will have a greater material production than (to use Khurshchev's words) the "moribund capitalism" of the United States. Your dictionary will define "moribund" as "in a dying state" or "on the verge of extinction."

And so it may be a safe assumption that, despite threats and barring miscalculations by either side, the war for survival of our system will be fought in the marketplaces instead of on battlefields. To win this conflict, America must rely not so much on armament and combat veterans as on economics and economic veterans.

Probably the most reassuring thing about our position is a general awakening to the possibility that our system may not survive. President Eisenhower said recently that, "It is not the goal of the American people that the United States should be the richest nation in the graveyard of history."

Now if this is not our goal, logically we should ask ourselves, "Does the formula which may be said to represent our economic system insure survival of our way of life?"

The answer is a qualified "yes"—yes, providing we add to our strength and attack more vigorously the weaknesses in our economy.

When we are concerned about the survival of our businesses, the first thing we do is to take a hard look at our balance sheets. We weigh our assets against our liabilities. Let's take a look at America's balance sheet.

Our assets are so obvious that we need dwell on them only long enough to give us the proper perspective in an examination of our liabilities.

On the left side of the balance sheet, freedom—political, religious, and economic—is still our greatest asset. This asset, won through the American Revolution, for almost two centuries has made democracy the hope of millions around the world.

Next in the asset column are the basic characteristics of our people. Other great sources of strength are our natural resources—a soil and climate second to none (our farms produce more food than we can consume).

High in the asset column is American industry—America's mass production and mass distribution systems. We all know that in the number of homes, automobiles, and gadgets, the United States is still way out in front. Just as examples, Americans own 47 million refrigerators and the U.S.S.R. less than 3 million (someone has said every Russian home is a refrigerator). One hundred and twenty-one million persons in the United States have life insurance policies worth over \$500 billion (the best insurance a Russian can get is to slip outside the Iron Curtain).

Yet these impressive assets that have yielded both freedom and the highest standard of living on earth are in jeopardy.

With our system under attack, our liabilities seem to outweigh our assets.

Every day we are losing battles to the enemy and we have lost, for the most part, the moral leadership of the world. Donald David, Chairman of the Committee for Economic Development, said recently, "Our civilization, based on the spiritual concept of man created in the image of God, has acquired the reputation of being hard, cold, and often inhumanely materialistic."

RESERVOIR OF GOOD WILL NEARLY EMPTY

In 1941, Wendell Willkie, a businessman who looked beyond his business, made a trip around the world. When he returned, he pointed out that, over the years, America has built up a reservoir of good will—a national image in the eyes of other nations that pictured America as the champion of individual freedom—a people with an unselfish desire to help nations less privileged. That was 18 years ago. If Wendell Willkie were alive and making that same trip today, he'd be a disillusioned man. He would find that reservoir of good will nearly empty. At a time when we can least afford it, we seem to have replaced an asset with a liability.

It is hard for us to realize that millions of people in countries undergoing great social and economic changes now consider us allied with reactionary forces. As our liabilities are overpublicized and overplayed both by our friends and our enemies, these millions doubt the intrinsic worth of our economic system and question whether it will survive.

Is it any wonder that our national image is marred when headlines around the world read, "3,600,000 Unemployed in United States, New Low Since December, 1957" (that's more than the total population of some of the uncommitted countries), "Mob Lynches Negro in Mississippi" (foreign newspapers don't bother to point out it was the first lynching in 4 years), "Strikes Threaten to Paralyze Hospitals," "Inflation Weakens U.S. Economy." A worried citizen who had been reading too many headlines went to a doctor for a checkup. After a thorough exam, the doctor said, "You're as sound as a dollar." The patient said, "Gosh, Doc, I didn't know I was that bad off."

When we find ourselves in a defensive position, we might ask ourselves questions like these: Are we businessmen assuming our share of the responsibility for strengthening our economic formula or are we too preoccupied with beating last quarter's profits? (Of course, that's important, too.) Are we moving fast enough in eliminating weaknesses in our own businesses? For example are we prepared to move faster in the direction of a true business democracy in which employees become partners through stock ownership or sharing profits or both? (That may be the only long-range solution of our labor problems.)

Have we the courage to fight monopolistic labor tactics rather than take the expedient way out? Are we prepared to take a more active part in Government? Or, to sum up, as dealers in commodities and securities, are

we also prepared to discharge our responsibilities as dealers in human security and human freedom?

Some of our most serious liabilities lie in another important segment of our economy. Even that mythical figure, the man in the street, is beginning to understand that the greatest single threat to our economic system is the short-sighted philosophy of some of our labor leaders. Where there is no regard for a relationship between productivity and wage increases, when strikes are called in callous disregard of public health and welfare, when the philosophy becomes prevalent that "we'll get ours regardless of its effect on the business or social community," then our system begins to fall apart. Rising break-even points, loss of world markets, foreign competition that we can't even meet in our own domestic markets are the signals of the approaching storm. Economic storms breed in a climate of unbalanced budgets, wage-price thrusts and unfavorable trade balances.

INDUSTRY AND LABOR MUST WORK AS A TEAM

The philosophy of more pay for less work is being carried to a point where we are dividing up something we haven't got (and it may not be long before Moscow is saying, "We planned it that way.")

We are late in facing up to these liabilities that mar the effectiveness of our economic formula. It may be that we need stronger unions, but unions which get their strength through discharging their responsibilities to society as a whole. It may be that industry-wide bargaining, strike insurance, and legislation should be the means of striking a better balance between industry and organized labor. One definite conclusion may be drawn: we need desperately a greater will to fuse the interests of economic groups into the common objective of promoting the public welfare. This is the real core of our domestic problem if we are to preserve our institutions against the worldwide challenges they now face.

Our form of society, shaped around a capitalistic system, places primarily on business the responsibility of finding solutions for economic problems. While Government is in a unique position to promote a balance between divergent economic interests, you and I and thousands of business leaders should take a major share in shaping an economic system that will insure its survival. Politicians are the mouthpieces of their constituents. Their constituents, for the most part, work for us. What we do either in the public interest or otherwise, sooner or later will be reflected in Washington or the State Capitol. How fast and how well, also, largely depends upon us.

We are reaching the point where industrialists and labor leaders must submerge their short-term selfish interests if they want our economic system to survive. Either we start hanging together or we'll hang separately.

On the grounds that it is not the function of government, some of our leaders in Washington appear to be reluctant to make an all-out effort to bring industry leaders and organized labor closer together. The relationship between management and labor in this country reminds me of the relationship between manufacturers and retailers which may be found in some countries in Europe. Apparently there is a strong antagonism between these two European groups because they believe their interests are divergent. While in this country the manufacturers and retailers, for the most part, work closely together for the reason that they realize one cannot be prosperous without the other. Industry and organized labor are equally interdependent. They must work together as a team if either is to remain strong.

NEED FOR A NATIONAL COUNCIL

Up to now, government, management and labor had had no common meeting place where attempts can be made to close ranks against our common enemy—where conflicting interests may be examined in an atmosphere other than that of an emergency. A possible first step toward a solution is the formation of a national council, appointed by the President, composed of forward-looking leaders in government, labor and industry. This seems like a logical step in breaking down the hostility between economic groups and promoting understanding. Similar councils at the State level might well implement the efforts of the national council. In our own State, steps are being taken under the leadership of our Governor to move in this direction. These are only first steps, but we can only start from where we are and there is a pressing need for action.

But a formula for survival embraces more than correcting some of the basic weaknesses in our economic structure here at home. In this hot economic war now being fought on two fronts—here and abroad—we seem to be doing even more poorly abroad than at home.

Let's take international trade as a measure of our effectiveness. We're coming off second best in every brush with Russia and with most of the industrialized nations of the free world. The excess of U.S. exports of goods and services excluding military aid, over imports dropped from 5,800 billion in 1957 to 2,800 billion in 1958 (over 50 percent). (The 1957 figures were affected slightly by the Suez crisis so the comparison is not entirely valid.) And this decline in our trade balance is continuing in 1959. Our failure in the market places of the world cannot be ascribed solely to rising costs. After all, the wage-price spiral is not a U.S. phenomenon. It will be found in most of the industrialized countries of Europe.

The reasons for our ineffectiveness are primarily a lack of central direction and inability to move fast. In a shooting war, the President becomes Commander in Chief in fact as well as in name, and Congress temporarily delegates to the executive branch some of its powers. In this hot economic war, we are still using cumbersome peacetime methods. The story is told that recently when Khrushchev, Mikoyan and a third Russian were at a cocktail party in Moscow, a message was handed to Khrushchev, a matter of great importance had to be decided. In a corner of the room filled with guests, the three men made a quick decision of far-reaching importance.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE, FIRST LINE OF DEFENSE

I am informed that if the same matter had to be settled in Washington, 8 to 10 committee meetings involving 10 to 20 people in each meeting would have had to be held. There would be delay after delay, and the final decision would not be clear cut. While Russia is capturing markets, we are in committee. The first camel must have been designed in Washington. You know the definition of a camel—it's a horse designed by a committee. Nor do you win a war by legislation or legislative hearings.

We have many dedicated men in Washington, but their efforts are nullified through lack of central direction, overlapping jurisdiction, and insufficient authority. Under the present system, or lack of it, planners are afraid to make commitments. They are not sure of their authority or where they stand, because Congress controls the purse strings on a year-to-year basis. Steps in the direction of remedying this situation are the Fulbright amendment to the administration security bill and the President's recommendation made on Monday for a billion-dollar development bank and fund for Latin America.

These bills provide for greater emphasis on long-range loan funds and economic aid.

In this hot economic war, it's time we dealt with this emergency through emergency measures. Business as usual and Government as usual have no place in unusual times.

But measures such as these just mentioned, in themselves do not go far enough. A system that is fast-moving and flexible enough to compete with aggressive competitors in the marketplaces of the world is desperately needed. There is a pressing need for centralized and top-flight direction and authoritative leadership in our foreign economic affairs.

International trade is our first line of defense. For military defense, we have a Department of Defense with Cabinet status, independent of, but working with, the State Department. Equal Cabinet status should be given to another Department of Defense—a Department of International Trade. By having a department headed by a Secretary of Cabinet rank, the United States will be in a position to marshal its forces and compete aggressively in the world markets.

In this capacity, the Secretary of International Trade should have the right to make trade agreements, subject to the approval of the Senate. He should also have at his disposal funds of sufficient size so that he can undertake to develop long-range programs to compete in international trade as well as assist underdeveloped countries.

In this fast-changing world, whether our form of society survives is primarily a question of whether we take positive steps like these. If leaders in industry, labor, and Government will dedicate themselves to the solution of some of these major weaknesses in our society, we shall revitalize our national image, an image which once again can capture the imagination of the world. By so doing, we shall insure a strong America and a free world.

Opinion Poll Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I am reporting herewith the percentage results of my latest poll of public thinking in the 29th Pennsylvania Congressional District on 12 major national issues. I sincerely hope my colleagues in the Congress find them interesting and informative.

As background, I might point out that I have been taking these polls since first coming to Congress in 1939. They are in the form of a printed questionnaire, requiring simple "yes" or "no" answers, and they are mailed to the voters of my district, regardless of political party. The district is almost evenly divided between Republicans and Democrats.

The returns to this questionnaire were exceptionally good, and the total response virtually constitutes a referendum of the district.

The questions and the percentage replies follow without editorial comment.

	Yes	No
1. Do you believe that the Federal Government should promptly start a program designed to orderly terminate farm price supports?	94	6
2. Do you think that the Congress should pass an annual appropriation of at least \$1,000,000,000 for national debt retirement prior to the passage of any other appropriation bill?	85	15
3. Do you agree that if State and local officials enforced existing laws against criminal activities in labor unions that Federal laws in this field would be unnecessary?	38	62
4. Is it your impression that from a military point of view we are stronger than Russia?	51	49
5. Are you more in favor of building the Kinzua Dam than any other plan you know of for controlling the floodwaters of the upper Allegheny River?	67	33
6. Would you vote to reelect President Eisenhower if it were legally possible for him to run again?	63	37
7. Do you favor Federal funds for urban renewal projects?	30	70
8. Would you vote for Federal financial aid to public schools not limited to building construction?	33	67
9. Granting that so many dollars will be voted for foreign aid, would you favor increasing aid to Latin America and decreasing aid to western and southern Europe?	63	37
10. Do you believe that Government is more to blame for inflation than business and labor?	52	48
11. If current wage negotiations in the steel industry indicate a price increase for steel, would you favor the imposition by law of price and wage ceilings for steel and affected metal products?	59	41
12. This, the 86th Cong., has been labeled a "Can Do Congress" by some and a "Won't Do Congress" by others. Would you agree that it is a "Do Little Congress"?	71	29

Action on Water Pollution Control and Saving of Wilderness Areas Sought by Conservationist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, an able spokesman for one of our Nation's leading conservation organizations has reviewed in a recent article the need for early congressional action on two issues of great importance—the House-passed water pollution control bill and the wilderness area preservation bill. The article was written by Mr. Howard Zahniser, executive secretary of the Wilderness Society. Because both of these bills may soon come before the Senate for action, I believe many of my colleagues will find Mr. Zahniser's article both useful and informative. I ask consent to have the article, published in the New York Times on August 2, 1959, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 2, 1959]

TWO CONSERVATION BILLS PENDING—SENATE LEADERS URGED TO ACT ON WILDERNESS LEGISLATION

(By Howard Zahniser, executive secretary, the Wilderness Society)

A couple of weeks ago a group of national conservation leaders, meeting in Washington with a representative of Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, urged attention to pending legislation dealing with two main conservation objectives: clean streams and a system of wilderness areas maintained under a soundly established national policy and program.

Meeting in this mid-July discussion were executives of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, the National Wildlife Federation, the Wildlife Management Institute, the Wilderness Society, and Washington representatives of the Izaak Walton League and of Trustees for Conservation. The delegation, however, spoke also in effect for many other conservation organizations and for other groups supporting conservation programs. Twenty-two national organizations and 58 other State, regional, and local groups had supported the wilderness legislation being advocated, and practically all such organizations and groups that had acted had favored the measure being advanced to clean up the Nation's streams.

For clean streams the Senate leadership was urged to act favorably on a bill (H.R. 3610) already passed by the House of Representatives; for wilderness preservation the Senate was being asked to take the first steps toward enactment of a measure (S. 1123) that would also require House approval.

PUBLIC SUPPORT

As Congress enters the hot Washington month of August, prospects for this legislation are still uncertain. The outcome will probably depend on the amount of public support given these bills throughout the country.

In 1948 the Federal Government undertook a program to help control pollution in the Nation's streams. Twice renewed by Congress, the program has made much more than an important beginning in a Federal aid program of construction grants administered by the U.S. Public Health Service under the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Yet funds made available have not been sufficient to help municipalities across the land do much more than keep up with new sources of contamination. To clean up the streams will require a larger program.

This is the objective of the Blatnik bill (H.R. 3610) passed by the House on June 9 by a vote of 255 to 143, under the leadership of Minnesota's Representative JOHN BLATNIK, long a national champion of clean streams. This measure, now pending in the Senate, would amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase the authorization of construction grants for sewage treatment works to \$100 million per year over a 10-year period. Present annual allocations, which are inadequate, total only \$45 million.

The interest of conservationists is also focused on the wilderness bill, now before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which Senator JAMES E. MURRAY is chairman. This measure, to establish a national wilderness preservation system, was reintroduced this year in the Senate by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY of Minnesota and RICHARD L. NEUBERGER of Oregon and 17 other cosponsors, and by Pennsylvania's Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR and 10 others in the House.

This bill was held over from last year to the present Congress by demands for field hearings, as a result of which the public interest has grown greatly and the expectation of favorable action has increased.

Strong opposition to the bill has been continued by timber and other commercial interests. According to supporters of the measure, these interests hope for future opportunities to exploit the areas that the wilderness bill would more clearly safeguard, although these areas are already in the National Park System, or within some 20 out of the 275 National wildlife refuges and ranges, or within specially designated portions of the national forests that are mostly above timberline. They make up only about 8 percent of the national forests.

The proposed wilderness system was designed to avoid damaging or threatening other interests. Special provisions have been included to safeguard existing grazing and other interests, and to provide for mining and other nonconforming uses of wilderness where these would be in the public interest.

NEED FOR PROTECTION

The fact that opposition has come from commercial interests in the face of such a reasonable and modest proposal has been surprising to proponents of the program. At the same time it has emphasized the need for added protection.

Commercial opponents of the wilderness bill have made much of an argument to postpone this legislation until the 3-year Outdoor Recreation Resources Review, which has just gotten under way, has been completed. Recognized as a delaying move, this argument has been refuted by demonstration that wilderness legislation will facilitate the review by setting up guidelines, policies, and procedures that will help the review commission both in formulating its recommendations affecting wilderness and in indicating how they can be applied.

The original wilderness bill introduced in the 85th Congress was the subject of hearings held in June 1957, in Washington, the proceedings of which were published in a 444-page volume. Revised on the basis of criticisms and suggestions at these hearings, the bill was changed in 1958 and made the subject of hearings in Washington on July 23, 1958, and in the West in November 1958. These proceedings have been published in two volumes that total 1,060 pages. Two additional field hearings were held in March and April on the bill as introduced in this 86th Congress, these proceedings being published in a 490-page volume issued last week.

In addition much correspondence has been received by the legislators—preponderantly in favor of the bill. During the course of the November field hearings, the Senate committee tabulated the mail and reported that the total number of persons communicating were 1,284 in favor of the bill and 173 against.

SOME CHANGES PLANNED

Changes expected to be incorporated in the bill are elimination of Indian lands from the system, revised procedures to govern the incorporation of certain national forest areas, and elimination of a proposed National Wilderness Preservation Council. With such changes the wilderness bill now has the support of the Government's land administering agencies that would handle the program. Even with the elimination of features that have been strongly favored, the bill is earnestly advocated for immediate passage by its conservation supporters who feel the urgency of positive legislation for wilderness protection. The Senate committee is being strongly urged to report the bill favorably to the Senate for passage early this month.

"It is time," said Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton in his June 17, 1959, report on

the wilderness bill, "that wilderness and allied values be given greater recognition—their rightful place—in the statutes relating to management, development, conservation, and use of Federal lands and associated resources." He urged Congress to "give serious consideration to taking action now to initiate the establishment of a wilderness system by granting existing wilderness areas statutory protection," which is what the wilderness bill would do.

Asylum for Fulgencio Batista

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives to an outstanding story in the Daytona Beach (Fla.) Sunday News-Journal of July 26, 1959.

This article tells of the anxiety and plight of Mrs. Fulgencio Batista and her five children as they wait daily to receive some word that our Government has granted her husband asylum.

Many of the outstanding citizens of Daytona Beach, Fla., which is in my district, have signed a petition directed to the former President of Cuba, inviting him to again make his home among them. He lived in Daytona Beach from 1945 to 1948 and during the time he was there conducted himself in an irreproachable manner and was a fine and upstanding and public-spirited individual.

The text of the petition is as follows:

We, the undersigned citizens and residents of the city of Daytona Beach and other cities in Volusia County, Fla., hereby present this memorial to you and in such behalf represent and state as follows:

1. This memorial is signed by us who were your neighbors, acquaintances, or fellow residents when you lived in your adopted home in Daytona Beach from 1945 to 1948, and who witnessed and observed your high and irreproachable standards of ideas, concepts, conduct, friendship, fellowship, public-spiritedness, and citizenship;

2. At this, the time of your adversity, we desire you to know that we have and hold the same high degree of respect, admiration, and friendship for you as we had when you lived with us and later when you served as President of the Republic of Cuba;

3. And, finally, we express to you our sincere hope and trust that you and your family will return to your second or adopted home in Daytona Beach as soon as conveniently possible, and again become one of our residents and on a permanent basis.

Mr. Speaker, I am advised by the State Department that they are studying Mr. Batista's application for asylum. I would hope that favorable action will be taken on it soon. The grant of sanctuary by this country to a political refugee has never involved a political commitment or a determination of any political controversy. This man simply has a very natural desire to rejoin his wife and family in Daytona Beach.

The full story from the Daytona Beach Sunday News-Journal follows:

(By Mabel Norris Rees)

The followers of erratic Fidel Castro may be acclaiming their new hero wildly in Havana on this, the 26th of July, but among them are thousands who once felt the steady, cool hand of a lady during their time of trouble.

Today, while Cubans celebrate, the lady sits in Daytona Beach and weeps. Her world is crushed by events over which she had no control. Her heart is gripped by the hand of constant fear.

She is Marta Batista, wife of the fallen President Fulgencio Batista.

She lives in the Batista home on the Halifax River, daily praying for his safety in the Dominican Republic, praying for the day the State Department will grant him an entry permit. Her prayers are whispered at St. Paul's Catholic Church on Sunday in company with her children.

Marta Batista granted an interview with the News-Journal yesterday. Though she has stayed mostly in the background through the long weeks since that fateful New Year's Day of this year, she is speaking out now because of her intense worry over her husband.

She spoke out 6 days ago in a telegram to Mamie Eisenhower—a heart-rending appeal, woman to woman, asking understanding and help.

"I have called to the heart of many people and I swear that I never wanted to take a minute of your attention, but I am discouraged, I am almost dead," her message said. "My husband, Gen. Fulgencio Batista, is in the Dominican Republic fearing for his immediate and uncertain future. I have been a first lady, and I do not pretend for you to interfere in the decision of your honorable husband, but you are a woman, a wife, a mother, and to those human titles, I come with the hope that in some way you could help my husband who is a father of five children. One of them is a little girl of 2, and one is a boy of 4.

"My husband, who always has been a friend of the United States, will make sacred his promise of living in peace with his family in our home in Daytona Beach. I have devoted my life to help and pray for those who suffer, and I ask you, lady, in the moments of my sadness, shall I have you to help me? Dear lady, do your best. At least give your sympathy to make my husband admitted in the United States . . . I can't cry any more."

There has been no reply, as yet.

Two days later, Roberto Batista, who writes to his father every day, sent his own telegram to President Eisenhower.

"Sir: I am the second son of Gen. Fulgencio Batista. I am 11 years old, and was born in this country, which my father taught me to love. The house I was born in at Daytona Beach is now a museum for the will of my father, but we live next to it. Mr. President, I want you to know that I've not seen my father since last December, and our home is not what it used to be.

"We only see our mother crying all day long and the light in her room is never turned out because she cries all night, too." My younger brothers live in sadness and do not play like other kids do.

"Mr. President, do something for our happiness. We want our father to live with us. His life is in danger and we know also that if our father dies, our mother is so sick that she will die too, and we want them to live for us.

"Please, Mr. President, give the visa to my father to enter the country. Everybody knows in this city how he respected the law and citizens while he stayed here in the year I was born. Dear Mr. President, save the life

of my father. Bring him to us. Forgive me, Mr. President, and receive my respects."

Roberto also has not received an answer.

Washington attorneys for Batista say the State Department has not decided yet what will be done about the appeal for an entry permit. They say too that he did not try to come here last week, permit or no, as rumor had it.

The statement of Marta Batista to Mamie Eisenhower: "I have devoted my life to help and pray for those who suffer," was no idle boast.

THAT WAS HER LIFE IN CUBA

Dr. Blas M. Rocafor, a former Cuban attorney who was interpreter for the interview, talked extensively about her life there before he relayed questions to her. And her son, George, 16, interposed in English: "She worked until 3 o'clock in the morning, night after night."

"The President would conceive ideas that were needed in Cuba," Dr. Rocafor related, "and then he would turn them over to Marta to organize and supervise. There were the hospitals for children—three big hospitals in three different Provinces, and 36 dispensaries for the care of children. She formed committees to work in establishing them, and always she presided at their meetings.

"There were the schools and the school dining rooms. The President conceived the idea that they should be places where children of the poor could get good meals, paying just enough that they did not feel degraded by charity. So the children paid 5 cents for their meals; their parents could come, too, and pay 25 cents.

"Mrs. Batista supervised it all—including the hiring of dietitians to see to it that the meals were balanced."

Her rapid flow of Spanish cut in occasionally to say that it was her husband who conceived it all, and talked it over with her, and she took charge. They formed the National Institute for Public Assistance to provide general welfare, including homes for orphans and the old, and the Organization for the Rehabilitation of the Invalid, to aid the mentally retarded and cripples.

And they organized Christmas treats for the poor: Food befitting the season and toys for the children.

Through it all, there was always the presence of Marta Batista—organizing, supervising, making inspection tours, visiting the sick and injured in disaster areas, ordering a wheel chair sent here, a hospital bed there.

We were forced to explode the bombshell question: "But what of the story of the millions of dollars in jewelry scattered about her bedroom?"

George's dark eyes flashed: "That's a dirty lie. My mother didn't have time for jewelry—she worked 16 hours a day."

The question was translated to Marta Batista, and her gray green eyes reflected a deep hurt.

"If I had had all that jewelry, would I have left it lying around my bedroom? And I beg anyone to look at the pictures taken of me in Cuba—are there any where I was loaded with jewelry?" came the answer through Dr. Rocafor.

There were a few valuable pieces, yes—most of them gifts from visiting dignitaries. But Marta Batista said she cared little for jewelry, for social life, for ostentation, though it was expected from a first lady of a Latin country. She was always too busy, she said.

Then there is the story of the gold faucets in the "elaborate" Batista beach house. This was the only time that a flicker of laughter showed in her eyes, to be replaced swiftly by that look of a frightened woman, as she told what she says is the truth about the beach house.

In the first place, it wasn't a Batista house.

It was built by a wealthy sugar grower, and the Batistas rented it from him at the recommendation of a doctor who said Roberto needed to get the benefits of sea air for a throat condition.

But it had no solid gold faucets. They were fine faucets, as the rest of the house was fine, but not gold. And the Batistas turned them on only on rare weekends when they slipped away to the house for a week-end of rest.

Once Marta Batista was a beautiful woman. Tall, queenly in her bearing, she is yet lovely, but the last few months have taken their toll. She has lost 20 pounds. She runs her hands through her black hair so that her grooming suffers. Her pale face is drawn. Her eyes are red from constant crying.

She thinks of her husband's safety and of the effects of the fear of an assassin's bullet cutting him down on the thoughts of the children. Even 2-year-old Marta Maria shows it; their family doctor describes her as a "sad child." Her mother weeps afresh when she finds the baby standing before a picture of her father, fanning it and saying to the big, laughing man in the photograph: "Papa, please come home."

"We want only for him to be allowed to come here so our family can be together again," she said through the interpreter. "We are so close—always, no matter how tired he was, he never went to bed without going in to kiss the children goodnight. He was so proud of his little girl, after so many boys, and always, he took time to play with her. He was so concerned with the children's education, and determined they would be mannerly, courteous and considerate of others."

"For me, always, when we got dressed for a state affair, I would consult with him on what dress I should wear. We have been so close, so understanding."

Marta Batista feels confident that history will record that her husband was not the ogre he has been pictured by his enemies. She claims there were no murders of those enemies, and she points to the fact that her husband once had Castro, his worst enemy, in jail, and personally pardoned him after he had served 2 years of a 15-year term. She cites the constitution under which her husband operated, it had no death penalty.

Her eyes flashing, she said: "He never tortured anyone, as they charge. The records of the courts would show that everything was handled according to law and order. And he directed two revolutions—both without bloodshed. He did not believe in it."

She recalled the time 3 years ago when the palace was attacked and she and their children—with little Marta Maria on the way—were threatened with death. But even after that, she declared, Batista ordered no executions of those who had tried to harm his family.

Marta shrugged at the question of why they chose to go to the Dominican Republic when they fled Havana January 1. "It was just one of those quick decisions," she said. "He wanted to get out to save bloodshed; he said to me, 'If I am the cause of the trouble for Cuba, then maybe there will be peace if I leave.'"

But if he suddenly became bad for Cuba, she continued, "he still was the best president Cuba ever had. He did more for the people than any other. It's there in the hospitals, the schools, the roads—they can't deny them. And he always was trying to help the economy, building up plantations, providing more tourist attractions to bring in more money."

The other bombshell question: "What of the charge that he milked the treasury?"

Her eyes flashed even more as she got the question, and the reply came: "My husband

never took any money from the treasury for himself. He worked for the people of Cuba."

She said part of their hearts will remain in Cuba always, but now their only thoughts are to be together again and to live quiet, peaceful, useful lives in Daytona Beach.

The way he believes he can be useful, she said, is in helping Cuban refugees in this country, and in trying to soothe relationships between the United States and the island. She pointed to his stand during World War II, when he defied German submarines, virtually at the door of Havana, to supply air bases and cooperate with the U.S. military effort in every way—including joining the declaration of war 24 hours after Pearl Harbor.

For the sake of what was good in the past, for the sake of what he hopes to contribute to the future, and for the sake of his sorrowing family, Mrs. Batista thinks the United States should grant that entry permit.

So she prays today that she will receive an answer from the First Lady of the United States.

Pan-Asian Culture and Recreation Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, plans for the development of a Pan-Asian Culture and Recreation Center on a tract of land along the Potomac River in nearby Calvert County, Md., were announced recently, and I take this opportunity to call the attention of this body to these proposals.

According to reports concerning this project, the center will cost several million dollars, and will carry the endorsement of numerous Pan-Asian countries and various American foundations.

An article concerning the proposed center was included in the July 30 edition of the Calvert Independent newspaper of Prince Frederick, Md., and I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this item be printed in the Appendix of today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Calvert Independent]

CULTURAL CENTER PROPOSED—PAN-ASIAN CULTURE AND RECREATION CENTER TO BE DEVELOPED

On Monday of this week Mr. William A. Reick of Lower Marlboro, Mr. Emerson Phillips, president of the Calvert County Chamber of Commerce, and Senator Edward T. Hall were guests for lunch of Mr. and Mrs. William D. Lee, owners of the Chinese-American Restaurant "Genghis Khan" at Connecticut and Florida Avenues in Washington, at which time Mr. Lee explained the development that is being planned on a 138-acre tract of land on the Patuxent River in Calvert County.

Mr. Lee is a Columbia graduate and his guests were greatly impressed with his sincerity, his religious background, and his keen interest in our American way of life.

The development will be known as "The Pan-Asian Culture and Recreation Center," and will include a swimming pool, a golf course, tennis court, a center culture build-

ing with dining facilities in keeping with the customs of the Pan-Asian countries, an amphitheater, and Asian style structures. Each country would have its own building of the architectural design representative of the 23 Pan-Asian countries. The center culture building will have hotel facilities to accommodate at least 75 people.

Mr. Lee stated the purpose of such a development would give a true down-to-earth picture of the American and Pan-Asian way of life and methods of living. He also stressed the importance of religion in this center and stated that great emphasis would be placed on the freedom of worship of each country. As he so aptly stated, "Without religion there is no culture—there can be no way of life."

This \$5 to \$6 million project will carry the endorsement of the 23 Pan-Asian countries, the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, Mrs. Guegenheim, Mrs. Merriweather Post, and the United Nations.

Following the signing of the option which was consummated on Monday it is expected that ground will be broken in the spring.

Mr. Lee is the promoter and organizer and his three guests were indeed impressed with his comprehensive knowledge of the necessity for better international relationship and could visualize the importance of such a development and offered themselves to be of whatever service that they could possibly render.

Mr. E. Steuart Vaughan, a Calvert real estate broker, handled the transaction.

The Federal Credit Union Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. BARR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, when I came to this Congress about 6 months ago, I was assigned to the Banking and Currency Committee. Since last January our committee has been hard at work on many different bills that have dealt with the financial institutions of this country. It has been a real privilege for me to work on this legislation in committee and to defend it on the floor of the House. Our record so far has been excellent. We have passed bills concerning the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the Inter-American Bank, the Federal Reserve System and technical bills designed to modernize the banking laws of the United States.

There has been one big trouble with all this hard work. I am sure that it has been constructive legislation and of real value to this Nation. But all these bills have been so technical and so complicated that it has been very difficult for me to explain to the people of my congressional district just what I was doing.

Last Friday we finally came to a bill which I defended on the floor of the House that everyone can understand. This was the credit union bill. In Marion County, Ind., there are 93 credit unions with a membership of over 60,000 people. These people have joined together in different industrial plants, offices, and agencies of government in

a cooperative effort to meet their short term needs for money. While there are not too many people that I can talk to about the highly technical provisions of the Federal Reserve System, there are thousands and thousands of people who understand perfectly well just how a credit union works and what it means to them. It is for this reason that I was so pleased to be able to do my part on the committee and before the House of Representatives in defending this bill.

Basically this credit union bill is an attempt to modernize the law—to bring it up to date. This is just the same thing that we have been doing with the great financial institutions that make up the membership of the Federal Reserve System. Many of us feel that the United States is facing a drastic shortage of money and credit in the next 10 years. Our population is increasing at an explosive rate. In the next 10 years it is very probable that we will have 50 million more people in this country. It is going to take a lot of money and a lot of credit to make sure that these people have jobs, to see to it that they have houses, and that they have the opportunity to live a decent life. It is absolutely necessary that this Nation use its savings as wisely and efficiently as possible. This is the theory that we used in all our previous banking legislation, and this is the theory that we are using in the credit union bill.

Basically this is what the credit union bill does:

First of all, it permits a credit union to make a loan for 5 years instead of the 3-year limit that is now in force. Second, it permits a credit union to loan as much as \$1,000 instead of the present \$400 limit. Third, it makes it a Federal crime for anybody to rob a Federal credit union. The rest of the bill deals with technical parts of the law, but these three provisions are the things that will be of most interest to credit union members.

The short explanation above shows that in the credit union bill we are trying to bring existing law up to date. We are trying to use the savings of the members of these credit unions wisely and productively. I am certain that this is a good bill, and I think it is especially fitting that this legislation should come on the 50th anniversary of the credit union movement of the United States and the 25th anniversary of the Federal credit union legislation. My work toward the passage of this bill is my personal anniversary gift to the 60,000 members of credit unions back in Marion County, Ind.

Great Lakes Become Scientific Laboratory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, with the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway, the Great Lakes region—the greatest

reservoir of fresh water in the world—is coming increasingly into the spotlight of national affairs.

For the most part, expansion of trade and commerce on the Great Lakes—stimulated tremendously by the seaway—is generally considered to be the major interest of the Great Lakes region.

The significant lakes area, however, is also experiencing a wide variety of other activities.

According to a recent article in the Milwaukee Journal entitled "Great Lakes Become Scientific Laboratory," for example, a number of research projects are underway.

With more than 100 scientists from the United States and Canada engaged in research activities, special studies are being made to gain information: First, to aid commerce in connection with the St. Lawrence Seaway; second, to gain more data bearing on Chicago's diversion of water from Lake Michigan; third, to determine the effects of the lakes on weather in the region; fourth, the impact of increasing population on the lakes; and other purposes.

For the future, I believe that the Great Lakes region—now surrounded by the greatest agricultural—industrial complex in the world—will become increasingly important as a commercial, tourist, residential, cultural, and recreational center of the world.

As an example of the kind of ground-work that will help to create the new status for the lakes area, I ask unanimous consent to have the article from the Milwaukee Journal printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

GREAT LAKES BECOME SCIENTIFIC LABORATORY—HALF DOZEN RESEARCH PROJECTS ARE UNDERWAY THIS SUMMER IN THEIR WATERS
[From the Milwaukee Journal, Aug. 2, 1959]

(By R. G. Lynch)

The Great Lakes are a huge scientific laboratory this summer with more than 100 scientists from the United States and Canada engaged in a half dozen projects for Federal agencies and the States of Michigan, Ohio, and Illinois.

Information to aid commerce in connection with the St. Lawrence Seaway, information bearing on Chicago's diversion of water to flush sewage down the Illinois River, the effect of the lakes on weather in the region and the impact of increasing population on the lakes are some of the things involved.

The five lakes together constitute the greatest reservoir of fresh water in the world, a natural resource of tremendous importance to the region bordering them. One of the important problems is that of keeping this fresh water from being contaminated seriously.

States are exercising greater control over inland waters. Some prohibit industries which use a great deal of water from building on inland waters. Some are making greater demands for maintenance of water quality.

More and more industries are expected to seek sites on Great Lakes shores to be near water supplies and to facilitate waste disposal. Of course, population increases will follow and domestic wastes will increase.

WASTE IS PROBLEM

Increased commerce since the St. Lawrence waterway was opened has been accompanied by an increase in wastes from steamships.

The University of Michigan's Great Lakes Research Institute, which has been working on the lakes for several years, will continue studies of currents, plant and animal life, bottom core samples and water conditions in northern Lake Michigan and Traverse Bay, Lake Huron.

It also will explore the natural aging process of the lakes and the effects of the St. Lawrence Seaway, and carry on a cooperative project with the university's meteorological laboratories concerning the drag force of wind on water.

Currents affect navigation and distribution of fish food and wastes. Knowledge of them can be used to predict bacterial quality of deep water and to determine hydroelectric possibilities.

This summer, the Michigan Institute will carry on several projects. It will survey industries on Lake Erie to determine the temperature and composition of water they use.

It will study microscopic plants, the beginning of the food chain of water organisms, in Grand Traverse Bay. It will take core samples of Lake Huron's bottom to study the relation between the geology and erosion along the shore north of Port Huron in the Lexington area.

Ohio also is studying geology and shore erosion on Lake Erie. The findings of the two studies will be of value in the whole Great Lakes area.

RAINFALL STUDIED

Effects of the lakes on weather in the region, particularly rainfall, are being studied by personnel of the Illinois Waterways Commission.

The Chicago station of the Federal Weather Bureau is studying the relationship between rainfall and lake levels. Presently the belief is that it takes several years for rainfall in the watersheds, or lack of it, to influence lake levels.

The Canadian hydrographic office and the U.S. lake survey are charting deepened channels and ports of the seaway.

The U.S. Public Health Service is working on a problem of filtration of treated municipal sewage through sand beds. Clogging of filters is believed to be caused by some dissolved organic chemical from living organisms.

And commercial fisheries agencies of both nations and several States and Provinces are continuing efforts to control the sea lamprey and restore the lake trout fishery.

The Wisconsin conservation department has two men checking commercial fishermen's catches in Lake Superior for the recovery of stocked trout and the percentage of lamprey scarring on all trout.

Jim Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial that appeared in the June 12, 1959, issue of the Iola (Kans.) Register, following the address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the Board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., before a joint meeting of the Iola Area Civic Clubs on June 11, 1959:

JIM FARLEY

Jim Farley, whom several hundred Iolans got to see and hear for the first time yesterday, has been quite a fellow in his 71-year

lifetime. And it hasn't all been politics either.

You might be interested to know—

That his first job, after graduating from the Packard Commercial School of New York City in 1906, was as a bookkeeper for the Merlino Heilholz Paper Co. In exactly 20 years, he had worked up to the position of sales manager for the Universal Gypsum Co.

In that same year, 1926, he formed his own building supply company under the name of James A. Farley & Co. And in 3 more years he had merged with five other building material companies to form the General Builders Supply Corp.

He served as president and director of this very considerable company until 1933 when he resigned to become Postmaster General for 7 years under President Franklin Roosevelt. Incidentally, he was reelected to this position with General Builders Supply in 1949.

Meanwhile, of course, (1940) he had been appointed chairman of the board of directors of Coca-Cola Export Corp., which is the main job he has held since being Postmaster General.

But he is also a director of Coca-Cola Co. of Canada, president and director of Coca-Cola International, a director of Compania Embotelladora Coca-Cola of Cuba, and a director of the Empire State Foundation, Inc.

But he still has a little time to spare so he is also a trustee of the Cordell Hull Foundation and the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation.

His political career began when he was appointed town clerk of Stony Point, N.Y., in 1912. He was a member of the New York State Assembly in 1923, chairman of his local county Democratic committee from 1919 to 1929.

He was chairman of the State Democratic committee from 1930 to 1934 and of the National Committee from 1932 to 1940. He was a delegate to every Democratic National Convention from 1924 to 1948.

And just to wind it up, he is first vice president of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, New York.

Vice President Nixon's Trip to Russia and Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD representative editorials which reflect the almost universal acclaim for Vice President Nixon's trip to Russia and Poland.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Aug. 3, 1959]

NEW DIMENSIONS

It will take time, perhaps a lot of time, to assess with confidence the results of Vice President Nixon's visit to Russia, and its sequel, his current visit to Poland.

Today's announcement that Premier Khrushchev and President Eisenhower will exchange visits, however, dramatizes one certainty: The past 10 days have profoundly altered, at least for the moment, the nature of the relations between the statesmen of East and West.

These relations, from the very beginnings of the Bolshevik regime, have been confined rigidly to meetings between the statesmen, and even these have for the most part been at arm's length. They have also been largely sterile. Personal contacts that approached friendship have been rare, and most often a prelude to the demotion of the Soviet official.

Mr. Nixon's visit has added a new dimension to these relations.

He has been allowed to speak freely, and at length to the Russian people over television and radio, as Soviet representatives have been able to speak to the American people.

He has made the most of this opportunity, to tell them frankly, though diplomatically, why the United States feels compelled to arm for the defense of itself and its allies. He has cited the record of this country's efforts to reach agreement on disarmament and other thorny problems, and told them openly that the Soviet radio and press have not been giving them the whole truth.

He has made the most, too, of opportunities to show the friendly face of this country to the Russian people in personal contacts.

It is an opportunity that has not been given to other Western statesmen, and the response has been warm. It is evident that the plain Russians who met him discovered that America, too, can be warm, and may begin to believe that Americans are as anxious for peace as they are.

The results of these contacts with the people may be far reaching, if the Soviet Government allows them to be.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Aug. 3, 1959]

A FAIR AND FORTHRIGHT SPEECH

Vice President Nixon's half-hour speech from Moscow Sunday to a multimillion Soviet radio and television audience was remarkable not so much for the presentation of fresh ideas but for the clear and forthright manner in which the basic ideas for achieving world peace were stated.

This was the first time in history that any senior American Government official has had the opportunity to talk directly and frankly to the Russian people—to have his remarks translated on the spot in full and without fear of censorship.

That Mr. Nixon managed to combine so well blunt talk about Soviet obstinacy and praise for Soviet progress without appearing either belligerent or hypocritical, is a tribute to his statesmanship.

In carefully chosen words, with strict adherence to facts and without rancor, Mr. Nixon expressed the American desire for peace and friendship with the Soviet Union based on mutual respect, not on surrender or dictation by either side.

Saying that both countries were too strong to tolerate being pushed around, he laid the responsibility for world peace squarely on Khrushchev's shoulders.

Praising the Soviet Premier as a born leader of men with tremendous drive and talent, Mr. Nixon urged him to use his energies to create a better life for his people.

Specifically and categorically he stated that if the Premier, however, used the resources of his people to promote the Communization of countries outside the Soviet Union, nothing could result but continuing fear, distrust, and tension.

For emphasis, in substantiating the American desire for peace, he made the telling point, "We have fought in two world wars and have demanded and received not an acre of territory or a cent in reparations."

Unlike the generalities and strictly diplomatic doubletalk that have plagued so many efforts to achieve understanding, Mr. Nixon made several good and detailed recommendations for the promotion of a more relaxed

atmosphere between the United States and Russia.

He urged that the language barrier be removed, and neatly congratulated the Soviets on being far ahead of America in this respect. He urged that the exchange of teachers, students, visitors, and all types of cultural programs be sharply expanded.

And most important, he said, was the need for a much greater exchange of information so that misconceptions which we have about each other can be removed.

There is little doubt that Mr. Nixon's whirlwind, 11-day tour of Russia has given him a better insight into the workings of communism and the minds of the Soviet people than that of any other short-time American visitor.

He has been to industrial cities heretofore off limits for Americans; he has spoken to thousands in Moscow, Sverdlovsk, Novosibirsk, and other great centers; he has had a rough and tumble, highly spectacular, and blunt argument with Khrushchev and has been allowed to speak freely over a nationwide radio and 50-station television hookup.

He has, in short, presented the official American point of view to the Soviet Government and the Russian people in concise, unmistakable, and eminently fair language without bluster, belligerency or exaggeration.

He has handled himself with dignity, given as good as he got and in all personal appearances showed himself to be friendly and sincere.

He now has the opportunity to repeat this excellent performance in Poland. If the warmth of his reception at the Warsaw airport is any indication of the willingness of the Poles to hear some plain American talk on world conditions and what can be done about them, Mr. Nixon's tour will have been a success indeed.

[From the Yonkers Record, Aug. 2, 1959]
NIXON, KHRUSHCHEV, AND THE CITY OF YONKERS

Editorials in a weekly newspaper by tradition are supposed to comment on local matters. And that's just what we are doing by picking Vice President Nixon's historic tete-a-tete with Comrade Khrushchev as a subject.

For what happened in the now famous first meeting between these two is of supreme importance to every citizen of Yonkers and to every other American and to every individual all over the world who cherishes freedom. Thus Mr. Nixon as a world figure is fittingly a local subject.

To begin with when Mr. Nixon left the United States as a potential presidential nominee for 1960, his presidential boosters privately conceded that he had much ground to gain if he were to beat off the rapidly advancing newcomer to politics, the dynamic, personable Governor Rockefeller. Now, a short time later, Mr. Nixon, by his superb handling of a difficult situation, has zoomed his presidential stock and henceforth will be measured, not as a Vice President necessarily overshadowed by the dominance of the Office of the President, but as a vital, personal force completely equipped to stand on his own capable two feet and slug it out with a crude double dealer in an atmosphere of barely submerged hostility.

This demonstrable asset will give many a political pollster a second and considerably altered look at the Nixon who has ably acquitted himself in every home in the Nation where there is a television set.

Mr. Nixon's head-on clash with the ram-bunctious monologues of Khrushchev have at the very least given us two things which we ought to remember. One is the ordinary language which Mr. Nixon wisely used in the free exchange with the Russian "Big Wheel." This is the kind of language, stripped of

State Department soft sounding euphemisms, which is understood by all people. And secondly, Mr. Nixon has given us firsthand evidence that Khrushchev and the rest of his Kremlin cohorts are never to be trusted. Mr. Nixon exacted a public promise from Khrushchev that the meeting would be translated fully for the Russian people and the Soviet captive nations. This promise was not kept. Here in America and in every free nation around the globe, the Nixon-Khrushchev meeting was honestly, completely translated. Khrushchev returned the compliment by deleting some of Nixon's remarks and even appropriating some of the Vice President's telling blows to himself.

There's a great lesson in the devious way of the mind of the Communist in all this. We in Yonkers should study it and learn it well. It can help equip us to combat the sick mind which is sucked into the deadly pervasion of clever Communist propaganda.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News,
July 31, 1959]

PILGRIM'S PROGRESS IN RUSSIA

Vice President Nixon is doing himself no harm as the record of his Pilgrim's Progress in Russia unfolds. Thus far he has done the United States a lot of good. The consternation within the breasts of international diplomats, however, appears to be as unprecedented as are the methods of the pilgrim.

The lads with morning coats and striped pants are agape and aghast at this routine of chucking babies under the chin and slugging it out with Khrushchev just inside the kitchen door. It isn't done, you understand. But Pilgrim Nixon does it, with all the vigor, and all the deft folkiness of running for Congress in California.

Nixon seems to reason this way: A man like Khrushchev is half peasant, half Caesar, with Karl Marx cataracts over his eyes and a ball-bearing tongue. Well, then, if Khrushchev decides to yank a post off the bedstead and make a bludgeon of it, a bedstead has more than one post for bludgeoning purposes in defense. Khrushchev sticks out his jaw, he is leading with his chin—why not let him have it?

It isn't diplomacy. But Khrushchev understands it. He even seems to appreciate a man who can and will meet him on his own terms. And the proletariat understand hopping out of a car to shake hands or chuck a baby's pink chin.

Nobody is going to trip Nixon up on Marxian dialectical dispute. Dick Nixon met and downed Alger Hiss, the smoothest customer that ever sought to serve Moscow's interests. With the exception of J. Edgar Hoover, no American in office today knows more about the Communist theory and practice of world domination.

Hailed or heckled, the Yankee Pilgrim knows what to do. He can give as good as he gets—and have a wonderful time while he is at it. He may not settle the problems of our days, but he has already let Russia know that when we go horse trading we expect to come back home with something more than the halter.

As that simple idea sinks in, maybe we will be getting somewhere later on.

[From the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel,
July 30, 1959]

GOOD EVENING

(By Clifford B. Ward)

Pity at this moment the poor pinkish liberals in this country who despise Vice President RICHARD NIXON, but don't know, lacking signals from Moscow, how they should assess Nixon's behavior and reception in the Communist motherland. They can't very well say that he has acted like a chump to alienate the Russian leaders, because after roughing up the Russian leaders, the latter

gave every appearance of liking it. For the first time, Khrushchev and the others seemed to show a healthy, wholesome respect for an American shrewd enough to cut through the diplomatic jungle growth and swing on the Russian jaw. And to the discomfiture of both the Kremlin leaders and the Communists here, the people of Russia have shown so much affection for Nixon that it's highly embarrassing to them.

Nixon's political trick of jumping out of parade automobiles to shake hands and exchange words with ordinary people along parade routes is making the same hit in Russia as in any American city. It only goes to prove that human beings are pretty much alike the world over.

LIBERALS' NIGHTMARES

What would have made a great picture to cause the liberals in this country to have nightmares from now on would have been a photograph of Westbrook Pegler shaking hands with Khrushchev in Moscow after Nixon introduced the two men. If there is any man that the liberals dislike it is Pegler and there was Pegler in Moscow being presented to Khrushchev by the Vice President.

In our perverse way, we wish that Nixon had even said, "Aw nuts," to Khrushchev, giving further respectability to the American idiom of speech, but in effect he did the same thing. To the credit of Khrushchev, he liked being roughed up, as much as he liked roughing up Nixon.

Certain political figures always seem to have the hand of destiny on them and Nixon is one of those persons. Whenever his enemies try to put down a trap for him, he ends up using the trap for his own profit. And it all started from a political point of view while a Congressman. Looking at Alger Hiss under oath, Nixon decided that Hiss was lying about his acquaintanceship with Whitaker Chambers. Had he not had a second thought about Hiss' credibility, Hiss would have gone free, but more than that Nixon would never have been heard of politically.

ATMOSPHERE CLEARED

State Department bureaucrats have probably been taking tranquilizers ever since Nixon landed in Russia, but he has done a lot to clear the atmosphere of some heavy threatening clouds. He may have accomplished more with his blunt, frank remarks to Khrushchev than all the ministers did at Geneva after weeks and weeks of diplomatic gobbledygook.

What has scored a hit for Nixon is very old, old stuff, which put in one bottle can be labeled courage. A timid person would never have undertaken the Russian trip. A timid person would never have dared to talk back to Khrushchev and the other Russian leaders. And apparently, despite the fact that they have roughed him up, the Russian leaders actually like him. As we say, that must make Reds in this country and elsewhere wonder how they are going to follow the game without a better program.

[From the Los Angeles Examiner, Aug. 3,
1959]

NIXON'S SPEECH

In contrast to the teacup pleasantries of the past, which more often masked differences than furthered understanding, Vice President Nixon's speech in Moscow Saturday was resolute modern statesmanship.

It was blunt where it needed to be.

It was sympathetic in recognizing the yearning for peace of the Russian people and friendly in acknowledging their vitality and strength.

It was a warning to the Russian leaders that there can be no peace by "surrender or dictation" and a direct warning to Premier Khrushchev that if he continues to try to impose communism on nations out-

side the Soviet Union, he will insure "an era of fear, suspicion and tension" for himself and his people.

It was a clear and calm explanation why the existence of our foreign bases has been compelled by previous Communist aggressions and the enormous proportion of Soviet effort that goes into weapons.

It was a factual countdown of the proposals we have made for disarmament and peace, all of which have been rebuffed or twisted out of expectation of achievement.

It was a quiet and forceful affirmation of the right "of different peoples to choose the economic and political systems they want," and thus an implicit assurance to captive nations that we do not accept the status quo of their captivity.

Naturally, we do not expect Khrushchev to rush to the microphone with a panting endorsement of Mr. Nixon's views.

But we hope the millions of Russian people who heard him will have a better understanding of our country's aims, motives and principles.

We think the free world will approve the Nixon speech and we hope the uncommitted nations reflect upon it.

As for ourselves, we second President Eisenhower's message to Mr. Nixon on the windup of his Russian travels: Well done.

[From the Shreveport Times, July 29, 1959]

NIXON, KHRUSHCHEV, AND AESOP

What the West has needed for a long time in its dealings with Khrushchev is more of Vice President Nixon.

The Vice President's emphatic—yet courteously spoken—verbal lambasting of Khrushchev when Khrushchev lambasted the United States seemed to amaze the Red dictator. He had been talked to bluntly by President Eisenhower, but always it had to be through diplomatic notes. He had insulted the British without retaliation. With Mr. Nixon he found himself facing a person as tough—perhaps tougher—than he, and vastly better informed and better able to handle himself on any subject.

Mr. Nixon did not insult Khrushchev. He just pared him down to frying size. In the end, Khrushchev seemed to change his whole approach as he was given the only treatment he understands—straight from the shoulder.

The Nixon-Khrushchev meetings and exchanges were in sharp contrast to the visit some time ago of Prime Minister Macmillan of Great Britain to Moscow, although the environment in each case was directly parallel. Both Mr. Nixon and Mr. Macmillan went to Moscow by official invitation of Khrushchev. Both were greeted coolly but courteously at the airport. While each was touring the city talking to people informally, Khrushchev, in another part of town, delivered tirades against the West in general and the Nation of his visitor in particular. Both were taken to Khrushchev's country home for overnight visits in a sort of unspoken apology for Khrushchev's conduct. But here was the difference:

Mr. Macmillan figuratively hid his head in chagrin and uttered nothing but milk-toast replies to Khrushchev. Mr. Nixon traded verbal blow for verbal blow, face to face with Khrushchev, and "made him like it." The Vice President aroused pride and satisfaction in the hearts of free people. Mr. Macmillan did not.

When Khrushchev roared on with long criticisms of life in free countries, Mr. Nixon smilingly told him: "You talk too much. Quit filibustering and do something." Khrushchev likes to talk in idioms, mottoes, fables, and even allegories. He told Mr. Nixon that the way to get rid of bedbugs (problems) is to catch them one at a time and pour boiling water in their ears. He loves to use the one about the sorcerer's ap-

prentice who became so adept he "disappeared the sorcerer." Mr. Nixon, when asked by Khrushchev to drink a toast to "end of American bases overseas," replied: "I don't like this wine." He then proposed a toast "in better wine"—to peace. Khrushchev withdrew his toast and drank to Mr. Nixon's.

Mr. Nixon, in light vein, could have resorted to Aesop's Fables, as Khrushchev often does. When the latter boasted that Russia is stronger and tougher than the United States, Mr. Nixon could have replied with this one by Aesop:

"Wandering in a lonely place as the sun went down, a wolf noticed the long shadow cast by his body. 'Fancy a big fellow like me being afraid of the lion,' he said. 'Why, I must be 30 yards long. I'll make myself king and rule all the animals, every single one of them.' But for all his boasting, a strong lion caught him and sat down to devour him. Too late, he regretted his mistake. 'Conceit,' he wailed, 'has helped to bring about my ruin'."

And when Khrushchev got tough about American bases and brought a seeming stalemate in serious discussions, Mr. Nixon could have quoted Mr. Aesop this way:

"On a hot, thirsty summer's day a lion and a boar came to drink at a small spring. They started quarrelling which should drink first, and so provoked each other to a mortal combat. But stopping for a moment to take breath, they looked around and saw some vultures waiting to devour whichever of them was killed. This sight made them stop their quarrel. 'It is better for us to be friends,' they said, 'than to be eaten by vultures and crows.' * * * Strife and contention are ill things, which end in danger for all parties, if they have not the sense to be reconciled."

In fact, that is just about what Mr. Nixon did say, but in blunt English and not in the language of fables. He told 5,000 Russians hearing him in impromptu street talk: "If we cannot learn to live together, all of us will die."

Khrushchev had better understand the seriousness of that statement. And the West would do better to use Mr. Nixon more often as its emissary in discussions with Khrushchev.

Inequities in Our Immigration Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I do hope that before this session of Congress adjourns, legislation can be enacted and signed by the President to liberalize our immigration laws with respect to inequities to some nationalities that exist in the present legislation.

I am herewith submitting a resolution which was unanimously adopted by the Order of Ahepa at its recent district convention in Fort Wayne, Ind.:

ORDER OF AHEPA,

July 20, 1959.

HON. RAY J. MADDEN,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: At the district convention of the Hoosier District No. 12 of the Order of Ahepa which was held at Fort Wayne,

Ind., a resolution was unanimously adopted which reads as follows:

"We appeal and urge you to give full support to additional Greek quotas for Greek families and relatives, to liberalize our immigration laws, and to humanize its policies. Additional Greek quotas should be transferred from other undersubscribed nationality quotas and visa appeals. May we call to your attention the fact that at the end of each fiscal period nearly one-third of the immigration quotas literally are wasted or unused. Many countries in South America are quota exempt, while Greek quotas are frequently exhausted and very heavily oversubscribed. This inequity should be corrected. Thus, it is urgent to give full support to H.R. 3033 and S. 952, and/or similar legislation. Such action will allow separated families to reunite and aid fourth-preference quotas to reunite separated families of brothers, sisters, and adult children of U.S. citizens. Also, such action will reaffirm further America's friendship to Greece—a nation which has been a bulwark in the freedom fight against communism and aggression. The attention of all hellenism and the eyes of eastern orthodoxy are focused upon your action on this vital legislation. Now is the time for Congress to act to remove the many inequitable and discriminatory aspects of our immigration laws."

We on the district lodges would appreciate your support on the above matter knowing that in the past you have been very fair and equitable on your decisions on this urgent matter.

Fraternally yours,

SPEER C. SKALTSAS,
Secretary, 12th District.

Untold Story of Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following review of Mr. Earl Harding's recent book by Dr. Louis Martin Sears, noted historian, author of many historical works and essays, and now emeritus professor of history, Purdue University:

THE UNTOLD STORY OF PANAMA

Those Americans who still idolize Theodore Roosevelt will be grateful that this definitive exposure of his chicanery at Panama was made so many years after his death. Even so, he lived to see America pay heart-balm to Colombia for our unneutral attitude toward the Panama revolution.

It is unlikely that the international law firm of Sullivan & Cromwell will derive any satisfaction from the exposure of William Nelson Cromwell's equivocal relationship to the assets of the French Panama Canal Company. "Who got the \$40 million"? Is it possible that some of these found their way to Cromwell himself and his \$19-million estate?

On a more constructive side, Mr. Earl Harding's careful research provides the soundest of bases for America's present rights in Panama which liberals treat so lightly when cooperating with the Russians to communize the Caribbean. Witness the lighthearted, even jolly, abandonment of both terminals of the Panama Railway.

Among the numerous personages so carefully assessed in the present pages, Philippe Bunau-Varilla, hitherto a somewhat shadowy figure, emerges in a clear but far from rosy light.

The book is peculiarly timely when American rights are jeopardized by Communists without and traitors within.

LOUIS MARTIN SEARS.

Swiss National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, August 1 is the anniversary of the founding of the Swiss Confederation and is one of the oldest national holidays in all Europe. The Swiss people, keenly aware of their distinct individuality and possessing a robust character, have maintained their freedom because they proved always ready to defend their liberties against all comers. They have taken up arms innumerable times in defense of their freedom in the course of many centuries.

The Swiss people built their cherished republic in the hard way. Of course there is no easy road to national independence, but the stouthearted people of that mountainous country high up in Europe attained theirs very gradually in slow stages. Beginning with the Defensive League formed on August 1, 1291, their persistent efforts led to practical independence in 1499, and finally culminated in complete independence from the Holy Roman Empire in 1648.

Since those distant days the Swiss people have stoutly maintained their independence and their freedom of action against all foes. This little country of just over 15,000 square miles, with a population a little over 5 million, has earned the respect and admiration of all countries, great and small, powerful and weak. No conqueror or dictator has dared to violate Swiss neutrality, which the people cherish as their most priceless possession next to their independence. As a matter of fact the Swiss feel, with considerable justification, that their very independence is in a way conditioned on their centuries-old neutrality.

Today Switzerland with its democratic government, its efficient democratic institutions, its highly developed technology, and its sound finance and stable currency, has become a living model for efficient democracy. Through their industry, ingenuity, education, and utilization of their natural gifts, the well-meaning, humane, impartial, and highly public-spirited Swiss people have made a valuable contribution to the whole world. By working together, irrespective of their French, German, and Italian origin, they have proved to the world that for the good of all concerned it is better to subdue linguistic and racial feelings and develop a higher and better type of patriotism. In this spirit they have fought

their adversaries, have won their independence, and have proved always ready to fight for its preservation.

On this anniversary of their national holiday, I wish them continued prosperity and a happy and peaceful future.

Poison in Your Water—No. 150

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Champaign (Ill.) News-Gazette of June 3, 1959, entitled "Council Hears Danger of Bad Drainage to Health":

COUNCIL HEARS DANGER OF BAD DRAINAGE TO HEALTH—CITIZENS AIR FEAR OF DEATH OF CHILDREN

(By Coryl Crandall)

A dead child because of sewage and filth in Champaign streets is among the possible results of bad drainage here, Champaign City Council was told Tuesday.

Violent language was used by Burt E. Nixon, unsuccessful Council candidate this year.

Nixon, 1612 West Clark, described in blunt terms and loud voice the debris he and his neighbors see floating in their streets, lawns, and walks each time the rain is more than mild.

And a new Champaign City Council—in office just 1 month—listened.

FROM WEST CLARK

A woman, among the 14 persons present, all of whom were from the 1600 block West Clark, choked to stop tears:

"My doctor said action will come only after some child dies from sewage contamination. 'We want our children.'"

Each complaint was heard before Councilman Ellis Danner, University of Illinois civil engineering professor, told what must be done.

NO DISAGREEMENT

Neither Mayor Emmerson V. Dexter nor any councilman disagreed.

"Drainage improvement in one area is not the answer to the problem which faces the growing city of Champaign. Here is a problem for the entire city," Danner said.

"Drainage in one area will lead only to flooding in another. Drainage must have some place to go."

Danner explained that Clark, Daily, and Dietz, consulting engineers, now are studying drainage needs for the entire city. The survey is financed with a Federal grant.

AWAITING SURVEY

"When this survey is completed, the council will consider what action it can take," he said.

"It may cost several million dollars," he said. "But it will be only what is necessary."

Apathy on the part of Champaign citizens can deter the progress of drainage plans, Councilwoman Gladys Snyder reminded:

"Voters will decide future city improvement; no voters from just one area, from all areas."

ANSWERS STATEMENT

Danner, in answer to Nixon's claim that four council members from the same district

could not appreciate the problems of another district, told the citizens:

"I would not be here if I did not have an interest in the welfare of the total population, of all areas."

"The council can do only what the money it has will allow it to do," Mrs. Snyder said. Sewage backing up into residents' basements and the necessity of special care to keep children from filth-flooded streets, were brought to the attention of council members.

HINT LEGAL ACTION

Threats of legal action against the city because clogged drainage tile ran beneath his home were mentioned by Nixon.

"A member of the last council sweet talked me out of action," Nixon said. "He said something would be done. But there has been no change."

Drainage troubles for as long as 8 years was cited by some.

MANY COMPLAINTS

Pumps bought at the owners' expense for flooded basements; walls marred with holes because of drainage backup; constant increase in drainage damage—inspite of all past drainage construction—were among complaints.

Technical questions on present drainage construction and why it was not lessening the problem were raised.

Among citizens present were Mr. and Mrs. James E. Stanley, 1617 West Clark; Mrs. Hazel M. Huber, 1626 West Clark; and Mr. and Mrs. George H. Nance.

The Farm Program: A National Asset, Not a Liability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, because of the wide amount of concern which has been, and continues to be, registered relative to the farm situation today, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a statement by Mr. Gordon Sprague, an economist for Land O' Lakes Creameries, Inc. It is my belief that this statement deserves the widest possible audience.

The statement follows:

THE FARM PROGRAM: A NATIONAL ASSET, NOT A LIABILITY

Commentators on our national economy recommend plans, procedures, and actions for the quick solution of our national farm price problem. They point out that the farmer is responsible, in part at least, for the increase in the cost of living. They say the cost of price supports exceeds \$5 billion a year. They say farmers are inefficient wards of Government. They say that farmers who produce products not price supported are just as prosperous as farmers who produce price-supported products; consequently price supports serve no purpose. They say that the farm price-support program is obsolete and should be junked.

The attacks on the present program are, at best, sketchy. At best, they are only partly true; at worst, they lack verification. The advice to junk the entire project, if followed, will create more and greater problems than those which might be partly solved.

The present farm program was an outgrowth both of the depression of the 1930's

and the war. In 1932, for instance, the realized net income of farmers from farming was less than \$2 billion, and the gross farm income for the same year was only slightly more than \$6 billion. That was at the depth of the depression following 1929. It was recognized then that creating higher farm purchasing power was necessary to restore national prosperity.

What is the present situation? Gross farm income for the 3 years, 1947-49 (the years most usually selected as a basis for comparison using Government statistics), show the average realized gross farm income from farming as exceeding \$33 billion. For 1957, the gross farm income was \$34.3 billion, an increase of less than 2 percent over a period of 10 years, which, for the rest of the economy, were years of vigorous national growth. But during this same 10-year period, farm production expenses increased from \$17.9 to \$23.5 billion or more than 30 percent. Obviously, therefore, net income for farmers declined, and the reduction was from \$15.7 billion in 1947-49 to \$10.8 billion in 1957 or a decline of 31 percent. In 1957, farmers' net income, at \$10.8 billion, was less than one-third of their gross income. These basic data are shown in the table following. They show that more than \$20 billion per year of farm income is disposed of as payments to others in the economy.

Responsible, qualified people seem agreed that without price supports, prices of farm products would again, as in the early 1930's, decline to very low levels. If this is true, the accumulation of losses would soon go far toward destroying the present purchasing power of farmers. This would sharply reduce the payments from farmers to others in the national economy.

Realized gross and net income of farm operators from farming

	1947-49 average	1957	Percent change
	Million dollars	Million dollars	Percent
Realized gross farm income....	33,696	34,330	+1.9
Production expenses.....	17,979	23,400	+30.7
Realized net income.....	15,717	10,930	-31.0

THE FARMERS' CONTRIBUTION TO NATIONAL PROSPERITY

What are the farmers' production expenses? They amounted to almost \$18 billion 10 years ago. In 1957, however, they amounted to over \$23 billion. These production expenses are payments to others (largely nonfarm people) for the machinery, fuel, labor, repairs, fertilizer, and the like used by farmers in producing crops and livestock. This particular area of relationship between farmers and the remainder of the economy is usually left out of the farm problem picture by those who would solve all problems by eliminating price supports. But this is an area in which the Nation is vulnerable to a reduction in farm income through lower prices. This is precisely one area in which the need for farm price supports was recognized at the depth of the prewar depression.

The gross national product in the third quarter of 1957 was at the rate of \$445.6 billion per year. For the first quarter of 1958, it declined to \$427 billion. During this period, national unemployment was increased and there was general alarm that the decline in prices would begin to feed on itself and create a depression. The entire drop in gross national product from the highest quarter to the lowest was only \$15.8 billion. In other words, a reduction in gross national product of \$15 billion promoted a national depression scare within the United States. But \$15 billion is considerably less than the contribution of the farmers to the gross national product each year.

How long and at what level would the contribution of the farmers through their production expenses and net income be maintained without price supports? Obviously, some farmers could maintain their purchases for a period of time on the capital accumulations. However, there is no doubt that without price supports a reduction in the gross national product would result because of the contraction of payments to others in the economy from the farmers. In other words, it would be much more difficult and perhaps impossible to support prosperity within the United States without income supports of some sort to underwrite continued purchasing by farmers.

An investigation of some of the expense classifications, together with their change between the average of 1947-49 and 1957, throws a great deal of light on the contribution by farmers to the total economy. The table below shows one such classification. In 1957, for instance, interest was paid to the extent of \$468 million, an increase of about 100 percent over that of 10 years earlier. Taxes, at \$1,265 million, increased 57 percent. The entire list of categories of farm expenses shown in the table gives a very good indication of the amount of money contributed by farmers to the gross national product through production expenses. They also show that farm expenses increased by about 30 percent over this 10-year period. The gross income for farmers, we recall, increased only about 2 percent.

It is clear, therefore, that to a very large extent farmers do not retain the money received from sales of their crops and livestock, including money received from price supports, but serve as a relay point from which money is widely diffused throughout the economy.

Distribution of farm production expenditures

Item	1947-49 average	1957	Percent change
	Million dollars	Million dollars	Percent
Interest.....	233	468	+100.9
Taxes.....	804	1,265	+57.3
Net rent.....	1,311	1,080	-21.4
Feed.....	3,589	4,083	+13.8
Seed.....	546	534	-2.2
Livestock.....	1,499	1,947	+29.9
Fertilizer and lime.....	825	1,277	+54.8
Repairs on buildings.....	618	613	-0.8
New buildings.....	719	1,112	+54.6
Operation of motor vehicles, machinery and equipment.....	2,053	3,122	+52.1
Machinery and equipment.....	567	1,195	+110.8
Motor vehicles.....	744	1,608	+116.1
Cash wages.....	2,903	2,872	-1.1
Miscellaneous.....	1,567	2,314	+47.7
Total.....	17,979	23,490	+30.7
Gross national product.....	250.6	440.3	+75.7

FEWER FARMERS EACH YEAR

The number of farms is declining rapidly. Estimates indicate that the current rate of consolidation removes almost 100,000 individual farms each year. This seems to be a very rapid rate of change in an industry which must produce most of the food used in the United States as well as a large portion of our exports. It would seem that those persons who search for a utopia without a farm problem might redefine their objective. Although reduction in the numbers of farms has been accompanied by some decline in prices, there is no apparent decline in acre productivity.

It also seems obvious that if farmers are wards of Government, then Government is a poor trustee, because only a few more years at the present rate of demise and there will be no more wards. This, of course, will not happen, but what is proposed to take its place?

PRICES RECEIVED BY FARMERS HAVE DECLINED

The index of prices received by farmers, based on the years 1947-49 as equal to 100, had, by 1957, declined to 89. The part of this index attributable to prices for field crops had declined to 94, whereas the part attributable to prices for livestock and livestock products had declined to 85. This shows, beyond any doubt, that the farm program, so far as nonfarm living costs are concerned, has contributed nothing to inflation or increased cost of food. The farmers have operated with increasing efficiency, producing larger crops and selling them for lower prices. This is in keeping with the longtime economic history of development of agriculture and industry in the United States. But within the 10-year period under consideration, agriculture was one of the few places in the economy where increased efficiency has been carried out in such a way as to benefit consumers and provide a surplus useful for foreign trade. This is one of the outstanding economic developments of the postwar period, and one for which the farmers should receive an accolade from the remainder of the American public rather than criticism.

FARM VALUE OF FOOD

Now, for a more direct evaluation of the cost of food for which farmers are so often criticized. This criticism simply is without justification. The farm value of food sold from farms at the 1947-49 level was \$18.3 billion. In 1957, it was \$19.5 billion. The increase was 6.6 percent. But what about the quantity that was sold?

POPULATION INCREASE HAS NOT INCREASED COST OF FOOD

During the years since 1947-49, the population of the United States increased from 146.1 million persons to 170.3 million in 1957, an increase of 16.6 percent. But with this increase of almost 17 percent in population, the gross farm income as we have seen, increased less than 2 percent. The farmers, therefore, did not contribute to any increase in the per capita cost of living either through food or clothing, and consumers, individually, were living much more economically at the farmers' expense in 1957 than they were 10 years earlier. There are very few spots in the history of the economy of the United States which show a comparable increase of efficiency during these inflationary years.

Retail cost and farm value of food produced on farms

	1947-49 average	1957	Percent change
	Billion dollars	Billion dollars	Percent
Retail-store cost of farm produced foods.....	37.8	50.4	+33.3
Farm value.....	18.3	19.5	+6.6
Farm to retail marketing bill.....	19.5	30.9	+58.6

In 1947-49, \$18.3 billion worth of food (farm value) fed 146.1 million persons. By 1957, the population reached 170.3 million persons, an increase of 16.6 percent. The increase in cost of food was at a lesser rate (6.6 percent) than the increase in population. But more important, an increase in cost of food at the farm level equal to the 16.6 percent increase in population would have justified a food bill of \$21.3 billion in 1957 and this without any allowance for inflation. It is obvious, therefore, that the price-support program has been a bargain to consumers in the United States because the advance in cost of farm produced food at the farm level has lagged as compared with the population growth and inflation.

WHAT PRODUCTS ARE PRICE SUPPORTED?

What about the notion that farmers are just as prosperous when they produce things which are not supported and have no surpluses? If this were true, what farmer would ever produce any wheat or cotton. This argument exposes poor thinking. The reason there is seldom a surplus of the products which are not price supported is simple. Farmers produce relatively little of these products. When the price of the unsupported product falls, farmers shift some of their production resources to price-supported products. So the surplus for all farm production accumulates in those products which are price supported. There are, therefore, no products which do not receive price support. The price supports for the basics carry the burden for all the others. The program was planned this way. It has worked as planned. In this respect, at least, price supports have not failed.

WHAT IS THE COST OF PRICE SUPPORTS?

How much money is lost to the Treasury for price supports each year; no one knows. It varies from year to year. It is far less than \$5 billion per year, because that number includes the total appropriation for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, more than half of which has nothing to do with price supports. In some years the cost is much higher than in others. Of these things, however, we are sure:

(1) The cost of food to consumers has not been increased by price supports. It has in fact been reduced by more than the cost of the price supports.

(2) The farmers are among the most efficient producers in the United States today, and are in no way to be considered wards of Government.

Because—

(3) The economy as a whole is responsible for farm price supports. High income for farmers is necessary for national prosperity. The farmer keeps only about one-third of his gross income for himself and his family. The remainder is paid out to others. Without these payments by farmers, the tempo of the economy would slow down.

There are men in the Congress who are diligent students of both the farm and national economy. It is wrong to try and create a situation of hysteria in which undue pressure is placed on these men. Their talents are great, but they need them all to lead the Nation toward the many complicated objectives of which farm prices and prosperity are only a part.

U.S. Position of Sovereign Rights in Perpetuity in Panama Canal Zone Supported by Queens County, N.Y., Chapter of Catholic War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following letter of transmittal from Mr. Thaddeus Budzinski, vice chairman, Americanism Committee, Queens County, N.Y., chapter, Catholic War Veterans, and a copy of a resolution adopted by this chapter re-

garding U.S. rights in the Panama Canal Zone:

CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS,
QUEENS COUNTY CHAPTER,
Rogo Park, N.Y., July 29, 1959.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Your continued great interest in the sensitive case of the Panama Canal is greatly appreciated by us.

In this connection you may be interested in reading our resolution 14, adopted 6 months ago, a copy of which is attached.

It is reassuring to know that our Nation can depend upon outstanding legislators such as you, Mr. Flood, and we wish you well in your future patriotic endeavors.

Sincerely,

THADDEUS BUDZINSKI, OSS,
Vice Chairman, Americanism Committee.

RESOLUTION 14

Whereas the United States of America constructed the Panama Canal at its own cost and expense, as a consideration for the granting to it, under treaty with the Republic of Panama, of exclusive sovereign rights in perpetuity over the Canal Zone; and has always made available to the maritime traffic of all nations the use of the facilities of the canal without limitation, except in times of war, and any change in the present policy of control would be detrimental to the best interests of our country and would not serve any useful purpose, but would be a potential threat to our defense and security: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Queens County Chapter of the Catholic War Veterans of the U.S.A., Inc., in annual convention assembled, call upon our national department to petition the Congress of the United States to take immediate and effective steps to protect and maintain without impairment, the sovereign rights of the United States of America in the Canal Zone and to firmly resist any and all efforts to modify or alter the existing and established authority to control the Canal Zone and the Panama Canal.

Ignoring Some Monetary Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, so much has been said and written about the desirability of allowing the Government to broaden the base of its monetary policies that I thought it would be interesting and informative if all Members of this august body carefully read and digested the import of the editorial that appeared in the New York Times under date of August 2, 1959. I therefore include it with these remarks:

IGNORING SOME MONETARY FACTS

When William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, appeared before the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, he found the Democratic members virtually united in criticizing one basic policy of the Reserve System. This was its so-called bills only policy, which means that in its conduct of "open market operations" it confines its purchases and sales of Government securities almost exclusively to those in the very-short-term category.

In short, they stood with Representative HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin. Representative Reuss is the author of an amendment to the administration's proposal for eliminating the prevailing ceiling of 4¼ percent on the coupon rate for Government securities with maturities of 5 years or over. The Reuss amendment would establish it as the sense of Congress that the Federal Reserve, while cleaving to its principal mission of conducting a sound monetary policy, should, when appropriate, buy Government securities as an alternative to the technique of reducing the member banks' required minimum reserves. The basic objective, when one removes the frills from this suggestion, is the always politically popular one of achieving cheap money by increasing the money supply.

Since this is what the proposal boils down to, nonparticipants in this controversy may be excused for wondering about a strange omission on the part of Mr. Reuss and his supporters. We refer to the fact, so spectacularly ignored by Mr. Reuss and his fellow advocates of cheap money, that Congress passed and sent to the White House only a few days ago a bill that would liberalize drastically the amount of reserves that member banks are required to maintain under the present law. This would be achieved by permitting the banks to count their vault cash in the form of currency and coin in computing their reserves. It would provide the banks with an estimated additional reserve of \$2,447 million (based on the figures as of the last week in June). This could permit a sevenfold expansion of bank credit, or roughly \$17 billion. Mr. Reuss and his colleagues seem to think that this legislation isn't worth mentioning. We doubt that many nonpolitically minded followers of this controversy would share their point of view.

Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to include Victor Murdock's famous editorial "Wheat," which first delighted Kansans in 1937 and is now presented to a new generation who love this golden land. Coming from this great wheat country, I thought I should bring this editorial to the attention of this distinguished body:

The sun is setting in the wheat country. The wind halts as the day dies, and the birds, after careening conclave in midair, wheel with much dispute and wing ruffling confusion of choice, to their final tree in the grove where as the rustling leaves grow still their greenery deepens into shadows and turns purple against the shafts of gold, lanced by the sun across the landscape. Along the damp edges of the hedge the crickets intone for the nightlong chorus and a hunchbacked yellow sunfish noses a single widening circle upon the blue-green mirror of the pond. Across the meadow, grass, flower, and weed from their drab day array brightened to translucent pinks and shining fibrous silvers, quiver, ripple, flush in the pageantry of leveled light.

Silence grows. The house, the barn merge into the tranquillity and thrust with strength from a window, back to the weak sun, a blaz-

ing bolt of his own light. The horses in their stalls, taking their respite erect, twitch the hay from the mow and grind and grind, in contemplative content and the cow, moved by some vagrant emotional unrest, offers an unavailing protest from her place, which, having begun weakly, she as incontinently concludes. The pullets fidget and fluff fussily and feebly along their perch. The swine contest for the single undesirable corner of the sty in repeated pyramids which at last collapse to a permanent repose. The dog, with an air of despair in exploration, makes final forage at the back door.

Silence grows. Down by the stream, with its trees which bend over it to look upon it and never tire, a moccasin evidences his presence on a log, by sliding from it, and a muskrat plunges from one hiding-place to another with a single splash and leaves no trace. A raincrow, alone at last with silence, mourns and prophesies. Between purpling east, house, barn, grove, stream, and the empty west, the wheatraiser stands before the wheatfield and its wigwam shocks, marshaled in farfing line as at attention. They and the bristling stubble are gold, dull, dead gold.

He and they have traveled long and far together. This is one of the thousands of resting places, of breathing places they have come to. The sweat, the vexations, the defeats, the depredations and deprivations of toil a little while ago were heavy enough upon him. But now as he turns and looks across the dull, dead-gold field to the empty west the burden of the day's work lifts, and the yellow twilight strokes his soul in benediction.

Savings Bond Rate Raise?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, for some years now I have been introducing legislation which if enacted would provide for a better return on U.S. savings bonds. In this Congress the bill is H.R. 596. I believe that the passage of this bill would provide some inducement for our citizens to keep their Government savings bonds and to buy new ones.

In this connection I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Sylvia Porter as it appeared in the Washington Evening Star of July 29, 1959:

SAVINGS BOND RATE RAISE?

Congress must pass a law this session permitting the Treasury to raise the interest rate on savings bonds.

If Congress does not pass this legislation, it must assume the risk of sabotaging the entire savings bond program.

These are facts:

The interest rate the Treasury is paying the 40 million owners of over \$42 billion of outstanding savings bonds has become painfully out of line as a result of the upsurge in the whole level of interest rates since mid-1958.

The interest rate has become glaringly unfair to the 8 million Americans now buying bonds under payroll savings plans.

It is far below what the Treasury is paying to other holders of its I O U's—the big institutional and individual investors who buy its securities in the open market.

It is far below what an individual can earn simply by putting cash in most savings banks or savings institutions.

Under the present rate, a savings bond will pay you 3½ percent interest if you hold it to maturity in 8 years, 11 months. It will pay you 3 percent interest if you hold it 3 years.

Most savings institutions will pay you 3½ percent, 3½ percent or even 4 percent interest on your funds. The Treasury itself last week put 4½ percent coupons on some new short-term notes.

This is not fair to the holder and new buyer of savings bonds. The Treasury freely admits that "in all fairness . . . some revision in interest rates is called for."

Savings bonds—as well as cash and insurance—do belong in the basic nest egg of the average American family. The purchase of the bonds under a payroll savings plan is a superb way to discipline yourself into saving regularly and conveniently in absolutely riskless securities.

But because the program makes sense for the millions who aren't and don't want to be sophisticated investors is no justification for penalizing the savings bond holder. While it can be properly argued that the savings bond buyer should not be paid as high an interest rate as the investor who takes the risks of buying bonds in the open market, it cannot be properly argued that the savings bond buyer should be at the bottom of the interest rate totem pole.

It was in recognition of these points that the Treasury on June 8 asked Congress to remove the rate ceiling on savings bonds so it could improve the terms. In essence, it proposes to pay holders of savings bonds 3½ percent if they keep their bonds to maturity in 7 years, 9 months, and 3 percent if they keep their bonds 2 years.

The improvement is modest enough. But the legislation is now stymied in Congress because the request was attached to another for removal of the present 4½ percent interest ceiling on new U.S. marketable bonds. This request has led to a squabble involving vital political and economic issues of tight money, the independence of the Federal Reserve System, etc.

No matter what Congress decides to do about the 4½ percent rate ceiling, though, it must raise the savings bond rate ceiling. The savings bond program is losing ground, is getting hard to defend.

Trinity Power—Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, on July 24 the House Interior Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation considered the joint development proposal, supported by the Interior Department, of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to construct and operate the power facilities on the Trinity River in California. That morning the following editorial appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald:

TRINITY POWER—AGAIN

We hope that the House Interior Subcommittee which today will take up once again the 3-year-old proposal for a partnership private-public power project for the Trinity River Dam in California will attempt to appraise the issue in fairly cold-

blooded economic terms. It is easy to run against the power company—in this case, Pacific Gas & Electric—and to allow partisan, emotional feelings about private versus public power to becloud the facts. Neither the partnership plan nor the alternative all-Federal power scheme considered for Trinity seems to us ideal.

Under partnership, the company would buy falling water at rates based upon the cost of steam-generated power, so that the consumer would realize no benefit from presumably cheaper hydropower. Under all-Federal development, municipal power systems would be given first chance at the dam's output at the subsidized Bureau of Reclamation rate—but these benefits would accrue only to customers of publicly owned systems at the expense of taxpayers generally. We do not know what a true cost-based price for the power from Trinity would be, but we suspect that P.G. & E. would be getting more for this energy than it's worth and the municipal systems, if they sold it, would be getting less—and running unfair competition with P.G. & E.

Why shouldn't the falling water be sold by the Government at what it costs to provide it—not for a figure arbitrarily tied to steamplant costs? And why shouldn't the energy thus produced be made available, whether through private or public intermediaries, to all consumers of the area, whomever they are served?

Mr. Speaker, the Post and Times Herald has taken a realistic approach in recognizing that the issue of Government construction versus private construction should be settled on its merits rather than on political considerations. The article correctly concludes that since all the taxpayers, under Federal construction, would be called upon to subsidize the so-called preferred customers, constituting only a few municipal systems in northern and central California, the great majority of the power users would not only be paying higher electric bills themselves but would, through their taxpayments, be making possible the subsidized rates of some neighboring communities which would receive the power at less than its cost of production.

As a member of the House Interior Subcommittee which heard the testimony I agree with the editorial's hope that my colleagues "will attempt to appraise the issue in fairly cold-blooded economic terms" and not "allow partisan, emotional feelings about private versus public power to becloud the facts." The company's joint development proposal should be permitted to stand on its own legs and be considered objectively and strictly on its merits.

State Participation in Emergency Feed, Seed, and Roughage Program

SPEECH

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the committee for the good work they have done on this program to make it possible for us to use more milk.

Outlook for Constructive and Helpful Legislation as a Result of Hébert Subcommittee Hearings Into Employment of Retired Military Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Investigations Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee, headed by the able gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], is currently looking into implications of the employment of retired military officers by defense contractors.

Thus far, Mr. Speaker, the information developed by the committee does not appear to justify some of the sweeping accusations against these officers that have been made on the floor of this House and elsewhere, but I do believe that the committee is performing a most useful job and I believe that there is every likelihood it will come up with positive and constructive legislation that will enhance rather than impair our defense program.

In that connection I was extremely pleased to read the editorial which appeared in the August 1 issue of the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal, indicating the constructive nature of some of the legislative recommendations which the committee hearing are likely to lead to.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial:

HAPPY ENDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL RETIRED INQUIRY?

Although it will be some months—certainly not before January—until the Hébert subcommittee issues a final report, there is already good reason to hope that the investigation into the employment of retired military officers by defense contractors will have a happy ending. Such a forecast is possible, because of the outstanding manner in which Chairman F. EDWARD HÉBERT, Democrat, of Louisiana, has been conducting the hearings, and because of the forthright testimony of senior officers of all the services.

The hearings to date have illuminated the important contributions that are being made to the defense program by retired officers whose vital skills and talents are being retained on active duty. Representative HÉBERT and his associates are building a detailed record also of the need to unify laws and regulations pertaining to the post-retirement employment of service officers. The Journal in the issue of May 17, 1958, published one of the most comprehensive reviews of this problem ever assembled and said that the corrective action was essential.

The Hébert investigations subcommittee has brought to light the fact that many officers employed by defense contractors would have preferred to remain in Federal service in civilian status following military retirement. They were thwarted, however, by restrictive legislation dating back to the 19th century.

It can be anticipated that one of the most crucial results of the inquiry will be a proposal to liberalize the dual employment and dual compensation restrictions imposed on Regular officers. In past years, the Defense Department, in on-again-off-

again behavior, has proposed to Congress that the outdated and discriminatory legislation be changed. What will be required in order to capitalize on the situation that has been pointed up in the current hearings is the readiness of the Pentagon leadership to go before Congress next January with a fully documented case on the need for legislative action.

It is still too early, of course, to make a final assessment of the Hébert subcommittee hearings, but on the basis of the proceedings to date, there is good basis for anticipating that the report to be issued early next year will avoid any free-swinging charges such as were expressed by some ill-informed legislators. Instead, what can be anticipated—certainly what must be hoped for—is a carefully reasoned document which will insist that action is essential to clarify confusion and disparities in present legislation, and which will urge changes in restrictive legislation whose usefulness has been outlived and which now is harmful to our national interests and security.

The Hébert report undoubtedly will recommend that rules be spelled out explicitly in the matter of retired officers taking jobs directly involving sales. Possibly a 2-year or 3-year interval will be advocated. Actually, only a relatively small number of retired military officers retired within the past 3 years are engaged in direct sales to the services. The fact of the matter is that a 2-year or 3-year specified limitation, instead of restricting post-retirement employment, may very well broaden post-retirement employment opportunities.

There is no question that many firms today hesitate to engage retired officers for sales activities, no matter how long they have been out of uniform, for fear of running afoul of the complex and disparate legislation now on the books.

To sum up: What started out as an investigation prompted by shotgun efforts to cripple the utilization of retired officers may well conclude with a straightening out of discriminatory legislation against retired service people that has long needed forceful attention.

A New Wonderland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, kilowatts used to be practically the end and purpose of public hydroelectric power projects in California. However, the incorporation today of comprehensive recreational facilities in the plans for these developments is adding immeasurably to the benefits the public derives from them.

In this connection, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following timely editorial from the Sacramento (Calif.) Union of July 19, 1959, entitled "A New Wonderland":

A NEW WONDERLAND

Even though you haven't been bitten by the public power bug and your philosophies lie with private ownership, it is possible to take one of E. A. Combatalade's guided tours of El Dorado County and become ravingly enthusiastic over what Sacramento Municipal Utility District is accomplishing there.

Not alone will the benefits of this vast power-creating project be measured in kilowatts. Quite the contrary, because when the entire project is finished in probably 6 years, at a likely cost of \$175 million, the whole contour and the whole future of a ruggedly beautiful mountain country will have been changed.

El Dorado County will be dotted with new lakes and streams, its present hidden beauties will be opened by 80 miles of new road, its recreation potential will have been made available to millions.

It is in terms of recreation that SMUD will pay its real hidden dividend. Consider just this one tiny aspect: Enough increased water will flow in the South Fork of Silver Creek to create 10 new miles of trout fishing in place of a dried-up creek that now exists.

As for the new lakes, one so large it will have 45 miles of shoreline, consider these figures for persons using Lake Shasta for boating, fishing and camping: 33 percent come from the bay area, and 20 percent are all the way from Los Angeles.

The West is running out of such recreational facilities as Shasta Lake affords, but now comes El Dorado County to open new and isolated vacation territory, majestic in its timber stands, primitive and grand.

Mutual Security Appropriations, 1960

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8385) making appropriations for mutual security and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, once again the House of Representatives has before it a grave decision, one of far-reaching consequences to the American taxpayer, to the American Nation, and to the nations of the world. It is my feeling that we must, in the consideration of this as well as other legislation, give thought to the effect it will have upon America itself. Foreign aid, by whatever name it might be called, is a very expensive proposition. It does not make it less expensive to call it mutual security or mutual aid or any other of a dozen terms that have been applied to it.

It is costly to the tune of more than \$3 billion. At least the \$3 billion is this year's installment upon a legislative habit that America acquired quite a number of years ago. In the period from July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1958, the post-war period, our Nation has expended \$57 billion for foreign aid, \$20 billion of that for military aid, and the remainder for all other forms of aid. In addition to outright grants, loans to nations abroad have been made in that same period of time in the amount of about \$20 billion. One can readily see that it is no inconsequential sum that we are discussing when we talk about the foreign aid program of this country.

I will concede for the purposes of ar-

gument that there is some good to be obtained in our foreign aid program, that some of the funds win friends for Americans, that the expenditures on certain projects have helped nations immeasurably, that there are nations in the world today who might have turned their thinking toward the Soviet sphere had we not come to their assistance. I can also concede that there will be some military value to the guns and ammunition that we have made available to other nations in the event there is armed conflict on a worldwide scale. It may be true that the foreign aid program has, to some extent, kept the Soviet Union off balance by providing an obstacle to the uninterrupted course of that nation's plan.

Much of the utilization of the foreign aid program is couched in secrecy. We are told that such secrecy is necessary in order to keep from tipping our hand as to some military or security plans we may have. It has also been suggested that a secrecy cloak is necessary so that other nations will not know in advance what their fellow nations are receiving from Uncle Sam's largesse. But some secrets just cannot be kept. There are revelations now and then in the press which have caused great consternation in the minds of many, that have labeled the foreign aid program in pretty somber tones. Money is being wasted. Funds are being utilized for projects that do not accomplish a useful purpose. Some of America's money finds its way into the hands of scheming gain seekers of one type or another. All the while we are increasing our own national debt and paying a high rate of interest on the money that we owe. We are not only taxing our citizens and using about 4 percent of the tax for this program, but we are also borrowing money to help pay for it. I will concede, of course, that we cannot attribute the entire national debt to the foreign aid program, nor can we attribute all of the current deficit to the foreign aid program, but if 4 percent of our expenditures in the current year are chalked up to foreign aid then, of course, we must agree that 4 percent of any deficit is also a contribution to the foreign aid program to the indebtedness of the United States. The American taxpayer could well do with a little aid himself.

Much of what I read and what I learn from my colleagues who are in close contact with this program, convinces me that America's contribution is too great. The program itself, even if administered properly and without waste, is too extravagant. To sum it all up, I have reached the conclusion that I will vote in opposition to the current mutual security appropriations bill, just as I voted against the authorization bill earlier this year and just as I have voted against each and every such bill in the years past.

The arguments which have brought me to that conclusion can be summarized as follows: The expenditure is too great. The funds are being used in part in a wasteful manner. There is too much secrecy in the administration of the pro-

gram. Expenditures are not obtaining for this Nation enough benefits to justify them. The program is a drain upon the taxpayers and Treasury of the United States out of proportion to the benefit gained either by America or by the nations which receive the assistance which we foist upon them and which they have come to expect as a matter of right.

Mobilize American Medical Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege this morning to introduce a distinguished constituent of the Sixth Congressional District to the members of the Subcommittee on Health and Safety of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Mr. John T. Connor, president of Merck & Co., Inc., of Rahway, N.J.

Mr. Connor testified in support of the International Health and Medical Research Act of 1959. As I pointed out in my introduction, he has an unusual background in the field of health and medical research, including service as General Counsel of the Office of Scientific Research and Development.

Because I believe his statement is of the utmost importance to the Congress and to all those who subscribe to the need for improved health services throughout the world, I include it herewith under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF JOHN T. CONNOR, PRESIDENT OF MERCK & CO., INC., BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH AND SAFETY, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, AUGUST 4, 1959

Chairman Roberts and members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity of expressing to this committee my views in support of the International Health and Medical Research Act of 1959.

This measure should be, I believe most firmly, an essential component of America's health legislation, for two principal reasons:

1. It will give new vigor and new meaning to U.S. foreign policy in the currently developing and infinitely more complex phase of the cold war.

2. It will protect and advance the health of the American people by bringing new research knowledge to America's medical scientists, and by opening up new avenues for research discoveries under conditions not possible in the United States alone.

The program proposed in the bill will operate in three principal geographical areas—the free world nations of Western Europe and Japan, the Soviet Union, and finally, the newly developing nations. Each area represents a different potential and each calls for different handling.

We can expect a continuation and extension of the present cooperation between us and the industrialized nations of Western Europe and Japan. The National Institutes of Health currently make grants to medical

scientists in these countries, and many of our academic scientists have informal relationships for exchanging information with their scientific peers there. In addition, licensing arrangements have been worked out by many U.S. pharmaceutical and chemical firms through which our new drugs and chemicals are made available to foreign commercial manufacturing firms. Many of their new developments are made available to American firms for production and marketing in the United States and in other countries, thereby enabling U.S. medicine to benefit from discoveries by foreign companies and helping to bring our drug developments to people who need them throughout the world. Equally important, many American firms, such as the Merck, Sharp & Dohme international division of our company, carry on their own extensive production, marketing, and other operations throughout the free world.

Let me urge that this committee, as did the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in its report on the companion bill to your measure, Chairman ROBERTS, express its view that our Government should not use U.S. tax funds to subsidize foreign commercial firms in developing new pharmaceutical, chemical or biological products. In fact, I think that the contracting authority in this bill should be limited to contracts with nonprofit or governmental organizations. As a competitor of those foreign companies, I can assure you that they are fully capable, both financially and technically, of supporting their own programs for chemical, pharmaceutical and biological research and development. My motivation is, of course, to attempt to help preserve our private sector type of enterprise in this field to the fullest extent possible. Beyond that, however, the economic recovery of those countries is by now so complete that their governments can well afford to support medical research to the extent needed and desired.

The second area of possible medical research cooperation will be with Soviet Russia. As a practical matter, cooperation with the Russians can take the form of expanded person-to-person discussions through the greater exchange of research scientists, teachers, and students, as well as fuller interchange of medical and scientific literature. It's even possible that there might be joint projects with them in basic research or in clinical studies.

I earnestly hope for the growth of cooperative developments and the fair exchange of scientific and medical knowledge with Russia. Such cooperative effort might contribute to improved understanding and communications between the peoples of the United States and Russia. It might even encourage the progress of what Dr. Albert Sabin calls creeping capitalism within Russia as the Russians see the value of personal incentives and rewards, and apply them more and more, as they seem to be doing in their technical activities.

But I feel compelled to sound a note of caution, based upon my own personal experience as General Counsel of the Office of Scientific Research and Development and, later, as an official of the Department of the Navy during and right after World War II.

Any such cooperation with the Russians in the medical research field should be initiated on a small scale. It should be developed gradually, step by step. There should be safeguards that the plan is in fact reciprocal. Certainly we must not lightly trade away the important technical resources of our pharmaceutical and chemical industries. If we should bargain away our hard-won American research knowledge, technical skills and production know-how, we will be handing over to Russia a valuable national asset. We would permit the Rus-

slans to free thousands of skilled scientists, engineers and technicians for military development and economic warfare, instead of taking the sensible course of requiring them to expend their own time, effort and resources in developing pharmaceutical and chemical know-how, as we have had to do.

So much for the problems of cooperation with Soviet Russia. I want now to talk about competition with the Russians, the hard core of our relations with Soviet Russia today and certainly for some time to come.

Here we are projected into the third area in which the program provided in this bill would operate, the newly developing countries. It is the area which I feel demands priority attention. It is the area of desperate need for health and medical progress; the area likely to produce fresh answers to many age-old scourges of man, as well as to newly discovered or newly developing diseases; and the area of sharpest competition with the medical offensive of Soviet Russia.

The most powerful political force in the world today is the rising expectations for a better life among the peoples of the uncommitted and newly developing nations. To the people of these nations, the burdens of disease and pestilence are far more real and important than great power rivalries or even the threat of nuclear war. If their aspirations are to grow in the patterns of a free society it is clear the free society must offer practical solutions to their elemental problems of existence. When life itself is so precarious, ideology is not a pressing concern.

Medical scientists tell us that the coming field of medical research is environmental research, examining whole population groups in the context of their geographical surroundings, their nutrition and dietary habits, cultural practices and living conditions, occupations and progress in technology. As man is increasingly able to change and shape his environment, research dealing with geographical areas and entire populations becomes of increasing significance and urgency.

The disease belt that girdles the earth, largely in the tropical zone, creates a reservoir of disease that lies perilously close to our own shores and our own homes. The airplane carries its passengers between continents in far less time than the incubation period of many diseases. Yet we have lost much of the natural immunity to disease common to people who have survived to maturity in less protected environments.

The Soviet Union is fully aware of these facts. And we have new evidence, in the recent World Health Assembly in Geneva, of Russia's efforts to use health and medical research for the purposes of Communist propaganda.

In the World Health Assembly, Russia sought to gain representation in the region of southeast Asia, in addition to the European representation she now enjoys, and was surprised to find out she is not welcome there. Russia sought to gain undeserved credit for proposing an international health year, a plan in fact first advanced in the United States. From time to time Russia has called loudly for expanded medical research programs by the World Health Organization, but when confronted with the chance to support tangible action at the recent Geneva meetings, Russia voted against a sound proposal strongly supported by the United States.

In recent weeks renewed attention has been given to the use of live vaccines in the world fight against polio. Dr. A. A. Smorodinstev, of Leningrad, reported successful use of live virus vaccine among nearly 2 million Russian school children. If confirmed by WHO observers, the results of those tests can be very useful and can be a most helpful precedent of possible Russian cooperation.

But the real test is yet to come—in the areas of propaganda and international politics. The vaccine used by the Russians was developed by Dr. Albert B. Sabin, of the University of Cincinnati. Under Dr. Sabin's supervision and direction our Merck Sharp & Dohme Laboratories produced the "seed" material which Dr. Sabin sent to Russia for their experiments. Already the Kremlin is using the tests for propaganda within Russia. It will be interesting to see, should Russia make the vaccine available to other countries, how much of the credit for developing the live virus vaccine they will share with Dr. Sabin and the United States.

There are many other indications that Russia is moving into the important vacuum on the health front. We have word of Soviet health teams in north Africa and south Asia. We hear of a cobalt radiation machine sent to Thailand, hospitals for Ethiopia, and Burma, and Indonesia. Even poor Poland, not able to care for the sick among her own population, has to contribute to this Communist health export program.

Russia in 1958 had 25 percent more doctors per capita than the United States. She is now producing new doctors from the medical schools at the rate of well over 16,000 a year, much more than the 7,000 doctors graduated in the United States last year. What does the Soviet Union plan to do with this rising supply of doctors, many of them trained in the languages and cultures of Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America? Reports from inside Russia indicate that she is planning to send about 2,000 of them a year to the developing countries, primarily for political objectives, not humanitarianism.

To meet this Russian health offensive will require an aggressive, dynamic mobilization of all America's medical resources—the highly trained members of our private medical profession as well as the U.S. Public Health Service personnel, the medical schools and research institutes, the foundations, the voluntary agencies, and the pharmaceutical and medicinal chemical industry.

America's physicians have already expressed their active concern for this problem. Many of them have testified before this committee. Others have expressed their concern through the American Medical Association, and through voluntary groups such as Medico and the quite exciting Hope hospital ship project of the People-to-People program. It is my firm belief that the program provided for in this measure will be successful only as it enlists the support and utilizes the services of private medicine.

Another important asset in this competition with the Soviet Union is America's pharmaceutical and medicinal chemical industry, one of our strongest national resources. Through its research, the industry has accumulated a valuable store of knowledge and know-how. We are far ahead of Russia in our ability to develop and produce important new drugs. I have searched diligently and I have yet to unearth a single important development by Russia in pharmaceuticals. All the new discoveries and developments in modern drugs—diuretics, antibiotics, vitamins, sulfa drugs, antibiotics, hormones, mental health drugs—were developed among the nations of the West.

I would not want to close my testimony without commenting on one provision of the bill that I consider of critical importance, its administration within the National Institutes of Health.

The heart of this measure is its objective of advancing human health by promoting international medical research on a scientist-to-scientist basis. This objective must not be obscured by diplomatic policies or lost in government-to-government negotiations.

The National Institutes of Health contain the great range of scientific and administrative skills, the knowledge, and the experience essential to the successful operation of medical research programs. NIH has a fine record in the development and execution of research program in complex scientific areas, demanding sensitive relationships with public and private groups, universities, industrial companies, and scientific organizations. Its technical study groups and advisory councils assure that the criteria for evaluating projects will be solely scientific merit and scientific potential.

The broad programs of the proposed International Institute, dealing with multinational health problems and in areas of basic life processes, must be carried out in close cooperation and coordination with the categorical research programs of the existing Institutes.

The varied resources to fulfill the requirements of an effective international research program can be found only in the National Institutes of Health.

It is my conviction, Mr. Chairman, that medical research should be left in the hands of medical scientists.

This setting up the Institute of International Health and Medical Research in the National Institutes of Health, establishes the mechanism and provides the means for pooling the research knowledge of nations, for mobilizing a war against disease, for guarding the health ramparts of America.

The bill before this committee is primarily a research bill. It is my hope that you can provide in the bill for special attention to research, research training, and fellowships in the newly developed areas of the world where the need is so urgent.

I respectfully urge that the committee make provision in the legislation for the following functions and activities:

1. Research teams to survey the health problems of the newly developing areas, country by country, and establish priorities for the medical research and assistance that can be most fruitful in each country. Every effort should be made to enlist leading private physicians and research specialists as members of these teams. The research teams should secure the views and cooperation of the medical profession of the country in which they work.

2. Research in the science of public health in order to give added emphasis to the importance of public health and to encourage programs of public health education by the host countries. Fundamental needs for sanitation, pure water, nutrition and preventive medicine are problems of survival for the great mass of the peoples of the developing areas.

3. Expanded training of nurses, hospital and clinical technicians, and other members of an effective health team. Although trained primarily for research under this program, they would form a permanent cadre of medical and health personnel in their countries. They would provide essential supporting personnel made necessary by the greatly expanded training programs for doctors, research specialists and others provided for in the bill.

The foreign aid programs before the Congress have generally been directed toward development of resources. I urge that the committee favorably report this bill on the practical consideration that good health is a resource, indeed the most precious resource of any people. And through this measure not only can we nurture the good health and good will and friendship of the uncommitted billions in the developing areas, who look to us for support and guidance; we shall help build the health and strength of the United States.

Distressed Area Bill Deserves Better Fate From President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the problem of distressed areas in Pennsylvania and in many other States continues to be of major importance, despite the improvement noted in some sectors of the economy.

Pennsylvania has made some significant progress in attracting new industries to diversify its economy, but it is clear that area redevelopment legislation is needed to provide an overall coordinated attack on the basic causes of chronic unemployment.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial on this subject from the Harrisburg, Pa., Evening News:

DISTRESSED AREA BILL DESERVES BETTER FATE FROM PRESIDENT

President Eisenhower's fellow Pennsylvanians cannot share in his joy over the unbroken string of vetoes he boasts.

One of them—last September's pocket veto of the aid to depressed areas legislation—still rankles in the Keystone State, which continues to have more chronically depressed areas than any other State.

Gov. David L. Lawrence has just returned from a flying visit to Washington during which he tried to rally the Pennsylvania congressional delegation to virtually unanimous bipartisan support of new depressed area legislation now bottled up in the House Rules Committee. And he paid a visit to House Speaker SAM RAYBURN to try to ease the way for the bill's consideration.

It's a familiar role for a Pennsylvania Governor. George Leader fought hard for the compromise \$275 million bill that finally passed last year, only to have the Ike veto kill it. And it's a role that merits full cooperation by Pennsylvania Republicans in Congress.

Pennsylvania hasn't sat on its hands through the years doing nothing about its depressed area problem. Local efforts have been considerable. And the Commonwealth's PIDA program to bring more industry into the hard-hit areas of the State has begun to pay off. But even this hasn't been enough. An extra push is needed by the Federal Government to really get those areas started on the way back to economic health.

The Eisenhower administration can point to general economic recovery if it wishes, but the good news never can apply to the depressed areas of Pennsylvania where unemployment constantly remains over the distressed limit set by the Government.

"Giveaway" is a word that doesn't apply to this legislation either. The vast bulk of the funds involved would be in revolving loans. There would be some grants for needed public facilities.

The Senate faced three bills when it took up the subject this year:

The administration's \$53 million bill, which hardly would take adequate care of Pennsylvania's needs alone.

A full-measure \$389.5 million bill, sponsored by Illinois' Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS and 38 other Senators.

A compromise \$200 million bill, sponsored by Pennsylvania's Republican Senator HUGH SCOTT, who had criticized Ike's veto but wanted to come up with legislation that

might sidestep further Presidential disapproval.

In March, the Senate approved the Douglas bill. On May 14, a House committee trimmed the figure to \$251 million. It remains stymied in the Rules Committee.

There is every hope that the Governor's trip and the Pennsylvania delegation's pressure will break the logjam and aid to depressed areas will pass once more.

Another veto by the President is a possibility.

But President Eisenhower must realize by now that his \$53 million program would be hopelessly inadequate, that Federal aid to be matched by States and localities is needed to give these distressed areas an economic lift and that his veto can't help but rebound against such administration programs as foreign aid.

The domestic aid program for which Pennsylvanians are fighting again is too important to be killed by the House or by another ill-advised Presidential veto this year.

New Hospital: Community Cooperation at Its Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, Sunday afternoon, July 19, my hometown, Jeannette, Pa., celebrated the answer to many years of planning, working, and sacrificing.

It was on this date that the Jeannette District Memorial Hospital was dedicated.

As the speaker for this occasion, I was prepared to join many leaders in religious, medical, political, business, and labor fields in giving credit where due and to impress upon my peoples the need for continued effort if the hospital was to be a success.

A short chronological history of this project shows the will of the people co-operating and achieving at its best.

HISTORY

In 1947, the movement for a hospital in Jeannette was started by Mr. Joseph Cononico, of Jeannette. He assembled a group of interested citizens of Jeannette and the surrounding area to initially start Operation Hospital. During 1948 and 1949, hopes and plans for the new hospital were conceived. When the city of Jeannette donated a 6½-acre site in Paruco Park, concrete plans for the hospital were formulated, and a drive for funds began. You demonstrated your desire for a new hospital by pledging \$435,000. Based upon the success of this first drive, the structure of the originally planned 70-bed hospital was erected, the main exterior work was completed, staircases were built in, and provisions were made for the installation of elevators.

In 1952, another drive for funds was conducted in order that the existing structure might be completed, and the drive resulted in additional pledges of \$60,000. This additional amount was

inadequate to complete the structure as a result construction remained almost at a standstill until 1955 due to lack of funds.

In 1955, interest was renewed, and plans were drawn up for the addition of an east wing to the existing structure which would increase bed capacity to at least 100. This addition was considered necessary due to the increased demands for hospital services in our growing area. But before going any further with construction, two great problems had to be solved. First, how could the community procure and retain the administrative staff necessary to maintain the high level of efficiency we desired for our hospital? Secondly, where were the necessary funds going to come from?

The Sisters of Charity came forth with the answer to the first problem, by agreeing to provide the administrative staff for operation. They would assume supervision, and the maintenance of the highest standards of efficiency would be definitely assured.

After provision was made for an administrative operating staff, the solution to the second problem was begun by conducting a third drive for funds in 1955, during which time pledges amounting to \$535,000 were obtained. The Greensburg Diocese also volunteered a gift of \$300,000 making a combined total of \$835,000. The association was aware that these funds were not sufficient to complete the job. Accordingly, through the untiring efforts of several members, they were successful in obtaining Federal funds to supplement the funds from the third drive. After bids were received, the association realized that increased construction costs required greater funds. It was at this point that with the aid of Hill-Burton Federal funds, the Greensburg Diocese volunteered additional financial assistance amounting to \$250,000.

These combined efforts have not been in vain, because our hopes and dreams of a new hospital have finally materialized. The total cost of the completed project is over \$2 million. Your hospital is a modern and up-to-date facility consisting of 100 beds and 28 bassinets. It is understandable that the demands of industrial and personal requirements in our fast-growing area will call for the many services which our Jeannette Hospital offers.

We can all be proud of our new hospital. Its completion has only been made possible by the cooperation, sacrifice, and many hours of hard work by many devoted Jeannette and area citizens. It is to these citizens we wish to express our heartfelt thanks for a job well done.

Now that we have its doors open in the name of Christian charity, this beautiful and practical structure has already given the community a much needed lift in community pride and feeling of security.

One cannot stress too much the work of the auxiliary made up of generous-hearted, inspired women from the surrounding communities as well as the city itself. It was their example and determination through the dark days of

dampened ardor and financial worries that—along with the bulldog tenacious courage of a few men—kept the project alive.

As a citizen of this community I cannot help but feel the pride that comes from living in a community where things can and are done by public-spirited cooperation.

We know our problems are not over and that the Sisters of Charity will need the continued unselfish help of all of us. This hospital is part of our town to be cared for, nurtured, protected, and serviced.

If we do this as a community, the good Sisters of Charity in turn will give us the care and protection our hospital is capable of producing.

Let us then rededicate ourselves to our original purpose "to build and maintain a hospital for the care and betterment of our community and its peoples."

Fiscal Condition of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 7, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, Californians are genuinely proud of the record that the new State administration is making in our State.

Gov. Edmund G. "Pat" Brown, working with a friendly Democratic legislature, has accomplished more in the last session of that legislature than any Governor has accomplished since the turn of the century.

We of California are particularly concerned with the affairs of our State. The annual State budget is rapidly approaching the \$2 billion mark and expenditures must be carefully watched in order to keep it under control.

The State controller, Mr. Alan Cranston, who took office with Governor Brown, released a statement of the fiscal condition of California under date of July 13, 1959, showing that the State's general fund during the 1958 and 1959 fiscal year cash balance was approaching \$14 million.

I know that Mr. Cranston's report is of interest to all who are interested in State government and I am happy to make it part of these remarks:

SACRAMENTO, July 16.—The State's general fund ended the 1958-59 fiscal year with a cash balance of \$13,773,358. State Controller Alan Cranston reported today.

"But general fund expenditures still outran revenues by \$61,659,388—or better than \$5 million a month," Cranston said.

This, despite the fact that the State legislature advanced the collection of \$55,167,752 in insurance companies taxes from November to June.

Other factors which contributed to the healthy glow of the general fund were transfers from the last of the reserve funds and stringent governmental economies that saved an estimated \$5 million in the last 6 months of the fiscal year.

One of the transfers was a \$55 million shift that killed off the so-called rainy day fund created out of World War II revenues and left untouched until recent high-expenditure, low-revenue years.

"Total revenues for the 1958-59 fiscal year were \$1,211,682,245, an increase of \$104,487,456 or 9.44 percent over the 1957-58 fiscal year," Cranston said.

Total expenditures were \$1,273,341,633, an increase of \$98,824,139 or 8.41 percent over the prior fiscal year.

"The June 30 cash balance of \$13,773,358 compares with a balance of \$5,728,701 as of June 30, 1958," Cranston said.

Cranston said the foregoing figures, contained in the controller's preliminary annual report issued this week, reflect merely the cash position of the general fund as of June 30 and do not account for obligations incurred but not yet paid nor revenues accrued but not yet realized.

"The size of the general fund surplus must await the computation of transactions figured on an accrual basis," Cranston said. This, he indicated, would be done by August 15.

Major revenue sources for 1958-59 included:

Sales and use taxes, \$631,096,838; up 4.54 percent.

Bank and corporation franchise and income taxes, \$175,404,605; up 1.91 percent.

Personal income taxes, \$160,679,653; up 7.73 percent.

Insurance companies taxes, \$105,832,480; up 129.88 percent.

Inheritance taxes, \$42,009,037; down 1.61 percent.

Liquor taxes, \$41,799,498; up 8.14 percent.

Interest on investments and treasury deposits, \$13,041,740; down 13.26 percent.

"The greatest single cost item paid from the general fund was \$571,045,118 for apportionments to elementary schools, high schools, and junior colleges," Cranston said.

Support Grows for White Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, on July 21 the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] and I introduced in the House, and Senators HUBERT HUMPHREY and GEORGE AIKEN introduced in the Senate, concurrent resolutions calling for the establishment of a Great White Fleet of mercy ships to carry American surplus foods, medical aid, and supplies to disaster and distress areas throughout the world.

This bright new concept for peace, the idea of an Oklahoma naval officer, Comdr. Frank A. Manson, of Tahlequah, has inspired a tremendous outpouring of commendation, good will, and support from the American people across the length and breadth of the land. As you know, the July 27 issue of Life magazine, with a striking cover picture and its lead story and editorial column, threw its full support behind the Manson plan for a Great White Fleet as a "bold proposal for peace," and had a strong followup story in its August 3 issue.

On the day the concurrent resolutions were initially introduced in both Houses of Congress, all types of news media in America immediately showed great interest in the proposal. Radio and TV networks, news services, and independent newspapers made many inquiries and followed up with stories. Great American newspapers have endorsed the idea editorially. For example, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 23 in an editorial entitled "To Relieve Human Suffering," said in part:

It would be hard to do more good at smaller cost and we hope that Congress will look with favor on the proposal and that in turn it will be approved by President Eisenhower.

In an editorial entitled "Great White Fleet," the Christian Science Monitor of July 27 said in part:

As a dramatic, impressive, traveling advertisement of Americans' dominant desire to be helpful, not warlike, the idea has enormous possibilities. It certainly should be seriously explored and considered.

A much smaller newspaper, which I understand publishes twice weekly, the Franklin Times, of Louisburg, N.C., in an editorial on Tuesday, July 28, called Manson's idea the "boldest, most imaginative plan offered for world peace and good will we think since the Marshall plan. We highly endorse Commander Manson's plan and would like to see it put into operation with all possible speed."

The response of the American people to this proposal for a new Great White Fleet has been terrific and overwhelming, if the reaction received in my office by telegram, letters, petitions, postal cards, telephone call, and personal calls, is any indication. More than a thousand written communications, some of them signed by 20 or more persons, have already been received on this subject alone. One letter, received from Geneva, Ill., reads as follows:

A citywide poll was demanded and taken by the citizens of Geneva, Ill., for the promotion of the Great White Fleet. The results are as follows: Those in favor, 3,485; those against, 73; not voting, 2,345 (estimated).

The proposal of the Great White Fleet, if my mail is any criterion, touched a deep wellspring of American faith, vision, and desire to see evidence of the great American dream become more visible to the world. Of all the communications received, only a dozen were opposed to the plan at last count.

Several persons enclosed checks or cash with their letters as tangible evidence of their deep interest and strong desire to see the Great White Fleet go into action. Many, many more, including individuals, corporations, and associations, pledged financial support at the proper time. Some called for a "dollar crusade." At least one person wrote he would be willing to send \$100 a year for this purpose. Another person said he would pledge 5 percent of his monthly income and said:

With 12 to feed, it's all I can do—wish it was more.

Offers of help are being received from very strong and influential groups. Over the weekend, the initial sponsors of the resolutions in the House and in the Senate received a wire from George Killion, chairman of the Committee of American Steamship Lines, composed of major American flag steamship companies operating under contract with the Maritime Administration, offering to meet with sponsors of the project to discuss "ways and means of lending our shipping know-how to the advancement and operation of this inspired project. Our efforts would be directed to establishing experienced shipping organization on a nonprofit basis." We expect to meet with a committee soon to discuss this fine offer.

The Radio and Television Executive Society has strongly endorsed the Great White Fleet proposal. The American Board of Abdominal Surgery called the White Fleet "certainly a positive step," and offered to assist in any manner you desire to obtain the best qualified abdominal surgeons for the White Fleet, and also to provide space in the Journal of Abdominal Surgery to tell the story of the White Fleet.

The American Merchant Marine Library Association has offered its service in providing seagoing library units for the vessels of the Great White Fleet. Publishers, advertising agencies, civic organizations, and many other leaders in business and professional fields have endorsed the plan and offered help and support.

Offers to volunteer their own personal services in the Great White Fleet have been received from many persons in many professions. In addition to doctors and registered nurses, we have had letters offering personal volunteer services from dentists, medical photographers, chaplains, optometrists, licensed practical nurses, hospital dietitians, helicopter pilots, medical secretaries, teachers, physical therapists, and one licensed embalmer. Of great significance to me is the fact that many young people, in high school and in college, have written in connection with their desire to serve with the Great White Fleet, and they indicate they could let this plan be a significant part of their own planning for future education and training, and their own life's work.

Perhaps the strongest support has come from churches and church people across the Nation. Letters of strong support have come from Protestants and Catholics alike, and from people of the Jewish faith. One Buddhist group from a nearby State strongly endorses the proposal.

Because it is typical of the mail along this line which is being received, I should like to quote from a letter received from the pastor of a Congregational church in Iowa:

I am a parish pastor who wishes to commend you and thank you for supporting the idea of the New White Fleet. So long as the project continues to be a nonpartisan, unselfish effort to help peoples of the world who are in need for any reason, I shall be able to speak and work for it. Let us not

turn this into a political method but rather let the strength of America speak for itself in surplus given freely, medical and teaching abilities given kindly, and service to mankind as the single aim. A nation as blessed as we are can find a new value in life when it gives to others what it has so much of itself.

He goes on to say he has asked his parish to study the proposal—something many other ministers, Sunday school teachers, and church leaders have done.

The American people who have written to me from practically every State in the Union always provide provocative ideas and are a never-failing source of original thought, and great inspiration. In addition to the overwhelming sentiment in favor of the Great White Fleet, there is a strong overtone of the very profound and very urgent desire of the American people to promote the cause of peace and to be helpful to victims of suffering and disaster throughout the world.

A number of letters are concerned that the project might be considered a propaganda scheme and urge that careful precautions be taken to prevent such an eventuality. For example, one man from Illinois wrote me in part:

One reservation: The suggestion that a seventh ship might be added to exhibit U.S. culture and industry might be fraught with danger. It could give rise to the suspicion that the real reason behind the fleet is not true altruism but a desire to create good will for American industry. This would be disastrous to the fleet idea. One suggestion: If a seventh ship were to be added why not make it international in scope and have exhibits of some of the best cultural and most helpful scientific advances from all over the world? I have in mind exhibits of drugs to heal diseases, works of UNESCO, peacetime uses of nuclear energy, etc. This could do much to bind mankind together.

Other letters have suggested that the United Nations, the World Health Organization, or the Red Cross should be brought into the picture. Still others would like to see the ships of the White Fleet named for great names in medicine, for the great nurses of history, or for great scientists.

Many who write stress the urgency for immediate creation of the Great White Fleet and point out that now that it has been publicized "there would be unfavorable repercussions if it is allowed to lapse." Another concern in this connection is the fear that there is "nothing to prevent Russia from taking the idea and beating us to the field." One Tennessean wrote in part:

With all due respect, please hurry before this turns out to be another Aswan Dam and the Little Ruskie, Mr. K., get in on the act by beating us to it.

Excerpts from some of the many other letters received provide some examples of true Americana. One such letter starts with the sentence:

My husband and I just read the Life magazine article on the Great White Fleet.

And the next concluding sentence reads:

Damn the torpedoes, full speed ahead.

Another letter says:

The newly proposed Great White Fleet could be any color as far as I'm concerned. If this plan doesn't materialize, you'll not only disillusion the American people, but also those people who have long been waiting for just such a Great White Fleet.

The text of another letter follows:

I see no point in making my views known in terms of deathless prose. Here's my vote for the Great White Fleet—enthusiastically.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I should like to convey a message to one of our esteemed colleagues by inserting in the RECORD the text of a letter received from Point Lookout, Mo., which reads:

I am, not one of your constituents but would sure like to say that I am one of the many down here in these Ozark Hills who would back your bill or resolution favoring the New White Fleet completely. You might pass this letter on to our good friend CHARLIE BROWN and tell him we would like to see him back it, too.

Mr. Speaker, I might add that Mr. Brown introduced his House Concurrent Resolution 320 calling for the creation of the Great White Fleet on July 21, the very day the initial resolutions were introduced.

Before going on to a discussion of the response from my own Second District of Oklahoma, I should like to read a few excerpts from a self-styled teenager, also from Missouri, who said she had just finished reading about the Great White Fleet. She wrote:

I am only 14 years old, but I am as concerned in our Nation's peace as anyone. The world needs more Commander Mansons. The only thing fighting accomplishes is killing people, while a fleet of mercy ships would create a "good" feeling between those nations that are not as fortunate as the United States. This is just my point of view, but maybe other people have the same idea. This is a teenager's opinion.

Mr. Speaker, the mail I have received from the Second Congressional District of Oklahoma has been overwhelmingly in support of this proposal. Only one letter has been received at last count from my district in opposition; and, of approximately 65 letters received from Oklahomans outside my congressional district, only one was opposed. The letters of support are similar to those received from all over the country, and include offers of financial support, the volunteering of professional services by physicians, television personnel, dentists, and teachers, and general strong endorsement of the Manson plan.

I am proud to say that the first written message I received on the Great White Fleet proposal came from my district. On July 21, the officers and members of Veterans of Foreign Wars, Post No. 4877, in Muskogee, Okla., wired me through their commander, Clyde Neff, as follows:

The proposed resolution of sending mercy ships to the world's disaster areas is of a vital concern to the VFW Post 4977. This proposal would help promote peace and good will throughout the world. As one nation and one people under God, we should aid our fellow man in time of need. Therefore,

we fully endorse and support this proposal and trust that every effort will be put forth for its passage into law.

John Mahoney, of Radio Station KVIN, in Vinita, Okla., sent me "a short comment on the Great White Fleet proposal of fellow Oklahoman, Commander Frank Manson," and called it the "best constructive thinking, to encourage good will and further better American interest abroad since 'Willie and Joe'."

My old and cherished friend, Dr. J. R. Graves, of Westville, Okla., wrote me that he endorsed the Manson plan 100 percent, and added:

Now Ed, you may think I am displaying a false impression, but I believe I could get 500 signatures of endorsement and not cross the Barren Fork or the Illinois.

These are two Oklahoma rivers whose confluence is near Adair County where Dr. Graves resides.

Other persons writing letters of strong endorsement from my district include James Dunn, tSate service officer of the State Veterans Department in Muskogee; Dr. James H. Elliott, of Nowata; Mr. Robert E. Sattler, of Bartlesville, 1st Lt. Donald R. Adair, of Pryor; Mr. Jim Nevens, of Beggs; Mr. and Mrs. Ben Terry, of Henryetta; Mr. and Mrs. Virgil Fields, of Jay; Mr. G. N. Irish, of Muskogee; Mr. Marcel Lefebvre, of Okmulgee; Mr. W. H. Wilson, of Porter; Mr. Joe Kearney, of Henryetta; Mr. Charles L. Harris, of Muskogee; and Mr. Gentry Lee, of Bartlesville.

Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of the American people from whom I have heard in connection with the Great White Fleet proposal overwhelmingly endorse it, just as do the people from my congressional district and from my State. It is my understanding that there are 45 House concurrent resolutions already introduced calling for the establishment of this Great White Fleet, and that 34 Senators are now co-sponsors of the Senate concurrent resolution in the other chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the earliest possible action by the Congress on these resolutions, and suggest that the President, with the authority already at his disposal, get things underway immediately so that the Russians do not, as so many Americans have pointed out they could, beat us by bringing this magnificent concept into actuality.

Mr. Speaker, as a final note and as an indication of the potential meaning to the world of this proposal, let me insert in the RECORD this one letter I have received from across our border to the north:

MONTREAL, QUEBEC, CANADA,

Tuesday, July 28, 1959.

DEAR MR. EDMONDSON: Being a young Canadian teacher I can offer you neither time nor money for the wonderful new white fleet which you are sponsoring.

The courage, ingenuity, and kindness of yourself and your fellow Americans will make this dream a reality. We are proud that the United States is our neighbor country.

In the coming season I shall explain your endeavor to my large class, and each child will offer prayers for its success.

May God bless you.

Sincerely,

ROSEMARY SAMSON.

Peoria Journal Star Editor in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the 10th, 11th, and 12th in a series of articles by Editor Charles L. Dancy appearing in the Peoria Journal Star:

[From the Peoria Journal Star, July 29, 1959]

SOVIET RESORT LUXURIOUS, BUT MEDICINAL
(By Charles L. Dancy)

SOCHI.—I finally got to swim in the Black Sea. I had tried to find and buy a swimming suit at both Yalta and Odessa, and at Sochi I finally succeeded.

Cost is 35 rubles (not bad, by my count). At 10 to 1, \$3.50. At 4 to 1 it would have been almost \$9. The suit is by checking here about a \$1.50 bargain basement type.

The Black Sea is quiet for one so big. Virtually no tides, no swells. It is cool and refreshing and not as salty as the ocean. The beach is a solid mass of round stones.

The Chaika (Seagull) Hotel in Sochi is a place of fabulous luxury—a long hike involving a half-dozen flights of stone stairs past fountains and through parks and by statuary to get through the grounds to the entrance.

One doesn't think of this kind of wasteful luxury in the Soviet Union, and the Chaika was built by the Communists. It was not a summer palace of the czar, like some others. But they imitated that kind of grandeur.

It would hardly be practical in the United States because of the fantastic job of keeping it up. However, in Russia, there are still many people with limited ability who are kept busy doing small, menial, and dirty jobs for next to nothing in pay.

In the evening I went to the summer theater, a big Grecian-styled amphitheater, open air, with Greek columns surrounding it. But the show was an Armenian troop in dinner dress offering an imitation-American show, with jazz orchestra, master of ceremonies, comedians, torch singer, and the whole business. Pretty dreary.

The big hit with the audience was a fat little guy with heavy eyebrows that were pinned to his hairline who sang American songs (in English) in a Dean Martinish voice with Frankie Laine gestures.

The following morning I went to a place that would open the eyes of any Pekinese, another palatial building with beautiful grounds—but this was a "sanatorium" known as the "heart of Sochi" where 5,000 people a day are treated for various ills with sulfur water.

The familiar odor of sulfur water, so plentiful at Pekin Mineral Springs Park, is everywhere, and lines of people are bathing, having arms dipped in swirling bowls of sulfur water, and sitting in rows with inhalators over their faces breathing sulfur water steam.

There are 46 sanatoriums in Sochi, almost all built "since the revolution," and channeling their patients to this spot for sulfur

treatment. They say they treat 2 million a year—and I believe it.

This is one of the big propaganda stunts, shoving millions through these palaces to get "health" treatments, and telling them how much the new regime does for the people—at 500 rubles a head from the worker (and the rest from his union). Doctors "diagnose" every case and "prescribe treatment" for every person getting this sulfur water series.

In one area everyone is getting a sulfur water shower. The Russians say: "It won't cure baldness, but it will arrest it."

From these luxurious surroundings I was to go to the other extreme that afternoon.

[From the Peoria Journal Star, July 30, 1959]

RAGGED PEASANT ARMENIANS, AT RESORT RUSSIANS

(By Charles L. Dancy)

SOCHI.—Professor Rai, an Indian associated with the University of Calcutta, Mr. Peoples, and Eugene (Sochi guide) took a drive of 75 miles through the Caucasus Mountains deep into Georgian S.S.R. to a high mountain lake called Ritz and a high mountain called Aghuna.

The professor has been in Russia 2 years on a grant from the government to "translate Bengalese poetry into Russian" and, I suspect, also get a very thorough Communist indoctrination. I haven't met a Russian as aggressive in following the party line as he.

Driving inland we had to stop the car four times because of herds of goats or donkeys on the road. Each time they were being guided by men riding weatherbeaten horses, and these men looked like pictures out of the dark ages. They wore greasy caps, ragged baggy heavy-cloth clothes, and were themselves lined and whiskery.

"Most of the peasants are Armenians here," said Eugene. They surely weren't Russians.

We passed an old woman, bent almost double under a load of wood on her back, trudging up the mountain.

We also passed an old-fashioned pack train. A few more ragged peasants on beat-up horses and a long string of horses and mules with gear stacked on their backs.

Coming back we were delayed for long periods by work gangs, made up mostly of women, who were busy shoveling tarry oil onto the road and then hastily throwing crushed rock on top with their shovels.

It is back-breaking work and people may say that the Russian women are muscled and strong like men, but they still look like women and work like women and handle shovels like women.

Yet, at the top, after passing through all these views out of the distant and brutal past, we came to this lovely lake with a beautiful blue restaurant built like a Swiss chalet, a dock, and a bunch of speedboats—all this against the background of the snow-streaked, cloud-crowned mountains.

I saw no "Armenians" here. Only Russians eating, drinking wine, and ripping about in the speedboats.

This helped make some of Professor Rai's comments harder to take than usual, and we argued a bit. Eugene was usually silent. At one point he interjected to say that Russia and America are both modern countries with much energy, and each has some good and some bad. If we could exchange knowledge, he said, we would both be better off.

(I note that Khrushchev denies any such thing. They are ahead in everything, says Khrushchev.)

At another point, Professor Rai remarked that we may both be off base, and China "may well be the country of the future."

At this point, I could see the steam coming out of Eugene's ears. All he did actually say, however, was "I don't think so. Their language is a handicap to mass education."

Later at the free market (most of the peasants again were Armenian) Rai asked if the prices are fixed. It was really more of a statement than a question, following Eugene's statement that it was a free market for peasants.

Eugene said, "No."

"You mean they change from booth to booth and from day to day?" persisted the professor.

"No," said Eugene impatiently. "They are fixed by natural law. You cannot sell for more than it is worth. No one will buy. You will not sell for less. Natural law."

The professor subsided, and mumbled: "Supply and demand."

[From the Peoria Journal Star, July 31, 1959]

SPECIAL SEATS AT RED CIRCUS A REAL JOKE

(By Charles L. Dancy)

SOCHI.—We went to a Russian circus, and it is quite a sight. They placed us (as usual) in a front row box. Behind us in the other row in the same box was a Russian couple.

"For some reason," said the woman, "they are being seated in the front row and we were seated in the second."

A little later when they learned Peoples and I were Americans they laughed out loud.

"Naturally," said she, "Americans—first row, Roosevelt, behind." Big joke. (Not the first time I have heard comment that Americans and West Germans get special, plush treatment.)

This couple were very friendly throughout the evening thereafter, and did not seem to resent the situation, but found it amusing—and interesting.

The circus acrobatics were pretty amateurish, and I don't know if the lion act was superbly professional or very amateurish. I know one thing, that the Russian circus keeps you on the edge of your seat. Whereas at home you know the pros can do what they set out to do, and add a few false moves for thrills—here they seem to be doing their best, and just barely getting away with it—so you don't know what is going to happen next.

Finally, they had a lion act where the lions rode around the ring on the backs of the horses. I've never seen this before.

However, I doubt if we ever will over here. The horses' heads are held low with a brutal bit in the mouth belted to the special lion saddle. I don't think the SPCA would go for this or for the vicious prodding of the lions with long spears thrust through the bar, or whacking them with said spears, to get them to perform as advertised.

The professor rode back with us, and again started the Red theme (which is supposed to sap our will) that a Socialist world is inevitable because of the superior planning of the party system.

He's a literary man and has quoted Burns at me, so finally I just reminded him: "The best laid plans of mice and men gang aft aglee."

He suggested we change the subject.

J. Hyde Sweet Has Been an Active Newsman for 50 Years at Nebraska City, Nebr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL WEAVER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1959

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, on August 15 of this year one of the great men of

Nebraska journalism and a former Member of this House, J. Hyde Sweet, editor and publisher of the Nebraska City News-Press, celebrates his 50th year of active newspapering in Nebraska City.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate him on the excellent service he has rendered his hometown readers and the people of Nebraska through his astute observations on the passing scene carried daily in his own column and on the editorial page of his newspaper. He has made through his writings a major contribution to the people of his city and State.

It was on August 15, 1909, that Hyde Sweet came to Nebraska City as part owner and business manager of the old Nebraska City Press, the forerunner of the present News-Press. It was not long until he moved from the business office to the newsroom and began putting his writing talent and his ability as a shrewd observer to work. As a reporter he developed a flair for finding the right angle to a story and an ability to bring out the human interest in the happenings he observed around him.

Within 10 years he evolved into a columnist and began his Kick Column which has since become one of the most widely quoted news column in the Middle West. He has not, however, confined his writing ability to this column alone. He writes the daily editorial for his newspaper and I have always found these editorials to be composed of good writing, keen observation, and sound commonsense.

The people who work with him on the News-Press will celebrate his 50th anniversary with a dinner and open house on September 2. I would like to add to their best wishes my own congratulations on 50 years of past excellence and my hopes for many more years of the same kind of generous service rendered by a great and good spirit to the people around him.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the Record with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than

six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

"Democracy Versus Communism," a Textbook for Everyone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, some years ago, I addressed the House and pointed out that there should be written and made available to the people and, especially the schools, a book on communism, analyzing the principles of government advocated by the Communists and, more or less in a parallel way, outlining the principles of government upon which democracy or a representative government is based.

The Institute of Fiscal and Political Education undertook to have such a book written. The responsibility for writing it was given to Prof. Kenneth Colegrove, of Northwestern University, in which he was ably assisted by other eminent scholars. The result was a book entitled "Democracy Versus Communism."

The publication and distribution of this book filled a vacuum in our educational system. It was written in such a way that it appealed particularly to primary and high school groups. The interest developed for this book has been astonishing.

In view of my long experience in the Congress and, as a former teacher, I readily saw the need for such a textbook and the impact it would have upon our young people. The reception given it has been gratifyingly astonishing.

I will not burden the RECORD with many of the favorable reviews and comments on the book but I do want to include a few.

There follow two quotations from Cardinal Cushing:

I have always been convinced that unless our people receive proper anticommunistic education they will be continually indifferent to this international conspiracy; they will be disunited in their opposition to it; they will be an easy prey for all those who are commissioned by Moscow to spread the communistic line.

In the fall of the year we will probably recommend the book "Democracy Versus Communism" to our school assistants with the hope that they will follow the example of the secretary of education of the Archdiocese of New York.

Also, the following quotation from Hon. Harold Hayes, Chief, Publications Branch, Department of Defense, which has given wide distribution of the book in its libraries at home and overseas, is not without significance:

Congratulations on the review in the New World Review. It was what you expected, to

be sure. When the Communists yell "murder," you know your aim is good. This review proves again the effectiveness of "Democracy Versus Communism."

Probably one of the best authorities on communism is Vice President Nixon, who writes as follows:

This is just a note to thank you for your letter of July 7 enclosing an article which Lyle Wilson wrote about your book "Democracy Versus Communism." I certainly agree with his statements and would greatly appreciate being able to take you up on your offer to send me another copy of the book. I would like to have several of the people who will accompany me to Russia read it before our departure.

The New York Daily News had a cogent editorial on the merits and importance of "Democracy Versus Communism":

THE NATURE OF THE ENEMY—I

Not enough Americans, President Eisenhower feels, are aware of the nature of communism and Communists, and of the fact that the free world is literally in a life-and-death struggle with this 20th century slave philosophy and its slave-driver practitioners.

The President voiced that worry of his at a White House dinner one evening last week for a few press representatives—a dinner which made headlines around the free world for the next couple of days. He went on to express the hope that the U.S. press would do what it could to acquaint all its readers with the nature of the Communist enemy and the scope of the worldwide criminal Communist conspiracy against human liberty.

General Eisenhower was not exaggerating the threat of communism, or overstating its savage hatred of Western civilization and its dealed plans for wrecking that civilization and taking the world into a new dark age.

Accordingly, the News begins today a series of editorials under the title "The Nature of the Enemy," in which we will do our best to explain this malignant growth which Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels planted in the world's body politic with their "Communist Manifesto" in 1848.

The editorials will appear about once a week.

WE'LL DO OUR BEST

They will go into every major aspect of communism—its naked military threat of world conquest if the West ever drops its guard, its plans for economic warfare, waged from its arsenals of slave labor, its achievements up to now along that line, the training of Communist conspirators, communism's hatred of religion and the reasons for that hatred, what a Soviet occupation of the United States would do to most Americans, and the ways in which the free world, with courage and sacrifice, can crush this octopus.

We'll start out by recommending what we regard as a great book on communism, which we believe ought to be in use in all high schools in this country, and which many an adult could read with great profit to himself or herself.

The book is "Democracy Versus Communism," by Kenneth Colegrove, published by D. Van Nostrand Co., Princeton, N.J., for the Institute of Fiscal and Political Education;

424 pages, numerous pictures, cartoons, maps, and diagrams.

VACCINATION FOR BRAINS

Dr. Colegrove's book has been in circulation about 2 years. It is now in use in some 1,000 schools around the country. We hope it may spread to all the other high schools—fast—as a basis for courses in communism to vaccinate young Americans' brains and souls against this plague.

Only by teaching communism's aims, methods and philosophy, as Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, said in Washington last week, "can the Soviet plan for world domination be exposed to our young people and their will to resist it and recognize it be sharpened."

The Colegrove book will achieve that result better than any other books we've seen, for young people of high school age. ("Protracted Conflict," surveyed in this space a week ago, is written in a style geared more to college students and adults.)

"Democracy Versus Communism" is divided into short, easily read sections throughout, and contains hardly a word that any high school student will have to look up in the dictionary.

It contains a short history of the Communist idea (first hatched by the ancient Greek philosopher Plato, so far as recorded history shows), then sets forth on a detailed account of present-day communism—how it operates and what its objectives are, and how far short it has fallen of delivering the heaven on earth which it promises.

Along with the detailed explanation of communism goes an equally detailed description of how the American free-enterprise system (which Colegrove frankly and proudly calls capitalism) works to deliver the highest living standards ever seen in the world.

We think Colegrove is a little too impressed by the United Nations, and a little too charitable toward such creeping Socialist things in this country as the Tennessee Valey Authority. But aside from that, we believe this book is a masterpiece which should become a milestone in the history of American education.

The following is also a review of the book in the Washington Daily News by its noted writer, Lyle C. Wilson, under date of July 6, 1959:

TEXTBOOK FOR EVERYONE

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

This essay is an unabashed plug for a textbook which is being used in about 1,000 U.S. schools but which should be used in many thousands more.

The book is "Democracy Versus Communism." It was prepared and published by the Institute of Fiscal and Political Education, D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., Princeton, N.J., prints and distributes the book for the Institute.

It is simply written, well within the comprehension of high school freshmen or, even, eighth grade students. This book is recommended reading for interested adults, however, because it explains effectively what are the great basic differences between democracy and communism.

Too many adults, interested or not, are not sufficiently aware of these differences as to be able to explain to themselves or to others what these differences are. It

would be good for the United States if all citizens would read this book.

If you think you are a superior type who understands and can simply explain the basic differences between communism and democracy, then, friend, pause right here and have a go at it. If you are unable to state at least some of these basic differences simply, quickly and easily, then you owe it to yourself and to your fellow citizens to buy this book and to read it.

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON is a knowledgeable fellow about communism. He could do worse, however, than to get a copy of the institute's book for airplane reading when he flies this month to Moscow. Perhaps John Marshall, who is president of the institute, will send a copy to the Vice President for free.

If so, Mr. Marshall might also send one to the White House. President Eisenhower flunked his biggest test on the difference between communism and democracy. Ike was frank enough to make a public confession. He told a news conference in 1957 that he and Soviet Marshal Zhukov had "many long discussions about our respective doctrines."

"I was very hard put to it," Ike confessed, "when Zhukov insisted that their system appealed to the idealistic, and we completely to the materialistic, and I had a very tough time trying to defend our position."

A student in any of the 1,000 schools where the institute's book is being used as a text would have represented the United States better than Mr. Eisenhower in those talks with Zhukov. Students in the multithousands of schools in which the book is not used, however, probably would be no better informed on this subject than Mr. Eisenhower. The President has some ideas on the subject and they are good ones. For example, he said in 1956:

"Competition for men's minds begins when they are students. This is when they must be taught to discriminate between truth and falsehood. Specifically they must be taught to discriminate between the American form of government and the Soviet form."

That is exactly what "Democracy Versus Communism" seeks to teach.

Another review is by Elizabeth Moos who writes a critical review in the New World Review of "Democracy Versus Communism," which by reason of the source and views of the critic in themselves constitute a strong recommendation for the book, in my opinion:

COLD WAR TEXTBOOK

(A review by Elizabeth Moos of "Democracy Versus Communism," by Kenneth Colgrove, D. Van Nostrand Co., Princeton, N.J., 1958; 424 pp.)

We have had during the cold war period, a spate of hate-Russia publications. This textbook, published for the Institute of Fiscal and Political Education, is one of the most elaborate and biased of any I have yet read. It is directed to the youth of our country and may make—may be making—a contribution to distrust, prejudice, and fear, essentials in war psychology.

It is slick, no expense has been spared to make the format attractive. It is full of pictures and drawings, tests to help teachers, summaries, etc. In the preface a number of educators, some of whom are well known for scholarship and objectivity, are mentioned and we are told that they have criticized the text. The implication, of course, is that they have approved it. Probably because of this "sponsorship," the text has been adopted by boards of education in 21 States in spite of the fact that the author is better known for his support of McCarthyism and his attacks on scholarly foundations than for his educational achievements. It is difficult to believe

that such informed educators as Dr. Howard Wilson and Dr. Richard Burkhardt, who are mentioned in the preface, have approved the book as published.

The book makes little pretense of being objective; the thesis is clear from the very beginning and no propaganda device however dishonest, is omitted in the effort to prove it. The thesis that everything Communist, i.e., Soviet, is wholly evil, that everything American is democratic and completely perfect.

There is some history, treated very tentatively in an effort to prove that revolutionary change is per se wrong and the Russian revolution not only wrong but unnecessary. The czar was making the necessary changes; "Many freedoms that the Russian people had under the Czar were swept away when the Bolsheviks seized power * * *" and "almost half the people could read and write * * *" (under the Czar). We know what the "rights" of the people were before the revolution and we know that, at most, 24 percent of the people were literate. But will the teachers or students who use this text know it?

In the effort to present a picture of our democracy as ideal, some statements are made that are rather more than merely misleading. Contrasting our treatment of minorities with the treatment purported to be given by the Soviets to their minorities we learn that "by 1957, integration was well on the way in the Southern States," that the Indians who are still trying to hold some of their land (granted by treaty) "have been gradually gotten off their reservations * * *" are becoming self-supporting useful citizens." Our democracy, writes Mr. Colgrove, rests on the principle of a vote for everyone, and now "one man, one ballot is the rule in the United States." Not a word do the students hear about the struggle now going on for this very right to vote of which millions of our colored citizens have been deprived.

Material on the Soviet Union, its government and the life of its people, is an amazing hodgepodge of bits of fact, pure fiction, generalization. There are no objective scholarly references quoted, no bibliography. Quotations are used out of context, usually with no source given, undated. Pictures are used in questionable ways. So we have a picture of Soviet children doing exercises with rods—an exercise often used in our gymnastics. The caption is "Russian children are being given special exercises to strengthen their arms and hands for factory work." No documentation is given for this. Cartoons, some obviously dating from the twenties, are printed with neither date nor source. The many drawings were done to illustrate the thesis, in comic-book style with crude representations of the Soviets as robots or monsters.

When it is necessary to admit something positive, the author always counteracts it at once. So when we read that now there are refrigerators, washing machines, TV and cars in the Soviet Union we read in the next sentence that "Communist visitors say that no one but high government officials, army officers, or factory managers can own such luxuries." What Communist visitor? When? Much of the most violent anti-Soviet writing is material quoted from stories told by refugees or some of the well-known anti-Soviet writers. Such melodramatic stuff is featured by being set in bold type, on a special page so that students who may not manage to read the dull text will surely get an emotional impression that may arouse hate and fear. This horror stuff is presented without background or date in most cases.

In every chapter, whether dealing with foreign affairs—treated from a point of view considerably to the right of John Foster

Dulles—or with the Communist Party of the United States of America, which is described largely by such notorious informers as Louis Budenz and Bella Dodd—errors of fact abound.

Let us illustrate with one or two from the section on children. (Much of this would seem to be taken directly from George Counts' "Country of the Blind"). Boarding schools that are being set up under the new law are for wealthy little Communists. The facts—these schools are particularly for parents who need help or for orphans; neither finances nor politics enter into the question of admission, fees, as usual, are small and according to ability to pay. The old story that children are taught to spy on their parents is repeated several times. Fact—the code of the young pioneers stresses the importance of respect for parents and older persons; there is no documentation for the spying story, and that is why none is given in the text.

"The Young Octobrists are similar to the Hitler Wolves." "Specially selected children are sent to Young Octobrist schools." Fact—there are no such schools. The Young Octobrists are a loosely organized group of youngsters from 6 to 10, something like our Cub Scouts, doing crafts, singing, etc., preparing to be Boy Scouts. Their code is on the wall of many elementary schoolrooms. I copied it, and it may be of interest to see what these little ones—Wolves?—must be like.

(1) Study well, love your school, respect your elders; (2) an Octobrist is an honorable, moral child; (3) an Octobrist must love work; (4) an Octobrist is a friendly child who sings and lives happily.

The economic picture is given without the use of any Soviet figures. A table is presented showing how many hours of work are needed in the U.S.S.R. and the United States to buy articles. It is meaningless, and no reference is provided. What is left out is almost as dishonest as what is left in. There is no factual material on the Soviet budget. This would show the truth about spending for welfare and education in relation to armaments. It is easier to make generalizations. There are no quotations from the mass of reports that appear in press and magazines by visitors to the U.S.S.R., official and unofficial. Most of the educators, scientists, medical men and businessmen have come away with an impression decidedly at variance with the picture this book aims to present. So they are ignored.

What will be the effect of such a dishonest book on students? If they do not have other sources of information, if they read it, they will know that they are expected to answer the test questions near the end with a clear negative.

The questions:

"Can a nation that rejects religious teaching come to agreement with a nation that supports freedom of religion?" (Note the dishonesty of the phrasing implying that a nation, read U.S.S.R. that rejects religion cannot support freedom of religion.)

"Can a nation that breaks treaties" (lengthy proof has been given that the U.S.S.R. is such a nation) "come to agreement with a nation that respects international law?"

"Can democracy and communism ever be reconciled?"

Following—logically—we find a section on atomic bombs. Some people, we are told, thought we should not have dropped bombs on Japan. The explanation is as follows: " * * * the people were weary of war * * *" and although the allies had assisted Soviet Russia to expel the Nazi invaders, Stalin delayed declaration of war on Japan. Accordingly President Truman consented to the use of the bomb."

The fact is that the U.S.S.R. declared war on Japan on August 8, just as agreed. Truman ordered the use of the bomb 2 days before this date.

Reviewing this book has been a tough assignment. Its incitement to hatred arouses anger—the kind that is aroused when we read about the strontium 90 in our children's milk. The only positive thing that can be said about "Democracy Versus Communism" is that its overstatements, simplifications, and bias are so crude that many of our students and teachers will be too sophisticated and have too much general information to be greatly affected by it.

The sponsorship of "Democracy Versus Communism" by the Institute of Fiscal and Political Education is a patriotic effort and in the long run will constitute a fine service towards good government, and while decorations cannot be given for such a service this patriotic organization deserves the profound appreciation and support of the people.

The book has disturbed the Communists and pro-Communists because it is a penetrating book which is reaching the young people.

If "Democracy Versus Communism" is adopted generally by the high schools the fight against communism will be won in the minds of the people.

The Cause of All Mankind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, Mr. Norman Knight of Boston, Mass., president of the Yankee Network Division of RKO Teleradio Pictures, operating the Yankee Network, WNAC Radio, WNAC-TV, and WRKO, recently made a speech in New Bedford, Mass., entitled "The Cause of All Mankind." It is an excellent speech in which Mr. Knight makes very constructive suggestions for stifling and annihilating communism in the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that this speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a very fine editorial from the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, commenting on Mr. Knight's speech, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD following Mr. Knight's address.

There being no objection, the address and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CAUSE OF ALL MANKIND

(Remarks by Norman Knight in accepting 1959 award from American Heritage Committee, New Bedford, Mass., June 5, 1959)

Were we pessimists, we might say it is unfortunate that so few people in this land of ours are aware of the dangers of communism.

Were we optimists, we might be inclined to feel that we are making great progress in fighting the Communist threat.

I like to believe, though, that we are neither optimists nor pessimists but that we are realists, and that we are constantly aware of the

traits of our Communist enemies and, conversely, that we are appreciative of the fine, decent qualities of those Americans who support true American traditions and are not apathetic to the Communist menace.

My remarks will be brief, and it is my wish to spend most of these few minutes discussing the words of wisdom of a man whose writings and whose actions as an American have always given me great personal pleasure and pride. He was first called the Father of his Country. As much as I admire George Washington, this is not the great American to whom I refer since some years before this title was passed on to Washington, a man was called the Father of his Country because of his work at the very beginning in establishing the independence of our country.

Of all the patriots, this man was the only one to sign all five of the great state papers that achieved our independence—the Declaration of Independence, the Treaty of Amity and Commerce with France, the Treaty of Alliance with France, the Treaty of Peace with England and, of course, the Constitution of the United States.

When I think of the work of your good committee, the American Heritage Committee, and of our own modest efforts in the field of promulgating American traditions, I always like to think first in memory of Benjamin Franklin.

It is particularly fitting as we attend this function in New Bedford, itself the scene of great American historical traditions, that we reiterate thoughts expressed by Benjamin Franklin because not only was he first called the father of his country but I believe it was Carlyle who later called him father of all the Yankees.

Were Benjamin Franklin alive today, he would not have need to philosophize any differently nor with greater depth or perception than he did during the 18th century were he able to guide us in our current struggle with communism.

Boston-born Franklin believed that an essential service of man to his fellow man was the free communication of ideas, and without this communication he felt there could be no real freedom and no universal peace. His first public act at the age of 16 was to start fighting for freedom of speech and the press. His last public act just before he died at 84 was an appeal for the emancipation of slaves, employment for freed Negroes and education of slave children.

Franklin was, above all else, a practical man, and his beliefs were backed with action.

His brother, James, was publisher of the New England Courant and was thrown into jail for criticizing British authorities in Boston. To save the paper, young Benjamin, then an apprentice, was named publisher and with rare courage under the pen name of Silence Dogood he wrote these words in the London Journal:

"Without freedom of thought, there can be no such thing as wisdom; and no such thing as public liberty without freedom of speech; which is the right of every man. * * * Whoever would overthrow the liberty of a nation must begin by subduing the freedom of speech."

Were Franklin here today, I am sure that he would say there are many ways to subdue the freedom of speech, and one of these would be apathy, doing nothing about something.

When I think of the Communist menace sometimes it occurs to me that next to creating frictions among religious, ethnic, and racial groups (which I still consider to be the foremost objective of the Communists in America) the most important target for communism is plain and simple apathy. From the day that our Founding Fathers signed the Declaration of Independence until this very moment, America has remained

great because of what her people have done. Our problems have been caused by the things that we did not do.

Americans must think and act to meet Communist aggression here and abroad. This is why I have insisted that our organization reprint and distribute materials that will better educate New Englanders to the menace of communism, this is why we have produced films and other visual materials that would show Communist leaders to be untrustworthy and that is why we have produced the only continuing network program in today's radio which pictures in depth the fanaticism of hard-core Communists and the need for grassroots opposition to communism by Americans everywhere.

It is fitting that we call this last described program—the dangers of apathy. It was made possible only by the resources that we have available to us, the determination of people like Jack Maloy and my other associates who have contributed so much to this task and most importantly by the dozens of men and organizations whose backbreaking work over the years has developed the storehouse of information which our communications media can distribute. The undercover agents who have worked voluntarily, the FBI, and other law-enforcement groups, the American Legion, and the American Heritage Committee, and other patriotic committees, the citizens who have moved forward to help us, all of these have made it possible for us to further our objectives in this work.

Now we must urge others to join us. There are many things we can do. Let us take courage from the words and deeds of Benjamin Franklin and other revolutionary patriots and find ways to do things to express our patriotism with action. Here are some of the things that all of us can do:

1. When we see communications media courageously fighting communism, be they magazines, newspapers, TV stations, radio stations, or any other type of media, write to them and encourage them to continue their work.

2. When articles concerned with American traditions are printed, order reprints and distribute them to more people.

3. When special TV and radio programs are scheduled, such as our "Dangers of Apathy," call friends and urge them to call more friends to listen to the program.

4. Order reprints of such statements as J. Edgar Hoover's recent one-page statement, "What You Can Do To Fight Communism," and mail them to your friends and neighbors.

5. Write to your Congressman, your Senator, and to members of the executive branch of our Government and praise them and encourage them when they stand up and fight communism at home or abroad.

6. Speak out against any act of bigotry or prejudice, because words that create friction among Americans aid the Communists' cause. Denounce as un-American any man or woman who spreads hate in any form, because, as Franklin once said, "Fools multiply folly."

7. Seek to find ways at the grade-school and high-school levels to encourage reading of American history and to stimulate forum discussion, contests, and other activities concerned with acts of American liberty and justice. A great fear of the Communists is that American children will gain a greater appreciation of American heritage and the great struggles that have won and maintained our freedom.

8. Demand honesty from public servants, union officials, and management men, all of whom have trusts, since it is proven that in many countries graft precedes confusion and confusion precedes communism.

9. Certainly be constructively critical where circumstances deserve criticism, but be alert to Communist-inspired criticism of Govern-

ment services and Government functions. Do not support demands for further expansion of governmental expenditures except where they are deemed necessary for national security, for it is an oft-repeated Communist statement that capitalistic countries are doomed by inevitable economic collapse. Our answer must be one of concerted economy, balanced budgets, and immediate planning to institute reduction in the national debt. Individual support by Americans everywhere is essential to the attainment of these objectives.

10. Be informed and urge others to be informed through a sincere desire to know all possible about communism's devious plans and maneuvers which change in execution (but never in long-term objectives) almost on a daily basis.

For all of us it is important to remember that our fight is not just the fight for New Englanders, nor is it the fight only for Americans. Our opposition to communism serves an even greater cause, best expressed in a statement made by Benjamin Franklin, whose foresight must have destined his remarks to be as appropriate today as they were the very hour that he expressed them. I have studied these remarks many times, and our finest statesman of the 20th century could not weld words in such a way as to do greater justice to our situation in the world today than did Franklin's almost two centuries ago:

"All Europe is on our side of the question, as far as applause and good wishes can carry them. Those who live under arbitrary power do, nevertheless, approve of liberty, and wish for it; they almost despair of recovering it in Europe; * * * 'tis a common observation here that our cause is the cause of all mankind, and that we are fighting for their liberty in defending our own. God grant that not only the love of liberty but a thorough knowledge of the rights of man may pervade all the nations of the earth, so that a philosopher may set his foot anywhere and say, 'This is my country.'"

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union-Leader, July 24, 1959]

KNIGHT'S SOLUTION

Norman Knight, president of the Yankee Network, which includes WNAC radio and television in Boston, delivered a stirring address in New Bedford, Mass., recently in which he offered a 10-point program to stifle and annihilate communism from these United States. The occasion for Mr. Knight's remarks was his reception of the 1959 award from the American Heritage Committee.

This newspaper can only say "amen" to Mr. Knight's proposal along with the guarantee that we will most certainly continue to do our share toward this common cause—the elimination of communism here and elsewhere in the world.

Mr. Knight's 10-point program follows:

1. Encourage news media of all sorts in their courageous battle against communism.
2. Order reprints of articles dealing with American traditions and distribute them to your friends.
3. Urge your friends and neighbors to watch special radio and television programs dealing with the battle against communism.
4. Order reprints of such statements as J. Edgar Hoover's "What You Can Do To Fight Communism," and mail them to friends.
5. Write your Congressman, Senator, and to high Government officials encouraging them to battle communism.
6. Speak out against any act of bigotry and prejudice.
7. Seek ways to encourage the teaching of American history in grade schools and high schools, and stimulate forum discussions and like programs.

8. Demand honesty from public officials, union officials, and management men.

9. Be constructively critical when deserved but be ever alert to Communist-inspired criticism of Government processes.

10. Be informed and urge others to be so.

Mary T. Norton

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply grieved and shocked to learn of the passing last Sunday, August 2, of our distinguished former colleague from New Jersey, Mrs. Mary T. Norton. This loss will be felt deeply by all of us who knew her and worked with her during her long years of service in the House. For the people of Washington, Glenn Dale Sanitarium stands as a fitting memorial commemorating her 7 years' work as chairman of the House District Committee. For Mrs. McCormack and me, the loss is that of a close personal friend. I shall always hold Mrs. Norton in high esteem as a conscientious hard-working colleague, as we defended the wages and hours bill against opposition in May of 1940, and when she served as cochairman with me of platform and resolutions at the 1944 Democratic National Convention.

Mary T. Norton would like to be remembered, I am sure, primarily as a wife and mother, as a devoted family woman. Born in Jersey City 84 years ago, she attended the public schools and had just graduated from high school when her mother died. Her family came first and she deferred any plans of her own for 5 years while she cared for her father and managed the home. Then she felt free to take a secretarial course at Packard Business College and worked as a stenographer until her marriage to Robert Francis Norton in 1909.

The great personal tragedy of her life, the death of her only child in infancy, started her on a long and distinguished career in legislative service. To overcome her despondency and grief, she began to work for the Queen's Daughters Day Nursery. Her qualities of leadership were soon recognized by local and State officials and in 1916 she became president of the Day Nurseries Association of Jersey City. From this office to higher State and national positions were only short steps for Mary Norton as she blazed the trail with a long line of firsts. In 1923 she became the first woman elected freeholder in Hudson County and the State of New Jersey. In 1925 she was sent to the 69th Congress representing the 12th New Jersey District, becoming the first Democratic woman to be elected to Congress, and the first woman Representative of any Eastern State. She became the first woman to head any House committee when she

served from 1930-37 as chairman of the House District Committee, earning the affectionate title of "Lady Mayor of Washington."

Some Members of the House will remember the gala occasion in 1945 when we helped Mary Norton celebrate her 70th birthday and 20th anniversary in Congress. Similar festivities 5 years later on her silver anniversary in Congress and her 75th birthday, were somewhat saddened when she announced from a hospital bed her plans for retirement in 1951. We were pleased, however, that she elected to remain in Washington as a special consultant on manpower to the Labor Department until 1953.

Wife, mother, businesswoman, legislator—her career was varied, her life was rich and full, her heart was big and kind. When she could no longer be a mother to her own son after his death, she turned, through welfare work, to being a mother for other people's children. Her horizons broadened and soon she was working for the entire Nation. Genial and unassuming, we shall all feel the loss of her wonderful presence. Our sympathy goes out to her two surviving sisters, Mrs. Joseph B. McDonagh and Miss Anne Hopkins.

Some Good Can Come From a Meeting Between American and Russian Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the better peoples of various countries understand each other; and the more communication there is between countries, the better the chances are for peace between those countries.

I believe some good may come from the proposed meeting of our President and Soviet Prime Minister Khrushchev. Whether any good will actually be realized from the meetings will depend principally on whether Mr. Khrushchev is actually interested in promoting peace between the two countries, or whether he will simply repeat empty slogans of peace, without taking any action to back them up.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a discussion of these meetings, in an editorial entitled "Washington and Moscow," published in the Washington Post for Tuesday, August 4, 1959.

In addition, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "A Bid for Peace," from the New York Times for Tuesday, August 4, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Aug. 4, 1959]

WASHINGTON AND MOSCOW

When all the caveats are entered against expecting too much of the exchange of visits by Prime Minister Khrushchev and President Eisenhower, there remains cause for great satisfaction that the invitations have now been issued and accepted. A single exchange is unlikely to clear away all or even most misconceptions, much less to end the fundamental rivalry between the Soviet Union and the United States. But if there is a will to use the opportunity constructively, it can be helpful in reducing some of the more inflamed differences to manageable proportions. It also can point the way to fruitful cooperation in the future.

In a sense Mr. Khrushchev's trip to Washington next month and Mr. Eisenhower's trip to Moscow later in the fall will be substitutes for the elusive summit meeting. That this country's principal allies, Britain, France, and Germany, have consented to the procedure is an indication of their confidence that the United States will make no invidious deals behind their backs. It is nonetheless useful for President Eisenhower to go to Europe in advance to consult with Messrs. Macmillan, De Gaulle, and Adenauer so as to allay any misgivings and to arrive at a common understanding of essential Western interests.

There doubtless will be a few misgivings elsewhere amid the general jubilation that the leaders of the two largest powers are thus to talk face to face. Among some of the smaller countries there will be a latent fear that Messrs. Eisenhower and Khrushchev will somehow agree to a revival of the old Stalin formula for dividing the world into spheres of influence. That would be the complete antithesis of American policy and objectives, but the only meaningful reassurance will be in the results of the talks themselves.

The other likely center of concern will be Peking. Communist China may well look with extreme displeasure upon the prospect of any rapprochement between its benefactor but potential rival, the Soviet Union, and the United States. It is not beyond possibility that China will seek to create tension, as in a renewed Quemoy-Matsu crisis, in an effort to compel support from the Soviet Union and thus to queer the visits.

To a considerable degree the agreement to exchange visits represents an acknowledgment that the negotiations at Geneva have become futile. President Eisenhower has in effect abandoned his position that there would be no summit meeting without a showing of some progress at the conference of foreign ministers. This particular concession, however, involves no departure from basic principles—it in no way alters, for example, the Western stand on Berlin—and it is a concession that the administration is well advised to make. In view of Mr. Khrushchev's obvious desire for a visit and in view of his unique place in the Soviet system, it had become increasingly apparent that nothing substantial would be done through ordinary diplomatic means.

If any question of face is involved, the administration has the technical explanation that this will not be a summit meeting as such—although it could be the prelude, if it is successful, to a series of summits. Moreover, the concession is not without compensations. Mr. Khrushchev's acceptance of the invitation amounts to a de facto alleviation of the Soviet threat on Berlin. He cannot afford to cause new trouble if he has any real hope of improved East-West relations.

Unquestionably the Khrushchev tour of the United States will beget many problems, not the least of them security. Unlike the situation in the Soviet Union, where the Government turns demonstrations on and

off, in this country the Government cannot predict the behavior of crowds or of individual zealots. The seeming inability of the Soviet leaders to believe that anything is ever accidental is itself a cause of misunderstanding. In any event, there is now especial reason for Americans, and particularly new Americans who have enjoyed this country's hospitality, to behave in an adult manner. No one is required to admire or approve what Mr. Khrushchev represents; the essential reason for his visit is that he is the leader of this country's principal competitor nation in a world in which both nations must live.

From Mr. Eisenhower's personal standpoint, his schedule for the remainder of the summer and autumn will impose a heavy burden upon a man nearly 69 years of age. Vice President Nixon, a man of seemingly boundless energy, has shown the fatigue of a strenuous trip. It is a tribute to the President's renewed health that he feels able to subject himself to such strains. Perhaps one reason for his willingness to do this is that he sees the possible beginning of fulfillment of his fondest dream—the advancement of a just peace. This dream was interrupted by his heart attack after the Geneva Conference in 1955 and subsequently was frustrated by a long series of disillusionments.

It is important to guard against more of these disillusionments, and the best way is by avoiding naive or rosy hopes—and empty slogans. Mr. Khrushchev is not suddenly going to liquidate his empire or disengage or agree to Western terms on anything of substance. If he did, the agreement would automatically be suspect. Rather, the opportunity is in a much longer range adjustment.

If it is possible to isolate any single root of friction between the Soviet Union and the United States, that root is the Soviet philosophy of revolution for export. Americans dislike many things about the Soviet system—its repression of individual freedoms, its antireligious dogma, its slavish conformity, its subjugation of other peoples. But if these aspects affected only the people of the Soviet Union itself, it would be their business and the remainder of the world would have far less reason for concern.

To expect Mr. Khrushchev to renounce the ends and means of communism would be as foolish as to expect a true believer to renounce his faith. What is possible—no probable but possible—is that Mr. Khrushchev may find it expedient to change his tactics, and that such a change of tactics will over a period of years mean a metamorphosis of objectives. It is possible that in process of living together with the West in what Mr. Khrushchev calls coexistence, Soviet communism will lose some of its imperialistic aspects, not by design but by evolution.

This is to say that the Communist system may follow the pattern of the Moslem conquests and the crusades and, while continuing to proclaim its external aspirations and beliefs, may gradually turn inward. Indeed, a case can be made that with the remarkable Soviet economic advance, the rise in living standards and the demand for consumer goods—a process bound to be encouraged by trade fairs, cultural exchanges and even Mr. Khrushchev's visit—this is already happening. History may show that this is the principal change of the post-Stalin era.

Of course there is no guarantee that such an evolution will turn out to be more than wishful thinking. Even if liberalizing forces are at work, an accommodation with the Soviet Union will not be easy. Berlin and a host of other dangerous issues remain unsolved. Soviet technological advance has put Mr. Khrushchev in a cocky mood. He most certainly will take advantage of any Western weakness to get anything he can get. Western unity and strength were never more

necessary; and, paradoxically, more adequate military strength now is the essential prerequisite to any satisfactory reduction of the arms burden.

What lies ahead is an opportunity, the first of its kind since the cold war began 13 years ago. If we use the opportunity wisely, we may at the least dispel some of Mr. Khrushchev's unreasonable fears and at the same time persuade him of the enormous peril of miscalculation. At the best, we may succeed in opening a new vista of mutual tolerance for the two countries under the awful and wonderful potential of the atom.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 4, 1959]

A BID FOR PEACE

In a supreme effort to melt the ice that clogs relations between East and West, President Eisenhower invites Premier Khrushchev to make an official visit to the United States next month, and the Soviet ruler, who has publicly bid for such an invitation for months, accepted "with pleasure." In return the President proposes to visit Soviet Russia later this fall.

The projected exchange of top-level visits, prepared by lower level visits and prolonged negotiations in full consultation with our allies, has found general approval and even acclaim at home and abroad. But just to demonstrate anew the unshakable solidarity of the West and to discourage any Soviet attempt to sow suspicion among the allies the President also proposes, prior to Mr. Khrushchev's visit, to go to Europe this month to confer with Prime Minister Macmillan, President de Gaulle, Chancellor Adenauer and other Western statesmen to concert Western policies and iron out remaining differences.

In announcing these visits President Eisenhower has yielded not so much to Mr. Khrushchev's importunities as to Western pleas to use his personal authority and prestige to break the East-West deadlock, reaffirmed by the impending failure of the Geneva Conference of Foreign Ministers and the halting pace of the Geneva Conference on a nuclear weapons test ban. He has yielded with obvious reluctance, but he has always said that he was willing to go anywhere and do anything to promote a just and lasting peace, and the proposed visits are part of his search for such a peace.

Nevertheless, it is essential to keep the Soviet-American visits in proper perspective. However sympathetic the American people may be toward the Soviet peoples, and however much the latter may reciprocate this feeling, as shown during the visit of Vice President Nixon, Premier Khrushchev will come to this country as a decidedly unfriendly dictator who has vowed to "bury" us in a Communist world conquest. But as an official visitor and guest of the President he is entitled to and must receive not only adequate protection but also all the usual courtesies. And however bitterly resentful members of the captive nations may feel toward him there must be no repetition of the disorderly incidents that marred the visit of Mr. Mikoyan.

Furthermore, however much Soviet propaganda may try to represent them as such, these visits do not denote any Soviet-American summit conferences. They may pave the way to an East-West summit conference if they induce the Soviets to permit enough progress in actual negotiations to make such a conference worth while. But there will be no real negotiations during the visits themselves, certainly no deal to divide the world between the two superpowers at the expense of our allies, as the Soviets have been urging. Mr. Khrushchev will stay in Washington only 2 or 3 days, which is not long enough to resolve issues that have stymied the foreign ministers for nearly 2 months.

Indeed, the announcement specifically states that his talks with the President will be informal, and Mr. Eisenhower's return visit to Soviet Russia will be a personal one, during which he will make no attempt to speak for the West but only for the United States.

Despite these limitations, Premier Khrushchev's visit may yet prove beneficial to world peace. He claims to have abandoned the Marxist-Leninist dictum that communism can conquer the world only by war and is all for peaceful coexistence and competition. That may well be true as regards an atomic war with an atomically armed West. But it does not stop him from threatening war over Berlin or fomenting war in Laos in an effort to undermine the Western position at the risk that any war might get beyond his control. In that respect he is not only the prisoner of his own propaganda but is also deluded by his previous visits to smaller and weaker countries than his own and by his very real misconceptions about the United States, attested to by all his recent visitors.

Because of all this Mr. Khrushchev's visit to the United States should prove an enlightening experience for him. It should give President Eisenhower the opportunity to tell him to his face that the United States will neither abandon nor betray either its allies or freedom. It should also enable him on his tour through the country to get a firsthand view of both the real American way of life and of our industrial power. If both these factors help to keep him from reckless adventures that could lead to war and if they induce him to engage in genuine negotiations on terms the West can accept, the world will be the gainer thereby.

The Steel Strike Must Be Settled Without Adding Fuel to the Fires of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the current steel strike represents one of the most irresponsible acts on the part of those who have been entrusted with the interests of American workers. For many years, I have been concerned with the maintenance of competition between domestic producers and their foreign competitors. The continuance of the steel strike for any length of time will seriously affect communities throughout the Nation who will lose their competitive position in the world's steel markets.

Mr. Roger M. Blough, chairman of the board of the United States Steel Corp., in his statement issued on July 28 unequivocally stated that unless the United States Steel Corp. was forced through Government intervention to make an involuntary settlement, it would not increase the general level of steel prices in the foreseeable future.

Mr. Blough's statement is of such importance that I request leave to insert it at this point in my remarks.

STATEMENT BY ROGER M. BLOUGH, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, UNITED STATES STEEL CORP.

For the sixth time since the end of World War II, the Steelworkers' Union has called a

nationwide strike to enforce its demands for an inflationary wage settlement.

Like all strikes, this one will be settled sooner or later—and we all sincerely hope it will be sooner. Like other strikes, this one involves differences over wages, fringe benefits, work rules, and similar issues.

But it also involves more. It is a test of whether the steel industry, or any industry in present-day America, can successfully resist the enormous power that has enabled our modern labor unions to exact—frequently with the aid of Government—inflationary wage increases from one industry after another, round after round, throughout these 14 years.

In the past when strikes have been settled, the settlement has been followed by an increase in the general level of steel prices where competitively feasible. This has been dictated by good business judgment as an attempt to recover the increased employment costs incurred and to provide revenues to offset the inevitable increase in other costs involved in operating a business.

Many people mistakenly believe that a steel wage increase would not be inflationary if it did not result in an increase in steel prices; and thus we hear much debate about whether the companies could afford to boost wages and benefits another notch.

But the fact is, of course, that whether steel prices rise or not, inflationary wage increases in construction, motors, steel, oil, or other major industries ripple out over the entire economy as other unions strive to catch up to the new, high level. And as these rising employment costs spread, they force higher costs and higher prices everywhere, for employment costs—direct and indirect—represent more than three-fourths of all production costs in American industry. Taxes, too, inevitably rise with other costs, for much of tax revenue finds its way into employment costs.

The ripple effect of rising wage costs is still in evidence. There have been a number of wage increases so far this year, many of which are of a catchup nature; and there are certain to be many more if the demands of the Steelworkers' Union prevail. This is because the average earnings of steelworkers are already about \$7 a day higher than the average earnings in all manufacturing industries. And any increase which widens this gap will tend to pull up wages, production costs, and prices in every other industry.

That is why we in the steel industry have sought and bargained for a settlement that would involve no increase in employment costs—or at least sustainable ones which could be met—in the end—by the elimination of wasteful practices arising out of various provisions in our old labor agreements.

And that is why 3 months ago I said that it was not the intention of United States Steel to change the general level of our prices in the foreseeable future and that I earnestly hoped future events would enable us to maintain this position.

Now we would like to go further. In the hope that removing any doubt as to the intentions of our company with respect to price will be helpful to the successful conclusion of the present strike-bound negotiations, we believe it is timely for United States Steel to make this further statement—a statement to which we intend to adhere in the absence of an involuntary settlement mandated by some public body or authority. And the statement is this:

"Whatever the length of the strike, and whatever the eventual outcome of the negotiations—so long as they are voluntary—we in United States Steel do not intend to raise the general level of our steel prices in the foreseeable future.

"We believe that competitively this is no time to raise prices. We know that employment costs abroad are but a fraction of our

own. We know that imports of foreign steel and products made from such steel are increasing. And we know the tough competition that steel faces from other materials produced domestically. These things alone would dictate a hold-the-line position on prices.

"We believe, therefore, that the long-range interests of all employees and our customers and stockholders will best be served by this policy.

"If events dictate a change in our situation next year, we will necessarily be required to take whatever steps are then indicated—but as of now we foresee no general increase."

We realize that this hold-the-line position has a direct bearing on the demands of the union because we intend to continue to negotiate in the context of that position.

We also realize that except in period of extreme demand, every company in an industry such as steel must meet the lowest price of its competition, and that the force of competition will thus deter other steel companies from seeking price relief.

Understandable as other attitudes may be, we believe that our Nation faces a number of serious problems today, not the least of which is wage inflation. All of us in United States Steel, stockholders, and all employees alike, share with our fellow Americans in every walk of life the responsibility to help to combat further inflation with the resources at our command. And we hope that by this action we may aid others in their desire to combat the seemingly irresistible pressure for ever-higher wages and prices.

JULY 28, 1959.

Goals of the International Typographical Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the International Typographical Union is the oldest trade union in the United States. Through the years of its development, the ITU has been in the forefront of labor organizations seeking to establish democratic processes by which its members can direct and control the business affairs of the union.

Last week, the Oregon Typographical Conference maintained an Oregon industry booth at the Oregon Centennial exposition, which now is underway in Portland. As a part of the industry booth activities, members of the Multnomah Typographical Union distributed to all visitors a historical sketch about the ITU. The sketch was written by John K. Standish, of Portland, Oreg., and describes the operating procedures and goals of the International Typographical Union.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Standish's historical sketch printed in the Appendix of the Record, with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**INTERNATIONAL TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION, OLDEST
AND MOST DEMOCRATIC, MODEL FOR ALL**
(By John K. Standish)

PREFACE

The subject of the early civilized people is immediately associated with ancient history and classified in the category of tedious repetition by many. But in order to visualize and perceive the furtherance of our subject we review their developments so that we may form a contrast to our current era.

Those early people by laborious steps from storytelling, picture writings (hieroglyphics), cuneiform and crude alphabets, have done well to convey salient features of their life and culture to us through the scattered specimens of their work still available.

Although nature decrees our physical development, she leaves our minds to the influence of society we live in. Following the ever-changing status of the workers, from Egyptian times through the guilds and into the beginning of unionism in England, has taught us that individually the worker is very insignificant.

As the merchant guilds unfolded, the factory system came into being. As merchants became more wealthy, they came to be farther removed from the reality of the workers' conditions. Thus the craft guilds, predecessors of trade and industrial unions, were born from necessity.

The mechanical system of manufacturing, which refused to recognize the individual worker's right to happiness, developed conditions such as child labor, long hours, low pay, unsafe and unsanitary plants. This led directly to the revolt and attempt by labor to improve the workers' conditions. Thus, history repeated itself and unions (like the guilds) were born from necessity.

The real object of organized labor is the right to bargain collectively. Trade agreements stand for industrial peace and are the steppingstone to improved conditions. Arbitration is the governor of capital and labor relations and on it depends how peaceful the relations may be. The union label means that an object was manufactured under sanitary conditions, standard wages have been paid and good workmanship is in evidence.

From adequate and absolutely humane ideals came the control and organization of all unions. Future generations shall learn much from this era of unionism. Upon what may be the ultimate in unionism depends upon how well founded in its principles future generations may be.

THE INTERNATIONAL TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION

The International Typographical Union is the oldest union in America. Its local branch in Washington, D.C., was founded in 1815. Its local in New York City was founded in 1850 by Horace Greeley. In 1852 these and other locals merged to make the national union, which now has its headquarters in Indianapolis. Today this union has approximately 800 locals and more than 110,000 members and apprentices.

In towns of 7,000 and above, they set the type for over 90 percent of all newspapers and printing establishments.

Printshops used to be dark and dirty; the air in them was foul; the workday was 12 hours; tuberculosis was an accepted printer's ailment; the average age of printers at death was 28.

The union made up its mind to change this and lift that age. All local unions of the union formed committees on sanitation which pleaded with employers and health authorities, and pushed printshops into the forefront of early industrial sanitary progress. Then, in 1892, the union established the Union Printers Home at Colorado Springs—a sanatorium for tubercular members and place of retirement for aged ones. The union has spent more than \$9 million

on it. A union member, with 25 years or more membership may receive a weekly pension of \$22, and a \$500 mortuary benefit.

Work in a modern composing room is fast, intense, exhausting. The union has gradually brought the worktime of its members down from 12 hours a day to a maximum of 37½ hours a week—except for war needs and other emergencies.

The years added to the lives of its members cannot be a mere coincidence. The average age at death has been lifted from 28 to the following levels:

By 1900, to 41; by 1910, to 46; by 1920, to 53; by 1930, to 59; by 1940, to 64, and at latest report is 68.

This union has served life. Its success is unquestionable. So next: Has it won this success by dictatorship over its members and class war against its employers?

It has not. Among its locals there have been plenty of instances of hottheadedness and unreasonableness. The main point nevertheless remains that the Typographical Union is utterly antidictatorship and utterly anticclass war.

You start toward being a member of the Typographical Union by becoming an apprentice. You can become an apprentice at 16. Then for 6 years you study your trade by practice in the shop and by taking 149 printed lessons sent to you by the union's bureau of education. These lessons are so complete that they have been adopted by many school systems as official textbooks.

A special set of lessons tells you about unionism. You are taught that union men must sacrifice for each other in order to continue to have a union. You are taught that it will be your duty to attend union meetings and to vote on all union matters.

You are also taught about employers. You are taught that labor should not be unfriendly to capital; that capital and labor both are essential to efficient and economical production; that the union should insure high-class workmanship; that it should strive to reduce unit cost; that the employers of the Typographical Union have virtually never broken a contract with the union, and that no local should ever break a contract with any employer; that every local should regard itself as a partner with the employer in the production process; that every preacher of class war, every Communist, every Fascist, every Nazi, is an enemy to the union and should be eliminated from the whole labor movement.

On all these lessons the apprentice must pass examinations. Then he becomes a journeyman and a full member of the union and starts voting. He spends a lot of time voting.

The Typographical Union insists that its locals shall manage their own local affairs. Every local must hold a regular monthly meeting on a regular stated day. It must elect an auditing committee or employ a certified public accountant to examine its books every 3 months. It must vote on every contract with an employer; and the contract binds every member. It must vote on any proposed strike and get a three-quarters majority before striking.

In these circumstances no one-man rule is possible. The Typographical Union nourishes democracy's taproot: local self-government.

A democratic union has two advantages for the country. The first is that it tends toward relations with employers that are more human and intelligent and stable. But the second is even more important.

The whole democratic world, in order to meet the competition of the totalitarian world, has to perfect its democratic institutions. It has to democratize its daily business life 364 days in the year and then achieve democracy by going to a political polling place on the 365th.

If you visit a union composing room, you may see the compositors, in a lull of work, gathered into a quick huddle. They are holding a meeting of their chapel—a subdivision of their local. They are rapidly settling among themselves some point of shop technique or shop discipline. These little cells represent daily, hourly, practice in democratic living. They represent economic government by consent. They train men to detest autocracy and to desire democracy in all things.

Freedom needs such men. Free democratic business must learn that in order to survive against the totalitarian state it has to have such men. The final merit of the Typographical Union is that its institutions are organized to produce such men.

With the introduction of the typesetting machine about 1890 a great revolutionary change in the industry reached a practical stage of development. The International Typographical Union at that time had a membership including pressmen, bookbinders, stereotypers and photoengravers. By 1904 these latter groups had all withdrawn and established their own national organizations.

**Public Interest Can Best Be Served by
a Cut in Steel Prices With No Change in
Wage Rates**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER BOWLES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the text of a letter which I sent to President Eisenhower yesterday concerning the steel situation:

AUGUST 5, 1959.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As wartime Price Administrator and Director of Economic Stabilization, I was deeply involved on a week-to-week basis with the complex interrelationship of prices, wages, and profits in the steel industry. Over the years since then, I have been increasingly disturbed in watching the operations of this key industry which has such widespread influence on employment and manufacturing costs throughout our economy.

In these 14 years, the steel industry has been shut down six times by labor-management differences. One hundred and ninety days of production have been lost. As a result, an estimated 45 million tons of steel production that might have been produced were not produced and, of course, the losses in wages and profits run into hundreds of millions of dollars.

The present impasse is now moving into its fourth week. Unless some agreement can be reached soon, the implications for our economy as a whole are decidedly disturbing.

We are now emerging from our third recession in 10 years. This series of setbacks has slowed our average annual rate of growth to the lowest levels in several decades.

Continued loss of steel production and steelworker purchasing power will curtail our prosperity still further. Moreover, as steel stocks dwindle, almost every industry in America will become affected. Bitterness between the workers and management, which

already is distressingly great, will become greater.

If a labor-management settlement is followed by a price rise, the adverse effect on our economy as a whole will be increasing still further. Already the price of steel has risen from the OPA ceiling of \$54 a ton in 1945 to \$155 in 1959. This is four times the increase in the wholesale price level in this 14-year period.

Of the 9 percent rise in average wholesale prices since 1953, 7 percent has been directly due to increases in steel and steel-using products.

If it had not been for a drop in the wholesale prices of farm products which have gone down 9 percent since 1953, the inflationary pressures generated primarily by the steel industry would have been even more evident. This means that sagging food prices have been balancing skyrocketing steel prices.

When asked to explain its repeated and extensive price increases, the steel industry has invariably pointed out that hourly wage rates have also tripled. Continued repetition of this explanation has led many people to assume that the blame for high prices belongs exclusively to labor. This, however, leaves out a critically important point—the relation between hourly wage rates and labor productivity.

Corporate profits are determined by many things. To the degree that labor cost is a factor, it is not the price of labor per hour but the cost of labor per ton of steel produced that is important. Although this precise figure is one of the world's best kept secrets, the external evidence indicates that the increase in wage rates has to a considerable extent been offset by the increases in labor productivity.

Mr. President, I realize that you have recently directed the Secretary of Labor to extend his one-man factfinding role to an 18-month study of the basic problems of the steel industry since the end of World War II. This study will be valuable in casting badly needed light on these complex cost-profit relationships.

However, the situation which now confronts us is urgent. Further drift will slow down our economy and endanger both jobs and profits at a critical point in our general recovery.

Viewed strictly as a contest between management and labor, it seems clear that steel wages, in view of recent increases in labor productivity, could and should be increased with no increase in prices. Operating at high capacity, the steel industry could continue to set record profits.

Yet I believe the public interest can best be served by a cut in steel prices with no change in wage rates. The evidence seems clear that the steel industry could take this important step and still maintain record profits.

Naturally such a proposal is not being pursued enthusiastically by either management or labor. However, there are times when we must all look beyond special group interests in the broader public interest. I deeply believe that we have now arrived at such a point in regard to the steel industry.

A reduction of \$10 per ton in steel prices could be reflected this fall in lower prices of automobiles, washing machines, refrigerators, and other home appliances. It could reduce the cost of our highway program, industrial construction, machine tools, and other essential items.

It could also help restore to our economy as a whole the vitality which can only come when our productive facilities are being used to capacity and when our people are fully employed. In regard to the steel industry itself, it could serve to increase sales, assure steadier and larger employment and improve our competitive position in regard to steel imports.

In recent months we have heard much about the danger of inflation, but in my opinion too little about economic growth. I submit that both problems are closely interrelated and that both could be partially met by a reduction in steel prices.

For this reason I respectfully suggest that you call on the steel industry to take this bold, creative action for the long-term good of our country and our economy.

May I add that no one should understand this need for such action better than former Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, now president of the National Steel Corp. On many occasions Mr. Humphrey has called upon various segments of our economy—and particularly upon labor—to place the Nation's welfare before lesser group interests.

Although half of his steel corporation is not union-organized, and therefore still in production, Mr. Humphrey is now in a unique position to initiate moves for the general reduction in steel prices. I can think of no action which would be more helpful in reversing the inflationary pressures to which he so frequently refers.

I am therefore taking the liberty of sending Mr. Humphrey a copy of this letter.

With my personal respect and regards,
Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES.

Major DAV Effort Establishes Permanent Service Program for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a recent issue of the "Disabled American Veterans' Monthly," the publication of the National DAV organization, points up the success of a new and promising program for providing permanent financial support of the organization's outstanding veterans' service programs.

The program of perpetual rehabilitation funds is set up under the DAV Service Foundation. State and local DAV organizations are encouraged to receive special trust funds as a permanent memorial from DAV units and individual benefactors.

The DAV Service Foundation must retain the full perpetual rehabilitation fund intact as a permanent memorial. Only the earned interest is transferred at the end of each fiscal year into State and unit trust fund accounts, as designated by donors, to be made available to the DAV to support national rehabilitation service officers in their services to veterans.

This program is a noteworthy example of how an outstanding national service organization has set up the machinery to carry on its work program. Two Members of Congress, Representatives LEE METCALF, of Montana, and LAURENCE CURTIS, of Massachusetts, are recognized in the memorial honor roll of perpetual rehabilitation funds among the initial benefactors.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the "Disabled American Veterans' Monthly" concern-

ing this program be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as follows:

PERPETUAL REHABILITATION FUND PROJECT CONTINUES TO GAIN MOMENTUM—115 DONORS NOW ON ROLLS; JUDGE MCCLERNAN ISSUES APPEAL

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Perpetual rehabilitation funds, established with the DAV Service Foundation, were increased from 50 to 115 (130 percent) during the last fiscal year ending on June 30, 1959, according to Executive Secretary Millard W. Rice and the aggregate amount went up from \$7,550 to \$20,830 (175 percent), in amounts ranging from \$100 to \$1,300.

The names of the 115 benefactors, or of the individuals or organizations memorialized by them, together with the respective amounts of their special trust funds, appear on the DAV memorial honor roll, listed in the order in which they were received, as printed elsewhere in this issue of the monthly.

Under its master declaration of memorial trust, the DAV Service Foundation must retain each perpetual rehabilitation fund as a permanent memorial to the benefactor—or the person or organization designated by such benefactor. Only the interest earnings therefrom (4 percent per annum) are transferred, after the end of each fiscal year, into the respective State trust fund accounts, according to the States designated by the donors. Such earnings accumulate to become available for appropriation to the DAV for its use in maintaining its national rehabilitation service officers in each State.

Although only \$195.16 was so transferred as of June 30, 1959, \$536.38—an interest increase of about 175 percent—was allocated as of June 30, 1959. Several times that amount should become transferable as of June 30, 1960, depending upon the additional number of memorial funds received in the meantime. During the last 10 years, \$3,300,000 has been appropriated by the DAV Service Foundation to the parent organization exclusively for rehabilitation service.

GRASSROOTS IDEA

Since the inception of this grassroots idea, some three years ago, by concerned members of the DAV chapter in Butte, Mont., with their first \$1,000 check, special trust funds have come in from 30 States, at a gradual accelerating rate—11 in 1956, 15 in 1957, 44 in 1958, 45 during the first 6 months of 1959, with 25 of them during May and June.

Such special trust funds have been established by 40 DAV chapters, 3 State departments, 3 auxiliary units, and 6 other organizations, in their own names; by 3 DAV units as memorials to former officers, by 3 individuals (2 of them anonymous) in the names of DAV chapters, and by 60 individuals, in their own names or in memoriam of others, including 16 deceased husbands, wives, mothers and fathers, and two living persons—precedents which could well be followed by many DAV and auxiliary units.

Although most of the individual benefactors are DAV members, increasing numbers of other social-minded Americans have also enrolled, including one who started out with \$100, which, by monthly payments, has been increased to \$1,180, with his declaration that he intends to continue payments of \$110 each month for the rest of this year. Supplemental payments of \$100 or more have been made by 11 benefactors.

MONTANA LEADS STATES

Montana still leads all other States, with 22 enrollees, ranging up to \$1,100, with the aggregate total equivalent to about \$5 per DAV member in the State. If a similar record were attained in all States, the total would be more than \$1 million, according to

Judge John B. McClernan, the "tired old adjutant" of the Butte Chapter 106, and the originator of perpetual rehabilitation funds. The judge was appointed chairman of the DAV national perpetual rehabilitation fund committee by Commander Williams.

Pennsylvania, with 12 enrollments passed Minnesota with 10 during the month of June.

Seven special funds have been assigned as to Washington, D.C., although several of them originated from other States. Six are assigned to Florida, five each to California and Massachusetts; four to Indiana, Michigan, and New York; three to Colorado, Illinois, Louisiana, Maryland, and Ohio; two to Missouri, Nebraska, Texas, and Virginia; and one to Alabama, Arizona, Connecticut, Kansas, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wisconsin.

Having been directly responsible for the establishment of 33 special trusts by DAV units and others, 17 national service officers are now listed on the national commander's NSO honor roll.

DAV SETS EXAMPLE

"Once the DAV itself has set the example of having accumulated at least \$100,000 in special perpetual trust funds, then," according to Judge David B. Williams, "other social-minded Americans will be impressed by such sincerity of purpose and will be more likely also to establish such memorial trust funds, during their lifetimes, by bequests in their wills, and by designations in their insurance policies."

"If only 1,000 DAV members each provided in their insurance policies, or in their wills," continued the commander, "for the establishment of a \$1,000 fund eventually the service foundation would be entrusted with \$1 million, with annual interest earnings therefrom of about \$40,000. Thousands of DAV members could afford to so arrange. Thousands of others could probably also be converted to the plan, if DAV rehabilitation service enthusiasts would explain to them the essential vital factors involved for distressed claimants in future years."

VOLUNTARY DONATIONS MADE

Commander Williams says that during his travels throughout the country, his biggest thrills have been voluntary donations ranging up to \$1,000, from various DAV units toward these special funds, and that he was told of many more, in the planning stage. Recently he reported that the first individual to establish such a special fund, Howard E. Merhar, past department commander, of Butte, Mont., handed him a \$100 bill in the name of his wife, who is a past department auxiliary commander, as a unique way in which to celebrate another happy wedding anniversary; later, Mr. Merhar followed up with a \$100 check in the name of Howie's Supper Club, operated by Wilma and Howie Merhar.

According to DAV Service Foundation Chairman John L. Golob, an increasing number of individuals and DAV units have declared their intentions to establish such memorial funds, by making installment payments, which remain in reserve funds until \$100 has been accumulated—the minimum required—whereupon same is transferred into a perpetual rehabilitation fund, in accordance with the expressed wishes of each benefactor.

The memorial honor roll is also scheduled to appear, as a part of the DAV Service Foundation's annual report to the DAV, in the DAV's annual report to the U.S. Congress, which is then printed by the U.S. Government Printing Office as a public document.

PRF CHAIRMAN'S APPEAL

Judge McClernan, as the chairman of DAV Perpetual rehabilitation funds, has just issued an appeal, as follows:

"While there is but little time remaining before our national convention at Miami Beach, I am sure there is much that can be done toward carrying out our national commander's intention in appointing a DAV perpetual rehabilitation fund chairman.

"We all realize that the financial position of our units vary widely from one end of the country to the other, from creeping insolvency to munificent wealth; and none of us wish to work a hardship upon our financially disabled units. But the truth is—and we all know it—that many, many of our chapters and departments could come to Miami with \$100 in their hip pockets, to present to our national commander for the purpose of creating a perpetual rehabilitation fund in the name of their unit, or in memory of some revered member. Fully 90 percent of our chapters could raise, beg, borrow, or steal \$100 to present to him for the same purpose. If our splendid blind veterans national chapter can do the trick, then the rest of us can do it.

"This perpetual rehabilitation fund program has now spread into 30 States and is becoming better and better understood by our members. Seventeen national service officers have so far been directly responsible for enlisting 33 trust benefactors; theirs will be the first names to be inscribed on the new national commander's NSO honor roll. More and more of us are coming to realize that this plan of raising a large trust fund, the principal of which can never be spent but the income from which shall always be available for our service work, is the only safe and sure way to protect the future of our great organization.

"I am very happy to undertake this job, because I have confidence in our Disabled American Veterans. I believe that, in spite of the stormy conventions they put on, and beneath their rough exteriors, they have hearts that beat only for their organization. I know they will go down the line with Commander Williams and every future national commander to help build this memorial trust fund, and thereby help build the DAV.

"My comrades, this thing is not a service foundation program, it is not a national headquarters program. It was conceived and born at the chapter and department level. It will most certainly grow and prosper as our chapters and departments get behind it. I urge every DAV unit that is financially able, to join this memorial trust program, by bringing to Miami Beach, presenting to our national commander, your own perpetual rehabilitation fund.

"The perpetual rehabilitation fund march is on, and nothing will stop it, until the security of the Disabled American Veterans is guaranteed forever."

Small Cities and an Ill-Considered Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to insert a letter I have received from Joseph J. Bendel, Jr., executive director of the Redevelopment Authority for the City of York, Pa.

Mr. Bendel gives eloquent testimony to the importance of adequate housing

legislation for the small cities of America and highlights the tragic shortsightedness of the President's ill-considered veto of S. 57.

The letter follows:

THE REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
OF THE CITY OF YORK, PA.,

July 31, 1959.

Re the future for urban areas, Housing Act, S. 57.

The Honorable JAMES M. QUIGLEY,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We in the city of York were stunned upon receiving word that the Housing Act, bill S. 57, was vetoed by the President. It amounted to a torpedoing of a renewal program which after 10 years has learned, not only what the objectives of the program are; but, more important, how to obtain results.

We are aware that you voted with the majority on the above bill. May we urge you to continue support of its minimum provisions. If an overriding of the veto appears logical, may we urge you to take that action.

Perhaps a brief explanation of our local program will help you in encouraging other legislators to support bill S. 57.

The city of York is located in south-central Pennsylvania and was the capital of these United States for 9 months during the Revolution (1777-78). Its present population of approximately 60,000 is squeezed into a saturated area of less than 7 square miles. The city is the nucleus of a metropolitan area of over 225,000 persons.

The core of this city reveals its old age (over 200 years) and has many ailments. It suffers from a declining tax base caused by unused office space and storerooms in the downtown area, congestion in streets designed for the horse and buggy, loss of old and inability to attract new industry, inadequate parking facilities, lack of open areas and finally, and most distressing, the pockets of substandard housing and blighted areas in and around the center.

In 1950 the city of York organized itself to take action and pinpointed its slum areas and prepared two projects; but unfortunately local conditions caused delays to each. By 1954 York had constructed 242 units of public housing and could almost immediately show the elimination 242 units of undesirable substandard housing. In 1957 the first redevelopment project, Wellington Redevelopment Area, commenced and it is interesting to note that this 20-acre area was an unsightly eyesore in a predominantly good residential neighborhood and that our reuse is not garden-type (high rent) apartments but 124 units of private resale housing to be sold at \$9,800 to \$11,000 and 72 units of low rent public housing. You can readily see that the reuse was aimed at the lower middle income bracket (\$4,000 to \$5,000 a year). This project will double the city's tax dollars, maintain the residential neighborhood, provide decent housing for lower income families, and rid the city of an unsightly eyesore. (NOTE.—City contributed \$144,000 noncash grant-in-aid site improvements and a cash grant from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, \$300,000.)

We have another urban renewal project in execution (July 17, 1959) which will employ clearance, rehabilitation, and conservation. The city planned this project without Federal assistance; the Commonwealth sharing the planning costs with the city.

The city is carrying out its workable program and is spending over \$35,000 of local funds this year, on planning for the future. A complete study of the problems of York's core is being prepared. It is our hope to schedule projects over the next 20 years. We

need assurance of a continuing Federal program of financial assistance.

We also have one project which is completely planned (loan and grant application), but cannot receive a capital grant reservation until we have bill S. 57 passed. The city used local funds for planning. We have two other projects which are presently being planned and are dependent on bill S. 57.

A SUMMARY OF PROJECTS

Wellington Redevelopment Area: Nearly completed.

Park Lane Renewal Area: Just started.

Center City Study: Nearly completed.

Cookes Renewal Area: Planning completed.

Gates House Renewal Area: Waiting for bill S. 57, planning underway.

North Spur Renewal Area: Request Federal assistance for planning, need bill S. 57.

We are not one of the large cities involved in the program. There are many more like us and we need help today. It will be difficult, if not impossible, to keep this program going without help. It is not necessary to remind you that the money asked for urban renewal is a drop in the bucket when compared with the foreign aid assistance, farm subsidies, and defense budget. What will we have to defend, if we do not work to make our communities a better place in which to live.

We urge you to stand behind bill S. 57. If we can provide you with information, please contact this office.

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH J. BENDEL, Jr.,
Executive Director.

Tribute to Late Appellate Judge Joseph Weldon Hale, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Waco Bar Association and McLennan County (Tex.) Bar Association has done credit to itself in the resolution it has passed honoring the late justice of the court of civil appeals there, the Honorable Joseph Weldon Hale.

Joseph Weldon Hale served with great distinction in the practice of law. From the time he was admitted to the bar in 1917, he was dedicated to the highest principles of the law.

After war service and some time in private law practice, he served with great distinction as associate justice of the Texas 10th court of civil appeals at Waco for many years.

Judge Hale also demonstrated his good citizenship and his deep interest in bettering his community, State, and Nation by his activities, such as managing the campaigns of gubernatorial candidate Lynch Davidson and former Gov. Pat M. Neff; active interest in the Baptist Church; leadership in the Waco (Tex.) Community Chest and Library Association; service as a trustee for Baylor University; and many other activities. He was a friend of mine, and encouraged me to strive for better government in Texas.

The State of Texas, our Nation, and the city of Waco lost a fine citizen and a very able jurist when Judge Hale died.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution passed by a committee of the Waco-McLennan County (Tex.) Bar Association honoring Judge Hale.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO THE HONORABLE CHARLES F. KOEHNE,
PRESIDENT OF THE WACO-MCLENAN COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION:

We, your committee appointed to prepare resolutions with reference to the death of the Honorable Joseph Weldon Hale, beg leave to submit the following:

Judge Hale was born in Jones County on May 29, 1891, and was the fifth of nine children born to John Henry Hale and wife, Drucilla Hale. The family moved to Coryell County in 1895, and later to Falls County in 1905, and in 1906 Judge Hale entered Baylor Academy and worked his way through the academy and the college department, graduating in 1915 with a bachelor's degree. Beginning in September of the same year he was elected superintendent of the Rockport schools, and served in that capacity for the years 1915-16, and while there he began the study of law, and after the school year had finished he came to the office of the late Pat M. Neff, and the Honorable Walton D. Taylor, where he studied law until he was admitted to the bar in 1917. His early law practice was interrupted by World War I, but after his discharge from the Army he entered the law offices of Messrs. Neff and Taylor, and later successfully managed Mr. Neff's campaign for Governor, and thereafter became secretary of the Democratic executive committee, and served in that capacity from 1921 to 1925. After Mr. Neff took his office as Governor, Judge Hale was made a partner in the firm of Taylor and Hale. This partnership continued for some several years. A short time after Mr. Neff was Governor, Judge Hale managed the campaign of the Honorable Lynch Davidson for Governor, and owing to the fact that he had managed the Neff campaign and the Davidson campaign, and having served as executive secretary for the Democratic committee for a period of 4 years he became widely and favorably known as a man of great executive ability throughout the State, and particularly with the leaders of the Democratic Party.

Judge Hale had been in the practice only a short time until his ability as a trial lawyer became well known to the members of the bar and the judiciary, and to insurance companies and other large corporations seeking the appointment of a highly trained and successful defendant's lawyer. Justice Hale's success as a defense lawyer brought to him a clientele of insurance companies, and his reputation as a defense counsel on insurance claims was widespread over this entire State. He was leading counsel in representing the insurance company's interest in the gas explosion that resulted in so much loss of the Liberty Building many years ago. Although Judge Hale was a very busy man in his profession he took time to take an active interest in the Baptist church and the affairs of Baylor University, and in the Masonic lodge. He was a member of the board of directors, and a member of the board of deacons of the First Baptist Church for many years. He was a trustee of Baylor University for many years, and during the time he was in the practice he was called to public service by the citizenship of Waco and was elected to the place of commissioner, and later became mayor of the city of Waco from 1935 to 1937. He was a director of the Waco Community Chest 1943-46, of Lake Waco Country Club 1944-47; of the Waco Public Library Asso-

ciation 1944-50. He was president of the community chest 1945-46, and of the library association 1949-50.

Judge Hale was appointed associate justice of the 10th court of civil appeals by former Governor O'Daniel on January 1st, 1941, to succeed the late James P. Alexander, who resigned to take the office of chief justice of the Supreme Court of Texas. Justice Hale had not been a member of the 10th court very long until he demonstrated that he possessed judicial ability, and it was not long until he was regarded as one of the outstanding appellate judges of Texas. He enjoyed that distinction throughout his judicial career of a little more than 18 years. The Waco-McLennan County Bar paid tribute to Justice Hale at a special session of the 10th court of civil appeals after he announced his retirement from that office, and Dean Abner McCall, of Baylor, was especially requested to make some remarks concerning the life of Judge Hale on that occasion. Dean McCall characterized Justice Hale as "a man who lived most abundantly, and has excelled in so many fields of service that his accomplishments seem almost incredible; that no appellate judge in Texas is more highly regarded for his judicial ability than Justice Hale." The Waco News-Tribune, on Tuesday, June 16, following the death of Justice Hale, had the following editorial:

"JOSEPH HALE, A PARAGON IN THE PEOPLE'S SERVICE"

"There is in the world today much discussion of whether a government of the people, by the people and for the people can endure. The case for the affirmative can be epitomized by citing the life of Joseph W. Hale, who died here yesterday.

"Other men, including some of his friends and associates, rose to higher station in the name of the people. None of them surpassed, and few equaled, Judge Hale's intelligent, selfless, devoted labors for the democratic system of government in Texas. At city, county, and State levels, Judge Hale proved himself a paragon in the public service.

"If our philosophy of government is to endure in the face of stresses and tensions complicated by today's technology, we must find more men of the caliber of Joseph W. Hale.

"The question is whether such men are born or made. We are inclined to think they come from a happy combination of the two. By nature, Joseph W. Hale was coolly intelligent, clear eyed, reserved, and alert. These qualities enabled him to put into practice the political philosophy in which he believed with all his heart and soul. It was a fortunate thing for the people of Waco and the people of Texas."

Surely, no finer tribute could be paid to a member of the judiciary by the press. Needless to say that Justice Hale enjoyed the confidence and respect of the membership of the bar, and all those who were fortunate enough to know him. His contribution to the bar will always remain outstanding in the judicial history of our State. He was an untiring worker and carried his part of the great load while he was a member of the 10th Court of Civil Appeals. His opinions are now recorded in the law books of Texas, beginning with Southwestern Reporter 147 2d page 846, and ending with volume 320 SW 2d 381. These opinions will remain there so long as our present system of government shall endure. Judge Hale's opinions have not only been cited by the appellate courts of our State, but they have been cited also by appellate courts of our sister States—this is no little compliment. During the period from 1941 to 1959, some of the most difficult cases that came to our court arose out of what is commonly called the field of domestic relations involving the custody of children of tender age. Certainly no greater question could present

itself to the court, because the disposition of a child of tender age involves the welfare and destiny of a human being, our most precious asset. We think one of the most important opinions written by Justice Hale during his tenure as a member of the 10th Court of Civil Appeals will be found in a child custody case styled: *Oldfield v. Campbell*, recorded in volume 191 SW 2d 897. We think this opinion illustrates the character and ability and the judicial thinking of Justice Hale more accurately than it is possible for us to express. This opinion illustrates what we are trying to say:

"The recently declared public policy of this State in dealing with dependent and neglected children is to secure for each 'such care, guidance and control, preferably in his own home, as will serve the child's welfare and the best interest of the State; and when such child is removed from his own family, to secure for him custody, care, and discipline, as nearly as possible equivalent to that which should have been given him by his parents.' * * * This unfortunate infant never had any semblance of a home or family of her own until she was graciously taken in by appellants. The tender, loving care which they are ready, able, and anxious to continue giving to this little girl is beyond any reasonable doubt, we think, more nearly equivalent to that which should have been given by the child's natural parents than any institution could possibly give at this time. This child is only 3 years of age. She needs a mother. She needs a home. She needs them now."

The foregoing pronouncement will remain a guiding light to the judiciary of Texas so long as our present estimate of human values shall prevail.

So, today, the Waco-McLennan County Bar, as well as the entire bar and judiciary of the State of Texas, stands indebted to Justice Hale for the fine life he lived so well, and the very fine way that he used his time and abilities to contribute to the general welfare of our city, county, State, and Nation. He will long be remembered: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Waco-McLennan County Bar Association, That in the passing of the late Justice Joseph Weldon Hale, we have lost a man of very great character, an outstanding lawyer, a great judge, and a very fine citizen, and that his family, which includes his widow, Mrs. Iva Hale, a daughter, Mrs. Tom Meredith, and his granddaughter, Laura Lee have sustained the loss of a devoted husband, father, and grandfather; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to his family, and a copy be spread upon the minutes of the Federal court, the district courts of McLennan County, and the Court of Civil Appeals for the 10th Supreme Judicial District, and the Supreme Court of Texas, at Austin.

Respectfully submitted.

JAKE TIREY,
Chairman of the Committee on
Memorials and Resolutions.
BEN R. SLEEPER,
W. R. DUNNAM,
HILTON E. HOWELL.

Trinity Power Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, on page 5 of the House report accompanying the

1960 Atomic Energy Commission appropriation bill—

The committee notes that the Atomic Energy Commission is currently negotiating with the Duquesne Light Co., a private utility, to increase the electrical generating capacity and efficiency of the Shippingport Atomic Power Station at Duquesne's expense. Such continued cooperation by a private utility with the Government is encouraged and it is hoped that a successful agreement will be quickly worked out.

This excerpt from the Appropriations Committee report is illustrative of the advantages to the Government accruing from an electric company's participation in the joint development of Government projects. The proposal of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to construct the power facilities on California's Trinity River, if accepted by the Congress, would provide another case of the Government and business cooperating in a mutually successful enterprise.

The House has rightly refused to appropriate for needless Federal construction of the Trinity generators in view of the company's offer to spend its own money to do so; and the House Interior Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation recently heard testimony on the proposed legislation to permit the utility to build and operate the plants, and pay the Government over \$4.6 million a year for the use of the Trinity falling water to turn the turbines.

The House conferees should not accede to the Senate on this item, presently included in the Senate public works appropriation bill; for, as quoted above, the same House Appropriations Committee stated on July 17 that "cooperation by a private utility with the Government is encouraged." Trinity now presents another splendid opportunity to encourage cooperation by a different private utility with the Government, which would then be spared the cost of constructing the powerplants and would receive over \$230 million in falling-water payments and \$83 million in taxes. The gain to the Government and to the taxpayers generally under joint development of the Trinity power facilities certainly justifies the company's participation in this project.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that "such continued cooperation by a private utility with the Government" should be "encouraged and it is hoped that a successful agreement will be quickly worked out" in this instance also. There should be no appropriation for needless Government construction at Trinity.

India: the Glorious Gamble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on a number of occasions I have pointed out that the great country of India plays a key role in the world struggle precisely

because she is not militarily aligned to either side in the cold war. Japan has cast her lot with the democratic West. China has cast her lot with the Communist world. India, the largest uncommitted nation in Asia, is in a pivotal position.

In a current article, Walter Lippmann says:

What happens in India during the next 10 years will be of critical importance in the great conflict generated by the rise of communism.

Mr. Lippmann also points out that "the Indian economy is so appallingly poor that if it grows only at the rate of 4 percent a year, it will take 35 years to increase the Indian per capita income to just over \$2 a week. If that is the best that can be done, there will be a political disaster in India before the 35 years are over."

America faces a tremendous opportunity in India. This dangerous opportunity is spelled out in elegant language by Mr. Lippmann in his article, "India: the Glorious Gamble," which appears in the August 1959 Ladies Home Journal. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

INDIA: THE GLORIOUS GAMBLE

(By Walter Lippmann)

(A wise American tells us: Poverty will be conquered in India soon. If we don't help the Indians do it our way, the Communists will try it theirs.)

We have now been engaged in the cold war for some 10 years, and we knew many things today that we did not know when it began. One of them is the subject of this article. It is that what happens in India during the next 10 years will be of critical importance in the great conflict generated by the rise of communism.

Ten years ago, in the years immediately following the Second World War, the critical area of the world was Western Europe. Great Britain, France, Western Germany, Italy and the low countries were prostrated and exhausted, bankrupt and without defenses. Worst of all, they were unable by their own efforts to rebuild their ruins and to revive their economies, and thus they were without hope. This crisis—which threatened to bring about the downfall of Western civilization in Europe—was met in this country by two very great acts of statesmanship. One was the Marshall plan; the other was the organization of NATO. These two acts made it possible for Western Europe to recover from the war, and to become, by its own hard work and know-how, the second most productive area in the world.

But in the very years when we were making it possible for Western Europe to bring about its own recovery, the Western position and influence in China collapsed. Whether this could have been prevented has been hotly debated in this country. The fact is that China now is a Communist country, and that there is no practical prospect whatever that the Communists who rule China can be ousted from abroad or overthrown from within.

The Red-Chinese Government is working with a fierce and fanatical energy to overcome the immemorial poverty and backwardness of the Chinese nation. It is a terrible and awe-inspiring spectacle, which rests on this fundamental thesis: that in order to raise the great masses of Asia out of their primitive way of life, it is necessary to sacri-

rice the lives of many, and the comforts of most, of a whole generation of the Chinese people.

Is this necessary? Is this the only way? Must a backward people choose between remaining backward and submitting to an ordeal of tyranny and of cruelty in order to get over the hump and into the modern age? On the answer to these questions depends, we had better realize, the future of southern Asia, of the Middle East, and of Africa, and, it may well be, of a part of Latin America.

These questions cannot be answered by generalities; as, for example, by declaring that our democratic system of free enterprise is better than the Communist system. We must teach ourselves to understand that our system, which grew up on a rich and empty continent, cannot be duplicated in Asia. Because of that, though the picture of our material prosperity is admired and envied, it is in fact readily exploited for Communist propaganda. For what the Communists say is that in the overcrowded and backward countries they alone have a way of lifting the people within sight of an American standard of life. They point to Russia and say they can prove their claim by what has been done there in the past 40 years.

The influence of communism in the underdeveloped countries of the world lies, above all else, in the example of Russia—in the demonstration that in 40 years a defeated and backward country, which had to fight a civil war and a World War as well, has become one of the two mightiest powers in the world.

You cannot, as they say, beat a horse with no horse. We cannot beat the Soviet example by our example. For we are not an example that backward peoples can follow, and unless we can manage to create an example which they can follow, we shall almost certainly lose the cold war in Asia and Africa, and perhaps elsewhere.

There will be some, I know, who will say: "Why is it our business to create an example which the backward peoples can follow? Do we not have enough problems of our own to worry us without taking on any responsibility for solving the problems of the great masses of backward peoples?"

The answer to these questions is that we can no more withdraw from the world community than an American family can withdraw from the community in which it lives. Least of all, can a family withdraw if it happens to be, as we are in the world, the richest member of the community? It is impossible to say: "My children go to a private school. Why should I pay school taxes for the public schools?" It is impossible to say: "I go about in my private automobile. Why should I care about buses and streetcars and subways?" For the same reason, the United States cannot make itself richer and richer, and not care what happens elsewhere. We cannot do this because if we did those of us who have a conscience would have a bad conscience. And even if we did not have a bad conscience, it would be frightening to live in a world in which we had aroused the envy and had provoked the hatred of so large a part of mankind.

There is, however, so it seems to me, an even greater reason than these. It is that we have the opportunity—indeed, we may call it a privilege—of playing a leading part in a noble and fascinating and decisive human adventure. The age we live in, this 20th century, is the beginning of many things, and of these the most important is the awakening and the uprising of the submerged masses in the old imperial lands.

It is an uprising not only against foreign domination, but also against their own native feudalism or tribalism and above all against their abject poverty. We could not, of course, control this historic movement even if we tried. But what we may be able

to do is to assist in a demonstration for all the world to see of how, without the sacrifice of human rights, it may be possible to conquer poverty.

We come now to the practical question of where this demonstration can best be made, and of how it can be made.

It can best be made in India. Why in India? First of all, because the demonstration must be made in a big country. Russia is a big country and China is a big country. And what we have to do is to demonstrate that poverty can be conquered in a big country. We have already proved in Puerto Rico what can be done in a small country which has a rich friend. Puerto Rico is inspiring. But it does not prove the point that has to be proved: that the standard of life can be raised decisively in a very big and a very poor country.

The second reason for choosing India for this demonstration is that if India turns to communism, as almost surely it will if it fails in its present plans of development, Asia will be dominated by three Communist powers—the Soviet Union, China, and India.

As things are going now in India, the rate of progress is so slow that for all practical human purposes there is no progress at all. The Indian economy is at present growing at a rate of about 4 percent a year. We must not be misled by the fact that this rate of growth is in fact faster than our own. That is a statistical illusion. For the Indian economy is so appallingly poor that if it grows only at the rate of 4 percent a year, it will take 35 years to increase the Indian per capita income to just over \$2 a week. If that is the best that can be done, there will be a political disaster in India before the 35 years are over.

The third reason for choosing India is that India now has enough technical ability, enough competence in organization, in management and in administration. Enough for what? Enough to use successfully an amount of foreign aid that will make possible within the next 8 to 15 years India's transition from economic stagnation to a condition of sustained economic growth.

The aim of India, as for any of the industrially underdeveloped countries, is to reach as quickly as possible the point of "economic takeoff" from which point on it can sustain its own further economic growth through its own surplus of capital and the normal channels of international investment.

Until this stage of development has been reached, India will require outside aid. It is estimated that India's need will be for between \$8 and \$10 billion of foreign exchange before it can reach the point of economic takeoff.

As a first step toward this goal, India is now preparing a third 5-year plan which envisions a total capital investment of \$20 billion from 1961 to 1966. One-fourth of this amount—\$5 billion—is required in foreign exchange and must come from such outside sources as the private-capital markets of the Western World, the World Bank and foreign governments. It is this effort to obtain \$1 billion a year from outside sources that the United States will want to support.

The third 5-year plan is designed to develop the sectors of India's economy that are crucial to its further development. The capital investment will be in agriculture, chiefly to build dams to provide water, and factories to provide fertilizer. It will also be in the development of oil, in steel, in the nonferrous metals, in heavy machinery and in the further development of coal, electric power and transport.

If the 5-year plan can fulfill its objectives, India in 1966 will be within a few years of achieving self-sufficiency, of having become an independent, self-generating economy. It will be close to its goal. It will be close to that point in its development where it will

need no foreign capital beyond what can be obtained by normal commercial operations and private foreign investment.

This can be done, as I said above, because India already has the administrative capacity to carry out successfully a large and sustained program of economic development. India is a frightfully poor country. But it is not backward, as are many countries in Africa, for example, where the masses are still living in the Stone Age and where society is still tribal. In India there is an educated class in government and in industry which is quite capable, if, for the next few years, it has some material help from the outside, of accomplishing the takeoff from the ancient stagnant poverty of Asia toward a progressive, independent, modern economy.

This is what Russia has accomplished in the past 40 years. This is what China may be accomplishing now.

Nobody can guarantee that India will succeed. The honest thing to say is that the odds are not unfavorable, and that what is asked of us in money is not very much, considering what we and all the world may win from making the attempt. What is asked of us is the better part of a billion dollars a year for the next 5 to 10 years. This is less than one-ninth of our present investment in surplus crops which we do not know what to do with.

To be sure, a billion dollars is a lot of money and even the United States cannot afford to throw it away carelessly. But a billion dollars a year for a few years to help India make the takeoff may be, if the experiment and the demonstration succeed, as good a gamble as this country has taken since Jefferson made the Louisiana Purchase and Seward bought Alaska. For if India can rise out of the stagnant morass of Asian poverty without resorting to the totalitarian method, we shall see one of the very great moments of the age we live in.

It will have been proved to all the world that there is another way to conquer poverty than that which is now being used in Russia and in China. If there is such another way, a resounding blow will have been struck for the cause of freedom.

When I think of this glorious gamble which is offered to us, I think of what is the alternative to our taking this monetary risk. If we will not make the contribution, what then? The answer is that in all probability there will set in a great despair in India, and in this despair the Communist alternative will find little resistance.

By failing now to respond to India's need, to meet this stirring challenge, we shall deprive India of choice. We shall, in effect, be asking India to sacrifice a whole generation to the totalitarian alternative. We shall be saying that we cannot afford to demonstrate that a democratic solution is possible.

If that happens because we do not understand the issue, just what, I ask myself, will we have been doing with the dollars which we refused to spend on the great gamble?

All or Nothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, dramatization of creative capitalism as the last, best hope of our Nation is emphasized by Raymond Moley in an article in the current issue of *Newsweek* maga-

zine. Mr. Moley condemns the all-or-nothing philosophy which we all too often see applied with respect to programs of the Federal Government.

Mr. Moley's comments are timely and appropriate and I submit them for the consideration of my colleagues.

ALL OR NOTHING

(By Raymond Moley)

It is a matter of real regret that this piece may not agree with the sentiments of many conservative friends whose confidence and encouragement, either directly or through epistolary channels, I value beyond measure. But it seems to me that certain extremely practical reflections should be expressed plainly, reasonably, and in good humor.

I refer to many conservatives who in the past and recently have expressed, either in print or personally, great unhappiness concerning political leaders whose views and votes have not completely and specifically met their own convictions. The vice of such irreconcilability is that it defeats the very objectives that most conservatives are earnestly seeking. This habit, it seems to me, is much more a threat to sound government than all the power and prattle of radicals. The all-or-nothing attitude means a house divided, which cannot stand.

A few specific examples will illustrate what I mean. There are those who would abolish, not reform, the income tax; or stop, not rationalize, all foreign economic and military aid; or smash, not regulate, labor unions. In one State an irreconcilable ran for the Senate last year and only succeeded in electing a radical over the moderate Republican. In Idaho, to be more specific, some businessmen insisted upon putting "right to work" on the ballot against the advice of wiser heads and almost defeated a good Republican Governor. I believe in "right to work" supported by law. But I also believe that when the die is cast the proponents should be prepared. These were not. At the moment, there is considerable growing about Vice President Nixon as a Presidential candidate: "He is too close to Secretary Mitchell, and Mitchell is too friendly to labor." "He is too hard on civil rights and too soft on welfare." Etc.

CAN'T PLEASE EVERYBODY

President Eisenhower has been "too soft" on many things during these years, they say, and sometimes their complaints have been well taken. Even Senator Robert A. Taft, some conservatives thought, was too compromising. And Herbert Hoover, before Democrats created him as an archreactionary, was too progressive for many Republicans.

There are many conservative propaganda agencies sending out bales of literature which convert only the converted. The country can't be saved with words. It must be saved by toil and sweat in the precincts, but this the complainers leave to those pros whom they likewise excoriate.

The all-or-nothing conservative must realize that unless a political candidate or official is a hypocrite, he cannot conform to all the views of millions. The election of a public servant under our system is a choice of alternatives. In reaching for the branches, one may miss the firm trunk of the tree. Finally, there is the political consideration that the expression of such ultraconservative views gives the radicals exactly what they need for ammunition.

NEW NATIONAL POLICIES

I yearn sometimes for the pastoral days when I was a little boy and McKinley was President and Mark Hanna was running the Republican Party. McKinley was vilified by the New York conservative press in 1896 because he had voted for a silver act in 1878. Hanna was Senator Lodge's idea of a mon-

ster. But McKinley espoused the tariff views since made a fetish by Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower. Hanna was a real friend of labor and a humane and popular employer. And despite the all-or-nothings of the time, the 1896 promise of a "full dinner pail" was redeemed with interest.

Since then, certain issues have been settled as national policy: The vicissitudes of old age are a national concern; securities selling must be regulated; the farmer must be protected from periodic ruin, and big labor unions are here to stay.

I want to anticipate the liberals who may read the foregoing. I want no part of their present philosophy.

As for the taunts of "me-tooer" and "so-you-would-do-all-those-things-but-better," my answer would be that I would like to see most of "those things" done better, and some I would quit doing at all. But while doing so, I would dramatize creative capitalism as the last, best hope.

Ex-Gov. Charles A. Sprague Calls Attention to Modest Salaries of AFL-CIO Labor Leaders in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, organized labor has come under much attack, during recent years, because of the unsavory activities of a relatively few leaders of that great body of American working men and women. Therefore, it is a pleasure and privilege to call to the attention of the Senate favorable observations about organized labor from a source of unimpeachable integrity and sincerity. As the annual convention of the Oregon AFL-CIO opened in Seaside on August 3, one of Oregon's most eminent editors and publishers, ex-Gov. Charles A. Sprague, discussed on the editorial page of his Oregon Daily Statesman the salaries paid to the top leaders of organized labor in our State. Members of the Senate will be interested to learn that James T. Marr, executive secretary of the Oregon AFL-CIO, is paid an annual salary of \$9,880. J. D. McDonald, president of the AFL-CIO in Oregon, is paid \$8,840; George Brown, director of the political education division, is also paid \$8,840. Mrs. Zoe Wilson, director of women's activities, is paid \$5,200.

And ex-Governor Sprague, a Republican, who served with distinction as Oregon's chief executive from 1938 to 1942, adds the observation:

Considering the capabilities of these employees we would say they are entitled to higher pay—and they shouldn't have to strike to get it.

Because the country has seen a few unsavory and unethical examples of labor leaders who profit inordinately at the expense of their members, I want to call to the attention of the U.S. Senate the fact that a former distinguished Governor of our State, a Republican, has called attention to the compara-

tively low salaries paid to the top leaders of the AFL-CIO in Oregon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Labor Convention," from the Oregon Daily Statesman of August 3, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR CONVENTION

The annual convention of the Oregon AFL-CIO is being held the first 3 days of this week at Seaside. It is the fourth convention since the merger of the two organizations. The older, AFL, has a much longer period of activity on a statewide scale.

Labor conventions are always serious business for those who attend, though in off hours there is time for fraternization—and there is a fraternal spirit among those active in the labor movement, the common form of address in meeting being, "Brother * * *

The convention opens Monday with the usual address by the president, J. D. McDonald, giving his review of year past and his recommendations for the future. The secretary-treasurer, J. T. Marr, has published his annual report giving information to constituent unions of the activities of the State executive. One feature is a detailed financial report both of receipts and disbursements. This showed for the last year total disbursements for all programs of \$229,862. The receipts were from per capita dues and contributions, mostly from member unions. Salaries certainly are modest: for Marr \$9,880, McDonald \$8,840, George Brown, director of the political education division, \$8,840, Zoe Wilson, director of women's activities, \$5,200. (Considering the capabilities of these employees we would say they are entitled to higher pay—and they shouldn't have to strike to get it.)

The labor movement has incurred deep hostility in its continuing battle for improved wages and working conditions. Some of it is deserved, for duress remains a tool which labor brings out for use on occasion, but the AFL-CIO in Oregon merits a great deal of respect for the quality of its leadership, and the cleanness of its operation, free from graft or scandal or selling out the interests of members. With growing experience in labor negotiations both management and labor will mature in their relationships, with less of strife and violence which have marred industrial relations in former years.

The Public Demands That We Stop Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, responsible businessmen are showing increasing concern that excessive spending proposals before the Congress will add fuel to the inflationary fire.

Mr. Frederick R. Kappel, president of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., has expressed his views in a statement which appeared in the Nation's Business press this past week. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed as an extension of my remarks:

I have received a number of letters from men and women who are concerned about inflation. One A.T. & T. share owner asked, "Why in heaven don't you speak out on this subject?"

The letter went on to say, "If you would alert the 1,625,000 share owners and 700,000 employees to the facts about inflation, they would help spread the news."

I warmly agree that it is essential to alert more people to the dangers of inflation, and we in the Bell system are speaking up and speaking out at every opportunity.

In recent articles and bulletins to employees, the Bell system companies have discussed the threat which inflation poses to the purchasing power of the dollar and to savings, insurance, and pensions.

At the annual meeting of the A.T. & T. share owners, I pointed out that inflation has been a tough problem in the telephone business. But we have not just talked about the problem; we have developed more efficient equipment and introduced many economies of operation. It is worth noting that the price of telephone service has generally gone up less since World War II than most other things.

But we know that the forces of inflation are far too widespread and powerful for any one individual or business to stem them singlehanded.

This brings me to the question that I believe so many are asking, "How can I help?" In these ways, it seems to me:

By giving spoken and written support to those who are working for a strong, sound, and stable dollar.

By opposing unreasonable demands, excessive spending, and schemes that add fuel to the inflationary fire.

Your friends and associates, and especially your representatives in Congress, are entitled to your constructive views.

For our part, we will continue to fight inflation by pushing research hard and effecting economies in our business. And by speaking out against this threat to the people and the country.

The Invitation to Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I send to the desk an article entitled "The Invitation to Khrushchev," written by Mr. David Lawrence and appearing in the Washington Evening Star of August 4, 1959. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Aug. 4, 1959]

THE INVITATION TO KHRUSHCHEV—FUTILE GESTURE SEEN AS BERLIN ULTIMATUM STANDS WITH VIOLATIONS OF 1955 ACCORD

(By David Lawrence)

President Eisenhower certainly deserves an "A" for effort in trying to maintain world peace—but his decision to invite Soviet Premier Khrushchev to visit the United States probably will prove, through no fault of the President, as futile a gesture as was the summit conference of 1955 at Geneva.

Memories are short, but only 4 years have passed since Mr. Eisenhower fraternized with the top leaders of the Kremlin, including Nikita Khrushchev, amid worldwide acclaim and enthusiastic comments in the West that this was the way to bring about an easing of tensions and a solution of the current controversies of the cold war.

But every pledge made at Geneva has since been broken by the Soviet Government. It became necessary afterward for the United States actually to take a military posture in the Far East to prevent a Soviet-inspired invasion of Formosa by Red China's forces. Also, the United States had to land marines in Lebanon and take other measures to forestall a Soviet conquest of the Middle East.

Not only has the solemn promise, made at the 1955 summit meeting at Geneva, to assure the reunification of Germany, been broken, but within the last few months the Moscow government has issued an ultimatum to the Western powers to withdraw their forces from West Berlin or face the threat of war.

For several weeks now it has been the American position that there must be some "give" on the part of the Soviets before there could be a summit conference. The Moscow government has refused to give an inch. Consequently, the conference of the four foreign ministers has been deadlocked and is ending in failure.

The President has said there would be no summit conference until developments at Geneva justified it. Nikita Khrushchev insisted that the foreign ministers couldn't settle anything, and that the summit was the place to do it. He hasn't yet had his way entirely on that point, but he will have a chance in a two-man summit meeting to indicate whether the Soviets mean to withdraw their ultimatum on West Berlin.

Meanwhile, the President will go to London and Paris later this month to canvass the views of Prime Minister Macmillan of Britain and President de Gaulle of France. Presumably, Mr. Eisenhower will reflect the views of the Western allies when he meets Khrushchev, though the President will, as he says, not be their authorized spokesman in a formal sense. Then, after Premier Khrushchev has visited America, Mr. Eisenhower will pay a return visit to the Soviet Union.

Two points of view prevail today about the exchange of visits between the Soviet dictator and the American President. One is that tension will be eased and the cold war will thaw out a bit. The other view is that Khrushchev will tighten his hold on the Soviet people and will tell them that America now accepts the leaders of communism as equals. With a controlled press, this would mean misleading propaganda inside the Soviet Union and within the countries occupied by Soviet troops. The impression will be cultivated that the United States no longer is hostile to communism and that all dissenters in Eastern Europe had better give up their battle.

Time alone will tell which view of the Khrushchev trip will turn out to be the correct appraisal. But the Soviets thus far have given not the slightest indication of any concessions or changes, nor have they exhibited any evidence that they will not break agreements again.

The President, himself, is under no illusions. He knows that Khrushchev is bent on world conquest. But Mr. Eisenhower is betting on the inevitable restraints that peoples themselves can exercise when their leaders go too far. He is hoping his own visit to the Soviet Union will furnish another opportunity, like that accorded Vice President Nixon, to convey certain truths to the Soviet citizens.

It's a gamble, and hereabouts the comment is often heard that the advantages of

a visit by Khrushchev outweigh the disadvantages, and that no harm can be done by trying to educate him.

This, however, ignores the effect on the peoples of the captive nations of Eastern Europe who yearn for freedom and who have hoped in vain that the leadership of the West will do nothing to enhance the prestige of their oppressors. It is not a happy augury for the peoples inside East Germany and Hungary and Poland, where the fighters for freedom took a chance just a few years ago and made a heroic effort to secure their liberty.

But within a few months the Soviet game will have been exposed. The Soviet Premier will have been to America and will have discovered that Americans are not afraid to make sacrifices when challenged on a basic principle of human liberty. If he miscalculates in the future, as he has in the past, there certainly will be less demand for summit conferences thereafter for a long, long time, and there may even be pressure for the cutting down of trade and further exchanges with the Soviet Union.

Hitler misconstrued Chamberlain's mission to Munich in 1938 as a sign of weakness. It is to be hoped that Khrushchev will not thus misconstrue Mr. Eisenhower's concessions currently being made in a spirit of good will and accommodation. For it must be admitted that the Soviet leader now has been given his way. He goes to a summit meeting with the President of the United States without having acceded to the Western demand that he withdraw his ultimatum on Berlin.

Khrushchev's Tender Nerve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago a significant editorial appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., discussing the proclamation "Captive Nations Week." Since Nikita Khrushchev has been formally invited to visit the United States, the proclamation should be repeated upon his arrival.

This editorial deserves much consideration and expresses the views of our people.

The editorial follows:

MR. K'S TENDER NERVE

When Congress approved a proclamation of "Captive Nations Week" it was intended as a reminder that we of the free world had not forgotten the countries and peoples enslaved within the Soviet imperial empire; that, while we couldn't do very much about it, we recognize the bondage in which they are held by the Soviet Union.

It could very well have gone virtually unheeded had it not been for Nikita Khrushchev.

It was coincidental that the week was timed to be concurrent with Vice President Nixon's first days in Russia and there has been much fear expressed that it would handicap him in dealings with Khrushchev. The Soviet ruler has commented bitterly time after time about the resolution since Mr. Nixon's arrival. He has succeeded in calling more world attention to captive nations than conceivably would have been attracted by the mere passage of a congressional resolution in Washington.

At one point in an exchange with Mr. Nixon, the Communist leader made a statement that must be recognized throughout the world as idiotic; as a bare-faced lie—that on one could find a single captive in the Communist empire. Does he think for a minute that savagery in Hungary has been forgotten; that informed peoples do not know that 3 million Germans have fled Communist domination in East Germany; that anyone is ignorant of the flight of Vietnamese from North to South; that North Koreans are still deserting communism in North Korea?

If Khrushchev was talking for home consumption, the captives in the satellite nations are not deceived. If he hoped to convince anyone beyond the Communist orbit, it was wasted effort. Out of sheer fury he succeeded only in reminding the slave states—and the free world—of their serfdom.

Is General Motors a Better Risk Than the United States?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, in the August 1959 issue of *Fortune* magazine there was published a very challenging article entitled "Is General Motors a Better Risk Than the United States?"

I ask unanimous consent that this article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Is General Motors a Better Risk Than the United States?

A sobering, not to say humiliating, paradox of the times is that the credit of the U.S. Government these days appears to be a good deal poorer than that of General Motors or many a lesser enterprise. Last month the Treasury found itself in the extraordinary situation of paying 4.7 percent to sell 1-year bills, or something above the prime rate for commercial loans. The total national debt has now ballooned to nearly \$290 billion, much of it in short-term form. While the number of owners of private corporate securities has doubled since 1946, redemption of U.S. savings bonds has been running ahead of sales; long-term U.S. marketable bonds have recently been bumping bottom; and since early 1958 the United States has lost some \$2.8 billion of gold to other countries. Rarely has a rich and powerful nation, whose obligations should command universal respect both at home and abroad, found itself in such shabby and indeed foolish financial shape.

It is to the immense credit of the Eisenhower administration that it proposes to meet head on this loss of confidence in the American dollar and in dollar obligations. Its first and most important step has been its drive for Government economy, which, together with mounting tax receipts, may turn a \$12.5-billion budget deficit in the past fiscal year into a small surplus this year, and a very considerable surplus in fiscal 1960-61. Its second step has been to ask Congress for latitude to raise interest rates on U.S. savings bonds, and to eliminate the 4½ percent interest ceiling on U.S. marketable bonds that was imposed back in 1918 and is now wholly out of line with market realities.

This request, of course, should have been granted for the asking. Unfortunately, it has stirred up in Congress an angry debate about the policies of the Federal Reserve Board and led to proposals that the Board hold interest rates down by supporting the Government bond market. This is an irresponsible and dangerous idea, on which the administration should not compromise, even though it may mean foregoing legislation on interest ceilings at this session. Soon or late, however, Congress and the country must face up to the facts of life. The Government will never solve its debt problem by selling bonds to itself. It will do so only through fiscal prudence, maintaining the integrity and independence of the Federal Reserve System, and freely issuing long-term securities that can pay their way.

The fundamental case for so doing was powerfully argued by Secretary of the Treasury Anderson himself when he appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee in June. In his initial statement—a classic exposition of sound monetary principles—he pointed out that the difficulty with the debt is not just its enormous size. The basic difficulty is that with interest ceilings on long-term bonds the Government is forced more and more toward short-term financing.

ONE STEP FROM MONEY

Of the total debt of \$290 billion, some \$45 billion is in the form of special issues held by various Government trust accounts, including social security. Another \$50-billion-odd is in savings bonds. Most of the balance, the so-called marketable debt of \$183 billion, is a vast jumble of short-term bills, 1-year certificates, notes of under 5 years, and bonds of over 5 years. Since World War II the average maturity of this debt has fallen from about 9 years to something less than 5 years. And in the next 12 months the Treasury will have to refund and roll over no less than \$78 billion of obligations.

The dangers of this kind of floating debt are not just that it keeps the Treasury constantly running to the money market but that maturing obligations—whether they be short-term bills or maturing bonds—are in Secretary Anderson's phrase "only one step away from money," and give the economy a highly unstable liquidity. Hence the rational objective of the Treasury is to lengthen out the debt by placing new long-term issues with the public; and on coming to office in July 1957, Secretary Anderson himself made a substantial effort in this direction. The process was interrupted in the summer of 1958 when the bond market collapsed partly as the result of overspeculation, partly through fears of continuing inflation, and partly because the economy was swinging from recession to recovery with an inevitable tightening of interest rates as private borrowers returned to the market.

That tightening has gone forward rapidly, with the result that Government bonds, issued in a period of easier money, have remained well below par and yields on even medium-term bonds have ranged in some cases over 4½ percent. With an interest ceiling on marketable bonds of 4¼ percent, the Treasury is effectively blocked off from the medium- and long-term market. Meanwhile, an interest return of 3¼ percent on E and H savings bonds has proved insufficient to attract small individual investors. In this case, no less than in the case of the marketable debt, limitations on interest rates have proved to be a snare and delusion.

EXPLOSIVE PACKAGE

Thus Secretary Anderson had and has in logic an airtight brief for freeing the Treasury's hands. Indeed, so powerful was this case that it looked for a time as if the House Ways and Means Committee, chairmanned by the immensely able WILBUR MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, would give him about

what he wanted, with no strings attached. Thereafter, the combined pressure of congressional advocates of easy money, and the historic position of the Democratic Party against high interest rates, came into play. On July 8, the Ways and Means Committee tentatively agreed to a package deal that was far from satisfactory to the Treasury and that outraged the Federal Reserve. Under the deal, the President could at his discretion lift interest rates on Government marketable bonds above the 4¼ percent limit for only 2 years—an unsatisfactory grant of power at best. To this the committee appended a loosely worded proviso which, while making a bow toward sound monetary policy, nevertheless would declare that it is the sense of the Congress that the Federal Reserve System should bring about needed future monetary expansion by purchasing U.S. Government securities of varying maturities, rather than by other methods.

Whatever the eventual fate of this provision, it represents a powerful and dangerous congressional trend toward unsound monetary policies that should be opposed by the Treasury no less than by the Federal Reserve. Unfortunately, its implicit philosophy has become all too popular. In the House, Representatives including the indefatigable WRIGHT PATMAN, CHESTER BOWLES, and HENRY REUSS have argued that Reserve purchase of Federal bonds is the way to avoid high interest rates and facilitate Treasury financing. In the Senate, LYDON JOHNSON seems to feel that such rates are not the result but the cause of inflation. Meanwhile, so-called liberal intellectuals like Leon Keyserling have been asserting that high interest rates impede economic growth, a point that cheerfully overlooks the fact that that in the easy-money days of the thirties the United States had some 9 million unemployed. "The Federal Reserve System," intoned Mr. Keyserling last month in a new pamphlet, "should move toward supporting the Government bond market at par, and help to stabilize Federal borrowing at much lower interest rates than the current levels."

But this pronouncement of Mr. Keyserling gives the whole show away, and indicates clearly why present efforts to dictate and change Federal Reserve policies should be defeated even if this means deferring action on Treasury interest rates. Over the years, of course, there has been considerable technical discussion as to how the Fed should fulfill its primary mission of controlling the Nation's money supply; and so learned an authority as Allan Sproul, former chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, has argued that it should occasionally buy and sell long-term governments as well as short-term bills as at present. But what soft-money advocates in Congress clearly want is something quite different and much more dangerous.

Their idea is that the Fed return to its wartime and postwar practice of indefinitely pegging Government bonds to make them attractive to the public. This is to turn the Fed into an "engine of inflation," since, as it buys securities it creates new high-powered bank reserves. To argue, as some Congressmen have, that these can be extinguished by raising Reserve requirements is impractical and could end in a nationalized banking system. Finally, those who advocate bond pegging—overtly or covertly—have wholly misunderstood the role of interest rates in the free economy. Interest in simplest terms is the price of borrowed funds, and to try to hold this price down artificially is on a par with tinkering with the thermometer as a means of curing a feverish patient.

SYMBOL OF SECURITY

The high road to an expanding and healthy economy lies in a quite different direction. It is first to limit Federal spending and to

achieve not just budget balance but a budget surplus. Such a surplus would relieve the Treasury of some trips to the market for new money and would thus ease the present pressure on short-term money rates. But more, a substantial surplus would allow the Government to pay off part of its short-term debt, and to begin to issue bonds of longer term in far happier circumstances than today. This, however, would be only a beginning at getting the debt under control. In addition, the Treasury with a surplus in hand could begin to make advance refundings of bonds now nearing maturity, replacing them with much longer term obligations at interest rates in tune with the market, thus recasting the entire structure of the debt.

Such refunding was attempted with some success last summer by the Government of Canada, and the United States should be able to do better once it has achieved a surplus. Whatever may be said against Secretary of Treasury Andrew Mellon he did in the twenties manage to pay off debt, give respectability to Government securities, and incidentally reduce interest costs. Even more in point is the accomplishment of the British Government in the 19th century—the great century of expansion, currency convertibility, and prosperity. In this period Britain so managed its finances that the British consols (bearing no maturity and paying 3 percent or less) became a symbol of security and was avidly sought by investors throughout the civilized world.

There is no reason why, given time and persistence, the U.S. Government cannot issue obligations that will achieve equal distinction and renown. A national debt, said Alexander Hamilton, is a national blessing. It can be if securely held by people who trust the borrower. But such confidence must be earned. The United States will never earn this confidence by turning the Federal Reserve into an agency of printing-press money. It will do so as the Treasury puts its house in order, restores a surplus, and issues obligations that can meet the acid test of the market place. The proponents of easy money have nothing to offer but more inflation. It is just not good enough for a country that, as never before, should insist on maintaining the integrity of the dollar.

Labor Backs Turner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, people in the field of labor are fully appreciative of the many difficulties that confront them in undertaking to get fair consideration of their positions in matters affecting the public interest and the welfare of the working people.

For this reason I am exercising my leave to extend my remarks and insert in the Record the following statement, which appeared in the Trades Unionist, publication of the Central Labor Council, Washington, D.C., Saturday, July 25, 1959:

LABOR BACKS TURNER

At this week's meeting of the CLC it was adopted with an emphatic unanimous vote that:

In the light of a local newspaper's statement, challenging the authority and accuracy

of the testimony before the House District Committee, July 9, of Mr. J. C. Turner, the president of the Greater Washington Labor Council, in support of an equitable unemployment compensation bill (H.R. 1378), the Greater Washington Central Labor Council should take the necessary steps to cause the record of said hearing to show:

1. J. C. Turner is the unanimously elected president of the Greater Washington Central Labor Council, the election having occurred in open session of that body on January 19, 1959.

2. The data presented and the position taken by Mr. Turner in his testimony had previously been unanimously approved by the Greater Washington Central Labor Council and by its affiliated organizations.

3. Mr. Turner is a man who, by his record of achievement in labor and other civic activities in the Washington community, commands the respect of his fellow citizens.

4. In view of the actual facts, the attack on Mr. Turner was wholly unwarranted and unethical and it merits the censure of all citizens honestly concerned with a good community program of public service.

Vernon Louviere, Respected Washington Reporter, Had Exacting Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Mr. Vernon Louviere, of the Bascom Timmons Agency, which is known to virtually all Members of the Senate, is one of the ablest, most intellectual, independent, and respected members of the Washington press corps. He is noted for his ability to probe to the heart of a subject and to interpret it to his readers. He is also known for the fairness and accuracy of his reports.

Mr. Louviere's journalistic abilities come from a wealth of experience which began in New Orleans and has included time on a Washington daily newspaper as well.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "New Orleans Beat 'Baptized' Vernon Louviere as Newsmen," written by Zarko Franks, and printed in the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle of July 24, 1959.

The article points out that Mr. Louviere's investigations included investigations of crime when he was in disguise. The article reads like a detective story when it discusses the things which Mr. Louviere uncovered. It states that he was taught in the school of hard knocks to go after the real story and to get the facts. The article pays great tribute to this able newspaperman.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NEW ORLEANS BEAT "BAPTIZED" VERNON LOUVIERE AS NEWSMAN
(By Zarko Franks)

A fire-eating editor once said:
"Give me a reporter baptized on the police beat. One who has seen first-hand death and suffering and scandal."

"He must be part confidence man, part bloodhound and part humanitarian."

"And let him be dedicated always to the great God Story."

His colleagues say that Vernon Louviere, Chronicle Washington correspondent, comes close to that high water mark.

HE'S SEEN IT

His background as an investigative reporter in jazz-loving, high-living New Orleans is testimony to his no-holds barred approach to a story.

Since then he has worked on several other newspapers (two folded) before he joined the Chronicle bureau in Washington.

Today, his job is keeping Texans informed of what's going on in the Nation's Capitol.

His chief concern, of course, is matters of interest to Texas.

This means keeping abreast of the Texas twins, Speaker SAM RAYBURN and Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON.

APPRAISES JOHNSON

As far as JOHNSON is concerned, Louviere says:

"I think he's running for President. He's been making all the noises and, of course, denying it at every breath."

Covering the Nation's Capitol, to Louviere, is a far cry from the blood and tears of a New Orleans police precinct.

However, the basic requirements of good reporting, he says, are the same.

His most memorable newspaper story, he recalls, is a celebrated murder case in his hometown of New Orleans.

He was working on the New Orleans States at the time.

HERE'S STORY

The badly decomposed body of an unidentified man was found in a swamp. A knife was in his back.

A filing station attendant named Donald Easterwood was accused of murder.

The body was identified by a housewife as that of her husband.

She based her identification on a blue button on the khaki pants worn by the dead man.

She had sewn such a button on her husband's khakis, she said.

The little finger on the slain man's left hand was crooked. Her husband had such a twisted finger, she said.

Thus the corpse was identified as that of Sam Jones.

Louviere and a photographer slipped into the jail and had several minutes alone with the accused killer.

The police had beaten him to make him confess, he sobbed. He showed them his bruised body.

SUSPECT ACQUITTED

The camera clicked, and Louviere listened. At the murder trial, the defense introduced the pictures and Louviere's story repudiating the confession.

Donald Easterwood was acquitted.

"The Hitchcock punchline in this story," says Louviere, "came a year later. Sam Jones, identified as the dead man, was found alive in New Orleans."

The body with the knife in its back in the swamp? It was never identified, he says.

During his investigative hey-day in New Orleans he and a registered nurse, posing as a married couple, called on more than a score of midwives, suspected of performing abortions.

LAWS TIGHTENED

His series of stories led to tightening up of State laws governing midwives.

Louviere, a big, soft-voiced man, was educated in public schools in New Orleans and attended L.S.U.

For some 4 years he served as a member of an armed guard crew (U.S. Navy) aboard merchant ships during the war.

Louviere, 39, his wife, Jean, and their three children, Nancy 13, Adrian Ann 9, and Tommy 7, live in Arlington, Va.

Congress restores interstate aid to levels anticipated when the interstate program was originally established.

JOHN C. MACKIE,
State Highway Commissioner.

JULY 31, 1959.

Mr. JOHN C. MACKIE,
State Highway Commissioner,
Lansing, Mich.:

I have received your telegram of July 30 deploring action of House Ways and Means Committee in reporting slow-down financing plan for construction of the National Interstate Highway System. I agree that this would have serious effect on the several Michigan projects mentioned in your telegram and would regret any delay or slowing up of interstate program in our State. Since Ways and Means Committee, however, has rejected all other proposals for additional financing, I do not know what alternative remains at this late date in our session. It is too bad that members of your Democratic Party who control this committee as well as House of Representatives did not support alternative financing plan which would have permitted the program to proceed according to schedule. Now that we are apparently faced with this financing proposal or nothing, I am afraid we will have to support whatever the Ways and Means Committee brings before us.

Congressman ALVIN M. BENTLEY.

National Interstate Highway System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following exchange of correspondence I had with John C. Mackie, Michigan State highway commissioner, concerning the financing plan for the construction of the National Interstate Highway System reported out of the Ways and Means Committee last week.

LANSING, MICH., July 30, 1959.

Hon. ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
Member of Congress, House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Michigan will be forced to scrap its 5-year, \$1½ billion new highway program if Congress passes slow-down financing plan for construction of the National Interstate Highway System reported out of House Ways and Means Committee yesterday. The Department is stunned and dejected at the committee's action. The bill will reduce Federal highway aid to Michigan in 1960-61-62 \$141 million under levels anticipated when our program was announced. (From \$278.6 million to \$136.8 million.) Frankly, it almost amounts to a break in faith by the Congress with the various highway departments from amounts planned when the 1956 Federal highway bill was passed and the Federal gas tax increased from 1½ to 3 cents. We have been desperately gearing our engineering right-of-way and design schedules pointing toward a record 1960 construction year which would put Michigan far out front in highways. It seems incredible long hours of urgent labor we have put into gearing for 1960 may have been spent in vain. Michigan has already programed \$84 million in 1960 Interstate Federal aid with the Bureau of Public Roads, but the committee bill will allow us only \$58.6 million instead of the \$96.7 million we had been promised. The action amounts to penalizing States that have moved with speed to build roads. Grim reality of what proposed cutback means probably best illustrated by projects which will be slowed or indefinitely delayed, scheduled for 1960 and 1961. They include the following:

1. Walter P. Chrysler Expressway, Metropolitan Detroit, plus right-of-way and engineering on 12 miles of the proposed Fisher Expressway in Detroit, Wayne County.

2. One hundred and fifteen miles Detroit-Muskegon Expressway, U.S. 16 (Interstate 96) in Livingston, Ingham, Clinton, Kent, Ottawa, Muskegon Counties.

3. Forty-seven miles relocation U.S. 25 (Interstate 94) which calls for extension of the Edsel Ford Expressway through Macomb and St. Clair Counties to Port Huron.

4. Seventy-two miles of relocation of U.S. 27 and U.S. 2 (Interstate 75) in Crawford, Otsego, and Chippewa Counties.

5. Forty-four miles of relocated U.S. 10 (Interstate 75) in Oakland County from South Oakland County to connection with the Fenton-Clio Expressway in Genesee County. We will have to abandon our announced schedule for these and a few other projects unless

Help Wanted for the "40-Plus"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the National Conference of 40-Plus Clubs of the United States considers both moderate and desirable my plan to create a Federal Interagency Committee on Federal Employment of its Older Workers. It is becoming increasingly clear that the Government itself must do more than grind out high-sounding releases on employment of the aging. In fact, the Government itself must take positive steps to preserve for such workers opportunities for Federal employment without discrimination.

There are more than 14 million people in the United States today over 65, and we are rapidly becoming an older population.

Labor Secretary James P. Mitchell and HEW Secretary Arthur S. Flemming have been calling for the employment of older workers and their retraining to make it possible for them to find new employment. Yet the Federal Government itself does very little to train or employ older workers. Without positive steps to enable older workers to find employment on a fair basis with other workers, the words of these Federal officials fall pretty flat.

My bill—House Joint Resolution 437—would insure that the Federal Government would set an example for private industry to follow in the employment of older workers, not just sit on the sidelines.

Dr. Harry J. Johnson, president of the Life Extension Foundation, points out that other countries do not have our type of mandatory retirement programs because other nations do not feel they can face the industrial consequences of shelving a large segment of their most productive people when they are still able to work.

The Chairman of the National Committee on the Aging, G. Warfield Hobbs, points out that half of the country's 9,000 scientists and 32,500 engineers over 65 are retired and he comments that—

We talk of educating youngsters in science but we overlook those we already have. A scientist in the hand is worth two in the cradle.

At the present time, even if a Federal employee wants to work past his mandatory retirement age and is capable of doing so, he finds that he cannot because of the narrow restrictions imposed by the very officials of the Federal Government who have been busily exhorting private industry to set an example in the employment of older workers.

I include here the text of a letter I have recently received from the president of the National Conference of 40-Plus Clubs of the United States, Mr. Henry Carter, in support of my measure, House Joint Resolution 437.

The Chinese Communists, So Extolled in the Past as Benevolent Liberators and Agrarian Reformers, Decide To Let Millions of Chinese People Die of Starvation Rather Than Receive Food From the International Red Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Washington News of August 3, 1959:

[From the Washington News, Aug. 3, 1959]

RED CHINESE CRUELTY

Red China continues to turn down offers of assistance even though hundreds of thousands of Chinese are suffering from record floods and droughts.

The International League of Red Cross Societies in Geneva asked that unarmed cargo planes be permitted to fly over areas in south China to drop supplies. But Peiping scornfully rejected the idea.

The reason is clear. The Communist regime has made fantastic claims of rising food production and to accept help would be to admit it had few or no reserves for an emergency.

Obviously, too, the commune system is failing and any confession of inadequacy would hasten the demoralization of the Chinese forced to live under its rigorous rules.

Viewing people as mere pawns of state politics, the Communists would rather let the mainland Chinese starve than admit they can't feed them. This cruel indifference will not be lost on millions of overseas Chinese aware of the relatives' suffering, or on the neutral nations around the rim of the Communist tyranny.

I also include the text of House Joint Resolution 437, as well as an article from the Reader's Digest regarding the obsolete employment policies which are causing a huge waste of valuable talent and skill:

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF FORTY
PLUS CLUBS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., July 20, 1959.

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. McDOWELL: I have received your letter of July 15 and have noted with interest your proposed bill for the establishment of a Committee on Governmental Employment of Older Workers.

It would seem to me that your proposal is both moderate and desirable, and might well serve as a step toward more concrete measures toward the same end in respect of employment of older workers in business and industry. Certainly, if the Federal Government is showing itself to be an enlightened employer with respect to older persons in Federal employ, it will be in a far more effective position to urge analogous employment policies upon private employers.

Necessarily, reeducation in this field is not a thing which can be arrived at overnight or by executive fiat, and it would seem to me that the step by step approach exemplified in your resolution is the wise and proper way to proceed.

If I can be of any assistance in this matter, please let me know. You are of course at liberty to use this letter in whatever way seems to you appropriate in the premises.

Sincerely,

HENRY CARTER,
President.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 437

Joint resolution providing for the establishment of a Federal committee on the employment of older workers in order to preserve for such workers opportunities for Federal employment without discrimination because of age

Whereas it is the policy of the United States Government that equal opportunity be afforded all qualified persons, consistent with law, for employment in the Federal Government; and

Whereas this policy necessarily excludes and prohibits discrimination against any employee or applicant for employment in the Federal Government because of age; and

Whereas it is essential to the effective application of this policy in all civilian personnel matters that all departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government adhere to this policy in a fair, objective, and uniform manner: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby established the Committee on Government Employment of Older Workers (hereinafter in this joint resolution referred to as the "Committee"). The Committee shall be composed of seven members as follows: (a) one representative of the Civil Service Commission, to be designated by the Chairman thereof, (b) one representative of the Department of Labor, to be designated by the Secretary of Labor, (c) one representative of the Office of Defense Mobilization, to be designated by the Director thereof, (d) one representative of the Department of Defense, to be designated by the Secretary of Defense, and (e) three public members to be appointed by the President. Not more than two alternate public members may be appointed by the President as he may deem necessary. Four members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum: *Provided*, That at least

one public member (or alternate public member) and one nonpublic member are present. The President shall designate the Chairman and the Vice Chairman of the Committee, and each member of the Committee shall serve at the pleasure of the President.

SEC. 2. The Committee shall—

(1) advise the President and the Congress periodically as to whether the civilian employment practices in the Federal Government are in conformity with the nondiscriminatory employment policy with respect to employment of older workers, and, whenever deemed necessary or desirable recommend methods of assuring uniformity in such practices;

(2) at the request of the head of a department or agency consult with and advise them concerning nondiscriminatory employment policies with respect to employment of older workers and regulations of such department or agency relating to such policies;

(3) consult with and advise the Civil Service Commission with respect to civil service regulations relating to nondiscriminatory practices with respect to the employment of older workers;

(4) review cases referred to it under the provisions of this joint resolution and render advisory opinions on the disposition of such cases to the heads of the departments or agencies concerned;

(5) make such inquiries and investigations as may be necessary to carry out its responsibilities under this section.

SEC. 3. The head of each executive department and agency shall be responsible for the effectuation of the policy with respect to the employment of older workers in connection with all civilian personnel matters under his authority.

SEC. 4. The head of each executive department and agency may refer any case coming within the purview of this joint resolution to the Committee for review and an advisory opinion whenever he deems necessary.

SEC. 5. The Civil Service Commission shall issue such regulations as may be necessary to implement the policy of this joint resolution.

[From Reader's Digest]

HELP WANTED FOR THE 40-PLUS

(By Ronald Schiller)

Forty-seven-year-old Harry Davis boarded his usual commuter train in a pleasant suburb. There was nothing in his appearance that set him apart. But the appearance was a mask, for Harry Davis was a man in desperate trouble. After 23 years with the same firm, he had lost his \$11,000 job as office manager when his company merged with a larger concern. And despite a year of heroic effort, he had been unable to find another position—because of his age.

When the train reached the city, Harry strode purposefully down the station platform. But instead of boarding a bus or taxi to his office, as did the other passengers, he went into the waiting room. This was the moment when that feeling of despair and panic invariably assailed him. He waited for it to subside, then telephoned the three employment agencies where he had applications on file. He got the usual answers: "Nothing interesting for you today, Mr. Davis." Next he opened his newspaper to the employment section (he didn't like to read it on the train where friends might see him) and scanned the long columns, skipping those ads which specified "under 40" or "under 45," circling others which required personal letters. Most of the rest of the day he spent sitting in offices waiting to be interviewed by personnel managers, most of them younger than he, who had answered his letters regarding previous ads.

Harry's interviews usually went well. He is capable, intelligent, and well-qualified for

the positions he has sought. But he cannot hide the damning "age: 47" on his application blank. He is on the wrong side of that mysterious, senseless 40-year age barrier which, in the American labor market, separates the employables from those considered "too old" to hire.

Among Harry's worst enemies are the pension and retirement plans that many firms have instituted to protect their employees. To hire a man Harry's age a company may have to pay twice as much in premiums as for a man in his thirties. When Harry has offered to waive his pension rights or pay the additional premiums himself, he has usually been told that it is "against company policy" or that it would "mess up the bookkeeping."

A big problem to a man in Harry's position is to maintain his morale. A dozen times a day he has to remind himself, "You're in fine health, you're in the prime of life, you've had valuable business experience. You may land the very next job you apply for. Just keep plugging."

But these self-administered pep talks cannot stay Harry's rapidly deteriorating financial condition. Like many white-collar workers, he has never been able to save much money. There has been a family to raise—two sons—and his position has required that he maintain a good standard of living. He received 2 months' severance pay when he was discharged, and State unemployment compensation helped while it lasted. But, outside of a little money in the bank, his only assets are a 3-year-old car, some life insurance, and a \$16,000 house on which there remains a \$10,000 mortgage.

I do not know what is going to happen to Harry and his family. When I last saw him he was on his way to another interview, for a job as supervisor of a shipping department for a small firm that would pay him \$4,000 a year. "It's a young company," said Harry hopefully. "With my experience there should be plenty of room for advancement."

Everything related here about Harry Davis is true except his name. But whatever we call him, he is important to us. He is representative of a growing reservoir of unemployed American men over 40, and women over 35. I have interviewed many such men and women, ranging from factory and office workers to professionals and executives. Their stories differ in detail from Harry's but they all share three things: frustrated lives, shattered hopes, and fear of the future.

Age bias in employment is an increasingly serious matter in the United States, because the proportion of middle aged in our population is rocketing upward. Fifty years ago the average life expectancy of American men was 47 years; today it is 67. Moreover, people today stay young longer. Their normal useful working life has stretched considerably. Yet employers continue to set age limitations in their hiring policies that might have applied in the 1890's.

The Department of Labor recently made an extensive survey of employers to find out why they don't hire older workers. The reasons were difficult to pin down. But the general feeling was that older people were too slow to meet production requirements, too set in their ways, less creative than younger workers, harder to train, more prone to absenteeism, and that their physical condition was not as good.

The latter charge is undeniably true; if a job involves heavy physical work, a young man is apt to be better. But the other "reasons" have turned out to be myths. A survey of 3,313,000 employees made by the National Association of Manufacturers showed that in work performance 93 percent of the older workers were equal or superior and only 7 percent were not equal to younger workers. A more detailed study by the University of Illinois revealed that rates of absenteeism and

lateness are actually lower among older employees, and that their loyalty, sense of responsibility, and morale are higher. They are also less prone to accidents.

On the white collar and executive level a common myth is that serious morale problems develop if older men are put to work under executives younger than themselves. In cases where circumstances have forced the issue, this theory has failed to hold up. Two years ago, for example, a New Jersey electronic concern, needing executive help, violated its own employment age policy by hiring two men in their fifties. They turned out so well that last year five more were hired. "From now on older men get preference here," the young president of the firm told me. "They've upgraded the whole level of work."

"Actually," states the NAM report, "older workers are the cream of the crop."

As a result of such findings, a few large concerns have begun to reexamine their employment practices, with good results. One department store now makes it a policy to hire older workers. "Hiring employees over 40 is good business for us," reports a Chicago manufacturer, adding that any slowing of speed among older workers is more than made up by higher quality work. An insurance company, disturbed by the fact that many girl officer workers quit work after a short time, now makes it a policy to hire older women.

The Forty-Plus clubs, composed of older unemployed executives who have banded together in several cities to help each other find jobs, were among the first agencies to dramatize the situation, and over a period of years report some remarkable successes. The New York club has placed so many of its members in the past 2 years that it has had to advertise for new job seekers. The Boston club reports it return to employment "83 out of every 100 men" within 8 to 28 days. The San Francisco club's roster has dropped by two-thirds.

Meanwhile, to help women over 40 find employment, San Francisco businessmen last year established an organization called Careers Unlimited. It has placed more than 50 women in jobs each month. Similar organizations have been springing up in other cities.

But hopeful as these activities are, they have not yet succeeded in skimming off more than a fraction of the middle-aged job seekers who report to Government employment agencies each month. The tragic fact revealed by the Department of Labor survey is that half of all employers still have age restrictions, and that between 50 and 60 percent of the job openings are still not available to men over 40 or 45, or to women over 35.

Federal and State Governments have not been idle. Two years ago the Federal Government took the initiative by abolishing age restrictions on Federal jobs. Five States—Colorado, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island—have passed laws forbidding age discrimination against workers, by either government or private employers.

But employment experts now place their greatest hope in a new concept: special job counseling for workers over 40. The Department of Labor plans to help install trained counselors in all 1,700 of its employment offices this year. The program is based on the highly successful experiences in Canada and New York State, where special advisers have succeeded in raising job placement of older workers by as much as 400 percent.

The job counselor's task ranges from helping an applicant to recast his whole plan for the future down to such simple advice as telling a woman to use less lipstick. Sometimes the counselor's most obvious advice requires the most persuasion, such as convincing a job seeker to be more realistic

about pay demands, or to look for a job on the fringes of a city where younger people are often reluctant to work, or to retrain himself in a skill that is in greater demand.

In analyzing an applicant's qualifications the counselor also searches for hidden employable talents the job seeker may not himself know he possesses. Examples: a 55-year-old textile salesman, unemployed for 16 months, found satisfying work as a proof-reader; a 59-year-old former Army paymaster won a position as head of the research department of an advertising agency.

Persuading employers to drop their age bars is the toughest part of the counselor's job. It takes missionary zeal, diplomacy "and sometimes a touch of honest guile," says Joe Nawn, special counselor to the 40-plus job seekers at the Newburgh, N.Y., State Employment Office. Once an employer phoned Joe asking if he had a receptionist—"under 30, of course." Joe knew a widow who qualified in everything but age and badly needed the work. He talked so fast and enthusiastically about the lady's experience, ability, and charm that the question of age never arose again. A month later the employer called to say how pleased he was with his new receptionist. "Did you know she was over 50?" asked Joe. "Gosh," exclaimed the shocked employer: "I forgot to ask her age."

"No community today can afford to be without the services of a special job counselor for the 40-plus," says Senator Thomas C. Desmond, chairman of New York State's Legislative Committee on Problems of the Aging. "But the counselor cannot do the whole job. He needs the community's help."

Desmond's plan for community action consists of four steps: (1) Organize a steering committee of members from the local chamber of commerce, service clubs, and other civic groups; (2) make sure a special job counselor is appointed to the local employment agency; (3) utilize the local schools' vocational and adult-education services to retrain the unemployed when necessary; (4) enlist the community's biggest guns to help break down local employers' prejudices against older workers.

Any suggestion that older workers should be hired as a charitable gesture, or as a civic duty, infuriates Senator Desmond. "It should be no such thing," he explodes. "Employers should hire them because it's to their own economic self-interest to do so. Older workers earn every dollar paid them."

The crisis that confront the 40-plus right now, in an era of almost full employment, will seem minor compared with what we may expect in the 1960's, when the World War II baby crop enters the labor market. Unless business changes its attitude soon, warns Secretary of Labor James Mitchell, the growing number of middle-aged unemployed could become "the most potent group this country has ever known and force some kind of public program for its own survival."

The fact is, as President Eisenhower has stated, "We cannot afford to squander our manpower through a prejudice which obscures the values of maturity, responsibility, and constancy found in older workers."

Verrazano Bridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to understand the hubbub about

giving the bridge across the Narrows the name "Verrazano."

The Staten Island Chamber of Commerce questions the honoring of "a foreigner who made a navigational mistake." The name "Verrazano" should not be strange or foreign to the American people. He did contribute to the navigational and geographical progress of his times and is worthwhile honoring. We have named a bridge Kosciuszko. It may be that some people cannot spell it—that is just their misfortune. Many cannot spell Tappan Zee, the bridge across the Hudson. No one would change the name "Tappan Zee" for that reason. If Staten Islanders cannot spell the name "Verrazano," giving the bridge this name would be a good way for them to learn how.

As to the doubts about Verrazano's discoveries, there are grave doubts concerning many navigators and their exploits. Furthermore, the name "Verrazano" is held in highest esteem in Italy, and the naming of the bridge would be another link in the chain forged between our country and the forefathers of Verrazano. Throughout the Nation bridges have the names of distinguished men of the past.

National Citizens Committee for Columbus Day Planning Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, more and more, free governments are learning to recognize the need for building bridges of mutual understanding and friendship between peoples in order to bring governments and free nations together in their common quest for peace.

Many years ago, a fearless navigator of immense spiritual faith and indomitable courage sailed the seas to link the Old World with the New. His bold historic act has served as an inspiration for men of ideas and vision, and the name Columbus is a symbol for all of the Americas.

Because there is so much ferment in the world today, and especially in the Latin Americas where our brothers feel so fiercely the surge for freedom it is my hope that the symbol of Columbus and the theme "Americans All" may be significant factors in establishing closer ties between the peoples of the Americas.

As national chairman of the Columbus Foundation, it was my privilege to convene a planning conference of the National Citizens Committee for Columbus Day at the Press Club on June 30, 1959. Among those who addressed the conference were, U.S. Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon; Representative THOMAS MORGAN, of Pennsylvania; and Representative ARMISTEAD SELDEN, of Alabama.

Since all of these distinguished gentlemen have dealt with Latin American

affairs, their remarks are particularly noteworthy. It is important to point out here that Senator MORSE serves as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, Representative MORGAN is chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and Representative SELDEN is chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herein the speeches of Senator MORSE, Representative MORGAN, and Representative SELDEN:

SPEECH OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE BEFORE NATIONAL CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR COLUMBUS DAY PLANNING CONFERENCE AT THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, JUNE 30, 1959

Mr. Chairman, it is a real pleasure and honor for me to be here with you today to participate in this 1959 Columbus Day Planning Conference.

Jack and Ruth O'Brien, through their very active work with the National Citizens Committee for Columbus Day, are fulfilling the role of true citizenship. Too many times, people with good ideas and good intentions think that only government can carry out some worthwhile program, particularly when it involves international relations or policies. It is easy to forget that in a free country, government policies often follow, as well as lead. Here is one instance where a group of private citizens, acting on their own behalf, are giving leadership to the U.S. Government in an area where leadership has been sadly lacking, and the progress you are making is in no small part due to the vigor and public-spirited manner which Jack and Ruth have displayed. They have been of great assistance to me, too, in my work as chairman of the Latin American Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate.

POTENTIAL VALUE OF COLUMBUS DAY

Columbus Day celebrations and observances could become the instrument for a rebirth of the good-neighbor relationship which characterized our policy toward Latin America in the 1930's and 1940's. Columbus Day is, after all, the common heritage we share with our neighbors to the south. It does not depend for its existence upon an artificial act of government; and even if it were never marked or celebrated anywhere, it would still exist in history as the common denominator of all the people of the New World, the Western Hemisphere.

That is why Columbus Day has many advantages. It presents us with an opportunity we should not miss. It unites people of varying races, religions, and national origins as no declaration of any government or national official can do. It is our common heritage, and in marking it, we have a great opportunity to stress and emphasize the many other heritages we share with the people of Canada and of Central and South America.

It is even more appropriate that we should do so when we are seeing in Latin America a steady rise in the tide of freedom and liberty and a steady decline in the domination of human beings by dictatorships.

RISE OF FREEDOM IN WESTERN HEMISPHERE

The force of freedom in Latin America is not a transitory thing. True, it began a long time ago and has languished from time to time, even during its modern phase which began about the turn of the century. Yet when one contemplates the record of the past 7 years, it is truly remarkable. No less than eight countries—Argentina, Bolivia, Colombia, Cuba, El Salvador, Honduras, Peru, and Venezuela—took the long step toward democracy, mostly by revolution. The combined population of these countries is about 55 million—and I wish to remark, parenthetically,

that if we fully understood the significance of the struggle for freedom of this huge sector of humanity, we would put aside 1 day in all of America, call it the "Day of Liberty," and forever commemorate the acquisition of freedom by the people of America.

The number of men and women who so recently gained their freedom represents the crescendo in freedom's force in Latin America. But it is not alone the number—striking as it is—which tests this force of the surge of freedom. The test is found in two facts, often overlooked. One is that the tyrannies which were overthrown were not isolated tyrannies. They constituted a system, a network, a sinister apparatus aiding one another, so that what was destroyed and put to rout was an international system of despotism. The second fact is that the people who won their freedom, won it by their own efforts, by their own sacrifices. Thus, while the extent of the force of freedom is signified by the numbers involved—and this number can be increased if we go back a few years before 1952—the strength of the force of freedom is revealed by the international strength of the apparatus it has destroyed, and the durability of the force of freedom is revealed by the fact that it was achieved by the people themselves. I know that the people of the United States applaud this effort, and that in their achievement the people of Latin America have won a position of lasting dignity in the minds and in the hearts of the people of the United States.

Let me turn now to the future and to the question of how we can improve on what we have done, and how we can devise among ourselves more friendly acts which will match the friendly words which one still hears around the hemisphere and also drown out the unfriendly words which have come in increasing volume in the last year.

What is the significance of freedom's powerful surge for the future of Latin America? The consequences I see for the future are deep and overwhelming in their impact.

First, is the now inevitable trend toward democracy. What has been revealed during the past decade or so is the instability of dictatorship, which is another way of saying, the instability of governments not founded on the will and consent of the people. I may be accused of excessive optimism, but instead of a past in which occasional experiments in democracy interrupted a general practice of dictatorships, in the future I see dictatorships, if they reappear at all, as momentary interruptions in the inevitable and irresistible growth of democratic government.

Second, the force of freedom carries with it a profound popular will for economic development. When economic and business activity is in the hands of a dictator supported by a small aristocracy, the rhythm of development is slow, erratic, and incomplete. Where people are free, the will to develop is comprehensive and strong. Economic development is inevitable for Latin America, at a faster pace than ever before and on a broader scale.

Third, the fruits of economic development are bound to be better distributed. Economic development requires careful planning, the proper selection of objectives, the training of people and the exercise of self-discipline. In the free community, the support of the people must be solicited for the Nation's program. It can only be done by giving the people a permanent stake in the community's welfare. The people of Latin America have already demonstrated that their struggle for liberty has been won in the midst of widespread poverty. They will not again easily surrender their liberty for bread alone. But the demand for economic development which originates with the people must promise a rise in the standards of

living. It must promise widespread education and technical training. It must promise the increased application of modern science and technology in all avenues of life. When it is the popular will from which development springs, the riches of development must return to the people in increasing measure.

FREEDOM WILL LEAD TO FRIENDSHIP

Finally, I foresee an eventual development of a new level of friendship and understanding between the United States and Latin America. Friendship between nations must ultimately rest upon the deepest sense of dignity, of self-respect, which nations feel about themselves. As freedom is acquired, as development occurs, as stability and progress are achieved, a nation's self-respect grows. The extremes of popular nationalism, so widespread at the beginning of the journey of progress, are converted into self-confidence as nations acquire the mastery of self-government. And when self-confidence begins, so does the possibility of friendship and understanding. I foresee, thus, as the product of the present surge for freedom, a new level of friendship—a friendship between the United States and its neighbors based upon equality in freedom and equality in our confidence to master and employ for the good of all, the instruments of progress.

These are the possible future products of the force of freedom. They constitute altogether a vast change in the New World, from the pessimism of Simon Bolivar about the possibilities of freedom in America, to the optimism of freedom's own conquest. There are many obstacles yet to be overcome, but the people of this hemisphere will conquer these obstacles. Communism is one of them. At this very time the forces of communism are attempting to link themselves to Latin America's march to freedom. But what has communism to offer? It offers this hemisphere a formula on how to lose freedom. Whichever way one looks at communism, at bottom its fundamental doctrine is revealed: That the only way a community can progress is to surrender its freedom to a dictatorship of self-styled pundits—the so-called leadership of the proletariat—who arrogate to themselves the final wisdom about the laws of mankind's development. Dictatorship is the heart of the Communist matter; but Latin America already knows more about freedom and how to acquire it than does Soviet Russia.

The whole question of inter-American relations and its role in all these areas is currently the subject of a thoroughgoing study by a subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, of the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate. This subcommittee has been diligently at work for almost a year; it has another year's work still ahead of it. We have called in some of the outstanding universities and research institutions in the United States to study various aspects of the problem and report to us. Those reports, which are not yet complete, will be followed by hearings and further exploration by the subcommittee itself. We are determined to do a thoroughly objective, nonpartisan job, and we hope that we can make useful, constructive recommendations. It would be premature at this point for me to try to anticipate what those recommendations will be, and I shall not do so. I think I can, however, lay down certain general principles.

I want to speak particularly of economic development which is the modern expression for Roosevelt's freedom from want and which is by all odds the major problem of inter-American relations.

There are, it is said, many ways to skin a cat, and there are also many ways to achieve economic development. I am distrustful of anybody who picks out one way, and says this is the only road to salvation.

I do, however, have some suggestions to make regarding economic policy for all the American countries, my own included.

ECONOMIC NEEDS OF LATIN AMERICA

There are three elements in economic development, and each is as important as one of the legs on a three-legged stool. These elements are people, resources, and capital.

Much of the current discussion of inter-American economic problems, I think, centers too much on the need for capital to the neglect of the development of human resources, but I do not underestimate the need for capital, so let me talk about that first.

At this particular point in time, it is in the national interest of the United States to export capital, just as it is in the national interest of most of the other American Republics to import capital. And this is exactly what has been happening to the tune of several million dollars a year. It has occurred largely in the private sector, and on balance, it has made a great contribution to economic growth.

But it is mainly equity capital, looking for a profit. There is nothing wrong with this, as far as it goes. The trouble is it doesn't go far enough. It doesn't go into the kind of nonprofit development which is essential to economic growth. A great many developments of this kind have been financed through the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Export-Import Bank, and the Development Loan Fund. I hope more will be done through the forthcoming Inter-American Development Bank. But I wonder if all of this is being done in the most effective way possible.

Better results would follow, in my judgment, if greater use were made of line-of-credit arrangements under which credits are established and drawn on, as needed, for a variety of specific projects. In certain circumstances, it might even be possible and desirable to work out provisions for these lines-of-credit to revolve—that is, for repayments automatically to replenish the total amount of credit that could be drawn.

Greater use of such line-of-credit arrangements, it seems to me, would make it easier for all the peoples of this hemisphere to develop their own resources in their own way.

I think it must be frankly realized that all of the investments and all of the technology of the United States will not by themselves bring about the kind of economic development which we are seeking in the American Republics. That can only be done by the people of these Republics themselves. We in the United States can help, but we cannot do the whole job.

If it is fundamental that people have the right to develop their own resources in their own way, it is equally fundamental that they are the ones who must do the developing. A 20th century economy cannot exist in an 18th century social structure. Education is of paramount importance in this respect, and so far as I am aware, not a single country in the Americas is making a sufficient investment in its own people.

It takes capital to develop resources, but it also takes people; and the people come first. This is a field in which the activities of Columbus Day and the Organization of American States could well be expanded.

POSSIBILITY OF COMMON MARKET DESERVES STUDY

Another field for great OAS concern is that of economic cooperation. In considering the economic problems of this hemisphere, we ought, in my judgment, to pay more attention to Adam Smith's doctrine of natural advantage. That is, each of us ought to concentrate on doing that which we can do best. No nation of this hemisphere, not even the United States, is big enough to be a self-

contained economic unit. If any nation tries to become self-sufficient, it is not only doomed to failure; worse, it wastes resources which are more badly needed in other lines of endeavor.

From this, it follows, in my judgment, that we should think more along the lines of moving toward economic unity just as we have moved toward political unity. I realize that this will be difficult, that it will involve some possibly painful adjustments for all and that it cannot be done overnight. But I think its benefits will make all its difficulties and adjustments worthwhile. I am hopeful that the Central American Economic Union will point the way toward larger groupings.

An American common market would not only lead to more efficient use of resources; it would also contribute to the formation and growth of the institutions which are indispensable to economic development. It would, for example, make possible larger financial institutions and more extensive markets for securities.

HEMISPHERIC DEFENSE AND DISARMAMENT

Finally, it seems to me that the OAS could make a historic contribution in the field of intra-hemispheric defense. We have seen how the OAS has already made great and encouraging progress in the pacific settlement of disputes among its members. I suggest the time has come to build upon this progress and explore the possibilities of arriving at a regional agreement, within this hemisphere, for the reduction, or at least the limitation, of armaments. Such an agreement would have several obvious and immediate advantages.

For one thing, it would at once free very considerable resources which are now going into armaments and which are more badly needed for schools and other aspects of socio-economic development.

For another, it would tend to diminish the influence of the military and increase the influence of the civilian branches of Government. This would have a very salutary effect, especially in those few countries which still suffer under military or quasi-military dictatorships.

Finally, it would, I think, set a good example for the rest of the world.

As many of you know, I hold to the position in the Senate of the United States that the United States should not grant military aid to dictatorships anywhere in the world, including Latin America. I am willing to support some military aid to free nations in Latin America for hemispheric defense, but even here I think it is preferable to develop a hemispheric police force under the jurisdiction and direction of some international organization such as the Organization of American States.

I am a strong supporter of increasing economic aid programs for Latin America, preferably on a line-of-credit loan basis related to specific economic projects that will help bring direct economic benefits to the people of Latin America.

A distinguished Brazilian pointed out a few months ago that the relations between the United States and Latin America are perturbed, on both sides, by the prevalence of psychological behavior complexes. As a consequence, he added, the instrumentality of inter-American cooperation has increasingly become a mechanism for juridical and political coexistence rather than a system for mutual understanding.

Our biggest piece of unfinished business is to repair our mutual understanding. This is what the members of this audience are peculiarly well equipped to do. Whatever your vocation may be, I ask you to make this your avocation. I ask you to take it seriously.

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE MORGAN, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to meet with representatives of the National Citizens Committee for Columbus Day. My distinguished colleague, PETER RODINO, has kept me informed of the committee's past activities, and I welcome the opportunity to be brought up to date concerning its future program.

It is particularly appropriate for the committee to undertake to broaden the traditional observation of Columbus Day to emphasize the heritage which all of the nations and peoples of the Western Hemisphere share in common as a result of the discoveries of Christopher Columbus.

Columbus Day has in the past been celebrated in part as a reminder of our indebtedness to the older nations of Europe and of the ties which continue to bind us to them. It seems to me to be highly desirable that in addition to looking back across the Atlantic toward the Old World, those of us in the United States as well as those in our sister Republics should look around us within this hemisphere. If we pause and look around us and remember how much the date 1492 means to every one of us, it will bring home to us again the unique relationship which exists between the peoples of our hemisphere.

There is a tendency for nations as well as for individuals to become so preoccupied with their own day-to-day problems that they give too much emphasis to their differences. Anything we can do to reemphasize the things we have in common and our obligations to each other should make things better for us all.

Rather than taking more of your time, I am very happy and fortunate to be able to call on the Honorable ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, who is chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs. I am glad to be able to transfer to him responsibility for further discussion of the relations of the American Republics with each other. I am sure that you will find that he understands the problems of our hemisphere and that he is very much interested in the work of your group.

Chairman SELDEN and his subcommittee have recently issued a "Report on U.S. Relations with Latin America" which has been widely read and has received many favorable comments. He is a thoughtful and well-informed observer of the Latin American scene. It gives me the greatest pleasure to present to you the Honorable ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, of Alabama.

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE SELDEN OF ALABAMA

Mr. Chairman, as has been pointed out, last May the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the Foreign Affairs Committee (of which I am chairman) issued a report on U.S. relations with Latin America. In our examination of inter-American relations prior to the report, we were particularly concerned with the climate of misunderstanding which we found. Bitterness and antagonism were showing up as unwelcome guests even at inter-American conferences.

As long as the atmosphere is charged with grievances and recriminations, we will make little headway in resolving the very real conflicts of interest which are bound to crop up among nations of dissimilar stages of development and of wealth.

In the past, serious problems have confronted us without straining the entire fabric of inter-American relations. The difficulties brought about by the depression of the thirties and by dislocations due to World War II were probably greater than those which confront us today. We asked our-

selves why it was then possible to reach friendly understandings, even to disagree on issues, without engendering intense antagonisms; and why today, on the other hand, even minor irritations seem to give rise to downright hostility.

The subcommittee's conclusions and recommendations are set forth in a 10-page report. Dr. MORGAN and I brought along a handful of copies for those of you who might be interested. Other copies are available from the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Also, the committee has authorized the printing in Spanish of a number of copies of the report, and it is hoped these copies will be off the press by the end of the week.

In our report, you will find no discussion of such substantive problems as what might be done about the instability of Latin America's markets, or ways to promote economic development. Rather, the subcommittee concerned itself in this report with underlying misunderstandings which are impairing efforts to work out solutions to such questions.

I have been deeply impressed by the efforts of the National Citizens Committee for Columbus Day and the Columbus Foundation. Their work has been directed toward creating the very atmosphere of inter-American understanding that the subcommittee found to be indispensable to effective Hemisphere cooperation. There is no better road to inter-American respect and understanding than by individuals' getting to know each others problems and aspirations.

The Columbus Foundation's initiative in setting up its sister-city program is exactly the kind of approach the subcommittee had in mind when it recommended, and I quote from our report:

"We believe that nongovernmental contacts between people of all the American Republics are an essential avenue toward better understanding. Such organizations as the Inter-American Bar Association, the Inter-American Press Association, and the Inter-American Regional Organization of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions have contributed enormously toward the basic component of strong inter-American ties—an appreciation of each others' problems and aspirations. Moreover, personal contacts between private citizens remove any lurking suspicions of ulterior motives which sometimes attach to a Government-instigated program, no matter how altruistic might be the intention.

"We urge more professional and other groups to undertake similar relations with their Latin American counterparts."

One final word from the congressional point of view. It is extremely gratifying to find groups of private citizens making foreign policy their business. Previously we have noticed tendencies which might be described as "leave it to the State Department" or "leave it to Congress." These are mighty poor substitutes for the kind of strong inter-American bonds that can be forged when a growing circle of Americans, north and south of the Rio Grande, join hands to make the new world the land of peace and plenty our Founding Fathers envisioned.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply grieved yesterday to see in the paper a picture of, and a notice of the passing of, the late Mary Norton, Member of Congress from New Jersey, one of the handsomest, finest women I have ever been privileged to know. She was elected to Congress a few months before I was, and I found inspiration from her in our close congressional service. She was a fine and true friend.

Before coming to Congress, Mary Norton had a fine record of accomplishments, and as a Member of Congress she became a highly respected politician and national figure. She added luster to her name. She was thoroughly loyal. I do believe the cause of women never had a finer friend than she. She believed in their having their place in the sun. Mary Norton was warmhearted and strong, loyal to her family, loyal to party, loyal to her country.

Although she was a Democrat, when she went to Boston she often spoke of me. There was no party line in her friendships. We who served with her here—and there are not many left here now—know of her tremendous fight for every cause she thought was right. She wanted to help the underprivileged. Her battle for improved labor conditions will receive the gratitude of children yet unborn. It was not a political gesture in any way. She was a great patriot, always fighting for national defense. She always pushed onward and upward. She was a very religious woman, a power in her church, a power in the country.

We cannot spare women like Mary Norton. In my opinion, we cannot replace her.

My deepest sympathy goes to her sisters and brother and their children, and to the family she loved and helped so much, and to her countless friends.

The following is an article that appeared in the New York Times on Monday, August 3, 1959:

MARY T. NORTON, 84, LEGISLATOR, DEAD—JERSEY U.S. REPRESENTATIVE, 1925-50, HEADED LABOR COMMITTEE 10 YEARS

GREENWICH, CONN., August 2.—Former Representative Mary T. Norton, of New Jersey, died of a heart attack today in Greenwich Hospital. She was 84 years old.

Mrs. Norton was stricken yesterday at her home here at 52 Lafayette Place. She had moved here 3 years ago from her former home at 2400 Hudson Boulevard in Jersey City.

Surviving are two sisters, Mrs. Joseph McDonagh, of Greenwich, and Miss Anne Hopkins, of New York.

DEAN OF WOMEN IN CONGRESS

Mrs. Norton held the record for length of service by a woman Representative when she announced on her 75th birthday in March 1950 that she would not seek reelection to Congress. She served for 25 years in the House.

She was induced to enter politics by Mayor Frank Hague, of Jersey City, in 1920. Her district, the 13th of New Jersey, formerly the 12th, comprises Bayonne and part of Jersey City.

Mrs. Norton was the first woman elected to Congress by the Democratic Party. She was chairman of the House Committee on the

District of Columbia for 5 years, being the first woman to head a congressional committee. She also was named to the House Labor Committee and in 1937 became its chairman. She held the chairmanship until 1947, and then became a member of the House Administration Committee.

Her interest in labor affairs never waned, however, and when the Taft-Hartley bill was being discussed in Congress, she said:

"The labor baiters and the labor haters at long last are having a field day."

In 1945 she had met opposition from labor groups when she introduced a House bill seeking to implement President Harry S. Truman's request to Congress for authorization to set up fact-finding boards in industrial disputes.

FETED BY COLLEAGUES

In both 1945 and 1950 fellow Members in the House feted Mrs. Norton. On her 25th anniversary in Congress and her 75th birthday, Mrs. Norton, in a hospital with pneumonia and influenza, issued her announcement of retirement.

Mrs. Norton was a staunch New Dealer and helped to guide the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt's wage and hour legislation as well as to defend it later. She also championed the Fair Employment Practices Act and was instrumental in raising the minimum-wage level from 40 to 75 cents an hour.

Mrs. Norton served as State Democratic Committee vice chairman from 1921 to 1932, and as chairman in 1932 to 1935 and again from 1940 to 1944.

In 1923 she became the first woman elected a freeholder in Hudson County and the State. Mrs. Norton was named delegate-at-large to the Democratic National Conventions from 1924 through 1940 and in 1944 was a delegate serving on the platform-drafting committee. In 1944 she became a member of the Democratic National Committee. Four years later she was the convention chairman of credentials.

ALWAYS BACKED HAGUE MACHINE

She maintained her support of the Hague machine throughout her career and at the time she announced her retirement was instrumental in retaining Mr. Hague on the New Jersey State Executive Committee by outmaneuvering his enemies.

During her early years in Congress, Mrs. Norton introduced the first resolution to repeal the 18th amendment and spoke widely for repeal of prohibition. She also opposed the Gillette bill, fostering dissemination of birth-control information.

She was born in Jersey City on March 7, 1875, the daughter of Thomas and Marie Shea Hopkins. After attending public schools and a business college and working as a stenographer and secretary she was married in 1909 to Robert Francis Norton, a businessman. He died in 1934.

After the death of her infant son, Robert Francis, Mrs. Norton became active in day nurseries and was president of the Day Nursery Association of Jersey City. She received an honorary doctor of laws degree from St. Elizabeth's College in 1930 for constructive humanitarian work in welfare and politics. In 1937 she received a similar degree from Rider College.

In May 1947, she was named the outstanding Catholic woman of the year and received the Siena medal of Theta Phi Alpha, National Society of Catholic Women, at ceremonies in Norwood, Mass.

Mrs. Norton was a member of the National Business and Professional Women's League, the Queens Daughters and the Catholic Daughters of America.

The Late Mrs. Mary T. Norton

SPEECH OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Nixon Scores Behind Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by the well-known columnist, Gould Lincoln, appeared in the Washington Star of August 4.

Mr. Lincoln analyzes the visit of our Vice President, RICHARD M. NIXON, behind the Iron Curtain in an intelligent, calm, and thoughtful manner.

The Vice President has shown himself a man of stature; he has made no mistakes in a most difficult situation. While his visit will not bring about the millennium that some expect, it has done no harm, and certainly will do nothing but good.

NIXON SCORES BEHIND IRON CURTAIN

(By Gould Lincoln)

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON has done a great service to the American people—and to the people of Russia. This may, or may not have won to himself votes for the presidency next year. The good he has done goes beyond that. The service he has rendered in his 10-day visit to the U.S.S.R., and particularly by his final speech, carried by radio and television to millions of Russian citizens, has set an important precedent. It should increase the probabilities of world peace.

It seems unthinkable that any people should believe that the United States is bent on aggressive war of conquest. Certainly, it is incredible. The Russian people, however, have been told over and over again that the purpose of our Government is to overthrow the Communist Government and force upon the Russians the American brand of democracy.

And now Mr. Nixon has conveyed to the Russians the plain and simple fact that the United States wants peace—not war. President Eisenhower has stated this time and time again. But the statements of the President have been withheld from the people of Russia. The Iron Curtain was pulled aside to permit the Vice President to tell the Russians the truth. This, in itself, is a hopeful sign.

President Eisenhower has now announced that Russia's Prime Minister Khrushchev has been invited to visit the United States, and that he, Mr. Eisenhower, will visit Russia later. Having allowed the Vice President to speak directly to the Russian people, it would be strange, indeed, if the President is not accorded the same privilege when he goes to Moscow and other parts of the U.S.S.R. Mr. Khrushchev, of course, will be free to talk to Americans when he comes here in September.

These interchanges of visits of the heads of the two most powerful nations in the world may lead to better understanding, to better relations, and to a more easy peace.

CITES DRIVE AGAINST NATIONS

Mr. NIXON's address to the Russians included a frank invitation to the Russian Communists to lay aside their announced program of world communism and world domination, the ultimate result of that program. He told the people quite flatly that as long as their leaders persist in this drive for communizing the world, including the United States, they must expect the United States and its allies of the free world to

maintain their military bases within easy striking distance of the U.S.S.R. Further, he said that this country will continue to increase its military strength. Mr. NIXON's whole tone was firm, but distinctly he engaged in no saber rattling. His warm appreciation of the Russian people and their hospitality to himself and Mrs. Nixon was a strong, overlying theme.

To those who have followed the Russian Communist drive to engulf and, indeed, to enslave the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe, it seems almost hopeless that U.S.S.R. leaders will accept Mr. Nixon's invitation to give over their ideas of world domination. But there it is, as Mr. Nixon laid out the proposition for a real world peace. Thinking Russians, as they come better to understand the real purpose of the United States and its people—which is to live and let live, to allow each people to select their own form of government—may take a new look.

GRASPS ESSENTIALS

Mr. Nixon has again shown himself a master at grasping the essentials of the most vital problems which confront the United States, the U.S.S.R., and the whole world. His whole bearing during his momentous visit to Russia at a tense moment, with the East and West in virtual deadlock over the problems of West Berlin and all of Germany, was a credit to himself and to his country. Whether he was engaged in rough and tumble debate with Russia's Khrushchev, or whether he was being heckled by persons in the throngs which greeted him, Mr. Nixon never lost his dignity, and he was never at a loss in meeting the situations as they developed.

The United States has engaged in four wars since the closing years of the 19th century, two of them world wars. It has opposed world aggression by a conquest-mad emperor. It has fought world conquest by Fascist and Nazi leaders. Finally, it has fought a war, the Korean war, against Communist aggression. In none of these wars has the United States failed in its objectives. But it seized no territory of other nations and made it its own. This is the simple truth, and Mr. Nixon used it effectively in his argument to the Russian people they need fear no aggressive action by Americans against their people, their government, and against their progress to better and better living.

If Mr. Nixon has been able—as it seems he must—to remove this mote from the eye of the Russian people, to disprove the teaching of their leaders, he has done incalculable good. The price of peace for the Russians is not their own freedom. It is the abandonment of world aggression.

Significance of Vice President Nixon's Speech to the Russian People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the speech delivered by Vice President Nixon to the Russian people last week was an event of enormous significance. For the first time since the cold war was launched some 13 years ago, the Soviet Government has permitted a high American official to address its people directly over governmental facilities without

prior censorship. As such, the speech constitutes a major breakthrough the Iron Curtain and marks an important development in Soviet-American relations.

Writing in the Washington Star of August 3, David Lawrence describes the Vice President's speech as a "phenomenon unparalleled in the history of diplomacy." Believing that Mr. Lawrence's article contains an excellent analysis of the impact of the speech on world affairs, I include it with my remarks, as follows:

U.S. SPUTNIK IN THE COLD WAR—NIXON'S TV SPEECH TO RUSSIANS HAILED; WILL KHRUSHCHEV REPLY ON U.S. TV?

(By David Lawrence)

A phenomenon unparalleled in the history of diplomacy has just occurred. It is of transcendent importance in the struggle for world peace—a sputnik, it might be called, in the progress of international relations.

For, in the midst of the cold war, a leader of one Nation has spoken in criticism of a hostile government directly to the people of that country. It was an address as tactful and yet as argumentative as a diplomatic note.

The speech made by Vice President Nixon to the people of the Soviet Union contained little that had not been said before in the formal and informal exchanges of views among the foreign ministers of the two sides at Geneva and through their ambassadors for several years past. But it was of tremendous significance because these words were transmitted directly over television and radio to the Soviet people inside their own borders and over their own governmental facilities.

It was something that could not have been arranged without the sanction of the Soviet Government itself, which hitherto has maintained a strict censorship of what might be said to the Soviet people either through the press or over the air.

The Vice President didn't mince words. He made pointed criticisms. But they were couched in earnest, polite, dignified and reasoned phrases. He didn't pull his punches, but he handled himself without giving offense. Ever since his college days, when he was a prize debater, RICHARD NIXON has known how to argue persuasively in competition with adversaries before big audiences.

The Vice President himself worked 6 hours on his speech. He chose his words carefully and covered every vital issue. It was a masterpiece of diplomacy, yet it was an effective appeal over the head of a government to the people—something that President Woodrow Wilson first enunciated as a principle in his war address of 1917 when he said "We have no quarrel with the German people, but only with their autocratic government."

It is most unfortunate that inside the United States so much press speculation by supporters and opponents of Mr. Nixon has been devoted to the question of whether the trip enhances his political prestige for the presidential contest in 1960. This detracts from the true importance of the Nixon visit to Russia and Poland.

For today it is the impact of the Nixon address on the course of the "cold war" that is alone important. His mission was authorized by President Eisenhower and is therefore associated with the conduct of our foreign relations.

Did the Nixon trip help toward world peace? Did it advance the cause of the West in its indefatigable endeavor to find a common ground for "getting along" with the dictatorship in the Kremlin?

These questions are difficult to answer because Khrushchev is a ruthless man who has

been guilty of ordering mass murders in Eastern Europe, where he holds many countries as his captives. He is fanatically wedded to the idea of world conquest by threats of military action, by spreading communistic ideas and then by infiltrating other governments and taking possession of them.

Should Khrushchev be invited to come to America, and when? This is a subject for diplomacy's experts to work out. The whole thing started with a belief on Khrushchev's part that a summit conference would enhance his prestige with his own people. The West thought it better to have a foreign ministers' conference first to ascertain if the Berlin crisis could be solved by such a meeting. President Eisenhower said he would go to a summit meeting only if the results at Geneva justified it.

Now Geneva is acknowledged to be a failure. Cleverly, no doubt, Khrushchev figured that by opening up doors for Vice President Nixon and giving him a chance to visit Russia and Poland he could get a two-man summit conference anyway. For President Eisenhower has insisted there must be some give on the part of Khrushchev before a general summit conference is held, so that the West would not seem to be negotiating under the duress of the recent ultimatum to us to get out of Berlin. The demand and accompanying threat have never been withdrawn.

The Soviet Premier says he would like to come to the United States when "the time is ripe." The President told the press last week that such a trip might come about eventually when the American people have been conditioned to it.

How can this happen? Overnight the Soviet leader could withdraw his ultimatum. Maybe that's why he issued it—eventually to get an invitation to come to the United States. If he comes, he can have television and radio audiences to listen to him but he also will have persons in all parties answering him and interrogating him.

When this appeared to be the way things were shaping up in Scandinavia, Nikita Khrushchev backed away through he had been officially invited. The time, he felt, was not ripe. Maybe Khrushchev wants only an invitation to visit the United States, and then might decide that in this case also "the time isn't ripe." Lots of Americans would agree with him.

The Volunteer Fireman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include the following editorial which appeared in the Star, a newspaper of Southampton, Bucks County, Pa., on July 29, 1959, and which calls attention, and gives well-deserved credit, to a fine group of public-spirited citizens:

THE VOLUNTEER FIREMAN, AN HONORED CITIZEN

One of the interesting facets of American life is that the average individual has a great deal more spare time than he is willing to admit. Men usually find spare-time interests that provide a keen interest or something entirely different from their vocational pursuits. Since the war, many men have be-

come active as auxiliary policemen, firemen, little league coaches, managers, or have become involved in other activities.

We know of no other spare-time interest that brings greater satisfaction than serving as a volunteer fireman. Here an individual is devoting his spare time protecting lives and property from the ravages of fire.

Firefighting brings out good physical coordination in a man and sharpens the senses to accept danger with the knowledge that fire can be controlled and extinguished by tested and scientifically proved measures.

A volunteer fireman is following in the footsteps of many famous citizens who served in this role and distinguished themselves. It is a proud and honored activity.

Look at the volunteer firemen when you next meet them and you'll find they are a hardy breed of men, willing to sacrifice several hours a week for the good of the community and their neighbors. True, there is no pay, but the reward comes in knowing that when a fire emergency arises, they are the men who with fortitude, using training and good commonsense, can render a fire harmless.

Your township fire company needs men—good men—who are willing to devote a few hours each week to the job of becoming a firefighter. A man can lift his head a little higher and command the respect of his neighbor because he belongs to that band of picked men—the volunteer firemen.

Award Winning Essays in My True Security Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege and pleasure to be present at the My True Security national awards banquet in Washington, D.C., on July 21, when the national winner and the two runner-up winners delivered their essays. This contest was sponsored by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce and the Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co., of Newark, N.J.

These young people impressed me with their sincerity and wisdom. I liked all three essays, and, had I been a judge, I would not have known in which order to rank them. The first place was awarded to Miss Martha Reynolds, of 111 Margaret Avenue, Marietta, Ga. She will receive a \$1,000 scholarship to the university of her choice. One runner-up was Herbert S. Edwards, 2040 South Fillmore Street, Denver, Colo. He wins a \$500 scholarship. The other runner-up was John R. Williams, of 1212 4th Street North, Fargo, N. Dak. He will also receive a \$500 scholarship.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am having printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the essays which were judged the three best in the United States in this contest. In doing this, I wish to pay tribute to the sponsors and all participants for taking part in a project, the objectives of which were most worthwhile and which did a great deal toward

stimulating constructive thinking about the values of our national heritage.

The essays follow:

MY TRUE SECURITY

(By Martha Reynolds)

I am a teenager. I could be almost any teenager living in almost any of the growing cities in the United States. I go to school and to church; and, with the exception of Elvis Presley, I like the things most teenagers like—hamburgers and french fries, Rock Hudson, football, Dick Clark, crew-neck sweaters, and crew-cut boys. Recently, I've become aware of the necessity to think seriously about my life. Teens everywhere face this problem of making important decisions about the future.

My generation lives in a stimulating age and has much to anticipate, for our modern advances point the way to a better life for all. In my own lifetime I've seen the wonder of color television, the near extinction of the polio menace, and a submarine that can safely travel under the virgin Arctic ice. I've heard America's wish for peace on earth broadcast to all the world from outer space, and probably in my time I will see man at last reach the moon.

In the height of this wonderful age, however, I find that I cannot ignore the hazards of a moving world. A cold war as deadly as any battle now exists. An ICBM could destroy in a few moments the life I know. Modern revolutionists, practically at my own doorstep, fight to preserve and extend freedoms, I, too often take for granted. Today is a time when both young and old must be continuously struggling to preserve the dignity of the individual.

The omnipresence of such turmoil and confusion certainly tends to make any plans for jobs, further education, or future homes and families seem insecure. A small child can find security in the reassuring glow of a light in the dark, in the touch of a familiar hand, or in the comfort of a mother's kiss. But how can we teenagers find this needed assurance of safety when this atmosphere of unrest is like the grin of the Cheshire cat, always with us? Youth discovers this assurance in the democratic principles on which our country rests—basically, respect for the worth of the individual and a supreme loyalty to God.

America is one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. And because its Government was instituted to promote the general welfare, I know that even I am guaranteed an opportunity for developing my initiative and achieving my dreams. Free enterprise is another form of my security, because the individual can achieve personal goals through working with others by the organization and division of labor.

Thomas Jefferson once said, "As long as we think as we will and speak as we think, the condition of man will proceed in improvement." So as an American citizen, even though my rights are assured, to be truly secure, I must accept these rights and the responsibilities that accompany them. When I go to the polls soon to vote for my first time in a city, State, or nationwide election, I will face the responsibility of using my individual discretion. So I'll be guaranteeing my security by active participation in the affairs of my government, and industrial self-government.

Myriads of people inhabit this United States, each an individual, each important because he has his own abilities, his own goals, and his own ambitions. And yet, as President Eisenhower has said, "One basic opportunity unites us: to promote strength and security, side by side with liberty and opportunity." The American way of life enables adults and teenagers to advance the

true promise of human progress and dignity—freedom—my true security.

MY TRUE SECURITY

(By Herbert S. Edwards)

In this age of unrest and uncertainty, security is foremost in almost everyone's mind. I believe we have placed too much emphasis on the material aspects of life, security being one of these. It seems to me that my true security is not tangible. Material security is always in danger from fire, flood, decay, and all other means of destruction. Thus, I think a person who depends for his security on material bases such as wealth or physical strength has no true security, for he has only temporal resources to cope with loss, defeat, and disaster. Lasting security cannot be guaranteed. If material and physical security are so important, what would happen if one should lose them? After all, is a guaranteed, secure future really as safe and important as so many think? Prison inmates have complete economic security.

One's self-reliance will be built up only by forcing himself to take the initiative and become a nonconformist in the sense of standing by what you believe in the face of criticism. Today's desires to belong to a group and to follow the crowd certainly relieve a person of self-reliance and the need for initiative. Many people place themselves in a clique for security, only to find themselves lost in the group. A person who balks at following the crowd or questions its authority, may find himself on the outside, looking in. A group can take away security just as fast as it can give it. A person who has depended upon a group for all his security, and has either been rejected or become separated from his group is certainly without any means of self-assurance. To belong to a group may give one temporary security, but to become detached may result in permanent insecurity and disappointment. Where, then does true security lie, and how can one find it?

I believe that my true security is in the realm of the mental and spiritual phases of life. True security is not attained except when one relies on himself and his own resources of character and the spirit for his future. We can build up our resources if we can develop self-reliance and self-confidence in ourselves and our work. Self-reliance, in turn, may be developed by relying upon our own initiative. Progress is made because of insecurity. Complete material security may discourage initiative and self-reliance. Therefore, I believe that if one's true security is placed in self-reliance, initiative and resourcefulness, he has a lasting security which will assist him in overcoming or effectively dealing with adverse circumstances whenever they arise. My true security, then, is not to be found outside myself in the temporal things of life, human or otherwise, but can be built up only within myself.

MY TRUE SECURITY

(By John R. Williams)

To me, "security" is a dirty word. I do not seek it and would not accept it were it offered me. Unlike so many of my fellows, I am searching for something better than what I presently have. Unlike many young people today, I wish to be the master of my own fate, the captain of my own soul. I cannot and will not blindly follow the herd plodding blissfully toward an uncertain goal in the comfortable rut of mediocrity which so typifies "security."

Today Americans are eagerly searching for security. If and when they find it, man will be able to count the remaining days of our civilization on the fingers of his two hands. This great Nation and the way of life it has come to represent were not created by

men seeking security. They were hammered and chopped and carved and dug and plowed out of the wilderness by steel-hearted men who sought but one thing—opportunity.

For 7,000 years mankind groped in the darkness; then in 1776 a new nation was born, and the people of the earth knew that at last they had found the promised land. There was no security here, and everyone knew it—yet from all corners of the earth they streamed to America—the land of opportunity.

When America's early pioneers first set their eyes to the west they had only their two hands and the soil. There was no TVA out there, no social security, no minimum wage—there was only freedom, but that was enough. Some failed again and yet again to succeed, so there was poverty, too. But every man was free to rise just as high as his own feet could carry him, and because his success or failure was determined solely by his own abilities and willingness to work, he realized the only true security possible in a government of, by, and for the people. Our forefathers knew that there is no short cut to the promised land, and it is time their descendants were becoming aware of the fact also.

There is, to my way of thinking, but one hope for the preservation of civilization as we know it—that mankind learn once more the beauty and dignity of honest labor. Businessmen, farmers, and laborers alike must learn to solve their own economic problems instead of running, hat in hand, to Uncle Sam. They must realize that the mad merry-go-round of bread and circuses—all in the name of security—will destroy this Republic just as surely as it destroyed ancient Rome. There is very little security in a grave. It is time for Americans to realize that the best kind of security is insecurity, and that hard work is not only the best thing for them, but is in fact the hope of the world.

Blacklisting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, in these days of labor-leader hate-mongering and antiunionism near hysteria on the part of some diehard predatory profiteering organizations and persons, it is important to sane and sensible legislation to know the real truth about matters of such grave concern as the article that appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD repeating a Twin Falls, Idaho, newspaper editorial.

This reported item charged bluntly that organized labor's political action committee was operating a blacklisting operation within its official activities.

First of all, the word "blacklist" brings to me one of the most dreaded and disgusting memories of my youth.

I was born in a coal-mining community and have a bitter and blind opposition to the use of the term on the practice of blacklisting.

Recently, during our subcommittee hearings on the ill-disguised antilabor bill parading as a reform measure, we heard the story of a young retail clerk.

This worker lost her job through a series of company-engineered court and

NLRB rulings. Her dismissal was and is clearly and irrefutably traced to her union activities in trying to help form and maintain a union in one of the all-too-many places of employment who profess to like unions; but the point I am leading up to is that by the simple expedient of having all other cooperating employers in the Duluth area demand a letter of recommendation before hiring, this girl has been blacklisted for life.

She has two alternatives—move away, change her name, find a reasonable employer—and you can hardly find this kind around here anymore—or become antilabor—shout it from the house tops and be welcomed back into lower standard working conditions employment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you can understand partly my deep-seated opposition to blacklisting and especially resent its use by labor unions, the members of which have too many times been its victims.

I am happy to be able to put into the RECORD correspondence between myself and the director of COPE, a long-time friend, James McDevitt, formerly president of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor.

In passing, I would like to say that Jim McDevitt is a respected and respecting union official, and any insinuations to the contrary are false and unfair.

The letters follow:

JULY 29, 1959.

Mr. JAMES L. McDEVITT,
National Director, Committee on Political
Education, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: In reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 23, page A6395, I note an extension of remarks by the Honorable H. H. BUDGE, of Idaho.

He included in his remarks an editorial from a local newspaper from Twin Falls, Idaho, dated July 15, 1959. In case you missed his remarks, I am enclosing same.

It appears to me as though the extension is a direct charge that COPE has prepared, and is preparing, a "blacklist" on Members of the Congress based upon their voting records. Having known both yourself as a person, and COPE as an institution, I am disturbed by this allegation. I have always believed in the fundamental right of any organization to publish its views on the voting records of members of any legislative body. This right, to me, is fundamental and, needless to say, one of the privileged rights of our Constitution.

Personally, I do not see it as this article attempts to make it appear as a threat, nor do I see it as any violation of the prerogatives enjoyed not alone by COPE, but by all other free institutions in this country.

I do not believe that charges such as those should go unchallenged or unannounced, and I would appreciate it very much if you would give me, at your convenience, the story behind COPE's listed analysis of voting records.

With kindest regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. DENT,
Member of Congress.

COMMITTEE ON POLITICAL EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C., August 3, 1959.

HON. JOHN H. DENT,
House of Representatives, Congress of the
United States, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I thank you for your inquiry concerning the insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of an editorial from the Twin Falls (Idaho) Times-News, of July 15, 1959. Certainly, if editorial writers and others were as scrupulous as you are in sec-

ing information, the labor movement would not now be subjected to the calumny that is being heaped upon it.

The Times-News editorial is based on a completely twisted account, distributed to its clients by the United Press International News Service a few weeks ago. UPI, on the basis of an article appearing in our weekly publication, Political Memo From COPE, dated July 6, 1959, stated COPE had issued its first blacklist of the 1960 campaign. In truth and fact the article merely reported three rollcall votes in the Senate on amendments sponsored, respectively, by Senators McCARTHY, CLARK, and DOUGLAS, which related to the tax laws.

As you are well aware, taxes are a subject of utmost concern to all citizens these days and particularly to those in the middle and lower income groups who bear the heaviest share. We felt, and still feel, that they are entitled to know which Senators voted for these amendments, which, in our view, would have plugged some gaping loopholes in the tax laws, and which Senators voted against these amendments.

To say that this reporting of a vote constitutes a blacklist is the most arrant nonsense comparable only to the statement in a recent article by Paul Martin of the Gannett News Service straight-facedly reporting, "It is estimated unions spent \$510 million on political activities in the 1958 congressional campaign."

I can tell you categorically and without qualification that COPE has no blacklist or purge list or anything remotely resembles these items. It never has had and, so long as I am its director, never will have.

My feelings on this subject of a blacklist are strong, because I have known too many honest union men and women who have trudged from employment office to employment office, in search of work, only to be told that there was none for them because they were union members. You know, I am sure, of the blacklists that were so prevalent in the coalfields and steel mills of our Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in the pre-Wagner Act days. No more despicable instrument was ever devised nor was there anything so destructive of men's dignity.

COPE has published and will continue to publish the voting records of the elected representatives of the people both at the time of the vote and in summary form at the end of the session. Our parliamentary system is unique among the world's parliaments in that such a vote is provided for in the rules of Congress and published in the official RECORD of Congress. Certainly it must have been the intention of our forefathers to give the widest currency to the votes cast there, and I have always been puzzled by the reluctance of some to have their votes made known.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES L. McDEVITT,
National Director.

Nixon's Tour Reveals Weaknesses in Soviet Position at Home—We Must Constantly Keep the Spotlight on Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr.

Edgar Ansel Mowrer. This was written before the President announced the invitation to Khrushchev to visit this country, but the basic weaknesses in the Soviet position still remain and we must be on guard not to help Khrushchev out of them. Acceptance by the United States, without any change in his position, will only make him stronger at home and abroad, and thereby increase the danger of war.

The article follows:

NIXON TOUR SPOTLIGHTS SOVIET FEAR OF TRUTH

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Vice President NIXON has shown himself as much a master of "people-to-people politics" in the U.S.S.R. as at home. Unquestionably, however, the benefits of popular contacts, the gain for peace by "getting to know each other," the results of insisting that Russians are "like Americans" (something those familiar with Russian literature will question) are much overdone. The Russian people have not now and will not for some time to come, have anything to say about their government's foreign policy and they can at any time be dragged kicking into any sort of war the Kremlin may desire.

(How well they would fight such a war is another matter. Millions would have helped Hitler if he had shown any desire to rescue them from their servitude.)

Perhaps the Vice President's chief accomplishment has been to illuminate the psychological weakness of the Bolshevik regime. Communists flatter themselves that they are masters of propaganda, and most people will admit that they are. What Nixon's visit demonstrated is their almost pathological fear of exposing their subjects to counter-propaganda, especially when backed by anything as real as the American exhibition in Moscow. I suspect that Khrushchev underestimated the effect of that exhibition upon those Russians who saw it, underestimated the Russian people's distaste for any new conflict and did not expect to find in Nixon the skilled counterdisputant which our Vice President turned out to be.

PROPAGANDA PUT TO TEST

Unquestionably, the Soviet propaganda machine has had to work overtime trying to counter the effects of both the American exhibit and Nixon's incessant talk of peace and friendship.

In reply, the Soviets launched what the New York Times called a "massive propaganda effort to make the Vice President look like a fool, an incompetent and a liar. It is impossible to believe that the Soviet leaders had any real desire to let Mr. Nixon ease present tensions when one reads what the controlled Soviet press and radio said about him." (Whoever thought they had?)

To counter both Nixon and the effects of the American exhibit Nikita Khrushchev himself took to the radio on July 28. In a speech to factory workers redolent of Mussolini at his worst, Nikita asked if they did not have bread enough, if they lacked vegetables, if they are short of housing. (One can imagine their answers.) He announced that he had challenged Nixon to show whether capitalism or socialism would provide more of the good things of life, and then he got tough about Berlin and the possibility of war. At the end he yelled:

"As a result of World War I, Russia became a Socialist country.

"As a result of World War II, 12 other countries became Socialist countries.

"As a result of world war III, should it ever be launched by the imperialists, capitalism will be eliminated." (And Soviet communism as well.)

SERIOUS EFFORTS

Meanwhile, numerous other Soviet radio and TV speakers tried to undermine the American exhibition. For instance, Vishnevsky (July 26) emitted the following comment: "We cannot see any photographs of one-sixth of the American population which, according to Senator HUMPHREY, still lives in poverty. . . . Chairman Butler of the Democratic National Committee stated that over 15 million Americans live in slums."

After admitting the attraction of American commodities, Vishnevsky asked: "Where is the machinery? Where are the achievements of U.S. science?" Then followed a number of imaginary conversations between keen-witted Russian visitors and bumbling American guides in which the former demolished the latter and showed up the hollowness of American claims of prosperity and of the exhibition's honesty.

Obviously not since almost a million Russians under General Vlasov voluntarily took part in German attacks against their own country has anything so shaken the self-confidence of the Soviet rulers. In fact, far from inaugurating a stepped up series of political exchanges I suspect that Nixon's tour may have persuaded the wily Khrushchev to limit exchanges in the near future strictly to a visit to the United States by himself—if only he can wangle an invitation.

University of Oregon Teachers Kindle Nepal Flame of Learning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following story describing the work of a University of Oregon team of educators who have been working in Nepal since 1953 to help the citizens of that nation improve its educational system. The contract between the University of Oregon, the Kingdom of Nepal and the International Cooperation Administration ends September 30.

I have talked with some of the Oregon educators who have been responsible for the success of this program. They have, from time to time, stopped by my office when they came through Washington, D.C., en route to or from Nepal. I have found them encouraged with the progress of the program, encouraged with the way in which the people of Nepal have responded to it.

This story by Ralph Olive touches well on the highlights of the program. Olive points out that according to Dr. Charles D. Byrne one of the strongest dividends has been the training of Nepalese students in the United States. Dr. Byrne believes they will form a nucleus of trained educators who will pass on their new ideas to their countrymen.

This sort of work, sponsored by the countries involved and directed by responsible men from responsible institutions of higher learning and elsewhere build toward peace and better understanding. Mr. Olive's article which ap-

peared in the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard of August 30, 1959, follows:
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON TEACHERS KINDLE NEPAL FLAME OF LEARNING
(By Ralph Olive)

Nepal has been described as "a little country with a big problem."

More accurately, that would read many big problems. Nepal, a kingdom, is now under democratic rule. With the new freedom, have come many needs—one of the greatest is education for the people.

Since 1953, a University of Oregon team of educators has worked in Nepal to help solve one of those problems—widespread illiteracy and a complicated and inadequate educational system.

Nepal lies between Tibet and India, a rectangle roughly 500 miles long and 90 to 100 miles broad.

The country has a varied population of 10 million people.

In the book, "Education in Nepal," prepared by the Nepal National Education Planning Commission, this statement appears:

RICH HERITAGE
Rich in cultural heritage, proud of her incomparable mountain peaks and scenery, here reside an industrious, eager, willing people, who have only recently gotten a hold on their own bootstraps and are now pulling themselves out of the mire of the Dark Ages of the recent centuries. The mud is thick, the pull is long, and the load is heavy.

The University of Oregon already has done much to lighten Nepal's load, and provisions have been made for Nepal to help itself in the years ahead.

A contract between the University of Oregon, the Kingdom of Nepal, and the U.S. International Cooperation Administration will end September 30, Paul B. Jacobson, dean of the university school of education, has announced.

Some financial aid will continue, from the U.S. Government, and Nepalese students will go on studying in this country. But most technical advice will end, and University of Oregon faculty members in Nepal will come home.

FACULTY MEMBERS
Hugh B. Wood, professor of education, is now in charge of the program in Nepal to revise and improve the country's educational system. Wood first went to Nepal in 1953, later returned to Oregon for a brief period, then again went to Nepal. He has been director of the program except for 2 years, when Charles D. Byrne, professor of education, and former chancellor of the Oregon State System of Higher Education, took over those duties.

Other Oregon faculty members who are, or have been, in Nepal, are Francis E. Dart, of the physics department, Thomas Ballinger, assistant professor of art and education, and Clarence Hines, professor of education, and former superintendent of Eugene Public Schools. W. W. Olson, formerly with the university school of education, now at the University of Florida, and James Tuley, a Washington architect also took part in the planning. Tuley was placed on the university staff temporarily for this work.

The International Cooperation Administration provided \$840,000 to help Nepal rebuild its educational system, and that amount was matched by the Government of Nepal. A contract was signed for a 5-year period—and the work began.

The Oregon educators found the members of the Nepal National Education Planning Commission and other government leaders in Nepal willing and anxious to build a good system of schools, from the primary grades through the university level.

PROBLEMS OVERWHELMING
But the problems were overwhelming. Facilities were inadequate. The literacy rate was estimated at 2 percent, and only a small percentage of school age children were actually in the classroom.

On the other hand, Nepal had a rich cultural heritage, and the people did want education. They wanted it badly.

Among other things the Oregon team members had to accustom themselves to a new land, and a different way of life. Language, fortunately, was not a great barrier. Most government officials and educators in Nepal speak English, at least well enough to understand, and to make themselves understood. When necessary, interpreters are available.

In the villages, language was another matter. There it was quite likely that most of the residents did not even speak Nepali. There are many dialects in Nepal, adding to the difficulties of a standard system of education. From the beginning, the Nepal Education Planning Commission decided to stress Nepali as the national language, with all instruction to be given in that tongue.

When necessary, classes are conducted in a local dialect, while Nepali is being learned, but the change to the national language is made as soon as possible.

PROGRAM OUTLINED
A many-phased program was outlined by the planning commission, with the aim of putting the country on its feet educationally quickly. Here are some of the main points:
Establishment of a teacher training center for primary school teachers.

An adult education program: Adult literacy classes at the village level.

Addition of primary schools. About 1,400 new classrooms have been opened.

Training of eight Nepalese educators at the University of Oregon. These administrators returned, after 1 year's study, to plan a 4-year degree-granting college of education. The college was in operation within a month after their return to Nepal.

The college of education, in addition to a regular curriculum, has sponsored workshops, seminars and laboratory schools. It has a bureau of publications and a bureau of research.

A general improvement of existing colleges has been part of the overall program. Demonstration teaching was provided to improve instruction; additional staff members were employed when needed.

A central library of 5,000 volumes has been established to serve the several colleges.

MAJOR ADVANCE
A major advance in higher education has been the development of a charter for a national university. A university commission was appointed to draft the charter, develop the administrative structure, and plan other details of the university. Organizational plans are complete, and the university is officially established.

Architect James Tuley, Fulbright student in India in 1956, developed a master campus plan, and is designing the first buildings. Construction is scheduled to start this fall. The institution has been named Tribhuvan University.

Byrne believes one of the greatest benefits of the program is the provision to train Nepali graduate students in this country. To date, 37 students have been sent here, and seven more will come in the fall. Of the 37, some have completed their training, and returned to Nepal. Others are still in the United States.

Most of these students have studied at the University of Oregon. Four are now at Oregon State College, for subjects offered there, and one is at South Dakota State, which has a complete printing program.

"The training of these teachers will pay strong dividends in Nepal for years to come," Byrne noted. He believes they will form a nucleus of trained educators, who in turn will pass on their new ideas to their countrymen.

A beginning has been made. It will take years more, but Oregon educators, and members of the planning commission in Nepal, believe the kingdom has taken a big step toward lifting itself out of the mire of the dark ages.

America's Veterans
EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE HOLT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a speech given by Comdr. Ferdinand Mendenhall, USNR, at a Memorial Day service. Commander Mendenhall is the editor of the Van Nuys News & Green Sheet, Van Nuys, Calif., which is in my congressional district, and is well known in the Los Angeles area for his many community and charitable undertakings. He was also selected to attend the recent National Strategy Seminar held at Fort McNair. I find the subject matter of this speech a constant reminder of the price of peace, and the importance of keeping America strong spiritually, economically, and militarily.

The speech follows:

Men of the Jewish War Veterans and B'nai B'rith, and fellow Americans, I stood in the midst of a military cemetery that lay on a gently sloping hill. Far to the left and far to the right and up to the crest of the hill and beyond were row on row of white crosses, each cross standing like a guard of honor for the man whose name it bore.

You can read about men dying in battle, about one, or a score or a hundred being killed in this place or that and it's just another story. But you can't stand in the presence of those stars of David and Christian crosses—those many, many stars and crosses—and not be appalled at the fruits of war.

Who were these young men? Where did each one come from? What were their hopes, their ambitions, their goals in life? Where did each one meet his tragic fate, and why, why did he have to die?

Questions, but no answers. An emptiness inside and nothing to ease it. Then a prayer for peace, a real peace, a lasting peace, springs to the lips. But no words are spoken. Peace can be prayed for but this alone is not enough. It must be worked for. And as never before the individual responsibility for peace surges within. The promise to live better, to strive harder for a better world, fills the heart. These men must not have died in vain.

And they will not, if in your heart and mine that promise be kept.

And because we, as the living exponents of the creed of freedom and dignity for mankind, gather here today in honor of Americans who have advanced on the battle-grounds, who have flown into the skies to turn back oppressors, and who have gone down to the sea in ships, believe that these men must not have died in vain, so stand we united and pledged to the principle that

in your heart and mine, that promise be kept.

Memorial Day, considered as the most beautiful and sacred of our patriotic days, has been an annual observance since 1868. It was first proclaimed for the decoration of the graves of soldiers who fought in the Grand Army of the Republic and was known as Decoration Day. With the passing of years, it has come to embrace the lost men of all our wars, and with this widening of scope has been designated Memorial Day.

And as we are gathered here this morning in Beth Olam Cemetery, countless like observances are taking place throughout the United States and in far corners of the lands overseas where Americans paid the supreme sacrifice for the principles of mankind in which they believed.

To those of us who have been closely engaged in these theaters of war, these resting places can only be considered as hallowed ground, with the grave marks echoing the horrors, the waste, the toll of the dead, and the terrible needlessness of war.

At this moment we are in essence a part of the ceremony today in Arlington National Cemetery across the Potomac from Washington, D.C., for gathered there is a multitude paying homage at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldiers, and reading on that tomb the engraved, timeless inscription so powerful in its simplicity: "Here rests in honored glory an American soldier known but to God."

Down through the years, parents and families of American soldiers forever reported as missing in action all like to think of the Unknown Soldier, no doubt, as their son, brother, or husband. But who would know?

He may have come from the fields of our farms; he might have been a storekeeper, a lawyer, a man of letters, or a laborer or student. He may have answered the call to colors, or he may have been drafted. This man may have been of the Jewish faith, or a Catholic, or Protestant, or again, one without religious ties. His might have been from a family of wealth, or he may have been very poor. All these conjectures can only remain just that. We shall never know this, or anything else about this man as an individual.

But we do know this: That he was an American infused with the spirit of 180 years ago running full and red in his veins, that he went down on the field of battle to protect and preserve the ideals of this Nation which have made it at once humble and great. For he knew the need for defending these principles as surely in World War I as did the thousands of his companions who also died in that holocaust, or in the Second World War, or in Korea.

Thus, the Unknown Soldier has become a symbol of America. In death, he is the Eternal Light as his monument inspires our past and present generations, and those in all the future to come, with the dignity among nations we enjoy as Americans. His sacrifice is the eloquent reminder of our rights and privileges of living and accomplishing, of working, of our American family hearth, and of the freedom of worship, and of the freedom of speech and thought. By his example are our youth inspired to go forth and uphold these tenets when the aggressor would turn upon us, so that all the precepts of these freedoms written in blood and toil by our forefathers may be kept secure for us.

And because we have advanced sturdily through the decades with unswerving allegiance to these principles espoused by our forebears, just as surely do we become the target for dictatorships and false "isms" which would seek to uproot and destroy us, that they might feast on the bounty of this land and this populace, wresting from us without conscience that which Americans have carved from the wilderness and have

bled to preserve. Within the present lifetimes of many of you before me, have we engaged in two giant world wars, and in a more recent—but equally vicious—conflict to turn back the forces of a treacherous foe who enslave millions of human beings, a ruthless power devoted to crushing human rights and dignity under the heel of oppression. A foe bent upon world conquest and dedicated to a policy of half-truths, false promises, distortion of facts and use of brute force where necessary in endeavors to capture the minds of men and to corrupt the circle of free nations within this world.

As these insidious forces are pressed against America and its sister nations, we continue to face an era fraught with clouds of threats and martial danger which can be met only with strength in fact on our own part. We have come to integrate the production and maintenance of such strength in arms with our domestic output to the end that defense and normal economy expand mutually in a manner possible only in a land as resourceful, gifted, and well endowed as the United States.

Earlier generations knew these problems in their own times, when your ancestors and mine were faced with tyranny and chose to break apart from such ties and to form a nation conceived under the proposition that all men are created equal, and with equal rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We have learned through the ages that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. No doubt George Washington had this in mind when, on the eve of his crossing the Delaware, he called his commanders together and said, "Let none but Americans stand guard, tonight."

In his ranks stood our forefathers—yours and mine—men dedicated to the principles for which they were willing to fight and to die—refugees, perhaps, from another and oppressive pattern of life. But refugees in a glorious and determined sense of the term, fashioning the firm foundation on which a new republic was born.

This, in essence, constituted the brotherhood of man, in justice and understanding. Broadly conceived, is this not the guiding beacon for which our men have fought down through the years, even as good men have gone forth to fight the cause of right against might since the beginning of time?

And is not the spirit of this brotherhood as alive and vital today among men of goodwill as we could find it a century, or 5 centuries, or many centuries ago? Do you remember when the troopship USS *Dorchester* was torpedoed February 3, 1943 in the Atlantic Ocean? Do you remember that hundreds of young Americans were aboard, bound for the war overseas, and that there were not enough lifebelts for all? Do you remember that four chaplains handed their own lifejackets to four enlisted men, then locked arms, joined in prayer and went down with their ship? These gallant men of the cloth were the Reverend C. V. Poling, the Reverend George L. Fox, Rabbi Alexander Goode, and the Reverend John P. Washington. And do you remember that one was a rabbi, another was a Catholic priest, and the others were Protestant clergymen? In that one act, they memorialized the truth of the brotherhood of man, carried on the escutcheon of honor for all time to come.

One other example: When the drive was going forward during 1944 to recapture western Pacific island strongpoints from the enemy, I was assigned as naval gunfire officer with one of the most gallant, hard-fighting Marine Corps regiments in leatherneck history. As we stormed ashore to lead the attack on one particular island, one morning, vicious opposing fire made inroads in our front ranks, and I could see the boys go down even as we charged by them. Three days later, when the fighting had moved in-

land and the beachhead was firmly established, I came back to the shore for a brief conference. At the precise place where we had ripped through the sand and undergrowth only 72 hours before, there were fashioned three crude but proud markers—the Star of David and two Christian crosses—placed close together where these three young fighters and companions died together even as they had lived together—brothers in principle and brothers in deed.

Some weeks later, when the Stars and Stripes unfurled to proclaim the objective won, we buried our dead—and there were many who had answered the final call—on a small island not far from the main ground. Where each man had fallen, it seemed to me that that was a precious bit of American soil, because he had fallen there. And as I would look over this new cemetery, even as you can look about you at Beth Olam—this house of sweet stillness wherein we gather to pay tribute in the name of Jewish war veterans, and of all our heroic dead—the realization would come to me as I voiced it to you in the opening: "You can't stand in the presence of those Stars of David and Christian crosses—those many, many stars and crosses—and not be appalled at the fruits of war. . . . The promise to strive harder for a better world, fills the heart."

These men must not have died in vain. . . . And they will not, if in your heart and mine that promise be kept.

May God grant that we can gain inspiration from the heroism of our fallen war dead whom we honor today, an inspiration which will carry us through any dark hours which may beset our Nation.

It was the Great Emancipator standing on the hallowed ground at Gettysburg who said, "We here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that the government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Under the guidance of the Almighty, then, shall we keep faith with these dead, with our country, and with mankind by exemplifying the virtues of justice and brotherhood in thankful realization that the price they paid for liberty—gaged by the measure of history—was not, after all, too high.

Mrs. Mary T. Norton Beloved "Aunt Mary"

SPEECH
OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, as one of those who had the pleasure of knowing "Aunt Mary" during her term of service here in the House of Representatives, I feel a keen sorrow over the news of her death.

I remember vividly this gracious woman, the late gentle lady from New Jersey, Mrs. Mary T. Norton. Generous of nature and character this unassuming and unpretentious, fine lady who held such a high place for many years here in the House and performed in such a distinguished manner, came to be looked upon by many of us as "Aunt Mary."

Still vivid in my mind is the memory of her help to me as a freshman Member of the House and her sincere and honest

counsel and advice. For this I am and shall ever be grateful to our beloved "Aunt Mary."

Mrs. Norton was a champion of human rights and an ardent advocate of the cause of human welfare. Her service in the Congress was studded with brilliant accomplishment and worthwhile achievement. And despite the awesome responsibilities she never failed to give of herself unselfishly to many charitable endeavors, winning many awards and honors for her work in this area.

Although she retired from the Congress in early 1951, "Aunt Mary" never retired from the cause of helping others. I kept in touch with her over the years during her retirement, and from time to time learned of her continued good works.

It is sad to know that "Aunt Mary" has left the scene, but she has earned a lasting place in the lives and hearts of many whom she has helped and in the history of our country as a great humanitarian and a great public servant. She was truly a dedicated person who served her fellowman and country with a full measure of devotion.

Nixon More Than Holds His Own

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the entire world has watched with interest and has been impressed by the conduct of Vice President Nixon on his tour of Russia. His firm, but polite discussions with Russian leaders have shown that America is resolute in standing up for the principles of peace and understanding which mark our relations with all countries.

Significant of some of the fine reviews he has received, I wish to call attention to an editorial which appeared in the Davenport (Iowa) Daily Times on Monday, July 27, entitled "Nixon More Than Holds His Own." Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial in the Appendix of the Record:

NIXON MORE THAN HOLDS HIS OWN

Time must elapse to gauge the effect of the sharp exchange between Vice President Nixon and Premier Khrushchev and the succeeding conversations which were minus the bitterness.

A first observation is that the attitude of Khrushchev throws grave doubt upon the value of a summit conference and seriously raises the question of whether President Eisenhower should put himself in position to be verbally assaulted by the brawling Soviet dictator.

The cordial dinner and a night at Khrushchev's home for the Nixons cannot erase the venom of Khrushchev's attitude in his first meeting with the Vice President.

Nixon answered Khrushchev's thrusts at the opening of the American exhibition aptly—so aptly that the Soviet applied censorship to the exchange.

Furthermore, the Soviet did not want its people to understand Vice President Nixon's formal address. While the Russian radio carried the 3,000-word speech, no interpretation was given. In his address, Nixon described life in the United States and our high standard of living.

The Russian press is belittling the American exhibition.

Khrushchev ran smack bang into the type of encounter his deputies Mikoyan and Kozlov have reported to him.

Perhaps Nikita wasn't satisfied with the way the deputies countered blasts at Russia when they were in the United States and decided he'd show them. He didn't get away with anything. Nixon was more than his match.

Three immediate happenings are coincidental with Khrushchev's outburst. They are:

Proclamation of Captive Nations' Week by President Eisenhower following a resolution by Congress: This was a direct slap at Russian aggression set forth in legislative and executive action.

Accusation by the United States of attempted murder by Red China and North Korea in the June 16 attack on a Navy patrol plane over the sea of Japan.

Visit of Secretary Herter to West Berlin to bolster morale there as useless Geneva conference seemed near its end.

Those events can represent intent of the United States to take the offensive in the cold war and to use every opportunity to expose Russian perfidy.

Support is lent this interpretation by the fact that Vice President Nixon had the advice of President Eisenhower when he left for Russia and it could well have been agreed that the Vice President would use no soft answers if Khrushchev opened up on him.

Washington has reacted favorably to Nixon's handling of Khrushchev. It is recognized generally that the only way to treat the Russians is by forthrightly upholding the position of the United States. One effect of the Nixon encounter with Khrushchev should be the stiffening of the spines of the British who are obsessed with the idea that even if concessions are necessary a summit conference must be held.

Retired Military Officers' Influence on Defense Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, last June 3 I introduced an amendment to the defense appropriation bill which would deny funds to defense contractors who employed retired general officers who are on active service within the last 5 years. By one vote, the House rejected it, but the chairman of the Defense Appropriation Subcommittee assured the members that an Armed Services Subcommittee would investigate influence peddling by general officers in procurement contracts.

The subcommittee under the chairmanship of Congressman F. EDWARD HEBERT, Democrat, of Louisiana, has been investigating this matter. I had the privilege of testifying before the commit-

tee and was interrogated by the chief counsel and the members. I made no accusations against particular officers, but highlighted the inherent dangers of general officers obtaining employment with defense contractors and the possible added cost to our defense appropriation bill. It appears that I have stepped on the toes of a "sacred cow," the military officers, and the great defense contractors. Their apologists and protectors in various magazines and newspapers are disparaging my attempts because I dared to criticize this relationship between our retired general officers and defense contractors.

It must be remembered that our annual appropriations for national security totals \$45 billion this year and approximately \$14 billion goes to aircraft and procurement of military equipment. Financial reports indicate that profits of these aircraft companies and electronic companies are soaring. These companies, through their magazine editors, are seeking to belittle my attempts and congressional attempts to find the facts and eliminate the influence in defense contracting.

If the President of the United States would end the authorization for negotiated and letter contracts and would have the Defense Department grant defense contracts through competitive bidding, we could eliminate in a large measure the military influence on defense contracts, reduce our cost, and retard inflation. However, our President, our Commander in Chief, and a military general, seems disinclined to interfere with his former colleagues, and the Defense Department, which is under his jurisdiction, continues to negotiate contracts without competitive bidding and on a negotiated and on a letter basis.

Several attempts to belittle the Hébert investigation and to "pooh-pooh" my efforts have come to my attention. In the August 1959 issue of the magazine, Air Force and Space Digest, the senior editor of the magazine, which is published by the Air Force Association, has attempted to ridicule my testimony before the Hébert committee. The Navy News, in a screaming headline by a feature writer, claims that the investigation by the Hébert committee is a waste of time, that "I am an expert in wasting time," and that the only result of the committee hearings would be to rebut my claim of military influence on defense contracts.

Of course, these magazines and newspapers fail to mention supporting testimony, such as that of Adm. Hyman Rickover, who indicated that there were pressures put on him by military men, but it did not influence his decisions. To an extent Admiral Rickover agreed with me that there should be a timelag between retirement from military service and employment by a defense contractor. Other witnesses have indicated that a timelag is necessary. Others have suggested a code of ethics and a requirement to report overtures and attempts to influence.

The San Francisco Chronicle, which is interested in protecting California defense industries, in a July 10 editorial,

has come to the defense of the military officers and takes serious issue with me.

What the Hébert committee has found out will be reported in due time. I have given the Congress and the Armed Services Subcommittee the benefit of my views. I am not in charge of the investigation, but will give information as it comes to my attention. I know that the Hébert subcommittee is acting in a responsible manner, is not destroying reputations, and is trying to extract facts from embarrassed and reluctant officers who receive lucrative salaries while enjoying retirement benefits.

In this morning's Washington Post, August 5, 1959, Marquis Childs in his column made some discerning observations. I submit this article as a partial answer to those magazine critics and military apologists who are belittling me in order to defend a system in which they are peculiarly interested. I am sure my colleagues and readers will find this article interesting and informative. It follows:

OLD SOLDIERS FIND IT PAYS TO RETIRE
(By Marquis Childs)

Why do firms with huge defense contracts from the Government hire retired admirals and generals at five-figure salaries? Is it because they know the right people in the Pentagon and can lobby through big contracts? Are they merely front men? Or do they have real ability worth \$50,000 or \$75,000 a year?

These are questions which a House committee, headed by Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT, is trying seriously to answer. Behind the inquiry is a supercharge of resentment and frustration not only in Congress but, judging from congressional mail, in the country as well.

One source of resentment is the fact that if the ordinary citizen, trying to live on his social security retirement pension, to which he has contributed throughout his working life, makes more than \$100 a month, he loses the pension. Yet an admiral or a general, retiring with a pension of \$12,000 a year, to which he has not contributed, can take a salary with private industry up to any amount, including the bonanza of stock options in the company, and still keep his Government pension.

Reflecting this resentment, the House came within a few votes of adopting an amendment which would have forbidden officers to take defense jobs for 5 years after their retirement.

HÉBERT frankly admits that his committee finds it difficult to pin down just what it is that the generals and admirals do for their salaries. But he says, too, that in trying to get the facts he is also trying to be fair. Inevitably, the inquiry spills over into the munitions lobby and the part played by the admirals and generals.

Last week the committee looked into the Aerospace Industries Association, maintained by the companies producing aircraft, missiles, and rockets. Eighty percent of their business is with the Government and they contribute in proportion to their sales to a fund that last year totaled \$1,419,115. The biggest companies, such as Douglas, Boeing, Convair, and Lockheed, contributed \$75,000 each.

Orval R. Cook, a retired Air Force major general, is president of Aerospace at an annual salary of \$49,999.92. He testified that besides research and educational projects, Aerospace does some lobbying. One goal was the contract renegotiation act, with Aerospace undertaking, as Cook tactfully put it,

to clarify the "definition of excessive profits. This effort, which failed, would have meant millions in cold hard cash to the big contractors."

What startled HÉBERT and the other committee members is that Aerospace is listed, for income tax purposes, as a nonprofit organization. In questioning Cook, it developed that the company's \$75,000 contribution is charged to the Government as a contract expense and then the company, on its income tax return, deducts it because it goes to a nonprofit organization.

"In other words," said HÉBERT commenting on Cook's testimony, "the taxpayer is paying to fight himself under this setup, and paying it two ways. The taxpayer has to pay for that contract against which \$75,000 is charged. So it is an expense item. The company is then allowed a tax deduction because it has contributed to a nonprofit organization and the nonprofit organization takes that money to advance the interests of the contract."

Asked how he thought he would come out if he were playing poker with a man who was using his money, Cook laughingly replied, "I would lose." He stressed in his testimony that lobbying is only a small part of the function of Aerospace, some of whose members have 100 percent of their business with the Government.

Pressure looking to big headlines has been on to subpoena Gen. Douglas MacArthur, whose salary as chairman of the board of Sperry-Rand is \$68,000. MacArthur was given five-star rank during World War II under a special act providing that five-star generals and admirals remain on active duty for life at a total compensation of about \$20,000 a year.

It is hardly necessary to add that these are the exceptions. Down below the generals and the admirals the great number of retired officers live frugally on relatively small pensions they justly feel they have earned. But they will also come under provisions of the legislation almost certain to come out of the inquiry.

Dedication of Maj. Frank M. Parker Army Reserve Training Center, Chambersburg, Pa., August 1, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to participate in the ceremonies in connection with the dedication of the Maj. Frank M. Parker Army Reserve Training Center, Chambersburg, Pa., Saturday, August 1, 1959, and to deliver the principal address.

The dedication ceremonies were attended by hundreds of citizens from Chambersburg and vicinity as well as the military Reserve units who will use the new center for training purposes. The program was interesting and revealed the great admiration and respect that the community had for Maj. Frank M. Parker who lost his life in Korea, as well as the "citizen soldiers" who comprise the Army Reserve units in Chambersburg.

My address follows:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE FRANK M. PARKER ARMY RESERVE TRAINING CENTER, CHAMBERSBURG, PA., AUGUST 1, 1959

It is a pleasure to be here in Chambersburg, with my wife and son, taking part in a ceremony of such great significance, both local and national, as the dedication of a new Army Reserve Training Center.

I appreciate the invitation and I share wholeheartedly in your satisfaction that the Army has honored Chambersburg, both by selecting the city for this center, and by naming it for Maj. Frank M. Parker, Jr., whose life and death reflect such glory upon his native city.

The sturdy and dignified memorial, serving so practical a patriotic purpose, and a purpose so suited to the character and career of Major Parker, must be gratifying to all who knew and loved him, and most of all to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. James M. Parker, to his wife, Phyllis, to his son, Frank M. Parker III, and to his daughter, Phyllis Kim Parker.

It is good to think that the children of Major Parker, who gave his talents and his energy, his enthusiasm and talent for leadership, to the service of his country, will live here in his city, with—ever before their eyes—this substantial evidence of the honor in which their father's name is held by his grateful country.

On this occasion, I should like to salute the Reserve organizations that are presently assigned to this Reserve training center; namely:

1. The 439th Engineer Company (float bridge), Company A, Third Battle Group, 12th Infantry, 79th Division;
2. Company C, 279th Transportation Battalion (armored carrier) 79th Division;
3. The 920th Ordnance Detachment (technical intelligence);
4. Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 2375th Engineer Group (combat) (reinforcement training).

As some of you have undoubtedly heard me say before, I look upon the work of the military Reserves as an essential patriotic duty, a sacrifice of time and effort which good citizens gladly undertake in order to do their part toward keeping their country alert and strong.

The Frank M. Parker Army Reserve Training Center is one of thousands of similar installations throughout the country authorized by the Congress of the United States to provide our Reserve forces with the necessary training facilities.

This Reserve training center will enable the local Army Reserve to continue to maintain their proficiency in the complicated art of modern warfare in this day and age.

Speaking of our Reserve forces as a whole they have not always been in the favorable position of having available adequate training facilities that the Chambersburg units will now enjoy.

Frankly, prior to World War II and also for a period of 4 or 5 years after World War II, our Reserve forces were sadly neglected, however, at that time the Congress recognizing the deplorable state of our Reserve forces enacted into law the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950.

Under the provisions of this so-called basic law—which is the keystone upon which our Reserve facilities programs operate—Congress indicated it would underwrite the construction of permanent training facilities throughout the country so as to insure the maintenance of an adequate Reserve program.

Under the provisions of the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 armories are constructed which are 100 percent federally

owned and authority is also given to contribute to the individual States for the construction of new National Guard training facilities.

In the latter case, the Federal Government contributes 75 percent of the money required for the development of the Reserve training facilities in conformance with Federal requirements.

For a moment I would like to review the actual status of the Army Reserve training program which includes at the present time nearly 2,000 Reserve training centers scattered throughout the Nation and our Territorial possessions yet only 458 of these training centers are considered by Army commanders to be adequate for continued long-range use.

As a result in the case of the Army Reserve the Department of Defense with the permission of Congress has initiated a vigorous and accelerated program of construction designed to replace existing inadequate facilities.

Thus, during 1958 there were 112 new centers under construction and 80 additional centers were programmed for fiscal year 1959 and 1960 thereby resulting in a total of more than 465 newly constructed facilities for the Army Reserve by the end of fiscal year 1961.

In referring to the Army Reserve program I am not unmindful of the Reserve components of the other branches of our Armed Forces who are likewise benefiting from the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950.

These Reserves of the Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and our National Guard play indispensable roles along with the Army Reserve in defense of this Nation in time of war.

The readiness of our Nation's military Reserves is a vital part of our national security and is best indicated by the recent assignment to the National Guard of concurrent responsibility with Regular Army forces for the manning of Nike batteries located throughout the United States.

This sharing of military responsibility is indicative of not only the state of readiness of various Reserve components but likewise reveals the new mission of the Reserves in modern warfare.

The overall program which involves the National Guard Reserve calls for the deployment of 33 Nike battalions at 116 sites by June 30, 1962.

All 24 of the Nike batteries scheduled to go "on-site" this summer have key personnel currently training at the Army Air Defense Center at Fort Bliss, Tex. The remaining members are actually training at Nike sites under the supervision of the Active Army.

Final transfer of the responsibility of manning the Nike sites from the Regular Army to National Guard units will take place following 2 weeks of field training this summer of the National Guard personnel concerned.

My purpose in referring to the National Guard and its new role in manning Nike battery sites is to emphasize by example the constantly changing requirements of a military reserve in this missile age.

Continuing to use the National Guard Reserve as an example it may be of interest to state that these National Guard missile sites are operated in much of the same way as a volunteer fire department.

In other words, a nucleus of full-time technicians man the equipment around the clock, keeping it in constant readiness and capable of initiating effective fire on the enemy without additional help.

The remaining members of the Nike missile unit are citizen soldiers in their communities and keep up on their military skills by attending weekly drills with their units.

In the event of an emergency these members report immediately to their unit and augment the full-time technicians already manning the equipment thus providing ade-

quate personnel to man and operate the missile unit.

This readiness of our Nation's military Reserves as exemplified by the National Guard Nike missile battery personnel is indicative of the degree of readiness that is to be found in the Reserves of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

In addition the changes in the mission of the National Guard reflect similar changes in military tactics and tables of organization applicable to all Reserve components.

What I am trying to say is simply this: Historically we have had both time and space advantages after the initiation of hostilities in which to expand our forces and provide for their support.

The advent of nuclear weapons in combination with swift means of delivery has denied us these time and space advantages in the event of a general nuclear war.

These changes in military tactics and tables of organization are not only affecting the mission of the Reserves but our military forces in general.

While some may disagree with my views I can see future wars being fought from continent to continent with guided missiles carrying nuclear warheads.

This means that the type of our present-day military machine will be obsolete in a few years unless we keep abreast from day to day with the development of nuclear weapons and the resulting revolution taking place from day to day in the technique of prosecuting war.

As we pass through this transitional period, Congress will be called upon to make momentous decisions affecting military manpower and equipment together with the roles and missions of our Armed Forces.

It has been said many times that without a strong economy the military might of our Armed Forces is imperiled.

Therefore, as we face decisions in the field of national defense, we must protect our economy by getting the most for our Armed Forces out of every dollar spent for national security.

As a member of the House Committee on the Armed Services, which has legislative jurisdiction over the reserves of our country, I wish to take this opportunity to commend the officers and men of Chambersburg's Army Reserve units and at the same time congratulate and thank the citizens of this area for the support they have always given our civilian soldiers, sailors, and airmen who, in the final analysis, are the bulwark of our Nation's defense.

In conclusion it is fitting that on the occasion of the dedication of this Army Reserve training center that we recognize it now and for posterity as a monument to the career and qualities of Maj. Frank M. Parker, a military Reserve who gained undying fame in rendering service to his country as a citizen and a soldier.

Maj. Frank M. Parker will long be remembered, with grateful affection and admiration, by the people of Korea whom he aided and defended, and by the people of America, to whom he stands as an example of stalwart patriotism, untiring energy, and industry, and friendly good neighborliness.

His memory is fittingly symbolized by the Bronze Star of valor; his outstanding service in Korea; symbolized by the sturdy bridge erected in his honor over the Imjin River; and by the loved and honored family that he has left behind him here in the Chambersburg area.

Major Parker will be remembered, too, from this day forward, as his spirit is enshrined in this building and in the organizations identified with it.

May his example be honored and followed by all who are privileged to know and to use the Frank M. Parker Army Reserve Center.

Comments on Proposed Amendment of Section 315 of the Federal Communications Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is expected that the House will shortly act on a bill which would amend section 315 of the Federal communications law to exempt various types of radio-TV newscasts from that law.

The American Civil Liberties Union, in a communication to me, presented a general discussion of the problem, which they believe would be of interest to the Members of the House.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the statement in the RECORD:

On June 30 the American Civil Liberties Union filed a statement concerning the various proposals before the Senate and House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to amend section 315 of the 1934 Federal Communications Act. We have now read the text of the bill approved by the Senate committee on July 15.

The key section of the bill is this paragraph: "Appearance by a legally qualified candidate on any newscast, news interview, news documentary, on-the-spot coverage of news events, or panel discussion shall not be deemed to be use of a broadcasting station within the meaning of this subsection."

At first glance, this would appear to eliminate the kind of problem created by the Federal Communications Commission in its decision in the *Lar Daly* case, by removing the handicap from which radio-TV networks and stations suffer with respect to the fullest presentation of news. As we said in our June 30 statement, we heartily endorse legislation which would exempt bona fide newscasts from the equal-time requirement of section 315.

However, the inclusion of "panel discussion" in the exemption presents the question whether such programs really fall within the bona fide news category or are in the area of speeches, for which, under section 315, equal opportunity must be accorded. As we said in our June 30 statement submitted to the committee:

"Our next comment has to do with the other bracketed portion of S. 1858, section 315(e)—'panel discussion, debate, or similar type program.' We recognize that there is some resemblance between such broadcasts and newscasts, news documentaries or news commentaries strictly defined; but we believe that there is also a dissimilarity, which may cause such broadcasts to be more properly treated as outright speeches of a candidate are treated. So, we urge that such broadcasts not be included in any exemption from the application of section 315 until a more thorough study can be made, particularly in the context of how outright speeches are to be treated."

We now again emphasize the need for the most careful consideration of what types of news program should be covered in the proposed exemption from section 315. In properly dealing quickly with the problem raised in the FCC's *Lar Daly* decision, which could interfere with real radio-TV news coverage, it appears to us that a more fundamental revision of section 315 is proposed without

sufficient guidance to the industry and the FCC on definitions.

For example, in last fall's gubernatorial campaign in New York State, the Republican, Democratic, Socialist Labor, and Independent Socialist parties took part in a discussion of the campaign issues. Would it be permissible, under the proposed new wording, to exclude minority party candidates from such a discussion? Also, minority party candidates have heretofore received some time for candidates' on-the-spot acceptance speeches at conventions. Would it be permissible, under the proposed new wording, to exclude them—even though such acceptance speeches by major party candidates were put on the air?

The desire to give a fair hearing in the presentation of campaign views on the air, which underlies section 315, is not basically a problem affecting the networks. Their news programming is so exposed to public review that any unfair treatment would be prevented by sensitive and experienced network executives. However, the situation at the local station level is different, where the understanding of section 315 and the local station management's responsibility is not as keen as on the network level. Thus, the real harm in failing to expose the public to the views of all candidates comes in the area where discussion and thought is most needed—the local community.

We hope that you will give careful thought to the problem we have raised above and that the Senate and the House will—pending further study—avoid broad changes in section 315.

Poison in Your Water—No. 151

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Sunday Independent of June 7, 1959, entitled "Health Problem Created Over Sewage Facilities":

HEALTH PROBLEM CREATED OVER SEWAGE FACILITIES

The inadequateness of sewage facilities in the rapidly expanding Dundee area has created a health problem for both Hanover Township and Nanticoke, a municipal official has revealed.

Some of the buildings of the section are equipped with sumps, while others have cesspools. Even so, the overflow is emptying into Black Creek which passes through Nanticoke on its way to the river.

Hanover Township police recently investigated a stench at Dewey Park and found it was due to sewage in the creek. The stream was running unusually low, due to lack of rainfall over a 4-week period, and contained little more than sewage, the investigation revealed.

The installation of sanitary sewerlines at Dundee and Loomis Park has not been planned by the Hanover Township Board of Commissioners, incidentally. Members say it would be too costly to pump sewage uphill to the sewage disposal plant located at Lyndwood. It would be better and more economical, they say, to run it through Nanticoke's lines—if and when the city establishes sewage disposal facilities.

Meanwhile, Dewey Park residents can do nothing but hope that Black Creek will run high for the balance of the spring and summer with a good mixture of sulfur water from mine operations in the Ashley-Sugar Notch area. Newport Township is allowed to dump its sewage into Forge Creek because of the high acid content of water fed into the channel daily by the mine at Wanamie.

Resolution Honoring Dr. Max Nussbaum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE HOLT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues a resolution passed by the California State Legislature honoring Dr. Max Nussbaum of Temple Israel of Hollywood, Calif.

The resolution follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 224

Resolution of Assembly, California Legislature, 1959 regular session, relating to Dr. Max Nussbaum

Whereas the life and achievements of Dr. Max Nussbaum are so extraordinary as to have been the subject of the nationally televised show "This Is Your Life," on April 22, 1959, the eve of Passover; and

Whereas the eve of Passover was appropriately chosen as the occasion for honoring Dr. Nussbaum in view of his participation in a modern-day exodus from Nazi Germany that in some ways paralleled the great Biblical exodus which preceded the first Passover; and

Whereas Dr. Nussbaum was born . . . with a rabbinical heritage, for his father, grandfather, and other forebears were rabbis; and

Whereas he followed in their footsteps, studying for the rabbinate at the rabbinical seminary in Breslau, Germany, and earning his way through the Universities of Breslau and Wurzburg, and receiving the degree of doctor of philosophy; and

Whereas Dr. Nussbaum was ordained a rabbi in 1936, and gave aid and comfort to his people in that capacity at the risk of his life during the period of Nazi persecution and oppression in Germany; and

Whereas he was instrumental in assisting many of the oppressed and persecuted in escaping from Nazi Germany; and

Whereas after many harrowing experiences and under threat of arrest and death, Dr. Nussbaum himself escaped the Nazis and migrated to the United States, where in 1942 he was appointed Rabbi of Temple Israel in Hollywood, Calif.; and

Whereas Dr. Nussbaum was the cornerstone in the establishment of the Hollywood Inter-Faith Forum, which has done much to increase understanding and cooperation among various religious groups; and

Whereas Dr. Nussbaum has performed a leading role in raising funds for and serving in various ways the people of all faiths; and

Whereas in his own faith Dr. Nussbaum became chairman of the national executive council of the Zionist Organization of America, the national vice president of the American Jewish Congress, and a director of the United Israel Appeal: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That Dr. Max Nussbaum is an outstanding example of the type of citizen of which this State can be justly proud and

that this body commends Dr. Nussbaum for his outstanding career as religious leader, humanitarian, and spearhead of interfaith understanding and cooperation; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit suitably prepared copies of this resolution to Dr. Max Nussbaum of Hollywood, Calif.

Signed:

RALPH M. BROWN,
Speaker of the Assembly.

Attest:

ARTHUR A. OHNIMUS,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

It Isn't Too Much To Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CARLTON LOSER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous-consent rule, I wish to call to the attention of the Congress a rather timely editorial appearing in the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner of a day or two ago.

It is now apparent that the head of the Government of Soviet Russia will visit the United States soon at the invitation of the President.

It seems to me that it is manifestly in the national interest that our No. 1 basic industry get back into production of steel before Nikita Khrushchev arrives in this country for his tour of the United States.

America's greatest industry is at a standstill—steel. Its smokestacks are smokeless, and thousands of men are on strike. Unless this controversy is settled soon thousands of others not involved in the controversy will be idle.

Such a dilemma will furnish fuel for Mr. Khrushchev's "mill" when he returns to Russia and reports to his people on the visit.

Secretary of Labor Mitchell has criticized the contending parties for the slowness of the collective bargaining, and I am not now informed as to what progress is being made. I have no opinion as to the merits of the claims of either party to the dispute. My point is that this controversy should be settled as soon as is practicable, and certainly before our visitor from the Soviet Union arrives.

The Banner editorial poignantly points up this situation, and expresses the hope "that when Nikita Khrushchev arrives for that visit he will not be treated to the sight of smokeless smokestacks." May I express the hope that the contending parties will amicably and equitably settle the controversy, and that the might and strength of America—its steel production—will be presented to Mr. Khrushchev in a most favorable light.

I commend the reading of this fine editorial to Americans everywhere. It follows:

[From the Nashville Banner]

IT ISN'T TOO MUCH TO HOPE

It isn't too much to hope, surely, that when Nikita Khrushchev arrives for that

visit he won't be treated to the sight of smokeless smokestacks—the symbol of shut-down—atop America's basic industry.

That is, of course, steel. It is another production line in which this Nation leads the world; but it is paralyzed right now—the fires out; closed by strike, for failure to reach contractual terms acceptable to both sides. And worse than that, some related industries crippled, with the further threat that if the controversy is prolonged many of these likewise will grind to a halt.

That isn't a picture of solidarity calculated to enlighten the Soviet Premier on facts of national strength. On the contrary, it could suggest to him the exact opposite of that, and indulge his own exaggerated ideas of weaknesses and paralysis of democratic methods in the pinch.

And if, in addition to smokeless chimneys, he is treated to the glimpse of picketing—with placards of accusation, and signs of dissension; if he hears the hubbub of furious assault and counterassault, Americans assailing Americans—the picture he will get is of disunity. That won't convince him of oneness. It would, in fact, gratify him as substantiation of his false premise that capitalism is hanging on the ropes, just ready to be pushed over by the Communist thrust he has been ready to supply.

America has the opportunity of showing its best face—its true face—to this official guest; and by a demonstration of its capacity for good sense and self-discipline accomplish something that conceivably could shape world events toward peace. The responsibility is not the President's alone, or the Government's; it is shared by all.

It is in America's interest in every way, to get those production lines turning again—and on a basis that will not whip up the forces of inflation.

It is not too much to ask that this settlement be speeded.

Let's get the smoke pouring again and those furnaces going, before Mr. Khrushchev comes calling. It would be downright embarrassing to have to tell him about harmony when there were signs all around at testing to the contrary.

The Late Honorable Mary T. Norton

SPEECH

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow and a sense of deep personal loss that I learned of the death of the Honorable Mary T. Norton. Like all who had the privilege of knowing her, I had the greatest respect and admiration for this wise and gracious lady who made such a tremendous contribution to our national welfare during her long public service.

Mrs. Norton combined great ability and breadth of vision with a strong and courageous will. As a Member of the House, especially as chairman of important committees, she was instrumental in the enactment of numerous important measures that have been of lasting benefit to the whole country. Mrs. Norton's name will always be associated with progressive, humanitarian pro-

grams. She had deep compassion for the poor and weak, and was a staunch advocate of social welfare measures.

Mrs. Norton had many memorable firsts in her distinguished career. She was the first Democratic Congresswoman, the first woman to head a congressional committee, and the first woman chairman of a major House committee. Her accomplishments were great, and she has earned a unique place in American history.

The American people have much reason to be grateful to this dedicated public servant. She was a great lady, and her passing is keenly felt by all who knew her. I join my colleagues in expressing to her dear ones my deepest sympathy.

The Doctor's Dilemma Is Our Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, our Nation faces an increasing shortage of doctors. Reasons for this shortage and what can be done to solve it are set out in "The Dangerous Decline in Doctors," by Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER. This article appeared in the Progressive magazine for August 1959. Senator NEUBERGER believes in medical research and the other aspects of the field. He has good reason to. As he states in the article, "It has taken at least four such individuals—trained physicians—to save my life."

The article follows:

THE DANGEROUS DECLINE IN DOCTORS

(By Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon)¹

As a recent cancer patient, I have a keen personal appreciation of this country's urgent need for an adequate supply of trained physicians. It has taken at least four such individuals to save my life.

There was the specialist in internal medicine who detected the tumor in its early stages, before it had begun to produce overt symptoms. A surgeon removed the tumor. A pathologist studied the tumor carefully and then revealed that it was of a cell-type responsive to destruction by radiation. For 5 months a radiologist administered cobalt 60 rays to the customary spread area of this particular malignancy.

In addition to these doctors, I could also list the famous cancer specialist who came from the East to consult on the case, the physician who administered the anesthetic, the assistant surgeon who participated in the operation, and an associate of the radiologist who assisted in the cobalt therapy. There were two other pathologists who concurred in the diagnosis regarding the type of tumor involved.

¹ Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, U.S. Senator from Oregon, has been a leader in health and medical research legislation since he entered the Senate in 1955. He was the successful sponsor last year of bills providing additional salary protection for the skilled researchers of the National Institutes of Health.

This is a total of 9 or 10 skilled physicians who were necessary at one stage or another of the case. And mine was only one of the 450,000 new cases of cancer diagnosed in the United States each year.

Are we as a nation producing enough physicians to handle this and other medical problems of equal or greater magnitude? The answer to so crucial a question is not especially encouraging. Two decades ago 133 doctors ministered to the sick needs of each 100,000 Americans. Today the figure has dropped slightly to 130 doctors. By contrast, in the Soviet Union, which had a 1940 ratio of only 73 doctors for every 100,000 Russians, there are now 164 doctors to serve this many people. Even though American medical training is more thorough and of longer duration than its Soviet counterpart, these comparative figures are a challenge to the entire American Nation—particularly in their clear demonstration that our country is not training enough physicians.

The good health of any population is dependent upon the quality and quantity of its doctors. At least in the latter respect, the United States is falling short. A panel of distinguished consultants has recently reported to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that "it would not be in the public interest for the number of physicians per 100,000 population to fall below 132. . . . Yet, in order to sustain such a ratio, the production of doctors would have to expand by the year 1970, according to the Federal constants, to 8,700 annually from medical schools in our own land and 750 additional from foreign schools. This compares with the output of only 6,800 physicians in 1956. Our domestic production of doctors will have to increase by at least 27 percent. As many as 20 new medical schools may have to be built if the current number of doctors per 100,000 Americans is not to drop, and a medical school requires many millions of dollars for the building, equipping, and staffing of its elaborate facilities.

"And," adds the report submitted to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, "to meet this need, construction would have to begin in the immediate future and be completed within a few years." Not even 20/20 vision can detect any such activity. Few new medical schools are on the drawing boards or in the blueprint stage, and a medical school rarely graduates a class earlier than 10 years after its construction has started.

Why is the United States, a nation wealthy enough to spend \$15 billion on liquor and tobacco and some \$25 billion on motor cars, confronted with an alarming dearth of the trained men and women required to keep Americans well?

To begin with, medical education in the United States is running an annual operating deficit of between \$10 million and \$20 million at the present time. Despite this fact, the cost of becoming a doctor is virtually prohibitive for the average family. Medical tuition fees have been raised constantly, but they have failed to keep pace with medical school budgets which rise still faster. Many medical students end their training heavily in debt. Worse yet, some of the best qualified of these students often must quit for financial reasons before they receive their medical degrees. There is a paucity of funds for scholarships and other assistance. The National Defense Education Act, despite all its good intentions, has made only relatively small sums available. Balancing the budget has become a higher goal than meeting national health needs.

Four years in medical school may cost a minimum of \$10,000—perhaps a good deal more. Besides, it must be remembered that medical education follows chronologically

after at least 4 earlier years in undergraduate work, when other debts may have accumulated. The typical patient in the United States looks at his doctor bill and then decides that doctors literally coin money. This unquestionably is true during a doctor's peak earning period. But many lean years have preceded this affluence.

Before he can practice on his own, a doctor spends some 3 or 4 years in residency at a hospital or institution. The New York Times has pointed out that salaries for interns rarely exceeds \$100 a month; they may be as low as \$70. What does this mean, the Times has pertinently asked, for doctors who have committed the folly of getting married and acquiring children? I know personally some interns who do not earn enough to feed and shelter their families. Unless their wives worked—and worked hard—they would be literally destitute. I remember some of my discussions with wives whose jobs made it possible for their husbands to continue at the fine medical school of the University of Oregon. One of them, who worked as a waitress because the tips gave her better pay than most opportunities open to a woman, said:

"When my husband finally treats his first private patient, we and the children will have behind us about 8 years of mushy breakfasts, canned soup lunches, and macaroni dinners. We don't even have a car of our own. If my husband ever becomes a successful doctor with two big cars in the family garage, I think we will have really earned it. Most people don't know about the sacrifice which goes into a medical career."

But need training for a doctor be as prolonged as it is now? Dr. Willard C. Rappleye, dean of the Columbia University Medical School, is one of those who doubts this is necessary. Dean Rappleye has observed: "There is no really good reason why youngsters interested in medicine could not be permitted to complete their preparation for medical schools earlier, either by letting them enter college sooner or by letting them take some of the needed work in high school. If they are not bright enough to do the work sooner, they do not belong in medicine. In Europe, medical training begins at 20. It should here, too."

Because justice cannot be done to an intensive scientific curriculum if the student himself is holding down an outside job, most medical students must depend upon financial assistance from parents at home or upon the earnings of their wives. Yet, in spite of the heavy burden upon the student, a medical school in America generally collects only about 20 cents of every dollar of its basic operating budget from tuition payments. The student is strapped financially, and so is the medical school. In the fiscal year of 1955-56, a total of only \$160 million was available to all the medical schools in the Nation. This was far less than Americans spent for chewing gum or permanent waves during the same period.

Many citizens believe that medical schools are extravagant and wasteful. Yet how many of these citizens want sketchy or skimpy training for men and women who will be licensed to cut with surgical knives into the human body, to administer dangerous drugs and strong medicines? Robert M. Cunningham, Jr., editor of Modern Hospital, has written in a public affairs committee pamphlet that "medical school budgets have already been trimmed to a point where any further reduction would endanger the quality of the program—that is, of medical teaching and research, and eventually of medical practice and medical care. Faculty time per student today is already 7 percent lower than it was 10 years ago; some schools have had to reduce teaching staffs to bare minimums * * * current

deficits now make it difficult to retain capable faculty members. Any further retrenchment, at a time when medicine is moving forward swiftly, is unthinkable to those who recognize our medical schools as a national resource."

Dr. Howard A. Rusk, medical editor of the New York Times and himself an international figure in the field of human rehabilitation, has emphasized that we shall need a net increase of about 5,250 new doctors each year in order to treat adequately the 230 million people who will be living in the United States by 1975. Our current rate of increase, however, is only 3,000 doctors a year. Nor does the imminent shortage of doctors take account of the other personnel shortages in realm of health, which Dr. Rusk lists as 70,000 more nurses [needed], 8,000 more occupational therapists, 3,500 more medical social workers, 6,000 more physical therapists, 2,200 more dietitians, 10,000 more clinical psychologists, 3,000 dental school graduates.

I referred earlier to the far higher proportionate increase in the number of doctors in Russia than in our own Nation. One explanation for this is that 76 percent of all Soviet physicians are women. The Russians have learned that medicine is a profession equally suited to females and males.

Have these Russian women doctors guarded successfully the health of their people? One answer has been supplied by John T. Connor, president of Merck & Co., one of the great American pharmaceutical manufacturers, in an analysis of Soviet medicine. While conceding that the average American doctor has 22 years of education behind him as compared with 16 for a Soviet physician, Connor recently noted the fact that, in 1927, life expectancy for the typical American was 58.5 years as contrasted with only 44 for the Russian citizen. By 1956, the average American lived to be 69.5 years of age, but the Soviet citizen was up to 67. "The Soviets have made this remarkable record by cutting their mortality rate 75 percent since the revolution," said Connor. "They have made most of their progress in fairly recent years."

In Russia a female medical student receives her whole education from the state. She pays no tuition and her keep is furnished by the government. In turn, she sacrifices much freedom. She can be sent to minister to the workers in a certain factory, to the students at a particular college, or even to the inhabitants of a fishing village on some lonely river in far-off Siberia. No American doctor would tolerate such servitude to the state. Yet we pay some penalties, too, for our complete individualism. Senator ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska, a graduate of Harvard Medical School, has observed that "large areas of Alaska are almost totally lacking in medical services. Many of their people live and die without benefit of therapy."

While there may be plenty of doctors in a fashionable, high-income area like Beverly Hills, the shortage can doom to earlier deaths than necessary sharecroppers on the Mississippi Delta or unemployed loggers in the Oregon hills. American doctors, being completely human, seek out locations in which the likelihood of prompt payment of bills is fairly promising. Who can blame them, in the light of our acquisitive culture? Furthermore, we have made relatively little use of a great reservoir of potential skill and talent in our Negroes who aspire to be doctors. Their opportunities for medical education are so scant and difficult as to be practically nonexistent. Yet, why should they not have the chance to treat and care for their people? In the comparatively rare instances where Negroes have gone to medical school, they often have become practitioners with a high degree of skill and knowledge.

What shall we do in our country? Once again, the answer can be found in prompt, generous, and effective action at the Federal level. The panel advising the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare was headed by Dr. Stanhope Bayne-Jones, former dean of the Yale Medical School. It included many other illustrious figures in modern medicine. Most of these people were conservatives in their economic approach. Yet they concluded that the total medical effort of the Nation would decline "unless a large construction program designed to expand markedly the facilities of the Nation's system of medical and related schools is undertaken in the immediate future." And they added:

"The consultants find that unless construction funds become available on a much larger scale than has heretofore been contemplated, the output of physicians will not keep pace with population growth and the needs of the Nation for research workers will not be met. Unless there is a marked change in social philosophy leading to private gifts or State appropriations on an unprecedented scale, large Federal appropriations will be required." The consultants, most of them doctors, recognized that only the U.S. Government possessed the resources to do the job.

Three steps are urgently needed to protect the health of the American people:

1. There must be \$500 million in Federal funds appropriated soon for the construction of medical teaching and research institutions. A good beginning has been the \$30 million annually provided for health research facilities in legislation sponsored several years ago by Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama. The Bayne-Jones report has warned that "even if funds in the order of \$500 million to \$1 billion were made available immediately for construction of new medical schools, it seems certain that the number of physicians per 100,000 population will decline between now and 1970." We must remember that it calls for a capital investment of about \$50 million to erect a new medical school, to say nothing of the cost of its day-to-day operation.

2. Adequate scholarships must be provided for all young men or women of talent who aspire to be doctors, and these must be offered without any restrictions, as to race, creed, religion, political affiliation, or color.

3. Extra incentive must be furnished to induce gifted medical students and other scientists to enter medical research. The family doctor would have only aspirin tablets and a clinical thermometer unless there had been people of genius in research laboratories over the years. I have introduced an amendment to the Federal Scholarship Act providing 10-percent forgiveness on any student loan from the Government for each year spent in medical research—up to a total of 50 percent. This is only a frail and modest beginning, but it firmly establishes the principle of Federal encouragement of additional participation in medical research.

Taxpayers interested in a balanced budget will ask how these things are to be paid for. I agree with them that we cannot continue indefinitely shoving off our burdens on the citizens of the future. They will have plenty of problems of their own. Therefore, I have introduced four bills to increase Federal revenues by a total of some \$3.2 billion. They are:

1. Raising the Federal gasoline and motor-fuels tax by 1½ cents a gallon.
2. Restoring the excess-profits tax of the Korean war on the manufacturers of armaments and weapons of war.
3. Reducing the special depletion allowance for oil and gas companies from 27½ percent to 15 percent.

4. Permitting the U.S. Post Office Department to set its own postage rates, based on sound fiscal and cost-accounting methods.

These proposals may call for sacrifice. Yet can such pocketbook sacrifices begin to compare with the agony, suffering, and even death we may be inflicting upon future generations of Americans if we do not provide sufficient facilities to train the doctors needed to protect them?

United States Has Road Fund Obligation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an editorial from the Sunday, August 2, 1959, State Journal, of Lansing, Mich., putting the finger on one of the many and major faults in the Ways and Means Committee proposal for the highway trust fund.

If there has been a single laudatory comment upon the recommendation to slow down the interstate highway program and to earmark part of the automobile excise tax to pay off a revenue bond issue, it has escaped my notice.

I strongly recommend that the committee give this problem additional study, and come up with a more acceptable answer.

The State Journal's editorial follows:

UNITED STATES HAS ROAD FUND OBLIGATION

News of a prospective slowdown in the interstate superhighway building program came as something of a thunderbolt to State highway planners during the past week.

Justifiable indignation was voiced immediately from many States at the unexpected recommendation of the House Ways and Means Committee. Michigan, as one of the States whose programing has been energetically pushed, seems likely to be a major victim of the cutback if it materializes.

What the planning experts know but few average citizens realize is that diversion at the Federal level of funds collected from America's motorists is primarily responsible for the present lack of money to carry through the multibillion-dollar program on the basis of the original Federal pledges to the States.

It is a little-publicized fact that less than 60 percent of Federal automotive taxes goes into highways. The remainder is channeled into the Government's general fund and is used for nonhighway purposes such as foreign aid and new post offices, to cite only two examples.

Federal gasoline and diesel fuel taxes and levies on tires and tubes go into the highway trust fund, but excise taxes on automobiles, parts and accessories and the tax on lubricating oil, amounting to a combined total of more than \$1.5 billion yearly, go into the general fund.

If the recommendation of the House committee prevails and the interstate highway program is drastically slowed, the Federal Government will not be keeping faith with the States which have moved forward to meet previous commitments for expressway construction in the next several years. For

that matter, the Federal Government will also be reneging on an implied promise to motorists that the tax increase on gasoline voted in 1956 would provide the funds necessary to complete the 40,000-mile interstate network by 1972.

The plan, as advanced by the House committee, is to drag the project out at least four more years, with particularly sharp cutbacks scheduled for 1960, 1961, and 1962.

Michigan, for instance, already has programmed \$84 million in 1960 interstate highway construction out of a total of \$96.7 millions that had been promised the State for the fiscal year. The House committee's proposed slowdown would cut back Michigan's program in 1960 to only \$58.6 millions. Further cutbacks are indicated for 1961 and 1962.

Comparative accident statistics already show that the safer superhighways can be the means of saving thousands of lives now needlessly sacrificed. Even so, the lengthening by 4 years of the period during which the entire 40,000-mile interstate highway system would be completed, as now proposed by the House committee, would encounter fewer violent objections if the Federal Government did not waver on commitments made for the early years for which plans already are well advanced.

Highway construction, as every motorist realizes, involves a lot more than simply bringing in a paving machine to lay a ribbon of concrete. It takes months of advance planning, in engineering, in right-of-way purchases, in alerting the highway construction industry to impending needs, and in accumulating vast stores of materials.

As a case in point, the Michigan highway department, accepting the Federal Government at its word, proceeded in good faith with preparations for the big construction program outlined for 1960. If the program is cut back as now proposed much of the effort, time and money spent in preparation for the Michigan interstate construction program in 1960 will have been expended prematurely and hence wastefully. It might better have been used for other phases of the State highway program. Michigan, in fact, only last week sold \$50 millions in highway bonds at a high interest rate to provide funds for the building program.

President Eisenhower had recommended that the Federal gasoline tax be increased an additional 1½ cents per gallon, to a total of 4½ cents, to provide more funds for the Federal aid program. Motorists generally were not in sympathy with the President's recommendation, and Congress declined to accede to the request.

The logical view of motorists that all automotive taxes be used for highway construction before new taxes are added for this purpose, was not supported, however, by the House committee, which instead recommended that the program be slowed down but suggested that a \$1 billion bond issue be created to cushion the blow. The bond issue is opposed by the administration, as inflationary.

In view of the potential savings represented by the House committee's recommended cutback in foreign aid, it would seem only reasonable for Michigan to expect its full 1960 Federal allotment for interstate road building.

Unlike many of the Federal Government's other expenditures, the highway construction funds are a commitment amounting virtually to a contract with the States. Since Michigan has proceeded in good faith in the direction pointed out by Washington, certainly there is an obligation now for Congress to seek and find ways to make good on its end of the bargain.

The 115th Tactical Fighter Squadron, Air National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE HOLT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the splendid record of the 115th Tactical Fighter Squadron, 146th Tactical Fighter Wing, of the California Air National Guard. This squadron and wing is located in the 22d Congressional District of California, which I represent, and has earned not only honors for its safety record, but the high regard of the community for its cooperation and civic endeavors.

In addition, I should like to point out that the wing has won a total of six awards within the past year; three of these awards were won by the 115th Squadron. First, the wing was presented a trophy for the best operational readiness of any wing on the west coast for the 6 months, April to October 1958; second, the 115th received a flight safety award for an accident-free record for July 1 to December 12, 1958; third, the 115th received the coveted Spaatz trophy from the National Guard Bureau for the best tactical squadron; fourth, the 115th won the Air Force Association outstanding unit trophy for the past year; fifth, the 146th won the Continental Air Command certificate of meritorious achievement in flight safety; sixth, one of the members of the 146th has been named the outstanding airman in the Air National Guard. Col. Robert D. Campbell, commander of the 146th Tactical Fighter Wing, and the men of the wing, deserve our commendation and congratulations.

The following article appeared in the July 1959 issue of Flying Safety magazine, published by the U.S. Air Force:

When a fighter squadron flies in bad luck for years, then wins a flight safety award for an outstanding accident-free record, there's more to it than a change of fortune. Other units can profit from the measures employed by supervisors to make the 115th Tactical Fighter Squadron a credit rather than a debit to the Air National Guard and the U.S. Air Force. The question is, What did they do right?

For years the 115th Tactical Fighter Squadron had either led the accident parade or been right in there pitching for the runner-up honors. Bad luck seemed to dog the footsteps of each succeeding commanding officer and operations officer. Standing operations procedures were rewritten. Pilots were harangued, grounded, or hanged as befitted their offenses. Corrective action was always promptly initiated, after the fact, after the bent or charred F-86 or T-33 was assigned to the base fire detachment for practice drills. Letters were written and conferences held to explain the discouraging succession of accidents. But none of these measures filled the bill. Accidents seemed to keep right on happening, and the hole in the dike was always plugged after the hangar was afloat.

Then suddenly, 2 years ago, mid-March of 1957 to be exact, the grim parade of accidents stopped. Missions were flown as briefed, and the birds came back unbent and unbroken. Month after month went by without so much as a scratch except for the fairing around the landing gear when the barrier caught a couple of strays. Deservedly, the 115th was nominated for the flight safety award and proudly accepted the honor. Here was news in capital letters. News on the positive side for a change. Not the kind of news that makes the front page, of course. But the kind of news that makes commanders and supervisors all up and down the line happy, contented, and ulcer free. But more than the surface news that all was well, there must be a story underneath. Why had the 115th become the model unit instead of the black sheep? What had this outfit done right?

Col. Robert D. Campbell, commander of the 146th Wing, ANG, at Van Nuys, Calif., and former commander of the 115th Squadron, had the ready and obvious answer to the why of the change. "Improved supervision at all levels has brought the 115th out of the woods," was his brief comment. Nothing startling here, of course, and yet it is the unarguable answer to the question of why any unit makes progress in efficiency and flight safety. Of course, this is easy to say. The details of how this improved supervision came about, just what steps were taken to improve supervision, are more to the point. So with the thought that other organizations might profit from the hard-won lessons of the 115th, Colonel Campbell decided to call together all the supervisors involved in the rags-to-riches story of the 115th and put on paper the actual day-by-day measures taken to do the job.

Looking back to the period just before the accidents stopped, the assembled supervisors agreed that the first step in the right direction came from a basic policy change within the 146th Wing. At that time it had been the policy of the wing that all rated staff members be current in the tactical aircraft assigned. This means that the 115th and the other squadrons assigned to the wing were carrying an insupportable load of attached pilots. The 115th itself had 81 assigned or attached pilots to fly in the 25 assigned F-86's, and two T-33's. Simple mathematics, a little multiplication in this case, showed that there just wasn't enough time to go around. If the available time were prorated, none of the pilots could comply with the minimum 60-2 requirements. Furthermore, the tactical or seat pilots had not the least chance of flying the 110-plus hours required annually by CONAC Training Directive 10-12. The result was, of course, that pilots would come out to fly time after time and find no airplane available. This in turn meant that rechecks were needed for those who did not maintain currency. And the IP load on the two full-time flying training supervisors became ridiculous.

Therefore, the first step, a policy change by the wing, was the decree that only the assigned tactical pilots, their commanding officers, "ops" officers, group and wing commanders, two flying training supervisors and the Air Force adviser would fly the unit's aircraft. In the case of the 115th this brought the pilot load down to a workable 39 total. The admittedly loose supervision now had a chance to tighten up.

The order then went out to weed out all the unlucky pilots, and all those who were not fully participating in the program for one reason or another. A review of the records was made and check rides the grand scale. Heads started to

roll of weeding out pilots, flight qualifications now came under And changes were made

here. Higher qualification standards were set up and the new flight commanders had to measure up to some pretty exacting requirements. When the smoke cleared, all the flight commanders appointed had been through Nellis gunnery training, or had been instructors at Nellis; had had Korean combat experience, and had been through, or instructed at, the Air Force Instrument School at Moody Air Force Base, Ga. It goes without saying that the flying training supervisors were also of comparable experience.

An analysis of the past accident records showed that 60 percent of all major mishaps had occurred on cross-country flights. Pilots had, in the past, been authorized flights beyond their individual capability and as a result had been dotting the landscape with smoldering heaps of F-86 aluminum. Poor weather flying technique turned out to be the main cause factor, and cross-country flying was suspended for all pilots until they were put through a complete instrument training program. For 4 months the squadron pilots stayed close to home and flew hood and Link until things shaped up.

The briefing guides and methods now came in for their share of attention. The guides were revised, the PIF brought up to date, and flight leaders were retrained to brief according to a strict and comprehensive method.

Next, the squadron standardization board was rejuvenated and the old double standard days were gone. The older pilots now no longer flew according to the old 8th or 5th Air Force rules. As the commanding officer, Maj. Charles Nelson says, "The boys found out that they were no longer going to fly according to Hoyle or Goren. They were going to fly according to me."

For the reader who knows little about Air National Guard operations it might be wise to digress for a bit and review the bidding on Guard operations and the men who fly with the Guard. Contrary to the opinion of some, the Air National Guard is a full-time operation and is assigned operational duties by the Air Force, through the major commands. These duties augment the overall operations commitments of the Air Force. The standards of training set up for the Air National Guard through CONAC are fully as demanding as those set up for regular units. The individual pilots fly as many hours annually as the regular Air Force pilot and all this in spite of the fact that almost all of them have outside civilian jobs. Only two pilots, the flying training supervisors, are assigned full time duty to a guard fighter squadron. In the last 6 months of 1958 the 115th flew 2,455 F-86 hours, 352 T-33 hours, 275 C-45 hours and 173 C-47 hours.

The planes are maintained according to the same tech orders the Air Force uses and the average guard squadron maintenance records compare very favorably with those of the Air Force in such things as in commission and AOCIP rates. As Colonel Campbell says, "I've never had any kick about the maintenance done by my Guardsmen. Our troubles were always primarily in the operational field. But just to tighten up everywhere along the line, we looked into the maintenance-operations relationship. Maintenance now, in effect, schedules operations in that planes are flown according to inspection schedules and with this better planned inspection program we get better quality control. There's no pushing of maintenance by our ops people. Furthermore, the maintenance supervisors are always included in our flying safety meetings and contribute greatly to the safety effort."

The Guardsman pilot must spend most of his otherwise free time in ground and air training at the various sites and many of them commute well over 100 miles to their stations. In the Van Nuys setup, the average commuting distance is about 25 miles.

Naturally, this creates problems at home because the little wife takes a dim view of the absentee husband routine. Recognizing this, Colonel Campbell has suggested that the guardsman keep his guard pay separate and show the little woman just what it will buy. Anything from a mink coat to a washing machine, bought solely with guard pay, is a real persuader, according to him.

To go on with the operational changes, a hard minimum of 10 hours per month was set up for the tactical pilots. A pilot can miss this 1 month but the second month will see him getting the fish eye from the commanding officer, and his days in the guard are numbered. A recheck is automatic if for any reason the pilot gets less than 2 hours per month.

A full-time air officer is on duty at any time the planes are in the air. At a drome such as Van Nuys where the runway is only 6,000 feet long and the surrounding area is well built up with residences and factories, it is especially important that airplanes do not attempt any get-home heroics. When an emergency exists the air officer generally orders the pilot to another airdrome. It must be noted here that there is no radio landing aid at Van Nuys airport. Furthermore, their fine record has been made in an area of poor visibility and high air traffic density.

The flying safety officer duties were given to one of the full-time flying training supervisors, Capt. Henry J. "Jack" Williams. According to Jack, "There's no such thing as a part-time flight service officer and the practice of having one of the part-time pilots carry on this job had to stop."

With the short (6,000-foot) runway at Van Nuys, special operational restrictions were put into effect. The F-86 would no longer be flown with external tanks when the temperature climbed to 80 degrees or over. The T-Birds were cut down to 100 gallons maximum in the tip-tanks, and the barrier was raised on every approach. Two saves of '86s have been recorded so far and served to preserve the safety record.

A special operational problem arose when a USAF policy change resulted in Guard units getting new pilot trainees direct from basic flying school with no F-86 time under their belts. Fifteen of these young pilots came to the 115th during the past 2 years, and five of them were eliminated through the stringent training requirements which were imposed. These five, though badly needed by the squadron, were potential accidents and had to go. The other 10 are today fully operationally ready with fine gunnery records. And this in spite of the fact that the 115th cannot at any time schedule gunnery missions from the home drome. Most of the missions were flown from George and Williams Air Force Bases, the latter 300 nautical miles away.

The 115th has set up a comprehensive quarterly exam on emergency procedures. In addition to this the daily flight briefings include one or more questions on emergency and normal procedures. Furthermore, attached to every clearance, local or cross-country, there is a mimeographed emergency procedure question which the pilot must answer and the air officer must check, before the pilot takes off.

The training folder system on each pilot has been closely watched. In this way the flight commanders or check pilots have access to all mission reports, the standardization mission profiles, the ops readiness certificate, all exams and questionnaires, and the Link trainer grades. Nothing in a pilot's record is left to the memory of the supervisor. A bad trend is thus quickly spotted and a check ride scheduled.

On cross-country flights, the F-86's are not allowed to fly alone. Two or more aircraft are always scheduled. The T-33's have two

pilots aboard unless the mission is transition solo. The tactical pilots are required to be current in the F-86 only. The IPs and supervisors are the only pilots required to be current in more than one aircraft. Further than this, since the squadron has had the F-86A, E and F models at one time, a pilot flies only the A or the E and F. One checklist at a time is enough, according to Capt. Jack Williams.

Supervisors tightened up on the boring holes method of flying. Every hour was made to pay off in solid training with specific mission assignments. Individual instrument minimums were placed on each pilot of the organization according to his ability. One pilot might be allowed to fly into an away-from-home airport with the published minimum weather prevailing. Another might be required to sit on the ground until the weather picture improved. This one requirement has caused a lot of hurt feelings but no hurt flesh.

Two years ago the wing commander requested a visit by the Operations Safety Survey team of the Directorate of Flight Safety Research. Within 3 months of the team's visit all recommendations made had been complied with. Colonel Campbell is enthusiastic about the help given him by the specialists who accompanied General Caldarone on this visit.

In a high-density area such as Van Nuys the midair collision is always a threat. To combat this, special corridors for approach and departures were set up locally in cooperation with Burbank and the Federal Aviation Agency. Today, near-miss incident reports are infrequent. And the pilots at Van Nuys fly from an airport which lies under two Victor and three low frequency airways.

To wrap it all up, according to the supervisors at Van Nuys, the safety award came as a result of making every pilot a flying safety officer, aware at all times of his individual responsibility toward an accident-free record. To be a flying safety officer the pilot of course had first to know how to fly and to take pride in his individual ability. In June of 1957, the 115th had only one pilot qualified ready, according to AFM 335-25 and CONAC Training Directive 10-12. Today, 29 of the 31 assigned seat pilots are so qualified. The other two are now at Air Force schools receiving additional specialized training. The 115th is now a firm unit of competent, responsible pilots, average age 26, who are prepared to join the Regular Air Force on an equal basis when the need comes.

Interesting Views on Cooperative Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, there has been widespread comment on a bill introduced in the other body, which would relieve agricultural cooperatives from certain restraints of the antitrust laws.

I am sure that my colleagues will be interested in reading the editorials on this legislation by the Dairy Record, of St. Paul, and the Washington Post:

[From the St. Paul Dairy Record, July 29, 1959]

BILL TO EXEMPT CO-OPS FROM ANTITRUST LAWS RAISES STORM OF PROTEST—SENATE RETURNS MEASURE TO AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE ON MONDAY OF THIS WEEK

WASHINGTON.—Approval of a bill by the Senate Agricultural Committee, without hearings, to exempt agricultural cooperatives from antitrust laws raised a storm of protest here last week.

Action by the Senate was scheduled last Friday, but the bill was skipped over on the Senate Calendar, after objections were raised from both sides of the aisle. Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Democrat, Texas, majority leader, said the bill might be brought up again later.

However, the bill was returned to committee on Monday of this week, and observers here feel certain that there will be no further action on the measure. A similar bill has been introduced in the House by Representative WATKINS M. ABBITT, Democrat, Virginia. The Senate bill was sponsored by Senator RUSSELL B. LONG, Democrat, Louisiana.

WOULD OFFSET COURT ORDER

The measure is receiving major attention because it would counteract a court order directing the Maryland-Virginia Milk Producers Association to get rid of Embassy Dairy here. The case is now pending before the Supreme Court (Daily Record, July 22).

In a letter sent to each Member of the Senate, officials of Chestnut Farms, Thompson, Harvey, and High's Dairies stated that the proposed bill would give cooperatives sweeping and retroactive immunity from antitrust prosecution which no segment of the economy should have.

"The bill," said the four firms, "can be a terrible assault on the entire business community." The dairies suggested that a close study be made of the position taken by the Justice Department, whose antitrust lawyers strongly advised against passage of the measure.

JUSTICE ATTACKS BILL

Included with the letters went copies of a statement to Senator ELLENDER, Democrat, of Louisiana, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, from Deputy Attorney General L. E. Walsh, which outlined the Justice Department's position on the measure.

Walsh stated that the proposed bill could amount to virtually complete exemption of cooperatives from the antitrust laws.

He added that "we are aware of no reason why the exemption from antitrust prohibitions which cooperatives already enjoy should be further increased." He pointed out that the Capper-Volstead Act has always been considered to include the right of cooperatives to own and operate marketing facilities.

MAY HURT COMPETITION

But acquisition of such facilities by a cooperative in a particular instance "may run afoul of the antitrust laws because it may seriously imperil competition or tend to create a monopoly," Walsh noted.

Farmer cooperatives themselves may be harmed by the proposed legislation, he warned. "If the bill were to effect complete exemption of cooperatives from the antitrust laws, a cooperative injured in its business by unfair business practices on the part of another cooperative would be left without a remedy," he said.

"Under such circumstances, individual farmers would be at the mercy of cooperatives in competing for markets and small cooperatives would exist at the sufferance of the larger ones," he claimed.

CITES POSSIBLE CASE

Under this proposed law, said Walsh, an association or associations of agricultural producers might be free to purchase a supermarket chain, with no basis for antitrust scrutiny, and afterward the acquired company could engage in predatory pricing—to drive out competitors—with no fear of antitrust laws.

Also announcing its opposition to the measure last week was the Milk Industry Foundation.

Late in the week, cooperative leaders here were reported to be viewing developments on this bill with alarm. They fear the unfavorable publicity will bring on renewed and stronger demands for repeal of the present cooperative tax exemptions.

[From the St. Paul Daily Record]

CO-OP BILL STINKS

One of the most vicious pieces of legislation to come before this session of Congress is that introduced by Senator RUSSELL B. LONG, Democrat of Louisiana, and Representative WATKINS M. ABBITT, Democrat of Virginia, which would make cooperative organizations practically exempt from antitrust action and could, conceivably, make it possible for giant cooperatives to take over the entire food industry.

The bill has been introduced in the Senate by Senator LONG, and one of the startling things about it is that approval was given to the highly controversial measure by the Senate Agriculture Committee without hearings. It is a bill that should have been shelved summarily in committee.

According to the Long bill, an activities, contracts, and practices of cooperatives would be subject to, and within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The Department of Agriculture has indicated that it is opposed to Congressional action at this time because of the action now pending in the Supreme Court on the Embassy Dairy, Maryland-Virginia Milk Producer Association case. However, a spokesman for the USDA, who was not identified, did waver on the subject by stating that it might favor something along the lines of the bill in the future.

The Department of Justice, however, is taking a firm stand on the matter, for Deputy Attorney General Lawrence E. Walsh told the Senate committee in a letter that the measure radically revises existing law and would have the effect of cancelling the Justice Department's lower court antitrust victory that requires the Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association to divest itself of the Embassy Dairy that was acquired by that Cooperative in 1954.

He pointed out that the language of the bill could very well be interpreted as granting the cooperatives of practically blanket immunity from antitrust prosecution. Mr. Walsh stated that the farm cooperatives now are immune from antitrust prosecution when they organized to establish uniform prices, to operate processing and distribution facilities and to jointly buy farm equipment and other supplies.

However, it did point out that under existing law, a farm cooperative is just like any other corporate entity and is subject to antitrust restrictions against predatory conduct such as blacklisting, boycotting, and monopolization.

The bill has all the earmarks of sponsorship by the Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association which apparently is fearful that the case will meet the same fate in

the Supreme Court that it did in the lower court. The association has refused to admit or deny sponsorship of the bill which probably gives more credence to widespread reports that it is the moving spirit behind the proposed legislation.

The bill is manifestly unfair to private business that must abide by the monopoly laws. It conceivably could make an octopus of giant cooperatives, for it would provide them with such power that it would be possible for them to absorb heavily taxed private business and, carried to the extreme, it would mean a long step toward a more socialistic state.

Looking at the measure from a standpoint of the cooperatives, themselves, the proposal stinks to the high heavens. Not only would it be possible for the giant cooperatives to absorb private businesses, but it also would be possible for them to lay down an ultimatum to smaller cooperatives to merge or to be squeezed out of business. Fantastic as it may seem, it is in the realm of possibility that 10 or a dozen large cooperatives could take over the entire dairy industry or, for that matter, the entire food industry.

It is such legislation as this that brings increased demands from private business that tax exemptions which have been granted to cooperatives be eliminated. If the Maryland-Virginia Association is the sponsor of the bill, it is doing a tremendous disservice to the entire cooperative movement. It is bound to be repugnant to far-sighted cooperative leaders who want to see the cooperative movement grow and prosper on merit and not by legislation.

All we can hope for the Long-Abbutt measure is that it be so overwhelmingly defeated when it is presented to the Senate and the House that no group again will have the effrontery to make such a proposal, ever.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 1, 1959]
CO-OP MONOPOLY BILL

The Senate squeezed out of a very embarrassing situation the other day when it sent the co-op monopoly bill back to its Committee on Agriculture. Its embarrassment arose out of several factors. First, the measure had been quietly taken to the floor without any public hearings. Second, no one seemed to know precisely what it means. Third, it would apparently have reversed three important court decisions which have applied the antitrust laws to prevent the consummation of restrictive or monopolistic practices.

In these circumstances, the Senate might well have blasted the bill clear out of the legislative ballpark. Instead it merely returned the measure to the committee that had previously ignored its defects.

Though the Agriculture Committee has not yet scheduled hearings, it is expected to do so, and the co-op bill may soon be back on the floor. Perhaps it will then be better understood than it was last week, but this is by no means certain, for the committee is inclined to look at the bill as it affects the co-ops, and the chief question about this measure is the effect it would have on food monopolies extending far beyond the farm and farm marketing agencies.

The Department of Justice fears that this seemingly innocuous bill would enable a cooperative to buy all marketing outlets in an area and force all farmers to participate or be denied a means of getting their crops to market. Persons owning farms might also buy up the big grocery chains and engage in predatory pricing practices without running afoul of the antitrust laws. These fears do not seem to be exaggerated in view of the blanket immunity to the antitrust laws

which the bill would give to "farmers and/or associations of farmers, planters, ranchmen, dairymen, nut or fruit growers, and producers of other agricultural products." Any measure which threatens to open so enormous a gap in the laws against monopoly and restraint of trade should at least be scrutinized by the Judiciary Committee before going to the Senate.

It seems to us obvious, too, that no measure of this sort should have any bearing on antitrust cases already in litigation. Congress should be most reluctant to upset decisions of the courts already rendered or to interfere with decisions yet to be handed down. This suggests that if any bill should survive scrutiny by the Agriculture and Judiciary Committees, it should be made specifically inapplicable to existing cases before the courts—a provision that might substantially lessen interest in it.

Why the Public Needs Some Help in Analyzing the Contentions of the Parties to the Steel Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the following letter, which appeared in yesterday's New York Times, contains a very clear discussion of how the public would benefit from an analysis of the wage-price controversy in Big Steel from the standpoint of the public interest:

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The public relations offices of the steel companies and the steel union, whose advertisements appeared periodically in your paper since May, are performing a real disservice to the public by so distorting and burying the facts as to make informed public opinion on the merits of the respective sides virtually impossible.

The union has made some good points in its advertisements. But much of the merit has been lost in a myriad of half-truths—for example, it argues that a wage increase is justified and can be paid without increasing the cost of steel to the consumer. To bolster this position they assert that the present wage of \$3.03 an hour is misleading because steelworkers seldom work a 40-hour week. The union argues that workers averaged 40 hours a week only 1 year in the past 13.

This is an important consideration but does not tell the full story. No mention is made of the number of times when workers have been able to work overtime at time and a half. Ignored also is the fact that irregularity of work is not peculiar to the steel industry alone but is a characteristic of automobiles, construction and in fact much of heavy industry. No evidence has been presented to indicate that the irregularity of work in steel is greater than present wage differentials compensate for.

COMPARING WAGES

The union also maintains this irregularity of work has meant that 70 percent of the workers do not earn enough money to support their families decently. It is always difficult to argue with the man who claims he

needs more money since most of us find ourselves in this deplorable position regularly. The fact remains that one-sixth of the steelworkers earn over \$6,200 a year. Averages are always misleading but the union would be in a sounder position if comparisons between steelworkers wages and averages elsewhere were made.

The union's position is that an increase in wages can be paid out of profits without increasing the price of steel. To support its position the union cites the fact that 1958 was the fourth best year for steel profits despite the fact that the industry only operated at 60 percent of capacity. Certainly the recent announcement of steel profits has done nothing to weaken the union's case.

Rather a different story, however, is found if yearly profits are computed on rate basis as a percent of sales or investment. Total dollar profits in steel have risen sharply; as a percentage of sales and investment the rise has been much less pronounced or even negligible, depending upon what base year is selected for comparison.

In this connection one of the most flagrantly misleading advertisements of the union is one comparing the years 1952 and 1958. The point is made that labor costs were only 42.1 cents of each sales dollar in 1952 and 42.8 cents in 1958, while profits had increased from over \$143 million to \$301 million. Obviously what should have been compared for the 2 years is total wages—\$2,085,014,889 (1952), \$2,405,994,652 (1958), and total profit—\$143,678,740 (1952), and \$301,555,231 (1958), or profits as a percent of sales, in which case the rise of the profit rate would be sizable, 5 to 6.3, but would not carry the gross distortion implied in the union's figures.

PRICE LEVEL

Nor have the steel companies been innocent of misrepresentation in their advertisements. Thus they have said that steel wages have already risen more sharply than inflation, implying that the steelworkers have kept well ahead of the game. While this is true, it ignores the fact that the general level of wages has risen more than the price level (which of course it must do if workers are to share in any of the benefits of increased productivity).

In presenting the inflationary effects of past wage increases, the companies have advertised the relation between a rise in wage rates and the rise in costs per man-hour of input. Costs per man-hour of output are then identified with the costs per ton of steel. The fact is that the two are greatly different and it is likely that treating the two as identities may overestimate the increased cost of producing a ton of steel from a wage increase by several dollars.

Nor would we ever know from the steel companies' advertisements that irregularity of work accounted for any of the high hourly wage or that from 1954 to 1958 there has been a decline of nearly 50,000 in the number employed. Union advertisements have supplied these figures, however, and it is perhaps too much to ask the companies to substantiate the union's case.

No attack upon (or defense of) either position has been intended in the above analysis. Both sides seem convinced of the importance of securing a favorable public opinion. The achievement of this goal might mean more in the long run if readers were given the necessary information to render an informed judgment.

HOWARD D. MARSHALL,

Associate Professor of Economics and
Chairman of Department at Vassar
College.

POUGHKEEPSIE, N.Y., July 29, 1959.

Appendix

Commentary on Hon. Allen J. Ellender,
of Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, one of the most distinguished, alert, and perceptive of our Washington commentators is Tris Coffin, a man who is known to practically all of us.

In his broadcast last night over station WWDC, Mr. Coffin referred to the work that has been done by one of our ablest and most tireless Senators—the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. Coffin described at length the hard work that Senator ELLENDER has done in traveling around the world to dig up facts which Congress can use. He specifically went into the hard travels of Senator ELLENDER in the Soviet Union.

To Senator ELLENDER, such a trip is not a pleasure jaunt. He avoids the fine hotels and the luxuries and comforts of the great cities of the world. Instead, he goes into the back country—into the small towns and the rural areas where the people live and work. And the information that he has gathered has made him one of the best informed Members of Congress on the daily life of the Soviet people.

Mr. President, the commentary by Mr. Coffin is in his usual style—readable, interesting, and factual. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from this broadcast by a distinguished commentator about the contributions that have been made to the Senate by one of our most alert and distinguished Senators be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

For 3 years, a short, amazingly energetic man with eyes as keen as a hawk's has been traveling the length and breadth of Russia with a pencil, note pad and camera. No press secretary, no mob of reporters, no arguments. Just looking around and finding out what's what. His notes are a gold mine that the President might well read.

This remarkable traveler is Senator ALLEN ELLENDER from the southern bayous of Louisiana. He is a 68-year-old widower and farmer, and he likes to travel alone and off the beaten paths. He has a great eye for the significant detail. I dare say no American has a greater personal and practical knowledge of Soviet Russia than ALLEN ELLENDER.

He started out in 1955, and then again in 1956 and in 1957. He went places and saw things permitted no other man from the West. In the greying light of early morning, he sat in sheds in remote Siberia waiting for

the small plane to take him to the next stop. He tramped through acres of grain and cotton land, feeling the soil and touching the plants. He walked among the machines in factories and talked to workers. He saw the thrilling, roaring drop of water over giant new dams. He rode on distant rivers. He conversed with Russians of almost every imaginable type.

Senator ELLENDER was not doing this for publicity, for he got very little. He wanted to find out for himself what Russia looked like, what it was doing, and what its people were thinking. He knew how to easily shrug off propaganda. He wanted facts. And he wanted them for a very good reason.

The rate of Soviet progress in turning its great untapped resources to man's use—he thought—would set our own pace. Should we stroll along casually and sit down for a rest on a park bench? Or should we step ahead briskly. Resources is Senator ELLENDER's special balliwick. He is chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, and chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee handling water development.

In one of his reports, Senator ELLENDER told the Interior Committee, "The traditional concept of the Soviet Union as a backward, semideveloped nation is incorrect. I visited several hydroelectric power stations that were more than 1½ times as large as anything we have in this country. I saw foundations poured for turbines and generators which will have a rated capacity of 300,000 kilowatts each—much larger than anything we have. These projects were designed, constructed, and all component parts built within the Soviet Union. As a result of my inspection of Russian installations, I am convinced that in water transportation and hydroelectric power development, they are inching ahead of us, and in some areas of the tooling industry they are very close to our standards. There is absolutely nothing we can do about such developments in Russia," the Senator said. "They are doing it with their own resources to meet the needs of their own expanding economy. . . . However, we can provide funds for the execution of an adequate resource development for America. This is needed to strengthen us as much as an army."

After Senator ELLENDER's 1957 trip he reported again to the Senate, "Almost uniformly I found improvements in Russian conditions as contrasted with my impressions last year and the year before. As a matter of fact, some of my previous estimates, particularly about Russia's agricultural potential, had to be modified in the light of my trip through Siberia. This enormous area which," he said, "most of us consider the world's icebox—a huge prison camp—a vast waste of barren land—is actually becoming Russia's breadbasket."

"While the climate is somewhat more severe than our own upper Middle West," the Senator explained, "the area has proven itself capable of producing some fruits, considerable livestock and dairy products, and a large variety of root crops and grains. Yields of grains are high, although methods of planting, cultivating, and harvesting are obsolete by our own standards."

This busy, curious Senator went deep into the virtually unknown land of Siberia and reported in his notes, "Visited the Novo-sibirsk branch of the Academy of Science. Staff increased from 20 to 700 in 1957.

Siberia and Krasno-yarsk areas represent 2 percent of the earth's surface, have 10 percent of the world's electric power potential."

One of the most fascinating out-of-the-way spots Senator ELLENDER stopped was Irkutsk. This is across the towering mountains from the empty deserts of Mongolia. Here on a mountain plateau is the legendary Lake Baikal. It is 360 miles long and at some points almost a mile deep, crystal clear from snow melt. Songs have been composed of this area, for even way in the days of the Czars political deportees walked hundreds of miles across the Ural Mountains and southern Russia to this lake. When Senator ELLENDER saw, as he noted, was a huge hydroelectric power center, a booming aluminum industry, housing project, schools, a hospital, a cultural center, kindergarten, stadium, and stores. The immense project was begun only in 1951.

Perhaps the most startling information Senator ELLENDER gained was that there was no deep rebellion smoldering against the Soviet state. (This was confirmed last week by the American Governors in their report to the President.) True, as ELLENDER discovered, there were complaints—the factory managers objected to getting so many orders and counterorders from Moscow, the women wanted cosmetics to look prettier, students wanted more literature from the outside world, but these were gripes and not the sparks of revolution. Senator ELLENDER found, too, in Siberia the pride and vigor of pioneers.

As ALLEN ELLENDER is himself a sturdy man, a man of the soil, this struck him as important, perhaps more important than all else he saw and heard in these three trips. For there can be fertile ground, but unless the human spirit has the will to plow it, it is of no value.

The President could well look over Senator ELLENDER's journals, and learn about Russia.

Importance of Exchange Visits at Every Level

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to voice my complete approval of the decision made by President Eisenhower to exchange visits with the head of the Soviet Union, Mr. Khrushchev. I am a firm believer in the importance of exchanges at every level. The difficult and vital problems which have confronted the United States and the other free nations of the world in dealing with the Soviet Union can only be resolved by the exploration of every possible avenue of negotiation. Our foreign policy must unceasingly be directed toward the

establishment of areas of agreement and understanding between leaders of the Soviet Union and our leaders. The arrangements made for the visit of Premier Khrushchev and the return visit of President Eisenhower may possibly prove to be important preliminaries to such agreements. There are many matters as to which Premier Khrushchev is misinformed, or about which he does not want to be properly informed. Let us hope his visit here will open his eyes to our way of life, and our goals. Such an exchange as is proposed by the President can do no harm, and may do some good.

We must make it clear, of course, that the United States contemplates no retreat from its firm opposition to the ruthless expansion of the Russian Communist Empire. As I understand it, one of the principal purposes motivating the President in arranging this exchange is to make abundantly clear the firmness of our resolve to support freedom-loving and freedom-seeking peoples everywhere. At the same time the President recognizes that mutual exchange of ideas and the exploration of every area of agreement may narrow down areas of disagreement and possibly lay the groundwork for a genuine peace.

Student Loan Program a Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the 85th Congress enacted, upon the President's recommendation, the National Defense Education Act wherein provision is made for loans to deserving college and university students. It shows the program to be widely acceptable and utilized. Much has been said as to whether students would seek after and would assume such debts to be repaid after their studies have been completed at a time when they are commencing their careers. The fact that American young men and women are eager in such numbers to undertake these obligations in order to secure an education which might be otherwise unobtainable is an encouraging index of our national vigor. Hon. Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, made a statement at his news conference on July 28, reporting on the status of the student loan program under the National Defense Education Act:

I ask unanimous consent to have this statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY ARTHUR S. FLEMMING, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

On the basis of a preliminary review of loan fund applications made to the Office of Education, colleges and universities across

the country expect nearly 121,000 students to apply for loans under the National Defense Education Act during the 1959-60 school year.

These students represent about 5.5 percent of the total anticipated full-time enrollment of approximately 2,200,000 at the participating institutions, and they are expected to apply—on the average—for loans of about \$500 to help them continue their education during the forthcoming school year.

The estimated number of student borrowers and the amounts they are expected to apply for are taken from loan fund applications received by the Office of Education from 1,372 colleges and universities planning to participate in the student loan program this year.

This will be the first full year of operation for the student loan program, since the bulk of the money appropriated for the 1958-59 fiscal year was not available until last May 20.

Institutions applying for loan funds this year—180 more than participated last year and representing nearly 88 percent of the total full-time college enrollment in this country—have estimated that their student loan needs during 1959-60 will total about \$60.5 million.

These institutions have on hand about \$15 million from the \$30.5 million distributed last year, thus leaving an additional requirement of about \$45.5 million this year. The institutions are required to contribute one-tenth of their total student loan funds under the National Defense Education Act.

Thus, of the \$45.5 million estimated to be needed this year, the institutions would be required to contribute \$4.5 million. This would leave \$41 million to be provided by the Federal Government.

The pending appropriation for student loans this year is \$30 million, thus leaving a possible deficit of \$11 million.

In this connection, however, it should be borne in mind that the applications have not yet been reviewed for reasonableness. Also, our experience so far would indicate that the actual need for loans will be less than the estimated demands. Taking these two factors into consideration, I am confident that the pending appropriation will meet, or come close to meeting, the actual needs of students for the coming academic year.

It is too early to say, of course, with any certainty what the actual situation will be. We will have a much clearer picture by the latter part of this year. If, during the course

of the first semester, the Federal appropriation turns out to be inadequate we will consider submitting a request for a supplemental appropriation at the beginning of the next session of Congress.

I should like to call particular attention to a new procedure which has been worked out for reviewing applications from individual institutions which is designed to improve distribution of funds within the State.

Funds are allotted among the States on the basis of their share of the total college enrollment and proportionately within each State on the basis of the amounts requested by the individual institutions.

Under the new procedure developed by the Office of Education with the assistance of leaders in higher education, an amount equal to \$20 for each full-time student enrolled has been adopted as a guide for determining the reasonableness of applications.

Institutions requesting more than \$20 per full-time student enrolled have been required to submit detailed justifications. These justifications will be examined critically by a recently appointed panel of college administrators.

When the necessary reviews have been completed, funds will be prorated within each State against the State's total allocation.

The student loan funds are administered by the colleges and universities. College students and high school graduates must apply directly to the institution for a loan.

The loan repayment period begins 1 year after the student has completed full-time study. The loan carries interest of 3 percent on unpaid balances over a 10-year period.

Student borrowers who teach in public elementary and secondary schools will be eligible for cancellation of up to 50 percent of the loan if they teach full time for 5 years or more. The cancellation is at the rate of 10 percent per year based upon the amount of the loan outstanding when they begin teaching.

The National Defense Education Act requires that special consideration be given to students with superior academic backgrounds who intend to teach in elementary or secondary schools or those whose academic backgrounds indicate superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, engineering, or a modern foreign language.

Attached to this statement is a table with additional details, by States, on the student loan program for 1959-60.

Applications for student loan funds for 1959-60 under the National Defense Education Act

State or Territory	Number of institutions participating	Full-time enrollment	Estimated number of borrowers	Estimated average loan	Funds now on hand	Federal funds requested	State allotments
Total	1,372	2,195,173	120,644	\$501.22	\$15,064,706	\$41,127,586	\$30,000,000
Alabama	24	35,569	5,409	216.24	207,382	851,095	429,412
Arizona	7	22,885	926	611.12	110,721	409,661	240,687
Arkansas	18	22,195	1,050	455.11	59,908	378,330	232,747
California	95	191,906	7,109	590.51	1,419,353	2,380,451	2,871,359
Colorado	18	32,251	1,144	630.00	173,877	482,872	406,661
Connecticut	18	29,053	1,577	417.39	290,013	356,724	404,077
Delaware	3	3,375	185	274.49	22,921	25,995	51,988
Florida	19	42,451	2,979	433.65	110,545	1,056,156	540,475
Georgia	34	39,569	1,816	507.33	182,132	666,224	450,743
Idaho	7	13,126	422	697.70	143,621	137,829	117,870
Illinois	58	105,795	5,782	531.07	737,791	2,094,725	1,501,629
Indiana	28	67,239	3,697	475.66	281,932	1,328,912	842,286
Iowa	41	44,079	2,130	539.49	278,276	785,453	578,094
Kansas	33	36,771	2,442	529.47	147,912	1,034,310	501,474
Kentucky	26	29,915	2,112	451.70	88,052	779,811	403,894
Louisiana	15	44,039	2,251	573.52	272,229	916,891	538,582
Maine	12	9,293	531	461.51	36,655	187,566	123,763
Maryland	20	26,307	1,258	561.05	130,765	517,661	392,747
Massachusetts	61	81,881	4,674	557.05	861,183	1,574,197	1,228,065
Michigan	41	102,488	3,701	649.07	575,138	1,628,783	1,332,763
Minnesota	31	56,800	4,047	444.10	210,232	1,415,368	678,452
Mississippi	30	26,622	1,863	397.36	98,646	578,980	329,300
Missouri	40	54,753	4,225	550.83	216,716	1,904,623	725,715
Montana	9	10,744	378	670.64	79,297	157,664	123,215
Nebraska	19	22,568	1,028	559.39	206,061	332,098	284,856
Nevada	1	2,277	50	700.00	22,190	11,610	25,269

Applications for student loan funds for 1959-60 under the National Defense Education Act—Continued

State or Territory	Number of institutions participating	Full-time enrollment	Estimated number of borrowers	Estimated average loan	Funds now on hand	Federal funds requested	State allotments
New Hampshire	7	9,300	957	\$312.46	\$79,209	\$197,829	\$115,631
New Jersey	23	35,538	1,342	612.51	218,532	543,327	594,178
New Mexico	9	10,858	903	404.89	22,529	308,704	138,617
New York	99	185,503	11,772	531.73	2,081,361	3,782,085	2,954,351
North Carolina	50	50,089	3,672	419.07	204,991	1,146,163	701,646
North Dakota	11	13,012	699	542.51	97,147	254,565	138,199
Ohio	57	106,803	5,531	568.16	676,065	1,911,494	1,404,049
Oklahoma	29	46,655	3,043	485.35	231,538	1,122,873	558,317
Oregon	18	28,613	907	617.15	228,152	313,719	362,596
Pennsylvania	80	117,558	7,000	592.47	841,587	2,437,751	1,757,848
Rhode Island	9	13,053	943	439.05	109,551	274,028	156,355
South Carolina	26	21,933	1,396	443.05	155,989	416,819	330,435
South Dakota	14	12,911	808	433.17	42,020	277,181	159,670
Tennessee	41	48,144	3,157	427.30	206,363	944,030	580,598
Texas	62	112,753	5,329	546.96	1,080,163	1,647,736	1,677,719
Utah	9	16,883	563	641.66	124,793	212,817	315,516
Vermont	13	8,361	965	313.38	85,243	178,528	96,523
Virginia	20	32,530	1,848	487.05	305,629	534,994	472,968
Washington	19	44,040	1,602	545.66	306,462	581,307	544,351
West Virginia	18	21,789	1,089	477.34	69,420	423,162	267,783
Wisconsin	30	54,335	2,067	605.12	435,554	715,782	685,866
Wyoming	3	4,850	280	382.86	5,657	91,389	55,368
Alaska	1	700	30	500.00	7,583	6,675	3,433
District of Columbia	10	17,901	979	685.05	148,948	470,074	322,264
Hawaii	3	5,615	65	940.95	55,326	5,252	77,949
Puerto Rico	3	15,435	960	485.42	94,509	334,343	180,045
Guam							1,188
Canal Zone							1,827

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, July 1959.

Red Doubletalk Helps Fool United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks I include a splendid article entitled "Red Doubletalk Helps Fool United States," written by His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing, archbishop of Boston, and appearing in the Boston Sunday Advertiser of August 2, 1959, an article which should be as widely read as is possible. There is no person in the world who understands more clearly the evil mind and the evil work of the Communists:

RED DOUBLETALK HELPS FOOL UNITED STATES
(By Richard Cardinal Cushing)

There is no end to Communist propaganda. We are forced to gaze in wonderment at the dynamic and expanding activities of the international Communist conspiracy.

Not the least of these is the current Seventh World Festival of Youth and Students, the first of such festivals to be held outside the Communist world. To this festival have come 15,000 to 17,000 young people as delegates. Advance announcements by the press of the Young Communist League of Soviet Russia declared that it was to be attended by delegates from 130 countries, the largest and most universal international youth assembly ever held.

The Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R., located in Munich, Germany, warned the free world on the eve of this congress in these words: "Its aim is to manipulate the youth of non-Communist countries in the interest of Soviet foreign policy. Particular emphasis will be placed upon influencing the youth of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The Soviet regime hopes to facilitate its future actions on the international scene by gaining full or partial support for its foreign policy from the youth of the non-Communist world."

The Communists admit this purpose when they proclaim: "The World Youth Festival will break the barriers separating the outstretched hand of friendship of one people for another." In Soviet-spawned lingo, this "friendship" always means the penetration of non-Communist minds with Communist ideas, leading at least to a widening acceptance of the Communist line in free world countries.

PEACE HELD OUT AS GOAL

As was to be expected, the Communists in our country are making good use of the World Youth Festival to win an increasing number of young people, and also adults, to accept the idea that concessions to Soviet Russia are necessary to win peace. They also draw on distinguished non-Communists, known in industry, education, and literature, followers of the Communist line, to praise and hail the Youth Festival. Thus they impress our own youth with the idea that surrender to Soviet Russia becomes more and more necessary and proper.

Among many other projects of Red initiative, there is the widespread agitation and education among youth directed all over the country by the educational director of the Communist Party. He caps this off in the June issue of Political Affairs, theoretical organ of the Communist Party, with an extensive report on party youth work.

He shows the great opportunity that now lies before the Communist conspiracy in the youth field in this country, since the comrades have been able to emerge successfully from the years of cold war and McCarthyism, during which they were also handicapped by relative prosperity in the United States.

TOOK FIFTH AMENDMENT

But when this educational director was called before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, he hid from the American Nation the true extent of these Red activities by constant appeals to the first and fifth amendments. He went to the extent of refusing to answer what his occupation is, although he is acclaimed in many Communist documents to be the educational director of the Communist Party.

By this appeal to the first and fifth amendments, he prevented publicity for seditious efforts among the youth of the Nation. There have been so many appeals to these amend-

ments by racketeers and Reds that there is no longer any news in them.

The Communists have also founded a faculty of social science to train Communist-minded youth in subversion among their fellows, and initiated similar training schools in summer camps. The director of this new national Communist school conducted a series of radio broadcasts over a Berkeley, Calif., radio station, preparing American young people with the idea of the justification for the overthrow of our Government by a Socialist revolution.

These lectures in pamphlet form, "On the Nature of Revolution," are being widely distributed by the comrades here in the United States. It is one measurement of how bold sedition has become in seeking to justify itself for the eventual destruction of our Republic.

REDS COUNT ON APPEASEMENT

Little wonder, then, that the United States was treated so roughly by Soviet Russia at Geneva that it was actually belittled and belabored by the Soviet Foreign Minister, Andrei Gromyko. For the Kremlin constantly counts on the spread of appeasement in the United States and, therefore, the spread of paralysis as to what we should do as its chief means to win our final acquiescence in one form or another to the expansion of Soviet dominion.

We cannot forget that while Gromyko acts so sullenly and stubbornly, his followers are forwarding Red infiltration of Latin America, and Moscow is giving them directives as to how they shall pursue this infiltration.

This thrust through Latin America is directed at placing the banner of communism at our back door. As long as we pursue our complacent attitude toward the Communist conspiracy in this country, represented by the letting down of almost all the bars on subversive activity, we can be of little influence in offsetting Red advance to the south of us.

If we wish to prevent communism from taking over the world, with resulting slave labor camps and catacombs over the face of the globe, there must be much more alertness to our duties as citizens.

EVERY AMERICAN CAN HELP

There are certain things that every one of us can do in the battle against communism, and it is to these that I wish to direct your attention. There is no one, no matter how lowly, who cannot make his contribution to the defense of American freedom. From first steps, many can go on by study to know more fully how to perform our duties at this critical hour.

The first of these first steps which commend themselves to us is this: Let us arm ourselves, each one of us, against any possibility of being deceived by those Soviet upside-down words that have played such havoc with our thinking and actions in the past. After all, when we note the history of the past 25 years, we will understand that communism's power to take over so much of the globe was the fruit of its partly successful attempt to conquer the American mind by infiltrating our thought processes.

We were regaled constantly with propaganda from without and from within America, containing words which meant a different thing to the Soviet mind than to our own.

THREE ACES IN RED HANDS

The three words which we might master as a start are "peace," "democracy," and "spirituality."

These are aces in the hands of the Soviet propagandists, smuggled into our country by the Communist fifth column and from thence into the minds and on the lips of non-Communists. They are a part of that famous (or infamous) Aesopian language, which Lenin introduced to the comrades in the preface to the Russian edition of his

study on "Imperialism, the Highest State of Capitalism."

As defined by the Moscow editors of his works, this is the roundabout, allusive language to which conspirators are forced to resort. Today, it is widely used by the Communists in order to cover illegal incitations by legal terms and to deceive us as to the true contents of Soviet policy.

The Steel Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on August 6, 1959, the Nashville Banner published a most enlightening, informative editorial on the subject of the steel strike. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

It isn't too much to hope, surely, that when Nikita Khrushchev arrives for that visit he won't be treated to the sight of smokeless smokestacks—the symbol of shutdown—atop America's basic industry.

That is, of course, steel. It is another production line in which this Nation leads the world; but it is paralyzed right now, the fires out; closed by strike, for failure to reach contractual terms acceptable to both sides. And worse than that, some related industries crippled, with the further threat that if the controversy is prolonged many of these likewise will grind to a halt.

That isn't a picture of solidarity calculated to enlighten the Soviet Premier on facts of national strength. On the contrary, it could suggest to him the exact opposite of that, and indulge his own exaggerated ideas of weaknesses and paralysis of democratic methods in the pinch.

And if, in addition to smokeless chimneys, he is treated to the glimpse of picketing—with placards of accusation, and signs of dissension; if he hears the hubbub of furious assault and counterassault, Americans assailing Americans—the picture he will get is of disunity. That won't convince him of oneness. It would, in fact, gratify him as substantiation of his false premise that capitalism is hanging on the ropes, just ready to be pushed over by the Communist thrust he has been ready to supply.

America has the opportunity of showing its best face—its true face—to this official guest; and by a demonstration of its capacity for good sense and self-discipline accomplish something that conceivably could shape world events toward peace. The responsibility is not the President's alone, or the Government's; it is shared by all.

It is in America's interest in every way, to get those production lines turning again—and on a basis that will not whip up the forces of inflation.

It is not too much to ask that this settlement be speeded.

Let's get the smoke pouring again and those furnaces going, before Mr. Khrushchev comes calling. It would be downright embarrassing to have to tell him about harmony when there were signs all around attesting to the contrary.

How Much Is Public Power Costing the People of Your State?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article:

HOW MUCH IS PUBLIC POWER COSTING THE PEOPLE OF YOUR STATE?

Every American is taxed to pay for Federal public power, and the cost to people in your State has run into the millions.

Federal Government electric power systems have already cost the Nation's taxpayers \$5½ billion. The list below shows about how much of this has been collected in each State.

If the public power lobbyists succeed in their plans for getting the Government still deeper into the electric business, the cost will soar to \$15½ billion. The cost to your State will be almost tripled.

Yet this spending for more and more public power is completely unnecessary. America's hundreds of independent electric light and power companies are ready and able to provide all the low-price electricity the Nation needs—without depending on taxes.

These companies have doubled the supply of electricity in the past 10 years, and will double the present supply in the next 10.

Federal public power keeps growing because most people don't realize they are paying for it. But informed Americans can stop it.

Will you help spread the word?

Alabama.....	\$51,700,000
Arizona.....	28,600,000
Arkansas.....	24,200,000
California.....	564,850,000
Colorado.....	52,250,000
Connecticut.....	123,750,000
Delaware.....	32,450,000
District of Columbia.....	36,300,000
Florida.....	125,950,000
Georgia.....	68,750,000
Idaho.....	14,300,000
Illinois.....	400,400,000
Indiana.....	132,000,000
Iowa.....	63,800,000
Kansas.....	51,150,000
Kentucky.....	57,200,000
Louisiana.....	67,100,000
Maine.....	23,100,000
Maryland.....	103,400,000
Massachusetts.....	194,150,000
Michigan.....	273,900,000
Minnesota.....	90,750,000
Mississippi.....	23,100,000
Missouri.....	127,050,000
Montana.....	16,500,000
Nebraska.....	35,750,000
Nevada.....	11,550,000
New Hampshire.....	17,600,000
New Jersey.....	232,100,000
New Mexico.....	19,250,000
New York.....	752,400,000
North Carolina.....	72,050,000
North Dakota.....	10,450,000
Ohio.....	338,800,000
Oklahoma.....	50,050,000
Oregon.....	50,050,000
Pennsylvania.....	306,550,000
Rhode Island.....	30,800,000
South Carolina.....	33,000,000
South Dakota.....	12,100,000
Tennessee.....	63,250,000
Texas.....	235,400,000

Utah.....	\$19,250,000
Vermont.....	9,900,000
Virginia.....	91,300,000
Washington.....	85,250,000
West Virginia.....	41,800,000
Wisconsin.....	114,400,000
Wyoming.....	9,350,000

Amounts (to nearest \$30,000) figured on the percentage of all Federal taxes collected in each State. Current tax collections used as basis.

National Future Farmers Leadership Conference

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, following the National Future Farmers Leadership Conference, which was held in Washington July 21-25, many editorials have been written regarding the splendid work of this organization.

Mr. Jerry F. Ringo, a former national officer, sent me an editorial from the Menifee County Journal of Frenchburg, Ky., entitled "National FFA Leadership Conference Should Be Annual Event" and an article entitled "National FFA Officers Give Quality Talks," and I ask unanimous consent that they be made a part of these remarks and printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NATIONAL FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE SHOULD BE ANNUAL EVENT

Demonstrations of youthful self-reliance, faith, and competence are rare enough today that when they occur effort should be made to continue their success. The recent National Future Farmers of America Leadership Training Conference, held in Washington, D.C., was such a demonstration.

It was indeed an inspiration to watch boys from every corner of our Nation, each a leader in his field, join on common ground to give united support to a common cause—the advancement of farm leadership.

These 250 plus farm-boy members of the Future Farmers of America are the elected officers representing the 380,000 members back in their respective States. They present a front as solid and as dynamic as any youth organization in America today.

Such was their impact that the Menifee County Journal goes on record as supporting a thought to make the Future Farmers of America national leadership conference an annual function. It could not be more fitting than to be held in the Nation's Capital, where Americans look for their own governmental leadership.

As conducted, the conference would enjoy a new group of State leaders each year. In addition to giving the Nation a look at the Future Farmers of America the boys would have an opportunity to investigate firsthand the historical and actual scene of their country's Government.

In the Future Farmers of America lies the farm future of America. The qualities which are brought out and developed today will be the guiding force of the agrarian progress of tomorrow. These boys are taught

to think, act, and create progress. They are prepared to employ the latest technical and labor extending methods available.

Future Farmers of America has and needs no better media for getting its story to the people than it has in its own members. Every member with which we have come in contact has been an impressive public relations interpreter of the Future Farmers of America.

We cannot improve upon a definition of the philosophy of the future farmer than as stated in the first line of the Future Farmers of America creed, "I believe in the future of farming, with a faith born not of words but of deeds * * *"

Such faith is evident in the deeds of the organization.

NATIONAL FFA OFFICERS GIVE "QUALITY" TALKS

"Almost all men are lazy. This makes it fairly easy for a hard worker to succeed."

Such was the quality of thought found in speeches delivered by the 1959 national officers of the Future Farmers of America in their addresses at the Donor's Banquet in Washington 2 weeks ago.

The above statement brought a mid-speech round of applause for Bryan Hafen of Mesquite, Nev., a vice president of the national FFA. Other speakers of the evening were equally competent in providing the audience with fast moving talks containing bright new thought.

A high quality organization at all its levels, the Future Farmers of America strives to raise its standards and improve its membership by affording them the guidance and opportunity to make the most of their potentialities. No one who has been fortunate enough to see in operation can doubt that the organization has been effective.

The next nationwide convention of the group will be in October at Kansas City, Mo., when 12,000 farm-boy members and their adult advisors meet.

Judging from past experience with FFA conventions it must certainly be another vindicating testimonial to the youth of today.

Labor Reform Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK W. BURKE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, in the Louisville Courier-Journal of August 5 there appears an editorial entitled "A Brighter Outlook for Labor Reform in the House." The simple clarity of expression and the graphic analysis of facts made in that editorial make it worthy of consideration by every Member of this body. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include that editorial at this point:

A BRIGHTER OUTLOOK FOR LABOR REFORM IN THE HOUSE

The ill-starred labor bill, which has been rewritten under pressures from every side in the House Labor Committee, is due to emerge this week and face the critical scrutiny of the House membership. It will also face some rivalry. At least two other groups, one with the official blessing of the administration, the other with the smiles of organized labor, are planning to introduce bills either tougher or softer than the one the committee has approved.

The committee bill has gained some prestige this week from its endorsement by the House's stern taskmaster, Speaker SAM RAYBURN. Mr. RAYBURN thinks the bill does a "splendid job" of controlling racketeering. He has long been an opponent of bills presented during debate or written on the House floor, and he is critical of both bills now being pushed as substitutes for the committee measure.

His opinion carries considerable weight. Chances for the committee bill, which is admittedly a compromise between the severity favored by the administration and the wrist slap preferred by undercover spokesmen for the Hoffa-led Teamsters, begin to look brighter than at any time since the House took over the Senate's final version of the Kennedy bill.

If the bill actually can fight its way through all the assorted hazards waiting for it in debate, it will become something of a landmark. It will be the first bill of its kind to overcome the pulling and hauling of tough labor and reactionary management since the Taft-Hartley Act. It does not remedy all of the admitted flaws in that law, but it clears up one or two of the more vexing ones. It prohibits hot-cargo coercion, by which the Teamsters have sought to forbid any common carrier to carry goods the union designates as "hot." It curbs picketing of the racketeering variety and imposes punishment on thieves and hoodlums misusing union funds and functions.

It will face one final hazard in the possibility of a Presidential boycott. But there are reasons why Mr. Eisenhower, in spite of his expressed dissatisfaction with both Senate and House bills, may be inclined to sign it. It is not a money bill, carrying appropriations of which he disapproves, and it is much better than no bill at all. A veto would make the President directly responsible for the fact that crooked unions may continue in business and that good unions would remain under the stigma imposed by the evil few.

Death of Michael L. Benedum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a living symbol of America's spirit of free enterprise was lost to the Nation in the recent death of Michael L. Benedum.

As "king of the wildcaters," and a pioneer of the oil industry, he displayed throughout his career an unquenchable faith in himself and in the future of our Nation.

His contributions were many. Some of these contributions are noted in an editorial carried August 1, 1959, in the Houston Chronicle. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Aug. 1, 1959]
**BENEDUM DEATH DEPRIVES OIL INDUSTRY OF
OUTSTANDING SYMBOL**

The death of Michael L. Benedum, at 90, deprives the oil industry of a living symbol of values which the American industry needs to preserve if it is to meet successfully the problems it faces. Benedum, as all-time "king of the wildcaters," represented above all an aggressive faith in himself and in the

American economy, to the degree that he numerous times risked his fortune to explore for more oil.

Benedum maintained an optimistic viewpoint, which is healthy for the industry. Twenty-one years ago, when he was 69, Benedum boasted that before he died he would discover more oil than he had in all his previous career. He made good the boast. At the time he made the statement, the economic and governmental factors so disturbing to many oilmen already were existent or foreseen.

Every legislator, whether at the State or national level, should note how Benedum's career helped the Nation. This Nation might have suffered a severe oil shortage in World War II had it not had the oil that Benedum discovered or inspired to be discovered. He might never have had such a successful career if the tax-and-spend advocates, who want to knock out the oil depletion allowance, had been successful 50 years ago. He would not have had the capital to put into the wildcat wells, on which many millions of dollars were lost while he searched for new reserves.

Benedum's zest for his work set a good example for American industry.

The Commune System and Its Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a report made by Chu-Yuen Cheng, expert on Communist China's economy at the Sino-American amity, and published by the China Tribune, New York City, and translated for me by Stephen C. Y. Pan, Ph. D., expert on American relations with the Far East.

The gist of the report is as follows:

I. BASIC CONCEPT OF COMMUNE

The commune system in Red China was established in April 1958. This was not sensational news to the free world, although it was a new attempt by Communist countries to destroy the private property system so that eventually the whole world could be communistic or communized. Its basic concept is to destroy the property system, the family system, etc., and to create a Communist world in its fullest sense.

1. In 1956 the 750 cooperatives had a series of setbacks and failures because many members wanted to withdraw. In Kwangtung Province alone, according to the Communist official report of 1956, there were 160,000 households who wanted to withdraw from the cooperatives. Of this number 80,000 were approved. Then the Communist regime wanted to eliminate the difference between the poor and the better-off peasants and tried to force them to join the communes so that everything would be shared by all, and all was for the communes.

2. In March 1958 the Chinese Communists launched a movement called Big Leap Forward. This movement mobilized 100 million to engage in irrigation projects, and some industrial plans for 3 months. Sixty million people were mobilized in the steel and iron industry. This produced a shortage of farmers to do actual farming. In order to meet this shortage of agricultural production, the Red regime tried to centralize every kind of production and distribution to its populace. They also tried to mobilize the people, to

give them military training, and to train them to live like military units rather than on individualistic levels. They also drafted 90 million women from 120 million peasant families to engage in production.

3. Mao Tse-tung himself declared: "If the communes were successful, communism becomes a reality and not a utopia."

Mao and his followers have endeavored to destroy the Chinese family system and the old farming system of China in order to make all the able hands (men and women) become militant citizens in order to help the advance of the program of world revolution.

There is a great difference between the cooperative system in Soviet Russia and the Chinese commune system. The Chinese Communist leaders claim they are more advanced in communism than the Soviet Union. Here are a few characteristics of the Chinese commune:

(a) The Chinese commune is far more extensive and more powerful than the cooperative form in the Soviet Union: In 1957, the Chinese Communists declared that collectivism of farming was successful. At that time there were 752,000 cooperatives, consisting of 120 million peasant families. On an average each cooperative consisted of 158 peasant families, but the commune averages consists of 4,800 peasant families. This means they are 20 times larger than the cooperatives.

(b) Commune members come from all professions: The former cooperatives were mainly of peasants, but the present commune compels the workers, the farmers, merchants, students, soldiers, as well as members of every other profession to become a member of the commune regardless of sex and age (except infants under the age of 14 are exempt from joining the commune.)

(c) The commune is all-powerful: The former cooperatives allowed each member to possess 5 percent of the land which he tilled, to raise his chickens and hogs and to engage in certain small businesses. In other words, under the cooperative system, small amounts of property were allowed. But under the present commune system, it does not allow anyone to own any land, timber, or real property or tools or poultry. Everything belongs to the commune and the members are only allowed to receive the bare necessities of life.

(d) The commune has the full power of distribution: The cooperative would pay each member according to his work and would give him either money or food, according to each family unit. But the commune system pays half in money and half in food—called half supply and half wage system. Each member goes to a public dining room, at a stated time, for each meal. Besides the food supply, each member of the commune gets about U.S. \$1 monthly wages. The wage of each member is based on his loyalty to the Communist Party and his physical strength.

(e) Daily life of the common laborers: The former cooperative system in Communist China simply practiced collective production and the peasants were allowed to have a family life. But the commune system has practically destroyed the family system on the farms and daily life is governed by two ideas: collectivism and militarism.

(f) Labor and militarism: Each commune is organized like a military unit and each member is required to do some sort of labor. They are under military and political discipline. The commune emphasized: (1) Political discipline; (2) military training; and (3) manual labor.

The communes also have their auxiliaries—such as production group, farming district, or unit. They are organized on a military basis—such as a squad, platoon, company, division, army, field troops, and military supply units. In other words, the commune is

the governing body, military group, production and distribution unit. It is indeed all-powerful.

II. LIFE IN THE COMMUNE

Since the commune has been established the daily life of each member is regimented. He eats in a public dining hall, he sleeps in dormitories, and he works in factories and training camps. This system applies to all women, including peasant mothers. Small children of the commune are sent to either a nursery or kindergarten (according to age), and old men and women are placed in old folks homes where they must work, such as washing dishes, sweeping, sewing, and other manual work.

It may be interesting to describe these public dining halls, nurseries, kindergartens, schools, and household teams.

(1) Public dining halls: Generally each dining hall holds 15 to 200 persons. Each commune obtains the necessary food for each member, who eats in the dining hall at a designated time and place. According to 1958 statistics, there were 2,650,000 public dining halls. Eighty-six percent of the farmers in the villages have to eat in the public dining halls. The small stoves in the homes of the farmers have been destroyed.

(2) Nurseries, kindergartens, and old folks homes: From 1 to 3 years old, children must be sent to nurseries and from 4 to 7 years old, children must be sent to kindergartens. From 7 years on children must start to work.

People over 65 (men and women) are sent to old folks homes, but are still required to do a great deal of manual labor. There were 4,750,000 nurseries and kindergartens in 1958. Eighty-five percent of all children under age 5 must go either to a nursery or kindergarten. There are over 100,000 old-age homes.

(3) Student dormitories: All students must live in dormitories and are not allowed to live with their families.

(4) Sewing, shoemaking, and laundry teams: Those over 65 are ordered to work in these areas. This also includes frail, aged women.

(5) Public dormitories: In order to force the populace to live under collectivism the commune has torn down millions of small houses and moved the original owners to the public dormitories or apartments. The scrap materials from the demolished houses are used to build these dormitories so that they could be concentrated in one place and easily controlled.

The above is only a sketch of how the people in the China mainland, under the commune system, actually live.

III. THE DILEMMA OF THE COMMUNE

Since the Chinese Communist imposed the commune system on the Chinese people, there has been much passive and even some armed resistance by the peasants and students. Officials of Soviet Russia have expressed their displeasure and disapproval. When Khrushchev himself spoke at the 21st plenary session of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, he indicated his displeasure and disapproval of the communes launched by the Chinese Communists. As a result of the peasants' and students' opposition and resistance together with the Soviet disapproval of the commune, the Chinese Communists were compelled to place the commune question into the agenda of their conferences at Chengchow, Honan Province on November 2, 1958, and at Hankow, Hupei Province on December 10, 1958. Finally, certain modifications and changes about the communes were decided by those meetings. The basic decisions, which have been followed in principle by the Chinese Communists, include the following:

(a) Expansion of the communes in the big cities has been temporarily halted;

(b) The people's communes are considered by the Chinese Communists as a phenomenon of socialism but not communism;

(c) Members of the communes may now be, to a certain extent, allowed to possess some houses, personal belongings, such as clothing, furniture, and a few other daily necessities;

(d) Separation of military organizations and control of productions.

However, the above modifications and changes cannot satisfy the demands and desires of the people, especially the peasants. Thus, the Communist Party has not and cannot claim to have successes in their communes. Consequently, since May this year, the Chinese Communist Party again relaxed certain regulations governing the communes. For instance, since then the peasants have been allowed to own small areas of land, and to possess some personal property including poultry, pigs, timber, and a few other items. In some districts, peasants have been permitted to obtain rice to do their own cooking. In others, the scope and activities of the communes are somewhat limited.

From what is stated above, it is evident that the communes in the China mainland have met many obstacles and the Communists have been forced to make more and more concessions to the people. It is possible without accepting or reusing the old name, cooperatives, the so-called communes in the China mainland may be forced to abandon the essential characteristics of their original plan of the commune system. Otherwise, the Chinese people may be forced to revolts in much greater scale than they have previously occurred at various places in China.

Closing of Geneva Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday we witnessed the closing of the Big Four Foreign Ministers Conference at Geneva.

Unfortunately, the Conference did not yield any substantial progress toward resolving East-West differences.

The significance of the Geneva meeting, however, should not go unnoticed.

During the 65-day Conference—broken by an interim recess—Secretary of State Christian Herter, his associates, and representatives of our allies, carried out their duties in a dedicated manner—under extremely difficult circumstances.

We recognize, however, that success in such a Conference depends upon readiness to obtain agreement by both the participating parties. Unfortunately, the Soviet delegation—under direction from Moscow—of course were unwilling to engage in the kind of negotiations which would result in resolution of problems. However, this should not unfairly reflect on the statesmanlike work of our representatives at the Geneva meetings.

Rather, it again reveals the adamancy of the Soviet delegates against any kind of agreement that would do other than serve their own aims of Communist expansionism.

In wrapping up the Conference, however, the door has been left open—as I believe it should be—for further sessions if deemed advisable. As often noted, it is better to be exchanging words than bombs. As yet, no date for reconvening has been agreed upon.

I ask unanimous consent to have the Big Four communique published in today's Washington Post and Times Herald printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN MINISTERS' TALKS COMMUNIQUE

GENEVA, August 5.—Text of the concluding communique of the Big Four Conference:

"Communique of the Geneva Conference of Foreign Ministers, 1959.

"The Conference of Foreign Ministers met in Geneva from May 11 to June 20 and from July 13 to August 5, 1959.

"The Conference considered questions relating to Germany, including a peace treaty with Germany and the question of Berlin.

"The positions of the participants in the Conference were set out on these questions.

"A frank and comprehensive discussion took place on the Berlin question.

"The positions of both sides on certain points became closer.

"The discussions which have taken place will be useful for the further negotiations which are necessary in order to reach an agreement.

Furthermore, the Conference provided the opportunity for useful exchanges of views on other questions of mutual interest.

"The Foreign Ministers have agreed to report the results of the Conference to their respective governments.

"The date and place for the resumption of the work of the Conference will be settled through diplomatic channels."

White House Conference on Aging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, on September 2 of last year, the President signed into law a White House Conference on Aging Act which had been passed in the closing days of the 2d session of the 85th Congress. In passing this legislation, the Congress felt that public interest required the enactment of legislation to formulate recommendations for immediate action in improving and developing programs to permit the country to take advantage of the experience and skills of the older persons in our population, to create conditions which would better enable them to meet their needs, and to further research on aging.

Since the enactment of that law, the White House Conference on Aging staff has been appointed and is working with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare special staff on aging to plan and prepare for the Conference to be held in January 1961.

I am happy to point out that a former colleague of ours, the Honorable Robert W. Kean, of New Jersey, has been named Chairman of the Advisory Committee for the White House Conference on Aging.

In recent weeks the public has become more and more aware of the responsibilities toward our rapidly growing population of older people. Wide press coverage has been given to the recently completed House hearings on the Forand bill, and also to the present hearings in the Senate before the McNamara committee. Life magazine at present is concluding a four-part article dealing with the field of aging.

Last week I had the occasion to read a report to the people from the gentlewoman from New Jersey's Sixth District, Congresswoman FLORENCE P. DWYER, which I feel painted a most complete picture of some of the things which are presently being done in the field of aging and some of the things which are in the planning stage. Certainly, we will all agree that one of our major concerns in the Nation today is the question of how best to meet our responsibilities toward our older people.

Since I feel that Congresswoman DWYER's report was so complete in the field of aging, I would like at this time to insert this report in the RECORD and to commend its reading to my colleagues in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

The report follows:

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

(By FLORENCE P. DWYER)

This past week has been a particularly significant one in a field of the highest importance—the question of how best to meet our responsibilities toward our rapidly growing population of older people.

Among the events that made it significant were these: The opening of hearings on the Forand bill, a proposal to include medical and hospital insurance for retired persons through the social security system; reconsideration of the vetoed housing bill with its proposed new program of low-interest loans for housing for the elderly; continued progress in arranging for the huge White House Conference on the Aging scheduled for 1961; and introduction of a bill to liberalize the restrictions on earnings of people receiving social security and for widowed mothers who must work.

Coincidence is not the only explanation for so much attention in one week to the needs of our older people. Consider these facts, for instance. Within 10 years the number of Americans over 65 years old will reach 10 percent of the total population. During that same period of time, the key productive age group—those from 20 to 65 years, from whom almost all the working force is drawn—will be reduced to only one-half our population. This represents an increase for the over-65 group of twice the rate for the population as a whole.

DEPRESSION AND WAR

It is also true that our senior citizens have lower and often declining incomes, with less opportunity than fully employed people to meet the higher costs of the care and services they need. Then, too, our present older generation was severely handicapped in preparing for retirement years by the worst depression and the most expensive war in our history. The collapsed incomes of the 1930's and the debased dollars of wartime and postwar inflation left very little for their futures.

The fact that a minority of our population will shortly be supporting the majority poses several difficult questions:

How can the income produced during their working lives more adequately support the needs of retired persons—the need for housing, medical care, recreation, and living conditions generally, at a level above that of bare subsistence?

How can senior citizens retain the sense of being needed, the feeling of accomplishment and of participation in the life of the community—in other words, how can they be spared the devastating impact of neglect in their advanced years?

What changes should we make in our educational system to prepare younger people for the sometimes unexpected demands of older age?

What practical improvements in our social security, employment, housing, and welfare laws can be made to help relieve old age of insecurity, boredom, neglect, and disillusionment?

CONFERENCE ON AGING

These and related questions will soon receive the most extensive consideration in history, as the planning and organization proceed for the nationwide White House Conference on the Aging. I was reminded of this the other day when I saw an old friend of Union County, former Congressman Robert Kean, of Livingston, here in Washington. Congressman Kean, you may remember, was recently appointed by President Eisenhower as Chairman of the White House Conference. In that capacity, he is a frequent visitor here, meeting with his national committee, establishing State committees, and preparing to mobilize available talents and experience so that the White House Conference in 1961 can offer the Nation an effective program of action.

Meanwhile, Congress has certain immediate responsibilities in this field. One of them is housing for the elderly. While the President unquestionably had good reason to object to certain provisions in the housing bill he vetoed, there is very reason to hope that any compromise housing bill will include at least the \$50 million program of direct loans for low-rent, specially designed houses for older people. This is a field where private financing has not been able to do the job at rents retired people can afford. Conventional financing of these houses, for example, require monthly rents about \$20 higher than would be true of units built under the proposed new program.

EARNINGS LIMIT UNFAIR

Another immediate obligation of the Congress—and one I consider especially urgent—is to lift the unwise and unfair ceiling on the amount of income which people receiving social security are permitted to earn without forfeiting their social security benefits. The present limit is \$1,200 a year or \$100 a month, completely inadequate for people who cannot live on their social security alone and yet who cannot earn enough more to afford to sacrifice their old-age benefits.

This is a terrible dilemma for older people forced to live on the edge of subsistence. To help remedy it, I introduced a bill last week which would raise the earnings limit to \$2,400, and for widowed mothers of children under 18 to \$3,600 a year.

To my mind, this is simple justice. Since the \$1,200 limit was first imposed, prices have greatly increased and purchasing power, especially for those on fixed incomes, has diminished. Furthermore, this limitation discriminates against those who do not have large savings or extensive investments, since income from these sources is not subject to the limitation. In recent years, too, medical authorities have come to recognize that part-time employment is of positive value for

the health and emotional welfare of many older people. The present earnings limit discourages such employment.

CHALLENGE TO DOCTORS

Closely related to this is the question of medical care for the elderly, on which subject the House Ways and Means Committee last week opened public hearings. While there are major objections to the solution proposed by the Forand bill, there is no escaping the fact that a very real and serious problem does exist.

In an extensive study last year, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare found that older persons have two-and-a-half times as much need for medical and hospital care as have persons under 65, and yet have only 40 percent as much private health insurance to pay for it.

These circumstances, I believe, constitute a tremendous challenge to the medical profession and to all those concerned with preserving the private nature of medical practice in the United States.

These are not isolated matters. They are interrelated and given high priority by the value we place on age. The mature years of our people can enrich and vitalize our whole society—if we take steps now to free our elders and learn to use their judgment, experience and invincible spirit.

Self-Service Post Offices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Post Office Department is to be congratulated on the proposed innovation of self-service post offices.

Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield is entitled to much credit for many modern improvements in our postal operations and this new service is certainly most useful.

The self-service post office will maintain regular postal service in many post offices that are present closed after office hours, and is further evidence of improved mail service that our people are getting.

An excellent article on this was written by Julius Duschka and appeared in the August 5 issue of the Washington Post.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACHINE WILL BE YOUR POSTAL CLERK AT SELF-SERVICE SUBURBAN STATIONS

(By Julius Duschka)

Self-service post offices planned for suburban and rural areas will do everything but write a letter.

The first such post office will probably be built in the Washington area early next year.

Deputy Postmaster General E. Q. Sessions said yesterday that the customer-operated substations will include automatic equipment for selling stamps and postcards, for weighing and mailing packages as well as letters, for purchasing money orders, for registering letters and for making change.

They will even sell writing paper.

No clerks will be needed. Sessions expects the post offices will have to be restocked with change and supplies once a day. He thinks regular postal employees can do this. The offices will be open 24 hours a day.

The mechanical heart of the stations will be vending machines which the Post Office Department hopes can be produced in quantity by January 1.

These machines, which also will be used in large post offices and at airline, railroad, and bus terminals, will provide automatic postal facilities for everything except packages and money orders. Separate machines are being developed for those.

The Post Office Department has had machines in operation for several years to sell stamps and postcards and make change, but has never used automatic machines for weighing, mailing packages, or selling money orders.

Sessions hopes to have a model of the vending machine in Washington soon after September 1. The prototype is being built by Electric Vendors, Inc., of Minneapolis. Sessions thinks the machines can be manufactured in quantity for about \$1,000 each.

Sessions said he will call for bids on a prototype self-service substation within a week.

Richard Nixon, Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, no one—not even the most rabid partisan—could have experienced anything but swelling pride as the Vice President and his charming helpmate came down the ramp at National Airport yesterday afternoon. Here were two returning Americans who a few days previously had sallied forth to meet on his own heath the man who has threatened to bury us. Here were two plain Americans with as humble backgrounds as any among us and yet who by the very persuasiveness of their charm had melted the hostility of people behind the Iron Curtain and perhaps in 10 short days had contributed more to the cause of peace than has any other person in the last decade.

Over the past several years we have seen many Western diplomats, including some of our own legislators, try to beard the Russian bear in his den and in nearly every case they have come slinking home to tell us the Communists are 10 feet tall and invincible. Well, Dick Nixon in a few short hours dispelled that myth and standing toe to toe with Mr. K. handed him back better than he gave. As a matter of fact, I surmise that by talking up to the Soviet boss and showing him that Americans have the courage of their convictions, and that bluster and bluff are not potent tools with which to turn aside truth and logic, Mr. Nixon has caused Mr. K. to reevaluate his previous estimates of just how far he can go before running up against the solid wall of American determination.

In his televised address to the Russian people the Vice President laid it on the line and firmly but without rancor re-

affirmed the basic desire of all the West; namely, that we have no aggressive designs on anybody and that all we want is to live at peace with all nations and races. A much-admired columnist, Mr. Gould Lincoln had this comment in Wednesday's Evening Star:

Mr. Nixon's address to the Russians included a frank invitation to the Russian Communists to lay aside their announced program of world communism and world domination, the ultimate result of that program. He told the people quite flatly that as long as their leaders persist in their drive for communizing the world, including the United States, they must expect the United States and its allies of the free world to maintain their military bases within easy striking distance of the U.S.S.R. Further, he said that this country will continue to increase its military strength. Mr. Nixon's whole tone was firm, but distinctly he engaged in no saber rattling. His warm appreciation of the Russian people and their hospitality to himself and Mrs. Nixon was a strong overlying theme.

And then Mr. Lincoln sums up in these words:

Mr. NIXON has again shown himself a master at grasping the essentials of the most vital problems which confront the United States, the U.S.S.R. and the whole world. His whole bearing during his momentous visit to Russia at a tense moment, with the East and West in virtual deadlock over the problems of West Berlin and all of Germany, was a credit to himself and to his country. Whether he was engaged in rough-and-tumble debate with Russia's Khrushchev, or whether he was being heckled by persons in the throngs which greeted him, Mr. Nixon never lost his dignity and he was never at a loss in meeting the situations as they developed.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have the right to be proud of this great American and we should humbly thank an all-wise Creator for having blessed our side in this cold war with this ablest champion of the course of freedom. Indeed, we might well echo the warm-hearted cheers of the Polish people as they pelted him with flowers and shouted, "Thank you, thank you, thank you, Mr. NEEKSON."

How Integrated Operation of Missouri River Dams Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Great System," which was published in the Pierre (S. Dak.) Capital-Journal. The editorial explains how the integrated operation of the Missouri River dams works.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pierre (S. Dak.) Capital-Journal,
July 22, 1959]

A GREAT SYSTEM

At the end of June the five large reservoirs on the Missouri River under control of the Corps of Engineers had 28,214,000 acre-feet of water in storage. This is the equivalent of about 1 year's total flow of the river at Yankton, S. Dak., during the period when there was no control of the river flow by the big dams.

The figure represents a gain of 1,790,000 acre-feet during June and an increase of approximately 3 million acre-feet over the amount in storage on the same date in 1958.

Substantial runoff from the mountain headwater areas during June, and substantial rainfall in the lower basin permitting reduced reservoir releases, accounted for the additional water in storage. Power generation at the four operating plants rose to 388 million kilowatt-hours, and a new high peak hour generation rate of 706,000 kilowatts on June 26.

Commercial barge traffic on the lower river, in the meantime, continued at a record-breaking level. The unofficial tonnage estimate for the first 3 months of the 1959 season, April through June, was 350,000 tons.

The Missouri River operating system is unique. Nowhere else in the world is so large a volume of water in so long a river under anything approaching the degree of control that exists on the Missouri. When the Oahe and Big Bend Reservoirs come into the system at full scale the degree of control will be even greater.

Currently the reservoir at Oahe, which held 502,000 acre-feet at the close of June, is being lowered 7 feet. This water will be captured in the Fort Randall Reservoir, where it will be passed through power turbines, and then will pass through turbines again at Gavins Point.

The result, of course, will be to permit the generation of more electricity at the dams downstream this summer. At the same time it will provide storage space in the Oahe Reservoir for the recapture of the water to be released through power turbines at Garrison and Fort Peck.

It is a great system.

Political Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting an editorial that appeared in the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star on August 4.

It is entitled "Political Courage" and commends my distinguished colleague, Bob MICHEL, for having that kind of courage. I have known Bob for many years. There is no question but that he has the courage to resist pressure from any group seeking something that is special to them. He is indeed a man who thinks independently, seeking always to do that which is best for his district and the country as a whole. He serves no man, no group, but all the people.

The editorial follows:

POLITICAL COURAGE

Let's face it, a lot of politicians, especially from communities as highly industrial and

organized as ours, simply hide when a labor issue comes up.

This is not unnatural, for too often labor leaders refuse to respect independence, or to admit that there is any middle ground where the general public and general welfare ought to be considered. Too often, they insist that a representative be a slavish stooge virtually 100 percent of the time—or else blast him as anti-labor. Nobody is allowed to be neutral or mildly pro-labor.

Hence, the slightest difference of opinion can bring out union organizers and union funds against any officeholder.

This, however, did not deter Representative Bob MICHEL from taking a frank and fair position on the labor reform issue, and sticking hard to the Eisenhower reform requests. Nor did he do so on the quiet.

He took his position to the people by press and TV, openly, honestly, and asked for reaction to see where he stands.

This is an unusual act of political courage these days.

However, we are not surprised at this quality in Representative MICHEL. When he was a fledgling Congressman, we had some strong feelings about U.S. TV policies. He did not agree with us. He could have dodged the issue entirely, but he didn't. He told us openly exactly how he felt and where he stood.

Although we thought him wrong at the time, we have respected his independence and his frankness and his courage ever since.

Now he simply cannot swallow as representative of what the American public wants and needs, a new House labor bill written in a large part by 13 Democrats on the committee who are indebted to unions for campaign funds, three former labor organizers, and three former union attorneys.

Such special interest legislation is bad for the country, and in the end bad for the people who cause it—because historically, there is an inevitable reaction to such abuses—the pendulum swings.

Bob MICHEL deserves every expression of support this community can give him in his effort to do the right thing.

He deserves it from responsible union men, who want to protect their present position and preserve the support of millions of non-union people, by curbing the arrogance, violence, and ruthlessness of the few who seem bent on reversing the attitudes of the American people toward unions.

The World's Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this is World Refugee Year. Now, 14 years after the end of World War II, the displaced and homeless still fill the camps of Europe, dislocated by new violence, new persecutions and new disorders which have followed in close sequence the finish of the conflict which engulfed the world. The refugee problem has long been with us, so long, in fact, that we think of it as just that, "the refugee problem", sometimes overlooking the human factors involved. For the refugee, to lose hope is to become submerged and to lose life's purpose.

The New York Daily News recently ran a series of articles written by Kitty

Hanson on the European refugee problem, stressing not the statistics with which we are all too familiar, but the very human problems to which we unfortunately sometimes become inured due to the passage of time and the interposing of other, more urgent considerations. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Daily News,
July 20, 1959]

WEST BUNGLES REFUGEE PROBLEM

(By Kitty Hanson)

The free world is failing the enslaved peoples of all Iron Curtain countries and the Communists are beginning to win the propaganda war by default.

This is the inescapable conclusion that strikes home again and again as one visits the border countries of Western Europe, tours their squalid refugee camps, talks with their officials and with representatives of the several international agencies struggling to cope with the steady stream of fugitives.

There are two kinds of refugees in Western Europe's "asylum" countries—Austria, Greece, Italy, and Germany—the "old" and the "new."

The old are displaced persons who refused to return to their Communist-dominated countries after the war. They have been waiting many years in camps for some free nation to accept them.

MANY HAVE ESCAPED REDS SINCE WAR

The new are those who have escaped from Communist countries since the war—for the most part, about 11,000 Hungarians left over from the revolution and Yugoslavs who have been pouring across the borders in great numbers ever since the revolution.

In country after country, in dreary camp after dreary camp, I met and saw and talked with refugees. Some of the "old" were teenagers who have spent all the formative years of their lives in camps. Some were children who were born in camp and know no other life. Many were adults who had seen their friends, and sometimes their families, move on to a new life while they continued to sit and wait.

All these men, women, and children had fled their homes in Hungary, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Albania, Czechoslovakia to find freedom in the West.

The freedom they have found is the freedom to subsist in camps or to starve in unofficial camps and slums. The new life they have found is a life of waiting and idleness—a life that saps their initiative, ravages their morale, and slowly sucks many into drunkenness and immorality.

Everywhere, in every country, the refugee is a source of friction.

There is friction between the countries that have given refugees political asylum and the rest of the West. There is friction between one asylum country and another. There is friction between political parties within a country, making the refugee problem a campaign issue. There is friction between the refugees and the citizens of the country that shelters them.

I came away from camps, officials, citizens, refugees, and agency workers with one picture of the refugee situation in Western Europe today:

It is an unholy mess; a bewildering tangle of red tape, restrictive rulings, conflicting interests, emotions, and politics.

It would be even more of a mess if it were not for the work of the agencies—international, local, religious, and nonsectarian—which work at the heart of, and in spite of, this tangle. Their efforts range all the way

from providing a sheet for a mouldy mattress to chartering a ship to move several hundred people halfway around the globe.

Chief among these are the office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the U.S. escapee program, and the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration.

NOT ALL FREE NATIONS OPEN THEIR DOORS

The latter was set up 8 years ago by 28 free nations of the West to even up the populations of overcrowded and underpopulated countries by transferring people who could not move without international assistance. The committee now is geared to transport people all over the world as fast as the free nations open their doors, but there is one major obstacle:

The doors are not open wide enough.

This is the crux of the refugee problem and it is creating most of the friction among the free nations.

In essence, the West has said to the people behind the Iron Curtain: "Come out. Reject communism. Freedom awaits you."

Then, the West has said to the free border countries—primarily Austria, Italy, Greece, and Germany: "In the name of the free world, give these people asylum."

ASYLUM COUNTRIES LEFT HOLDING BAG

As a result, these asylum countries have become reception centers not only for thousands displaced by the war, but also for a steady stream of men, women, and children who find life under communism intolerable.

The asylum countries must house, clothe, and feed these refugees, with varying degrees of international assistance. When it comes to taking some of the surplus human beings off the hands of the asylum countries, the rest of the world has been dragging its feet.

In fact, the major receiving countries—those that accept refugees for resettlement within their borders—go about it like housewives at a vegetable market.

Coldly and suspiciously they pick over the supply, selecting only the young, the healthy, the strong, and the productive; rejecting the old, the ill, and the handicapped as well as those considered possible security risks.

(In Austria, I met a former Hungarian diplomat who fled with his family to the West only to learn he could never be welcome in any country because his small son is paralyzed on one side.)

(In Greece, a family of four is waiting for the youngest child to die so that they may leave the country. The child suffered meningitis just days before they were to leave and thus disqualified the family for emigration. When he dies in a year or two, he will release his family at last for the new life they had sought.)

The selections commissions of some countries actually have felt the muscles and examined the teeth of the applicants for admission to their country. In one country, all women over 35 and men over 40 are rejected as "too old."

Almost all countries refuse admission to anyone with a TB scar, even though he does not have active tuberculosis. Active cases, of course, may not emigrate to countries where TB can be cured, but remain in camps, prime breeding grounds for TB.

REDS AIM PROPAGANDA AT FORGOTTEN ONES

As a consequence of these and many other restricting qualifications, there are in Western Europe today hundreds of thousands of refugees—most of them escapees from Communist slavery—living in misery and squalor, chafing at the red tape which keeps them from starting new lives in free countries and trying to ignore the Communist

propaganda that whispers that they have been "forgotten by the West."

This propaganda line is part of a highly organized Communist redefection movement. Its aim is to lure escapees back into the Iron Curtain countries by playing upon their homesickness, disillusionment, and anxiety about loved ones back home.

In Greece, for instance, I saw photostatic copies of 33 cablegrams sent to one Rumanian refugee which purported to be from his family. The series of vague messages built up his anxiety to the point where he finally slipped back across the border to reassure himself that his family was all right.

ARE SUCH PERSONS WORTH SAVING?

Then he escaped once more into Greece. Immediately the cable barrage was resumed. Finally, the man's will broke, and he returned to Rumania.

"If the Commies are willing to spend that much time and effort to get one refugee back," said a U.S. escapee program representative in Greece, "maybe the free nations ought to figure it's worth something to save them."

The long days, weeks, months and years during which a refugee waits for acceptance by a free country give the Commie redefection agents a clear and fertile field.

Adding still further tension and anxiety to the situation is the fact that the countries of asylum are getting tired of having to keep the discards while the rest of the West skims off the cream of the refugee crop. They feel that the other nations ought to take a fair share of the "humanitarian cases" as well as the strong and productive.

As a result, Yugoslavs have been getting a cold reception for nearly 2 years. Since June of this year, the chill has extended to the Hungarians.

The welcome mat is being hauled in. Refugees are being sent back across the border they crossed at such peril.

That peril is quite apparent to anyone who sees the border. I visited the frontier between Austria and Hungary about 40 miles from Vienna, where the free world ends in a tangle of barbed wire.

Concealed in a small grove on a wooded strip of no man's land, I stood with an uneasy Austrian gendarme watching the Hungarian border guards patrol the Iron Curtain—two parallel fences of barbed wire separating the free world from the slave.

The 5-foot strip of ground between the two fences conceals a murderous mosaic of mines triggered to maim or kill.

THEY'RE DESPERATE ENOUGH TO GAMBLE

Along the inner fence runs a strip of earth freshly plowed to trap the telltale footprints of men, women and children who dare to make the desperate bid for freedom.

The guards had seen us move past the official barricade. One came down into the wheat field only 100 feet away to look for us. The other scanned the countryside through field glasses from the narrow balcony of a watchtower 200 feet away. These watch towers, set on 60-foot-high steel skeletons, are placed about every 500 yards along the border.

"At night," said the gendarme in a low voice, "you can hear the dogs they use to hunt down the refugees."

Yet almost every night not only Hungary's Iron curtain but the locked borders of every other Communist-dominated country are pierced by someone desperate enough to gamble life itself on the strength of the free world's promise of freedom and a better life.

Some are shot. Some are caught. And those who win the gamble soon learn that the promises is not being kept.

The International Poker Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the invitation by President Eisenhower of the Soviet dictator, the head of the worldwide Communist conspiracy and also Prime Minister of the Soviet Union, Mr. Khrushchev, to visit the United States, has been received with sharp discussion and much concern by our people and properly so.

An objective appraisal of this concern is stated in a well considered article written by David Lawrence, and appearing in the Washington Star of August 5, 1959, which article I include in my extension of remarks.

It is my opinion that time will show that President Eisenhower made a serious mistake. It will be interesting to note "the law of natural and probable consequences" operating as a result of the President's invitation and the coming visit of Mr. Khrushchev.

The article follows:

THE INTERNATIONAL POKER GAME—MANEUVERS BY UNITED STATES AND SOVIET OVER GENEVA AND VISITS ANALYZED

(By David Lawrence)

A fascinating poker game has been going on for several weeks now, and the big question is: Who won—Khrushchev or Eisenhower?

The reasons behind the invitation by the President to the Soviet Premier are by no means clear, and it is not yet possible to say which one was outmaneuvered.

But these facts are known—that the Soviet Premier wanted a summit conference, and the United States didn't, though Britain was favorable and France was somewhat indifferent. The plan for a foreign ministers conference to be held at Geneva was devised on the theory that, if any substantial progress were made, this would justify a summit conference.

But Nikita Khrushchev is a stubborn man. He didn't want a foreign ministers conference. He sent his foreign minister to Geneva, but with instructions to make no agreements there. Gromyko complied 100 percent. The idea was to force a summit meeting on the pretense that only the heads of government could negotiate agreements.

Then the Western allies recessed the foreign ministers conference. President Eisenhower decided on another approach. He thought that maybe an exploratory consultation might be held between him and the Soviet Premier. If Mr. Khrushchev wanted to come to the United States on a visit—it had been said that this was his real reason for pressing for a summit conference—then an invitation to him alone to come to America might serve the broad purpose. At least, it would feel out the situation for the United States, and then it could be determined whether any progress sufficient to warrant a summit conference had been made.

Corroboration of this analysis is to be derived in part from the President's press conference on Monday of this week, when he was asked:

"The impression has somehow been received, Mr. President, in considering a possible visit by Mr. Khrushchev to the United States, that before you would issue an invitation to him, there would have to be some evidence of 'give,' in the sense of 'give and take' on the part of Mr. Khrushchev, on Western principles. May we take it that there has been such indication?"

The President replied as follows:

"No; I can't—I don't think you can say that, Mr. Belair. This is what I have said—that the holding of a summit meeting and negotiation, that that would be, to my mind, absolutely impractical and, as the State Department says, unproductive unless we could count on some positive results. But I would say these, so far as our discussions of mutual problems, are exploratory rather than any attempt at negotiation."

Mr. Eisenhower revealed that "some time back" he had suggested to the State Department that he believed, "in the effort to melt a little bit of the ice that seems to freeze our relationships with the Soviets, that possibly a visit such as I now have proposed would be useful, and we studied this thing and, in early July, I initiated the correspondence that finally brought about an agreement."

Under the circumstances, it now is apparent just why Foreign Minister Gromyko wouldn't agree to anything at Geneva. As long as a consultation with the President of the United States was being planned, the Soviet Government felt that nothing further need be done for the present. Conversely, it is possible that Mr. Eisenhower hoped his gesture might eventually have a beneficial effect. Apparently he still held to that view, even in his special conference with the press this very week, when he said:

"The visit itself (between Khrushchev and the President) has no direct connection with any possible later summit meeting. I, of course, would hope that the mere announcement would inspire the foreign ministers to a greater activity, and probably some greater effort at conciliation, so that there might be results before Wednesday, when they temporarily adjourn—at least that would justify the scheduling of such a later meeting, at what time I don't know. But in any event, even if they have to reassemble, I would hope they could do that, if they found it reasonable and proper."

"Now I merely want to make clear that this is a personal visit for the purposes that I have outlined, and are given in the statement, but with the hope that it will do something to promote understanding and possibly progress toward peace in the world."

The key phrases in that comment are those that say there is "no direct connection" with the later summit meeting and that "this is a personal visit." But the impression is inescapable that the President tried hard to assuage the Soviet Premier with a promise of an exchange of personal visits, hoping that something good in return would come out of the foreign ministers conference at Geneva or later in New York anyway. There is some reason to believe that the Soviet Premier accepted the President's invitation rather suddenly, for the United Press International as late as Friday of last week reported as follows:

"The President has told some visitors that an invitation to Khrushchev is like a high card in a poker game, not to be dealt out without something in return. He has referred privately to the foreign ministers meeting as a poker game."

As these lines were written, it was recognized here that some move by Moscow that would seem to be a concession to the President's viewpoint might be in the offing. If it came, the feeling here was that this might have justified the maneuverings on both

sides. If it didn't come, Mr. Eisenhower was represented as still hopeful of an eventual change for the better on the issues raised at the Geneva Foreign Ministers Conference.

A Tribute to the University of Texas' War on Cancer and the Leadership of Dr. R. Lee Clark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the most terrible diseases which affects mankind today is cancer. Yet we all earnestly hope this will not always be so.

Our men of science and medicine are working now toward new weapons to fight this enemy. The Congress votes increasingly large appropriations to fight cancer. One of the battlegrounds of the war on this disease is a modern building in Houston, Tex.—the M. D. Anderson Hospital and Tumor Institute of the University of Texas, one of the three top cancer research institutions in America.

One of America's leaders in this war is Dr. R. Lee Clark, director and surgeon in chief at the center. His leadership has helped to build the center into one of the finest of its type in the Nation. He has earned the respect and honor of his profession and of the general public. Dr. Clark came to the center in 1946, just 2 years after it began operations in a makeshift barracks. He has helped it become the modern, advanced medical research center it is today. Dr. Clark is from a family of educators. His father founded Texas Christian University. His uncle, Lee Clark, long professor of American history at Sam Houston State Teachers College, was my mentor in that subject. Before Dr. R. Lee Clark came to M. D. Anderson Hospital and Tumor Institute he had engaged in study and research for years in Europe, in addition to his American studies. The country is fortunate to have his leadership at the institute.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the University of Texas Record for spring 1959, entitled "University of Texas' War on Cancer."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS' WAR ON CANCER

There's a war going on in Houston, and the University of Texas is in the thick of it.

The enemy is cancer—a formidable foe which kills 24 Texans every day and which shows few signs of surrendering.

The battleground is the university's M. D. Anderson Hospital and Tumor Institute, a modern \$10 million pink marble building located on a 9-acre tract in the bustling Texas Medical Center.

TOP THREE

A next-door neighbor of the university's dental branch, M. D. Anderson (named for its

generous benefactor) ranks "among the top three cancer research institutions in the country," according to Dr. R. Lee Clark, Anderson's director and surgeon in chief.

"Only the Sloan-Kettering Institute in New York City, and the Roswell Park Memorial Institute in Buffalo have more comprehensive research programs," he said, "but, then, they have larger research facilities."

Certainly, Anderson is the only one of its kind in the Southwest. There is no comparable cancer research institution within 1,500 miles.

What makes Anderson unique? The fact that it has gathered under one roof three entities: research laboratories, educational-training facilities, and a specialty hospital.

A specialty hospital it is. "We see more cancer here in 1 year than the average general hospital sees in 10," said Dr. Clifton Howe, head of the department of medicine.

In an all-out offensive, Anderson battles cancer from three important fronts: research and education (heart and soul of the Tumor Institute which receives about 50 percent of the \$5 million a year budget), and patient care.

Anderson's assignment is a tough one: determine what causes cancer, how it behaves, and then prevent and control this medical scourge.

FROM MAKESHIFT TO MODERN

Named the M. D. Anderson Hospital for Cancer Research when created by the legislature in 1941, Anderson became a reality in 1944.

In makeshift barracks at the old Baker Estate on Baldwin Street, a staff of 25 started to work. Two dozen beds were leased in Houston hospitals; only 49 hospital patients were seen that first year. Research started but was limited to projects which did not require air conditioning—and they were housed in ex-stables. It was a humble beginning.

Since 1954, however, when Anderson moved into its new building, things have brightened tremendously.

In a colorful, comfortable setting, Anderson now maintains a 300-bed hospital, sees about 10,000 patients a year (as many as 300 a day), and employs 1,400 persons including a professional staff of more than 100 scientists and physicians engaged in 125 active research programs covering the basic sciences (biochemistry, biology and physics) and the clinical sciences (surgery, radiology, medicine and pathology). In between is the coordinating science of epidemiology.

NO HOLDS BARRED

In its efforts to defeat cancer, Anderson takes a "no-holds-barred" attitude.

Anderson fights cancer on the clinical level with radiation, surgery and chemotherapy (the use of chemical drugs which attack cancer cells without harm to normal cells).

On the basic science level, researchers fight cancer by learning more of how it starts, how it grows, how it behaves, how it affects its host, how it responds to treatment.

In 125 research projects (and an equal number still in the "dry run" stage), the problem is approached on a coordinated basis.

"Coordinated research is one of our principal efforts," Dr. Clark said.

In biology, working with the medical staff, Virologist Leon Dmochowski continues research wherein he saw for the first time anywhere virus-like particles in human leukemia through Anderson's \$35,000 electron microscope.

Using bacteria, fruitflies and mice, biologists carry on research that varies from human genetics to cytology, from radiation biology to microbiology.

In surgery, Dr. John S. Stehlin has treated more than 100 patients with a refinement of the perfusion technique developed from

Anderson research. This is a process whereby a patient with a tumor in a leg or arm receives massive doses of a chemotherapeutic agent (usually nitrogen mustard). A tourniquet applied to the extremity cuts circulation from the rest of the body. Using a heart-lung machine, circulation in the leg or arm is maintained while large drug doses are added—doses which can be tolerated in an isolated area but not in the entire body.

Anesthesiologists are perfecting a technique at Anderson for the control of pain in cases of advanced malignancy.

In medicine, Anderson's staff was the first to suggest cutting the pituitary stalk in the brain to change hormone balance in advanced breast cancer cases. Result?—a comparatively normal life without pain. Also in medicine, clinicians use radioisotope therapy for cancer of the stomach and intestines.

In pathology, the staff has developed and refined the "cryostat," an instrument which fixes frozen tissues to allow for final diagnosis within minutes. Pathologists, too, are working on ways of detecting cancer cells in sputum with an eye to earlier diagnosis of lung cancer.

PIONEERING

In physics and radiology, the staff has at its research fingertips some of the world's finest equipment.

With the slightest trace of a British accent, Physicist Warren Sinclair, formerly of London's Royal Marsden Hospital, said:

"I believe that this institution has one of the most outstanding radiotherapy programs in the country.

"Therapists here have a greater variety of radiation devices than any other institution in the U.S., and probably in the world."

Radiotherapy equipment includes two cobalt 60 units, a nine-ton Betatron and a newly-installed Caesatron unit.

"These units," said Dr. Clark, "give Anderson an excellent 'panorama' of equipment for radiation therapy."

He explained that the first Cobalt unit was designed at Anderson by Dr. Gilbert H. Fletcher, radiologist, and the late physicist, Leonard Grimmett, with Atomic Energy Commission help. "It was the first such design approved by the AEC for therapeutic use, so I suppose you could say we're 'pioneers' in that area of radiation," Dr. Clark said.

The second cobalt unit, newer in design, rotates around the patient. Both units have approximately the equivalent of 3-million volts.

The 22-million-volt Betatron, one of the most powerful of all existing X-ray units, has great penetration and is used for deep-seated cancers (as found in the gall-bladder or cervix).

The Caesatron, newest of the units, uses radioactive cesium in special cases (post-operative breast cancer, for instance) where less radiation penetration is required.

About 90 patients a day are treated with these radiation units.

CHEMOTHERAPY

More than 20 percent of Anderson's current research is in the growing field of chemotherapy. In fact, Anderson is headquarters for the four-State Southwest Cancer Chemotherapy Study Section, which includes several medical schools and hospitals.

Latest drugs and chemicals are being tested by 32 staff members in 39 research projects for their effectiveness against cancer, especially leukemia, which defies treatment by surgery or radiation.

REINFORCEMENTS

While research is the heart of the tumor institute, education is its soul.

Anderson, for example, gives specialty training each year to about 60 residents and fellows in the basic and clinical sciences;

holds an annual 3-day symposium on fundamental cancer research which brings basic scientists from all over the world to report on latest research findings in 1 general research area (this year's meeting attracted 524 delegates from 30 States and 14 foreign countries); conducts a fall clinical conference for Texas physicians to help them keep abreast on new methods of cancer diagnosis and treatment; operates a slide set service where Texas doctors can see color slides of 21,000 examples of cancer cases ranging from the earliest to the most advanced cancers; maintains for physicians a 15,000-volume library devoted primarily to cancer, and has begun offering, in cooperation with the main university's graduate school, academic work in graduate fields of biology, biochemistry, and physics.

PRINTED WORDS

One of Anderson's liveliest educational aspects deals with printed words.

The Cancer Bulletin, a colorful, sprightly bimonthly journal with an international circulation of 50,000, is edited by Anderson's staff to help practicing M.D.'s better diagnose and treat cancer.

Begun in 1948, the bulletin has been described as a "departure from the yawn-provoking trend found in most medical journals."

"Content—the bulletin's essential aspect—is not overshadowed by color or layout," said Dr. Russell W. Cumley, bulletin editor. "Every article gets hard scrutiny from 6 to 12 scientists."

Since 1957, the staff has edited a major scientific publication, the "Year Book of Cancer," the medical world's first cancer digest of thousands of articles pertaining to this disease.

Anderson joins hands with the University of Texas Press each year to put out in book form the papers delivered at the annual symposium.

In addition, a newsletter is mailed quarterly to all Texas physicians to keep them posted on Anderson activities and policies.

In the printed-words area, one must not overlook the 200 to 300 scientific papers published annually by the staff.

EXCELLENT CARE

Patients at the M. D. Anderson Hospital receive care and treatment usually unavailable in their own communities (radiation units being too expensive for small hospitals).

Anderson's patients (all Texans who must be referred by physicians) receive excellent care, said Dr. Melvin A. Casberg, university vice president for medical affairs.

Of Anderson's 300 beds, some 65 percent are paid for by the State to accommodate indigent patients. The other 35 percent are for full-pay patients.

Since its beginning in 1944, the staff has treated more than 28,000 patients.

COMPETITION

While Anderson faces a scientific problem on how to whip cancer, it faces other problems, too.

One of the most constant is the hiring of outstanding staff members.

"In certain areas of basic research and laboratory work, industry and several out-of-State research and educational institutions offer much higher salaries," Dr. Clark noted. "Our salary scales need to improve."

Other needs are for more research room (soon to be eased with the addition of a five-story research wing) and a nuclear reactor for research purposes.

When the university's committee of 75 turned in its final report, it said that M. D. Anderson has an excellent opportunity to attain national and international leadership in the field of cancer within the next 25 years.

This prediction, well along the way to becoming a reality, means only one thing: the ultimate winner will be the State of Texas whose citizens may have a cancer-free future.

FCC Rule Needs Changing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of interest in recent weeks in proposals to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to allow news coverage by radio and television stations of candidates for public office without unreasonable application of the equal-time rule.

The able junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] has helped a great deal to make possible the passage by the Senate on July 28 of legislation directed to this end.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial on this subject published in the La Porte (Ind.) Herald-Argus of July 31, 1959.

The editorial follows:

FCC RULE NEEDS CHANGING

Television like radio is subject to Federal regulation in the public interest but there should be sensible regulation and only that. Newspapers can print or not print, in general, what they like, on the theory that those who publish newspapers have an adequate sense of responsibility to safeguard essential rights and fairness. Those individuals who control TV and radio stations should be conceded a somewhat similar sense of responsibility.

Congress should pass as soon as possible the proposal to set aside the Federal Communications Commission's equal-air-time ruling, which borders on the ridiculous, even though the FCC was apparently serious in believing the ruling carried out the intent of the Federal Communications Act. This ruling means that such eccentrics as Lar "America First" Daly, who runs often for the pure joy of running, is entitled to as much air time as any Republican and Democratic candidate for president.

Should this ruling be applied vigorously, minor candidates for major offices, including a variety of freaks and crackpots, could create chaos on the air lanes before and during political campaigns. In 1956, for example, 9 minor contenders campaigned for the presidency, gaining from 8 to 175,000 votes apiece. Had each of these demanded equal air time as President Eisenhower after his news conferences, the confusion can be imagined.

The Senate bill would exempt all legitimate news programs, such as panel shows, interviews, and newsreels from the strict interpretation of the equal time regulation. This would appear to be reasonable. The TV and radio networks and stations, like newspapers and magazines, should be permitted to use their best judgment in coverage of political personages as news rather than as men or women seeking office.

The FCC can and must function to make possible fair allocation of time on the air waves for candidates whose purpose is to win votes. Bias or intolerance on the part of the stations or networks against any

legitimate candidate should not be permitted to bar him from the air lines or shove him away back in some corner. But the equal-time provision should be adjusted so that freedom of the air does not become ridiculous.

Senior Citizens Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on March 10 I introduced S.J. Res. 75, to provide for the designation of the month of May each year as Senior Citizens Month. Many of the State Governors have already proclaimed this observation, honoring the 21 million American senior citizens past 60 years of age.

I have an article from the September 1959 issue of Senior Citizen describing this activity in the States, and the proclamation for a Senior Citizens Month issued by Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York, which I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and proclamation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIRD OBSERVANCE OF SENIOR CITIZENS MONTH (By Anna C. Leahy)

The third nationwide Senior Citizens Month, sponsored by Senior Citizens of America, was observed May 1959. Forty-four States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico issued proclamations while civic-minded organizations reinforced and supported the proclamations with effective programs.

The general purpose of Senior Citizens Month is to call attention to the priceless human resources to be found in the talent, education, experience, and wisdom of older people. It is also to stress their physical, social, economic, and spiritual needs, and their right to equal opportunities for useful living in the community.

The entire month is the most popular form of statewide observance as it allows activities to proceed at leisurely pace, and gives time for consideration of distance, transportation difficulties, and other problems. However, a week, day, or shorter period is often chosen for special types of events.

Due to the number of SCM programs, it is possible to present only a few representative ones. The examples given will indicate, to some extent, the high quality and valuable content of the work being done by individuals and organizations.

New York State, a pioneer leader of the senior citizens movement, had its usual statewide program during May with a proclamation by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller. The excellence of the social and economic contributions made by New York to its older citizens, at this time and during its year around program, has stimulated similar contributions throughout the Nation.

Another observance that engaged the interest of people in all parts of the State is that of Washington. Sixty prominent people, each representing his own district, made speeches on topics concerning the interests and welfare of older people. Resource material was made available. This resource material included suggested picture shows; sample proclamations for mayors; fact sheets that gave basic information about older peo-

ple; statements of objectives, outlining practical method of improving unhappy living conditions of many older people, and ideas for community observance through recreation and other constructive projects with year-round possibilities. Miss Margaret Whyte, executive secretary for the Governor's council of the aging, is in charge of the Senior Citizens Month program.

Fort Worth, Tex., observes the entire month but selects a week to emphasize phases of the senior citizens movement. During this week an outstanding citizen is honored at a dinner meeting by the Womens' Civic Council, an organization formed by 25 civic clubs. There is a proclamation by the mayor of the city and tributes are made to the guest of honor by religious and civic leaders. This year William J. Marsh, composer of the Texas State song, was chosen "in recognition of his many contributions to Fort Worth's musical and cultural fields." As a mark of special recognition, Gov. Price Daniel sent a scroll to be presented with the plaque given by the council. Mr. Herbert Shore, president of Texas Society on Aging, made the principal address of the evening. About 350 guests were present.

The Los Angeles area also observes Senior Citizens Month and selects a week for special activities. The following report was sent by Mr. T. H. Edwards, vice president Senior Citizens Association of Los Angeles County, 11921 Santa Monica Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.:

The Governor of California proclaimed May as Senior Citizens Month and the week of May 17 to 23 was proclaimed Senior Citizens Week by the mayor of Los Angeles and all the mayors of cities in Los Angeles County. Pasadena held a conference on aging on May 11 and 12 with two different workshops each day with the purpose of educating the various communities on the needs and problems of the aged and the responsibility of the communities, churches and clubs toward them. Libraries, homes, housing authorities, and service clubs held open house for guests.

May 17: Churches in each area participated in honoring senior citizens at their services.

May 18: The various senior citizen and service clubs held special events in the individual communities.

May 18-20: Displays of senior citizen projects, hobbies, etc. were on exhibition in the Los Angeles City Hall rotunda, and also in the Hall of Records building.

May 19: At 9 o'clock a lawn bowling tournament.

May 19: From 8 to 11 p.m. Free dance at the Shrine Exposition Hall in Los Angeles.

May 20: A noonday luncheon with a noted speaker.

May 21: 2 p.m. A special live stage show of singing, dancing, and acting from the entertainment world of Hollywood, with Francis X. Bushman as M.C.

May 22: A shuffleboard tournament in one of the Los Angeles parks and also a stage show, "The Gay Nineties," in Pasadena by local talent.

Besides the special activities mentioned, the libraries, homes for the aged, housing authorities, and service clubs had various activities. The press and TV gave much publicity. The Senior Citizens Association worked in cooperation with many different organizations including Senior Citizens Service Center; Los Angeles City Recreation and Parks; Los Angeles County; Los Angeles County Commission on Aging; State Department of Social Welfare; Welfare Planning; Church Welfare Federation; Welfare Planning Council; Sears, Roebuck Foundation.

The Senior Citizens Association of Los Angeles County is composed of 114 clubs in the county. There are 500,000 senior citizens in Los Angeles County.

First Lady Mamie Eisenhower entertained about 600 guests from local homes for the aged and the blind at a White House garden party on the afternoon of May 28. Although wheelchairs and canes were in evidence, there was an air of gaiety and happiness with smiling exchanges of goodwill. Old friends met and new friends were made. Eighty-nine-year-old, Rebecca Clark, a resident of Carroll Manor, answered Mrs. Eisenhower's welcoming embrace by saying she had known the hostess "since she was a girl." Exsoldier Floyd Jones, lying helpless on a wheelchair, held a mirror in order to see Mrs. Eisenhower as she greeted him. Refreshments were served at two bright red and white striped awning stands. The guests sat in chairs and listened to the Marine Corps Band playing national favorites. It was a happy and unusual Senior Citizens Day.

"Going Like Sixty" club, Oak Park, Mich. enjoyed May 19 as Senior Citizens Day with an outing by bus to Lansing, where they were entertained at luncheon by the Silver Toppers.

On May 10, the Soroptimist Club of Pocomoke City, Md., dedicated Hartley Hall, a home for Senior Citizens, with Gov. J. Millard Tawes as principal speaker. Guests from Washington, D.C., Annapolis, Salisbury, and other neighboring cities came to join the people of Pocomoke in applauding the Soroptimists for their superior achievement. The club bought an old mansion, remodeled it according to State building regulations, and at an open house announced plans for adding more rooms and building an infirmary. Miss Anna Davis, president of Soroptimist said that now the building is paid for, they will concentrate on plans for maintenance and the care of about 25 guests.

A Senior Citizens Conference was held May 14, 1959, at the Opportunity School, West Columbia, S.C. Dr. Joy Elmer Morgan, Washington, D.C., was guest speaker. Dr. Will Lou Gray, the State Director of SCA, presided. At this conference the first State branch of SCA was organized (see account in Senior Citizen July 1959:59). Following the conference the State Legislature created a Commission on the Aging.

The president of the Soroptimist International of Clovis, N. Mex., Miss Alice G. Converse, reports a successful celebration of the first anniversary of the Senior Citizen Center of Clovis with 471 guests attending a fund raising barbecue. Senior citizen programs were given publicity by newspapers, television, and radio. To illustrate the co-operation between State and cities, Miss Converse sends copies of proclamations by Gov. John Burroughs and Mayor Benjamin Newt Hudnall of Clovis.

The names of the States participating in the senior citizens month program and of the Governors who issued proclamations or statements are:

Alabama, John Patterson; Arizona, Paul Fannin; Arkansas, Orval Faubus; California, Edmund Brown; Colorado, Stephen L. R. McNichols; Connecticut, Abraham Ribicoff; Delaware, J. Caleb Boggs; Florida, LeRoy Collins; Georgia, Ernest Vandiver; Idaho, Robert E. Smylie; Illinois, William G. Stratton; Indiana, Harold W. Handley; Iowa, Herschel C. Loveless; Kansas, George Docking; Kentucky, Albert B. Chandler; Louisiana, Earl K. Long; Maine, Clinton A. Clauson; Maryland, J. Millard Tawes; Massachusetts, Foster Furcolo; Michigan, G. Mennen Williams; Minnesota, Orville L. Freeman; Missouri, James T. Blair, Jr.; Nebraska, Ralph G. Brooks; Nevada, Grant Sawyer; New Hampshire, Wesley Powell; New Jersey, Robert B. Meyner; New Mexico, John Burroughs; New York, Nelson A. Rockefeller; North Dakota, John E. Davis; Ohio, Michael V. Disalle; Oklahoma, J. H. Edmondson; Oregon, Mark O. Hatfield; Pennsylvania, David L. Lawrence; Rhode Island, Christo-

pher Del Sesto; South Dakota, Ralph Herseth; Tennessee, Buford Ellington; Texas, Price Daniel; Utah, George Dewey Clyde; Vermont, Robert T. Stafford; Virginia, J. Lindsay Almond, Jr.; Washington, Albert D. Rosellini; West Virginia, Cecil H. Underwood; Wisconsin, Gaylord A. Nelson; Wyoming, Joseph J. Hickey; Puerto Rico, Luis Muñoz-Martin; District of Columbia [Washington], Commissioners Robert E. McLaughlin, David B. Karrick, A. W. Welling.

A NOTABLE PROCLAMATION

Whereas the foundation of these United States of America has been solidly based on the foresight, initiative, courage, strength, and determination of our senior citizens; and

Whereas these senior citizens have met the challenge of pioneering this country and especially our great Southwest with vision and firm resolve; and

Whereas the second half of life should be richer and happier than it now is, and the facilities and opportunities for living a useful and happy life should not be denied to any person because of age; and

Whereas increase in population of this age group due to the many components of the American way of life, becomes greater each year by a large percentage; and

Whereas better provision should be made for housing, [education], recreational, and employment needs of our senior citizens, as well as care for those who are not able to care for themselves; and

Whereas they should be given the opportunity to continue to use their wealth of wisdom, experience, and knowledge in aiding the community in which they live: Therefore be it

Resolved, That I, Benjamin Newt Hudnall, mayor of the city of Clovis, N. Mex., do designate the month of May as Senior Citizens Month in Clovis, and urge the cooperation of every organization, both religious and civic, in developing programs honoring and recognizing the necessary needs of our aging population, and to ask for prayerful guidance and wisdom. Issued May 1, 1959, by Benjamin Newt Hudnall, mayor.

PROCLAMATION

"The Senior Citizens of America have asked me to proclaim May as Senior Citizens Month. I am happy to comply.

"New York State is proud of its men and women who are 65 years of age or more. Their number today is in excess of 1.5 million. Their experience, judgment, skill, and loyalty constitute a major strength of our society. While the increase in the numbers of our aged brings with it new problems, what is needed, perhaps, above all is a new understanding among our people of the great opportunities that now exist to make the golden years in later life rich in service, usefulness, and creativity.

"Unfortunately, too many of these men and women find themselves without a full outlet for their talents. Most of our large corporations have rules which retire people at a specified age, regardless of their physical and mental fitness for service. Most of them, of course, remain as well qualified as ever, but are confronted with the problem of inaction.

"There are also people who find themselves jobless at the age of 45 through no fault of their own. They frequently encounter great difficulty in obtaining new positions.

"The New York Legislature took action on this issue last year by enacting a law which prohibits discrimination in employment on the grounds of age. This was a helpful measure but still much remains to be done to persuade many employers to live up to the spirit of that measure.

"In New York, we are fortunate to have the services of the Joint Legislative Committee on Problems of the Aging. Its work

has received national and worldwide recognition. It has been able to encourage housing for the aging, special counseling and placement of elder job seekers. It has also established Golden Age Clubs and community programs for the elderly.

"Various other State agencies, including the department of health, the social welfare department, the labor department, and the mental hygiene department, are also engaged in endeavors to meet this problem. It is desirable to focus attention on this issue.

"Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim the month of May 1959 as Senior Citizens Month in New York State, and I urge that social agencies, health and mental hygiene groups, churches, schools, fraternal and civic groups, and public and private agencies cooperate in promoting these purposes."

Given under my hand and the Privy Seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 15th day of April in the year of our Lord 1959.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

United States and Italy Renew Food-for-Children Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the truly heartwarming activities carried on under our surplus agricultural commodities distribution program is the joint program with Italy to provide food for needy Italian children. Under the program the United States makes dry milk and wheat flour available from Government-owned surplus commodity stocks. In turn, the Italian Government contributes food and distribution costs in the amount of \$11 million per year.

During the 4 years that the food-for-children program has been in operation, the United States has contributed approximately 108,000 tons of surplus food for the benefit of some 5½ million children. Under the terms of the renewal agreement for the coming year, we will provide food for use in over 34,000 school lunchrooms, children's homes, kindergartens, and summer camps.

Mr. Speaker, as this program offers an excellent demonstration of how our surplus food commodities can be used in the interest of humanity, I ask that the State Department press release of July 30 be included with my remarks.

UNITED STATES AND ITALY RENEW FOOD-FOR-CHILDREN PROGRAM

The agreement for a joint Italian-American program to provide food for Italy's needy children was renewed at a signing in Rome today by U.S. Ambassador J. D. Zellerbach and Italy's Foreign Minister Giuseppe Pella.

The agreement covers the period from October 1959 through September 1960 and will continue a cooperative child-feeding program which has been in operation for 4 years.

More than 1,600,000 children benefit from the program. Sixty percent of the food made available under the program will go to depressed areas. Under terms of the agree-

ment, the program will provide food for use in over 34,000 school lunchrooms, children's homes, kindergartens, and summer camps for children.

The United States contribution for the year will continue at approximately the present level. Four thousand tons of dry milk and 23,000 tons of wheat flour will be transferred by the International Cooperation Administration from U.S. Government-owned surplus commodity stocks.

The Government of Italy's contribution to the program, including food and distribution costs, will be continued at the present rate, which is valued at more than 7 billion lire (\$11 million) per year.

Not including the assistance provided for in today's agreement, the United States since 1956 has contributed about 108,000 tons of food toward the child-feeding program, which is carried out under the direction of the Administration for Italian and International Assistance Activities, an Italian Government agency.

Recognition of Oregon's Centennial by Weyerhaeuser Timber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Weyerhaeuser News, a monthly company publication of the Weyerhaeuser Timber Co., contains an excellent article on the Oregon Centennial in its July issue.

The article, entitled "Oregon's 100th Birthday Party," contains some wonderful pictures of logging and lumbering in the Pacific Northwest. I regret these cannot be printed because they graphically portray the role that logs and lumbering play in our State's economy. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be published in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON'S 100TH BIRTHDAY PARTY

The group of bearded men who sat down together in 1957 to plan for Oregon's admission to the Union had little expectation that timber would dominate the future of their State.

They were trappers, missionaries, farmers, lumbermen, miners, and merchants. What wealth they possessed could be credited to the gold rush boom in neighboring California. Looking out the window of their Salem meeting place, if they could see all the forests of the State, a generous sample of Oregon's green gold would unfold—magnificent stands of cedar, hemlock, spruce, Douglas-fir, and ponderosa pine—mating the hillsides and cluttering the valleys.

For many years to come, settlers would hack and burn the trees to clear the way for more valuable lowland fields and pastures.

The setting of the 1957 territorial legislative session was charged with hope. Then, as now, the borders of Oregon contained more timber than any other State. But mining fever had spread from the Mother Lode and the Comstock and many pioneers pictured a path of gold and silver leading to the Beaver State's future.

Agriculture, too, was booming. For 8 years, the gold rush had demanded more fruits, grains, vegetables, and meats than the sparse white population of Oregon Territory could produce.

The fur trade was responsible for the original settlement of the entire northern Pacific coast and there was reason to hope that the fashion for beaver hats would maintain trapping as an important Oregon industry.

Other optimists pointed to the rich treasure chest of fisheries in the new State's broad rivers and long coastline.

But long before the residents of Oregon Territory voted on statehood in 1857, the predominance of timber in the lives of their descendants had been indicated.

The Hudson's Bay Co. established the first sawmill west of the Mississippi at Fort Vancouver on the Willamette River in 1827. In the early 1830's, a mill at Oregon City was busy producing shingles for export to the Sandwich Islands.

An upstart young village called Portland, located a few miles downstream from Oregon City, was visited by four or five ships in 1848. Two years later, at the height of the gold rush, no less than 50 lumber-carrying vessels made it a port of call.

There were 30 sawmills between the Columbia River and the California line in 1849. But for many years, the major markets for timber products were limited to Oregon or California, which was quickly developing its own lumber mills. Heavily stocked timberlands were selling for only a few dollars an acre even into the 20th century.

The shadow of the future became clearer in the 1870's and 1880's as transcontinental railroads began to find their way into Oregon. At the same time, the advent of logging with railroads made the forests more accessible.

The perfection of softwood plywood at Portland in 1905 was another harbinger of the potential usefulness of Oregon's giant trees.

A new order in the industry was slow in arriving amidst the Nation's greatest stands of timber. It was climaxed when a series of disastrous forest fires shocked Oregonians into the realization that timber was the mainstay of their economy and their hope for the future.

The still-barren hillsides of the Tillamook Burn continue as a reminder that the heritage can be destroyed through carelessness.

Recognizing its indebtedness to nature's generosity with trees, Oregon is giving the place of honor to its billion-dollar industry during this year's statehood centennial observance. From June 10 to September 17, an estimated 8 million visitors will see the grandeur of the 33d State epitomized in a continuous spectacle on the banks of the Columbia.

Among the eye-catching features at the exposition grounds is the unique forest products pavilion. Laminated wood forms the gracefully curving roof of the seven butterfly-like hyperbolic paraboloids that make up the structure. In its 24,000 square feet of floor space, timber products manufacturers and dealers will display the results of a century of progress in the use of wood.

At the end of the 100-day exposition, the building will be turned over to Portland area 4-H groups for their permanent headquarters.

Weyerhaeuser Timber Co.'s colorful exhibit is located at one corner of the main exposition building. It contains samples of essentially every company product, including laminated beams, milk cartons, Nu-loc, and edge-glued products, shipping containers, pulp, plywood, lumber, and Silvatek products.

The company also took part in the display of a totem pole, a new landmark overlooking Portland. The 30-ton cedar log was donated by Weyerhaeuser's St. Helen's tree

farm. A three-unit miniature work train bearing the Weyerhaeuser symbol carts delighted centennial visitors on a half mile track around the fair grounds. Built by the Longview, Wash. mill shops, the gasoline powered train will later be given to Portland's zoo line railroad.

Homebuilders and suppliers have taken more than 2 acres of interior display space to demonstrate their arts and products. The Home of Ideas is another attractive showcase for wood that has become a favorite with visitors.

A complete operating sawmill of pioneer days has been recreated next to the exposition's main exhibit building. It features a primitive whip-saw mill, operated by two men. One, atop a log on a platform, and another below the log, laboriously fashion boards with a hand saw.

The operation is similar to one started at Coos Bay in 1853 near the site of Weyerhaeuser's modern mill, which today produces 350,000 board-feet of lumber in 8 hours.

On a hillside near downtown Portland is a reminder of an earlier centennial celebration. It is the Hall of Forestry—better known to tourists as the world's largest log cabin. Built entirely of wood, the sturdy building was a feature of Portland's Lewis and Clark Exposition of 1905. It has defied time and weather to become the city's most popular year-round tourist attraction as well as a reminder of the durability of wood.

Oregon enters its second hundred years of statehood with the Nation's largest quantity of standing timber. It has ranked first in the production of logs, lumber, and plywood since 1939. More than half of the State's income is derived from forest products.

Though many of the pioneers couldn't see Oregon's forests because the trees got in the way, they would no doubt be pleased with the results of their efforts and the destiny they created for their new State. That heritage is the assured growth of Oregon's industries, its population and its trees into a limitless future.

John W. Mahan, Commander in Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Recently Observed the Capabilities of the 6th Fleet and Concluded It Is One of the Best Deterrent Forces America Has To Prevent War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an interview article from the August issue of Navy magazine published by the Navy League of the United States. We have just spent a considerable amount of time determining the amount of money this Nation should spend for its defense during this fiscal year. Amid charges of waste, duplication, service rivalry, and conflicting missile systems it should be a real pleasure for all of us to see an outstanding example of a true force-in-readiness which is making the maximum use of its men and materiel and at the

same time is shielding this Nation 24 hours each day. The source of this opinion comes from one of our most distinguished citizens, John W. Mahan, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Jack Mahan is one of the most youthful and vigorous leaders that the VFW has ever had. He has greatly enhanced the stature and influence of the VFW in Washington and throughout the Nation. The membership has broken old records during his tenure.

Commander Mahan has, of course, fought for all of the matters traditionally of serious interest to veterans. In addition, he has energetically concerned himself with housing, education, and other matters of extreme importance to the Nation's welfare. National defense policy has been of primary concern to him. It is in this field that I would like to bring his views before this body today. He has traveled extensively in surveying our national defense posture. On one of his trips he had an opportunity to see the important effects of seapower actively exercised in an area of continuing crisis. His remarks, expressed in interview form, show a keen analysis and deep understanding of the military and diplomatic force constantly at work for us in the 6th Fleet. As you will see from the interview, he was impressed by the versatility of the balanced fleet which allows it to patrol the international waters of the Mediterranean unhampered by the vexing problems of fixed bases. It can exert its influence with the proper degree of force in a matter of hours. Lebanon is a practical example. The 6th Fleet story follows:

SIXTH FLEET STORY

Question: Commander Mahan, we understand that you have recently visited the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean?

Answer: Yes.

Question: What was your general impression of the fleet during your visit?

Answer: The 6th Fleet is one of the best deterrent forces America has to head off any local or general war.

Question: What makes the 6th Fleet such a good deterrent?

Answer: This is highly mobile force capable of striking anywhere in the Middle East and portions of Europe and Russia, if necessary. This fleet is also a force of diplomatic strength, which many Americans probably don't realize. There is no way of telling just how far back these diplomats in uniform have thrown the Communist timetable in local areas touched by the 6th Fleet, but from what I observed, the people who have been exposed to these Americans have a better understanding and liking for Americans in general, than in most countries I have visited.

Question: Commander Mahan, you mentioned a "mobile force." What, exactly do you mean by "mobile force"?

Answer: The 6th Fleet is constantly on the move—it's always moving around going where it is needed, hence there are no power vacuums in the Mediterranean, because the 6th Fleet has the capability to move quickly into troubled areas. This is what I mean by a mobile force. The fleet also contains a great deal of versatility—submarines, surface ships, carriers, and Marine landing forces. It can do the job on, over, under, and from the sea. It offers balanced seapower in all forms. From what I have seen, the 6th Fleet provides the

United States with otherwise unobtainable mobility and versatility in this critical area.

Question: Do you believe as some do, that the aircraft carrier is outmoded as an effective modern-day combat weapon?

Answer: No, I certainly do not. Even though we are entering the age of missiles * * * the aircraft carrier is still a vital element of defense in conflicts where missiles are not appropriate. These carriers can deliver precision attacks on picked targets and thus bring U.S. airpower to bear in any action we might be forced into. It also should be pointed out when talking about the pros and cons of aircraft carriers, that the enemy has modern aircraft that they will throw into a conflict, and this country must be capable of meeting such a threat. The aircraft carrier today is one of the best answers to this problem. But to launch modern aircraft capable of defeating any aggressor force we must have modern carriers that can handle them.

Question: Commander Mahan, do you mean that the Navy does not have the carriers to do the job if this country is attacked?

Answer: That is exactly what I mean. Most of the carriers now on active duty in the Navy are of World War II vintage, built either during or right after that war, and these carriers cannot take modern jet aircraft. Of course, the Navy does have some modern-day carriers, but they are few in numbers. Considering its normal life span, a ship is not much good to the Navy, or anyone else, after about 20 years—and World War II ended about 14 years ago. * * * Now many of these ships are getting to the end of the line. I firmly believe there is a definite need for carriers, either as a weapon or as a deterrent to any type of warfare. Remember the Russians can match us with aircraft and missiles, but they cannot match us with carriers. We must not let our margin of superiority over communism be lost by our default in not building carriers.

Question: But aren't these carriers vulnerable to both air and submarine attack?

Answer: Any naval ship is a target for either submarine or air attack. But so is any type of military and air base. The Navy has various tricks of the trade they can employ to offset an undersea or air attack. I am no expert in naval warfare, but I have seen some of the various defensive measures being used to protect the carriers. In any event, weapons are justified not by whether they are vulnerable to every action—all weapons and installations are vulnerable—but rather on the basis of what the weapon can do to the enemy. The carrier and marine amphibious forces may well be our margin of victory over communism in all-out war. The enemy must also be able to locate a carrier before they can launch any type of attack. These carriers are constantly on the move, so if the enemy cannot locate them, they certainly cannot attack them. Certainly they are no more vulnerable to attack than our fixed bases, and I believe them to be less vulnerable.

Question: Do you think that the Navy is making too much fuss over getting modern carriers, and other types of ships?

Answer: Again, no. Let me qualify the entire subject of ship procurement as I see it. The Navy is not in love with any one type of ship. They have eliminated the battleship over the clamorings of many people, and when the Navy feels that the aircraft carrier is no longer useful in our defense setup, I am sure they will move them out of the picture * * * the same also applies to destroyers and any other type of ship the Navy might have. Many ships the Navy has in the front-line defense system are old and

should be replaced if we are to keep control of the sea. For instance, about 80 percent of destroyer forces will have to be replaced within the next few years. These are a lot of ships, especially when you consider the destroyer is a multipurpose vessel capable of doing many jobs.

Question: Mr. Mahan, aside from the carriers what other general striking force does the Sixth Fleet have?

Answer: Well, there are many and I am afraid I don't have time to cover them all. One of the most impressive forces I saw were the battle-ready Marines carried by the Fleet.

Question: How could such a Marine force be considered an important element, in say a brush fire war? It takes time and planning to put a Marine force ashore.

Answer: Let me answer that question by saying this. It took only a few hours from the time President Eisenhower issued orders for the Marines to go into Lebanon until the first Marine hit the beach. Why? Because they had good planning and years of experience and practice * * * and were prepared for such an incident.

Question: Why are helicopters so important to the Marine Corps?

Answer: Because the helicopters make possible what the modern Marine Corps calls the vertical assault. The versatility and flexibility of this type of assault is practically unlimited, for it is based upon the idea of hitting the enemy where it will hurt him the most—and us the least. Combat ready Marines are transported in specially constructed troop ships. From these ships they can launch their forces, by helicopter, in attacks behind enemy lines, cutting enemy communications and disrupting his prepared defenses. These forces are supplied by helicopter and other aircraft. Basically, the helicopter and the vertical assault give the Marines, and the Fleet of which they are an integral part, the ability to attack the enemy unencumbered by the usual difficulties and restrictions imposed by difficult terrain, inadequate beaches, and concentrations of enemy forces. Manmade and natural obstacles to landing our Marines are of little significance in the vertical assault.

Question: You spoke of specially constructed troop ships. What exactly do you mean?

Answer: I believe the Navy calls them LPH's—Landing Platform Helicopter. They are ships designed to carry Marine assault troops along with the helicopters necessary to carry these troops to land. The ships are equipped with helicopter platforms and the necessary helicopters. In this way there is no time lost getting the landing vehicle to the troops and then getting the troops ashore. Speaking of the Navy's needs, I feel they should certainly have more of this type of ship. I think it is worth noting that, as an interim measure, to meet the need for this type of ship, two of the Navy's smaller carriers have been adapted for this service. These two ships, the *Boxer* and the *Princeton* are manned by both sailors and marines. Their use in this way is a reflection of the wisdom of the Secretary of the Navy, Admiral Burke, and General Pate in finding a workable solution to this pressing problem without spending huge sums of the taxpayers' money to get results. The development by the Marine Corps in this landing tactic—vertical assault—is perhaps the most significant development in our combat techniques since World War II. It gives the Fleet an unprecedented flexibility in moving U.S. power from the sea to the shore.

Question: How many marines are with the 6th Fleet, and are they ready for combat operations?

Answer: Let me answer the lead part of your question first. There is one reinforced marine battalion with the 6th Fleet. They have their own engineers, artillery, etc. As for them being ready, I think the answer is a positive yes. From what I observed, each and every man, from the battalion commander to the newest private knows his job. Each also knows why he is there and what he must do if called upon. The morale is high and the spirit cannot be matched. After talking to some of them, I feel that this reinforced battalion should be expanded to a regiment that has the necessary support to fight. A regiment would certainly give us considerably more authority than the present battalion.

Question: Could an enemy force bottle up the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean?

Answer: It would take a great many ships to do this, plus additional aircraft. If an enemy made 6th Fleet their sole target, it would take the pressure off the rest of the fleet making it possible for us to go where we wanted, when we wanted. No, I don't believe an enemy would do such a thing, but again, I'm not an expert.

Question: Well, couldn't an enemy destroy our supply bases in Europe, cutting off the fleet?

Answer: First of all, the 6th Fleet is supplied directly from the United States * * * ships, food, personnel. Not unless they knocked off Norfolk could they stop supplies from getting through to the 6th Fleet. As long as we control the seas, I don't think it will be possible for an enemy to stop supplies.

Question: Commander Mahan, there has been some talk recently about splitting America's defense forces into strategic and tactical force. What do you think about such a proposal?

Answer: I think it would be a tragic mistake if we do.

Question: Why?

Answer: Let's take the 6th Fleet for instance. I have said earlier that it is a multipurpose fleet, capable of performing both strategic and tactical missions. Presently the 6th Fleet's mission is both tactical and strategic. They are guarding allied sea communications throughout the Mediterranean, while at the same time they are prepared to protect movements of Middle Eastern oil to Europe and the United States. The 6th Fleet in its role could also deny the use of the Mediterranean to enemy shipping and protect our various north African bases. The fleet's aircraft could fly both tactical and strategic missions in support of our allies, plus supplying them with arms and supplies. No, the 6th Fleet is a good prototype of both strategic and tactical support. I think it would severely cripple our defense to disrupt such a team. The country is very fortunate to have a fleet like the 6th, very lucky indeed.

I have been dismayed and deeply disturbed by the proposals from several quarters that a new naval weapon be removed from naval command on the grounds that it is a strategic weapon. Now, I don't claim to be an expert in naval warfare, or any other kind. But, it just seems to me, from my own limited military experience, that * * * well, you can't put these things in such neatly divided categories like tactical or strategic. It seems to me that these proposals reflect the thinking of theorists, with no practical experience in the hard school of using—I guess application would be a better word—seapower. These men are captivated by the theory that command of a force should depend upon whether its targets are labeled strategic or tactical rather than upon the skill, knowledge, and experience needed to apply the force effectively against enemy targets.

Mrs. McGuire, a Texas Lady, and Her Sister in Maryland Are Leaders in Making a Better Life for Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Mrs. Marie C. McGuire, of San Antonio, Tex., and her identical twin sister, Mrs. Margaret C. Schweinhaut, of Kensington, Md., have been outstanding leaders in work to make a better life for elderly citizens of America.

Mrs. McGuire has worked with the housing authority in San Antonio for 18 years and has been instrumental in helping elderly citizens find satisfactory places to live. She is also author of a book on this subject entitled "Housing for Elderly." Her sister, Montgomery County delegate to the Maryland General Assembly, introduced a bill which was quickly passed by the State's legislature and created a committee to study the problems of the senior citizens of Maryland. Mrs. Schweinhaut is chairman of the Maryland Commission on the Aging.

Both Mrs. McGuire and Mrs. Schweinhaut show their active good citizenship by turning their ideas and ideals into real action.

I have known Mrs. McGuire for more than 15 years, and have watched her work with appreciation and enthusiasm.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record these articles:

First. An article by Marie Smith from the Washington Post and Times Herald for Wednesday, August 5, 1959, entitled "Twins Take Up Cudgels for Oldsters—Aged Have Double Chance."

Second. An article by William T. Noble from the Detroit News for Thursday, June 25, 1959, entitled "Twins Living Far Apart Find Careers Run Together."

Third. An article from the Washington Post and Times Herald for Sunday, July 12, 1959, entitled "Tawes Appoints Commission on Problems of the Aging."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Aug. 5, 1959]

TWINS TAKE UP CUDGELS FOR OLDSTERS—AGED HAVE DOUBLE CHANCE

(By Marie Smith)

When members of the Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged show up for their hearing this morning they may think they're seeing double. In the audience will be handsome, silver-blond identical twins who all their lives have been causing people to blink and look again.

They are Margaret C. Schweinhaut, Montgomery County's delegate to the Maryland General Assembly, and her younger sister (by 5 minutes), Marie C. McGuire, of San Antonio, Tex.

Mrs. McGuire, who is executive director of the San Antonio Housing Authority and a director of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment, will tell the subcommittee headed by Senator Pat McCNAMARA, Democrat, of Michigan, about San Antonio's pioneer work in providing housing and recreation facilities for the aged.

Mrs. Schweinhaut, who is chairman of Maryland's Commission on Problems of the Aging, will testify later. Today she'll listen to the testimony of others to get information that may be adaptable to that group's work.

Although the twins, who were born and grew up in Montgomery County, have lived 1,800 miles apart since their marriages 30 years ago, their careers have run a parallel course.

Both are Democrats and interested in politics. Marie worked in Senator LYNDON JOHNSON's first campaign for the Senate in 1938. Her political activities have been curtailed since she began work with the housing authority 18 years ago.

During part of that time, Margaret was assistant to the director of women's activities of the Democratic National Committee and while she was busy during a campaign, Marie would come to Washington to take care of Margaret's children.

Yesterday, the twins recalled that when Peggy first ran for the Maryland House of Delegates in 1950, it was Marie's picture on her campaign cards.

"I gave her the cards as my contribution to the campaign and had them printed in Texas. I didn't have a picture of Peggy, so I used my own and no one knew the difference."

But Peggy figures that must have been bad luck. "I lost that time," she said.

It was 5 years ago that Marie began thinking in terms of housing for older people and Peggy, who had just been elected to the Maryland Legislature began asking what her State was doing for its senior citizens.

As a result of Marie's work that followed, 610 units in San Antonio's public housing have been taken over for housing the aged, and in just 2 weeks, the city will open 36 motel cottage units giving the aged a choice of multistory or ground-level living.

Three years ago, Peggy Schweinhaut introduced a bill in the Maryland Legislature to create a legislative study committee to decide what Maryland was doing and where action was needed. It recommended a commission on the aged, and legislation creating the independent agency sailed through the legislature earlier this year and was the first one signed by the incoming Gov. Millard Tawes.

Because of Peggy's pioneering and promoting of the legislation and interest in problems of the aged, she was appointed commission chairman.

The twins went to the beauty shop yesterday and had their silver locks styled identically. Then they turned heads at the Statler embassy room where they recalled over lunch some of their "look alike" experiences.

They recalled:

That Marie accompanied Peggy's husband to an official judicial reception here once when Peggy was awaiting the birth of one of her two children.

They always made the same mistakes on examinations at school, although the teacher seated them on opposite sides of the room.

One striking difference in the sisters' lives is that Mrs. Schweinhaut has two daughters and Mrs. McGuire has no children. But because they have visited each other frequently "the children feel like they have two mothers instead of one," said Peggy Schweinhaut.

The twins no longer dress alike. "We did that until we graduated from high school and I think it's a big mistake for parents of twins to dress them alike," said Margaret. "Sometime I'm going to write a guidebook for parents of twins," she suggested wryly. Marie has already authored a book—"Housing for Elderly."

[From the Detroit News, June 25, 1959]

TWINS LIVING FAR APART FIND CAREERS RUN TOGETHER

(By William T. Noble)

ANN ARBOR, June 25.—Two handsome sisters are creating a stir among delegates attending the National Leadership Training Institute here. And not only for their erudition.

The sisters, both delegates, are identical twins. After a first glance at the tall, white-haired women, delegates blink and look again. It's like seeing double, and it's pleasantly upsetting.

Mrs. Marie C. McGuire, of San Antonio, Tex., and Mrs. Margaret C. Schweinhaut, of Kensington, Md., are representing their respective States at the conference on design for retirement in preparation for the White House conference on aging, to be held in January, 1961.

PATTERNS CONVERGE

The fact the sisters are attending the 3-day conference together is the result of one of those strange quirks that direct identical twins to think and act almost in unison. Although they went separate ways 30 years ago their activities almost uncannily have followed similar patterns.

Their tastes are identical—including politics. Both are Democrats, and are eager to use their varied talents to aid underprivileged persons. Both are university graduates.

Born in Maryland, December 1, 1904, the sisters dressed alike and were inseparable until Marie married John McGuire, now an engineer at the Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio. Six months later Margaret married Henry A. Schweinhaut, now a retired Federal judge, and remained in Maryland.

Both plunged into politics and social work. Mrs. McGuire became an active member of a long list of various commissions on appointment from governors. Mrs. Schweinhaut now is serving her second term as a member of the Maryland general assembly.

When it came time to send delegates to the institute here, Governors of the widely separated States chose the sisters.

"It was a wonderful feeling to know we would be working together on a project so close to our hearts," said Mrs. McGuire. "But I can't say we were too surprised to learn we both were being sent to the same conference. We think alike and, therefore, it seemed quite natural we would attend such a meeting."

IDENTITY MISTAKEN

The sisters see each other quite frequently. In February Mrs. McGuire attended a session of the Maryland General Assembly to observe sister Margaret in action. It created a commotion.

Perry O. Wilkinson, speaker of the house, ordered Mrs. McGuire to get out of the absent Hartford County delegate's seat and into her own Montgomery County position. When Mrs. Schweinhaut arose to explain she was properly seated, Wilkinson's eyes popped. And then it was explained.

The sisters, descendants of a colonial family that settled in Maryland in 1792, frequently send each other identical Christmas gifts.

There have been incidents of extrasensory perception.

When Marie left Maryland to make her home in Texas 30 years ago, Margaret awakened one night from a deep slumber.

"I dreamed my sister had smashed a glass table," said Margaret. "I wanted to know all the details."

Marie said that at precisely the same moment she had broken a motel table while ironing.

On another occasion Margaret packed her suitcases and told her husband she soon would have to visit Marie in a hospital.

Later the word arrived. Marie, indeed, had been hospitalized by a recurrent ulcer.

On the problems of aging, they are completely in accord: Oldsters should use their wisdom to help elect better representatives.

"The term 'elder statesmen' came from the Greeks who recognized the fact that older people are knowledgeable and therefore should help govern the country," said Mrs. Schweinhaut. "Retired folks should use their time and energy in politics. Too few of them do it."

There is one striking difference in the sisters' lives. Mrs. Schweinhaut has two daughters. Mrs. McGuire has no children.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, July 12, 1959]

TAWES APPOINTS COMMISSION ON PROBLEMS OF THE AGING

ANNAPOLIS, July 11.—Gov. J. Millard Tawes today appointed a newly created State commission for the aged and designated Delegate Margaret Schweinhaut, Democrat, of Montgomery as chairman.

The 16-member agency will be known as the State coordinating commission on the problems of the aging. It was created by the 1959 legislature to help older citizens in problems of employment, housing, medical services, and recreational activities.

Delegate Schweinhaut headed the legislative council committee which drafted the bill. It was the first act to be signed by the Governor after taking office and was listed as one of his campaign goals.

Tawes said at the time that a tremendous increase in the number of persons over 65 has "created problems which are beyond the powers of individuals or private philanthropy to resolve . . . [It] becomes the responsibility of the State to point the way to a better living for this group which constitutes 8½ percent of our total population."

The commission consists of 10 nonpaid members appointed by the Governor and 6 ex officio members from State departments which have some connection with problems of the aged.

Named by Tawes to serve with Delegate Schweinhaut are:

Senator William S. James, Democrat, of Harford, representing the Maryland Senate; 4 years.

Dr. C. Rodney Layton of Centreville, recommended by the medical and surgical faculty of Maryland, member of the medical organization's geriatrics committee; 2 years.

Dr. Herman Seidel, of Baltimore, chairman of the Baltimore City Medical Society's committee on geriatrics and chief of medicine at the Levindale Hebrew Home; 2 years.

Edwin Abbott, of Dundalk, international representative of the United Steel Workers of America, representing labor, for 3 years.

James T. Stott, of Baltimore, industrial relations official of the Bethlehem Steel Co., representing industry; 3 years.

Dr. Matthew L. Tayback, of Baltimore, assistant commissioner of health for Baltimore city, professor of biostatistics at the University of Maryland, chosen under a provision that one member shall be knowledgeable in research; 5 years.

Msgr. Leo J. Coady, of Hyattsville, chaplain of Carroll Manor, a home for the aged, director of catholic charities in the District of Columbia and Prince Georges County; 5 years.

Dr. Furman L. Templeton, of Baltimore, executive director of the Baltimore Urban League; 6 years.

M. Shakman Katz, of Baltimore, vice president, K. Katz & Sons, men's clothing; 6 years.

Ex officio members: Thomas J. S. Waxter, director, department of public welfare; Dr. Thomas G. Pullen, Jr., State superintendent of schools; Dr. Perry F. Prather, director, State department of health; Dr. Clifton T.

Perkins, commissioner, department of mental hygiene; Joseph Meyerhoff, chairman, State planning commission; David L. B. Fringer, director, employment service, of the department of employment security.

The Commission is authorized to hire a full-time executive director and was given a \$25,000 appropriation as a starter for its work.

It is empowered to make such surveys and studies concerning the problems of the aging as it may determine "to promote in every manner possible the welfare and the betterment of the aged people of this State."

Recommendations for legislation are to be submitted to the Governor.

Results of Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include a tabulation of responses totaling over 7,000, to my questionnaire recently mailed to some 35,000 constituents in my congressional district, seeking their views on current political issues.

I should particularly like to call attention to the fact that an overwhelming majority of their replying feel that legislation should be enacted in the labor field, and that to be effective, provisions should be included to restrict secondary boycotts and blackmail picketing.

With respect to choices for presidential candidates, this poll indicates a strong preference for Vice President Nixon over Governor Rockefeller and on the Democratic side, a slight lead for Senator KENNEDY over Adlai Stevenson. The tabulation was made prior to the Vice President's recent trip to the Soviet Union and Poland:

TABULATED RESPONSES TO 1959 QUESTIONNAIRE MAILED BY CONGRESSMAN FRELINGHUYSEN

1. On the subject of a balanced budget do you favor:

(a) Curtailing our domestic programs, if necessary, to balance the budget? Yes, 68.4 percent. No, 19.6 percent. No opinion, 12 percent.

(b) Cutting defense spending, if necessary, to balance the budget? Yes, 24.4 percent. No, 58.4 percent. No opinion, 17.2 percent.

(c) Balancing the budget regardless of defense or domestic considerations? Yes, 25.4 percent. No, 47.9 percent. No opinion, 26.7 percent.

2. On the subject of labor legislation do you believe:

(a) Legislation is needed to curb abuses by certain labor unions? Yes, 94.7 percent. No, 2.2 percent. No opinion, 3.1 percent.

(b) If labor reform legislation is enacted, should provisions be included to restrict secondary boycotts and "blackmail" picketing? Yes, 88.4 percent. No, 4.5 percent. No opinion, 7.1 percent.

3. Which form of Federal aid to education, if any, do you favor?

(a) Aid in school construction programs to needy areas? Yes, 57.5 percent. No, 19.9 percent. No opinion, 22.6 percent.

(b) Aid for teachers' salaries as well as school construction? Yes, 32.3 percent. No, 44.2 percent. No opinion, 23.5 percent.

(c) No Federal aid? Yes, 28.2 percent. No, 32.2 percent. No opinion, 39.6 percent.

4. In our foreign aid program would you favor a shift in emphasis from military assistance to economic aid? Yes, 48.8 percent. No, 30.8 percent. No opinion, 20.4 percent.

5. On the subject of farm subsidies:

(a) Should we reduce Government price supports and attempt to return to a free market system? Yes, 84.3 percent. No, 6.1 percent. No opinion, 9.6 percent.

(b) Should we cut off all farm subsidies? Yes, 47.6 percent. No, 30.6 percent. No opinion, 21.8 percent.

6. (a) Whom would you prefer as the Republican presidential candidate in 1960?

Name	Percent
Nixon	55.4
Rockefeller	24.4
No opinion	20.2

(b) Whom would you prefer as the Democratic candidate?

Name	Percent
Kennedy	21.6
Stevenson	17.1
Johnson	8.1
Symington	7.9
Humphrey	4.5
Kefauver	3.8
No opinion	36.4

Jehudi Ashmun, Father of Liberia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Jehudi Ashmun, known as the father of Liberia, was among the first children born in the community of Champlain, N.Y., following its settlement in the late 18th century. He was among the first to publicly state the opinion that if slavery continued, it was certain to overthrow the United States and bring it to chaos. He proposed the purchase of all slaves by the Government.

The village of Champlain, N.Y., will, on August 8, as part of the Champlain Festival, have a special program honoring Jehudi Ashmun. Among those attending will be ex-President King of Liberia, Ambassador Padmore, and the New York Liberian consul general. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from a pamphlet prepared by the community as part of this commemoration be printed in the Appendix of the Record. The citizens of Champlain are to be complimented for their efforts to preserve a too-little-known corner of our American history and heritage.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

JEHUDI ASHMUN

Champlain was first settled in 1788. Six years later, on April 24, 1794, a son was born to one of the original settlers, Samuel Ashmun, and his wife Parthenia.

Jehudi Ashmun attended Middlebury College and University of Vermont. He earned his way by teaching in his native village.

His future wife, Catherine D. Gray, also taught in Champlain.

After graduation he served as a professor in the Theological Seminary at Bangor, Maine, but in 1819 moved to Baltimore and to Washington, where he edited several religious periodicals.

About this time he became active in the American Colonization Society, which was endeavoring to establish a colony in Africa for former Negro slaves. In 1822 he and his wife sailed for this newly created settlement of Liberia with the second shipload of colonists, intending to return to America immediately.

But on his arrival in Africa in August, he found the colony in a wretched state of disorder and demoralization, without leaders due to death and desertion, and on the point of extinction through incursions of the neighboring savages.

With extraordinary energy and ability he undertook the task of reorganization. In November he was attacked by a force of 800 savages. Although he and his wife were both stricken by fever, he repelled the attack with only 35 men and boys under him. A few days later a larger attacking force was repulsed.

His wife died shortly thereafter, but Jehudi Ashmun remained in Liberia for 6 years. Working incessantly for the development of the colony, he expanded its territory, increased its agriculture and commerce, codified its laws, and initiated a democratic form of government. In July 1828, completely broken in health, he returned to America. Less than a month later, on August 25, 1828, he died in New Haven, Conn., where he is buried.

Jehudi Ashmun, the father of Liberia.

SOME NOTES ON JEHUDI ASHMUN FOREWORD

These notes on Jehudi Ashmun cover two periods in his life. The first reviews everything that has been learned about his youth until he left Champlain, never to return. The information has been gleaned from the "Life of Jehudi Ashmun," by Ralph Randolph Gurley, published in 1835, and from the research among local records by my father, Hugh McLellan.

The second section is composed of six letters discovered last year among the papers of the American Colonization Society in the Library of Congress. It is believed that they have not previously been published. These letters cover the last few months of his life, with his hopes of returning to Champlain, and his death and funeral in New Haven, Conn.

A poem to his memory, written shortly after his death by the New England poet, Mrs. Sigourney, will be found at the end of this article.

The site of Jehudi Ashmun's birthplace, on Oak Street just north of the village of Champlain, is indicated by a historical sites marker, erected by the State of New York in 1938.

CHARLES WOODBERRY MCLELLAN.
CHAMPLAIN, N.Y., August 1959.

JEHUDI ASHMUN IN CHAMPLAIN

Jehudi Ashmun left his native village of Champlain in 1816, before he was 22 years old—never again to see his parents, his brothers and sisters, his boyhood friends.

From his diaries and his letters, as published in his "Life" in 1835, and from the meagre surviving local records, we can learn something of his childhood and youth—not a great deal, but sufficient to show the development of his character and the growth of his consuming determination to obtain an education.

The earliest reference to him is found in a day book of one of Champlain's first doc-

tors, Dr. Benjamin Moore. On August 2, 1805, medicine valued at 12½ cents was delivered to Samuel Ashmun Esq pr Huda.

According to the records of the Presbyterian Church, on April 5, 1807, Samuel Ashmun and Mary, Nancy, Jehudi, Raymond, Samuel, Harriot, Eunice, and Orson Branch, his children by Parthena his wife was baptised by Rev. Amos Pettengill. Three years later, on July 15, 1810, Jehudi Ashmun was received into the church as a member.

From his "Life" we find that he commenced his studies—beyond that which was to be obtained in the local school—in 1808, under the tutelage of Reverend Pettengill, in preparation for further formal education. These studies were seemingly continued for the next 3 years, with occasional trips away from home on account of his health. During this period he considered the possibility of studying medicine or the law—in 1811, he obtained brief employment with a lawyer in the city of Troy, N.Y.—but finally determined that his life must be devoted to educational and missionary labors.

In 1812, therefore, he entered Middlebury College. Two years later he transferred to the University of Vermont at Burlington, seemingly for economic reasons, where he graduated in 1816 with the degrees of A.B. and A.M. and with "literary honors." His college career was repeatedly interrupted by poor health; in 1813 he is traveling in Vermont, and in 1814 in Connecticut.

From one of these trips, probably in 1813, the death of two of his sisters called him home, and it is presumed that it was at this time that he organized and took command of a military corps. During these war years Champlain was alternately occupied by British and American troops, and Jehudi was greatly perturbed by the burning by the British of the church-schoolhouse, although justified by the fact that it was at the time being used as an American military depot.

The size of his family prevented much parental financial assistance, resulting in further interruptions in his efforts to complete his college education by the necessity of earning his own living and tuition. This he accomplished by teaching school, at least one season in Champlain.

A fragment of school records has been preserved which show that the first common school district in the town of Champlain paid \$66 in March 1815 to Mr. Jehudi Ashmun for instruction. On July 17 of the same year \$24 was paid to Miss Catherine Gray, instructress and \$21 to Mr. Ichabod Fitch for boarding instructress. It is interesting to note that Jehudi's father Samuel was one of the three school trustees at the time.

Research has failed to identify Catherine Gray, beyond the fact that she had attended a girl's school in Middlebury, Vt. Whether Jehudi first met her there, and suggested her to the Champlain school as a teacher, or whether he met her in Champlain while they were both teaching there, has not been determined. However, an attachment was formed, resulting in their marriage 3 years later. In 1822 she accompanied him to Liberia, where she died 3 months after their arrival.

After his graduation from the University of Vermont in 1816, Jehudi accepted a position as the first instructor in the newly founded Maine Charity School. So far as has been discovered, he never returned to Champlain, nor saw any of his family again.

Jehudi Ashmun, as has been stated, suffered from poor health during much of his life. While this may be partially attributed to physical causes, a certain amount must be laid to the intensity of his character. He was ever a strict self-disciplinarian and taskmaster, as is shown in his journals which ac-

count for every waking moment devoted to some form of self-improvement or labors in behalf of others.

We may judge something of his intensity from a letter written to him in 1817 by a clergyman, one of the trustees of the Maine Charity School:

"You have preached 25 times in 2 months; that is, 15 times more than you ought to have preached. You do right to tell me your faults, and I shall do right in reproving you. Hear me then. If you will persist in preaching at such a rate, your race will be short. You ought to begin as you can hold out. Preach only when duty calls, and attend more to a regular course of studies. Count me not your enemy, because I thus write. It is not the language of hatred, but of love."

This typifies his method of working throughout his life. His perpetual urge to keep going, his feeling that he could not relax for a moment, his sense of obligation toward his fellow men—these as much as a frail body brought him to an early grave.

DEATH OF ASHMUN

(By Lydia Huntley Sigourney)

"Whose is yon sable bier?
Why move the throng so slow?
Why doth that lonely mother's ear
In sudden anguish flow?
Why is that sleeper laid
To rest in manhood's pride?
How gained his cheeks such pallid shade?
I spake, but none replied.

"The hoarse wave murmur'd low,
The distant surges roar'd;
And o'er the sea in tones of war
A deep response was pour'd;
I heard sad Africa mourn
Upon her billowy strand;
A shield was from her bosom torn,
An anchor from her hand.

"Ah! well I know thee now,
Though foreign suns would trace
Deep lines of death upon thy brow,
Thou friend of misery's race;
Their leader when the blast
Of ruthless war swept by,
Their teacher when the storm was past,
Their guide to worlds on high.

"Spirit of Power, pass on!
Thy homeward wing is free;
Earth may not claim thee for her son,
She hath no chain for thee;
Toll might not bow thee down,
Nor Sorrow check thy race,
Nor Pleasure win thy birthright crown,
Go to thy own blest place!"

Resolution on a Strong Foreign Policy Adopted by the American Legion, Department of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, today I received Resolution 48 from Tommy E. Jones, department adjutant, the American Legion, Department of West Virginia. This resolution was adopted at the 41st annual department convention held in Parkersburg, W. Va. The members request that a firm stand be taken to resist the Communist sphere of influence and establish a strong foreign policy.

The above-mentioned resolution follows:

**RESOLUTION 48 OF THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF WEST VIRGINIA**

The following resolution was adopted at the concluding session of the 41st annual department convention of the American Legion, Department of West Virginia, on Sunday, July 26, 1959, in Parkersburg, W. Va.:

"Whereas the department convention of the American Legion of West Virginia was addressed by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo in a most forthright and enlightening manner, tracing the history of the progression of the Communist plan, proclaimed by them, and made possible by the weakening of the United States of America from its rapid postwar demobilization, and impliedly augmented by subsequent lack of decision on a firm policy of resistance at crucial times and points; and

"Whereas he pointed to and enumerated the many countries and hundreds of millions of people who have been overrun and enslaved by Communist rule, while the free world stood by, lacking strength and the willingness to sacrifice, necessary to save those free people; and

"Whereas, from the history and pattern of the Communist aggression, it has become clearly evident that unless a firm and sacrificial stand is now taken and backed by adequate strength and determined resistance to every effort to spread the Communist sphere of influence, it will be inevitable that the remaining free nations will be gradually engulfed by the Red flood; and

"Whereas the American Legion deplors the seeming lack of understanding of and indifference to the meaning and dangers, inherent in these facts, by the average citizen, and particularly by many of our public officers responsible for formulating and implementing our foreign policy and an adequate national defense: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the American Legion, Department of West Virginia, in convention assembled, this 26th day of July 1959, That with the guidance and under the everlasting supervision of almighty God, that we call upon our representatives in the U.S. Senate and Congress to take a firm and audible stand on the issues involved in these alarming problems, to the end that a strong, vigorous foreign policy may be forthwith established, maintained and defended by every necessary implement of national defense and requisite cooperation with our allies; and

"That we call upon our public officers and representatives to discard all political expediency, and patriotically turn their undivided attention to problems inherent in saving our country, while there is yet time, from the fate of Rome and other great nations which fell because of indifference and weakness of their people and their leaders; and

"That we particularly call upon all members of the American Legion to fulfill the serious patriotic responsibility of bringing home to our people the truth of this situation and of aiding and stimulating our public officers in implementing of action required to meet this alarming necessity; and

"That this resolution be immediately released to the press and copies sent to the West Virginia representatives in the U.S. Senate and Congress and to Ambassador Romulo and the President of the United States. Also to the Honorable Christian Herter, Secretary of State, and the Honorable Neil McElroy, Secretary of Defense, and that it be forwarded for submission to the national convention at Minneapolis for action thereon, and a copy hereof be sent to each post in the department of West Virginia."

I, Tommy E. Jones, do hereby certify that I am the duly elected, qualified and acting adjutant of the American Legion, Department of West Virginia, and that the above

is a true and correct copy of the resolution adopted by the 41st annual department convention, at its concluding session, of the American Legion, Department of West Virginia, on Sunday, July 26, 1959, in Parkersburg, W. Va.

Given under my hand this 28th day of July 1959, at Charleston, W. Va.

[SEAL]

TOMMY E. JONES,
Department Adjutant.

Help for the Aging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that the benefits of modern-age development and discoveries that improve living conditions for humanity are manifold—major among which has been the extension of the lifespan for human beings.

Today, there are an estimated 15 million people over 65. An estimated 1,000 more persons are joining the ranks. By 1975, it is expected that there will be 20 million Americans in this upper-age bracket. In Wisconsin, there are an estimated 300,000 folks 65 and over.

Longer years of life, however, have brought with them problems, as well as blessings.

Major among these include:

First. Aging often means, not retirement on a bountiful income, but, rather, economic distress. According to surveys, three-fifths of all people over 65 have less than \$1,000 of annual income.

Second. Retirement, too, means forced idleness.

Third. Social patterns are changing, resulting in a vast proportion of these elderly citizens—who had homes with their children—now live in cheap, often inadequate housing—many times on deficient diets.

Fourth. Unfortunately, the social life of the community many times excludes the aging.

These, and other problems, confront our citizens in their golden years.

Philosophically, the Nation needs a change of its traditional attitude toward aging. Along with this goes the need for adopting constructive programs, including:

First. Providing the opportunity for individuals—in all possible cases—to continue to engage in useful, constructive work. This is important, not only in terms of the chance to be as economically independent as possible, but also to continue to give the community the benefit of a lifetime of experience in a given field.

Second. Providing opportunity for these folks to broaden their minds, through reading, education, television, radio, and access to other forms of mass media, opportunity to participate in group discussions, lectures, enjoying

music, and other advantages of our modern age.

Third. Improving our housing for the aging to provide them with the needed quarters, constructed, if possible, to meet the special needs of senior citizens.

Fourth. Making vocational and/or a vocational guidance available.

Fifth. Establishing counseling to better enable aging folks to adjust mentally and physically to the changed conditions of having reached maturity.

The goal, of course, is to make maturity an age of enjoyment rather than a nightmare of poverty, deprivation and unwantedness.

To deal with these problems, we recall that a White House Conference on Aging has been scheduled. As I understand it, the first meeting will be held January 1961.

A recent edition of the New York Times carried a thoughtful article by Dr. Howard A. Rusk, reviewing some of the major problems to be considered by the White House parley. As a constructive analysis of basic problems in this field, I believe it merits the consideration of the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 2, 1959]

HELP FOR THE AGING—A LOOK AT SOME OF THE MAJOR PROBLEMS THAT WILL FACE THE WHITE HOUSE PARLEY

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

WASHINGTON.—During the last few years, industry has turned increasingly to the use of brainstorming sessions among its executives and research personnel. The purpose of this technique, originated by Alex F. Osborn of Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborn, is to promote creative thinking in problem-solving through group discussion.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is now engaged in planning what will be both the biggest and longest brainstorm session ever held. The time and effort are justified, for it will be directed toward one of our Nation's knottiest health, social and economic problems—aging.

That meeting, the White House Conference on Aging, will not be held until January 1961. Staff work in preparation, however, started months ago, and in April, Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, named former Representative Robert W. Kean of New Jersey as a chairman of a 130-member citizens' advisory committee for the conference.

This committee, which had its first meeting here in June, will have overall direction of the plans, preparation and conduct of the meeting.

SCOPE OF CONFERENCE

The conference will be concerned with the major problems faced by older persons, such as economic security, retirement, housing, health and medical care, rehabilitation and recreation.

Preceding the actual conference 18 months from now, will be a series of local and State conferences devoted to the same problems. Forty-four of the fifty States have already made application for Federal grants of from \$5,000 to \$15,000 to help finance their State conferences and preconference activities.

Last Thursday, 20 nationally recognized leaders in various aspects of problems of the

aging, who are serving as chairmen of the planning committees for the Conference, met here in an all-day session with Secretary Flemming and his associates. Each of these planning committee chairmen will have available as consultants to his committee a number of highly experienced professional workers in the problems under study.

The necessity for such a large-scale approach to the problems of aging is dictated by the sheer size and complexity of the problem. Here briefly are some of the factors involved:

The number of aged persons in our population is increasing rapidly. Currently there are about 15,400,000 persons aged 65 and over in the United States, constituting 8.6 percent of the total population. But their numbers are increasing rapidly and by 1975 the aged will total about 20 million.

Most older persons live with some family member. Only 15 percent of persons 65 and over live in their own households, either alone or with nonrelatives. Four percent more live with nonrelatives, but not in their own homes. Only 3 percent live in institutions and another 3 percent live in hotels and roominghouses. The remaining 75 percent live in the homes of family members.

Most older persons are not working. In December 1958, only 3 million persons 65 and over—1 in every 5—had a paying job. In 1890, 7 out of every 10 men 65 and over were in the labor force. In 1945, the proportion was 1 out of 2; today it is only 1 out of 3.

Most older persons have low incomes. Three out of every five persons aged 65 and older have money incomes of less than \$1,000 a year. Of the remainder, half have incomes of \$1,000 to \$2,000 and the other half have incomes of more than \$2,000.

Most older persons receive social security. In June 1958, 6 out of every 10 persons 65 and over were receiving social security benefits and 1 out of 10 some other social insurance or pension benefits. The average monthly payment received in March 1959, however, was but \$72. About half of all aged married couples receive less than \$125 a month.

Most older persons are not on relief. In June 1958, 16.2 percent of persons 65 and older were receiving State old-age assistance payments. Percentages ranged from 58 in Louisiana to 3.9 in New Jersey. The national average of such payments was \$64 monthly, ranging from \$108 in Connecticut and \$101 in New York, to \$29 in Mississippi and \$33 in West Virginia.

Health is the major problem of the aged. More than half of the aged men who are not in the labor force retired voluntarily because of health reasons. Persons 65 and older use more than twice as much hospital care as those under 65, but about 65 percent of the aged do not have hospital insurance, as compared with 34 percent of those under age 65 who do not have such insurance.

An interesting suggestion has been made that a selected list of foreign leaders in problems of aging should be invited to participate in the conference. The Scandinavian countries, for example, have advanced programs in housing and income maintenance for the aged. Family acceptance of the older person in the home presents no problem in Korea.

There is much we could learn from the rest of the world about the problems of aging. At the same time, the White House Conference on Aging would be vivid evidence to other nations that we in the United States frankly acknowledge we have not solved some of our most difficult health, social and economic problems, but are working toward their solution in our traditional democratic way.

Dogfish Are Still a Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the dogfish shark continues to be a serious problem for commercial fishermen and sports fishermen of Puget Sound and the Pacific Northwest, as well as for fishermen as far away as the States of California and Alaska. The seriousness of this problem led me to introduce legislation and to appear before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on behalf of these fishermen who suffer losses of gear, time, and money because of this shark.

At one time the dogfish was taken for its liver. As much as 135 million pounds of dogfish were landed annually before 1949. This catch held the fish in check, but in 1950 the market for dogfish livers became virtually nonexistent because of low-cost synthetic vitamin A compounds.

This problem is international. Our neighbor, British Columbia, has the same problem and is doing something about it. According to the Seattle Times in its July 30, 1959, issue, the Canadian Fisheries Department has received an appropriation of \$250,000 for use as incentive payments to Canada fishermen. This program has been successful. Under leave to extend my remarks I want to include this news item in the RECORD.

CANADA TO PAY BOUNTY ON DOGFISH

The Canadian Fisheries Department has received a \$250,000 appropriation for eradication of dogfish sharks, Joe Whitmore, fisheries director for western Canada, reported yesterday.

The appropriation was disclosed in a telephone conversation between Whitmore and Milo Moore, Washington's fisheries director.

Moore said the news should be a boost for a dogfish-control bill now pending in Congress.

The bill has been approved by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and is under study in the House of Representatives.

"Unless we get such a bill, the Canadian program will fail," Moore said. "We should join with Canada in doing something about the dogfish-shark menace."

The Canadian appropriation provides for a bounty or subsidy of 10 cents a pound for dogfish livers, above what fishermen receive from processors.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation I have introduced, H.R. 7891, goes further than incentive payments. It would authorize the Secretary of Interior to investigate the use of chemical repellents to reduce fishing gear damage and to conduct a research program to develop commercial uses of the fish. I hope Congress will authorize this program because it offers a solution to the problem facing Pacific coast fishermen.

Preservation of Scenic Shorelines and Seashores of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the saving of America's scenic shorelines is one of the duties of Congress and the executive arm of Government. In the August 6 issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald appears a most effective editorial on this challenging obligation.

I subscribe to the views in the editorial, which mentions three pieces of legislation dealing with this topic—the omnibus shoreline bill, the administration bill to set aside three national seashores, and the Indiana Dunes bill. I am pleased to be either sponsor or cosponsor of all these measures. At the request of the administration, I have introduced their bill for consideration by the Senate Interior Committee.

The Washington Post defends the procedures described in the bills—that is, of prescribing overall boundary limits but leaving the precise borders of each park to administrative determination. That has been done many times in the past with safety and success. I also should add that one of the chief authors of the omnibus bill, introduced by the able senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] with many of the rest of us as cosponsors, is Joseph W. Penfold, conservation director of the Izaak Walton League of America and a man dedicated to preservation of the American outdoors. Senators MURRAY, DOUGLAS, MANSFIELD, GRUENING, ANDERSON, ALLOTT, and others who have been in the forefront of the save-our-seashore movement deserve the gratitude of all Americans everywhere because this is part of the priceless heritage of our country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the August 6 editorial of the Washington Post be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEASHORE POLITICS

The save our shoreline bill introduced by Senator MURRAY and 15 of his colleagues is the most ambitious proposal yet to preserve what is left of our vanishing seashore areas. Because this follows the introduction of other similar bills, however, there is a danger of public confusion, and in the melee the overall objective may be lost.

Mr. MURRAY's proposal differs largely in degree from another omnibus shoreline bill introduced by Senator NEUBERGER at the request of the administration. The administration is seeking \$15 million to acquire seven areas designated by the Interior Department as worthy of becoming national monuments. The bill which Mr. MURRAY has prepared would do considerably more than this. His measure, which Mr. NEUBERGER is also sponsoring, would permit the Government to spend \$50 million to pur-

chase 10 areas and would further provide \$10 million to assist State shoreline projects.

Both bills grant leeway to the Secretary of Interior in designating the specific boundaries of the shoreline areas. Some critics, including former Attorney General Francis Biddle, have expressed fears about this grant of authority. But the Secretary of Interior would have to return to Congress for an appropriation to acquire the new lands, and this seems a reasonable safeguard against arbitrary decisions.

Prompt action is needed before what is left of our shorelines is leveled by the bulldozers, and it is this sense of urgency which underlies the approach of both bills. The Indiana Dunes, one of the country's most prized shoreline areas, face imminent spoliation. This is why Senator DOUGLAS is championing a third measure dealing only with the Indiana Dunes. In order of priority, the most urgent need is to save the dunes first. Then the omnibus measure can be considered, with the administration request taken as the very minimum of what Congress ought to do before our beaches are all gone with the wind and concrete mixer.

Affairs of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues a most timely editorial as it appeared in the Washington Post of August 6, 1959:

AFFAIRS OF STATE

A subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia has some urgent business to lay before that greatest of deliberative bodies, the Senate of the United States. The subcommittee, after hearings and due consideration, has adopted the view that the Society of Oldest Inhabitants, an esteemed community organization, should be permitted to buy an abandoned firehouse for half price; the subcommittee is also of the opinion that St. Ann's Infant Asylum should be allowed to expand and to change its name to St. Ann's Infant and Maternity Home. We hope heartily that the Senate as a whole, after appropriate debate, will approve these measures, send them to the House of Representatives for consideration there and, in due course, submit them to the White House for Presidential approval.

It is not to be supposed that the District Committee of the House was idle while these proposals were being scrutinized by the Senate subcommittee. The House District Committee suspended its hearings on a number of bills providing for District self-government in order to weigh the merits of a proposal to permit prescriptions for paregoric to be issued orally. Happily, the committee approved the proposal. Just when the whole House will take it up, we cannot say with certainty. We can say, however, that if the House and the Senate would like to be relieved of the responsibility for such legislation—if they would like to be set free to consider such relative trivia as a defense budget for the United States or an exchange of visits between heads of state, there is an easy formula to liberate them. The formula is known as home rule.

Steel Company Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this past week the major steel companies announced record profits for the first half of the year.

In commenting on these reported earnings, I pointed out in a Senate speech that the steel companies have adopted a double standard whereby wage boosts are considered dangerously inflationary but profit boosts are completely in order. The rationale of such thinking escapes me completely as I am sure it does the vast majority of Americans.

In the August 8 issue of Labor newspaper there appears an excellent article on this very issue written by Mr. Duane Emme entitled "Wage Freeze Is Blasted While Steel Profits Soar."

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article be inserted in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Labor, Washington, D.C., Aug. 8, 1959]

WAGE FREEZE IS BLASTED WHILE STEEL PROFITS SOAR

(By Duane Emme)

During 10 weeks of fruitless negotiations that preceded the Steelworkers' strike, the union repeatedly said the steel industry could give employees a sizable wage boost without increasing prices. This past week the Nation saw the dramatic new proof of that contention.

Each of the 12 major companies in dispute with the union reported huge profits for the first 6 months of 1959, ranging from 88 to 838 percent more than was reported in the same period of 1958. One other concern, Crucible Steel, showed a 2,080-percent increase. These figures were after taxes and all charges.

All told, the 12, who have refused their workers one penny in unconditional wage boosts, rolled up \$694 million in profits for the first half of the current year—a 147-percent increase over the \$287 million reported for the same months in 1958.

Describing the reports as a mammoth pile of profits, Steelworkers' President David J. McDonald asked:

"How can the companies continue to justify the phony inflation issue when they are rolling in unprecedented wealth? How can they continue a heartless denial of needed benefits to workers?"

At the same time, McDonald said he welcomed government efforts to help settle the strike. At Labor's press time Monday, Federal mediators were holding joint meetings of union and management and Secretary of Labor Mitchell continued his fact finding study of the dispute.

However, Roger M. Blough, chairman of United States Steel, and Arthur B. Homer, president of Bethlehem Steel, warned the Government to "keep hands off." For the first time, they conceded they could possibly give workers a raise without boosting

prices, but only if a settlement is reached voluntarily.

McDonald said he would believe this when he saw it happen. The more likely course is, he added, "that when we get our deserved wage increase, the companies will raise prices as they have done in the past and falsely blame the union."

Mitchell issued a statement critical of both sides for not making a continuous effort to reach an agreement. Whether or not this meant the administration would step up pressures to settle the strike and perhaps intervene remained to be seen.

IKE NEUTRAL ON PROFITS

Meanwhile, these were other highlights in the picture.

At his press conference, President Eisenhower sounded almost apologetic for the companies when asked if the fantastic profits did not indicate the companies could grant a wage boost without increasing prices. He declined to venture an opinion.

One question was asked with United States Steel in mind. That "giant," which accounts for about 28 percent of all the steel produced, reported \$255 million in first-half profits—the greatest amount ever recorded by a steel firm in any 6-month period.

The President turned aside that question on grounds United States Steel might not be typical. However, the reports—some of which were in at the time of the press conference—showed other firms increased their takes by even greater percentages than "Big Steel."

MORE THAN ALL OF 1958

Four companies—Jones & Laughlin, National, Youngstown Sheet & Tube, and Colorado Fuel & Iron—netted more profits in the first 6 months of 1959 than they did in all of 1958.

Bethlehem, No. 2 in size among the steel companies, netted \$123 million, a 112 percent leap over the same months in 1958; Republic, third ranking, netted \$87 million, a 180 percent jump; Armco Steel, \$50½ million, a 141 percent hike; Wheeling Steel, \$11 million, a 267 percent jump.

Some Members of Congress were not as reluctant as the President in commenting on the amazing profit records:

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, declared in a Senate speech that the profits showed the steel industry was maintaining a double standard.

"They regard any wage increase for steel workers as dangerously inflationary, but at the same time they seem to feel alltime record profits are completely in order," he asserted.

Congressman LEROY H. ANDERSON, Democrat, of Montana, said it was scandalous that the industry has forced workers to strike to enjoy even a small share of its prosperity.

He added, "Let us have done with any pretense that this is an entirely free and competitive economy when it is evident that major segments of our economy, like steel, are governed by administered prices . . . set by a few big corporations at whatever price will yield the greatest profits."

Why We Cry Wolf

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

Record, I include the following editorial from the Lancaster News, Lancaster, S.C., of August 3, 1959:

WHY WE CRY WOLF

This newspaper has been consistently critical of the attitude of the U.S. Government toward the cotton textile industry. We wrote an article recently in which we said that unless this attitude changed the bankruptcy of the industry was not only predictable, it was inevitable.

This was written at a time when the industry is enjoying a considerable measure of recovery. Even the marginal mills are seeing profits for the first time in years. A reader asked us frankly if we believed what we had written. And we answered, just as frankly, that we do and we don't.

We do believe that if this Government continues its policy of giving financial aid and tariff concessions to foreign mills the American market will be inundated with imported textiles selling at prices no domestic manufacturer can meet. That will mean bankruptcy without question or quibble.

We do not believe that this Government will be stupid or shortsighted enough to let this happen. We cannot believe that Congress will sit idly by and allow a fuzzy-minded set of one-world theorists destroy an industry ranking second only to steel in its importance to the defense of the United States.

But we are not naive enough to think that this recognition of impending disaster will come unless those interested in the textile industry do some powerful shouting. If we seem to overstate the case, to cry before we are hurt, it comes from that fearful feeling that no one is listening.

Developments and Undertakings in Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared last week in the Christian Science Monitor commenting on a number of the central developments now taking place in Africa. These past weeks have seen on the continent a number of fresh developments and undertakings which will vitally affect the new and emerging nations of Africa and our relations with them.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 29, 1959]

THREE ROADS IN AFRICA

Three notable developments have made headlines about Africa in the last week or two, highlighting that vast stage whereon the discovery of a continent by its own people is being enacted.

These developments were (1) the meeting of three west African leaders in Liberia to consider formation of an all-African federation; (2) the proposal by Prime Minister Macmillan for a commission to study the question of Central African Federation, a project in which the white communities in the region take the leading role; and (3) the report of the British commission on the

uprisings in Nyasaland several months ago—uprisings against the Central African Federation.

These developments reflect major trends in African political evolution: The pan-African movement, the new French Community of Nations, and the British-led Commonwealth of Nations.

It seems likely these great movements will march side by side for some time to come. They cannot quite merge because of fundamental differences. But each makes contributions to African evolution which are essential in a century dominated by world struggle between democracy and communism—two systems much more divergent in method and purpose than are the three African movements.

In the pan-African outlook, for which Prime Minister Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana aims to remain the leading spokesman, African self-consciousness finds its greatest stimulus. This affects all Africans, even in the groups that form around African-French and African-British cooperation. But this cooperation also represents a valid relation between African natural resources and talents and European education and finance.

For the moment the pan-African movement has received a minor check. That was the result of the three-nation West African meeting. The conference decided to wait until Nigeria and the French Cameroons and Togoland achieved independence next year before trying to form a new African federation.

Meanwhile the building of a once-colonial into a Commonwealth area is presenting some difficulties to the British. Ghana is in the Commonwealth, and Nigeria will be, but always subject to the pull of pan-Africanism. Then, too, there is the question of the Central African Federation. This has split not only whites from Africans in the Rhodesias and Nyasaland, which make up this uneasy federation, but also the British Parliament itself. There the Labor opposition is beating the Macmillan government for its African policies.

It is interesting, as a token of British sincerity, that a commission appointed by the Macmillan government has just brought in a report contrary to certain past basic assumptions of the government, and this has become a British White Paper.

Into this overall picture, as it has unfolded recently, the French Community comes by way of its interest in a possible future challenge from leaders like the Marxist Sekou Touré, President of the only and tiny state that chose full independence from France under the de Gaulle Constitution.

This, then, is the mighty patchwork of Africa. It is being redesigned by African forces of the 20th century, sometimes in harmony, sometimes despite the divisions imposed on Africa in the 19th century. To comprehend its possibilities and its dangers is one of the chief responsibilities of free peoples as the wider struggle between liberty and totalitarianism goes on.

Malcolm "Okey-Doke" Smith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in this day and age too many demand too much of others and do not give enough of themselves toward the happiness of

others. It is refreshing, therefore, to meet a remarkable personality, Malcolm "Okey-Doke" Smith, a rigger at the Ford Motor Co.'s vast industrial plant in my home district, who has dedicated himself to making children happy with his one-man band.

The following article from the Southwest (Detroit) Journal tells of his efforts to entertain young people:

[From Southwest (Detroit) Journal, July 30, 1959]

MALCOLM "OKEY-DOKE" SMITH SETS HIS ONE-MAN BAND FOR MICHIGAN STATE FAIR

(By Jed Miller)

Biggest news for kids everywhere is that Malcolm "Okey-Doke" Smith, southwest Detroit's gift to good music, is going to have his absolutely unique one-man band at the Michigan State Fair.

It's just possible that the State fair hasn't heard about it yet—and it may be a long time before the downtown papers get wind of it, but Smitty has the band's buggy almost ready in his basement at 1449 17th Street in the Corktown section.

Of Scottish-Irish origin, Okey-Doke established himself as a true son of southwest Detroit when he took an early version of his one-man band to one of the Patton Park rallies and was literally mobbed by children, 14-deep, as he played banjo, electric piano, and the drums, all at one time.

He has applied automotive engineering to the old one-man band idea.

A nephew, M. M. Hunt dressed as a clown, was his source of moving power, wheeling the cart along. In the State fair mode, now being fabricated with delicate precision in his garage, Mr. Hunt will ride an old-time bicycle, high atop the contraption, easing the one-man band gently through the crowds.

Dancing puppets revolve around a pair of hard-working cymbals, and inside both the drum and the dancing platform are secret compartments where apples, candy, and cakes are dispensed.

Smitty has an idea that some enterprising merchants might like to sponsor his show.

Whoever does, is going to get his money's worth in goodwill and advertising. He has the darndest names for the four puppets atop the cymbals, and they would be more popular than Howdy Doody on the TV.

Malcolm "Okey-Doke" Smith is a rigger at the Ford plant. He is proud to work at the world's biggest industrial complex. A rigger, Smitty explains, is one of a group of men who can move heavy machinery or buildings. It must have been riggers that Henry Ford, Sr., used to get to move buildings that Edsel had erected, if the Ford biographers were correct.

Smitty got his nickname at the plant. Whenever someone wanted a giant stamping machine or engine-maker moved, they simply called for him, and he cheerfully replied, "Okey-Doke."

He is just 2 years short of retirement. Then, look out. Because one-man bands are bound to become the rage in Hollywood and on TV.

He didn't take up music (guitar, banjo, mandolin) until he was 28, but can now play along with the best of them, oldtime, cornball tunes, or new-style cool stuff. You just name it, and Smitty can knock out the tune on banjo or "git" and set your toes to twinging.

He's so good he was the only man selected out of 65 who auditioned for that very select and important Michigan group known as the Ford Girl's Club. They can command the best and they picked Smitty.

Why does he do it? Smitty has a simple explanation. He likes kids. Whenever he is in his basement music room, the windows are jammed with neighborhood children, and

Smitty is never too busy to pick out a request. "Some of the strangest," he says.

He is good at any national music and his Mexican neighbors love it when he swings into "La Paloma." When he sounds out a spiritual his colored friends join with sure and happy voices.

A favorite selection is "Bye, Bye Blues," one of the first tunes he picked out, note by note. Now there is no limit to his repertoire.

You can reach Music Man Malcolm Smith at TA 6-2120 or 1449 17th and he's never too busy. Call him up and ask for Okey-Doke.

Lincoln and Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an essay on Abraham Lincoln written by Christopher Vanier, of St. Kitts, British West Indies. This excellent and beautiful essay was the prize-winning essay in a contest sponsored by the USIA in the British West Indies, in which 54 schools participated.

Young Christopher Vanier, 17 years old, is now in the United States studying our institutions and visiting Lincoln shrines. We are honored that he is the guest of our country.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINCOLN AND US

Lincoln was not a God. Lincoln was not even a demigod; he was a man like us. He was not a rich man, nor a handsome man, nor a well educated man, nor a man for whom Providence has made the path of life a rosy stroll. He was a plain man of the people. Lincoln has been dead and buried now for 94 years. He was born at Nolin Creek, Kentucky, and lived all his life in a relatively small portion of the United States, thousands of miles away from most of us.

Thus separated in time and space, how does this man exert his lofty influence over the minds of other men? For Lincoln is loved and respected by people who have never seen America, people who will never see America, and people who do not wish to see America. He has monuments to him in England, books about him in Chinese, and interest in him from Australia to the West Indies. He is a guide and an example to administrators of freedom everywhere. What is the formula for the fiery jet of his fame that burns more vigorously on the bitter cries of his adversaries, and sheds light on millions, making the paradoxical fog of this life a little clearer?

The secret can be found in his actions while President. For if he had not been elected President of the United States, he would have been doomed to obscurity. He always possessed the propensities for greatness, but it was not until the Kansas-Nebraska bill, allowing the spread of slavery, was passed in May 1854, that Lincoln, as one biographer says, awoke from his "civic slumber." As an Illinois lawyer, he would never take a case in which he did not believe, and he could never believe in a cause which did not stir him as being just and right. And so it was with slavery. The

Kansas-Nebraska bill amounted in Lincoln's words to this: "That if any one man chooses to enslave another, no third man shall be allowed to object." This Lincoln would not condone.

Now Lincoln's main bulwark of greatness was to be as "the Great Emancipator." The Negro race, the poor and downtrodden everywhere owe him a great debt for this. And Lincoln in his glory is likewise indebted to these for his inspiration, because the major part of his eminence rises from his defense of them, and only through them did he fulfill his aspirations, as declared to the people of Sangamon county "of being truly esteemed by my fellowmen."

Lincoln personally hated slavery all his life, and told the Illinois Legislature that "Slavery is founded on both injustice and bad policy." He believed in freedom, and equality—not in achievement, but in opportunity—for all men. But though convinced of the moral turpitude of slavery, Lincoln made no determined attack on it until 1854, and even then did not join with the Abolitionists in their blind and violent extinction crusade, because he knew that this course would arouse seven devils—each worse than the first.

He was in favor of confining slavery to the South, and waiting for its slow, but ultimately inescapable disintegration. The South, however, deemed the spread of slavery essential to their survival. Lincoln fought this with all the mighty political eloquence of his ideals. It is needless to trace the well-known course he blazed across the political skies. Sufficient that he spoke as never before, and within 6 years of the Kansas-Nebraska Act, he was elected as President. In the seventh year, when he took up the active reins of Government, the ranks of slavery closed against him, and the Southern States seceded from the Union. Then began that terrible Civil War, lasting 4 bloody years, and costing 600,000 lives.

Had Lincoln's sole objective been to save the Union, he would have achieved a mere nationalistic hurrah, of little importance to other countries. But as Professor Randall said, Lincoln fused the cause of the Union with the cause of freedom. In January 1863, he declared all rebel slaves free—following in the wake of British freedom lovers. Lincoln was fighting for a nation "dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." Not only, however, was that American Nation at stake—the whole cause of humanity—freedom, popular government, that elusive conception, democracy—was being evaluated. Lincoln was "testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure."

And Lincoln is valued because he himself was one of the greatest battlefields for democracy and emancipated freedom. Liberty, equality, and fraternity were his ideals, and he suffered uncomplainingly to the end for them. A man of peace, who hated brutality, he was forced to send northern youths to battle and death. A man who loved honesty, who went "with malice toward none, with charity for all," he was disbelieved, buffeted, and lacerated by cruel criticisms from all parts. A man who was the friend of all, who pardoned hundreds from death—this man was murdered by a southern assassin.

Lincoln's death was his final guarantee to immortality. He could make no more mistakes—what he might have done was limitless—and he was a martyr to democracy. His philosophy and ideals, together with the tremendous drama and pathos of his extinction in the prime of his career lifted him above Illinois, above America, to the Valhalla which only the few can achieve.

While fully realizing all its limitations, Lincoln found democracy best, and his hopes were for equality, self rule, and happiness everywhere. He believed with Wordsworth,

that other great humanitarian, that God did not intend even the meanest and plainest of people to exist divorced from good, or from equal opportunities for good. His creed of freedom and of human rights embraces everyone, everywhere, as friends, and equals, and perhaps his greatest eulogy has come from Edwin Stanton in the words "Now he belongs to the ages."

Johnstown Babe Ruth League All-Star Team Wins New York State League Championship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that in representing the 32d Congressional District of New York I represent the home of the great national game of the United States of America, baseball, which was first played in Coopers-town, N.Y., 120 years ago this year. Because of this close connection with the great game of baseball I am always interested in the tremendous job that is being done throughout our country in training young people not only in the game of baseball but what is even more important in the qualities of sportsmanship which go with that great game. For this reason, I am particularly proud that the annual New York State Babe Ruth baseball championship was won this year by a team from my district, the All-Star Babe Ruth baseball team from Johnstown, N.Y. These splendid young baseball players are to be commended on their great victory. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Gloversville Leader-Herald which describes the game which won for them the championship:

JOHNSTOWN COPS NEW YORK STATE BABE RUTH LEAGUE CHAMPIONSHIP—KINGSTON ERRORS, TIMELY HITS SPARK RALLIES IN FOURTH AND SEVENTH FRAMES

Johnstown All-Stars celebrated its third year into the Babe Ruth baseball program last night with a 5 to 0 victory over Kingston for the New York State championship.

Playing before more than 1,200 fans in Amsterdam's Mohawk Mills Park, the Fulton County club, comprising Johnstown and Gloversville athletes, scored two runs in the fourth and three in the seventh for sixth straight tourney win.

Manager Bill Wilmot reported last night that the club plans to participate in the regional tourney in Griffith Stadium, Washington, D.C., providing funds are available.

An alert Johnstown club, taking advantage of Kingston mistakes, was on the short end of hits until the last-inning scoring spree.

Skip Scofield, who started on the firing line for the Sir Bills, checked the losers with four hits in four innings. He issued one pass and fanned three.

ALLOWS ONE HIT

Cole took over the hurling duties in the fifth and wound up with a one, three, and five performance, respectively.

Mike Ferraro went the distance for Kingston. The five errors committed by his teammates helped the Johnstown scoring. He

limited the Sir Bills to a pair of hits and two runs until the last canto. Ferraro fanned two, both in the fifth.

Johnstown threatened in the opening canto, but a double play started by shortstop Smedes ended the potential rally. An error on Michaelson's grounder to short and a pass to Steve LaMantia had the champs threatening in the second. Scofield popped up to second baseman Bruck to retire the side.

Gerald Gaydusek started the rally in the fourth with a double. Dom Ruggeri flied out to center fielder Falvey. Whittingham hit to shortstop Smedes, who attempted to nail Gaydusek at third.

The Johnstown catcher was safe when Davide dropped the ball. Michaelson sacrificed Whittingham to second. The two scored when Smedes scooped up LaMantia's hard grounder and made a bad throw at first. LaMantia moved to second. He attempted to reach third, but a perfect relay from Ferraro stopped the scoring threat.

LA'MANTIA DOUBLES

In the seventh, Michaelson singled to right field. A good piece of defensive work by Hetsco prevented the Johnstown center-fielder from advancing. After fouling several pitches, LaMantia hit to right field just inside the foul line for a one-run double.

Cole sent centerfielder Falvey back to the fence for a running catch on the first out and Hall grounded to third. Hornung walked. When he reached first, he kept on heading for second.

Pitcher Ferraro spotted the attempt for a steal and tossed to shortstop Smedes. Hornung stopped. He attempted to go back to first. That was the green light for LaMantia, who scooted home. When the attempt was made to stop the run, Hornung went to second, scoring on DiCruttalo's liner.

Gaydusek flied out to Ron Thomas in left field for the final out.

The visitors had players on base in every frame but the second. In the opening stanza, they loaded the sacks before Scofield slammed the door. Kingston had two aboard in the fourth and a double play started by Timer Whittingham closed up shop.

The losers, who eliminated Schenectady in the Intra-District playoffs, were bidding for a score in the fifth on a pair of passes. Cole settled down to have Ferraro hit to center fielder Jim Michaelson and strike out Rich Sickler to end the inning.

THREATEN IN SIXTH

Kingston threatened in the sixth. Bill Bolce walked, Jim Bruck fanned and John Falvey singled to center field. Michaelson slipped in fielding the ball.

Bolce continued to third when he saw the center fielder fall. Michaelson made a one-handed stab for ball, regained his feet and nailed Bolce at third with room to spare.

When Johnstown had the game wrapped up, Cole made fast work of his assignment in the seventh by fanning the first two batters, Ron Thomas, Hutch Davide, and forcing Vin Smedes to ground out to DiCruttalo.

That touched off the celebration by the youthful players and their many followers. It spread to the Glove Cities, where some fans started plans to attend the regional tournament.

Hal Schumacher, Dolgeville, former star hurler with the New York Giants, presented the State Championship Trophy to Bill Wilmot, manager of the Johnstown All-Stars, at brief after-game ceremonies.

"It is a privilege to present this trophy of New York State Babe Ruth League to Johnstown," Prince Hal said in congratulating the champions.

Schumacher also thanked Kingston, who he said, "came a long ways in the tournament. It is nothing to be ashamed of in finishing second."

"I hope this is just a start toward winning the national championship. You are enthusiastic neighbors, and you know we are neighbors," the Dolgeville resident added in bestowing praise upon the Johnstown team and its followers.

James White, assistant district attorney of Montgomery County and a member of the Amsterdam Junior Chamber of Commerce, tournament sponsors, presided at the brief program.

He introduced Amsterdam and Kingston city officials and members of the tournament committee.

The master of ceremonies thanked Amsterdam residents, who housed players for four days; merchants for their cooperation in the project, use of the baseball facilities and the patrons, who helped put the eight-team tourney across.

White also congratulated Johnstown for clinching the crown.

Johnstown			Kingston				
	Ab	RH		Ab	RH		
Hall.....	4	0	1	Davide.....	3	0	0
Hornung.....	3	1	0	Smedes.....	2	0	0
D'Cruttalo.....	4	0	1	Ferraro.....	3	0	2
G'y'dusck.....	4	1	1	Sickler.....	3	0	0
Ruggeri.....	3	0	0	Bolce.....	2	0	1
Wit'ham.....	3	1	0	Bruck.....	3	0	0
Mc'aelson.....	2	1	1	Falvey.....	3	0	2
LaMantia.....	2	1	1	Hetsco.....	3	0	0
Scofield.....	1	0	0	Bream.....	1	0	0
Cole.....	2	0	0	Thomas.....	1	0	0

Johnstown.....	0	0	0	2	0	0	3-5
Kingston.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0-0

Runs batted in: LaMantia, DiCruttalo.

Doubles: Gaydusek, LaMantia.

Errors: Davide three, Smedes.

Double play: Smedes, Bruck, Bolce; Whittingham, Hall, DiCruttalo.

Left on bases: Johnstown five, Kingston eight.

Strikeouts: Scofield three, Cole five, Ferraro two.

Bases on balls: Scofield one, Cole three, Ferraro two.

Hits: Off Scofield, four in four innings; Cole, one in three innings; Ferraro five.

Wild pitches: Ferraro.

Winning pitcher: Scofield.

Umpires: Fornal, Nowak, Broefel.

College Housing—An "Extravagant" Program?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

MR. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, at the time when Russia's first sputnik soared aloft in October of 1957, there was much fine talk about all that America would do to increase educational opportunities in an effort to keep abreast in scientific achievements.

Yet we have actually neglected rather than achieved many of our educational goals. For example, the President's recent veto of the sound housing bill passed by Congress has greatly imperiled many housing programs on college campuses. These programs are essential to the sound expansion of many of our colleges and universities, great and small, throughout the United States.

The bill which would have aided the implementation of these important housing programs—and thus directly af-

fected the educational opportunities of many thousands of students—has been described as extravagant.

Mr. President, I have received many telegrams and letters from presidents and deans of Oregon colleges and universities. I read from a typical letter, written to me by Mother Mary Gemma Pienett, O.S.B., president of Mount Angel College, in Mount Angel, Oreg.:

The news of President Eisenhower's veto on July 7 of the college housing bill was a definite shock and disappointment to the members of our college faculty and administration. Although our institution has not yet applied for a housing loan, we had planned to do so in the immediate future. It will be virtually impossible for us to continue operations, and take care of our increasing enrollment without expanded facilities.

The college housing program has fulfilled a great need in the Pacific Northwest. Cutting it off at this point would definitely cripple the educational program of our State, because the increase of our college-age population is continuing. Our college, like many others, could effectively care for a larger number of young people if we had housing facilities.

Is this extravagant talk, Mr. President? If it is extravagant, then it is an extravagance which we need if it means the difference between education and no education for many American youths.

In Oregon, for example, eight colleges received a total of \$6,319,000 under previous loans. This is not a great sum, but it has made possible dormitory facilities for 1,440 single men and women and 8 student families, plus new and remodeled dining rooms.

Today, because of the uncertainty of funds for college housing following the President's veto, three loan applications from Oregon are being held up. Dormitory space for 406 students and dining facilities for 750 more would be provided through the construction which \$1,739,000 in loans could make possible.

Extravagance, Mr. President? Housing loans are extended to colleges over a 40-year period with an interest rate equal to the average paid by the Federal Government in its borrowings, plus one-fourth percent for administrative costs of the program. The cost to the Government is small, if anything. The benefit to colleges and universities—and, more important, to thousands of students—is great.

Private financing for such projects, which the President said in his veto message would be displaced by the continued loan program, simply is not available. The Washington correspondent for a number of Oregon newspapers, Mr. A. Robert Smith, reported recently on the testimony of two distinguished educators—President Calvert N. Ellis of Juniata College, Huntingdon, Pa., and President John A. Hannah of Michigan State University—before the Senate Subcommittee on Housing. I quote from his dispatch of August 1, 1959, in the Oregon Statesman of Salem:

Dr. Ellis rebuffed the President's contention about displacing private money. He said "there is not adequate private financing" and as far as most private colleges are concerned, "a Federal loan program is the

only available guarantee that our building needs will be met.

"Without such a program, what assurance has a college like my own, not merely that it will be able to raise a loan at a rate of interest it can afford to pay, but even that it will get a loan at all? If we were to pretend that there is any satisfactory alternative to a Federal loan program, we should be conspiring to deceive the American people."

I was pleased to learn that the new housing bill just approved by the Senate Housing Subcommittee contains authority to extend this valuable program, despite the necessity of cutting the college classroom loan authority from \$62.5 million to \$50 million.

Extravagant, Mr. President, is defined by Webster as "exceeding due bounds, excessive, wasteful." The college housing program proposed in S. 57 and in the new housing bill does not exceed due bounds. It certainly is not wasteful. It is minimal. It is vital to the bare needs of American colleges and universities.

I hope that the Senate Banking and Currency Committee will give speedy approval to this feature of our much-needed housing bill and that it will receive rapid and favorable consideration on the floor of the House and Senate.

In conclusion, I ask unanimous consent that several letters and telegrams from Oregon educators on this subject be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with the dispatch of Mr. A. Robert Smith, "Colleges in Oregon Wait Federal Loans," which appeared in the Oregon Statesman of Salem for August 1, 1959.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., July 9, 1959.

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

We urge utmost effort to provide further college housing loans immediately. We are ready to build to meet current heavy demands which increase yearly.

MORGAN ODELL,

President, Lewis and Clark College.

LINFIELD COLLEGE,

McMinnville, Oreg., July 9, 1959.

HON. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DICK: From all that we have been able to learn it appears that there is little likelihood that the Congress will override the President's veto of the housing bill. If this is not done I would like to join with the host of college administrators in expressing a hope that the leadership in Congress will bring forth some kind of a housing bill during this session.

With the burgeoning college population I have a feeling that we owe them the opportunity of an education and thus provide a greater assurance of security for the Nation. We who are affiliated with nontax supported colleges have little opportunity to expand our dormitory facilities without the help of the credit of the Federal Government.

Linfield is now completing a classroom building and we today notified our building crew that with the completion of the unit next week there will be no further employment because the three projected

buildings will be unavailable through the Housing and Home Finance Agency. This will hurt the college similarly to other institutions across America. Of course, it will also add to unemployment.

I am hopeful that you will be able to use your fine leadership in effecting a satisfactory Housing bill to help us in education.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY L. DILLIN,
President.

MOUNT ANGEL COLLEGE,

MOUNT ANGEL, OREG., July 24, 1959.

The Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senator from Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. NEUBERGER: The news of President Eisenhower's veto on July 7 of the college housing bill was a definite shock and disappointment to the members of our college faculty and administration. Although our institution has not yet applied for a housing loan, we had planned to do so in the immediate future. It will be virtually impossible for us to continue operations, and take care of our increasing enrollment without expanded facilities.

The college housing program has fulfilled a great need in the Pacific Northwest. Cutting it off at this point would definitely cripple the educational program of our State, because the increase of our college-age population is continuing. Our college, like many others, could effectively care for a larger number of young people if we had housing facilities.

We ask your cooperation, Mr. NEUBERGER, in doing what you can to override the President's veto of the housing bill. This loan program seems to be one of the safest investments that our Government has made, so there seems little justification in dropping it at this point.

We appreciate your kind interest, and sincerely hope for a favorable outcome of this important legislation.

Sincerely,

MOTHER MARY GEMMA PIENNETT, O.S.B.,
President Mount Angel College.

[From the Oregon Statesman, Salem, Oreg., Aug. 1, 1959]

COLLEGES IN OREGON WAIT FEDERAL LOANS
(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—The Nation's colleges and universities strongly favor an expanded Federal program to help them accommodate growing student enrollments, but which the Eisenhower administration wants to abolish next year.

Two spokesmen for the academic community testified this week before the Senate housing subcommittee in favor of a new \$62.5 million program of Federal loans for colleges to build classrooms, laboratories, and libraries. This would be an extension of the 9-year-old program of Federal loans for college dormitories and faculty housing.

President Calvert N. Ellis of Juniata College, Huntingdon, Pa., and President John A. Hannah, of Michigan State University, disputed contentions against the program made by Eisenhower in his recent veto message on the housing bill. Dr. Ellis represented the Association of American Colleges, whose 778 member institutions include virtually all accredited liberal arts colleges and universities in the country. Dr. Hannah represented the American Council on Education, American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, American Association of Junior Colleges, Association of Higher Education, and the National Education Association.

An impressive point to the committee was the forecast of future student enrollment,

Dr. Hannah pointed out that when Congress launched this program, it was thought post-war enrollment would level off at twice the prewar level—2.6 million over 1.3 million. Instead, it is now over 3 million. He estimated by 1970 6 million students will be seeking higher education.

In his veto message, Eisenhower called this a subsidy program that would merely displace private financing and lead to Federal spending that is entirely unnecessary.

Both educators disputed this. They explained that the Federal loans are extended to colleges over 40 years at an interest rate equal to the average paid by the Federal Government in its borrowings, plus one-fourth percent to cover administrative expenses of the program. The rate is now 3½ percent.

"This program costs the Government nothing," Dr. Hannah declared.

Dr. Ellis rebuffed the President's contention about displacing private money. He said "there is not adequate private financing" and as far as most private colleges are concerned, "a Federal loan program is the only available guarantee that our building needs will be met."

"Without such a program, what assurance has a college like my own, not merely that it will be able to raise a loan at a rate of interest it can afford to pay, but even that it will get a loan at all? If we were to pretend that there is any satisfactory alternative to a Federal loan program, we should be conspiring to deceive the American people."

Dr. Ellis said Juniata College has built two modern dormitories largely through 40-year Federal loans. He said the best deal banks will offer is a 15-year loan at 5½ to 6 percent, if the school has good security. Dr. Hannah said the Government required Michigan State to obtain half its financing for new buildings from banks and insurance companies. Federal loans covered the balance.

"We simply cannot build fast enough through our normal revenue sources to meet the need," Dr. Hannah added. "Thus borrowing in substantial amounts is inevitable if our colleges and universities are to provide the required campus facilities for our young people—and it is unthinkable that we will not."

It is still a question whether Congress will try to override the President's veto or whittle down the bill in a modified form in hopes of getting him to sign it.

Under the college housing program, 11 sizable loans have been granted to 7 Oregon colleges and universities, mostly for dormitories. Three applications for other loans are now pending, and the availability of further Federal funds will determine whether they go through.

These pending cases are for Willamette University, \$689,000 for a dormitory to house 172 men; Lewis and Clark College, \$225,000 for a dorm for 82 men; and Linfield, \$825,000 for two dorms and a student union. One dorm is for 76 men, the other 76 women.

Those previously extended were for: Reed—\$223,000 for a women's dorm; \$334,000 for a men's dorm; \$300,000 for another men's dorm.

Lewis and Clark—\$465,000 for a men's dorm; \$590,000 for a women's dorm and a dining room.

Linfield—\$202,000 for a men's dorm; and \$75,000 for married students' apartments.

Pacific University—\$630,000 for a women's dorm and to rehabilitate dining facilities.

University of Portland—\$440,000 for a women's dorm; and \$1,460,000 for a men's dorm and dining room.

Eastern Oregon College of Education and Southern Oregon College—\$1,100,000 for a men's dorm on the La Grande campus and a women's dorm on the Ashland campus.

Report of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the full text of the 1959 Report of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy, at Colorado Springs, Colo.

Because I had the great benefit of the information and inspiration of being a member of that Board and attending on all of its sessions at the Academy beginning on May 11, 1959, and completing as of May 15, 1959, I have particular pleasure in presenting this text for the benefit of all the Members to read.

This was the first meeting of the Board of Visitors after the move of the Academy from its temporary site at Denver, Colo.

Now that I have had a similar experience of visiting two other academies during the last dozen years, I feel it appropriate to urge that all Members of Congress become as well acquainted as may be with the program and functioning of each and every of these Government Academies for the training of our youth.

The report follows:

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY, 1959

MISSION

The mission of the Air Force Academy is to provide instruction, experience, and motivation to each cadet so that he will graduate with the knowledge and the qualities of leadership required of an officer in the U.S. Air Force, and with a basis for continued development throughout a lifetime of service to his country, leading to readiness for responsibilities as a future air commander.

REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Appointment to the Board of Visitors

The Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy was appointed under the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 9355.

Preliminary data

Senator GORDON ALLOTT replaced Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL. Lt. Gen. Bryant L. Boatner and Dr. Robert L. Stearns replaced Gen. Carl Spaatz and Dr. John A. Hannah. Senator HOWARD W. CANNON was named by Senator RICHARD E. RUSSELL to make the visit in his behalf. Representative CLYDE DOYLE was nominated by Representative CARL VINSON to make the visit in his behalf. Mr. Edward P. Curtis visited the Academy April 24. Neither Mr. Curtis nor Mr. Victor Emanuel were able to visit at the time the rest of the Board did, because of previous commitments.

Convening of the Board

The Board convened at 9:30 a.m., May 11, 1959, and completed its inspection at 11:30 a.m., May 13, 1959. This was the first meeting of the Board since the move of the Academy to its permanent site near Colorado Springs, Colo., in September 1958.

Chairman of the Board

The Board elected Senator GORDON ALLOTT as its chairman.

Procedure

The Board made part of its inspection as a committee of the whole. Some aspects of the Academy's operation were examined by subcommittees of the board.

Comments of the Board

Morale: The Board found a high state of enthusiasm and morale prevalent in the cadet wing and among the staff and faculty of the Academy. The sincerity and dedication of the first graduating class speaks well for their motivation toward lifetime service careers.

Discipline: The Board noted that discipline was excellent in all phases of cadet training. Cadets were alert and responsive. Their individual initiative and maturing sense of responsibility are coupled with high concepts of honor and duty.

Curriculum: The Board was impressed with the opportunities offered by an enrichment program which permits each cadet to develop his individual knowledge and competence in accordance with his talent and his capacity for work. The Board was happy to note that the Academy has inaugurated a department of astronautics program and recommends it be continuously expanded to keep pace with the changing security needs of the Nation. All aspects of cadet education—academic, military, and physical development are well integrated to produce a graduate of which the Air Force and the Nation can be proud.

Academic methods: The methods used in teaching are designed to make best use of the cadet's time for classroom learning and individual study. The small classes permit the cadets to participate extensively and they are challenged to their best efforts. Section assignments are based on class academic standings to enable instructors to gear their teachings to the levels of students in their classes. It is suggested that the time and methods of examination be reviewed by a competent committee of the faculty with a view to avoiding interference with class instruction and discussion.

Instruction: By visits to classes in session and inspection of classroom, library, and laboratory facilities, members of the Board observed the effectiveness of teaching methods. In comparison with civilian colleges and university students on recognized tests of academic proficiency, the evidence shows that the cadets have responded favorably to the instruction as given.

Faculty: Members of the faculty are academically well-qualified officers on active duty with the Air Force. Thus, they bring to their classes both military and academic backgrounds that help them provide cadets with a high motivation for education and lifetime service careers. The Board reiterates the vital importance of Air Force personnel policies giving top priority to the assignment of high caliber faculty members to the Academy. The Board is happy to learn of the approval by the Department of the Air Force of a proposal from the Academy which will permit, under appropriate circumstances, Sabbatical leaves for professors. This policy, if pursued, will serve to revitalize and stimulate permanent members of the faculty.

Accreditation: The Board was gratified to learn that the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools had now accredited the Academy to grant degrees. This is a unique achievement for an educational institution that was yet to graduate its first class, and is a fitting recognition of a sincere, able, and effective institution of higher education.

Airmanship training: The Board was briefed on the various phases of the airmanship program. This includes military, flying, physical, and command training—as well as

the cadet way of life. These are the environmental factors, which, with the academic training, are calculated to develop the cadet into a professional Air Force officer, prepared and motivated for a lifetime career of service to his country. The navigation training and the course in astronautics are designed to give graduates pertinent skills and understanding of aerospace navigation.

The Board was also briefed on the current status of planning for pilot training of cadets. The Board regrets that the recommendations of previous Boards have not been carried out. At the time the Academy was authorized, pilot training was envisioned and contemplated as an integral part of the cadet training program. Such training would add materially to the motivation of individual cadets and to their future value as officers. The land for the airstrip was included in the original land acquisition program and is now available on the Academy site. The Board again strongly urges that the Academy be authorized to construct a suitable airfield at the earliest possible date to carry out primary pilot training. The cadet time required for primary pilot training is available from that now devoted to the extensive navigation program.

Cadet life: The complete life of the student is integrated into his course of training. The functioning of the cadet wing, the dormitory life, and the cadet honor code are all part of the cadet's education and motivation for a career as an Air Force officer. The Board feels that the leadership and administration of this program are excellent. Especially to be commended is the well-phased program of increasing the freedom and responsibility of upperclassmen to make the transition to the life of a junior commissioned officer a gradual one.

Religious activities: Cadets are required during the first 2 years to attend services with the cadet wing—Protestant, Roman Catholic, or Jewish. During his third year he may attend one service per month in a church of his own choice off base in lieu of attendance with the cadet wing. In the first half of his fourth year he must attend services but all attendance may be off base, in lieu of attendance with the cadet wing. During his last half year, attendance is voluntary on his part. In addition, there is considerable voluntary participation in such religious activities as the choirs, Sunday school, and religious instruction classes. Besides conducting these religious activities, the chaplains play an important part in the Academy's counseling program.

Physical equipment: The construction of congressionally approved buildings at the permanent site of the Academy is substantially complete, except for some of the dependent housing, the hospital, and the cadet chapel. Progress by last September was sufficient for the Academy to move from the interim location at Lowry Air Force Base at Denver. Further progress has continued throughout the school year.

Library: The center of any educational institution is its library, and the Board desires to commend the administration on its effective operation of a select and growing library and the extent to which it is used by the cadets.

Planetarium: A unique feature of the Academy is the planetarium which is an effective agency in the instruction of men not only in astronomy and navigation, but in an appreciation of three dimensional interplanetary space essential to the operational understanding of new weapons and techniques.

Fiscal affairs: The Board finds that the Superintendent has maintained a continuing personal knowledge of fiscal affairs of the Academy. The Board has taken cognizance of the recent report of the Comptroller General. However, it is the opinion of the Board that such issues as are raised should

be resolved between the construction agency, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the respective appropriate Committees of Congress.

Date of the 1960 meeting of the Board

The Board set the dates of April 6-10, 1960 for its annual visit to the Academy in 1960.

Remarks

The Board commends Maj. Gen. James E. Briggs and his entire staff on the highly successful operation of the Academy during his service as Superintendent. This is particularly outstanding in view of the move to the permanent Academy site in the past year, the academic accreditation by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, and the preparation of the first graduating class. It is recognized that such success is the result of a great effort by a well-balanced team, under General Briggs' leadership.

Recommendations

1. The Board reiterates that primary pilot training should be added to the curriculum of the Air Force Academy. Such training at the Academy should be given all physically qualified cadets and would constitute an essential step in the military pilot instruction of future career fliers.

2. Lack of a flying field at the Academy site introduces numerous difficult problems in the conduct of Academy flying operations. The Board again recommends that suitable flying facilities, built to proper Air Force standards, be provided at the Air Force Academy. Time and distance factors, plus extensive civilian and other military flying operations in the Denver-Colorado Springs area make any other facilities unsuitable and uneconomical.

3. The Board recommends that the curriculum of the Academy be continually reappraised to insure that it remains sound with respect to changing technologies and world conditions.

Respectfully submitted.

Gordon Allott, U.S. Senate; Henry Dworshak, U.S. Senate; Howard W. Cannon, U.S. Senate; Byron G. Rogers, House of Representatives; J. Edgar Chenoweth, House of Representatives; Clyde Doyle, House of Representatives; Dr. Arthur H. Compton, Dr. Robert L. Stearns, Bryant L. Boatner, Lieutenant General, USAF, Retired; James McCormack, Jr., Major General, USAF, Retired.

Congress Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Gaffney Ledger, Gaffney, S.C., of August 4, 1959:

CONGRESS RECORD

The record of the 1st session of the 86th Congress, which will probably end its deliberations in September, is now on the way to completion. It is a record which commands respect, viewed from any angle.

It will be recalled that the 1958 election produced the thought among many that the 1st session of the 86th Congress would be a radical or very liberal Congress. A large

number of excessively high spending bills was anticipated.

However, it has become obvious that a coalition of moderate Democrats and Republicans has been able to restrain the left-wingers, and there has been a tendency among the leadership of Congress to cooperate with President Eisenhower in reducing expenditures. This was, of course, partly necessitated by the recession of 1958 and the bleak financial picture which greeted Congress as it assembled in January.

In fact, the 1st session of the 86th Congress assembled with the Nation running head-on into a record peacetime deficit. That deficit totaled almost \$12 million.

President Eisenhower has vetoed a number of bills which he thought were too costly, and Congress has usually worked to write a bill the President could sign, as a result. There has been little acrimony between the majority leader in the Senate and Speaker RAYBURN, on the one hand, and President Eisenhower on the other. In fact, all of them have exercised an admirable restraint in delving into what would be considered low-grade politics.

As a result, this Congress is being termed the best, or most statesmanlike, to be seen in operation in Washington since World War II. A number of veteran reporters have come to that conclusion.

It seems probable that the labor bill, civil rights bill, housing bill, action on Federal highways, a sizable defense bill, and most of the other necessary legislation required, will be passed in good order. The civil rights bills, the labor bill, and many other bills, will not go as far as some people desire, but such legislation is practically certain.

In summary, the 1st session of the 86th Congress has achieved a moderate record, avoiding reckless spending, and accomplishing much. The leadership deserves the praise it is receiving from so many sides.

Labor Reform Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following text of a letter I recently received from a resident of my district in Michigan whose husband is a member of the Teamsters Union. I thought the Members of the House would be interested in the writer's remarks concerning the need for labor reform legislation:

JULY 30, 1959.

MY DEAR MR. BENTLEY: I understand that there is a labor bill coming up to be considered and I hope I am not too late in writing. More of us would write but the issue is so plain and clear that something must be done—we are so disgusted with labor's unjust practices—that a Congress that waits to be told just isn't capable of governing. Strong words, I know. Labor has for a long time been too big for the individual or group of individuals with its tactics, and Government institutions haven't achieved much better. We haven't lost faith that they will and woe to us all if nothing comes of all this.

My husband is a teamster because he had to be. They get little to say about their contracts and I have yet to hear of his voting

for anyone outside of his steward who to my knowledge votes for no one above him and they are all a little afraid of the whole mess.

Nevertheless, a good union is necessary in all our opinions.

The union practice of hiring picketeers to force a (store in this instance) to unionize when even the clerks didn't want to—no good. To our fellows, "You join or you lose your unionized customers" (the biggest ones).

This year, "You get a raise in the form of pension payments to union pension fund" (when my husband fervently hopes not to be a teamster forever) and a reduction in commission with additional hospital benefits. Also, "You take teamsters insurance (instead of Blue Cross) or we don't negotiate the contract."

I am hoping you Congressmen have enough political fortitude to write a labor bill that will turn these unions into law abiding citizens because we do need them—in regulated version.

Life magazine's description of a fleet of outdated navy vessels, a White Fleet, sounded rather good, propagandawise as well. While I feel much foreign aid is just tossed down an ungrateful barrel, this sounds as though it had possibilities.

When the White Fleet comes up before you will you give it consideration? I understand that Senator GEORGE Aiken and Representatives WILLIAM BATES and Ed EDMONDSON are supporting the idea.

Connecticut Needs Housing Bill for Urban and Regional Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK KOWALSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, the President's veto of the 1959 Housing Act has endangered not only the public housing program, college construction plans, and housing for the elderly but it has placed in jeopardy the slum clearance and urban renewal program.

A most important phase of this program, urban planning assistance, has been most valuable to the communities of my State, Connecticut, as evidenced by a letter I have received from James S. Klar, chief of the planning division of the Connecticut Development Commission.

With unanimous consent, I place Mr. Klar's letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION,
Hartford, Conn., July 28, 1959.

HON. FRANK KOWALSKI,
Congressman at Large, Connecticut,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. KOWALSKI: We understand that Congress is currently giving further consideration to a 1959 housing bill. The housing bills of 1954 and 1956 and the recently vetoed bill contained provision for urban planning assistance, commonly known as the 701 program. The Connecticut Development Commission has a very direct interest in this element of the housing bill since the Commission administers the 701 program in Connecticut.

The urban planning assistance program has provided Federal matching funds for technical planning work in municipalities under 25,000 population, in larger municipalities afflicted by disaster and in metropolitan or regional areas. Comparatively speaking, the cost of this program is low but we feel the benefits are great. Professional planning consultants working for the municipalities through the Development Commission prepare comprehensive plans of development, zoning and subdivision regulations, capital improvement programs and other technical tools vital to urban renewal programs and to the prevention of blight and decay. A comprehensive planning program is a prerequisite for participation in the Federal urban renewal program. This 701 program can go far to prevent blight and thus in the long run can reduce the need for costly urban renewal.

For your deliberations on a housing bill, we felt you might wish to know the status of the urban planning assistance program in Connecticut to date. Since 1955, 46 municipalities with a land area of 1,368 square miles and a 1950 population of 455,870 have participated in the program at a total contract cost of \$427,257. All municipalities aided have been under 25,000 population except for the disaster afflicted city of Waterbury. The 701 program has also resulted in regional plans for the three flood valleys and in the recently approved project for the capitol planning region around Hartford.

However, a great many municipalities under 25,000 population have not as yet had 701 aid and their opportunity for participation is largely dependent on passage of a new housing bill. Seventy-three municipalities with planning and/or zoning commissions which have a total area of 2,100 square miles and a 1950 population of 299,022 have not received 701 aid. There are also 32 municipalities with populations of less than 25,000 which currently lack planning and zoning commissions. These total 1,100 square miles and a 1950 population of 83,385. Were these to establish planning and/or zoning commissions, they could receive 701 aid.

If the 701 requirements were amended to permit aid to municipalities in the 25,000 to 50,000 population category as proposed in the recently vetoed housing bill, 16 other Connecticut municipalities totaling 436 square miles with a total 1950 population of 557,022 would be eligible.

The development commission is actively promoting regional planning. In addition to the capitol region which is now receiving 701 aid, one final and seven tentative definitions of regions have been made. Hopefully, regional planning agencies will be established within these regions. Section 701 aid will be vital for these agencies in preparing regional plans.

We also understand that the housing bill which was vetoed provided funds for State planning. We are very much interested in this phase of planning and would expect to undertake work under this program if available.

We feel that Connecticut has benefited greatly from the urban planning assistance program. However, the preceding statistics indicate that many more municipalities and regions are eligible and would greatly benefit from such aid. Congressional action will be required if this program is to be continued. Your support will be greatly appreciated.

Very respectfully,

JAMES S. KLAR,
Chief, Planning Division.

Paying for a U.N. Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include an article from the Manchester Guardian Weekly by Wayland Young:

[From the Manchester Guardian Weekly, July 23, 1959]

PAYING FOR A U.N. FORCE

(By Wayland Young)

Cybernetic mechanisms are not always a good guide in human affairs, but it does seem odd that they should never have been applied to the greatest political question of all: how the United Nations can keep the peace? Perhaps the two most widely accepted commonplaces in the world are that national armaments threaten peace, and that it is difficult to achieve disarmament without a permanent United Nations force. National forces equal fear of war; United Nations forces equal hope of peace. Any connection? Anything to be done? Any feedback?

At present the United Nations Organization is financed by contributions scaled to the National income of the member state, and poorer members are allowed a remission up to 50 percent scaled to their per capita income. This works fairly well; collections run between 98 percent and 99 percent. The United States pays 32.51 percent of the total, though there is a theoretical Assembly ruling that nobody should pay more than 30 percent. The Soviet Union pays 13.62 percent, and the United Kingdom 7.78 percent. At the other end, 16 little nations pay 0.04 percent, which is the flat minimum allowed.

The United Nations Expeditionary Force in Suez and Sinai and Gaza, which everybody hopes will be pathfinder and pace-maker for the future, is financed by a mixed arrangement. It cost \$30 millions in 1957. About \$15 million of this was raised on a percentage arrangement echoing that which finances the United Nations as a whole, and about \$14 millions came from individual contributions from those states which thought it was their duty to make them. (In 1959 the cost is expected to be only \$19 millions.)

Now let us imagine that a permanent United Nations force were to be built up, and that it were to be financed no longer by contributions scaled to the national incomes of member states, or states participating in the force, and still less by conscience money from rich states, but by national contributions scaled to the level of national armaments in each state. If a nation desired to keep 5 million men under arms, it would pay the United Nations military fund through the nose. If it only desired 10,000, it would pay very little.

The arrangement would be a tax on the destructive force in the world, which is national armaments, and the proceeds would be devoted to the constructive force which is international law and authority and the power to enforce them. For every soldier I pay to threaten my neighbor, I should

have to pay another to protect him and vice versa. It would make the punishment fit the crime with a vengeance. There would be a balance and a neutralization; our plight and its remedy would find their own level and cancel each other out like water in two connecting vessels. As the engine of national military might began to race so would the governor, by arming the United Nations, cut off the supply of steam at the most crucial place, which is the belief of a nation that it can get away with aggression unchecked.

As a matter of fact, it would be better to tax not the men but the machines. An ideal method would be to scale the payment to the number of dead there would be if all the weapons possessed by the country in question were to go off in heavily populated areas. Thus one rifle in national hands would finance one rifle in United Nations hands, but one H-bomb in national hands would finance several million rifles in United Nations hands, or whatever weapons the United Nations might collectively agree should be given to its forces. It is not likely that it would agree to give its forces H-bombs. There is nothing against the United Nations having only smaller weapons, provided it has enough of them. No single power is going to hold United Nations forces at bay with the threat of thermonuclear bombardment, or not for long, anyhow.

But to the extent that the national contributions were scaled to the power of weapons held, inspection would become necessary, and the proposal might fall into the same morass as the disarmament talks have. For this reason, it would perhaps be best of all to have a scale of payments based on that which is readily visible. Men are readily visible; no country at present keeps the number of troops it has secret. Ships and bombers are visible to the naked eye. A bomber capable of carrying a nuclear weapon, that is any bomber, if it exists in a country which has a nuclear industry, should be taxed at the nuclear rate. Rockets are not quite so visible, but their existence is at present loudly proclaimed by all the States that make them. The menaces should be believed, and the tax levied accordingly.

The most hopeful element of the whole proposal is the difficulty which governments would find in resisting it, should it be proposed. It has a kind of flashy neatness which might catch the imagination of peoples. One can hear the popular comment: "Well, that's only fair, I must say." Each conscript all over the world, as he took up his rifle, would think of the United Nations mercenary his government was paying to pick up another rifle. "Silly," he'd think it, "Why don't we both go home?" And in time his government might come to agree.

Federal and State Water Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, because of the continuing struggle in the 17 western States between the Federal and State Govern-

ments for water rights, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article appearing in the Eddy County News, Carlsbad, N. Mex. Eight Eddy County ranchers are named in a Federal complaint for taking too much water from wells on their own ranches for their own use.

The article follows:

PIONEER EDDY FAMILIES FACE U.S. COURT ON WATER RIGHTS—ORDERED TO ANSWER IN ALBUQUERQUE

Eight prominent Eddy County ranchers have been charged, in a Federal court civil complaint, with using water taken from wells on their ranches, to the detriment of Government water rights in Rattlesnake Springs.

All of the ranches involved are located in Eddy County, south and west of Rattlesnake Springs. Named in the complaint are H. F. Ballard, M. M. Bradley, George C. Brumble, Leroy Caffall, Arthur J. Mayes, John Mayes, A. M. Leeman, and George Smart.

Some of the wells which the Government seeks to close have been providing water for the ranchers as long as 11 years. They use the vital water for stock watering and small-area irrigation.

Opening gun in what promises to be a long drawn out fight for survival by the ranchers was fired by an impressive Government legal staff, headed by Assistant Attorney General Perry W. Morton, and including James A. Borland, U.S. attorney, David R. Warner, and Alfred H. O. Boudreau, Jr., all of whom are listed in the court action as attorneys for the plaintiff the United States of America.

Root of the complaint seems to lie in water needs of Carlsbad Caverns park, which pipes its water supply 5½ miles from the pool at Rattlesnake Springs. The suit claims that Government operations are entitled to a total of one-half cubic foot per second of water from the pool, of which two-tenths cubic foot is earmarked for use at Carlsbad Caverns. It is not made clear in the action what disposal is to be made of the remaining three-tenths cubic foot of water.

The Government's claim is that combined pumping effect of the ranchers' wells is depriving it of its total one-half cubic foot per second water allowance.

It further charges that the Government is suffering irreparable injury and has no plain, adequate, or complete remedy at law. The Government lawyers have asked the Federal district court in Albuquerque to appoint a special water master to police use of water by the ranchers.

The ranchers' side of the matter is yet to be heard. They have been ordered by the court to make their answer in the Albuquerque court within 20 days, failing which judgment by default would be taken against them.

Hoffa and Reuther: Contrast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the following article by George Todt, published in the North Hollywood (Calif.) Valley Times, offers considerable food for thought. Mr. Todt articulates questions that have bothered many fair-minded Americans. Legislative investi-

gations are an important function in congressional responsibility. But unless they are fair to all concerned, they are open to justifiable criticism and their effectiveness compromised:

HOFFA AND REUTHER: CONTRAST

Watching tough little Jimmy Hoffa, Teamsters Union boss, on the CBS television program, "Face the Nation," last Sunday was quite an experience. He certainly got unhappy at the prospect of labor being placed under antitrust legislation.

This gentleman is hard as nails, but you've got to say one thing for Jimmy, he certainly knows his subject backward and forward, too. And that subject, of course, happens to be his Teamsters.

In this specific area of knowledge, Jimmy racked up the television panel facing him with approximately the same ridiculous ease with which Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt systematically takes her questioners into camp on "Meet the Press" from time to time.

Quite by coincidence, young Robert Kennedy, Labor Rackets Committee counsel, was guest star of the latter show. His topic was mainly Jimmy Hoffa, as it has been during most of his tour of duty on the McClellan committee.

Kennedy has a tremendous predilection for ferreting out all the secrets of Hoffa which he can find. Maybe there is much to learn here, but it seems to me that young Robert's zeal might have appeared even more commendable in the past if he had displayed the same amount of desire to learn as much of the worldly affairs of Walter Reuther as he did the latter's archival, the boss of the Teamsters Union.

And thereby hangs a tale. Whereas both Hoffa and Reuther have been called before the Rackets Committee in the last 2 years, they did not receive the same impartial and eminently fair treatment from young Kennedy. No, not at all.

For our Mr. KENNEDY sent 40 or 50 investigators at a whack to look into the workings of Mr. Hoffa and others who were unfriendly to Mr. Reuther, boss of the United Auto Workers (UAW) and strong man of the AFL-CIO. But somehow, the great investigator could only spare two men when it came time to observe what went on in the Detroit stronghold of Uncle Walter. How come?

Come to think of it, one of these two men was even intimidated and threatened with loss of his job because 'twas said "he was out to get Mr. Reuther in advance." Or something.

At any rate, Mr. Reuther was hardly treated with the same degree of microscopic inspection as was Mr. Hoffa, and we may wonder why? Granted, of course, that Mr. Reuther is a much nicer personality and honest as they come personally—but what about that interesting matter of using Republican union members' funds for political purposes? Rumor hath it that many solons wanted to look closely into this vital subject—but Mr. KENNEDY nixed it.

Now why did young Robert Kennedy go slow on Reuther but attach Hoffa with full might and main? The answer, of course, seems bound up in the 1960 presidential elections. The quid pro quo, in this instance, would seem to be the help of Reuther's forces in behalf of Robert's older brother, Senator JACK KENNEDY, in return for his assault upon Reuther's main opponent in the labor movement today—Hoffa.

A strange story has come out of Washington since the labor rackets quiz got underway almost 2 years ago. It concerns the fact that only some 15 percent of the labor movement has come under scrutiny by this time—but almost 100 percent of the opposition to Mr. Reuther has been included in the 15 percent mentioned.

This doesn't mean collusion or that Mr. Reuther is calling the signals for the committee to gain the results most desirable for himself. I do not wish to imply that by any means. But I think it is quite probable that, if the facts are as indicated, perhaps young Mr. Kennedy may have taken it upon himself to direct the inquiry in just such a way as has since turned out to be the case.

Should this be true, the Republican Party may have as good a campaign issue for itself in 1960 as it is bound to have in the biased action recently taken against Adm. Lewis L. Strauss in the Senate.

Until we find out how much of young Kennedy's vendetta against Hoffa is based on personal considerations and politics, it might be wise to withhold our final judgment of the latter until all the results are in.

Could it have been that Mr. Robert Kennedy, campaign manager for his brother in 1952, has been playing to the Committee on Political Education (COPE) gallery all this time with an eye glued to 1960? What are we to think here?

Salute to Alaska, Our Newest State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1959

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a letter written by Miss Rose J. Boylan, of East St. Louis, Ill., to the editor of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, which appeared in the Mail Bag of the newspaper on July 6, 1958. Miss Boylan fittingly salutes our 49th State, Alaska:

SALUTE TO ALASKA, OUR NEWEST STATE

To the Editor:

What does one say now? "God bless you, Alaska." "May you enjoy your statehood." Or what?

If we are awkward in our welcome to the youngest sister—remember, most of us never did this before, nor expected to do it. We are packing away two generations of memories, along with our 48-star flags.

Take myself. I can remember St. Pius X as a living Pope. I can remember Nicholas II as Czar of Russia—but I can't remember an American flag that didn't have 48 stars.

When we put the flag out on July 4, back in those golden years my mother would quote the old jingle:

"Thirteen stripes are for thirteen States that first in the Union came;

For every State we have added a star—but the stripes remain the same."

I would say, "But we'll never change the flag again, will we? It'll be 48 stars all the time now, won't it?"

I knew that all the open spaces had been filled in—from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from Canada to the gulf. I knew that Illinois had become American in George Rogers Clark's time, Missouri through the Louisiana Purchase—that the Indian Territory was the State of Oklahoma now—and that New Mexico and Arizona were brandnew. My father told stories of reporting the first State elections in the Dakotas for the St. Paul Pioneer-Press; that was in 1889.

My mother thought a moment, "Alaska might come in some day," she answered, as people said then, "They might fly to the moon some day."

Alaska was the place where my aunt's friend, Miss Beulah, was a medical missionary. She sent us snapshots of Fairbanks. She sent us a basket of leather and bark and beadwork, that held our Christmas cards each year for more than 30 years. During those years, my brother and I, like millions of us, grew up under the 48-star flag.

It was that flag that people were so sentimental about during World War I. It was that flag to which even the most discouraged clung blindly during the depression.

We studied history and civics. The rules always stayed the same. Three-fourths of the States was 36. Two-thirds of the Senate was 64. Three generations of children learned it that way.

In days of plenty and days of peace, we rose to pledge allegiance at every public function. We fussed when flags were made into rosettes—that was only for bunting, not for our glorious 48 stars.

Our own flag hung solemnly from the corner pillar of the big porch, on parade days. We stood at the railing, hands on hearts, as one unit after another marched down our tree-shaded street. Flag and school pennant, flag and Union banner, flag and sacred emblem—always, year after year, holiday after holiday, the same flag.

"The 49th State" was a Globe-Democrat slogan in those days. It was a nickname for the St. Louis trade territory, and my father loved to joke about it.

But the flag that covered his casket still had 48 stars. So did hundreds of thousands of other flags—through two world wars and Korea.

The Philippines said, "Goodbye," and were on their way. New nations were founded, new rulers were crowned. But the 48 States with their 48 stars remained unchanged in a changing world.

Now, at long last, the change has come. Our own kid sister has come of age.

Something has come true that—all of our lifetimes—has been a legend of the long ago. The Union was not intended to be complete. Every so often another of the kindred comes to sit at the council fire. Every so often a new star of peace appears in the blue field.

ROSE J. BOYLAN.

The Late Mrs. Mary T. Norton

SPEECH

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the death this week of Mary T. Norton is a special loss to the people of New Jersey, to the women of America, and to me personally.

Mrs. Norton was not only the first woman in the Democratic Party to be elected to Congress; she was also the first woman to serve in that capacity from New Jersey. The people of the 13th District have great reason to be proud of that service.

Throughout her career, Mary Norton was a pacemaker and a precedent breaker. Her service in the House confirmed that women, indeed, have an important responsibility in the political life of our country. As the first woman chairman of a committee of the House of Representatives, in fact as chairman of both the Committee on the District of Colum-

bia and the Committee on Labor, she exercised wise and courageous leadership, and devoted her talents to social and humanitarian legislation that even today are important influences in the welfare of working people throughout the country.

While our paths seldom crossed, it was my pleasure on a few occasions to meet and talk with Mrs. Norton. And I have always cherished the fact that the very first telegram of congratulations I received on the occasion of my first election to Congress came from that wonderful woman.

But all of New Jersey knew and loved Mary Norton for her courage and determination no less than for her friendliness, gentleness, and broad humanity. Her success, the distinction she earned in the political life of her Nation, helped pave the way for those of us who came after her. Women of New Jersey and the country who believe that women have a role to play in American Government owe a great deal to the pioneering of Mary T. Norton.

Industrial Development for the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. QUENTIN BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following resolution approved by the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe July 28, 1959. I believe the tribe should be commended for its desire to improve the economic condition of its members and its foresight in laying plans for industrial development to accomplish that purpose:

Whereas the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe, hereinafter referred to as the tribe, is an unincorporated tribe of Indians, acting under a constitution and bylaws adopted April 14, 1944, by a vote of 116 for and 18 against in a general assembly meeting called for the proposal of a constitutional vote and approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs on February 14, 1946.

Whereas article 3, section 1, of the tribal constitution provided that the governing body of the tribe shall be the executive committee and under terms of article 4, section (a), provide that the executive committee shall exercise power not in conflict with Federal law as follows: (a) The power to represent the tribe in negotiations with Federal, State, and private agencies.

Whereas the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe desires to improve the economic conditions of the members of the tribe; and

Whereas the following described U.S. title lands designated as agency reserve appears to be excess to the needs of the Bureau; and

Whereas a portion of the area is now used for tribal homes; and

Whereas the executive committee of the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe wishes to set aside the area not used for tribal homes as a site or sites for future industrial development: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior effect the transfer of title in trust to the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe, the following described lands, to wit: Lots 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, and those portions of lots 2 and 3 of sec. 17, T. 152 N., R. 65 W., fifth principal meridian, not embraced in allotment No. 585 of Jesse G. Palmer, and the W $\frac{1}{2}$ E $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, W $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, NW $\frac{1}{4}$, SE $\frac{1}{4}$, sec. 20, T. 152 N., R. 65 W., fifth principal meridian, Benson County, N. Dak., comprising 538.85 acres more or less.

What REA Means to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, last Friday night it was my pleasure to speak to more than 800 customers of the Tuscarawas-Coshocton Electric Cooperative, Inc., at the fairgrounds in Coshocton, Ohio, in my congressional district. I talked on the subject of "What REA Means to America" and pointed out that since the Rural Electrification Administration was established, 95 percent of the farms in America have been electrified, which all demonstrates how free enterprise and Government can work together for progress.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the remarks which I made on this occasion in the Appendix of the Record:

WHAT REA MEANS TO AMERICA

Mr. Manning, Reverend Wells, Mayor Leach, President Darling, other distinguished officers of Tuscarawas-Coshocton Electric Co-op, ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to have this opportunity to be with you this evening and to think with you on an important agency of our Federal Government. It is my earnest, honest hope, in speaking to you, that something I might say, some thought I might express, will stimulate in you the desire to help me, and others in our Government, to do our jobs a little better, a little more efficiently, a little more energetically, so that all of us can make more progress. As you know I am a co-op user myself. Our home and farm in Knox County is served by the Morrow Rural Electric Cooperative.

We live, as we all know, in a challenging period in world history. While every generation has produced its own problems, and they have been many, I feel sure that, no matter what former period of human history you could choose, you would encounter no more churning, no more explosive situations, than we know exist in our world today.

At home, and abroad, we, as a free people, face problems of great magnitude. Tom Paine wrote, during the American Revolution: "These are the times that try men's souls. * * * You and I, as we become aware of all the potential peril points on this old globe, can repeat those words and put an exclamation point after them."

And yet, as Emerson once remarked: "The years teach much that the days never know."

As we get a little older, and a little more experienced, we can look back and see that progress is being made, in this or that field of endeavor. Let us realize that there is

nothing automatic about progress, however. All of human history—all of life—all the recorded teachings of mankind—teach us that every step of progress that has been made has been one long and constant battle. Men who wanted to progress, individually or in groups, have found that they must battle against inertia, greed, stupidity, human cruelty, as well as against all the forces of nature, from decay and depreciation to the onslaughts of the elements.

Let us bear in mind that all progress is an uphill fight, not only against people who do not want to move, but against all the impediments placed in our paths by life and nature.

William James said, and I quote: "If this life be not a real fight, in which something is eternally gained for the universe by success, it is no better than a game of private theatricals from which one may withdraw at will. But it feels like a real fight."

You who have been active in the REA movement know, from the history of the agency, that rural electrification has been a real fight, all during its history, and even before the Rural Electrification Administration was born. I did not know the men, but I knew of them, who had a hand in opening up rural America to electricity, and I should like to pay tribute to them. Foremost among them was Senator George W. Norris, the Independent of Nebraska, who for 25 years reigned supreme in the Senate as the man who thought the most about the future of his country. Among those early fighters there was a Congressman named John E. Rankin, of Tupelo, Miss., who no longer sits in the House of Representatives but still is remembered by the oldtimers there. John Rankin will always be numbered among the founders of the REA. And then there was Judson King, who died only a few months ago in his home outside of Washington. Judson King was a public relations man for the people. For most of his life, he battled, through his writings, for projects that would benefit all the people of this country, as opposed to ideas and ideals that were designed to help the few at the expense of the many. And, I am happy to report, my father-in-law, Representative Usher L. Burdick, was in that valiant and limited group that originally fought the battles for rural electrification. I'm also happy to report that Usher Burdick, although he retired from Congress at the end of the 85th Congress, still is alive and happy and as ram-bunctious as ever. While, as I noted, I did not know many of these men personally, I know them by reputation, and I am sure that there is tonight, among us, several individuals who may have known one or the other of them. It behooves us, I believe, to remember these stalwarts of other days, for we can gather strength from their struggles and their victories for the battles that may lie ahead.

These men lived, as we do, in a period of great change. But they never allowed the distractions, and the deliberate tactics of their enemies to divert them from the paths they knew they must take. We, too, must learn not to be diverted from our legitimate aspirations by the little, petty, picaresque things of life. We must keep our minds and our hearts on the larger goals, and push on, regardless of the disruptions which constantly will be placed in our paths.

The Rural Electrification Administration program demonstrates, I think, how free enterprise and a sympathetic government can work together to solve a vexing and difficult problem for human beings.

In 1935, before the REA came into being, only 1 farm in every 10 in the United States had electricity. For all practical purposes, rural America was in the dark. Of course, there were kerosene lamps, there were hand-operated waterpumps, and there were

Chic Sales outhouses behind every farmhouse. If you drove into the countryside after dark, in those days, the only possible lights you would see, besides the headlights of your own automobile, would be the dim and flickering lamps that would be burning in one or two rooms of the farmhouses.

Today, due principally to the foresight of the men who worked for the REA to become enacted into law, 95 percent of all farms in the United States have central station electric service. In less than 25 years, we have seen electricity transform the rural home into a modern, convenient place to live.

As we know, the REA made it possible for groups of local farms and other individuals to organize into cooperatives and to borrow long-term loans at low interest for the purpose of generating and distributing electricity, as well as building and operating rural telephone companies. In the past 23 years, some 1,000 of these REA cooperatives—completely owned and operated by local people in as many communities—have borrowed and used about \$3 billion from the Federal Government to build modern electric power systems to serve rural areas.

I doubt seriously if \$3 billion of Federal funds ever has been used more economically or with more lasting benefit to the comfort and welfare of as many people in the whole history of Government anywhere on earth. There is no telling how many elderly people have been able to turn on the water spout in subzero weather, instead of having to walk out into bitter cold to get water from the well. There is no computing how many women with child, alone and unattended on isolated farms, have been able to do their necessary household chores, more or less in the comfort of their homes, without having to strain themselves by pumping water outside, or injure themselves by other manual labor they might have had to do if they had not had electricity.

If there were any way that we, tonight, could look into the hundreds of thousands of homes that have been served through the years by electric power, made available because of the REA program, I am sure that we would see a story that would make all the miracles of ancient writ pale into insignificance. Electricity, we know, is a miracle in and of itself. The fact that, in the mid-thirties, our leaders of those days could be farsighted enough to see the challenge and to meet the challenge and make Federal money available to local groups, represents another miracle. And every home that has enjoyed a transformation as a result of the electricity represents another miracle.

These rural electrification systems today are operating in 47 States and in Puerto Rico. They have brought electricity to more than half of all the electrified farms of America, and because they have made this great service possible to half the homes, they have provided the competitive stimulus necessary to obtain service for most of the other homes of the country.

Back in 1935, when the REA experiment was just beginning, it was argued that all farmers who wanted electricity had it and that there was no market for power out in the country. Experience in the last 23 years has demonstrated how wrong this contention was. Rural people are using electricity at an ever-increasing rate, doubling their use of power every 5 to 7 years.

The success of the rural electrification program has been so overwhelming that many opponents no longer try to attack it openly. Instead, they are coming forth with proposals to improve the program. The President's budget message, with its proposals for REA, illustrates this point.

For 2 years in a row the administration has asked Congress to jack up the REA interest rate. This is being done despite the fact that all evidence indicates that such an increase would necessitate higher elec-

tric bills for all the consumers served and many co-ops, especially those in the thinner territories, would be driven out of business. As you know, REA is prohibited by law from serving towns with a population of more than 1,500, which means that it is barred from participating in the cream of the electric industry market.

For 2 years in a row the administration has also asked Congress to change the REA Act so as to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to turn a part of the loan business over to the Wall Street bankers. This proposal was so drastic that in the last session of Congress not a single Member was willing to put his name to the bill and sponsor its introduction.

In the budget message the President also asked for a tax on co-ops and he recommended a slowdown for the Federal power program upon which nearly half of the co-ops depend for their wholesale power.

The President is not the only member of the administration who has been harassing REA. The Secretary of Agriculture has extended his domination over the REA Administrator and drastically clipped his authority. All new loans, and all major loans, as a result of the Secretary's directive, must now be cleared with his office before they can be approved.

During this session of Congress a drive has been made to end the Secretary's domination and to restore to the Administrator the loanmaking authority that Congress gave him originally. Committees in both the House and the Senate gave prompt consideration to the bill, which was known as the Humphrey-Price bill, and by April both Houses had taken action, voting overwhelmingly for the measure which had been vigorously supported by rural electric systems in all parts of the country.

First the Senate, and then the House, gave their approval. However, when the bill reached the President's desk, he vetoed it. The Senate promptly overrode his veto, with several votes to spare. The scene changed to the House; and in the last hours before the rollcall the administration decided to make the Humphrey-Price bill a straight party-line issue. The President called upon all the Representatives who had voted for the bill in the earlier vote. He succeeded in getting enough of them to switch that on the final rollcall the veto was sustained by a slim four-vote margin. The House, in the biggest turnout for any rollcall in history, fell just four votes short of the two-thirds majority needed to make the bill a law.

The rural electric systems were defeated in their efforts to reestablish the authority and prestige of the REA Administrator; but it is to be hoped that the overwhelming vote will prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from interfering with the loan procedure in the future.

Another vital issue developed last summer, when the Comptroller General issued a ruling that if allowed to stand will seriously damage the REA program. The Comptroller General, Mr. Joseph Campbell, who served on the Atomic Energy Commission at the time of the Dixon-Yates scandal, and who was appointed Comptroller by President Eisenhower on December 15, 1954, in his ruling ordered an unprecedented restriction on the REA Administrator's loanmaking authority. This ruling completely reversed congressional intent as set forth in the REA Act and completely ignored 23 years of successful administration.

The Comptroller has still not reversed his ruling, although he has said he did not intend to enforce it. There are bills in Congress to investigate this damaging and disruptive procedure.

The big challenge of the future in the REA program is to complete the extension of service to the remaining 2 million rural resi-

dents, and to provide the necessary power capacity to service constantly growing needs.

The use of electricity from REA-financed lines increased from a monthly average of 134 kilowatt-hours per farm in 1949 to about 291 kilowatt-hours in 1957. Farmers are coming to depend more and more upon electricity as a production tool. About 400 farm uses for electricity are known; at least 250 of them increase production or make farming more profitable.

Farmers already use more electric energy for more farm tasks than was expected when the original lines were built. As a result, power distributors are faced with the necessity of heavying up the lines and substations to keep abreast of demand. A program of system improvements has been a major activity of most REA electrification borrowers in recent years.

An important result of the expanding rural electrification program is the increased business it brings into rural communities. It stimulates private business, both locally and nationally. I confirm what Mr. Erman said. Surveys indicate that for every dollar invested in rural power facilities, the farmer invests \$3 to \$4 in wiring, plumbing, and electrical appliances. Also, when power is available, the establishment of industry in rural areas is encouraged.

It has been a great pleasure for me to be with you this evening, and to think with you on this important subject. As you all know, I am pledged to work for the REA in every good way, consistent with the finest democratic principles of our country.

Equal Air Time Is a Very Important Part of the Democratic Process

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include a statement made by Dr. Timothy W. Costello, assistant State secretary of the Liberal Party of New York State, over WCBS-TV in New York on Sunday evening, August 2, 1959, at 7:30 p.m.

Dr. Costello's remarks follow:

REMARKS BY DR. TIMOTHY COSTELLO, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE LIBERAL PARTY OF NEW YORK STATE, OVER CBS-TV NETWORK, AUGUST 2, 1959

The position of the Liberal Party with regard to appearances of candidates for public office on television and radio is basic. We believe that not only are all bona fide candidates entitled to be heard, but that conversely, the people must be guaranteed the right to hear the viewpoints of all bona fide candidates.

We are aware of the problems involved in the appearances of candidates on news programs, panel shows and other broadcasts that may have no direct relationship to their candidacy. But we are even more concerned that the processes of democracy will always be maintained in this vital area of communication.

The president of CBS made a valid point when he said that the equal-time restrictions cause serious hardships for broadcasters. But he made a rather less-than-

valid assertion when he stated that, unless corrective measures are adopted, "we will have no choice but to turn out microphones and television cameras away from all candidates during campaign periods."

We would remind Dr. Stanton that the airwaves belong to the people, and that the assignment of radio frequencies and television channels to commercial broadcasters involves the broadcasters in a never-ceasing obligation of public service. And the processes of democracy in general, and political campaigns in particular, are all part of that public service.

The radio and television broadcasters, by reason of hardship, could no more divert their microphones and cameras away from events and issues of deep public interest than the power companies, also by reason of hardship, could divert electric current away from a community. And in this area, may I say parenthetically, we are concerned not only with free time on the air; we are also concerned with the increasing difficulty of getting even paid time for political broadcasts.

Equal air time is a very important part of the democratic process. And the sharing of the public forums by the candidates of the two leading parties is in the best tradition of let the people decide.

But if the democratic process is to flourish, major recognition must also be given to third parties. For in the history of our country, third parties have shown that they have a vital contribution to make. The Republican Party itself began as a third party. The records of achievement by the Progressive Party in Wisconsin and the Farmer-Labor Party in Minnesota are testimony to the importance of third parties.

And currently, although the Liberal Party of New York State is the only major third party in the Nation today, it too, we believe, is writing a record of achievement in the State of New York and in its cities and counties that brings echoes of agreement and of action from many other parts of the country.

The third parties of the past, as well as the Liberal Party today, have been the originators of much that was new and perhaps daring to begin with but that has now become part of the social and political fiber of the Nation. At the moment, I will name only old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, minimum wages, public housing, and civil rights. There are many more.

For a decade now, between 250,000 and 500,000 voters in New York State have voted for the Liberal Party's candidates at each election. This is greater than the total vote cast in the last presidential election in such States as Arizona, Delaware, Idaho, Maine, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Carolina, Utah, Vermont, Wyoming, and a few others. It is greater than the total vote of the two new, and let me say very welcome, States of Alaska and Hawaii.

We are dealing here with a major force in American politics. We are dealing with a party whose independent candidate for the U.S. Senate in 1952, Dr. George S. Counts, polled 490,000 votes; with a party which, in that same year, gave Adlai Stevenson 417,000 votes; with a party whose vote carried New York State into the Roosevelt column in the Presidential election of 1944; with a party whose 428,000 votes gave Senator Lehman his margin of victory in 1949; with a party that elected its independent candidate, Rudolph Halley, President of the New York City Council in 1951 with 583,000 votes, and gave him 428,000 votes for mayor in 1953; with a party whose 264,000 votes carried Governor Harriman to victory in 1954, and whose 295,000 votes made State Comptroller Arthur Levitt the only Democratic victor in 1958; with a party that elected its own candidate, Vincent

Corsall, the present mayor of the city of Oswego.

To quote Senator KEATING's recent statement, "Consideration must be given to significant parties such as the Liberal Party. . . . It must not be denied the opportunity to present its candidates and its views on an equal basis with other substantial parties."

In this complex situation of equal time, the Liberal Party realizes that there have to be certain standards applied and certain limitations imposed. But distinction must be made between bona fide parties and candidates with a significant political program, and the others—or we will be throwing out the baby with the bath water. Let's not destroy the good principle of equal time because it contains a weakness in detail, but rather work to eliminate the weakness.

In the quest for both reasonableness and fairness, we would join with CBS in seeking to define just who is and who is not a legally qualified candidate. In this regard, we would hold that the standards and requirements of each State should be the determining guide.

For example, New York State has specific and stringent requirements. And for the broadcaster to deny a candidate, legally qualified and authorized by the State, the right to the airways, is to arrogate to itself a sovereign power of the State.

We agree that bona fide newscasts and on-the-spot news programs should be exempted from the equal-time requirements. But with regard to panel shows, interviews, and documentary programs, we feel that only those should be exempted that are substantially removed from the participant's candidacy.

Unless a radio or television program comes clearly and unmistakably under the heading of news, it must provide the right to equal time for all legally qualified candidates.

We would make one exception. A candidate for the Presidency who is legally qualified in certain States, should be entitled to equal time only in those States and not nationally.

In the worldwide struggle that is now enveloping all of us—the struggle between democracy and totalitarianism—the problem we are discussing here becomes increasingly important. We must be on guard at every moment to see that the concept of free expression and communication is not eroded, eaten away by new encroachments, however slight or reasonable-appearing. We are here involved in nothing less than a defense of the fundamental processes of democracy.

"Service Pays Off"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have contended that if the airlines would utilize Friendship International Airport in Baltimore, their services would be patronized beyond expectation.

Several weeks ago on the floor of the House, I called attention to the fact that Friendship is finally taking on the honest identity of an aviation center. Recently American Airlines and Trans World Airlines inaugurated daily jet service to the west coast. This service

has really paid off, as is indicated in the timely editorial which appeared in the August 5 issue of the Sun, which follows.

I heartily concur with the editor that a direct jet flight to Europe from Friendship would be patronized by thousands of people from this area. When the Civil Aeronautics Board receives a request for a certificate to operate this service from Friendship to Europe, I trust it will recognize the fact that Baltimoreans will fully utilize it and the authorization will be granted promptly.

The Sun editorial follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Aug. 5, 1959]

SERVICE PAYS OFF

The first month's operation of jet airliners out of Friendship has happily settled the old chicken-and-egg argument about Baltimore's travel habits. The airlines had contended that need for good service had to be proved before they could venture to provide it. Baltimoreans had said that once the service was there, it would be used. How long this war of assertion might have gone on no one knows. Luckily it was settled by geography, which decreed that National Airport could not extend its runways to take jets. They had to fly from Friendship or bypass this area. And it turns out that Baltimoreans are using the service to the west coast in large and increasing numbers. The planes are full and everyone is happy.

What next? Well, how about a direct flight or two to Europe? A lot of Baltimoreans go to Europe, and the traffic of Government and diplomatic people from Washington to Europe is tremendous. A flight a day (using jets, not hand-me-down equipment) would surely be patronized by the thousands of people in this area who would happily cut out the New York stop on the way, and the bother and lost time entailed by it. If such a service were started this winter it could be in the swing by next spring's tourist season, at which time, it may be, more than one flight a day would prove economic.

New American Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Peoria Journal Star:

[From the Peoria Journal Star, July 31, 1959]

NEW AMERICAN POLICY

RICHARD NIXON's performance in the Soviet Union has a deeper meaning than might show on the surface.

NIXON is not putting on a show for home use in the political maneuvers for 1960—although that picture of him tapping Khrushchev on the chest is about the hottest political campaign shot of all time.

NIXON is there without doubt, however, as an instrument of American policy that has been thoroughly examined and discussed by the National Security Council—and as such we are seeing a basic change in the American foreign policy.

For 15 years we have been in a cold war which was being fought by the Soviets while we tried to do little more than shore up our defenses and hold on the 40-yard line.

It is small wonder that the Communists have made gains. The strongest defensive team cannot win if it never has the ball, and even passes up the chance to intercept a pass and is content to just knock the ball down. All we have wanted from the cold war is out.

The Soviets have repeatedly proposed, are now proposing, and have often enjoyed a situation in which they enjoy a privileged sanctuary in their own lands and satellites free from U.S. interference—while they roam the world fomenting trouble in every corner of the free nations.

Yet all this time their own gigantic police force, their own strict control of press, radio, and TV, and restrictions on books and movies expose their own fears of their own people.

NIXON has not been parrying Khrushchev's thrusts. He has been making thrusts of his own, and with telling effect. Nothing is more vital to peace than that we shake the confidence of Kremlin leaders, and NIXON is doing a tremendous job for one man in that direction.

The effect is also to serve notice that we will not huddle in our own corner of the world and dodge Red blows, but that we are prepared to carry the cold war to the captive peoples of the Soviet bloc.

A good offense is the best defense, said Knute Rockne. This is true in war as in football. It is also true in a cold war as a hot war.

And the myth of Communist shrewdness, inscrutability, and general ability to take advantage of us in every encounter is being exploded. If we fight back with their own cold war weapons every meeting can be a chance to gain.

The cold war will never be won any other way—and never be ended in any other way.
C. L. DANCEY.

Mary Norton

SPEECH

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, as a tribute as to the high esteem in which the late Mrs. Mary T. Norton was held by everyone, it is best expressed in the editorial which appeared in the Jersey Journal of August 3.

I would like to make this editorial part of the record of feeling that everyone held for Mrs. Mary T. Norton.

[From the Jersey Journal, Aug. 3, 1959]

MARY NORTON

Everywhere in the Nation today, people are recalling that it was Mary Norton who first really carved out a meaningful place for women in the Halls of Congress. Jersey City and Bayonne sent her to the House of Representatives not as a woman, nor merely as the widow of a Congressman, but as a capable legislator who could hammer out the Nation's laws as well as any man, if not better.

Historically, she was just what the Nation needed when many Americans were still wary of the effects of the suffrage newly extended to women and their participation in public life. Mrs. Norton was aware of her role as a trailblazer, and she met every challenge.

In 1925, when it was generally held that women Representatives had better be seen

and not heard, Mrs. Norton was outspoken, right from her freshman year. She later headed important House committees. As head of the District of Columbia Committee, she was virtually mayor of the Nation's Capital. She was the first to introduce a bill to repeal the prohibition law. She was chairman of the House Labor Committee which made a minimum wage-hour law part of the American laboring standard.

That Mary Norton's extraordinary congressional career should have originated in Jersey City is something for her hometown to boast about, even in this hour of mourning.

About "Pop"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine in Medford, Oreg., recently wrote asking, "Which is the purest soft drink on the market?" Miss Lynn Koch told me she had heard many pros and cons on this subject and she requested advice.

I referred her letter to the Food and Drug Administration and an answer was forthcoming almost immediately. Commissioner George P. Larrick noted:

1. We know of no soft drinks on the market that would be considered harmful when consumed in the usual amounts by persons in normal health.
2. We know of no basis upon which to consider one soft drink as better than any other, since an individual's personal choice as to flavor and other characteristics of a particular product is the ordinary method of selection.

Commissioner Larrick went into further detail in answer to Miss Koch's question and her observation that she was "lost without pop."

Miss Koch's question and the agency's reply is of general interest, I believe, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include her inquiry and the Food and Drug Administration's reply:

MEDFORD, OREG., July 5, 1959.

DEAR MR. PORTER: I have heard many pros and cons on this subject and I would like the question settled right now. Which is the purest soft drink on the market?

I know that you have all the information handy and through this information you could give me the facts. I would like to know which is the purest and the best for a person.

I hope you can get this to me soon because I'm lost without pop and I don't want to drink any that is not good for me.

Thank you so much for your time and trouble.

Sincerely,

LYNN KOCH.

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., July 27, 1959.

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PORTER: This is in reply to your request of July 21 for information on soft

drinks, which was the subject of a letter you received from Miss Lynn Koch of Medford, Oreg.

There are numerous soft drinks on the market in this country. Many of these products are manufactured and sold only in the State in which they are made and thus are not subject to regulation under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

Most of these products are quite similar in composition, and are made up of carbonated water, sugar, harmless colorings and flavorings, and a harmless acidulant. Some contain natural flavors such as lemon or orange oil, others contain a small amount of fruit juice, while others contain harmless imitation flavors.

We know of no soft drinks on the market that would be considered harmful when consumed in the usual amounts by persons in normal health. Most cola-type beverages contain between one-third to one-half grain of added caffeine. This is equivalent to about the caffeine in one-third of a cup of coffee. Caffeine has a stimulating effect which differs widely between individuals. Individuals who find coffee unduly stimulating, particularly at night, should recognize that cola beverages may exert similar effects. The amounts of caffeine in these products, however, are generally recognized as safe by authorities in this field. Aside from the sugar content of these products, they possess no other significant nutritional properties.

We know of no basis upon which to consider one soft drink as better than any other, since an individual's personal choice as to flavor and other characteristics of a particular product is the ordinary method of selection. If any evidence were available that a particular one were harmful, we would take action under the Federal law to remove it from the market. We are confident that similar action would be taken against a harmful product under State or other local laws if the article were not subject to Federal control.

We hope these comments will be helpful. If further information concerning this matter is desired, we shall be glad to try to furnish it.

Sincerely yours,

GEO. P. LARRICK,
Commissioner of Food and Drugs.

Aid for Impacted School Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the August 5 edition of the Washington Post and Times Herald, on page A-12, carries an article concerning an administration proposal to reduce aid to federally impacted school areas by \$61 million, which is now being considered by the House Education and Labor Subcommittee on General Education. The account relates that six "House Members complained that the denial of aid placed an unfair burden on the schools in their districts. The money has been appropriated to help school districts whose enrollments have been increased sharply by the impact of military installations."

In view of the deficit budget, there can be no quarrel with the thought that economy must be practiced somewhere

if expenditures are to be made elsewhere. Our colleagues who have attacked the move to reduce the aid program by \$61 million should be pleased to learn that the Treasury would have this sum available if we accepted the Pacific Gas and Electric Co.'s proposal to construct the Trinity River power facilities with its own funds. We certainly are not critical of these Members opposing this reduction since they undoubtedly feel it would work a hardship in their own districts.

However, in order to be helpful to them and others of my colleagues in the House, I am calling their attention to the fact that the administration is strongly advocating joint development with this regulated utility of the Trinity River project, and seeking to reduce aid to federally impacted school areas in the same amount; the answer is obvious: the \$61 million which the Government would be spared by not building the Trinity generators itself could be diverted to aid impacted areas.

The Post article referred to, above, follows:

MOVE TO CUT AID FOR IMPACTED AREAS STIRS ATTACK BY SIX HOUSE DEMOCRATS

An administration proposal to reduce aid to federally impacted school areas—including Maryland and Virginia—ran into more opposition yesterday.

The move to reduce the aid program by \$61 million was attacked by six Democratic House Members at a hearing before the House Education Subcommittee.

The proposal would cut \$3.5 million from the aid to Virginia and \$2.4 million from Maryland's share.

The House Members complained that the denial of aid placed an unfair burden on the schools in their districts. The money has been appropriated to help school districts whose enrollments have been increased sharply by the impact of military installations.

One Representative, CLEM MILLER, Democrat, of California, criticized the cutback as a typical administration effort to make problems disappear through "formulas and abracadabra."

Others who testified were Representatives JAMES M. QUIGLEY, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; D. S. SAUND, Democrat, of California; PORTER HARDY, Jr., Democrat, of Virginia; HARLAN HAGEN, Democrat, of California, and NEAL SMITH, Democrat, of Iowa.

A Cyprus in the Foothills of the Alps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article which appeared in the New York Times on July 29, 1959, which I commend to the attention of my colleagues:

A CYPRUS IN THE FOOTHILLS OF THE ALPS (By C. L. Sulzberger)

VIENNA, July 28.—A dispute that has smoldered 40 years in the mountainous South Tyrol again is poisoning relationships be-

tween Austria and Italy. If this cannot soon be pacified there is distinct possibility that violence may flare in the disputed area. And, unfortunately, negotiations have reached a stalemate.

The Western world is so preoccupied with the cold war and with its efforts to adjust to the strident claims of newly independent Afro-Asian lands that it tends to forget until too late its own internecine quarrels. This was the case with Cyprus, where a wholly unnecessary little guerrilla war was permitted by negligence to erupt.

Cyprus, happily, has been pacified. But if the festering controversy over the South Tyrol continues for much longer, one can predict with almost mathematical certainty a bitter altercation between Rome and Vienna, accompanied by troubles from a Tyrolean underground.

The scale of this controversy seems minuscule when measured against other political agonies. In 1918 the Alpine foothills of Austria's South Tyrol were awarded to Italy and became the Province of Alto Adige. A German-speaking minority, now numbering a quarter of a million, was maltreated under Mussolini. After World War II, by special accord, Rome guaranteed certain autonomous rights to the former Austrians under its rule.

But Rome foolishly chiseled on the agreement. It added the Trento Province, heavily populated by Italians, to the predominantly German-speaking Alto Adige Province with which Austria is concerned. Thus, the administrative area whose autonomy would be assured became predominantly Italianate. And more and more Italians have since moved in, provoking the Germanic minority's resentment.

Rightwingers in both Italy and Austria are now pressing their respective governments toward increasing intransigence. Vienna's Parliament unanimously endorsed a strong Foreign Office attitude. And the present Italian Cabinet has so small a political majority that it dares not appear moderate for fear of losing extremist support and falling. Furthermore, Rome worries about demands for greater autonomy in Sicily and fears to establish a precedent in the north.

THE BERG ISEL GROUP

Vienna doesn't suggest changing the frontier. It merely wants further privileges for the Alto Adige minority. But in Austria's own North Tyrol there is less restraint. Revisionists led by Dr. Aloys Oberhammer publicly lay claim to the Italian South Tyrol. Behind them is a small Tyrolean organization called the Berg Isel Society. This is believed to have gathered arms and explosives to smuggle into Alto Adige.

Austrians who have recently visited that Italian mountain region claim that a few hundred young hotheads there have stored dynamite for "action" if they do not obtain a new status by the end of October. They imply they will blow up vitally important hydroelectric stations. And in the distant background is a vague pan-German movement. The Bonn Republic has maintained a correct hands-off policy; but German nationalists have not.

In this impasse Vienna talks vaguely of bringing the matter before the World Court or the U.N. However, some legal experts say it could only be raised in the U.N. as a threat to the peace. Extremists consequently argue that bloodshed is a requisite preliminary to such action.

Thus, the problem becomes inexorably worse. The Rome and Vienna Governments are in political straitjackets which hamper their ability to compromise even if they should be so inclined. This deadlock favors neo-Fascist elements in both South and North Tyrol. So far Russia has remained aloof. How long will it refrain from trying to fan the flames between NATO Italy and neutral but pro-Western Austria?

A decade ago there were similar storm warnings over Cyprus. Yet the West chose blandly to disregard these while hoping for the best. Such wishful thinking allowed a running sore to become cancerous. A handful of Greek Cypriots transformed vehement protests into a partisan war.

The lesson of that tragedy was that disinterested friendly powers like the United States should attempt the role of honest broker while there is still a chance for constructive diplomatic action. We failed, until too late, in Cyprus. Now time is running out in South Tyrol.

Dancey in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the 13th, 14th, and 15th in a series of articles by Editor Charles L. Dancey appearing in the Peoria Journal Star:

MYSTERIOUS WOMAN TURNS UP ON TRAIN TO ROSTOV

(By Charles L. Dancey)

TRAIN TO ROSTOV.—As I left my room for the long walk down on the flights of stone steps through the gardens, etc., to the car to leave Sochi and catch a train to Rostov, Eugene joined me.

"Would you mind riding with a young lady to the station?" he asked. "She just got in, is very attractive, also an American, and she is leaving on the same train in the same carriage with you. I think you'll like her very much."

I thought he was kidding.

People don't just drop out of nowhere in Russia and turn up at the last minute as traveling companions—Americans especially.

In Yalta, Natasha had asked me what I was really doing in Russia. She had said, "You are no tourist. All tourists are old and rich and proud. And they don't travel alone."

Others had made similar remarks about age and traveling alone. Yet here suddenly heading for a place not a normal tourist spot, come from I don't know where, is supposed to be a young American woman traveling alone.

In the limousine, she sat, as real as could be. Maybe 25 years old, well dressed, made up, and peculiar only in being there at all and having fingernails about an inch long.

She talked American as Peoria, itself (said she was from California but volunteered little more). There was no trace of Gregory Ratoff here.

We rode to the station and boarded the train. Here was none of the crowding I'd heard much about, and none of the four-person sleeper compartments with mixed company folks talked about in Yalta (it certainly crossed my mind).

Instead we were ushered into a luxurious car where I had a private compartment, my mysterious companion another, and only two other rooms were occupied.

She came tripping back to my compartment loaded with fruit, bread, and other chow, and the white-coated whatever-he-was promptly popped in with a couple of cups of tea.

I made sure the door was left open, and I answered her running series of questions, but while it may have been pretty silly, I couldn't help figuring that this girl was either some kind of a nut, or something even more dangerous. I played it very cool.

What really threw me was when she asked what I planned to write about—and up to this point I'm sure I'd never mentioned any newspaper connection.

Now, Eugene could have told her—but if he did he gave her a devil of a lot more briefing off my passport than he gave me from hers.

In any case, I acted as dumb as possible (which comes naturally and easily I'm afraid), and as completely worn out as possible—the conversation wound down to nothing, and eventually she went back to her compartment and I went to bed.

In the morning we arrived at Rostov, and an Intourist guide was right by the tracks waiting. When I joined her she was standing talking to my companion of the train, who said goodbye, got back aboard, and continued on to wherever she was going while I went off to take a look at Rostov-on-Don * * * and try to catch a riverboat up to Stalingrad.

There were no other Americans in Rostov.

REDS REGARD SUNDAY AS REGULAR WORKDAY

(By Charles L. Dancey)

The Communists no longer abolish religious worship, but they are attacking it on two sides: (1) they have abolished Sunday as we know it, and (2) they have abolished religious teaching of the young.

Yet they have not stamped out religion in 42 years of trying. They say they will have it completely liquidated in another 50 years.

They have abolished Sunday simply by working a 6-day week and then dividing up the various normal business and office activities of a city into seven parts, each group working a different 6 days and having a different day of the week as the day off.

Thus, theoretically, only one-seventh of the city's employed are off on Sunday.

They say this is very "efficient," having recreational facilities (beaches and parks in particular) in heavy use every day and not overloaded on any given day. Actually, Saturday afternoons and Sundays still find crowds heavier than weekdays.

The real effect of this on churches is to make every day, to a degree, a "Sunday," so far as services are concerned.

I was able to visit half a dozen active churches—but none on a Sunday morning. I understand there is a larger service Sunday than on any other day.

Curiously enough, although I visited at odd hours on odd days, there was a small service underway for 20 or 30 or 40 people every time I came to a church. And every time the guide in that city remarked that this was very unusual. Most of the people are older, but not all of them.

Every guide also gave me the same propaganda spiel—that only the old and illiterate still "believe" in the "magic" and "superstition" of religion. They tell of supposed atrocities, claim that the church extorted money from the poverty-ridden peasants with threats and "mumbo-jumbo," and ridicule the incense, the rich ikons, and the colorful ceremonies.

Every guide that gave me this "pitch" giggled nervously as she did so, and every single one ended her long speech with: "Are you a believer?"

I must admit that in this atmosphere the first time this question came after such a description of "religion" I fumbled for an effective answer, but each time thereafter I was ready for them.

I would say: "What do you mean? A believer in what? Certainly not in all the things you have described as 'religion.' But I believe in God. However, I will tell you in what way I am an unbeliever. I do not believe that all the perfect order of the world of nature and of space which your scientists are revealing came to be by some accident or coincidence without a plan and a planner."

The Russians have it constantly drummed into them that nothing can be accomplished without central planning so this argument usually silenced their antireligion pitch.

One guide, however, simply fired back that "it is stupid to believe in religion." I told her that if it is stupid to believe in a God with perfect wisdom, it is much more stupid to believe that there is perfect wisdom in the writings of a 19th century German hack named Karl Marx.

To the question, "What do you believe?" they reply, "I believe in man."

This is the religion preached to the masses. A religion of science and health, but more than that of the hero-gods who have led and now lead the Communist Party. This is a throwback to the barbarian religions of humanism, elevating men to the status of hero-gods.

In the Moslem areas, the same tactics apply. Here, however, one can identify believers because the men wear a white roll as a sort of brim on their turbans, and the women wear a snow-white loose dress. One constantly sees a scattering of these believers even among the people in the heart of the urban centers.

There is also the Communist "religion," the true faith of this "elite corps." Its basic tenet is that the overthrow of capitalist society is historically and scientifically inevitable.

The "elite" who perceive this "scientific" truth and place themselves in the vanguard of this overthrow will inherit the world, as heirs of all existing political governments, all existing social aristocrats, and all economic capitalists. Those who do everything possible to hasten the day will be in this vanguard. Those who miss any such opportunity will not.

This dream of an invincible destiny is what drives them on, a destiny that will make the party members rulers of the masses, economically, politically and socially.

This is a religion of power, not of humanitarianism—and its bible consists of the works of Marx and Lenin with comments by Stalin, Mao Tse Tung and Nikita Khrushchev.

But for an organization whose own religion is based on a theory of history, they seem to have studied very little real and true history.

Otherwise, how could they be so confident that by forbidding religious instruction they will stamp out Judaism in 50 years?

Six thousand years of history say this is nonsense.

WAR HISTORY A LA RUSSIAN "BURNS HIM"

(By Charles L. Dancey)

Rostov.—Only here from noon until 7 p.m., when the boat heads upriver toward the Volga and Stalingrad, but an Intourist guide named Nina (Neena) met me at the train, took me in tow the entire time, and delivered me at the boat.

In Rostov, thus, in rapid succession I saw the inevitable stadium, theater, bank building, apartments under construction (and completed), and large, beautiful beach.

It is a factory town with workers living near the factories in more-or-less self-contained little areas (they must walk to work, in most cases) made up mostly of little,

square houses, one story, surrounded by high rickety fences.

I was also shown a TV tower, but saw no antennas, and was told the station began a year ago.

They say 70 percent of the city was destroyed during the war. It was fought over and taken and retaken several times. A few ruins remain. Much has been rebuilt. Much is building.

Here again I heard the question asked, "Nemyets? (German?)". And the questioner being reassured: "Nyet, Amerikanyets."

It seems to make a big difference to them. Here too was the inevitable historical museum where one is not-so-subtly given a large dose of Red propaganda.

They start with the little Greek statues of Athena dug up there and Greek weapons of ancient times, thence to Rostov as a fortress against the Turks, and to the history of the famed Don Cossacks and weapons and armor of the Russians, Tartars, Cossacks, and Turks.

Finally they come to World War I, "the first imperialist war," the revolution, the civil war in Russia (with no mention of the general who led the Reds to victory—Leon Trotsky) and a big set of pictures and weapons designed to show that when "the workers" came to power the Germans, French, British, and Americans, as capitalists, all joined forces against the revolution.

This burned me up, inasmuch as the Bolsheviks overthrew the liberal Kerensky regime that had deposed the czar largely by winning over the Russian troops with promises of peace. Indeed, Lenin had been in exile and the Germans put him on a special train and rushed him through the territory they occupied after the Russian revolution to get him in there and get Russia out of the war.

Then, when he did get to power and did make peace with Germany, the allies (who regarded Lenin with justice as a German agent) landed covering forces at key ports. These were, of course, withdrawn after Germany's surrender.

The Reds have rewritten all this. Now Lenin was there all the time. He is not associated with the nasty Germans. And all capitalist countries attacked the worker regime at the same time. As a final touch, according to them, they proceeded to whip us all.

Then, we come to what we call World War II. In Russia, this is known as "The Great Patriotic War." (Note: When Germany attacked Poland and later France, the official label was the "Second Imperialist War" during which Stalin cooperated with Hitler and grabbed off Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, plus part of Poland.)

This is also passed over.

This is not only the history they teach in schools but it is drummed into people in museums like this in every city, with physical exhibits and photos.

Ah, well, on to Stalingrad.

Distributive Rights of Foreign Beneficiaries as Affected by State Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House an important article,

which appeared in the June 1959 issue of Dickinson Law Review, on the "Distributive Rights of Foreign Beneficiaries as Affected by State Action." This article was written by two distinguished and learned members of the Pennsylvania Department of Justice, Deputy Attorney General Ralph S. Snyder and Special Assistant Attorney General Irvin Stander.

The article refers to recent Pennsylvania developments but also includes references to the situation in Oregon, New York, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, Vermont, New Jersey, Maryland, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Ohio, California, Montana, Nevada, and Iowa.

A Pennsylvania decision rendered by the Philadelphia Orphans' Court in Zupko's Estate brought forth an excellent opinion by Judge Robert V. Bolger, which upheld the constitutionality of the Pennsylvania act of 1953 on the subject of the protection of the beneficiaries living in foreign countries.

The reference in the article to the testimony of the Commonwealth's witness regarding the Soviet law is so enlightening with respect to the ownership of private property that the portion of the article is herein set forth in full:

When one considers the 400 pages of testimony heard by the court, including the testimony of the witnesses for the claimants and that offered by the Commonwealth, regarding Soviet law, economics, and political system, the veiled facade of the so-called people's democracy is destroyed. The Commonwealth's principal witness was Dr. Vladimir Gsovski, Chief of the European Law Division of the Library of Congress since 1931; lecturer at Georgetown University; author of two volumes on Soviet civil law; Director of Mid-European law project; editor of "Highlights of Mid-European Law and Activities"; graduate of the University of Moscow, 1913; Law School, University of Bratislava, 1926; and a former Russian lawyer and judge. He testified at great length about the insecurity and actual danger in the ownership of private property in the Soviet. He documented his testimony by citing chapter and verse from the Soviet Constitution, civil code, criminal code, published decisions of cases, and writings of legal authors.

The following important references to his voluminous testimony serve to illustrate how fully he proved the fact that Soviet beneficiaries would not have the benefit, use, enjoyment, or control of their distributive shares:

(a) He quoted from Professor Malitsky's book "Civil Code of the Soviet Republics" which states:

"Here lies a basic difference between Communist law and capitalistic law. The capitalist law is based upon the abstract (natural) rights of the individual. It places the individual in the center of the world, surrounds him with a cult, and therefore establishes limits to the state . . . however, the proletarian state limits the acts not to itself but to its citizens. . . . The proletariat bestowed rights upon the citizens of the state, but set for each person limits to private liberty to be observed in the exercise of private initiative."

(b) The Soviet Constitution, though it uses the term "private ownership" in only one place, provides that all private ownership of the means of production are abolished.

(c) Section 4 of their constitution calls for the liquidation of the capitalist system

of economy and the abolition of private ownership of the "instruments and means of production."

(d) Section 5 of their constitution places the ownership of all property in either the form of state ownership or the form of ownership of cooperatives or collective farms.

(e) The only form of ownership given to individuals is not of "private property" but "personal ownership" of their earned income, savings, dwellings, household effects and utensils, objects of personal consumption and comfort and the right of succession in personal ownership under section 10 of the constitution.

(f) The conduct of business for gain is prohibited since it involves ownership of the "instruments or means of production," except for artisans who do not employ hired labor.

(g) Despite the continued presence in the Soviet of some few independent farmers, the farmer is not permitted to own more than one cow, and two calves. He may not own a draft horse or oxen since these are instruments of production.

(h) Even artisans are proscribed in their activities. A tailor may produce a suit for a given customer, but is prohibited from any production for the market.

(i) The sale of goods in the open market by an individual subjects him to prosecution for committing the crime of speculation. The crime of speculation carries with it heavy penalties of banishment, imprisonment, and confiscation of property.

(j) There is no system of legal precedents in the enforcement of laws, and few decisions are published, since one of the basic doctrines in the Soviet system is "dialectic materialism," under which the Government does not want to have its own actions limited by its own courts or its own laws. This is a process of alternate progress and retreat dictated by circumstances.

(k) The criminal code can be applied ex post facto against acts which were not in violation when performed.

(l) The criminal code permits the prosecution of an act of a citizen as a crime by analogy to other offenses, leaving the interpretation of the analogy solely in the hands of the public prosecutor.

(m) Speaking of personal ownership, Dr. Gsovski stated: "My general conclusion is that personal ownership is in the darkest corner of the Soviet legal system, fenced in from all sides."

(n) Section 147 of the criminal code makes any contract invalid when "directed to the obvious prejudices of the state," and renders the contract unenforceable and the goods subject to confiscation. Any transactions involving a sale for unearned income would come under this category.

(o) A recent development in the Soviet has been the enactment of antiparasitic laws in many Russian states which subject persons living on unearned income to banishment in a proceeding by public judgment of the persons living on his street, in his apartment house, or in his collective farm.

(p) Russian citizens may not enter into any transactions involving foreign currency since this is a monopoly of the state bank.

(q) Any foreign currency received by a Russian must be deposited in the state bank where he receives rubles at the official rate of exchange.

(r) There is no system of redress by a private citizen against the Government or its administrative agencies, merely a right of complaint.

(s) There still exists the power in the Ministry of the Interior to banish persons for dangerous activity without any specified definition of the crimes involved, or guarantees of fair trial or right of appeal.

(t) The Soviet Constitution itself has been amended by various bodies without proper

notice or the guarantees usually associated with changes to a basic charter.

(u) When asked specifically his opinion regarding the right of a Russian national to the actual use, enjoyment, benefit, and control of moneys which might be sent from a Pennsylvania decedent's estate, Dr. Gsovski stated:

"The restrictions are so numerous and so indefinite that the actual use, enjoyment and control is reduced to a minimum and the such small portion of the money which the recipient would get under the exchange regulations, could only be used in a very limited way for a very limited purpose and for articles of personal consumption only."

(v) Private ownership of land is prohibited in Russia, although a person can buy a small house and place it on land assigned to him.

(w) Dr. Gsovski concluded by pointing out the various perils facing Soviet citizens who receive a sum of money from the United States, even though it be a small portion of the money sent because of the currency regulations. These perils include:

1. Possibility that the money may be considered unearned income which is not protected by the Soviet Constitution.

2. The use of the money to purchase articles which are not strictly necessary may be deemed dangerous activity, prejudicial to the state.

3. The attempt to sell any excess belongings purchased with this money might be subject to prosecution as speculation.

4. The mere use of the money for living purposes might be subject to prosecution for parasitism because it would be considered as living on unearned income.

The Commonwealth's expert witness on the restrictions imposed by the Soviet economic system and the Soviet currency regulations on foreign bequests was a specialist in the Soviet economy, Leon H. Herman, Economic Analyst for the United States Library of Congress. Mr. Herman is a trained economist who has published and lectured extensively on the Soviet economy. He reads and speaks the Russian language and uses for his source material Russian newspapers and economic publications, as well as official dispatches from the various U.S. officials in Russia. His prior experience includes almost 10 years of service in the U.S. Department of Commerce where he rose to the position of Chief of the U.S.S.R. section in the Bureau of Foreign Commerce.

Mr. Herman testified at length regarding the shipment of parcels to Russia, exchange regulations, purchasing power of the Russian ruble and standards of living in Russia and covered the following salient points:

(a) Parcels may be sent to Russia with certain limitations as to size, value and content. While they can be sent duty free this method imposes an insurmountable burden of paying the prohibitive duties on the recipient, and therefore the common method is to send the package with duty prepaid by the sender in U.S. dollars.

(b) One of the most troublesome limitations imposed by the Russians is that the parcel may not contain saleable merchandise.

(c) Since October 1, 1957, used clothing cannot be shipped in parcels to Russia.

(d) Prepaid duties on parcel shipments range from 25 percent to 250 percent of the value of the goods sent; on clothing the duty is 100 percent and on shoes 75 percent. On coffee, tea and cocoa that duty is 100 percent of value.

(e) The duties are prepaid in U.S. dollars and these go to the Soviet Government through the state bank.

(f) There are five additional charges on the sending of parcels levied by the Soviet Government for commissions, inspection fee, insurance fee, and two service charges by the shipping company.

(g) These prepaid duties collected by the Soviet Government on parcels shipped from the United States totaled \$1,700,000 during 1956. They were considerably higher in 1957 and amount to more than \$2 million.

(h) Shipment of dollars to Russia is prohibited and the recipient receives rubles, not dollars. Until April 1957 the recipient received 4 rubles per dollar, which is the official rate of exchange. Since then the United States Embassy has indicated that the Russian State Bank would pay recipient 10 rubles per dollar, but this is not the official rate, so the State Bank can resume the official rate at any time.

(i) Studies of the purchasing power of the ruble show that it is quite low, e.g., 4 rubles (\$1) for a pound of sugar; 8 rubles for a dozen eggs (\$2); 12 rubles (\$3) for a pound of butter.

(j) An analysis of the purchasing power of the ruble compared to the United States dollar shows that in the class of survival food items and luxury goods the ruble purchases from one-tenth to one-fifteenth as much as the dollar, which is a comparable ratio. However, in the class of nonsurvival items needed for everyday living such as wearing apparel, yard goods, suits, shirts, shoes, etc., the ruble's purchasing power drops to one-fiftieth of the dollar and buys on the average only 2 cents worth of goods although its official exchange value is 25 cents.

(k) In this class of goods, the Soviet controls consumption by imposing a hidden "turnover" tax which is reflected only in the increased selling price.

(l) The hidden turnover tax is used by the Soviet for its new capital expenditures and for the support of its military establishment. It represents from 40 percent to 60 percent of the total government revenue in Russia.

(m) The prepaid duties on parcels provide the Soviet Government with a sizable fund (\$2 million) per year for purchase of goods in the United States and for propaganda purposes.

(n) The Soviet has devalued and debased its currency many times. In April 1957, it suspended payments on government bonds for 20 to 25 years and thus wiped out over half of the currency value held by all Russians.

(o) The free market in rubles, which exists in many European countries and in the United States, quotes current exchange rates at 33 to 60 rubles for the United States dollar. Contrasted with the official rate of 4 rubles and the so-called premium rate of 10 rubles per dollar the free market fairly reflects the actual purchasing power of 2 cents per ruble in most cost-of-living items.

(p) Because the ruble has a 2 cents purchasing power in exchange for the dollar, the recipient of a money bequest would not get the actual use, control, benefit, or enjoyment of the funds which might be sent to him from the United States. The balance of the value of the dollars sent will be used for other non-economic purposes of the Soviet Government.

(q) Because of the heavy duties and other charges imposed by the Soviet the recipient of any parcel from the United States would receive a maximum of only 50 percent of the true value of the United States dollar used to purchase the goods in the United States, and the balance of the true value will be paid to the Soviet Government in the form of duties and charges.

The principal witness for the claimants was Prof. Harold J. Berman, teacher of comparative Soviet and American Law at the Harvard Law School and the Russian Research Center of Harvard University. Professor Berman testified at length regarding the Soviet legal system and form of government. While he attempted to show

a growing system of legal procedure in Russia, his testimony clearly revealed the shortcomings of their legal system in failing to protect the rights of the individual from governmental oppression and terrorism. Here are some of the pertinent admissions made by him on this subject during his direct and cross-examination.

(a) There is no effective constitutional restraint upon the power of the top leadership to change the law.

(b) Ex post facto laws can be and have been enacted in the field of criminal law.

(c) The top leadership of the Soviet can change any law under effective Soviet law.

(d) Most of his opinions as to the progress of the Soviet legal system were derived from conversations with judges, lawyers, and citizens and not from the usually accepted sources of the Constitution, statutes, and reported decisions of the courts. His testimony was almost entirely devoid of documentation.

(e) No Russian may purchase goods for resale without being guilty of the crime of speculation.

(f) The private ownership of real estate is limited to a private homestead without title to the land under the house.

(g) Ownership of the means of production is prohibited. If a loom or sewing machine is owned, the Soviet citizen can use it only to make his own clothes and he can employ no one to help him or to sell the products to others for gain.

(h) Foreign currency must be turned in to the State Bank for redemption into rubles at the official exchange rate.

(i) There is a provision in Soviet law for escheat to the state for nonclaimers of inheritances after 6 months from date of death.

(j) The rights of nonresidents of the Soviet are determined by the existence of treaties with the country of their nationality and there is no such treaty between U.S.S.R. and the United States.

(k) There is considerable doubt in Soviet law as to whether an American can inherit and receive moneys from a Russian estate.

(l) Banishment of a person for being socially dangerous still exists in the Soviet without any definition as to the elements of the crime.

(m) He admitted that, "one of the most vicious aspects of the Soviet legal system" is the "enactment in some instances of laws which are not published."

(n) The criminal code in Russia states that a person may be convicted of a crime analogous to other crimes in the code, without further definition of the nature of the crime.

(o) Antiparasitic laws are now being enacted in many Soviet States which make it a crime to live on unearned income. Trial is conducted by the neighbors of the accused and the penalty is banishment from 2 to 5 years. This law, the witness admitted, was "a violation of everything they had been proclaiming" about the progress of their legal system.

(p) The system of voluntary purchase of government bonds out of salaries was abolished in 1957 after an edict by the government postponing the maturity date of these bonds for 25 years. This repudiation or postponement involved 253 billion rubles of currency in Russia and amounted to one-half of the currency in circulation at that time.

(q) The U.S. Government prohibits the sending of any remittances from the U.S. Treasury of pensions, retirement funds, etc., to beneficiaries who reside in the Soviet.

(r) Berman affirmed a quotation from his own book "Justice in Russia," reading as follows:

"The restoration of law since 1936 although still a movement rather than an accomplished fact is one of the most significant

cant internal developments in Soviet Russia since 1917."

(s) He also affirmed a quotation from his own article in the Yale Law Journal of July 1957, stating as follows:

"Yet law and order cannot now be considered entirely secure in the Soviet Union. They can never be out of danger so long as the leadership endorses the philosophy that law is basically an instrument of force and that where the instrument fails, force must use more ruthless means. Nor can law be completely secure while the leadership believes that all social institutions and processes are essentially products of the time, of a given stage of historical development, and that there is nothing beyond the given stage, nothing sacred."

(t) The prepaid duties on parcels and the currency exchange rules on the remittance of moneys to Russia confer a distinct and substantial benefit to the Soviet Government.

One of the claimant's witnesses was Thomas V. Zug, trust officer of the Provident Traders Bank and Trust Co. Mr. Zug testified that he was in charge of the administration of this estate. He found four bolts of cloth in decedent's apartment and indications that these were to be sent to brothers and sisters in Russia. These were shipped to Russia through the Globe Parcel Service. Cross-examination revealed the extent of the prepaid duties and charges on these articles as follows:

(a) On a shipping invoice on which the cost value of the goods was \$38.10, the prepaid duty and shipping charges totaled \$45.10, over 125 percent.

(b) On a shipping invoice on which the cost value of the goods was \$16.40, the prepaid duty and shipping charges totaled \$29.95, over 175 percent.

(c) On a shipping invoice on which the cost value of the goods was \$32.90, the prepaid duty and shipping charges totaled \$42.69, over 130 percent.

(d) On a shipping invoice on which the cost value of the goods was \$40.10, the prepaid duty and shipping charges totaled \$46.40, over 115 percent.

From the testimony presented to the court, it appeared abundantly clear that the shipment of money or goods to Soviet beneficiaries is subjected to prohibitive charges for duties and currency exchange manipulations which serve only to fatten the Soviet exchequer. The benefit to the Soviet citizen is minimal and incidental. In the shipment of money the beneficiary receives rubles at a rate having a purchasing power of about 2 cents instead of the theoretical 25 cents produced by the official rate of exchange. Thus, the recipient gets only one-twelfth to one-fifth of the United States dollar sent, and the Soviet Government gets the rest.

In the matter of packages, the testimony clearly established that the duties on the most desirable goods range from 100 percent upward and the packages are limited as to value and content. Further additional charges are imposed for the benefit of the Soviet Government so that the actual benefit to the recipient is between 25 percent and 50 percent of the value of the purchase price of the goods sent, the balance going to the Soviet Government.

Overriding in these considerations, the testimony clearly established that the ownership of private property, as we know it, is extremely hazardous and tenuous in the Soviet Union. The Soviet laws, published or unpublished, existing or suddenly imposed on an ex post facto basis, and "subject to change without notice" are designed to discourage the ownership of personal property. Thus, Soviet beneficiaries of Pennsylvania bequests may be harmed rather than helped by the receipt of money from an estate.

Based on the overwhelming testimony of the Commonwealth's witnesses Judge Bolger made the following trenchant observations in his opinion:

"It is our opinion that although the testator gave his bounty to his brothers and sisters, residents of the U.S.S.R., that he did not intend them to be used as pawns through whom the Government of Russia would enrich itself at their expense so that they would receive little, if any, benefit under his will.

"The use of personal ownership and property rights is not only unprotected by Soviet law, but is also prosecuted.

"The finding is inescapable that minimal benefits would flow to the distributees and maximum benefits to the Soviet Government and would be available for uses inimical to the United States were the claimant's request granted."

Vice President Nixon's Trip

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, despite the trepidation held in some quarters over the outcome of Vice President Nixon's trip to Russia and Poland, it turned out to be a greater success than most dared to hope. Reflecting the general acclaim over his experiences abroad, and the skill with which he conducted himself, I include under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD editorials from two daily newspapers in my district.

The editorials follow:

[From the Lansing (Mich.) State Journal, Aug. 4, 1959]

HISTORIC OCCASION

Vice President Nixon made the most of his unprecedented opportunity to talk to a mass Soviet audience. His speech to the Russian people on a nationwide radio hook-up and a special combine of 10 television outlets was polite but firm. In it he stressed the strength of both countries and the desire of the American and Soviet peoples for peace.

Mr. Nixon said that because both the United States and the Soviet Union are strong, peace must be based on mutual respect and not be a peace of surrender or dictation by either side.

The Vice President told the Russian people that Soviet Premier Khrushchev "can go down in history as one of the greatest leaders the Soviet people have ever produced if he devotes his energies and talents to building a better life for the people of his own country." But, he said, Mr. Khrushchev and his people will continue to live in an era of fear, suspicion and tension if his objective is promotion of the communization of countries outside the Soviet Union.

Mr. Nixon replied to Premier Khrushchev's recent prediction that the grandchildren of Americans would live under communism by saying that "we do not object to his saying this will happen" but that "we only object if he tries to bring it about."

Mr. Nixon stressed what he regards as the desirability of more contacts between leaders of the two countries and suggested regular radio and television broadcasts by Premier

Khrushchev to the American people in exchange for President Eisenhower being given the same privilege to talk to the Russian people.

For the chiefs of state of the United States and Russia to talk regularly to the peoples of the other country would be an innovation in the conduct of foreign relations. Whether such a plan would have the effect that Mr. Nixon seems to have in mind will be questioned by those who are convinced that what will be important in the future will be Kremlin policy as it affects the United States and the rest of the free world, not what Mr. Khrushchev says in speeches to the American people.

Mr. Nixon provided additional evidence that he sees the hope of improved relations between the United States and Russia in increased contacts between leaders of the two countries when he said Sunday that the Soviet Premier should be invited to the United States to correct his "very real misconceptions" about American policies and attitudes.

The American people learned Monday, however, that an agreement already has been reached for an exchange of visits by President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev. Mr. Eisenhower said that early in July he initiated the correspondence that finally brought about the agreement.

If Mr. Khrushchev has what Mr. Nixon calls very serious misconceptions about the United States in spite of all the information that has been available to him, a visit to the United States might serve a useful purpose.

It would seem, however, that reports by Deputy Premiers Mikoyan and Kozlov on their tours of the United States would have been helpful in clearing up the misconceptions.

Premier Khrushchev may have real misconceptions about America, but he should have known about the attitude of the people of Poland who gave Vice President Nixon the greatest reception he has had during his travels in 60 foreign countries.

Mr. Nixon was showered with flowers, applause and smiles by a cheering, singing crowd of 250,000 Poles who greeted him as he arrived from Moscow. The repeated shouts of "Bravo America" should be significant to Mr. Khrushchev as evidence that the hearts of the Communist-ruled Polish people are with the West.

The Kremlin can find no support for its anti-American propaganda line in the fact that the Polish people's welcome to Mr. Nixon surpassed in enthusiasm and perhaps in numbers the official reception for Premier Khrushchev in Warsaw 2 weeks ago.

Whatever effect Mr. Nixon's address may have had on the Russian people, initial reaction of Soviet officialdom made it clear that the Vice President's words have not moderated the attitude of the Soviet Government toward the United States.

Radio Moscow went on the air following Mr. Nixon's speech with an accusation that the vice president had distorted Soviet foreign policy and a claim that he had dodged the question of American bases encircling the Soviet Union.

Deputy Premier Kozlov, who had an opportunity to clear up misconceptions he may have had about the United States during his tour of this country, made a scathing reply to the Nixon speech, asserting that the United States does not practice what it preaches.

It is on the basis of the Kremlin's attitude as revealed in official Soviet statements and in Soviet policy pursued in normal contracts between officials and diplomats of the two countries that the United States must continue to evaluate United States-Soviet relations and issues.

What Premier Khrushchev might say in regular speeches to the American people would be far less important than what those who do his bidding say and do in Geneva or East Germany or Hungary or other places where representatives of the Kremlin speak for the Soviet Government.

Many Americans share Mr. Nixon's views on the desirability of increased contacts between United States and Soviet leaders it must be kept in mind that there is already an adequate opportunity in normal contacts between representatives of the two Governments for the Soviet Government to make known any improvement in its attitude toward the United States.

[From the Flint (Mich.) Journal, Aug. 4, 1959]

NIXON IN POLAND

The great welcome given to Vice President Nixon in Poland was touching evidence that the people of Poland still have a very deep friendship for the United States. The nature of the welcome also served to emphasize that in the hearts of the people of Poland the spirit of freedom still is strong.

This welcome was not engineered. It was spontaneous. And one must wonder what Nikita Khrushchev thinks about it. The welcome given to him on his recent visit to Poland was pale, in comparison. The lesson should be clear enough to the Russian dictator.

The welcome—250,000 people—also was evidence that the Voice of America broadcasts are being heard regularly inside Poland. The official press and radio had not even announced the time of Nixon's arrival, saying only that it would be on Sunday. The Voice of America had been broadcasting the details of Nixon's visit for 3 days.

Another factor that makes the welcome so remarkable is that Polish officials took Nixon into town along a route not usually used for visiting dignitaries. Nevertheless, throngs lined the 15-mile route from the airport. Men, women, and children cheered the U.S. Vice President. Obviously, the people of Poland were determined to salute this representative of democracy.

Another indication of this was that 5,000 Poles were on hand when Nixon laid a wreath at the tomb of Poland's Unknown Soldier. There had been no advance announcement of the wreath-laying.

It is reported the crowd hushed when Nixon laid his wreath of red, white, and blue flowers, with a card reading: "In memory of Polish war heroes, from the people of the United States." How this must have stirred memories of gallant Poland's battle against the Nazi hordes—and the stab in the back administered by Soviet Russia.

The cries of the crowd must have an unpleasant ring in the Khrushchev's ears. They included, "Long live Nixon," "long live the President of the United States," "long live America," "we love Americans."

No, the Communists have not succeeded in crushing the spirit of the people of Poland. They never will.

Banks Grow Cool to Student Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues

the following item which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of June 14, 1959:

BANKS GROW COOL TO STUDENT LOANS

(By James J. Morrisseau)

New York State's effort to provide guaranteed low-interest loans for college students appears at the end of its first year to be a noteworthy success—everywhere but in the heavily populated suburbs of Long Island.

The New York Higher Education Assistance Corp. was set up by the legislature in April 1957, and issued its first loans on June 30, 1958. Since then, it has guaranteed loans totaling \$3,045,246 to 5,557 students.

PLIGHT OF LONG ISLAND STUDENTS

Thus, in the words of Donald G. Eichmeyer, assistant secretary of the corporation, the program has been a tremendous success.

Nevertheless, students and potential students who live on Long Island have in many cases found it impossible to secure loans under the HEAC program.

Only \$273,000 in loans to 473 students have been granted so far by the 6 banks in Nassau County and 13 in Suffolk County that are listed as participants in the program.

At least two of them, the Bank of Rockville Centre Trust Co. in Nassau and the Suffolk County National Bank of Riverhead, are no longer issuing loans under the program.

The primary problem is not limited to Long Island. Very simply, the interest and repayment provisions of the HEAC plan are not attractive to bankers.

LIMITED TO \$5,000

As the program is now set up, a student may borrow a maximum of \$500 in his freshman year, \$750 each for his sophomore and junior years, and \$1,000 for his senior year and for succeeding years of postgraduate study, but is limited to a total loan of \$5,000.

Thus the student may borrow up to \$5,000 over a period of 6 years, during which time he is required to pay only the interest on the outstanding loan—fixed by the corporation at a rate of 4 percent simple interest. Repayment of the principal, on the basis of an agreement reached between the student and the bank, does not begin until 3 months after graduation or other termination of studies.

"The package," said Grant Van Sant, vice president of the Long Island Island Trust Co. in Garden City, participating bank, and a member of the New York State Bankers Association Committee on Financing Higher Education, "is not palatable enough to make it generally acceptable to the banks in the State."

Another bank officer, who admitted that his institution had processed no applications and made no loans for several months, said his bank would participate in the program, but with little enthusiasm.

MORE IN MORTGAGES

Several observers said the problem was more acute on Long Island because there is more interest in college educations among suburban families and because of the rapidly growing population.

At the same time, new home construction on Long Island has created a heavy demand for mortgage money, which brings the banks a far greater return than the 4 percent on student loans. One banker pointed out that it costs the banks 3½ percent to borrow from the Federal Reserve system, so that, with operating expenses, they actually lose money on the student loans.

This, despite the public service nature of the student loan program and the admitted dividends in good public relations, is hard for the bankers to swallow.

The drawbacks are so serious that Nassau County's two largest banks have refused to

take any part in the HEAC program. They are the Meadowbrook National Bank in West Hempstead and the Franklin National Bank in Franklin Square, each with more than 30 branches, blanketing the county.

SOME QUOTAS ARE SET

The refusal of these banks, despite repeated overtures from the HEAC, to join the program has shifted the demand to the six participating banks in Nassau, all of which are smaller and operate with fewer resources. As a result, the participating banks have had to limit loans to students from their banking area, to set quotas on the total loans they will make and, in some cases, to suspend or discontinue the loan service.

Both Meadowbrook and Franklin National have announced great interest in the program, and a willingness to participate providing that a more equitable interest and repayment schedule can be agreed upon. They have also asked that parents be required to cosign the loan if the student is a minor.

Meanwhile, the Nassau students will find little relief outside their home county. Most banks in the program have adopted the rule that loans will go only to residents of their banking area, and in some cases, to applicants whose parents or relatives have deposits in the bank. Most banks adopted the rule early in the program when Westchester and Nassau students flocked to New York City and Suffolk to apply for loans. The County Trust Co. in Westchester has since joined the plan, cutting off emigrants from that area.

Suggested improvements in the program are now under study by the assistance corporation's board of directors, according to Mr. Van Sant. Most of these involve elimination of some of the redtape and improvement of the cumbersome method of computing interest.

But suggestions that the interest rate be made variable—pegged to 1 percent above the prime rate of the Federal Reserve System—have so far met an unwilling audience at the corporation. And there have been no results so far in the bank's attempts to vary the length of the repayment agreement rather than face a 6-year plan which the borrower now may demand.

There seems, however, to be optimism even among the nonparticipating banks that the kinks will eventually be ironed out of the program.

Certainly, there can be no question that the granting of substantial financial assistance to more than 5,000 students with the cooperation of 211 banks during the corporation's first year of operations is an important and commendable achievement.

The Great White Fleet: A Mission for Humanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, as one of the sponsors of a concurrent resolution calling for the use of some of America's idle warships in a worldwide mission to transport surplus food, medical assistance, and technical aid to distressed peoples, I am deeply moved by the manner in which the American people have

opened their hearts and minds to this proposal. My own South Dakota constituents who have written to me on this theme have endorsed the Great White Fleet idea without exception.

The deep humanitarianism of the American people and their basic religious faith in the brotherhood of man shines through the letters coming to me and to other sponsors of the mercy fleet proposal.

I am grateful to Commander Manson of the U.S. Navy who conceived of the idea, and to Life magazine for so effectively publicizing it.

Here is an idea in which all Americans can share by modest voluntary contributions. It will dramatize America's material and spiritual strength for all the world to see. It will give us a powerful instrument in the competition with communism for the uncommitted masses of the globe. Most of all, it will be good for the soul of America to thus heed the admonition of the Great Teacher that we feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and minister to the afflicted.

The Navy has many ships lying idle in American harbors—including four completely equipped hospital ships. We have other ships filled to overflowing with surplus farm commodities that are beginning to deteriorate. We have a host of the world's finest doctors, nurses, and technicians. We have millions of citizens who would contribute dimes, quarters, and dollars to finance the staffing and supplying of the mercy fleet.

Why should we delay in activating a small portion of our mothball fleet and devote it not to the science of killing, but to the science of healing? This idea may well be grabbed up and put into operation by the Soviet Government if we do not hasten to implement it.

The finest minds in the United States have deplored the unfortunate tendency of American foreign policy to react in a negative way to Soviet moves. There is a widely felt need for a more positive, imaginative U.S. foreign policy that would give America the initiative. We desperately need to hold up to the world the image of an America that has a positive faith and a constructive foreign policy of its own.

Who can cite a more effective device to dramatize to disaster and distressed sectors of the globe that America is concerned about all of God's creatures?

Listen to some of the letters I have received in reply to my White Fleet newsletter of July 25 which I will ask to have printed at the close of my remarks today.

A successful insurance man, who is a long-time fellow townsman and friend of mine, M. A. Hoellwarth of Mitchell, S. Dak. writes:

The Great White Fleet is the most important idea that has come across the brain of Christian man in a long while. Let's do it, as it is an opportunity to show the people in our world that Americans are unselfish and love their fellow man wherever he may be. One hundred percent endorsement.

A banker from Huron, S. Dak., Mr. Arlo Swanson, said:

I just finished reading your Washington report of July 25 in connection with the Great White Fleet for promoting peace and better relations between our Nation and less fortunate nations in the world today. I can see no better way to promote good will and peace than using our surplus grains and some of the ships that are in mothballs in giving food and medical care to the underprivileged of the world. I wholeheartedly support this movement and certainly encourage you to back it up.

Mr. and Mrs. Elmer Heide, who live at Canton, S. Dak., which is also the residence of my mother and my sister, have written:

We are especially interested in the Great White Fleet and sincerely hope it will become a reality soon. Certainly, a project like this is in harmony with the great commission of Jesus Christ. How can we make disciples if we neglect these crying needs?

Charles O'Neill, telephone manager of the city of Brookings, S. Dak., observed:

It is my sincere hope and prayer, that the idea of the White Fleet will very soon become a reality, as I am fully convinced that such a gesture by the American people and their Government can do nothing but good wherever applied. I surely would hope that there are enough intelligent men in the Congress to vote such a measure into existence. Direct humane relief is, as you have many times mentioned, our best defense against communistic aggression, especially in India, Greece and the other disease- and poverty-besieged countries.

A most enthusiastic response comes from H. R. Brekke of Madison, S. Dak., who said:

The idea of the White Fleet is the greatest idea of the century. In my opinion, it is a fulfillment of scripture of "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

One of my fellow World War II comrades who is also a resident of my hometown, Arthur Buehler, of Mitchell, wrote:

I wish to express my opinion about your supported idea of a new White Fleet. I, too, saw firsthand, as a soldier in Europe during World War II, such hunger and misery as you have described. I want to say that I am wholeheartedly in favor of the proposed idea.

I believe that Mr. Fred Becker, a jeweler from Mobridge, S. Dak., has expressed the reaction of many Americans when he observed:

People have been wondering why the Government has not been doing this for many years. It is a good plan.

A treasured friend of mine from Yankton, S. Dak., Emma Meistrik, has told me that:

Most persons are in sympathy with your program of disposing of U.S. surpluses to needy persons overseas.

Another Yankton resident, an attorney and businessman, Mr. John E. Walsh, has written:

As a citizen, I believe this would be a marvelous program and one which would be extremely meritorious. You should have the support of all of your constituents. I trust that it will be successful.

Rev. Einar Michaelsen, pastor of the Congressional Church at Brentford, S. Dak., has raised a most interesting ques-

tion with regard to the White Fleet proposal that deserves careful consideration. A portion of his letter follows:

I was pleased to read in the Aberdeen-American News that you also are advocating U.S. sponsorship of a White Fleet. You are to be congratulated for taking a forthright stand for the cause of peace; I want you to know that you have my most hearty support.

I wonder, however, if the fleet might be better handled under the sponsorship of the United Nations rather than flying the U.S. flag. Such a procedure, it seems to me, would eliminate any criticism of using the enterprise for propaganda reasons and also give other nations an opportunity to share their peculiar gifts with the rest of the world.

Many people are eager to play a personal part in implementing the mercy fleet idea as indicated by the following statement from Ernest C. Wirth of Vermillion, S. Dak.:

I am in full accord as to the mercy fleet and would welcome suggestions what to do to promote any more toward the realization of this hope. * * * Do write and state what I can do to help any further.

Mrs. Margaret McIntosh, the able public relations director of Yankton College, has written:

The Great White Fleet sound like a most excellent idea. Would not the giving of surplus wheat for seed as well as for bread solve—or help solve—the surplus problem as we all hope it can be solved someday freeing the billions of dollars that the storage costs and, at the same time, demonstrating, as you say, our good will toward the hungry nations?

The J. C. Penney Co. manager, Harold Dufelmeier of Chamberlain, S. Dak., writes:

Your Washington Report dated July 25 has just arrived. I am one of the many folks back home who wish you great success in your attempt to establish a Great White Fleet.

Alec McDonald, an old friend from Wilmet, S. Dak., writes:

Your newsletter came today. The idea contained is new to me, but nonetheless praiseworthy. What a great world it would be if we spent half as much for construction as we do for destruction.

Rev. Roger Grow, minister of the First Congregational Church of Beresford, S. Dak., writes:

I think that the White Fleet idea which is written up in the current Life magazine deserves the attention of the Congress. This seems to me to be a most wholesome idea, worthwhile—and the kind of thing that should meet with your approval.

My friend, Ivan Brewick, Mitchell insurance man, writes:

I was very much impressed with your newsletter about the Great White Fleet. When a person sees all of the sickness and suffering that goes on even in our land of plenty, and then hears all about the surpluses we have, it makes a person wonder if there isn't something that can be done to alleviate this misery and hunger in a lot of places.

A 16-year-old boy from Huron, S. Dak., Dennis Lyle, wrote:

I believe that if more ideas like the idea of the new White Fleet were forthcoming from the people of both Russia and the

United States, our problems would be solved. I sincerely think that the new White Fleet would help us more overseas than some of our aid programs.

George Holbosen of Willow Lake, S. Dak., has presented his views in slogan form:

Let's feed with the fleet, rather than fight with the fleet.

Judge William M. Potts of Mobridge writes:

I am very much in favor of promoting the Great White Fleet. Not only will this enterprise accomplish a great deal of good for poor people of the world, but it will also make it impossible for other nations to criticize the motives of the United States.

Other South Dakotans who have written me, and their comments follow:

Thomas Rowlands, Aberdeen, S. Dak.: I think this is the best ever.

Earl Buhler, Aberdeen, S. Dak.: I just finished reading your recent report concerning the Great White Fleet. In short, I think it is a tremendous idea.

Dr. P. O. Dickinson, Aberdeen, S. Dak.: Just a note to tell you that I think the Great White Fleet idea is one of the best to come before Congress in my memory.

Wilbur Tiohet, Meckling, S. Dak.: I think your proposal is the thing; get the surplus grain we have into the mouths of the starving people of the world.

Clem Heiberger, Spencer, S. Dak.: I am in favor of putting the White Fleet into service. In talking with Ewald Osterberg of Salem last evening, he voiced the opinion that it was a very good thing.

Truman D. Elder, Miller, S. Dak.: Received your interesting newsletter, and think your White Fleet idea an excellent one, as it serves many purposes. * * * I served in the Southwest Pacific area in World War II, and, too, noticed many cases of starvation, where a lot more good could be done with kindness, understanding, and supplying of more material comfort than mere cold dollars could bring.

B. J. Buisker, Britton, S. Dak.: The Great White Fleet is a great idea. Push it all you can.

Barney Van Hatten, Conde, S. Dak.: I approve of this proposal 100 percent. That would do more good than all the guns and bombs we could send.

Esther C. Rieck, Waubay, S. Dak.: I think the new White Fleet idea is a wonderful idea.

Frank Egan, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.: I am in receipt of your last report sent out July 25, 1959, and I approve of all this good work you speak of, and are trying to get set up relative to the White Fleet. I think that if we could get this material and food surpluses direct to the people, without some smart guy cashing in on it as in most of our past attempts to get through to the common people. Anyway, George, I'm for any attempt it might be to get our surpluses into the hands of these poor people, as I noticed Sunday while in the country a lot of our stored corn is not in too good shape

now; and if it is not moved before the winter sets in, won't be much good.

Mr. Speaker, there is one South Dakotan I would like to single out for special praise in connection with the Great White Fleet. I refer to Mr. August Kludt of Mount Vernon, S. Dak., who suggested a similar idea to me in a letter dated June 13, 1959. Mr. Kludt presented his suggestion a full 6 weeks before the article by Commander Manson appeared in the July 27 Life magazine. It indicates the vision and commonsense thinking that characterizes the people who live close to the soil in the rural heartland of America. I include a portion of Mr. Kludt's June 13 letter at this point:

I have often thought how it would be if we would use one of our old aircraft carriers for this job. If such a ship were outfitted with a complete flour mill and large baking oven (which most already have) and put such a ship in a foreign harbor where there is much need for empty stomach and give them ready-baked fresh bread, I think we would hit the spot where it counts most.

A load of wheat does not help much in the raw because the poor cannot buy it, and the rich don't need it, besides it lays in foreign bins too long and is again used to make money for the rich. This should not be.

Our ships should supply this floating bake-shop, thus putting many men to work and moving our wheat to where it belongs, to the hungry. I think this would cost less than paying a million dollars a day to keep our grain under lock and key from year to year.

I think there is too much howling about our surplus; it seems some think it is a curse instead of a blessing.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include my newsletter of July 25, a regular report which I send to constituents who request it, at this point in the RECORD:

WASHINGTON REPORT (By Congressman GEORGE MCGOVERN)

JULY 25, 1959.

DEAR FRIENDS: "The idea of organizing a new White Fleet grew out of things I witnessed at the close of World War II. Like thousands of U.S. servicemen, I saw diseased, destitute, and poverty-stricken peoples living on the Asiatic rimland and in parts of Europe and Africa. In some areas I saw people actually dying on the streets of starvation and disease. Such sights made deep and lasting impressions on me."

The author of the above observation is U.S. Navy Comdr. Frank Manson, 38-year-old World War II veteran now on duty with the Navy in London.

THE GREAT WHITE FLEET

He is the originator of a proposal which has been presented to the Congress by several Congressmen and Senators including myself. His idea is to take out of idle storage a few of America's warships, paint them white as a symbol of peace, load them with surplus grains, food, and medicine, and send them on a globe-circling mission of mercy to the disaster areas of the world.

Fifty-two years ago, President Theodore Roosevelt dramatized America's emergence as a world power by sending 16 of our battle-ships fully armed around the world. Commander Manson's proposed fleet would be for an entirely different purpose: To demonstrate to hungry, disease-ridden people that

the American people want a world of peace and that we stand ready to help other nations achieve better standards of life.

Commander Manson's impressions of the impoverished areas of the globe calls to my mind the destitute people of southern Italy with whom I lived for a year as an American bomber pilot in World War II. This was my first experience with human starvation, untended sick people and grinding misery. It was during those days of war and tragedy that I first resolved to work for a happier and more peaceful world. Commander Manson speaks for every thoughtful American who wants his country to do everything humanly possible to build a world where peace can be maintained with honor and dignity. This is no easy task, but it is the most important task of mankind.

COMMUNIST ECONOMIC THREAT

No one can doubt that America is everywhere challenged by a ruthless Communist threat which is not only militarily strong but which has every intention of beating us in economic and ideological competition. Khrushchev has bluntly told American visitors to Russia: "We declare war on you in the field of economics."

Highly trained teams of Russian technicians of all kinds, skilled in foreign language and the culture of the countries to which they are sent, are fanning out from Moscow into the underdeveloped areas of the world. They are telling the people that for centuries the Western Powers have exploited them, that communism provides a formula for a better life.

THE CHALLENGE TO AMERICA

America dare not ignore this highly organized Communist challenge. Great masses of people are grasping in desperation for some instrument to break the bonds of hunger and misery. They are no longer content to suffer in silence.

The contest between the free world and the Communist bloc for the allegiance of these uncommitted masses of the world will doubtless be the most significant global struggle of the next century.

The Great White Fleet is one dramatic device that we can use to demonstrate both the good will and the technical prowess of the American people. Such a fleet would be supported by voluntary contributions from the American citizenry.

MERCY FLEET LESS COSTLY, MORE EFFECTIVE

The cost would be much smaller and the results much greater than many of the questionable aid programs in which we are now engaged. The White Fleet would include one of the Navy's idle hospital ships manned by doctors and nurses who could not only minister to the most seriously ill or wounded, but who could demonstrate modern medical techniques to native doctors.

Stocks of surplus food and clothing would be carried on another ship. Still another would be a floating technical school capable of teaching natives techniques for improving their standard of living. Once established, the fleet could add a ship carrying exhibits of American agriculture, industry, education, and culture.

Resolutions introduced by myself and other Congressmen call upon the President to put the White Fleet into service. I would appreciate learning your views on this proposal.

Your friend and Representative in Congress.

GEORGE MCGOVERN.

(If you know of persons who are not now receiving this regular newsletter and would like to be on our mailing list, please send me their names and addresses.)

Appendix

Education Revolution?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 7, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, Sherman, Tex., is the scene of a highly important revolution in education. At Austin College, in the town of Sherman, an imaginative and daring experiment in liberal arts education is taking place. The principle of this experiment is that students will receive a more meaningful education when they, themselves, assume responsibility for the direction of their own studies.

The Ford Foundation was impressed with this experiment and has granted Austin College \$375,400 to carry it out.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Education Revolution?" from the Dallas Times-Herald of July 26, 1959, be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION REVOLUTION?

(By Al Hester)

SHERMAN.—On the sedate tree-shaded campus of 110-year-old Austin College a quiet experiment is underway which may eventually cause a revolution in college education.

The campus of the Sherman school echoes to the ringing of a chapel bell given to Austin College in 1850 by Sam Houston. Tradition and high scholastic standing have an honored place at the school. But President John D. Moseley has not let time-honored customs stifle the search for better education.

If Austin College's experiment is successful it may present college education and life in an entirely new light to college undergraduate students.

The emphasis in the Austin College plan puts great faith in the ability of students to assume responsibility on their own—a faith often lacking in conventional college programs.

Beginning in 1958 the college adopted the plan in which a pilot group of students is not subjected to an unconnected potpourri of college courses hemmed in by conventional lecture teaching methods.

The small group of students is given an amazing amount of freedom in pursuing studies. They study much of the time on their own, doing much outside reading. Lectures, when needed, are often by outstanding authorities. And within the next few years, the experimental group of students will be doing even more independent work—digging out a liberal arts education with teachers assuming the students can accept heavy responsibility.

But the Austin College plan is much more than a search to give students the most

meaningful liberal arts academic work possible.

The breadth of the plan so fascinated the Ford Foundation that it has granted Austin College \$375,400 to carry out its educational experiment. The funds will cover costs of planning and 3 full years of operation of the program and its review and evaluation.

In addition to a revamping of the classroom work of the college, the plan is concerned with religious maturity and campus life programs which affect all students, faculty, and staff.

Dr. Moseley and members of his faculty and staff have such an enthusiasm for the plan that a visitor to the campus is infected by it.

"We are trying to answer the question of what a church college is doing in business," Dr. Moseley said. "Is there something unique in the role of a church college?"

Dr. Moseley believes that Austin College, a Presbyterian school, must justify its existence just as other denominational schools must.

Dr. E. Ashby Johnson, who is taking a lead part in the plan, sums up the way many disenchanted college students feel upon completion of their schooling.

"I felt that I was shortchanged," he said.

Austin College leaders are determined that their students won't feel shortchanged when they receive their degrees.

Dr. Moseley doesn't look at the college undergraduate as a person who doesn't have sense enough to assume the responsibility of becoming educated.

He wants to give students a balanced college life and education. He hopes to free up professors from hide-bound methods of teaching. He wants students to develop a religious literacy—to know what religion means to them. And he wants a fuller participation by students in democratic processes such as student government and social activities.

Admittedly such goals may be hard to attain, but the Austin plan may point the way, he believes.

At the beginning of the 1958-59 school year the college set out to draw all phases of campus life into one coordinated learning process.

Thirty-two freshmen made up the first test group for a program of basic integrated studies. In non-academic portions of the college's plan, the entire student body, faculty and staff is participating.

These students are following a 2-year program which will give them more than the academic content found in conventional courses the first 2 years of college. Overlapping of subject matter which frustrates so many college students taking conventional courses is done away with at Austin.

Students don't receive grades for individual courses such as mathematics or English. They receive one grade for their entire year's work under the basic integrated studies plan. They don't operate on any semester plan, but continue their work for the entire year. Next year an additional group will join the original number of students taking part in the basic integrated studies plan.

There are three major areas in what the students term BIS. These are math-science, humanities, and linguistics.

In the math-science sequence of studies students begin with a concentration on mathematical principles. They then progress into physics and related fields such as astronomy, electronics and atomic theory. The math they learn is put to use as they go along, not forgotten as so much useless theory.

In the second year of the math-science sequence they'll study chemistry, geology, and biology. They get laboratory experience as well as theory work.

In the humanities sequence students study philosophy, religion, fine arts, literature, history, political science, psychology, sociology, and economics. A detailed study of Christianity and its backgrounds is included.

The third area involves study of a foreign language—either French or German—with English.

Students were selected at random from the incoming freshman class last year.

After their 2 years of basic studies they will enter the program of independent studies and concentration. Their junior and senior years they will do specialized studies, enabling them to concentrate in their major fields of interest. Assuming responsibility for the heavy dose of studies nearly overwhelmed some students at first, college officials said. But most of them are now enjoying the program.

Mike Parsons is a 19-year-old sophomore from Lawton, Okla. He was chosen to take part in the BIS and independent studies program.

"Boy, it sure hit me in the face at first. Real studying was hard for me," Mike said. "But the work is interesting. And my professors are interesting, too. They don't stick to the book. They have more freedom in teaching."

Mike believes he'll learn a lot more because of the experimental program.

Student government leaders are also pleased with the freedom they have under the Austin College plan. They have worked out a code of conduct for Austin College students and have more say in school affairs than many other colleges allow.

Austin College leaders don't apologize for the emphasis they place on religion in the plan. Students attend a worship service together each week. At other times each week freshmen and upperclassmen meet separately for chapel programs designed for their special needs. Freshmen deal with Christian principles as applied to college life. Upperclassmen work on developing a mature religious understanding.

Dr. Moseley says frankly he doesn't know if the Austin College plan will be a success, but he expects it to point the way for a better college education.

He points out that a medium-sized college such as the 750-student Sherman College is a flexible institution which can experiment to better college education.

"This college ought to justify its place by staying on the cutting edge to solve the problems of society and the church," he said.

Evaluation of the program at Austin College will be done by an independent organization, the Hogg Foundation of the University of Texas.

Half a Loaf?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, all of us have our experiences with political action groups. Most of them are well informed in their fields. Many of them are reasonable in their approach. An example of the well-informed and reasonable approach to legislation is that used by the League of Women Voters. They always keep the ideal in mind but find satisfaction in the small gains that are possible in the meantime. This attitude is well described in an article which appeared in their national publication, the National Voter, for July-August 1959. I include it here under a previous consent:

BETTER THAN NONE?

A league time for action is likely to be a time for reflection as well. Many league members, writing their Congressman about the mutual security program this summer, have asked themselves some basic questions about the nature of league action. They have been thinking, this past year, in terms of long-range foreign policies to achieve the world we want. Now they measure the current economic aid legislation against the yardsticks they have evolved, and the old familiar question arises: Is half a loaf really better than none? Shouldn't we hold out for the whole loaf?

THE IDEAL

"I feel that the spirit behind the world we want should be changed to the world we must have," wrote one leaguer, looking at the proposed mutual security program for 1960. "Leaving the league out of the picture completely, some sort of foreign aid bill will be passed. It won't attain our objectives—so why work and settle for much less than half a loaf? This bill would actually hinder our objectives. Knowing the immensity of the challenge of the revolution of rising expectations, we will of course settle for half a loaf—but only in the right directions."

"Let us plan minimum objectives for the world we must have: Separation of economic and military aid; more money for economic development and technical assistance (a combined program and a long-range program); unification of programs through the U.N. Let us plan an effective program with Congressmen who are sympathetic. Even if we should fail to achieve all we want this year, we would be oriented toward the future."

THE REALISTIC

Another league member, writing about the same problem, came up with a different approach.

"To be realistic," she says, "and to strive for that which can be achieved, I recognize that as an organization we must negotiate and learn to compromise. This is an art, and one needs instruction as to what legitimate concessions are. The citizen, the local leagues, cannot know wherein these areas lie, but it would be of tremendous technical help if the national board could guide us with information about accepting proposed legislation because of certain basic commitments that are part of that legislation. In some instances we would do this because there is no alternative, or because the compromises are secondary. There is also the

necessity to know what to do next, what are the following steps involved in eradicating weaknesses, omissions, or danger points in areas that we support with reluctance.

"If the terms of the unfinished job are not spelled out to us as we work on an item and after we finish the study, we, being human, confuse findings with statements of principle. They then become sacrosanct. An illustration in point would be the Trade Agreements Act. After supporting passage (upon recommendation of the national Board because this would be deemed an effective compromise for the moment), the next step would involve instructions as to the method of working toward the elimination of the peril point and escape clauses of the act. This would be a unique and forceful role for the national body, and at the same time people would come to understand the real scope of each piece of legislation and its meaning in terms of immediate and future needs."

IDEAL AND REALISTIC

These two views of league action differ more in emphasis than in substance: the one would strike out more vigorously for the ideal program; the other would continue to work for piecemeal gains, but relate each step more clearly to the ideal. There is one thing, however, that is essential to both: the existence of a clearly defined, generally accepted picture of the whole loaf.

Does such a picture of the ideal foreign aid program now exist in the league? Each year, as we have worked on specific aspects of technical assistance and economic development, we have moved toward clarifying the basic principles involved. This year, council added some firm strokes to the picture when it endorsed the principles embodied in the Fulbright amendments: emphasis upon economic rather than military aid; upon loans rather than grants; upon long-range aid; upon more adequate funds.

But council also recognized that the outlines of the ideal program—the whole loaf—are still far from clear to most league members. What are adequate funds for development? What is the proper balance between U.S. and U.N. programs? How can the multitude of agencies and programs be coordinated? Do we need all of them? Are there some essential jobs that none of them is doing?

As we seek answers to these and many other questions in the course of the coming year's study, the picture of a sound, adequate, total development program for underdeveloped countries should emerge to guide us in taking more effective, imaginative action. In the meantime—half a loaf.

Robert White II, New Editor and President
of New York Herald Tribune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 7, 1959

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the State of Missouri has given some extraordinary men to the Nation's press. Many come to mind, but I would call the Senate's attention to only one, a man whom it has been my privilege to know and respect as I have known and respected his father and other members of his family—a family which has played a leading and significant role in Missouri and national journalism.

I refer, Mr. President, to Robert White II, the new editor and president of the New York Herald Tribune, and, until recently, editor of the Mexico (Mo.) Ledger. Bob White was and is a born newspaperman. His family background is synonymous with distinguished newspapering and none has added greater luster to the newspaper profession than Bob White.

It is significant that the Herald Tribune has been, for decades, strongly Republican, while Bob White has been an active Democrat. Yet his paper in Mexico always stood above party and has always declared for the man rather than the party. Bob White will apply those characteristics to the Herald Tribune. He will also apply to the Herald Tribune the freshness that is characteristic of Missouri and of Bob White's own city of Mexico.

That this will be done, Mr. President, is illustrated by an editorial written by Bob White, as his first for the Herald Tribune. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ACCOUNTING TO OUR READERS

Our belief is that newspapers are important because you—the reader—are important.

And that newspapers will continue to be important just as long as the government of this city, this State, and this country is of, for and by you.

Believing this, then it follows that the new management of a newspaper owes you an accounting.

This is ours, as the new president and editor of the Herald Tribune.

We respect the tradition of the Herald Tribune. There is greatness in that tradition. And greatness for a newspaper only comes through high causes served well.

The most basic cause a newspaper can serve is telling you—the reader—the facts, the truth, the news. That shall continue to be our basic effort:

To report for you the truth as we find it * * * not as we wish it were.

There is another traditional cause to be served well.

It shall be served as usual on this page, in these editorial columns.

It is that grand, old American right, American privilege and, we believe, American duty of standing up to be counted.

Just as our opinions must not and shall not be found in the news columns they must and shall be found in the editorials.

We cannot promise that these opinions, these studied convictions, will always be right.

They won't be * * * because they come from human beings.

What we can promise is that they will be dead-level straight from the shoulder, sincere, our best.

Lastly, we ask for time.

There are to be changes in the Herald Tribune. The inevitable changes which come through having new hands at the wheel.

We believe they will come slowly, for we must build well and that takes time.

We must build well because newspapers are important. * * *

* * * And will be important just as long as our way of life is of, for and by you—the reader.

ROBERT M. WHITE II.

**Senator Kennedy Declares Passage of
Landrum-Griffin Bill Would Jeopardize
Enactment of Labor Reform Law and
Urges Passage of Elliott Bill**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1959

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the comment of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY, concerning President Eisenhower's television speech of August 6, 1959, on labor reform legislation.

Senator KENNEDY, as we all know, by his diligent work on the McClellan committee and in guiding a labor-management reform bill through the Senate, speaks with knowledge and authority in this field.

Senator KENNEDY's statement follows:

The President is wholly misinformed about the contents of the bill which passed the Senate by a 90-to-1 vote and about the House committee bill. Both of these measures would eliminate racketeering and the abuses disclosed by the McClellan committee in trade unions but, unlike the Griffin-Landrum bill, would not wreck the legitimate union movement. Passage of the Griffin-Landrum bill by the House would definitely jeopardize enactment of labor reform legislation at this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in a filmed interview this week, Senator KENNEDY told me he supported the bill reported by the House Education and Labor Committee and introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT]. Said Senator KENNEDY:

I hope that the Elliott bill will be accepted. I think we can get quick agreement between the Senate and the House on such legislation and go home feeling that we've done an important job in protecting union funds and the democratic rights of all union members.

The Senator went on to say that the bill sponsored by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFITH] "would not concentrate, as the Elliott bill does, on the shortcomings of a few racketeers and hoodlums but is instead an effort to limit the legitimate rights of all unions to bargain for their members."

Mr. Speaker, I should like also to insert in the RECORD the text of Senator KENNEDY's statement of August 3, 1959, concerning the need for labor reform legislation.

The statement follows:

This Congress must pass a labor-management reform bill. We cannot go home without enacting a responsible, effective measure that will strike hard at racketeers without penalizing honest union members—a bill that will carry out all the recommendations of the McClellan committee.

The Griffin-Landrum bill now offered as a substitute for the Elliott bill is not such a measure, and its adoption would endanger final passage of any reform legislation by

complicating the chances for a conciliation of the Senate and House version.

The Griffin-Landrum bill seeks to undo the conscientious efforts of the House committee members by substituting a punitive measure—restricting the rights of all honest union members—for a responsible measure aimed at the Hoffas, the Dios, and the Sheffermans, based on the McClellan committee reports and compatible with the strong, workable bill which passed the Senate 90 to 1.

The hodgepodge substitute bill, on the other hand, goes far beyond the recommendations of the McClellan committee—threatening to restrict the antiracketeering efforts of honest unions, to bog down small unions, and the bill's administration in a welter of redtape, and to weaken labor's legitimate rights at the bargaining table. Far more than that, it strengthens the grip of racketeers. I am hopeful that it will be promptly rejected by all those truly interested in passing a strong antiracketeering bill during this session of Congress.

Tribute to the Late Mrs. Mary Norton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 7, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on August 2 this country lost a great lady and a devoted public servant, for Mary Norton died on that day. Mrs. Norton was a humble, honest, intelligent woman; and her service in Congress will long be remembered. We remember her particularly for her efforts in getting one of the most important pieces of legislation passed in the last 25 years—the Federal Wage and Hour Act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Mrs. Norton Was Pioneer in Politics," from the Houston Post of August 4, be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, as a small token of my esteem for this great American.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MRS. NORTON WAS PIONEER IN POLITICS

The Federal wage and hour law is now so firmly established that few question its merit but in 1937-38 it was among the most controversial of the social experiments which stemmed from the New Deal. The Member of Congress who succeeded in getting it approved by the House after a long and bitter fight was Representative Mary T. Norton, Democrat, New Jersey, then chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Mrs. Norton, who died Sunday at the age of 84, was the first woman Democrat to serve in Congress. She was elected in 1924 and represented her New Jersey district for 26 years before retiring voluntarily. She considered the wage-hour bill her legislative memorial.

Mrs. Norton was a remarkable woman. She got into politics by taking an interest in civic affairs in Jersey City. She engaged in welfare work and became president of the Day Nursery Association of Jersey City. In 1923 she was elected a freeholder of Hudson County, the first woman to hold such a post. In the following year she was elected a delegate at large to the Democratic National

Convention in New York and thereafter began her 26-year career in Congress.

As a pioneer, she scored many firsts. She was the first woman to serve as chairman of a major House committee. In 1928 when other Congressmen were being more cautious, she introduced the first bill for repeal of the 18th (prohibition) amendment. She was the first woman to be elected chairman of the New Jersey Democratic State Committee. She was always reelected by large majorities.

While in Congress Mrs. Norton sought no personal privilege because of her sex. She said she was present with the same credentials as any other Member and wished to be treated in the same manner. Her greatest contribution perhaps was that through her ability she helped break down prejudice against women in public life.

**Algeria Needs Peace—The World Needs
a Peaceful Algeria**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, for too many years a real war has been raging the country of Algeria. That war soon will enter its 6th year. Because we feel the present situation in Algeria continues to constitute a threat to international peace and security, a number of us this week publicly urged a negotiated peace now between the two parties concerned.

A copy of our statement and a news release issued simultaneously follow under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD:

Sixteen U.S. Representatives today urged the Government of France to enter into negotiations to end the 5-year Algerian war. Their resolution was made public while foreign ministers of the independent African states are meeting in Monrovia, Liberia, expressly to help the provisional government of the Algerian Republic.

The Congressmen said they were deeply concerned that the war in Algeria was headed toward its sixth year. They said, "we cannot remain silent about this tragic war in Algeria and we publicly urge a negotiated peace now between the two parties concerned."

The statement, issued for the group by Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, Democrat of Oregon, said the signers "recognize the right of the Algerian people—as of all peoples—to self-determination and independence."

PORTER said he favors Congress memorializing the plight of captive nations, but he added "there should be no double standards. There are captive nations in Latin America and in Africa as well as behind the Iron Curtain."

The signers of the statement, all Democrats, are HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, of New York; VICTOR L. ANFUSO, of New York; EDWARD P. BOLAND, of Massachusetts; RICHARD BOLLING, of Missouri; CHARLES A. BOYLE, of Illinois; FRANK M. CLARK, of Pennsylvania; BYRON L. JOHNSON, of Colorado; GEORGE A. KASEM, of California; WILLIAM H. MEYER, of Vermont; ROBERT N. C. NIX, of Pennsylvania; ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, of New York; HENRY S. REUSS, of Wisconsin; JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California; FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., of New

Jersey; LEONARD G. WOLF, of Iowa; and PORTER.

Copies of the statement are being sent to French President Charles de Gaulle in Paris and to Prime Minister Ferhat Abbas, of the Algerian provisional government, through the Algerian office in New York City. Text of the statement follows:

"We the undersigned Members of the U.S. House and Senate, are deeply concerned that the war in Algeria will soon enter its sixth year.

"We recall the two resolutions passed by the United Nations General Assembly in successive 1957 sessions that a peaceful, democratic, and just solution should be found to end the conflict in conformity with the principles of the U.N. Charter.

"We recognize the right of the Algerian people—as of all peoples—to self-determination and independence.

"To achieve this right, thousands of Algerians are dying monthly and thousands more are refugees in other parts of north Africa and elsewhere.

"The present situation in Algeria continues to constitute a threat to international peace and security.

"Therefore we suggest that our U.S. Government take leadership in bringing the Algerian conflict to a just termination, not only for reasons of peace and humanitarianism, but to lay foundations for good relations between a free Algeria and the American people and their government in the years ahead.

"We recommend that our country urge our ally, France, to enter into negotiations for the cessation of the conflict.

"We urge that our country in the forthcoming 14th session of the U.N. General Assembly no longer abstain from voting, as it did in the 13th General Assembly, on any responsible resolution that urges continuing negotiations to reach a solution to the conflict.

"We commend our country for making available certain surplus foodstuffs to the Algerian refugees, and certain scholarships to Algerian students, and we urge our Government and its private agencies and citizens to continue to help these refugees.

"Thus we cannot remain silent about this tragic war in Algeria and we publicly urge a negotiated peace now between the two parties concerned."

Navarro County, Tex., Will Get 100 Dams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 7, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the need for soil conservation and flood prevention is recognized. In Navarro County, in northeast Texas, we see an outstanding set of achievements both completed and planned. The first dam of a flood-prevention program for this area was completed in 1953; and by 1969, 100 dams should have been built.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Navarro County Will Get 100 Flood Dams," from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram of August 3, 1959, appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Aug. 3, 1959]

NAVARRO COUNTY WILL GET 100 FLOOD DAMS

CORSICANA, August 3.—More than 100 flood detention dams will dot the Navarro County landscape 10 years hence, if present plans go as expected.

Farmers alone, estimates the Soil Conservation Service, will benefit annually to the tune of more than \$1,500,000 from these dams, which are expected to encourage bottomland farmers to plant low areas that hitherto have been left to brush and trees.

Since the first of such dams was built on Grays Creek in April 1953, 11 have been built on the same tributary in northeast Navarro County. Three are slated on Post Oak Creek this year.

By 1969, a total of 69 dams will have been built on Richland Creek and 25 on Chambers Creek, all within Navarro County.

Before the flood detention dam program began in 1950, lush and fertile bottomlands in many areas produced only weeds, because farmers would not risk having their crops flooded two or three times each year.

While flood prevention and soil conservation are the primary function of the dams, their value reaches into other areas, such as recreation and the protection of roads and bridges.

One landowner has leased his lake for hunting and fishing. Another has installed a 50-cent fee deposit box at the entrance to his lake, and the "honor system" has been financially successful.

Actual construction is paid for by the Federal Government, which contracts the projects.

The Government assumes the responsibilities until the dams are completed and sodded with grass, then turns them over to the soil conservation district, a State subdivision, which turns them over to either county or other group maintenance. Recently Navarro County voters approved a levy of 2 cents per \$100 valuation to maintain the dams.

The Late Honorable Mary T. Norton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish at this time to pay tribute to Mrs. Mary T. Norton, who for more than a quarter of a century represented the 12th New Jersey District in the House of Representatives. She died August 2 in a Greenwich, Conn., hospital following a heart attack at the age of 84.

I knew Mary Norton for many years. She began her service in Congress a year after I came to Washington as secretary to the late George N. Seger. I served with her in the House from 1940 until her retirement in 1951. She was a truly dedicated public servant held in high esteem by all of her colleagues.

At this time I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial tribute to Mrs. Norton from the Paterson Evening News, Paterson, N.J., of August 4, 1959:

AN ABLE WOMAN PASSES

Mary T. Norton, a great lady of New Jersey and national public life, has passed on to her eternal rest after a long and fruitful life.

Mrs. Norton, of Jersey City, amassed an impressive list of firsts in public life.

She was the first Congresswoman elected by the Democratic Party. Her tenure of 26 years—she retired voluntarily at age 75—is a record for congressional women. She was the first woman to head a congressional committee.

In addition, she was the first woman ever elected to the Hudson County Board of Freeholders, that service preceding congressional membership.

A staunch New Dealer, she supported her political preceptor, the late Mayor Frank Hague throughout her career, serving as Democratic National Committeewoman among important political posts.

An able lady with charm and grace, Mrs. Norton mixed practicalities of politics with an intuitive skill and in her trail-blazing career for New Jersey womanhood, set the pattern for many others who have followed her.

Tribute to Brig. Gen. William L. Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 7, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, one of this country's finest soldiers has retired from the Air Force, to take up residence in Amarillo, Tex. Brig. Gen. William L. (Jerry) Lee has served his country with devotion and ability. He is called the enlisted man's general, and the respect his men have had for him is known even to this old Navy man.

Texas is proud to have given Jerry Lee to the Air Force, and Texas is proud to have him back again.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Amarillo Globe-Times of July 30, 1959, appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARD-HITTING CRUSADER IS RETIRING—LEE'S FINAL REVIEW FRIDAY

(By Jean Ehly)

The invitation read: "Request the pleasure of your company at the retirement ceremony of Brig. Gen. William L. Lee, Friday, July 31, at 10 o'clock at the Air Force Flight Line, Amarillo Air Force Base."

General Lee, known as Jerry Lee, the enlisted man's general, will inspect his troops for the last time on Friday as they pass in review with the honor guard bearing the flags and the bands playing.

Possibly he will shed a few tears—he always does when leaving a base and old friends—but basically, he's a realist. He and Mrs. Lee will live in Amarillo as permanent residents at 4120 Paramount. He is considering a position in the public relations department of a Texas insurance company.

Retired generals don't just happen and the Nation's big companies seem cognizant of this. The 31-year record of General Lee with Uncle Sam shows great executive ability, experience, and wisdom. He received 12 military decorations including the U.S. Distinguished Service Medal, the Philippine Legion of Honor and the French Legion of Honor, plus about a dozen other academic honorary degrees. When he leaves his airbase headquarters this week, he will take his gold-fringed general's flag with the one star on the blue background. The incoming com-

mander, Brig. Gen. Charles H. Pottenger, will put up his own general's flag.

General Lee, a 200-pound muscular executive, who seems to crowd his khaki shirt, sat at his desk in the Pink Palace, as they call the base headquarters. I had just been offered a can of peanuts from which a 3-foot snake flew out when the top was removed. Gleefully, the general blew a boat horn, his crinkled face, so reminiscent of a mischievous "Skeezix," wreathed in grins. Then, sobering, he said, "Fun's over. Let's talk."

Said to be of the old military school, General Lee has been described as the "toughest guy in the Air Force." He talked of his career that has been dramatic and so legendary. He merited an article in the Saturday Evening Post when he was commander of the 13th Air Force in the Far East (one of seven such U.S. airbases in the world).

He chose a service career because he loved to fly.

"I planned ahead," he said. "I figured that if I made a career in the Air Corps and retired as a major, for instance, I'd draw \$375 a month pension after 30 years. In civilian life I'd have to make \$100,000 to net that much retirement income at 4 percent." Consequently, General Lee refused his father's offer to enter the dairy business in Weatherford, Tex., where he was born.

He entered Brooks Field Flying School in 1923, after an aggressively zesty boyhood of pranks and occasional suspensions from schools, although he graduated from Texas A. & M. in the top 10 of his class. He is probably the only bachelor of science in animal husbandry in the U.S. Air Force Officers' Corps.

Lee's career was a busy one in that he served at 21 different military bases and was on Gen. Douglas MacArthur's staff in the Philippines. Because he was the first instructor of the Filipino pilots, he was respected on the islands as "Father of the Philippine Air Force." It was during this pedagogical period (1937) that Lee taught an inquisitive American infantry officer, Ike Eisenhower, to fly.

Like most generals who earn their star, Jerry Lee went to war—in the Mediterranean. His 49th Bomber Wing of four-engined B-24's reached Italy in early 1944. Lee's responsibilities were 160 heavy bombers he sent against targets all over central and southern Europe, Regensburg, Ploesti, synthetic oil plants in Czechoslovakia, and targets in Vienna, Greece, Yugoslavia, and Austria.

Lee believes a superior power governs the universe. "I'd see a flier killed on his first mission, while there were many like me who survived. I only had a couple of forced landings, after 8,000 flying hours. You've got to be a fatalist in this business; it's pretty grim when a plane explodes in midair beside you through the flak."

It was as a second lieutenant in the Army Air Corps that he married Bertha Haag, a pretty San Antonio girl, who was destined to be among the most gracious and beloved of Air Force wives. The attractive Mrs. Lee is an inveterate golfer. She is a mother and a grandmother and the Lee's only son is Capt. William L. Lee, Jr., a doctor at Andrews AFB, Washington. Capt. Lee is the father of two little girls and one boy.

The Lees have had all the glamour and protocol of the "Big Brass." Lee has subscribed to protocol in military life. Personally, he is humble and unpretentious. He believes in strict military discipline. How can an officer command an airman of lower rank if he's been buddy-buddy with him the night before?

In 1952 the Lees were assigned again to the Philippines, where Lee was boss of the 13th Air Force. He was renowned for his sense of fun, aggressiveness, and good common-sense. He has never been a politician and

never pussyfooted or camouflaged issues. As one observer said, "He's too honest and outspoken for his own good."

Lee still shines his own shoes, washes his own cars, darns his socks, and cleans his car's spark plugs. Since they didn't always have help, Jerry Lee scrubbed floors for his wife 14 years around the world and he helps with the dishes. "Good family morale," he stated. He's proud of his wife's skill with the needle since she has made her own clothes, including evening gowns with sequins.

As a flying instructor in many bases, Lee has seen the evolution of planes from the open cockpit, wooden propeller—DH and PTI—to today's jet that goes faster than sound.

"With the jet, we've more horsepower per pound weight and faster speed," he said. "In 1929, we used to start our own planes by pulling the copper-tipped propellers through. The planes had two wings, little wheels and a tail skid. The PTI had 180 horsepower. The Curtiss-Wright A-3 went 110 miles an hour. Today, our planes land faster than that."

Up until 1935 Lee says the pilots wore boots, dress spurs, and fancy breeches with chamolais skin sewed inside the knee pads. "And some breeches were pink," said Lee, lighting a pipe. "We wore boots because most of our senior officers were ex-Cavalry. We'd take the boots off and hang 'em in the back of the planes. We flew in house shoes. When we landed, we'd put the boots back on. We also wore goggles, helmets and flying jackets since the cockpits were breezy. In the absence of radios, we'd hand notes from one cockpit to another."

"We used to be the Army Air Corps," he continued, "but in 1947 the Air Force as we know it today was born. There were 1,800 Air Corps officers in 1938, and during the war there were 400,000 officers." Oldtimers percentage-wise, like Lee, were a drop in the bucket.

"Congress passed an automatic promotion bill to entice men into the service—I was a second lieutenant 5 years and 10 months. We had to fight for promotions until someone died or retired. The promotion bill for that reason was a good thing," he stated.

In speaking of his own retirement (the general is only 56) Lee said, "Officers are retired to make room for younger personnel, only the service is taking in many young men and is pushing out the older ones with experience that can't be bought."

This frank, rugged militarist, with the iron gray hair that's never in place, has crusaded for many causes from speaker's platforms over the world. He has crusaded against world overpopulation, female he-wives, who domineer their husbands with nagging, and the hazards of the installment plan.

On the eve of his retirement, he's smoldering over Amarillo's complacency about world affairs. "We've got 20-40 percent communism and in the United States one American in 100 knows what's going on in Cuba, Red China, Formosa, etc. Communism is the same as socialism," he declared.

Bristling, he said, "Amarillo should appreciate this beautiful airbase. The Government is spending over 200 million out here—\$40,000 on each barracks that is rehabilitated. There's a new church and new buildings plus the 2½ million SAC runway." His slanting eyes that can be lost in a smile stared accusingly, "Amarillo people want to make a fast dollar; they won't rent their houses but want to sell them. We've only 500 new houses here in 900 families and there are 375 families in the mobile units." He shook his head. "When the military leaves a town because of no housing, they talk about it, which is bad publicity for the town."

The general denounces the general apathy of our businessmen. As a Rotarian and as vice president of the chamber of commerce,

he has noted that not all club members give their best to their town's interests.

Though Lee may talk gruff and spontaneous with some offtrail phrases, he's a master of the written word. Last year, he wrote over a thousand letters by arising at 5 o'clock in the morning. Maybe he wrote to an old Filipino cook or to the big brass in Washington. He writes to anyone who writes to him.

The general's fearless aggression has made him a debatable personality at times, but his men regard him as a square shooter. "He'll go to any extent to get his boys out of a jam, if they tell the truth," said an airman.

The Lees have attended the formalities of retirement parties, and last week Lee took his last official flight to Roswell, N. Mex. He likes to fly because something different always occurs—like weather, engine trouble, scenery varieties and trouble you never forget. He prefers a seasoned veteran pilot to an airplane driver because a veteran usually brings a plane in during a crisis.

As General Lee walked away from his last flight, he said to himself, "Boy, this is it." He didn't look back. Perhaps he was thinking about the Amarillo people who are so likeable, or that he likes this climate better than any place he's been—or maybe he was thinking of all those weeds in his new yard, so big he may import some sheep to keep it mowed down.

Economics in the Kindergarten

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 7, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, often it is our smalltown newspapers that spot really important ideas and bring them to the eyes of the public.

On August 4, 1959, the Hallettsville (Tex.) New Era Herald published an editorial entitled "Economics in the Kindergarten," which proposed that children be brought into contact with the simplest economic facts and principles from the first day they enter school.

Quoting President Emeritus Roscoe L. West, of New Jersey State College, the New Era Herald pointed out that a trip to see a train could be tied in with an explanation of how railroads serve the community.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMICS IN THE KINDERGARTEN

We frequently hear, and with good reason, that the teaching of economics is sorely neglected in American schools. A distinguished educator, Dr. Roscoe L. West, president emeritus of New Jersey State College, agrees. To those who oppose teaching fundamental economic ideas to very young children, he says: "Economics is considered a difficult subject. Anatomy is also considered a difficult subject, but our schools still teach such related subjects as hygiene, sanitation, and first aid. In both fields, the student should be given sufficient knowledge to take care of himself."

The fact is, Dr. West goes on, that economics can be made a regularly taught sub-

ject starting with kindergarten. As an example, he points out that a trip to see a train could be tied in with an explanation of how railroads serve the community.

There is nothing our totalitarian enemies would like more than generations of people who know little about economics and care less, and who are lost in fogs of misunderstandings and plain ignorance. This would perform a major service to the Communist cause, and to leftwing writers and agitators who are solidly grounded in dialectics. As soon as a child can encompass any knowledge, he should begin his economic groundwork.

Vital Need for a Housing Measure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 7, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, there are 5 million American families living in below-average homes at this moment. And the need for other types of housing is also growing more acute. For example, we need to provide more adequate places to live for the senior citizens of our Nation, whose numbers are increasing at the rate of a thousand a day.

People are living longer and our population rate is increasing.

None of these things apparently were considered when the housing bill was vetoed. Now the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], long noted for his work in behalf of the people, particularly in the field of housing, and his committee have brought forth another bill. Vital items have been pared from this bill in the hope it will meet with approval in the White House. I feel too much has been taken off when all the urgent needs are considered. In any event, however, this bill more than meets the administration halfway in an attempt to get through some sort of measure to help the people. I hope it will not also fall victim to the frightened policy of "No new starts." We need college dormitories and college classrooms. They are two of the most urgently needed types of buildings in America. Every time a college room is cut out of the bill, America's future is trimmed with it. I express the hope that the committee will not forget America's future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald for Friday, August 7, 1959, entitled "Saving the Bones."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAVING THE BONES

In view of the apparent reluctance of the Democratic leadership to attempt to override the veto of the housing bill, Senator SPARKMAN's Housing Subcommittee has shown good judgment in bringing out a fresh measure that ought to win the President's approval. The price for keeping the housing

programs alive apparently is to be a serious slowdown in urban renewal and continuing stagnation for the much needed public housing program. But essential mortgage insurance and other authority would be provided, and in the net the compromise program would be a good deal better than nothing.

Before Senate action is completed, we hope that Senator SPARKMAN will seriously consider trying to add another \$200 million or \$300 million to the proposed 2-year, \$550 million urban renewal authorization. Doled out over 2 years under the usual Budget Bureau quarterly allocation system, the sum now proposed would make pretty thin gruel. And next year, involved as he is likely to be in his own political campaign, Mr. SPARKMAN might find it very difficult to put through a supplemental program even though other senatorial friends of the renewal program concede that additional authority would then be necessary if the sum now proposed were not enlarged.

Having retreated very far on the first round from the kind of housing program which the Nation's mayors have urgently recommended, the Sparkman committee has again trimmed the program critically to meet Mr. Eisenhower much more than halfway. We trust that the administration will now join in a cooperative effort to salvage at least the skeleton of an adequate program for the American people.

Texas Farmers Discuss Fears

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 7, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there are farm problems in this country today, just as there have been since before I was born. I believe that the best way we can get to the root of the problems that plague farmers is to get the story from those actually concerned.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Texas Farmers Discuss Fears," from the Dallas Times-Herald of August 4, 1959, appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXAS FARMERS DISCUSS FEARS

(By Donald Warman)

Three men in trouble Monday compared their problems and explored ways out.

As men of the soil, who mark progress in decades rather than days, they agreed that long-range planning and patience are their solutions—if, indeed, there are solutions.

As delegates to the annual study meetings of the 70,000-member Texas Farm Bureau Institute, typical representatives of the Texas agriculture industry found they feared:

1. A nation of elderly farmers whose children have deserted the land in despair for their economic future.

2. A nation of 15-acre wheat farms, 10-acre cotton farms, and ½-acre tobacco farms as Government control continues its inroads on farm management. (Those acreage minimums are those exempt from present controls.)

3. Or, a nation of big farms in mass production, with the little farmer literally starved off the land.

All were born on the land. None plan ever to leave it. These are the three and their sectional viewpoints:

J. H. West, president of the TFB, farming 320 acres in cotton and grain sorghum near Bishop, Nueces County:

"There is no political solution to an economic problem. The express charge on money sent to Washington and back again is the heaviest freight rate in the world. What we must find is a free market, although an end to price supports would pull a lot of farmers under during the first few years.

"When you've used a crutch for years, it's hard to get rid of. The bureau is looking for gradual but constant relief from Federal props."

Ray Williams, farming 1,200 acres in cotton and wheat near Commerce:

"I'm a big farmer, but I started as small as anyone. It hurts me to see my smaller neighbors go under, but unless they hire out as workers they are doomed. The banks only lend to the big boys. On the other hand, I'm afraid to buy plots vacated near mine because the farm program is so unstable.

"I have two sons in college, both studying for teaching certificates, I hope to make one of them a farmer, but I don't know how I'll persuade him."

C. E. Gregory, farming 2,500 acres in cotton, wheat, maize, and cattle in Jones County, West Tex.:

"In the 50,000 acres of Jones County, there are three farmers under 40 years old. In 15 years, what will that mean? (Mr. Gregory is 55.) If a man is able to start farming now, he's able to retire now—it costs the same. In the depression it was the little farmer who survived. But the little farmer is dead now."

Emphasizing that they are here to explore their problems, delegates said that the bureau, part of the 1,650,000-member National Farm Bureau, adopts resolutions only on a nationwide basis.

Some 300 delegates from every county in Texas are in Dallas for the 3-day meeting at the Adolphus Hotel. General sessions in the mornings are followed by specialized seminars in the afternoons.

Rehabilitation Center Assured

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 7, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the city of Dallas, Tex., has almost completed a fund drive to finance a Dallas Rehabilitation Center. From beginning to end, every aspect of this project illustrates the good work townspeople can do at the local level when they get together and work toward a common goal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Rehabilitation Center Assured," from the Dallas Times-Herald of August 3, 1959, appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REHABILITATION CENTER ASSURED

The campaign for funds to build the Dallas Rehabilitation Center is near its goal.

Congratulations are in order to Fred F. Florence, general chairman; C. A. Tatum, Jr., vice chairman; William A. Blakley, treasurer; and Karl Hoblitzelle and R. L. Thornton, Jr., cochairmen of the sponsor's committee.

A special merit badge is deserved by James H. Bond, leader of the drive to raise the Dallas goal of \$550,000 to assure the location in Dallas of the institute in which persons who are handicapped by injury can be rehabilitated in this city for profitable employment. Currently, such persons have to be sent to other localities.

The final push to the goal came in the form of a donation of \$95,000 by the Caruth Foundation and Mr. and Mrs. W. W. Caruth, Jr. This gift in memory of Mr. Caruth's parents, Mr. and Mrs. W. W. Caruth, Sr., is one of the many philanthropies from the same source.

Other notable Caruth gifts include substantial contributions to Baylor Hospital, St. Paul's Hospital and Baylor University Hospital School of Dentistry. Several other institutions have been aided. The Caruth name is being written large in the life of Dallas, particularly in the field of medicine and health.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the Record with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than

six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. _____ addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]
Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbott, Watkins M., Va.-----
Abernethy, Thomas G., 6278 29th St.
Miss.
Adair, E. Ross, Ind.-----4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., N. J.-----
Albert, Carl, Okla.-----5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., N. C.-----
Alford, Dale, Ark.-----
Alger, Bruce, Tex.-----
Allen, Leo E., Ill.-----University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, Minn.-----4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., Mont.-----911 Beverly Dr.,
Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., Ala.-----3108 Cathedral
Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., N. Y.-----
Arends, Leslie C., Ill.-----4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., Ohio.-----
Ashmore, Robert T., S. C.-----
Aspinall, Wayne N., Colo.-----Arlington Towers,
Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., N. J.-----113 S. Lee St.,
Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., Kans.-----
Ayres, William H., Ohio.-----
Bailey, Cleveland M.,
W. Va.
Baker, Howard H., Tenn.-----
Baldwin, John F., Jr., Calif.-----
Barden, Graham A., N. C.-----2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., Nev.-----
Barr, Joseph W., Ind.-----Tulip Lane and
Glen Mill Rd.,
Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., Pa.-----
Barry, Robert R., N. Y.-----3019 Norman-
stone Drive
Bass, Perkins, N. H.-----
Bass, Ross, Tenn.-----
Bates, William H., Mass.-----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., Ohio.-----
Becker, Frank J., N. Y.-----
Beckworth, Lindley, Tex.-----
Belcher, Page, Okla.-----
Bennett, Charles E., Fla.-----1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., Mich.-----3718 Cardiff Rd.,
Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., Mich.-----
Berry, E. Y., S. Dak.-----118 Schotts
Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., Ohio.-----
Blatnik, John A., Minn.-----
Bilitch, Iris Faircloth,
(Mrs.), Ga.
Boggs, Hale, La.-----
Boland, Edward P., Mass.-----
Bolling, Richard, Mo.-----3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Ohio.
Bonner, Herbert C., N. C.-----Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., N. Y.-----
Bow, Frank T., Ohio.-----4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, Conn.-----
Boykin, Frank W., Ala.-----The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., Ill.-----
Brademas, John, Ind.-----
Bray, William G., Ind.-----
Breeding, J. Floyd, Kans.-----
Brewster, Daniel B., Md.-----
Brock, Lawrence, Nebr.-----
Brooks, Jack, Tex.-----
Brooks, Overton, La.-----4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S.,
Mich.
Brown, Charles H., Mo.-----3723 N. Oakland
St., Arlington, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., Ohio.-----Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, Ga.-----Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., Va.-----
Buckley, Charles A., N. Y.-----
Budge, Hamer H., Idaho.-----
Burdick, Quentin, N. Dak.-----
Burke, Frank W., Ky.-----
Burke, James A., Mass.-----
Burleson, Omar, Tex.-----2737 Devonshire
Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., Pa.-----
Byrne, James A., Pa.-----
Byrnes, John W., Wis.-----1215 25th St. So.,
Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., N. J.-----

Canfield, Gordon, N. J.-----
Cannon, Clarence, Mo.-----
Carnahan, A. S. J., Mo.-----
Carter, Steven V., Iowa.-----
Casey, Bob, Tex.-----
Cederberg, Elford A., Mich.-----
Celler, Emanuel, N. Y.-----The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E.,
Mich.
Chelf, Frank, Ky.-----
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, Colo.-----
Chiperfield, Robert B., Ill.-----1713 House Office
Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt
(Mrs.), Ill.-----2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., Pa.-----3735 Gunston Rd.,
Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, Iowa.-----
Coffin, Frank M., Maine.-----
Cohelan, Jeffery, Calif.-----2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., Ill.-----
Colmer, William M., Miss.-----
Conte, Silvio O., Mass.-----
Cook, Robert E., Ohio.-----
Cooley, Harold D., N. C.-----2430 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., Pa.-----
Cramer, William C., Fla.-----6714 Joallen Dr.,
Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, Nebr.-----4920 Yorktown
Blvd., Arlington
Va.
Curtin, Willard S., Pa.-----
Curtis, Laurence, Mass.-----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., Mo.-----
Daddario, Emilio Q., Conn.-----
Dague, Paul B., Pa.-----
Daniels, Dominic V., N. J.-----
Davis, Clifford, Tenn.-----4611 Butter-
worth Pl.
Davis, James C., Ga.-----
Dawson, William L., Ill.-----
Delaney, James J., N. Y.-----
Dent, John H., Pa.-----
Denton, Winfield K., Ind.-----
Derounian, Steven B., N. Y.-----
Derwinski, Edward J., Ill.-----
Devine, Samuel L., Ohio.-----
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., Mich.-----
Dingell, John D., Mich.-----
Dixon, Henry Aldous, Utah.-----1817 N. Quinn St.,
Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, N. Y.-----
Donohue, Harold D., Mass.-----
Dooley, Edwin B., N. Y.-----
Dorn, Francis E., N. Y.-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, S. C.-----
Dowdy, John, Tex.-----
Downing, Thomas N., Va.-----
Doyle, Clyde, Calif.-----3877 30th St. N.,
Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., N. Y.-----
Durham, Carl T., N. C.-----The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.),
N. J.
Edmondson, Ed, Okla.-----
Elliott, Carl, Ala.-----
Everett, Robert A., Tenn.-----
Evins, Joe L., Tenn.-----5044 Klinge St.
Fallon, George H., Md.-----
Farbstein, Leonard, N. Y.-----
Fascell, Dante B., Fla.-----
Feighan, Michael A., Ohio.-----
Fenton, Ivor D., Pa.-----3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., N. Y.-----
Fisher, O. C., Tex.-----Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., Pa.-----The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., Wis.-----
Flynt, John J., Jr., Ga.-----
Fogarty, John E., R. I.-----1133 House Office
Building
Foley, John R., Md.-----
Forand, Aime J., R. I.-----4108 Dresden St.,
Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., Mich.-----514 Crown View
Dr., Alexandria,
Va.
Forrester, E. L., Ga.-----
Fountain, L. H., N. C.-----The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr.,
Tenn.-----Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr.,
N. J.-----3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., Md.-----
Fulton, James G., Pa.-----
Gallagher, Cornelius E.,
N. J.-----
Garmatz, Edward A., Md.-----

Gary, J. Vaughan, Va.-----
Gathings, E. C., Ark.-----6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., Pa.-----
George, Newell A., Kans.-----
Gialmo, Robert N., Conn.-----
Glenn, Milton W., N. J.-----Arlington Towers,
Arlington, Va.
Goodell, Charles E., N. Y.-----
Granahan, Kathryn E.
(Mrs.), Pa.-----
Grant, George M., Ala.-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., Ill.-----
Green, Edith (Mrs.), Oreg.-----
Green, William J., Jr., Pa.-----
Griffin, Robert P., Mich.-----
Griffiths, Martha W.
(Mrs.), Mich.-----
Gross, H. R., Iowa.-----
Gubser, Charles S., Calif.-----
Hagen, Harlan, Calif.-----
Haley, James A., Fla.-----
Hall, David M., N. C.-----
Halleck, Charles A., Ind.-----4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, N. Y.-----
Hardy, Porter, Jr., Va.-----
Hargis, Denver D., Kans.-----
Harmon, Randall S., Ind.-----
Harris, Oren, Ark.-----1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., Va.-----
Hays, Wayne L., Ohio.-----1323 Barger Drive,
Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., N. Y.-----
Hebert, F. Edward, La.-----26 Cockrell St.,
Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, W. Va.-----
Hemphill, Robert W., S. C.-----
Henderson, John E., Ohio.-----
Herlong, A. S., Jr., Fla.-----
Hess, William E., Ohio.-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., Calif.-----
Hoeven, Charles B., Iowa.-----100 Maryland
Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., Mich.-----100 Maryland
Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., Ill.-----
Hogan, Earl, Ind.-----5211 Flanders
Ave., Garrett Pk.,
Kensington, Md.
Holifield, Chet, Calif.-----
Holland, Elmer J., Pa.-----
Holt, Joe, Calif.-----
Holtzman, Lester, N. Y.-----
Horan, Walt, Wash.-----
Hosmer, Craig, Calif.-----
Huddleston, George, Jr.,
Ala.-----
Hull, W. R., Jr., Mo.-----
Ikard, Frank, Tex.-----
Irwin, Donald J., Conn.-----The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., Calif.-----
Jarman, John, Okla.-----
Jennings, W. Pat, Va.-----
Jensen, Ben F., Iowa.-----2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., Mich.-----
Johnson, Byron L., Colo.-----
Johnson, Harold T., Calif.-----
Johnson, Lester R., Wis.-----
Johnson, Thomas F., Md.-----
Jonas, Charles Raper, N. C.-----
Jones, Paul C., Mo.-----1111 Army Navy
Dr., Arlington,
Va.
Jones, Robert E., Ala.-----
Judd, Walter H., Minn.-----3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., Mo.-----
Karth, Joseph E., Minn.-----
Kasem, George A., Calif.-----
Kastenmeier, Robert W.,
Wis.-----
Kearns, Carroll D., Pa.-----Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.),
W. Va.-----
Keith, Hastings, Mass.-----
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), N. Y.-----
Keogh, Eugene J., N. Y.-----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., N. Y.-----
Kilday, Paul J., Tex.-----3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., Tex.-----4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., Calif.-----
King, David S., Utah.-----
Kirwan, Michael J., Ohio.-----
Kitchin, A. Paul, N. C.-----
Kluczynski, John C., Ill.-----
Knox, Victor A., Mich.-----
Kowalski, Frank, Conn.-----
Lafore, John A., Jr., Pa.-----
Laird, Melvin R., Wis.-----
Landrum, Phil M., Ga.-----

Appendix

An Appeal to All Americans To Enter the Battle Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on August 3, 4, 5, and 6 of this year His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing, archbishop of Boston, wrote a series of articles "An Appeal to All Americans To Enter the Battle Against Communism" for the Hearst papers, the first article of which, appearing in the Boston Sunday Advertiser of August 2, 1959, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 6, 1959, appearing on page A6777.

In my extension of remarks I include the article written by Cardinal Cushing, appearing in the Boston Daily Record of August 3, 1959, entitled "Red Peace Slogan Means Expansion"; the Cardinal's article on August 4, 1959, entitled, "Red's Aim To Gain World Control"; and the article of the cardinal's appearing in the same paper of August 5, 1959, entitled, "Soviet Censorship Bars Spread of U.S. Messages."

There is no person throughout the world who more clearly understands the history and intent of communism and the evilness of the Communists and international communism than Cardinal Cushing. The articles of Cardinal Cushing should be read as widely as possible. They are ringing messages of the dangers of communism, constituting a powerful appeal for all men and women, whether in the United States or elsewhere, who believe in freedom and a government of law under God:

[From the Boston Daily Record, Aug. 3, 1959]

(In yesterday's Boston Sunday Advertiser, Richard Cardinal Cushing introduced his readers to the dark word of Soviet propaganda, and showed how "peaceful" interchanges and "cultural" relations are employed to spread Marxist theories in America. In today's installment he reveals what the Soviets really mean by the word "peace.")

RED PEACE SLOGAN MEANS EXPANSION

(By Richard Cardinal Cushing)

Let us understand, once and for all, that peace on Soviet lips is nothing other than constant Soviet expansion. By talking about guaranteeing peace, Soviet Russia means that as long as we give concessions to Soviet power, there will be no war. "Peace," "pax"—how sweet the word. Christ, the Lord, immortalized it when time and again, especially after His resurrection, He said to His loved ones—"Peace be unto you." The Communists have so twisted and turned the word that for that it means not the "tranquillity of order," not the "work of justice"—but a mode of existence in which there is no longer any opposition to communism. The obvious plan

that the Kremlin has is to mount one demand for one concession after another until the world is in their grasp.

Again, we have in the home of peace been violently threatened by Khrushchev and his colleagues with a catastrophic fate if we do not turn our backs on the 2 million people of West Berlin. War has not followed these bluffs, and we must draw the lesson from this that firmness is the only true policy left for the United States.

SOVIET TYRANNY

We can observe by way of contrast that when we took seriously the Soviet talk of "peace," we turned people after people and nation after nation over to Soviet tyranny. It was in the name of "peace" that we agreed to Soviet conquest of every one of the countries now behind the Iron Curtain.

We must be aware also that all of the appeasement sentiment and jargon, instigated by the Communists and carried out by many non-Communists, has been strong enough to persuade our Government to grant financial aid to the Communists Tito and Gomulka. Only recently the latter by his royal and subservient welcome to Khrushchev, assured us that he is Moscow's servant and no friend of the United States.

Soviet communism nevertheless considers Americans to be so stupid that as it proceeds with the farce of Geneva, it continues to raise throughout the world this cry of "peace." This is the main feature of the June issue of the World Marxist Review, the great directive giver to the comrades of the world.

CALLED HYPOCRISY

Its first and leading article is entitled "Peace Is Our Policy," and that slogan culminates the whole number.

The hypocrisy of this renewed battle cry of peace can be gleaned from his text, when measured against the Soviet blockade of any real peace at Geneva.

The comrades of the world are instructed to go out and spread ideas such as contained in the following thought: "The tireless efforts of the peace forces to ease tensions have led to a thaw in the international climate. The fact that the East and West have agreed to sit around the table is an important result of recent world developments."

Now, the peace forces, in the eyes of the Kremlin are always those groups and agencies which are susceptible to the Communist line and which recommended free world retreat before Soviet demands. So we soon learn from this directive article that it is the Western leaders who are blocking peace.

RED SURRENDER

Let these Western leaders, the Red argument goes, thrust aside the prejudices of the past and respect the popular will, and the result will be constructive solutions that will strengthen peace. Reading on, we find that these constructive solutions are the surrender to Soviet demands which mean that West Berlin shall become a Red satellite, leading the way to the completely Red Germany. In a word, we are to be persuaded over and over again that it is only the Socialist countries which stand for peace and the comrades are even given a fundamental argument to advance that view among the unthinking. This thought is that a new society has risen to which war is utterly alien, namely, Soviet Russia and the other Soviet-controlled regimes.

KREMLIN PLAN

The obvious plan that the Kremlin has is to mount one demand for concessions after another until the world is in their grasp.

If we Americans once and for all understand this, and let it be known among our associates, we will begin to prevent making the serious errors we made in the past. We will begin to halt the blackmail of this peace talk of the Communists.

It is to our credit as a nation that we did come to such an understanding in refusing to budge on Quemoy and Matsu, at the time that the Communists and their friends were filling the air with the predictions of the war calamities that would come down upon our heads if we did not give up these islands—and even betray Formosa itself—into the hands of Red China.

ABUSE HURLED

We are supposed to swallow that nonsense despite the Kremlin's war upon Finland, the attack upon Korea, and the threats of war which frequently come from the lips of Dictator Khrushchev. But in each instance, when we hear the Communist message through, we learn from the Soviet sources that it is the nation attacked which was the aggressor.

Likewise that abusive term is also hurled at any force that Soviet power intends to bring to its knees.

Thus in the June issue of the World Marxist Review, we learn that Adenauer's Germany is accused of militarism and pro-nazism. Echoes of that even filter into the United States, the appeasers seeking to weaken our will by trying to divide us from our West German ally.

[From the Boston Daily Record, Aug. 4, 1959]

REDS AIM TO GAIN WORLD CONTROL

(In today's installment of his series on Soviet propaganda in America, Richard Cardinal Cushing explains to Daily Record readers what a Red propaganda agent means when he speaks of democracy.)

(By Richard Cardinal Cushing)

If there was more understanding in America of the true definition of that Soviet word "peace," there would be less speculation in public statements and articles as to whether Khrushchev wants peace. There would be fewer assertions, publicly made in many instances, that the Soviet dictator does desire peace. Dictator Khrushchev, as the leader of world communism, desires one thing above all, and he is using the term "peace" to attain that objective.

That desired end from the Communist viewpoint is the continued spreading of Soviet control over additional nations until the whole world is under the dictatorship. Then, and then only, will it be prepared to yield to the perfect Communist society, where alone lasting peace is possible in Communist eyes.

RED DIRECTIVE

We are reminded of this in the No. 5 issue of International Affairs, the great directive giver that goes out from Moscow every month to the comrades of 83 different countries including the United States. On page 32 of that publication, there appears a carefully worked out article on the 21st Congress of the Communist Party of Soviet Russia and the other Socialist countries. The article begins:

"The Soviet Union's historic successes in the building of communism, in the victory of socialism in China and many other countries of Europe and Asia, and the formation and consolidation of the world Socialist system, have opened a new stage in the joint fight of these peoples for socialism and communism."

TIME IS NOW

The directive then goes on by means of extensive quotations from Nikita Khrushchev's report to that 21st congress, to indicate that the time has now arrived for all the Socialist countries to move into communism together.

Do you know what that entails, from the Communist viewpoint? It is nothing more nor less than a clear-cut signal to the comrades of the world that Soviet Russia is intent on world conquest. While the beginning of the Communist society can be made, the Reds contend, before the entire world comes under the Soviet dictatorship, it cannot be fully attained until the dictatorship is worldwide.

There is not a man or woman who cannot grasp the fraud involved in the Soviet definition of "peace." There is no one, no matter how preoccupied with other things, who cannot inform his family, neighbors, and representatives of this fraud, and show in consequence the urgency of a firm stand by the United States against any more concessions to Soviet Russia.

BACK FRIENDS

Our representatives, being patriotic men, will be encouraged by hearing that an enlightened American public wants us to stand firmly for our Nation and those countries which are our friends.

We can tell the same story about the word "democracy," which on Soviet lips is nothing other than the synonym for dictatorship. Every American man and woman can grasp that, and act upon this knowledge. This fact has again been emphasized by No. 18 on the New Times for 1959, coming here every week from Moscow.

On page 3 of that issue, there is an important article for the comrades entitled "The Working Class in Power." The whole theme of that contribution is to the effect that the United States is a dictatorship while Soviet Russia is the perfect democracy.

STRIKE DENIED

We read specifically that proletarian dictatorship—everywhere and in every form—is incomparably more democratic than the most democratic of bourgeois states. The United States is thus interpreted to be a dictatorship against the working class. And all of this nonsense is told the comrades. Here in the United States unions exist freely.

It is not the case in Soviet Russia. Here the workers have the right to strike. This is denied them by the Kremlin dictatorship.

FREE EXPRESSION

Here they have the right to free expression. That exists nowhere under the sickle and hammer.

When the Communists, therefore, speak of democracy they mean the extension of the Soviet dictatorship, and when they refer to democratic rights, within any free country, they have in mind the free right of the Communists to carry on their conspiracy for the destruction of all liberty.

REDS ARE SLY

And yet we, in our American eagerness to find something democratic in Moscow and its seditious followers, have been induced by sly Communist propaganda to throw down all our internal defenses. We have reached a point, by reason of those Supreme Court decisions, which have been criticized by the American Bar Association, whereby there is nothing that State or Nation can do effectively at present to safeguard its own security.

Surely every man and woman can popularize the idea that Congress should give favorable consideration to the several proposals in the American Bar Association report.

STATES RIGHTS

Among other things would be included the right of the States to defend themselves against subversion, now denied them; the limitation on the right to travel on conspiratorial purposes by members of the Communist fifth column and their close friends; and strengthening of the Federal Smith Act so that the Communist conspiracy can be treated for what it is under the law—a conspiracy against our Nation.

[From the Boston Daily Record, Aug. 5, 1959]

SOVIET CENSORSHIP BARS SPREAD OF U.S. MESSAGES

(This is the fourth and final installment of an article by Richard Cardinal Cushing, explaining the most common forms which Soviet propaganda has assumed in the United States, and how we may best guard against it.)

(By Richard Cardinal Cushing)

It is the sneaking hope that there is some democracy in the Soviet dictatorship that leads us today to enter into the alleged competition with Soviet Power that expresses itself in cultural exchanges, business exchanges, exhibitions, and the like.

This whole idea was originated by Dictator Khrushchev in February 1956, at the famous 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. He knew full well that there could be no genuine competition in such arrangements, as the Soviet people would never be permitted to receive the American message, whereas our country would be flooded with Soviet agents, including industrial, military, and political espionage agents.

We can behold the fallacy of this whole line of thinking from America's viewpoint, when we take note that at the American exposition in Moscow, Soviet censorship is imposed on American books attempting to reveal our culture. Book after book has been denied its place on the American exposition shelves, for fear the Soviet subjects might read one of them.

This is of course what could be expected from Khrushchev and company when we consider the punishment they gave to Boris Pasternak for his reflection on the desirability of communism. It is to be observed that the books shut out from the Soviet public included those of the mildest of writers, many of them proven friends of Soviet Russia in their own country. The truly anti-Communist books, which could have enlightened the people in Russia, were not even sent from the United States to the exhibition.

The latest word to enter the Communist dictionary for our confusion is "spirituality." This word we find emphasized at length in the May issue of the World Marxist Review. There the comrades of the world are advised to make full use of this term, and to understand thereby that dialectical materialism, that is, militant atheism, is more spiritual than Christianity or any other religion.

It takes little thought to see what is the intent of this torturing of definitions. Many critics of communism in the free world, led off by Pope Pius XI, 22 years ago, have pointed to the basically atheistic character of Marxism-Leninism. The Communists are now trying to move in to short circuit this criticism by coining their own definition of "spiritual."

In this article of directives in the World Marxist Review, they bring out at some length the claim that they are about to create "a new man" in the coming Communist society, where there will be "no war," "no taxes," and no headaches of any sort.

Thus, the comrades will now use the word "spiritual" in an entirely different background than religious people understand it. Their hope is to persuade many Christians and Jews in the free world that there is hope of bringing about a change in the atheism of communism, and that, therefore, these persons can become indifferent toward the fate of their brethren behind the Iron Curtain.

ABANDON HOPE

In addition, the Kremlin overlords plainly hope to induce certain other Christians and Jews to abandon all hope in the truly spiritual life by embracing the alleged spirituality of militant atheism.

There might be some reason in the past why Americans of good faith and sterling integrity have been fooled by Red usage of the words "peace" and "democracy."

Those are goals we all highly desire, but today surely we have learned that they cannot be attained by any appeasement of Soviet power. To the contrary, by yielding again to them we are preparing the way for a war waged by the United States at a great disadvantage and for the possible Red ending of all democratic rights.

Surely none of us is so naive (particularly out of our experience) to believe that spirituality can reside in any way in atheistic communism. And each one of us can dedicate ourselves to warning our fellow citizens of this new-coined term designed for our disintegration.

There are other simple steps in these beginnings for the defense of our homes and our Nation that can easily be made and which I will discuss in the future. For the moment, if we could move every American man and woman, to a true understanding of how we have been hoaxed by the upside-down, fraudulent language of Moscow and its agents, we would make great progress in protecting the American mind from Soviet domination.

Flood Control and Navigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an editorial from the Franklin County Tribune, one of the oldest and most widely distributed county papers in the State, published at Union, the county seat of Franklin County, Mo., as follows:

ANYTHING FOR RECREATION?

This past week the metropolitan papers of St. Louis have started a crusade for development of the Meramec River Valley to provide recreation for the St. Louis area and, at the same time, an adequate water supply for industry which might be induced to move to St. Louis.

So now we have another reason for building dams on the Meramec River, Big River, and Bourbeuse River. The Army Engineers were just going to provide water for navigating the Mississippi River, flood control, and a recreation pool. These high three-level dams never did seem practical for any of the three purposes. And now we add a fourth—to supply water for industry.

Maybe there'll have to be a dam built below Moselle which would combine the waters of both the Meramec and Bourbeuse. Or maybe still closer to St. Louis. Of course, Meramec State Park and Meramec Caverns

will be flooded, to say nothing of most of the bottom farms in the county. At the time this location was urged by the engineers, it was estimated that water would back up as far as the termination of East Main Street in Union.

We know that floods along these rivers can be controlled. The results of the Muskingum Conservancy District in Ohio prove this beyond any doubt. Why does the situation have to be clouded by vague promises of recreation and navigation pools?

If any concerted effort is made for controlling floods in the Meramec River Basin, we are sure it will receive the support of a vast majority of Franklin County citizens. And we know that we can expect the strong support of Congressman CANNON.

Mr. Speaker, also in this connection I include the daily column by one of Missouri's most gifted writers, as it appears in the July 30, 1959, issue of the *St. Louis Review*, as follows:

REVIEWING THE SPORTS

(By Glen Goellner)

The new Missouri legislation authorizing soil and water conservancy districts has been misinterpreted, it seems, as a green light to go ahead with the building of three high dams in the Meramec Valley.

Actually, conservancy districts and big dam projects are diametrically opposed. Much of the confusion in the Meramec Valley controversy results from belief that the two can be dovetailed to attain the same end.

The person who speaks in favor of the conservancy district plan for improvement of the Meramec Valley and against the big dam reservoirs is suspected of attempting to paddle against the current. But it is entirely possible that a conservancy district would eliminate the need of the costly dams on the Meramec, Bourbeuse, and Big Rivers.

The theory behind a conservancy district is to reduce the flow of floodwater by use of correct land measures. This involves reforestation, balanced farming, controlled grazing, and supplemental projects such as small lakes and check dams. These projects would serve to hold much of the rainwater on the sheds where it falls and prevent most floods before they occur.

The advantages of the conservancy district are numerous. They include:

1. The cost would be only a fraction of the approximately hundred million dollars needed to build the dams and reservoirs.
2. Floods would be checked throughout the valley, while the reservoirs would be helpful only in those areas below the dams.
3. Land would be kept in production and its fertility would be improved, whereas the reservoirs would take land out of production, and do nothing to improve the remaining land.
4. Improved game and fish habitat would result from the fertile soil and clean streams, while mudflats and mudcats would be created by the fluctuating reservoirs.
5. Local control and management would be retained under the conservancy district plan, with the project tailored to meet the requirements of the region, while the big reservoirs would be "engineered" from Washington.

If all of this is true, why are the big reservoirs being considered? Primarily because they are intended as an aid to navigation on the larger streams, and secondly, because the large expenditures would give the valley an economic shot in the arm.

The earthen dams proposed for the three streams would be 172 feet in height. The first 60 feet of water in the reservoirs would be for conservation. The next 32 feet would be auxiliary water to be let out without notice to raise the level of the Missouri and

Mississippi Rivers for navigation. The final 36 feet would serve as a reservoir to impound floodwater.

This means that the reservoirs ("lakes" is a kindly name for these artificial bodies of water) will be subjected to a fluctuation of 68 feet, from the crest of the conservation pool to the crest of the flood pool.

It can easily be imagined what a drop or rise of 68 feet in the reservoir level would do to adjacent resorts, swimming beaches, fish spawn, duck blinds, and some of the other sundry "advantages" that are used to promote the multimillion-dollar project.

River navigation probably is important, although there is reason to doubt that it should be achieved at the expense of the general public. And high dams and large reservoirs cannot logically be opposed if their construction can be justified.

The danger here is that the old custom of putting the cart before the horse may again be perpetrated. The conservancy district plan should be put into operation first, and the big dams should be constructed only if their need then becomes apparent.

A lush, green valley, rich with crops and wildlife and floodproof industrial and residential sites, would be much more valuable in the long run than three lakes good for little else than navigation and motorboating.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I include a letter which is self-explanatory:

CHARLESTON, Mo., July 24, 1959.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CANNON: Just read your letter in today's *Globe-Democrat* regarding the Army Engineers and the Meramec.

I have owned a farm on the St. Francis River, below Wappapella Dam, before and after its construction. I can tell you some hair-raising stories of its stupid operation. It has ruined the river land. It has not been a flood-control dam in any sense.

If anyone should want high dams, we in the lower Mississippi Valley should. We in this delta area are used to the Army Engineers swarming all over the place figuring where they can spend out their annual appropriation. We in Mississippi County are still smarting under the stupid application of the so-called Jadwin plan, which cost over \$26 million, ruined our natural drainage and might have cut a whole 6 inches off the disastrous 1937 flood on the Mississippi at Cairo.

If you ever need help at a hearing on the Meramec Dam, let me know. I'll gladly donate my time in coming up.

Keep up your good work.

Yours truly,

J. M. WALLACE.

P.S.—If we are going to spend public moneys on flood control, let's build small dams high in the hills—keep the water where it is needed, and where it won't overflow the rich valleys. Since the waters won't be "navigable," the Army Engineers can't barge in on the deal.

Posthumous Medal for Dr. Ames Ends Gus Lambert's Long Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article

appearing in the *New Orleans States and Item* of July 31, 1959:

POSTHUMOUS MEDAL FOR DR. AMES ENDS GUS LAMBERT'S LONG CAMPAIGN

(By Pie Dufour)

More than 7 years ago—it was in May, 1952—an old Spanish-American War veteran named Gustav Lambert sat at my desk and insisted that the forgotten man in the conquest of yellow fever was Dr. Roger Post Ames of New Orleans.

For years, Gus Lambert, who lived in Chicago, had been campaigning for credit for Dr. Ames as an important participant in Walter Reed's experiments in Cuba, which ultimately demonstrated that yellow fever was carried by the *Stegomyia* mosquito.

Mr. Lambert, who was an Army nurse and the righthand man of Dr. Ames in Cuba, told me with tears in his eyes that nonrecognition by the U.S. Government of Dr. Ames was "the most damnable injustice that has ever been done a man."

But Gus Lambert's long fight to gain recognition for Dr. Ames ended successfully. Last August, a bill introduced by Representative HALE BOGGS for recognition for Dr. Ames' work and the posthumous awarding of a medal to him. In 1929, Walter Reed and other Army personnel who participated in the Cuban experiments were honored by Congress. But not Dr. Ames. And so Gus Lambert's campaign was launched. It ended in the office of Treasury Secretary Robert B. Anderson on Wednesday when that official bestowed the medal on Dr. Ames' widow.

Dr. Ames, a New Orleans physician—for years his brother kept the Ames Pharmacy on Hurst and Webster—was a contract physician with Maj. Walter Reed's unit in Cuba and it was he, aided by Lambert, who was the attending doctor to the "human" guinea pigs who had volunteered for the test.

But no recognition came to Ames, whose work Major Reed himself characterized as "invaluable . . . in all . . . things that pertained to the success of the investigation."

The first voice raised to secure justice for Dr. Ames' memory—he had died in Guatemala in 1914 while on a yellow fever mission—was that of a classmate in the Tulane medical class of 1889, Dr. W. M. Brumby, of Houston. He spent years compiling an impressive record of Dr. Ames' yellow fever work in the Walter Reed experiments and declared:

"Dr. Ames . . . was recognized as an expert in diagnosis and treatment of yellow fever. . . . His lifework was consecrated to serving humanity at the beck and call of pestilence and death. He was the first and the only one the Army thought of in time of need, and the last one thought of in tribute or praise after death. He had no friend at court. His friend, Major Reed, was dead."

I had a chance, on the occasion of Gus Lambert's visit to New Orleans in May 1952, to look at the photostatic record Dr. Brumby had gathered on behalf of Dr. Ames. He flatly stated that Dr. Ames was the only doctor who was in contact with the 14 men who contracted yellow fever in the epochal experiment: "There is no record of any other doctor at any time having charge of the actual handling of the 14 patients that were sick with the yellow fever."

Spurred on by Dr. Brumby's evidence, Gus Lambert, then 78 years old and partially crippled, continued the campaigning for Dr. Ames that he had been doing for years. And this campaign brought him to my desk.

"Dr. Ames was a great man and a great doctor," he said. "Without him, the yellow fever experiment would not have been a success. I know. I was there. And Walter Reed knew it, too. Had he lived, Dr. Ames would have been given the credit he so justly deserved. But Walter Reed died a couple of years after the discovery."

Despite this, Lambert said, that he wasn't going to give us until he died to get Dr. Ames credit for participation—and important participation—in the conquest of yellow fever. He showed me a letter he had received from J. L. Hanberry, of Orangeburg, S.C., the remaining surviving guinea pig in the experiment, and another from still another in the experiment, the late John H. Andrus.

"I will always believe," wrote Hanberry, "that if Major Reed had lived that Dr. Ames and yourself would have been given the credit you so richly deserve."

Andrus wrote: "I consider it a very grave injustice that—during his lifetime—Dr. Ames received no recognition for having played one of the most important parts in ridding the world of yellow fever."

Despite this sort of evidence from the men who were there and a letter from Walter Reed to Dr. Ames on completion of the experiment, Gus Lambert and Dr. Brumby couldn't get Government action.

But finally, Representative Boggs got the story and his bill was passed. The happy ending came when Mrs. Roger Post Ames received the medal Congress finally got around to bestowing on her husband.

Further Difficulties in Hasty Tombstone Promotion Action: Few Reserve Officers Know Whether They Are Qualified or Not

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the hasty action of Congress in eliminating the 34-year-old legislation which authorized so-called tombstone promotions in the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard has created many problems. One of these, which was never considered by this body or the other body, is the problem of knowing whether individual Reserve officers, who are also affected by this legislation, are or are not eligible for promotions of this type, so that these officers can have a reasonable opportunity to make their decision for retirement prior to November 1 of this year. This serious situation is discussed in detail in the August 8, 1958, issue of the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal in two different articles. I desire to bring this material to the attention of my colleagues, as one other justification for their support of the Stratton-Huddleston bill, H.R. 8549, which would extend the deadline for terminating these promotions from November 1, 1959, to July 2, 1960, in the interest of fairness to all concerned.

I also desire to include with my remarks an editorial from the Navy Times of August 8. The various articles follow:

[From the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal, Aug. 8, 1959]

QUANDARY CONFRONTS SEA SERVICE OFFICERS ON "TOMBSTONES" WHAT'S "COMBAT" NOT CLEAR

Can a Navy or Marine Corps officer who elects voluntary retirement be assured that his "combat" decoration entitles him to a "tombstone" promotion? The answer is no.

In response to a Journal query, the Navy said this week that it has received a number of phone calls from officers asking if a medal they have earned permits them to be advanced if they submit retirement applications in time to meet the cutoff date established in the new hump bill.

These officers are being informed that a decision regarding the possibility of their receiving a grade increase on the retired list can not be made until the Navy has in hand a formal retirement request.

The Navy makes determinations concerning "tombstone" advancements only after an official retirement application is received, with the Secretary of the Navy having final word on the post retirement promotion.

Each case is individually reviewed by the Navy's Board of Decorations and Medals.

The law states that "tombstone" advancements will be awarded to officers "who have been specially commended for actual combat duty." The law does not state that award of a specific medal makes an officer eligible for "tombstone" promotion.

In making determinations concerning those eligible for promotion to the next higher rank on the retired list, the Board, as a general rule of thumb, interprets the word "actual" to mean "under fire."

Since the Navy does not make decisions before an officer asks to be retired, each individual is well advised to recall the circumstances surrounding his citation. Many citations made during World War II while technically "combat" awards, were not issued for service "under fire."

Some awards, in fact, are deemed by the Board to be "combat connected," and were issued for heroism following actual combat.

An example of the aftermath-of-combat citation would be a situation in which a rescue was made following the destruction of a naval vessel. An individual might have placed his life in jeopardy to save survivors after the actual combat exchange with the enemy.

Although, in this case, the individual acted heroically in a combat area, he might not be deemed to have been under enemy fire at the time he performed his valorous action.

AWARDS PROCEDURE

The awards that could be instrumental in advancement on the retired list are, in order of precedence: Medical of Honor, Navy Cross, DSM, Silver Star, Legion of Merit, DFC, Bronze Star, Air Medal, and Navy Commendation Ribbon with metal pendant.

As a general rule, the higher the award the greater the chance an officer has of receiving a retirement promotion.

Officers who have earned either of the two top decorations for extraordinary heroism have almost a 100-percent chance of being awarded postretirement advancement. There may be a few cases, however, of officers who have won the Navy Cross who may not be entitled to "tombstone" rank.

These officers may have received the medal for performance in a situation described above.

The majority of officers who have earned the third highest award—the Distinguished Service Medal—probably are not eligible for increased rank on the retired list, since this honor is given, in most cases, for meritorious service, not necessarily in a combat situation.

The fourth highest Navy medal—the Silver Star—like the first two on the list, gives an individual an almost automatic postretirement promotion.

DFC'S MAY DIFFER

Like the Distinguished Service Medal, the DFC may or may not entitle an officer for increased rank, since it is frequently given for noncombat achievement.

The Bronze Star also was awarded for both combat and noncombat duty and calls for a reading of the accompanying citation by the Board of Decorations and Medals.

The Air Medal, next lower in rank to the Bronze Star, seldom will entitle an officer to a "tombstone" advancement. The vast majority of Air Medals were issued automatically during World War II for each five missions flown by a pilot. The Navy does not hold, as a general rule, that the Air Medal fits the "specially commended" category.

The Navy Commendation Ribbon with metal pendant—the lowest award in the ladder of medals that may entitle an individual for advancement—is judged by the accompanying citation.

The Navy-Marine Corps Medal, which stands in rank between the DFC and the Bronze Star, has no bearing on "tombstone" rank. It is not given for combat heroism.

Award of a Purple Heart Medal is used as evidence that an officer has been in combat. It would clinch an officer's being eligible for a "tombstone" advancement, if he were the recipient of any other combat decoration.

[From the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal, Aug. 8, 1959]

The Navy may find itself under heavy fire from Capitol Hill if it doesn't take action to set up a procedure whereby an officer can be told in advance of his formal application for retirement whether or not he is entitled to the tombstone promotions that end November 1. As it now stands a decorated officer could very well apply for early retirement in order to attain the increased rank and then learn—too late—that he is not eligible.

Army and Air Force manpower officials resent the allegations which are being made in some naval quarters that these two services helped trigger the end of tombstone ranks for Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard officers. This, of course, is no new matter at the Pentagon. For more than 8 years, the Army and Air Force have taken the position that they didn't want tombstone advancements, and that it was up to the Department of Defense and Congress to decide if any changes in the law were desired. The Army and Air Force make the point that it was the Navy alone which went to Congress with the request for enactment of the "hump" legislation that resulted in the tombstone decision.

The Navy's surprise at the sudden turn of legislative events which resulted in the loss of a privilege that has been on the statute books since 1925 is evident in the fact that there was no opportunity to argue the case for extending the deadline beyond November 1. Although there is certain to be continued protest for weeks to come from many Sea Service officers, this will be tempered by the recognition among thousands of officers below the rank of commander and lieutenant colonel that without the passage of the "hump" bill, their chances for promotion would have been greatly reduced.

That's the way it always is with force out legislation or policy decisions to accelerate attrition. The older officers in senior ranks who must leave active duty are disgruntled over what they believe to be discriminatory action. On the other hand, the junior officers who must compete for a restricted number of vacancies in higher ranks generally take the attitude that, indeed, it's too bad some had to retire ahead of schedule, but without such retirements the good of the Service would be adversely affected.

A Presidential veto is out of the question on the Navy-Marine Corps "hump" legislation, which resulted from a Pentagon request. However, it will not be surprising if the Chief Executive decides to make some comment regarding the proposal to extend the effective date of the tombstone promotion repeal from November 1, 1959, to July 2, 1960.

No person in the administration knows better than the President the adverse morale impact in the Services when career people feel that the rules have been changed in the

middle of the game, a point that was stressed by Representative STRATTON in urging the July 1960 extension. Incidentally, one of the President's top legislative assistants is a Naval Reserve captain, Earle Chesney.

Representative STRATTON brought out a point that largely was overlooked in the quick Capitol repeal of tombstone advancements. This concerns the prospect of stepped-up retirements among Reserve officers on active duty, even though they are not directly affected by the "hump" selection features of the legislation. That's why it is significant that Congressman STRATTON gained in advance the support of Representative RIVERS, Democrat, of South Carolina. He is chairman of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Reserves.

Unless the Sea Services decide to fix specific deadlines for processing of retirement applications in time for November 1 retirements, there will be considerable consternation and confusion in officer ranks. As the situation stood at the time the Journal went to press, the Navy and Marine Corps were advising officers to submit applications as quickly as possible, but declined to set deadlines. Possible explanation is the Navy's hope that the tombstone death date of November 1 will be extended. If it isn't, the Navy and Marine Corps seemingly would be well advised to fix specific deadlines.

[From the Navy Times, Aug. 8, 1959]

SHAMEFUL

Well, the hump bill is through Congress. We do want to express our appreciation to the Senate Armed Services Committee for keeping a readjustment pay provision in the bill despite the numerous pressures to drop it. The \$2,000, plus payment for unearned leave, will be of some help to the officers forced from the active list on short notice.

But the committee did something else to the bill we don't like at all. We refer to the denial of advanced rank on the retired list to officers who retire after November 1—3 short months away.

Now there are arguments on both sides about these so-called tombstone promotions.

In favor of them is the fact that they didn't bring any extra pay, and that they were honors promised to those who by gallantry in actual combat helped the country they serve to a great victory. Also, such promotions were eventually going to disappear since no combat action after 1947—to all practical purposes, after 1945—could result in such a promotion.

On the other side are the facts that rank is somewhat cheapened and recalls to duty are in a grade never served in. There is also the fact that the Army and Air Force don't have them. (Though, on this latter point, we recall those release-from-duty promotions the Army and Air Force handed out to thousands of reservists—promotions which were worth money to those who remained in the Reserve programs.)

Personally, we think the tombstone promotions could have been allowed the originally slated natural death. But let's say, for the sake of this argument, that the advancements should have been abolished.

The questions then are what would have been the proper method and the proper time.

As to the method, the committee should have held hearings on the proposals, should have given those affected by the move and their representatives an opportunity to present their case. The right to be heard on pending legislation is one of the keystones of our form of Government.

Instead of this, the committee reported out the bill with the repealer on July 23; the Senate passed it July 27. The House accepted the amendments, and closed the case, the next day, July 28. Four working days.

As for timing, look what's been done.

Let's group officers into six classes:

1. The valley behind the hump.
2. The hump.

3 and 4. Captains and colonels above the hump with 5 years in grade.

5 and 6. Commanders and light colonels above the hump, twice passed over.

The valley isn't affected. They'll get normal OPA attrition at selection points; few have combat citations.

The hump is definitely hit. Not only do these majors and lieutenant commanders who earned citations as junior officers face double attrition rates in forthcoming selections, but those twice-passed over and, eventually forced out will lose the tombstone promotions they had been promised.

The four groups above the hump will be forced out in large numbers. But Congress, instead of sending them home with the thanks of the Republic for service in two wars, is giving them an extra kick in the pants.

Fine thing.

Of the groups, perhaps the twice-passed-over lieutenant colonels are the luckiest in that, at least, they know they've all got to go, and they can choose between \$2,000 and tombstone promotion.

The other three groups can't even make that choice intelligently. After all, two in three captains, one in five colonels, one in three commanders is going to stay. But if they wait to find that out, the deadline for a tombstone will have passed.

Also at issue, in addition to the \$2,000, are such things as (a) another 2½ percent of active duty pay for some, (b) maybe even the 22- or 26-year foggy, (c) adequate time for physical processing, (d) time to line up a new career. High prices indeed to take the tombstone they've earned.

What a dilemma. What a few uncertainty to be forced needlessly on top of the uncertainties created by the basic hump bill.

If tombstone promotions had to be abolished, then the date could have been geared to the expiration of the hump bill, 5 years hence.

Forcing these men who've fought two wars for their Congress and their country to rush out without waiting to know whether they are to be continued or not, or to rush out as soon as they hear the news (giving up the get-ready time promised them)—that, or lose a promotion which also had been promised them.

Well, the shameful deed has been done.

We can only hope that the Navy and Marine Corps heads—who had no part in this body blow—will bend every effort to minimize the deed as much as they can.

They can try to make retirement processing as fast and as thorough as possible, to insure that those who go can get out as close to the dates they wish as possible and with adequate physical processing.

And they can send them home with the thanks of the Navy and the corps, to offset a bit the ingratitude of Congress.

Mary T. Norton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include a richly deserved editorial on our late friend and former colleague, Hon. Mary T. Norton, appearing in the Washington Star of August 7, 1959:

MARY T. NORTON

Mrs. Mary T. Norton, dead at 84, will be long remembered in Washington for her good works in behalf of a better National Capital.

Although the interests of the former New Jersey Representative were varied, she devoted much of her long career in Congress to matters related to public welfare—always giving them the human interest touch. As first woman head of a House committee, she used her chairmanship of the District Committee to demand elimination of the city's slums, to seek suffrage for the District's "second-class citizens," to obtain the Glenn Dale Hospital for tuberculosis victims and otherwise to improve the lot of those who live here. A skilled politician and legislator, she fought hard and often successfully for the things in which she believed. Washington has lost a good friend with her passing.

The Reds Are Guilty of Genocide in Tibet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the Saturday Evening Post of August 8, 1959, appears an editorial entitled "The Reds Are Guilty of Genocide in Tibet," relating to Communist atrocities, in this case Red China, in Tibet, which editorial I include in my remarks:

THE REDS ARE GUILTY OF GENOCIDE IN TIBET

People in the comfortable countries, including the United States, have grown so used to reading about mass murders in far-away places that it is hard for them nowadays to feel these things as real. Atrocities have become commonplace. Have Red China's army and secret police been killing Tibetans in large numbers? Of course. But murder by Communists is such an old story that most of us merely turn the page to murders by juvenile delinquents.

The Chinese Reds are not simply suppressing a rebellion by taking the lives of the rebels. More than that, they seem to be killing Tibetans because they are Tibetans; thus they commit the crime of genocide, which means the slaughter of a people.

The matter has been investigated by the International Commission of Jurists, an alliance of lawyers with headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland. Its record is one of sharp struggle against tyranny. After the Tibetan uprising in early spring this legal group called on its branch in India to search out the facts.

Experts were appointed by the Indian Commission of Jurists to interview witnesses and collect and study documents. After 2 months of investigation, a report has been rendered by the general secretary, Purshotam Trikamdas, who was once secretary to Mohandas K. Gandhi.

The Indian commission has found "a prima facie case that . . . there has been an attempt to destroy the national, ethnic, racial, and religious group of Tibetans by killing members of the group and by causing serious bodily and mental harm. These acts constitute the crime of genocide under the Genocide Convention of the United Nations of 1948." Prime Minister Nehru, however, has said that, because of the absence of Red China from the United Nations, he doubted that the U.N. could take up the Tibetan case.

However, the charge of genocide was soon made officially by the legal head of the Tibetan Government, the Dalai Lama, speaking from his place of refuge in India. "Complete absorption and extinction of the Tibetan race is being undertaken," he declared. There is "terrible deportation and execution of innocent men."

A former delegate from India to the United Nations, B. S. Ghani, says that Red China has an "ultimate aim. It wants to colonize Tibet."

Hitler similarly wanted to colonize Poland and other countries of Eastern Europe. To that end he murdered vast numbers of their inhabitants. Stalin committed genocide repeatedly, long before that term was coined to give the crime a particular name. In two continents, from the Baltic to Central Asia and farther north in Siberia, he exterminated, he deported, he colonized. Men and women and children who escaped immediate death were shipped around like low-grade cattle. There are places like Kazakhstan, in Asia, where colonists from other parts of the Kremlin's empire have become the majority; those natives who remain are outnumbered in their own country.

Now Mao Tse-tung and his fellow slave-masters in Peking are apparently committing the same wholesale crime in Tibet. In view of the charges by the Dalai Lama and the Indian Commission of Jurists, the United Nations should make a thorough investigation, even if the guilty nation is not a U.N. member. Otherwise, what good is the U.N.'s Genocide Convention of 1948?

The Control of Inflation by Making Price Stability an Explicit Goal of National Economic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, my studies on the causes of inflation and its impact upon the various segments of our economy, have led me to suggest several areas where the Government could take specific steps to curb the disastrous effects of inflation.

One of the most elemental of these is the statement of policy which the Federal Government should make to insure that reasonable price stability is an explicit goal of our economic policy.

To do this, I have today introduced a bill which would amend the Employment Act of 1946 so that price stability can be included as an integral part of the economic policy of the country.

In addition to promoting maximum employment, production, and purchasing power under the act, my bill would add the simple but all-important statement, "at reasonably stable prices." This would become the new declaration of policy under the Employment Act of 1946.

In that section of the Employment Act dealing with the Economic Report of the President, my bill would call for the report to set forth also "current and foreseeable trends in prices levels prevailing in the economy, and other steps, if any, which have been taken to counter inflationary and deflationary pressures arising within the economy."

The legislation which I am introducing would also call upon the Council of Economic Advisers to include among its duties the recommendation of policies on purchasing power and maintenance of a reasonably stable level of prices.

The President has recommended in his state of the Union message this year that the Employment Act of 1946 be amended to include reasonable price stability as an explicit goal of the Federal economic policy.

The interim report of the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability and Economic Growth recommended that Congress give highest priority to the proposal outlined by the President.

My friends, this is one of the elementary things which Congress can do: speak out clearly on price stability and thus assure the people that it is our goal to fight inflation at this level by every means.

I do not recommend forced price controls. In many respects, they would be worse than our present situation. Price controls always lead to wage controls and the freedom of the individual and our economy both suffer. Such controls have been in force in war time, but certainly they should not be justified in time of peace. Peace stability can be implemented with the same force and direction that we give to maintaining as full employment as possible; or full production; or full purchasing power. The policy needs the direction which a specific national goal, backed by the administration and the Congress, can give it.

There comes a time in the implementation of our economic policy when we should give the consumer a break. I agree with my colleague, Congressman WALTER JUDD who helped draft the original Employment Act of 1946, and who also sees the wisdom of amending that act now so that price stability is covered.

Congressman JUDD feels that when the combined forces of industry and labor increase productivity, which usually results in an increase in wages and profits, there should also be some thought given to price reductions. I concur that one of the rounds in the wage-price spiral should veer off to benefit the consumer. Whenever possible, give him a reduced price to lower the cost of living and help improve his purchasing power. You can see how much we would broaden the base of purchasing power if we were to think in terms of reduced prices for the consumer once in a while.

At the present time one of America's largest industries is in the throes of a costly strike. Wages in the steel industry are high. Profits have been high also. There is no doubt in my mind that steel prices can be reduced and the normal workload carried on with a reasonable cost-of-living increase in wages, or comparable fringe benefits, and still give a tremendous boost to the average consumer who is seeing his purchasing power dwindle more each time there is a strike which increases wages and inevitably increases prices. What a great thing it would be to give the consumer a seat at the bargaining table and to consider his stake. We would really be combating inflation then.

I am also disturbed by the announcement that one of the major oil companies might increase the price of gasoline; only a cent a gallon to be sure, but, nevertheless, another increase. Nothing I have read or heard to date convinces me that

there is any solid justification for an increase. We all know that it would spread to the other companies and the consumer would be nicked again.

This is the time to hold the line; to use every voluntary means of holding down prices. When we do this we halt the spiral; we improve the purchasing power of the average individual and we make a solid blow against the cruelest tax of all—inflation.

Congress has the power to act in seeing that price stability is forthrightly enunciated as one of the goals of our economic policy. This would be the opportune time to make the simple, but important, changes which we need to put the Federal Government on the side of those taking earnest steps to control inflation. Whether it is my bill, or one of similar intent, is not important. The important thing is to write this language on price stability into law so that our future programs will be governed by it.

Blackmail Picketing in a Velvet Glove

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we are supposed to start debate on the so-called labor bill. I am sure every Member of this body is well aware of the deep issues involved. Every segment of our society has a vital interest in this proposed legislation because it affects all the elements of our complex economic life. It has much emotional appeal to the general public—because it affects every man who labors within or outside the unions.

Perhaps no one has a greater interest than the man who wants to labor and earn his wages free from the demands of coercive, racketeering, power hungry labor bosses—whose sole interest seems to be to get more money in the boss-controlled union treasury, so that he can get more power over his own members and the public at large by spending this money on controlling to a greater extent the political affairs of his community, State, and Nation.

Too many people are of the opinion that whenever a State adopts a so-called right-to-work law that this would solve all so-called labor problems. Such is not the case.

I trust that my colleagues will read the following letter written by a labor boss in Wichita, Kans. This is the new modern Teamsters approach for unionization of all employees. Read it carefully because this method and technique can be applied to any employer in America. The approach, as indicated in this letter, is clever and diabolical—another example of Hoffaism run wild. The letter shows the draftsmanship of a skiller operator who is sure of himself after being carefully advised by a sharp legal practitioner.

The form of this letter was initiated in Chicago and was used there on Chicago employers where it was highly successful.

Here is the letter as delivered to six trucking firms in Wichita, Kans. These firms are now being picketed as of this date—yet there is no strike, no contract negotiation, no nothing except blackmail of the rankest, foulest odor:

CHAUFFEURS, TEAMSTERS, AND HELPERS,
LOCAL UNION NO. 795,
Wichita, Kans., July 22, 1959.

DEAR SIR: Local 795, IBT, has decided to embark upon a campaign to organize your office and clerical employees. To induce your employees to join this union, we shall begin to picket your establishment on or about the 27th of July 1959. We assure you that the picketing will be entirely peaceful. We have instructed our pickets not to threaten, intimidate, or coerce anyone. If there is any violation of those instructions, please advise us and we shall see to it that corrective action is taken immediately.

We wish to make it clear to you that local 795 does not at this time represent, and of course we do not claim to represent, a majority of your office and clerical employees. Local 795 does not ask you to recognize it as exclusive bargaining representative for your employees, or indeed, ask you to recognize it for any purpose at this time. The purpose of our picketing is solely to call to the attention of union members and supporters of organized labor that your office and clerical employees are not members of local 795.

We hope that the demonstration of support of local 795 in its efforts to organize, which this picketing will produce, will persuade your employees to become members of our local union. When they do, they will join the thousands of other employees who are affiliated with the great International Brotherhood of Teamsters. In engaging in this picketing campaign, we are speaking for the members of our organization who are employed in businesses like yours and who feel the brunt of the unfair competition of your unorganized employees.

This point we must emphasize. We are not making any demand upon your company at this time to agree to or execute any contract with our union covering any of your employees. Under the law your company is permitted to recognize and bargain with our local union only after a majority of your employees have authorized the union to represent them. Therefore, even if your company should now or hereafter offer to recognize our union or enter into collective bargaining with us our union would refuse such an offer and we would continue to refuse until your employees lawfully authorize us to represent them. Should your employees desire to join our union, they may apply for membership at the office of local 795, 417 East English, Wichita, Kans., or ask one of the pickets for a membership application card which they can fill out and return to him. When we have received applications from a majority of your employees, we will contact your company further.

You should also understand that it is your right under the Constitution of the United States and under the National Labor Relations Act to advise your employees of the economic detriment which you and they will sustain as a result of the withholding of patronage from your concern by union members and sympathizers as long as they remain nonmembers of our union.

You may, in the exercise of your lawful rights, explain these detriments to your employees and urge them to apply for membership in the union and thereby acquire for themselves and for your company the good will of our union and its friends. You may not, and we are sure that you will not, threaten to take economic reprisal against your

employees, or grant them benefits, to coerce their choice in this matter. However, we feel sure that if your employees, who have been carefully taught to look to you for leadership on matters affecting their employment, are convinced that it is your sincere desire that they join the union, they will quickly realize that acquisition of union membership at the earliest opportunity is in their best interest.

Yours very truly,

S. E. SMITH,
President and Business Representative.

Mr. Speaker, now that you have read this blackmail letter—do you believe there are very many small businessmen in your district who can survive this sort of blackmail?

Briefly this is what the letter says:

"We know the law, and the law says we can picket you as an exercise of free speech so long as we do it peacefully.

"We know, also, that our picket at your door will put you out of business because you will not be able to move goods so long as our picket is there.

"We are under no necessity to sell the union to your employees because you will compel them to join our membership as quickly as the picketing shoe starts to pinch.

"There is no occasion for us to use force and violence and risk possible injunction proceedings against us because you, Mr. Employer, will do our job for us. You'll have to—or go out of business.

"We don't care about what your employees think or want. They will join our union or they won't work for you.

"We don't care, either, for the supposed constitutional or moral rights of your employees. They lost their rights when the lawmakers and the courts ceased to protect them and delivered their economic destiny into our hands."

This is the question every Member must answer: "Shall Congress submit to these blackmail evils?" Can a \$2-a-day man, carrying a placard, close up a business—under the guise of "It's legal because it is peaceful." We hear much about Iron Curtains—the Bamboo Curtain—the great free world society—but what about a curtain set up by a \$2-a-day picket?

The Speaker's Rebuke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial appearing in *Business Week*, August 1, 1959:

THE SPEAKER'S REBUKE

Speaker SAM RAYBURN has a sharp tongue, but there was considerable justice as well as sharpness in the rebuke he administered last week to some of the more vocal supporters of the Federal Reserve Board.

"I have been forced to the conclusion," RAYBURN declared, "that the Federal Reserve authorities have reached a point in

their thinking where they consider themselves immune to any direction or suggestion by the Congress, let alone a simple expression of the sense of Congress."

Speaker RAYBURN's voice is a powerful one in Washington, and when he says something like this, it is worth listening to. In fairness, though, his rebuke should apply not to the Fed itself but to some of its more ardent champions who have rushed to attack the proposed "sense of Congress" amendment to the bill raising the ceiling on the interest rate the Federal Government can pay.

The merits of the amendment itself may be arguable—though it can be remarked in passing that the language is moderate and the principle has been supported by some highly qualified students of central banking (*Business Week*, July 18, 1959, p. 123).

But whether the amendment is wise or foolish, the right of Congress to give these or any other instructions to the Fed should be beyond question. The Fed itself has always acknowledged this. But some of its partisans with their charges of a "political foray" seems to have forgotten it.

It is a basic principle of our Government—and an excellent principle—that the expert administrator operates not by divine authority but by virtue of his ability to persuade duly elected representatives of the laity that he knows what he is doing.

Regardless of what happens to the "sense of Congress" amendment, it will be a sad day for the country—and for the Federal Reserve System—if we ever try to operate on any other basis.

Washington Evening Star Supports Stratton-Huddleston Bills for More Orderly Termination of "Tombstone" Promotion Procedure in the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the other day the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] and I introduced legislation, H.R. 8549, to provide for a more orderly implementation of the decision of the Congress to bring to an end the so-called tombstone promotion procedure in effect in the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard. I am delighted that the widely read and influential *Washington Evening Star* has come out editorially in support of our legislation. I commend to the attention of every Member of this body and of the other body the thoughtful editorial published in the *Star* on August 8, 1959. I hope as a result of the consideration so ably presented in this editorial that Congress will soon support our legislation to bring about a fairer and more orderly elimination of the "tombstone" arrangement.

The editorial follows:

ONE-TWO PUNCH

Representative RIVERS of South Carolina, a member of the House Armed Services Committee, has given an apt description of the abrupt action of Congress in eliminating the so-called tombstone promotions of Navy, Marine, and Coast Guard Officers upon re-

tirement. He said the ban on honorary stepups in rank, on top of "hump" legislation forcing early retirement of many combat veterans, constitutes a one-two punch to officers who have served their Nation well. It is not surprising that turmoil among officers immediately affected has resulted, with potentially serious effects on morale of the sea services.

The "tombstone" promotion ban was not an economy measure, since the one-grade elevations in rank on retirement of decorated Regular and Reserve officers do not cost the Government a penny. They are purely honorary promotions, not increasing retirement pay. They do have value to the officers involved, however, in their quest for jobs in civilian life. It is true that the Army and the Air Force have been discriminated against in this system, which for 34 years has applied only to Navy and Marine officers. It was because of this discrimination, apparently, that the Senate amended the "hump" legislation to ban the retirement promotions.

But to end the 34-year-old practice by November 1 of this year, without advance notice to the many officers concerned and without giving them adequate opportunity to revise their retirement plans, is to deliver a low blow to men who deserve, instead, a pat on the back, at least. It takes time to process retirement applications, and some officers who may wish to retire before the November 1 deadline on "tombstone" stepups are at sea or abroad and will have little or no time to consult their families on their future course of action.

Since both houses of Congress have approved the sudden ban—with too little consideration of its far-reaching implications—there are only two ways in which the blow can be softened. One is by presidential veto, which is unlikely because of the urgency of the "hump" legislation to which the ban amendment is attached. This legislation is desired by the Pentagon to smooth out the so-called hump of officers awaiting promotion—a hump resulting from the vast increase in officer personnel during World War II. The other way is one proposed by Representatives STRATTON, of New York, and HUDDLESTON, of Alabama. They have introduced a bill to postpone the cutoff deadline on retirement promotions until July 2, 1960. That would give the affected officers more time in which to consider their retirement problems and to make decisions.

The delay plan makes more sense than terminating "almost overnight" (as Mr. STRATTON put it) a 34-year-old procedure for giving retired officers a bit more prestige and a higher rank to be inscribed on their tombstones.

A Bipartisan Commission To Study the Nonmineral Public Land Laws of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to establish a Bipartisan Commission To Study the Nonmineral Public Land Laws of the United States. The Commission will be charged with the responsibility of recommending to the next Congress a more effective, simplified, and adequate system of laws governing the transfer of title to public lands. I am convinced

that the alternative to a new and modern system of land laws is chaos.

Every Member of Congress from our public land States knows that there is something drastically wrong with present methods of transferring title to our public lands to individuals, associations, corporations, and to States and local governments. With ever-increasing frequency we receive letters from our constituents complaining about the delay, redtape, and injustices they have experienced after applying for a tract of the public domain under our existing laws. These complaints are duly relayed by us to the Bureau of Land Management, which administers the laws. I know of no more frustrating experience than that of being advised by the Bureau that the application from my constituent will be taken up in its turn, but because of the present workload action should not be expected for at least a year.

Modernization of our nonmineral public land laws is long overdue. As this Nation expanded it was to the interest of our Government to get the public domain into private hands as rapidly as possible. The Nation needed revenue, our land needed developing, and the country needed the crops such development produced.

Laws to facilitate the transfer of the public domain into private ownership were enacted to meet the needs of the times. Altogether, some 5,000 private and public laws have been passed by Congress for this purpose. Many of those laws are still on the books and as a result our Government and its citizens are confronted with a patchwork of conflicts and contradictions.

The multiplicity of these laws governing disposal of the public domain has created intolerable administrative difficulties.

For example, a single tract of unreserved, vacant public domain can be covered simultaneously by applications under the Desert Entry, Small Tract, Homestead, Private Exchange, Soldier's Script Rights, Public Sale, Recreation, and Public Purposes, or State School Selection Acts. The cost to the Government of resolving these conflicts, of deciding under which act the tract should be disposed of and to whom, vastly exceeds the value of the land itself.

Compounding the confusion created by this hodgepodge of law is the ever-increasing pressure from our citizens, local governments, and industry for acquisition or use of the public domain. Under present laws, each application must be considered separately. The land involved must be examined and classified. Protests must be heard. Appeals must be decided. Conflicts must be resolved. In 1954, the Bureau started the year with a backlog of 25,013 cases to be adjudicated. By 1958, despite generous increases in appropriations to expedite these cases, the backlog had increased to 54,725.

A large number of these cases are traceable to the operations of land locators. Taking advantage of the present complexities of our public land laws, they have led thousands of our citizens to believe that the public domain is

theirs for the asking. Their clients are not told that before they can obtain title under the Desert Land Act, the land must be irrigated and put into agricultural production. Assuming that water is available—which in most cases is not—this requires an outlay of over \$25,000. Yet these land locators continue to bilk the general public out of millions of dollars per year by filing applications which they know are doomed to rejection. The administrative burden this imposes upon the Government is tying up effective management or transfer of the public domain.

The study commission proposed in my bill would limit its consideration to nonmineral public land laws. I do not mean to imply that there are not conflicts in other public land use statutes. It is, however, in the field of public land disposition where administrative burdens imposed by conflicting laws are penalizing the individual seeking land, the Government, and the taxpayer.

The commission would be bipartisan, three members to be appointed by the Speaker of the House, three by the President of the Senate, and three by the President. A thoroughgoing study of our nonmineral land laws has been needed for years. The redrafting of these laws to meet present-day needs of our people is a must. Until this is done, effective and efficient administration of the public domain is impossible.

Saucer Groups' Family Quarrels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the second of a series of articles about flying saucers by Mr. George Todt, of the North Hollywood (Calif.) Valley Times.

In this article Mr. Todt reports on flying saucer devotees, the organized and unorganized people who seem dedicated to their cause, some merely as a hobby, others for serious scientific purposes:

SAUCER GROUPS' FAMILY QUARRELS

Are the flying saucer devotees just one big happy family?

No, they are not. Quite the contrary, in fact. Some of the aficionados are hardly on speaking terms with one another.

There is a valid reason for all of this, of course. The story behind the story is a fascinating one. Let's take a backstage look-see for ourselves.

The greatest schism among flying saucer fans—at least here in the United States, certainly—actually stems from the manner of approach to the interesting subject, itself.

Generally speaking, there are two main groups to be considered in the overall picture. They differ from each other almost as much as night from day. Actually poles apart, no less.

Just what is the realistic measure of difference, then?

One group prefers to be identified as "UFOlogists"—taken from the name "UFO," which stands for "unidentified flying objects." As a rule, these people are found to be the serious, scientific students of the exciting phenomenon now taking place in our heavens. Their eyes are turned expectantly up to the sky, but their feet are also very definitely upon the ground. Solid citizens, if you ask me.

They collect data, keep files of UFO sightings for future reference, make evaluations therefrom, and are of the considered opinion that the elusive celestial objects may at least be classified as the most stimulating scientific mystery of our times.

Among such intellectually curious students are numbered today many outstanding aviators, space scientists, engineers, radar experts, college professors, ministers, high-ranking officers of the armed services, and others.

Some of them have been demanding that the U.S. Congress should investigate the UFO's in an effective manner, holding open hearings on the subject—and then making the findings or conclusions available to the public.

Many Congressmen have lately been indicating sympathy for such a project—and it just might come off one day soon.

The second self-contained segment inside the un-integrated flying saucer fraternity, which represents the other side of the coin in this instance, is the so-called contactee group, or saucerians.

As the word "contactee" indicates, many of these people purport to have made contact with those whom they call the space people—either by physical means or utilization of mysterious and mystical techniques which are never subject to objective scientific analysis or other kinds of demonstrable proof.

Some of the contactees claim to have been whisked away by the space people to other planets where they say they were allowed to see the workings of advanced races on their their home grounds.

Others tell us that they have managed to achieve mind-to-mind contact with "etherians" on another planet of existence beyond this mortal sphere. Some explain that they have had visions in which supernatural beings explained to them that the saucers were merely the advance guard of the Lord's host en route to Armageddon.

And, of course, the ancient lore of Tibet and its hidden mysteries can also be counted to crop up in the astounding tales we are told.

All of which may be interesting enough to those who like to hear a good story upon occasion, but there is at least one glaring deficiency among these folks—some of whom manage to give us the impression of being quite sincere in their personal beliefs, incidentally.

Their fault lies in the fact that they are seldom concerned very much, if indeed they ever are, to back up their astonishing claims with anything resembling scientific proof of any type whatsoever.

Can we be blamed for wondering about them under circumstances such as have been described?

Khrushchev Would Feel at Home at TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the

Appendix of the RECORD, I include excerpts from a newsletter of August 9 by Mr. Thurman Sensing, executive vice president of the Southern States Industrial Council, of Nashville, Tenn., as follows:

As more or less of a postscript, we notice a Senator has written the President a letter urging him by all means to have Mr. Khrushchev include a survey of the TVA in his tour of the United States. Well, if the thought is to make him feel at home, we should say that is a pretty good idea—because he will certainly find no free enterprise there. But what is Mr. Khrushchev himself to think, when we parade the TVA before him with pride, than that we are already aping his philosophy of state ownership and state control—and that we are already on our way toward making his prophecy about our grandchildren come true? We all want peace, yes, but must we obtain it at the expense of consorting with Communists and by the loss of our self-respect?

Mr. Speaker, it is noteworthy, but not surprising, since the organization which Mr. Sensing represents is located in the heart of the Tennessee Valley Authority, that he would dare make such a statement; but the facts are, Mr. Sensing, like most every patriotic, deep-thinking American who lives close to the scene, knows full well that the final effect of that socialistic, autocratic empire within our free Republic will bring nothing but dictatorship and misery to the good people of that vast area who are at this very minute dominated by a board of three men not elected by the people.

One of the most important duties of Congress, now and in the near future, is to keep the Socialists from organizing the other great river valleys in the United States of America and prevent the same fate as has befallen the people in the Tennessee River Valley—for if that should be accomplished then 27 men not elected by the people would be in complete control of the lives and property of every American.

I hope every reader of this statement will write me requesting a copy of my speech of May 4 on this all-important subject.

We Celebrate Freedom on Grave of Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on July 5 the Palm Beach Post Times of West Palm Beach, Fla., printed a fine editorial entitled "We Celebrate Freedom on Grave of Patriotism." In the belief that these comments will be of inspiration to all Members, I have requested that it be printed here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

WE CELEBRATE FREEDOM ON GRAVE OF PATRIOTISM

Yesterday, the people of the United States of America observed the 183d anniversary

of a historic document—the Declaration of Independence.

Sadly, it was a perfunctory observance—a far cry from what was once referred to as "the great and glorious Fourth."

A few desultory firecrackers broke the general calm; the usual dutiful parades and unlistened-to speeches went off on schedule. But for the most part it was just another weekend holiday devoted to rest and pleasure seeking.

Engrossed in their own personal enjoyment of the rights of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," few gave thought to the valiant men who pledged "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor" to the preservation of those rights.

Fewer still, perhaps, pondered the contemporary meaning of the declaration "That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Actually, those words, in the precarious times of 1776, were little more than a pious hope for better times—a challenge to a despot. It was not until this yearning for freedom had been incorporated into written law, in the Constitution of the United States of America, that these unalienable rights became realities.

It was this Constitution which established a Government dedicated to securing those rights; a Government deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed. Freedom took therefrom form, substance, and meaning.

Our ancestors deemed this an event worth celebrating. For a century and a half, the light of patriotism burned brightly on the Fourth of July. No one was ashamed to be openly patriotic.

But of recent years it seems that patriotism has become old fashioned. Some are beginning to preach that independence is no longer an adequate word to describe the great event we celebrate on July 4.

One writer of recent vintage asked point blank the question: "Who is independent today and what are they independent of? . . . Just how many of us would want to be independent today if we could—Independent of strong central Government, allies, taxes, and all the services that taxes pay for?"

The implication here is plain, but the writer made it even plainer with the assertion that years of isolationism have made foreign entanglements inevitable, if not vitally necessary to the preservation of our Nation.

And he went on to redefine the meaning of freedom in the broader context of a decent life for all, achieved through national and international cooperation, even though it may limit a certain kind of rugged individualism.

That is the philosophy of socialism and of one worldism. And that is what has dimmed the luster of the glorious Fourth.

The founders of our freedom sought to prevent the establishment of a too strong central Government, knowing that such Government inevitably evolve into tyrannies.

They sought to avoid foreign entanglements, knowing that their freedoms could thereby be compromised.

They condemned taxation without representation and sought to put safeguards in the Constitution against unjust or confiscatory taxes.

They set up a government to be supported by the people, never intending a government to support the people.

They laid the foundation for an economy in which equality of opportunity gave birth to the free enterprise system—the most successful in the history of the world.

But now we are being told that these principles of freedom are out of style. The new freedom, it seems, depends on an all-powerful central Government which dis-

penses its blessings through a gigantic bureaucracy.

Free enterprise is an anachronism called "rugged individualism," a vestige of the Stone Age. In its place we are being offered the "freedom" of socialism.

And, naturally, the larger modern freedom encompasses the whole world. It is implied that none of us can be really free unless we rid ourselves of the nationalism which was once considered the keystone of our freedom.

Under the pressures of this "broader context" it is little wonder that the basic principles of freedom as laid down in the Declaration of Independence have been obscured.

"Government by consent of the governed" has in effect been held unconstitutional in recent Supreme Court decisions, and the small voices raised in protest have been drowned in the rantings of proponents of the new freedom.

Yes; we still celebrate freedom on the Fourth of July. But it was not secured to us by the men of '76. It is something that each generation must earn and preserve for itself.

History may record that our generation has failed.

The next generation may celebrate its "freedom" by rattling its shackles.

General Executive Board of Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America Recognize the Serious Threat of Low Wage Foreign Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the problem of foreign competition, in goods manufactured abroad in low wage areas where workers are not protected by American labor standards is one of our most serious economic problems of our day. We in the 32d Congressional District of New York, which is the center of the glove-manufacturing industry in America, are particularly conscious of this problem and of the heavy distress in terms of the unemployment of loyal American workers which it has created.

I was tremendously impressed the other day to have brought to my attention a statement adopted recently by the general executive board of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America dealing with this important problem. I believe the statement of the general board will be of interest to every Member of this House, and I commend the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America for their leadership once again in an important national issue. The statement follows:

STATEMENT ON IMPORTS OF MEN'S AND BOYS' APPAREL ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE AMALGAMATED CLOTHING WORKERS OF AMERICA, JULY 6, 1959

Unfair competition from imports represents a serious threat to the workers of the men's and boys' apparel industry in the United States and Canada. The volume of imports of apparel, particularly from Japan and Hong Kong, has increased enormously.

From 1954 to 1958, U.S. shirt imports, for example, have expanded over 800 percent. The knit-glove industry of the United States is well on the road to destruction; knit glove imports are about 250 percent of U.S. production. Imports of pajamas, robes, underwear, pants, raincoats, outerwear, gloves, sporting apparel, and equipment are increasing rapidly. Tailored clothing is arriving from abroad in ever larger quantities. Hong Kong's mail-order business in tailored clothing with customers in the United States and Canada continues to expand, and for the first time in Japan's history a ready-to-wear tailored clothing industry is being developed to export to the United States and Canada.

Unless effectively countered, the flow of men's and boys' apparel imports will continue to increase, with disastrous consequences for many segments of the industry and the destruction of many thousands of jobs. Producers in Japan and Hong Kong are being encouraged and assisted by large mail-order houses, chain stores and department stores which are apparently more interested in a quick profit on cheap labor than in a healthy domestic industry.

The apparel industry is particularly vulnerable to the kind of cutthroat competition represented by imports. Ever since World War II the proportion of the consumer dollar spent on apparel has been declining. The industry is intensely competitive, with a large number of small firms struggling for the declining share of consumer expenditures. As a result, profits are low, business mortality is high, and many firms are on the margin of existence. The struggle to survive in the industry's highly competitive environment generates powerful incentives to cut labor costs. Before the advent of the Amalgamated, the workers in the men's and boys' apparel industry bore the major brunt of this competitive pressure through starvation wages, and sweatshop conditions. The successful struggle to eliminate these evils in the men's and boys' apparel industry is a well-known part of the history of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

We now find that the hard-won labor standards of our members, and ultimately, their jobs, are threatened by these very same evils imported from abroad. The competitive advantage of imported wearing apparel is rooted in substandard wages—the equivalent of 10 cents per hour—and degrading working conditions. It is based on long hours of work—60 hours a week for women and children—under shocking conditions of health and sanitation. It is often the product of homework, with its shameful exploitation of the labor of the young, the aged, and the infirm. No apparel manufacturer in the United States and Canada can hope to meet this kind of competition, and no one should be expected to meet it, whether it is from Japan, Hong Kong, or any other country. It is completely destructive.

The Amalgamated Clothing Workers has long favored improved trade relations among the countries of the world. It has been a staunch supporter of the reciprocal trade program ever since the early days of the New Deal. But reciprocal trade was conceived as a middle-of-the-road approach to liberalizing international trade without injuring the domestic industries of any nation. It was never intended to be an instrument for destroying an important American industry by unfair competition from sweated labor abroad.

We shall not default on our responsibilities. We must mobilize our resources in an all-out effort to defend our labor standards and our jobs. We must be sure that not only the many millions of members of the AFL-CIO and the CLC, but all fairminded consumers, are fully informed about the human misery and exploitation behind these imports, and about the shocking conditions of health and sanitation under which they

are produced. We must see that they understand that purchasing these garments helps to destroy hard-won labor standards and millions of jobs. We must publicly expose the large chain stores, mail-order houses, and department stores which encourage these imports, and other retailers who carry them. We must direct our political energies toward legislation that will insure strict control over imports that are produced under substandard wage and working conditions. We must make certain that evils against which we so successfully struggled at home do not destroy us from abroad. We must leave nothing undone within our rightful power that will protect our security, our jobs, and our future.

Cardinal Speaks Out Against Visit by Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing, of Boston, recognized long ago the insidious nature of communism.

He knows how it alternates brute force with ingratiating duplicity that confuses the wishful thinkers and induces them to grasp at straws.

When it puts on the mask of peace it disarms the naive, and takes away their capacity to think clearly.

Cardinal Cushing is never taken in by this bland but deadly form of infiltration.

And so he has spoken out against the tragic blunder of our Government in opening the gates to the Trojan-horse visit of the "hangman of the Ukraine," the "betrayer of Hungarian independence," and "the tyrant of the captive nations" as he is known by those who are aware of his crimes against humanity.

Cardinal Cushing puts his finger right on the danger when he says:

His [Khrushchev's] only purpose of accepting an invitation to any country is to propagate communism. The Scandinavian countries knew that and their people protested with such vigor that Mr. Khrushchev canceled his visit.

Khrushchev may be welcomed by our Government, but he is persona non grata to the American people.

I ask you to read and remember the following article, titled "Cardinal Explains Opposition to Invitation For Khrushchev," that was published in the August 8 edition of the Pilot, official organ of the archdiocese of Boston:

CONSPIRATOR—CARDINAL EXPLAINS OPPOSITION TO INVITATION TO KHRUSHCHEV

(In the following statement, written especially for the Pilot, Cardinal Cushing explains some of the background against which Mr. Khrushchev's planned visit must be judged.)

In the light of my addresses and writings concerning atheistic communism, I could not favor an official invitation to the leader of that international conspiracy to visit the United States.

It can be said that communism is a fruit of the materialism of the world and a judgment thereon.

Like all of us, the Communist leaders fear another war. They say that it is possible to live together peacefully. But actually their ideologic war, a third world war, has already started, and their intention is to bring it to victory.

Khrushchev is a dedicated man. Therein lies his strength. But he is dedicated to a godless ideology, leading to slavery. That is what makes him so dangerous. Men like him have been won to nobler beliefs and have become their greatest champions. But whoever thinks that we can influence Khrushchev merely by showing him how our democracy functions and how well off we are, has no conception of the passionate, hate-filled contempt for our way of living which possesses Khrushchev and company. We cannot change him. Day and night, in thought and in deed, he is working with cunning determination together with his associates for the worldwide victory of communism. Every problem or situation—Berlin, Geneva, friendly visits, cultural exchanges—used to further one primary purpose—world revolution. Are we ourselves so completely without passionate faith in our ideals that we cannot believe others capable thereof?

I recall Mikoyan's visit. It was pitiable to see with what supreme cleverness he made use of the whole gamut of emotions—Idealism, love of peace, sentiment, simple-mindedness, vanity, business acumen, mammon. If we were taken in by him, what can we expect from Khrushchev's visit?

Ideologically disarmed, we lay open our country, through an invitation to Khrushchev, to the planned offensive of an ideologic elite force. That is like opening our frontiers to the enemy in a military war. It is unwise. What is more: If the United States opens her doors to the Communist world-revolution dictator, we fall the struggling people of the countries behind the Iron Curtain. But, if we refused to open our doors, we shall strengthen their courage; and the young nations of Asia and Africa, who are standing at the crossroads, anxious to learn about us, will see in the path of democracy a new and clearer light. Having invited Khrushchev how can we fail to invite the other dictators—the head of Red China et al.

But there is a more important aspect. The Soviet Union is an ideologic power arsenal. In a short space of time it has revolutionized 900 million people. We seem to be ideologically impoverished, possessing only little of the love of God and country that characterized our forebears. We have fallen for the idol of materialism. When we get into contact with the Russian thought power arsenal, the current runs toward us, not the other way.

But the current can be turned. The United States can become a moral ideologic power arsenal of such potency that the current will pass from us. Too long have we been content with pleasure, luxury, wealth, and lukewarm Christianity. Every Christian prays: "Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven." It is nonsense to pray like that without seriously desiring what we are praying for. If I really want it, then I must stand up for it, in my own life and in the life of others, in the life of the Nation and in the life of the whole world, with all that I am and have, led by God, in community with others who feel the same obligation. Then indeed the miracle will be achieved and other nations and peoples will be impressed. They will follow genuine moral leadership, not material progress.

That is Ideology. That is Christianity. That is moral strength. If we do not choose this way and live it, as individuals and as nations, we choose communism, as Khrushchev wants us. His only purpose of accepting an invitation to any country is to propagate communism. The Scandinavian

countries knew that and their people protested with such vigor that Mr. Khrushchev canceled his visit.

World Poverty and American Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Peter B. Kenen, a young economist with an outstanding academic and professional record, has written an excellent article, "World Poverty and American Policy," which appears in the spring 1959 issue of the Columbia University Forum. This publication is a quarterly journal of fact and opinion.

The author's qualifications to write about foreign economic aid, in its many aspects, are well set forth by his background and training. A 1954 Columbia College graduate, Peter Kenen has studied at Harvard and the London School of Economics. Presently, he is assistant professor of economics and of U.S. foreign economic policy at Columbia. A contributor to various professional journals, he is the author of a forthcoming book on British monetary policy which, as a dissertation, received Harvard's Wells Prize this year for works on economic subjects.

Mr. Kenen's thought-provoking article can well be studied, I believe, by all who are interested in a sound American foreign policy and a way to convince the great multitudes of people in other lands that our interest in humanity is direct and sincere.

I heartily commend to my colleagues a careful perusal of this article, which follows:

WORLD POVERTY AND AMERICAN POLICY

(By Peter B. Kenen)

Since the Second World War, the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America have grown restless. From Caracas, Leopoldville, Cairo, Beirut, and Djakarta comes evidence of their discontent, which the facts of economic life alone cannot explain. But neither can their foreign policies nor their bitter civil strife be understood without an appreciation of their economic circumstances.

The underdeveloped countries contain more than half the world's population, but produce less than a fifth of the world's output. Living standards in Asia, Africa, and Latin America are therefore far below those prevailing in Europe and North America. The gap, moreover, is widening. Population growth in the poorer countries has exceeded the increase in their income, while production has outstripped population growth in wealthier countries.

The peoples and governments of the underdeveloped countries have come to appreciate the possibilities of economic growth and to regard such growth as an inalienable right. They look to their more fortunate friends for assistance. Back in 1949, a group of economists reporting to the United Nations suggested that the underdeveloped countries ought to sustain at least a 2-percent annual increase in income per person. Such an increase, they pointed out, would barely suffice to keep the gap between underdeveloped

and developed countries from widening. The economists then argued that the underdeveloped countries cannot furnish even half of the capital required to achieve that minimum of 2 percent. A very large part of the necessary money has to come from abroad.

These circumstances pose three questions for American economic foreign policy. First, have we an obligation to assist the underdeveloped countries? Second, is our present foreign aid program adequate to the needs of those countries? And third, do our trade and tariff policies help or hinder them?

In meetings of the United Nations, Asian, African, and Latin American representatives insist that the wealthy nations, especially the United States, which enjoys the world's highest standard of living, should help the poorer ones to finance development projects. For many years, our representatives have been reluctant to acknowledge any moral imperative to do so. Indeed, our spokesmen repeatedly warned that economic aid would soon be discontinued, that we could not program foreign aid on a continuing long-term basis. The United States urged instead that the underdeveloped countries attract private American investment.

During the last 2 years or so our Government has begun to change its position. Washington has come to recognize that private capital will not come forward in quantities adequate to finance the minimum programs of underdeveloped countries, and that some of the projects which must be undertaken in those countries—such things as transport and irrigation programs—can never yield a profit sufficient to justify private investment. We have also come to understand that trade is no substitute for aid, that aid supplements the resources of underdeveloped countries, while trade does not. And while we are still reluctant to acknowledge that we have a moral obligation toward the poorer countries, we have learned that this doctrine is deeply rooted abroad and influences other countries' attitudes and policies. It does us no good to deny that we have an obligation to other countries, for they believe we have, and act accordingly.

Unfortunately, America's response to the needs of the underdeveloped countries remains inadequate. U.S. economic aid in fiscal 1959 totaled \$1,476 million. But \$773 million of that sum was allocated to defense support and was spent in Korea, Formosa, Vietnam, Turkey, Spain, and other countries armed by the West. Another \$150 million was used for technical assistance—to supply directly and through the United Nations the services of specialists in problems of agriculture, industrial planning, health, and in related fields. And \$60 million more was spent for refugee relief and other emergency programs, in the Middle East and elsewhere. The remainder, a bit under \$500 million, was supplied as grants and loans for economic development. The loans were furnished by a new Government agency—the Development Loan Fund—established by Congress in 1957.

The Development Loan Fund makes long-term loans at low interest rates, repayable in local currencies rather than in dollars. At first the Development Loan Fund was authorized to lend just \$300 million. In 1958 Congress increased its resources to \$700 million. But by the end of September 1958 the Development Loan Fund had committed itself to loans totaling \$456 million and had in hand loan applications for another \$2,100 million. By the beginning of 1959, President Eisenhower informs us, the Development Loan Fund had committed all of its resources. The President has, therefore, asked Congress to supply the fund with an additional \$925 million. This is a great deal of money, but it falls far short of the total of applications already received, let alone those which are likely to arrive from underdeveloped countries during the coming year.

To make matters worse, the President's 1960 budget asks for only \$668 million for direct economic aid, for technical assistance, and for the emergency relief programs to which we are committed. And if Congress runs true to form, it will cut back this modest request. The Development Loan Fund then emerges as the frail mainstay of our aid program for underdeveloped countries. It is frail not only because it is poorly endowed, but also because its operations have all the disadvantages of grants and many of the disadvantages of loans. Because Development Loan Fund loans are repayable in inconvertible currencies, the agency's funds will not "revolve." Congress will have repeatedly to enlarge its total capital. The underdeveloped countries must, nevertheless, find funds with which to repay us, and there are bound to be difficulties when that obligation falls due. The United States will find itself holding vast sums in currencies for which it has little use. We have, in fact, already accumulated large amounts of Indian, Pakistani, and other foreign currencies by selling surplus agricultural commodities under Public Law 480, and have had difficulty managing these balances so as not to disturb the monetary system in underdeveloped countries.

Surely the program to which we are committed—centered as it is on an inadequate loan system—is unsatisfactory in relation to the needs of the underdeveloped countries and Lilliputian in relation to our resources.

And it does not sufficiently exceed Soviet assistance. England's Alec Nove, in *Lloyds Bank Review*, estimates that Soviet bloc credits and grants now available to the underdeveloped countries total \$1,270 million; Soviet credits and grants to Asia, Africa, and Latin America have reached \$1,970 million, and the underdeveloped countries have already used \$700 million. Some of this assistance has, of course, been provided in armaments, and much of it is short-term credit. And we may insist—with pride—that free world assistance to the countries receiving Soviet loans greatly exceeds that furnished by Moscow. The United States, through the Development Loan Fund, the Export-Import Bank, and under other programs, has alone provided many times the sum ostentatiously proffered by the Russians. But the underdeveloped countries may be greatly flattered by invitations to Moscow's debut as an international lender. Moreover, the fact that the Soviet economy has advanced to a level at which it can spare resources to assist others is itself of profound political significance, and the Russians' generosity to neutrals in the distribution of credits is still more embarrassing to the West. They have pledged about \$925 million to Nasser's United Arab Republic, \$320 million to India, and \$250 million to Indonesia. Moscow has concentrated upon the most susceptible of the underdeveloped countries.

We certainly ought not to outbid the Russians project by project, country by country. Were we committed to do so, the Soviets could dictate the distribution of our foreign-aid program, merely by making irresponsible offers they had no intention of honoring. As this country has chosen to make foreign aid scarce, we must disburse it carefully, financing those projects which promise the greatest gains in income to the poorer countries. We cannot afford to spend just as Moscow desires.

To offset Russian political gains on account of foreign aid and to show the world how very much more generous our own efforts are, we should instead sponsor an International Development Association to make loans or grants to the underdeveloped countries. The United States and other free countries would furnish the Association's capital and would call upon the Russians to contribute. The creation of such an association has been proposed by Senator Mike

MONROE, and has been promised sympathetic study by the administration's able Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, C. Douglas Dillon. Were such an international agency established and were it to be directed jointly by donors and recipients, the allocation of assistance for economic development would be removed by one step from cold war maneuvering. At the same time, the contributions of free nations would dwarf those of the Soviet bloc, putting Moscow on the defensive. Such an arrangement, moreover, would probably enlarge the total of funds available for economic development; it would encourage contributions by other free countries, especially in Western Europe. With few exceptions, these countries cannot furnish enough assistance separately to justify establishing their own foreign aid programs.

An increase in U.S. foreign aid and the creation of an International Development Association to allocate that aid are not enough. The United States must help to solve one of the most pressing and complicated problems besetting the poorer countries:

Many of them produce only one or two commodities for export. These are generally raw materials or foodstuffs, and their prices are notoriously unstable. In fact, the prices of these basic commodities fell precipitously in 1957-58. Meanwhile, the prices of machinery and other manufacturers, the goods which underdeveloped countries import, have been rising. A group of prominent economists consequently estimated that the terms of trade—the ratio of export to import prices—of underdeveloped countries declined by some 10 percent during the 12 months ending March 1958. Since then, they have fallen further. As the underdeveloped countries' terms of trade deteriorate, their development programs must be cut back, for they cannot purchase the machinery and industrial materials they require. In the past year or so, one such country after another has therefore sought special assistance from the International Monetary Fund, straining the resources of the International Monetary Fund. For this reason, among others, President Eisenhower has proposed that the United States increase by 50 percent its subscription to the International Monetary Fund. Other countries will do the same.

But the foreign exchange supplied by the International Monetary Fund must be repaid. It therefore postpones, but does not eliminate, the need for a comprehensive price stabilization program. Unfortunately, only sporadic international efforts have been made since the war to stabilize commodity prices. Agreements are in force for wheat, sugar, and tin. Other important commodities have been neglected. And the arrangements which have been negotiated are not entirely successful. Commodity agreements which seek to stabilize prices at high levels generally resolve the shortrun problem of instability by creating a longrun problem of surplus disposal. When prices are stabilized at artificially high levels, supply exceeds demand and surpluses accumulate.

This difficulty is, of course, identical to that posed by the United States' own price support program. The solution which has been proposed for our farm problem may therefore be appropriate for world markets. Some years ago, the Secretary of Agriculture, Charles Brannan, urged that we stop supporting farm prices, that we let supply and demand determine prices in the open market. He urged that we subsidize the farmer directly, instead of maintaining high prices. This proposal would have lowered prices to the consumer and eliminated the problems of surplus storage and disposal.

The Brannan plan was never adopted in the United States but it could be revived to stabilize the income from foreign trade of underdeveloped countries. Instead of sup-

porting food, fiber, and minerals prices, we might agree to indemnify in whole or in part the country producing these products were prices to fall below an agreed-upon level. Conversely, the producing countries could agree to indemnify consumers were market prices to rise above that level. There are admittedly great practical difficulties in the way of such agreements. The consumers will seek to set the reference price low; producers will try to jack it up. These difficulties, however, ought not to deter us from entering into preliminary negotiations with some of the underdeveloped countries involved.

The problem requires immediate solution because the long-range development programs of the poorer countries are jeopardized by price fluctuations, and because the Soviet Union has emerged upon this field, too, as champion of these same countries.

To illustrate: in recent years the Russians and their satellites have purchased large quantities of cotton from Egypt, Afghanistan, and Iran, of rice from Egypt and Burma, and of rubber from Indonesia. These purchases have removed from the market surplus commodities which would otherwise have depressed market prices. In effect the Russians have engaged in a price support program of their own, concentrating as usual upon those countries which are most susceptible to economic and political penetration. To be sure, the Russians require these commodities for their own use. Their motives are economic as well as political, and they have sometimes driven a hard bargain. But the contrast between their posture and ours is striking. They have been buying cotton and rice. We have been selling them.

During fiscal 1957, the United States exported \$1,115 million worth of cotton. These exports were subsidized by our Government and have provoked bitter protests from countries relying heavily upon agricultural exports for foreign exchange. Our cotton program has sown anger in Peru, Brazil, the Sudan and other places, while American shipments of wheat have exacerbated already strained relations between the United States and Canada. To placate our allies the United States tries to insure that our sales of surplus agricultural commodities do not displace the exports of other countries. We have not been remarkably successful.

The most obnoxious and perverse American policies, however, are our import restrictions. This country has systematically limited its purchases of several commodities important to other free countries. During 1958 the President imposed quotas on imports of lead and zinc, to the consternation of Canada and certain Latin American countries. In 1957 the Government curbed petroleum imports, alleging that those imports were discouraging the exploration and expansion of our petroleum reserves. Petroleum is admittedly vital to the national defense. But that fact argues that we ought to conserve our own supply and encourage exploration and development in nearby countries, especially in Venezuela and Canada. Prudence does dictate that the West reduce its dependence on Middle East oil, as political developments short of war could deny us access to that region's rich fields. Only one circumstance, however, could cut us off from the Canadian and Venezuelan fields—a nuclear war. And if such a war were to break out, we would have to fight with the oil on hand, not that which we might bring out of the ground. The great destruction which would be visited upon us in the first days of total war could render our own oil industry inoperative.

Finally, an overhauling of our trade policies is all the more necessary because of recent developments in Western Europe. At the beginning of this year, six European countries—France, Italy, West Germany, Belgium, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands—set out upon the road to economic union. At

the end of 15 years, they will have dismantled all barriers to trade among themselves. As a first step they have reduced their tariffs on each others' goods by 10 percent. The European Common Market will ultimately bring great benefit to its six members and, therefore, to the community of free nations. In the process, however, American exporters may be materially injured. The present plan for tariff reductions in Western Europe itself implies discrimination against America. And the Common Market countries may intensify their restrictions on goods coming from the outside world. As the tempo of economic growth has slackened in Western Europe and as a species of stagnation may prevail for some time, there is real danger that the Common Market countries will use tariffs to export unemployment. Protectionism is the evil twin of recession, abroad as in the United States.

In order to defend its exporters against recrudescence of protectionism in Europe, the United States will have to enter into aggressive tariff bargaining with members of the European Economic Community. At present, however, this country is incapable of such negotiations. The reciprocal trade agreements program, reenacted by Congress last year, gives the President new authority to swap tariff concessions with other countries. That authority, however, is so narrowly circumscribed that the President cannot offer to other countries the concessions that will be necessary to preserve American export markets. The peril point provision in our Trade Agreements Act virtually forbids concessions which would injure an American industry. And a producer who finds the market for his product shrinking on account of a change in consumer tastes or technology may resort to escape clause proceedings to recover his losses by cutting imports.

In point of fact, very few tariffs have been raised on account of escape-clause action, but the threat of such action has doubtless discouraged many foreign producers from entering the American market. The President, moreover, has been unable to trade important new concessions with foreign countries because it is almost certain that these concessions would be nullified by escape-clause proceedings.

Let it be quite clear that no responsible official or economist wants a portion of American industry exposed to dreadful injury so that other firms may maintain their overseas markets. What is often and properly urged is the gradual reduction of our tariffs, and such financial and technical assistance to injured producers as they require to enter upon other lines of business. This twin proposal is intended not only to benefit our export industries, but also to benefit the American consumer. It would grant him access to inexpensive foreign products, in those instances in which foreign producers can supply goods more cheaply than American producers, and would most efficiently employ our own resources.

To return to the three questions I posed at the beginning of this survey: It is clear that the United States cannot ignore the demand for economic development abroad and that we have not yet begun to satisfy that demand. At the very least, we must enlarge our foreign aid program. Better still, we should enthusiastically sponsor an international program of economic assistance—an International Development Association. Finally, we must overhaul our trade and tariff policies and our system of farm price supports, to assist other countries in need of American markets and to raise the standard of living at home.

These proposals are no substitute for effective diplomacy. But diplomacy is impotent without them.

Labor Bosses Ride High

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include an editorial which was carried in the New Holstein Reporter on July 30, 1959. To me it discloses forthrightly the views of not only the individual members of labor unions but also the views of the general public.

The editorial follows:

LABOR BOSSES RIDE HIGH

After more than 2 years of investigations and hearings, during which his U.S. Senate committee uncovered graft, corruption, racketeering, and unbridled economic and political power in the hands of arrogant labor bosses, Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN has soberly declared: "We now know that labor cannot clean its own house." This is a challenge to the American people. Our only recourse is through legislation in our Federal and State Governments.

Speaking to the freedom forum which our national education program conducted in Los Angeles and to a luncheon audience of 800 Pacific coast leaders, Senator MCCLELLAN said the situation exposed by his committee constituted a threat to the freedom and economic welfare of every citizen in America. "At no time in our generation has our country faced more intricate and perplexing problems or graver dangers than those that now confront us," he said. "They represent a compelling challenge. On how effectively and successfully we face up to our responsibilities within the next few years and meet that challenge may well depend the destiny of our Nation and the fate of the entire free world."

Senator MCCLELLAN said the unwholesome conditions in labor unions "cannot be condoned by a decent society nor tolerated or permitted to exist by a government of law and order. Too many unions," he said, have "fallen into the hands of parasitically brutal, cynical men, to whom unionism means only a royal road to personal riches and power; men of beastly instinct who regard union members not as human beings but as mere chattels to be subjugated and manipulated to serve the malicious greed and avarice of their labor boss masters, or to be destroyed if they dare to protest or resist."

"Those who are perpetrators of this criminal exploitation have become brazenly arrogant and defiant. Some of them are threatening to go so far as to challenge the very supremacy of the Government."

Senator MCCLELLAN said flatly: "The AFL-CIO's code of ethics is ineffective" to deal with the menacing situation. It has not stopped corruption or improper activities, he said. "The truth is," he said, "the code is flouted at will with reckless abandon and contemptuous disregard by the Hoffas, the Brennans, the Cohens, the Becks, the Dioguardias, and others who neither respect nor observe it. Effective legislative remedies will have to be applied. That is now the only course we can pursue." He said the Kennedy bill now before Congress, with its watered-down version of Senator MCCLELLAN's bill of rights for the rank and file union members, is inadequate.

One of the best informed and wisest students of labor affairs and constitutional

Government in the Nation is Judge William G. Davisson, an Oklahoma friend of mine. He speaks bluntly about the need for legislative curbs on labor abuses. He notes that the power of labor bosses has been created by political demagogues, and that these demagogues in Congress today "refuse to enact legislation to curb the dangerous activities." They should be condemned by their fellow citizens, he says.

"If we are to believe the boasts of some of the outstanding union leaders, as quoted in the press of the Nation," Judge Davisson said, "they now control a sufficient number of votes in that great body to bring about the enactment of such legislation as they want, or to prevent the enactment of legislation looking to their proper regulation and control, and it is being demonstrated as the days go by that this is no idle boast. If this claim is true, and if we are to judge from such past legislation as the unsavory Wagner Labor Relations Act and from the present refusal to enact any real controls notwithstanding the pressing necessity thereof developed by the McClellan committee, then indeed are we far on the way to the fate predicted for us by McCauley."

"Lord McCauley, the great English Historian, said in effect that the American Republic could not endure and that it would fall as the result of the insatiable demands of selfish, self-seeking groups aided and abetted by political demagogues."

Uncontrolled power in the hands of arrogant labor bosses is a problem which every citizen must act upon—today. Our future prosperity and freedom are at stake. Senator MCCLELLAN's committee, and his legislation, merit the backing of all the "folks back home." That's you, too.

Some Observations on the Exchange of Visits With Khrushchev and Its Expected Impact on Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I know that many Members have given a good deal of thought to the exchange of visits between President Eisenhower and Soviet Premier Khrushchev, which will take place later this fall, and the implication which these visits may have on our foreign policy. In that connection, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD my current newsletter to the people of the 32d Congressional District of New York, in which I outline my views on this important subject in some detail. The newsletter follows:

While the House of Representatives waited last week for the all-important debate on labor legislation which is scheduled to begin on Tuesday, the second most important topic of conversation here has been the impending September visit of Prime Minister Khrushchev to the United States, and President Eisenhower's visits to the NATO countries later this month and to the Soviet Union in the fall.

In general, comment here in Congress on President Eisenhower's decision has been favorable although it has also been cautious. We recognize, of course, that the Geneva

talks have ended in failure, with the Russians refusing to back down from their earlier demands that we get out of Berlin. We recognize too that this is the kind of visit which Mr. Khrushchev has always wanted to make, and which, until now, President Eisenhower has steadfastly opposed in the absence of any area of agreement at the lower foreign ministers level. To this extent Khrushchev seems to have won.

On the other hand, there has now been an exchange of visits by the Soviet Deputy Premiers Mikoyan and Kozlov in one direction and Vice President Nixon in the other. Most people on Capitol Hill, regardless of party, would agree, I think, that Mr. Nixon's visit to Russia and Poland has been an outstanding success. He conducted himself with great dignity and ability, and by defending American principles in open face to face no-holds-barred debate with Khrushchev he has succeeded in breaking through some of the formal diplomatic barriers that have surrounded so much of our dealings with the Russians.

Vice President Nixon is convinced himself that the invitation to Khrushchev has been a wise move. I'm inclined to agree simply because this visit will make it possible for Mr. Khrushchev, who has never been to this country before, to see for himself that the American people are solidly behind our Government in opposing communism and all communism stands for and that we have the determination and will to fight for what we believe in if need be.

One of the real dangers in the cold war, as most experts have recognized, is that the Soviets might make the same kind of fatal miscalculation about us and our intentions as the Japanese did when they struck at Pearl Harbor. A trip to the United States by Mr. Khrushchev ought to convince him we are not softies, as the Japanese leaders so foolishly thought. If we can convince him of this we may prevent any similar miscalculation by the Russians, with regard to Berlin or Formosa, or any other critical trouble spot.

If the Khrushchev visit does nothing more than this, it will certainly have contributed to our national security.

On the other hand, most people down here also recognize very realistically that the Khrushchev visit is not likely to alter the general situation in the cold war. Mr. Khrushchev is still the same brutal dictator he has always been. Showing him politely around Washington, New York, or other parts of our country does not by any means indicate that we subscribe to his actions in making prisoners of the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain in countries like Poland, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary. Or just because Mr. Khrushchev may make a few bad jokes at a party in this country doesn't mean that we would be wise in backing down on our policy of firmness in Berlin. Even the face-to-face discussions between the Soviet dictator and President Eisenhower are not going to change the basic objectives and designs of Soviet policy, which are to spread communism over the world and bury capitalism, as Khrushchev has so often threatened to do. This is still their basic intention.

Nevertheless, these forthcoming trips by President Eisenhower are significant because they mean that the President is playing an increasingly more direct and personal role in the conduct of our foreign policy. Because of his wartime experience, and his admitted ability at dealing with people personally, I can't help but feel that these visits may help at least to clear the air, and give us the chance to look at the exact area of our differences from a slightly new angle. This in itself will be worthwhile, because, with the tremendous destructiveness of modern nuclear weapons, all of us must do our best to try to find a formula for peace.

I'm particularly pleased that President Eisenhower will be going aboard first to visit our NATO allies. This trip will underscore, before the Eisenhower-Khrushchev talks begin, our determination to keep our NATO alliance together, which seems to be the one thing which Mr. Khrushchev objects to most strenuously. I have just one suggestion for the President, and that is that he include in his visit a personal appearance in West Berlin. Berlin and the whole German question are still a major point of difference between us and the Communists, as Khrushchev has just recently made clear again. By making a personal visit to West Berlin, Mr. Eisenhower will underline in the clearest possible terms that Khrushchev's visit to Washington in no way reflects any change in our determination to stand behind the people of Berlin against the threat of Communist aggression. I hope Mr. Eisenhower will add this extra stop to his itinerary, because I am sure it will relieve the minds of many people who otherwise are seriously troubled over the Khrushchev visit.

Congress and Silver Spring Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial which was carried in the Milwaukee Journal, Wednesday, August 5, 1959.

Too many times local as well as State administrative officers seek office on the premise that the Federal Government should furnish the funds to carry out local responsibilities, instead of facing up to the issues that if improvements are needed taxes are going to have to be assessed.

The editorial follows:

CONGRESS AND SILVER SPRING DRIVE

The incredible mess we have allowed highway financing to get into in this country was never more apparent than it is right now.

Because a committee of Congress—not Congress itself—votes to cut back the gigantic Federal spending program, the reconstruction of Silver Spring Drive in Milwaukee is likely to grind to a halt. By no stretch of the imagination can this street be said to serve the national interest. It is a local thoroughfare, purely and simply.

Yet because this project, like thousands of others in this and other States, is so dependent upon Federal aid, bids will not be taken as scheduled this month for paving the divided roadway and constructing three overpasses. One section has been churned up for the laying of sewer, water, and gas mains. With postponement of paving, it will probably have to be given some temporary treatment to make it usable. The much needed rebuilding of Silver Spring Drive will wait some more.

The root of the trouble is that we have allowed ourselves to be kidded into thinking that streets and highways are easier to build with Federal aid—and that this is free money which flows from Washington at no expense to the local taxpayer.

The truth, of course, is that everyone who pays Federal taxes helps pay for the Silver Spring Drives and all the other Federal aid projects. What we have done, in large

measure, is simply to shift to Washington the right to collect and the power to control our money for local use.

We laugh when we read that no village lamplighter in Spain can be hired without authority from Madrid. Yet we don't even think it strange when a Milwaukee street goes unpaved because of what a congressional committee does in Washington, almost a thousand miles away.

Worthy of His Hire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the condition of the farmer is today more desperate than it has been since the administration of President Hoover.

Although the farmer works longer and harder and under greater weather handicaps than any other class in America, the price of his products steadily decline and the price of everything entering into his cost of production steadily increases.

Caught between the upper and nether millstones of dropping income and rising expenses, those who he feeds and clothes and who live sumptuously at his expense, instead of showing appreciation and endeavoring to assure him a fair wage for his labor and an adequate return on his investment are kicking the underdog and urging Congress to take from him even the little he has left.

Under leave to extend remarks, I am including a timely editorial on the subject from the August issue of the Missouri Farmer by one of the devoted farm leaders of the Nation, as follows:

U.S. CHAMBER RECOMMENDS FARM DISASTER?
(By Fred V. Keinkel, president, Missouri Farmers Association)

Do away with all price support and storage programs and let agricultural prices fall to free market levels? This is the recommendation which the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—a national organization of businessmen—has made to the House Committee of Agriculture. The committee, in apparent frustration over its thwarted attempts to pass much-needed legislation to halt the decline of farm prices, is holding hearings seeking to find a long-range solution to the farm problem.

Now it isn't difficult to understand why confusion and uncertainty surround the issue of national farm policy.

Even before an ear is harvested, it's widely recognized that the new corn program is a flop.

With acreage up by 25 percent (3 million acres), cotton is no doubt headed for trouble.

Hog prices have fallen to break-even levels or lower and the worst is yet to come.

Cattle numbers are building up at record rates.

"Disastrous," is an apt word to describe the poultry and egg situation.

And the President has turned thumbs down on what seemed a sincere attempt by Congress to improve the wheat program.

No, conditions are not improving in agriculture. If any other part of our economy of such importance were in such a position, the Nation would consider it a depression and call for immediate action.

Yet this suggestion to pull away from agriculture the only protection that it has, and without any other to take its place, is made by an organization supposedly speaking for the Nation's businessmen.

I wonder how many downtown merchants could remain open 6 months if they engaged in the type of free market practices which the national organization is proposing for farmers?

Suppose that all of those in business, from the steel manufacturers on down to the local dealer, were producing and marketing without restraint and that the price of the product was then determined strictly by the amount on hand?

What would be the price of steel, and subsequently of hog feeders, stock tanks, barbed wire, and farm machinery, without industry's production controls?

Would the U.S. Chamber of Commerce also ask Congress to do away with the tariff laws which support the price of manufactured commodities in this country? Would they favor legislation to outlaw the fair trade, suggested retail, cost plus, and the other forms of administered pricing which are interwoven into the business economy?

Farmers aren't asking Congress to break up the pricing patterns of industry, nor have they asked that tariff laws be repealed.

What farmers do desire is a national farm program that will give them the same measure of protection of price and purchasing power now provided industry and labor.

The farm is a business, too.

The average farmer has an investment in land and machinery of more than \$39,000, according to Government figures.

The farmer must bear risks comparable, if not greater, than those of the average merchant.

From his income he must pay interest, taxes, insurance, and keep his machinery and equipment in repair.

Mr. Speaker, in furtherance of the efforts to reduce the farmer to a condition of serfdom and peonage, self-seeking lobbyists are demanding that Congress deprive the farmer even of the right to organize and cooperate, the right freely accorded and utilized by every other branch of American industry.

Members of Congress have received many letters from people who have been propagandized and victimized by the National Tax Equality Association and I am enclosing a come-on letter written by J. T. Chase, of National Tax Equality Association, in which he makes the usual solicitation of a contribution from Mr. Poe, treasurer of Anchor Serum Co., St. Joseph, Mo. It would be interesting to know how much their take is a year from the unsuspecting victims on their sucker lists. But here is the letter:

NATIONAL TAX EQUALITY ASSOCIATION,
June 26, 1959.

Mr. E. A. Poe,
Treasurer, Anchor Serum Co.,
St. Joseph, Mo.

DEAR MR. POE: In our recent telephone conversation, I discussed the prospects for legislation by the 86th Congress that will effectively tax cooperatives.

Representative WILBUR D. MILLS, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, has stated that farm cooperatives will be taxed in 1959. His position is supported by recommendations of the U.S. Treasury.

We must back the efforts of our friends in Congress and in the Treasury; therefore I urge your full support, as previously suggested, in the amount of \$250.

It is now that your help will count most. Please let us hear from you while time is still on our side.

Sincerely,

J. T. CHASE.

Mr. Speaker, and here is the answer which Mr. Davis mailed to Mr. Chase in response:

ANCHOR SERUM CO.,
July 2, 1959.

Mr. T. J. CHASE,
National Tax Equality Association,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHASE: Mr. Poe reported to me of your telephone conversation with him, and further referred your letter to me for answer.

Very likely there are certain cooperatives operating in the United States that are violating the original principle, purposes and intent of the Capper-Volstead Act. However, when you refer to farm cooperatives I must take exception with you and your organization's viewpoint. The Nation's farm cooperatives have done more to upgrade the standard of living of the U.S. farmer than any group in America. This in turn has provided additional revenue for the farm family to purchase many necessities and luxury items, which has naturally assisted in aiding the overall economy of this country.

Sincerely I feel that the many members and contributors to your association are not fully apprised of all of the facts, and would recommend that you become better acquainted with the operations of the true farmer cooperatives.

Needless to say we cannot honor your request for a contribution to be used in the manner you have indicated.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE DAVIS,
President.

Mr. Speaker, also included is the list of the board of directors of the National Tax Equality Association as it appears on the back of their letterhead:

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Attorneys: B. E. Godfrey, McGown, Godfrey, Logan & Decker, Fort Worth, Tex.; John Mason, Mason, Knudsen, Dickeson & Berkheimer, Lincoln, Neb.

Banking: George S. Eccles, president, First Security Corp., Salt Lake City, Utah; R. E. Gormley, vice president, Georgia Savings Bank & Trust Co., Atlanta, Ga.; Irvin Reid, president, Citizens Marine Jefferson Bank, Newport News, Va.; John R. Thompson, vice president, United Savings Bank, Tecumseh, Mich.; Harold V. Gleason, vice president, Franklin National Bank, Franklin Square, N.Y.

Builders supply: R. R. Witt, president, Builders Supply Co., San Antonio, Tex.

Clothing stores: F. S. Porter, Jr., president, H. Porter Co., Phoenix, Ariz.

Coal: Philip P. Bash, president, C. E. Bash & Co., Inc., Huntington, Ind.; Charles P. Thompson, president, Calumet Coal Co., Chicago, Ill.

Cotton ginners: Frank C. Brooks, assistant counsel, Southwestern Cotton Compress (a warehouse association), Dallas, Tex.; Garner M. Lester, president, G. M. Lester & Co., Jackson, Miss.; W. H. Lovett, Dublin, Ga.

Cotton shippers: Charles W. Shepard, Jr., Charles W. Shepard & Co., Gadsden, Ala.

Dairy: David Pabst, president, Pabst Farms, Oconomowoc, Wis.; R. J. Splers, vice president, Abbotts Dairies, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.

Farm implements: L. H. Fleming, Jump Hardware & Implement Co., Queen Anne, Md.

Farming: J. B. McWethy, Fargo, N. Dak.

Fertilizer: R. B. Douglass, chairman of the board, Smith-Douglass Co., Inc., Norfolk, Va.; Howard A. Parker, president, Sylacauga Fertilizer Co., Sylacauga, Ala.

Grain: Oscar L. Malo, president, Intermountain Elevator Co., Denver, Colo.; George Potgeter, Steamboat Rock, Iowa; F. P. Heffelfinger, Jr., general manager, Omaha Elevator Co., Omaha, Neb.

Grocers wholesale: C. S. Ragland, president, C. B. Ragland Co., Nashville, Tenn.

Hardware, wholesale: Wallace Campbell, president, Campbell Industrial Supply Co., Seattle, Wash.; L. L. Flemming, comptroller, Herr & Co., Lancaster, Pa.; George D. Krause III, president, George Krause Hardware Co., Lebanon, Pa.; Seth Marshall, Alworth Building, Duluth, Minn.; L. D. Nuchols, president, American Hardware & Equipment Co., Charlotte, N.C.; W. H. Terstegge, president, Stratton & Terstegge Co., Louisville, Ky.; H. L. Thompson, Jr., president, the Bostwick-Braun Co., Toledo, Ohio.

Insurance: O. D. Evans, president, Standard Underwriters, St. Louis, Mo.

Lumber: Robert G. Rote, president, the Alvin F. Rote Co., Monroe, Wis.

Milling: R. E. Barinowski, president, Feed-right Milling Co., Augusta, Ga.

Oil distributors: Elbert J. Townsend, Townsend Oil Co., Le Roy, N.Y.

Oil production: E. C. Moriarty, Wichita, Kans.

Paint: J. F. Kurfees, president, Kurfees Paint Co., Louisville, Ky.

Petroleum refining: J. N. Champlin, Champlin Refining Co., Enid, Okla.; F. E. Mundell, Mundell Petroleum Co., Watertown, S. Dak.

Petroleum, wholesale: W. G. Baskerville, treasurer, Western Oil & Fuel Co., Minneapolis, Minn.; R. J. Coughlin, president, Westland Oil Co., Minot, N. Dak.

Pharmaceuticals: Arthur H. Einbeck, druggist, West New York, N.J.

Seed: Howard S. Abbott, Abbott Supply Co., Georgetown, Del.; J. H. Epting, president, Epting Distributing Co., Leesville, S.C.

Telephone companies: William C. Henry, president, Northern Ohio Telephone Co., Bellevue, Ohio; W. J. Holladay, general manager, Alabama Telephone Co., Fayette, Ala.

Mr. Speaker, every nationwide business, profession trade and industry in the country maintains its union, association, organization, and cooperation. Why should the farmer alone be denied that right—and especially when he is barely able to keep his head above water and of all the workers of the Nation is poorest paid and is permitted less voice in the control and management of his profession and his prices?

Cultivate Creative Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under laws to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following speech, entitled "Cultivate Creative Citizenships," by C. David Sadleir, president of Key Club International. I think this is a fine example of what these young men have to offer our country.

CULTIVATE CREATIVE CITIZENSHIP

(Address by C. David Sadleir, president, Key Club International, as presented to the 12th annual Ontario-Quebec-Maritime District of Key Clubs Convention, Sarnia, Ontario, March 31, 1959)

Mr. Chairman, district officers, International Trustee John, Kiwanians, Key Clubbers, and guests, it is an extreme pleasure for me to once again have the opportunity of speaking to the service-minded youth of the O-Q-M district. I bring greetings to all

of you from the Key Club International Board and the 45,000 young men we represent.

Twice now, within the past 2 years, I have shared the great experience of developing the theme and objectives of Key Club International. It is a distinct challenge and a real privilege for anyone to have a hand in formulating the policy and program that are the guiding lights of 45,000 young men. Each year the theme and objectives are developed as the result of many steps involving individual and group research on the part of the committee on resolutions at the international convention and, finally, the executive committee of the international board. It is unfortunate that such a small percentage of our membership really has the chance to concern themselves with the development of their program. Perhaps, this statement is misleading, because the chance is there; too many fail to take advantage of it by writing in their personal suggestions.

However, for the credit of those 10 or 15 individuals who are closest to the problem, it is necessary for me to point out that they are doing some original, creative thinking.

"Key Club International, believing that responsibility is the great educator; that imagination is the difference between creative and routine living; aware of the fact that its membership is privileged to love and serve two great nations, and realizing that our citizenship was bought with a great price, proposes to cultivate creative citizenship, so that we may be worthy of our heritage."

The February Keynote carried this introduction to our program for activity emphasis in 1959. Seven objectives have been developed along with suggestions for implementing each. The objectives, which I'm sure all of you are familiar with, by now, when analyzed are found to encompass the following: Spiritual values, juvenile decency, public apathy, full academic achievement, youth-adult cooperation, health and safety, creative thought and activity, which to me is the binding thread of our entire goal.

I do not intend to discuss the ways and means of carrying out this program. I have enough faith in the individual Key Clubber to believe that he can assimilate the suggestions which appeared with the original release of these objectives and, by so doing, bring this program to life. As a matter of fact, in my travels that have occurred since this program was released, I have already seen many evidences of the implementation of it.

Further, I am confident that the young men of Key Club International will continue to achieve the objectives with which they have been challenged. Instead, I want to illustrate the need and importance of each segment of this program. In short, I do not want to answer "How?" I want to answer "Why?" There is the question that too few of us bother to ask, even once in a while.

This year, I have come to realize that there are two big reasons for the growth of our organization. First, the attitude of our sponsor, Kiwanis International—the attitude of let us counsel, let us advise, let us be a good friend—but, let the boys solve, let the boy do. Now, I'm not sure of the psychology behind this, but I do know the "let's get the heck out there and do our job" effect that it has on you and on me. Second, the fact that in Key Clubbing the answer to "how?" is never the same. What might be a sound approach in Sarnia, could be a disastrous one in Savannah. In other words, our ultimate goal of unselfish service can be attained in many different ways. We have a flexible plan that can be easily adapted to different local conditions. Thus, before we could begin to discuss "how?" we would have to ask, "Where do you live?"

With God's guidance, promote high moral and spiritual values through good example. This is our No. 1 objective as we set out to cultivate creative citizenship. Ralph

Waldo Emerson said, "Great men are they who see that the spiritual is stronger than any material force; that thoughts rule the world." Just the other day, I read this phrase on a calendar, "Fear knocked on the door; faith answered; no one was there." Key clubbers, we have our challenge, our individual ability, our youth and, I hope, our enthusiasm. But, these are not enough to insure success. We must continually seek and heed God's advice. Key Clubbing teaches us to serve others and often this appears to be hard work. "But God's high wisdom knows a way—and this is sure, let come what may—who does God's work will get God's pay." I wonder how many of us could put into words the connection between spiritual values, civilization, and citizenship. Dr. Laurence M. Gould in This Week magazine said, "If America is to grow great, we must stop gagging at the word 'spiritual'. Our task is to rediscover and reassert our faith in the spiritual, nonutilitarian values on which American life has really rested from its beginning."

We have chosen to recognize juvenile decency. There was a time (according to our fathers), when the kid across the street (definitely, not Dad) could push over the neighbor's outhouse and be considered nothing but a mischievous boy. Now, thanks to the facilities of the press, radio, and TV, this mischievous boy with his juvenile prank has become a criminal at large. This is a bit exaggerated, but the point is that the majority of young people today are slandered and criticized for the wrongdoings of a few. I am not attempting to convince you that juvenile crime is not a growing problem, or that we should ignore these happenings. However, it would be nice to read about the activities of the local Scout troop on the 2d page instead of the 22d page, and it would be a change to unfold the newspaper and read through the first page without finding the activity of some unfortunate, but rarely downright malicious teenager, glamorized to the point of ridiculousness. The great majority of teenagers today, just as in the good old days, are friendly, high-thinking, God-fearing individuals who do deserve to be recognized.

Perhaps, the adults forget or just overlook this fact; which brings up another field for our activity emphasis—active public interest in all phases of community, national, and international life. Here we must use those indirect words, those polite, evasive ones with the meanings that can be interpreted in many ways; urge, encourage, because here we are dealing with adults, those people who are old enough to vote. But, we can, also, listen and watch and absorb. Arnold Toynbee has pointed out that "19 of 21 notable civilizations died from within and not by conquest from without. There were no hands playing and no flags waving when these civilizations decayed; it happened slowly, in the quiet and the dark when no one was aware." Let us be aware, Key Clubbers, and let us encourage this in others.

Full academic achievement—what a wealth of thought and worth is encased in this statement. In a previous speech this year, I suggested that knowledge is the first of three keys to a proud future. Selwyn Lloyd, British Foreign Secretary, who has also earned distinction as a lawyer and soldier, in an article entitled, "How To Live With the Russians," listed the things without which nations cannot make lasting political decisions. First on his list was education. Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, majority leader, U.S. Senate, commenting under the title "What I Believe—And Why," had this to say: "All nations are possessed of certain resources * * * of nature, of position, and of the human mind. Whatever we are to be, we must build from those things at our disposal, and to content ourselves with less than the ultimate potential is to deny our heritage and our duty." We have proposed to

cultivate creative citizenship so that we may be worthy of our heritage. Let us strive to gain our foundation of knowledge now.

"Take kindly the counsel of the years, gracefully surrendering the things of youth." These are the words of advice from the writing of Max Ehrmann. This is the friendliest and, certainly, the most tactful way I have ever heard an adult say that we should "be seen and not heard." It is true that we have still much to learn, but it is also true that we must acquire a good deal of our knowledge by working along with experienced people. Isn't this the case when one starts out on a new job? Almost invariably, the management assigns an old experienced hand to help the new recruit adjust to the job. But is it not also true that not all of the good suggestions in the suggestion box come from these old, experienced workers. There are many things in the community that can be accomplished by youths and adults working in cooperation and sharing the load. Thus, our objective to "stimulate more active cooperation between youths and adults." There is a special relationship for Key Clubbers and Kiwanians. To the Key Clubbers I say this: "Be ever aware of your individual debt to the men of Kiwanis for providing the rich opportunity of Key Clubbing." And, to the Kiwanians let me express the sincere hope that you realize the potential and scope of this youth organization you have chosen to sponsor. Let Key Clubbers share in your projects, but not just as errand boys. These are young men who dig deep, think tall, and dream true.

Did you ever stop to think that there is a connection between your personal health, your citizenship, and ultimately your freedom. Again, quoting Selwyn Lloyd: "Every legal or economic inequality because of creed, color, or race, every social injustice that sets apart 'a second-class citizenry' is as good as an enemy salient in our front line." Mr. Lloyd is referring here to the social caste system, but I wanted to incorporate his phrase "second-class citizenry." A healthy nation of good citizens, that is, a nation of citizens healthy in mind and body, and soul, is necessary for freedom. One of the great responsibilities of free people is to strengthen ourselves through good health and safety programs. We of Key Club International realize this and have incorporated these ideas in our sixth objective: "Inspire safety consciousness and realization of the need for mental and physical fitness."

Behind the Speaker's desk, high on the wall of the U.S. House of Representatives, inscribed for all to see and all to ponder, are these words of the great statesman, Daniel Webster: "Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its power, build up its institutions, promote all its great interest, and see whether we, also, in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

Surely, this is the secret wish of every thinking teenager. All of us, somewhere in our long, long thoughts have wondered what our individual purpose is. On the other hand, all of us, as we sweat out a set of examinations, as we rack our brain for the solution to the algebra problem, as we crawl out of bed for school on Monday morning, have asked ourselves the question, "Is it worth the effort?"

Have you ever stood at the end of a long school corridor, after classes have been dismissed, after the corridor is empty and the only light is that provided by the late afternoon sun? If you have, and most of us have, then I know that your answer to "Is it worth the effort?" must be "Yes." To say "No" would be to deny the thrill of that basketball game, the wonderful companionship of our fellow students, the dedication of our teachers, and the love and encouragement of our parents. To say "No" is to fail in our duty and forsake our heritage.

Going. Building. Creating. That's fun, that's living. Arriving is the end. We have chosen to cultivate creative citizenship. We must, therefore, go, build, and create. This is our program—our challenge for 1959. To meet this challenge successfully we must strive through creative thought and creative activity. It is not enough to just keep the ball rolling. Some morning we will wake up and find that the choices of buying or selling, of voting, of striking or not striking, of building a new school, of giving foreign aid, of war or peace, is now ours. God help us then if we have failed our duty or forsaken our heritage.

Ours is a noble cause based on high ideals. Let us use our minds and be creative.

Doing, even if what is done turns out to be unsuccessful, is the way of the creative man. The man who sees a dozen possibilities, but who has not the initiative to act on any one of them, is not creative. We are not equally creative, but that should not be an excuse to wait for a push or pull. We have been provided with a rich opportunity by the men of Kiwanis International. The program is there challenging each of us. Now is the time to answer it with our interest, our youthful enthusiasm, and the ultimate that we have in creativeness.

Fellows, I know we can do it; we are doing it right now. This is but one inning in the game of life and I guess we're still on the bench, or carrying water and peeling the oranges. But, our turn at bat is coming soon and I know 45,000 young men that will be ready. Get all you can out of key clubbing and be humbly proud that you are a Key Clubber.

Is it worth the effort to cultivate creative citizenship?

"Two roads diverged in a yellow wood
And sorry I could not travel both
And be one traveler; long I stood
And looked down one as far as I could
To where it bent in the undergrowth;

"Then took the other, as just as fair,
And having perhaps the better claim
Because it was grassy and wanted wear.
Though as for that the passing there
Had worn them really about the same.

"And both that morning equally lay
In leaves no step had trodden black.
Oh, I kept the first for another day.
Yet, knowing how way leads on to way
I doubted if I should ever come back.

"I shall be telling this with a sigh
Somewhere ages and ages hence
Two roads diverged in a wood and I—
I took the one less traveled by
And that has made all the difference."

—From "The Road Not Taken," by
Robert Frost.

Submarines and Our Island Continent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therewith an article by the distinguished writer for the Charleston News and Courier, Anthony Harrigan, appearing in the magazine U.S.A., under date of July 17, 1959, entitled "Submarines and Our Island Continent."

Mr. Speaker, I commend this to the House of Representatives:

SUBMARINES AND OUR ISLAND CONTINENT

(By Anthony Harrigan)

"Antisubmarine warfare is as big a problem as air defense."

Rear Adm. John S. Thach, USN, commander of task force ALFA, makes this assertion and pauses.

Overhead, on the flight deck of the *Valley Forge*, flagship of the ASW force, Grumman S2F tracking aircraft are landing. The noise drowns out talk in the admiral's mess. We wait for quiet, so we can resume our talk of antisubmarine tactics and equipment. Present are Admiral Thach's staff officers and engineers from General Dynamics and Thompson-Ramo-Woodridge and Convair. An editor of *Fortune* magazine came aboard this afternoon.

The conversation in the admiral's mess has ranged far. We have heard suggestions for collapsible sonar buoys as big as a house. A civilian pointed out what we all are well aware of—that the Department of Defense has spent comparatively little funds on antisubmarine warfare. Task force ALFA was the creation of the Office of Chief of Naval Operations.

Several of the officers at table have stressed the need for an electric fence—an undersea DEW line to protect the United States against Soviet submarine attack.

Admiral Thach points out that as soon as the American people understood the capability of long-range bombers, they demanded an adequate Air Force. He is convinced they will do what is necessary once they grasp the threat posed by the 450 submarines of the Red fleet. The admiral hammers home the theme of American vulnerability to missile attack from Soviet submarines.

"Chicago," he says, "is easier to hit than this ship."

After coffee we go to flag plot, the nerve center of task force ALFA. The ports are sealed in this cabin high in the *Valley Forge*. But the radar shows us at the center of the dark viewer, with 5 destroyers moving around us in a protective circle screen at a range of 10,000 yards. Somewhere under the seas nearby are two hunter-killer submarines, *Sea Leopard* and *Cubera*, which belong to this task force.

This small group of warships—and a companion force of similar makeup which operates out of Quonset, R.I.—are the only ready antisubmarine units in the Atlantic Fleet. To protect the shores of this country against Soviet undersea aggression, the Department of Defense has authorized the use of 2 aircraft carriers built and paid for in World War II, and 10 destroyers of the same vintage. Such is the material with which Admiral Thach and the officers and men of his command prepare a defense against an enemy undersea fleet bigger than all the submarine forces of the free world nations combined.

But there is no grumbling or off-the-record anger at the skimpy forces assigned. "We need high motivation," says Admiral Thach, "and I think we have it. Every person in this outfit is trying his level best to get the last bit of detection out of every piece of equipment."

Both the zeal of the men in ALFA and the inadequacies of their equipment are evident in flag plot. Commander R. A. Ryzow, operations officer for ALFA, is plotting the results of a Whisky 2 Uniform exercise on a large plexiglass board. The marks he makes on the board with a grease pencil represent reported sonar contacts. The S2F tracking planes have dropped sonar buoys—listening devices—and are employing a type of echo ranging in their search for the target submarine. If nothing results, they will follow a rectangular search pattern

over an ocean area of several hundred square miles.

Killing is not the problem of ASW. For the kill, the Navy has atomic depth bombs. "But," says Admiral Thach, "We must find a sub before we can kill it."

The nature of the ocean depths makes this an enormously difficult job. The depths are dark but not in the least silent. Whole mountain ranges lie below the surface of the Atlantic. Vast troughs and canyons and strange cavities are to be found under the seas. Temperature layers provide protective barriers for submarines. Sonar cannot penetrate these layers. Differences in salinity affect acoustical conditions. Most confusing of all is the noise of marine life. Hissing electric eels, moaning whales, and booming drumfish persuade sonar operators that what they hear is a submarine.

Finding a submarine says Admiral Thach, is not even as simple as finding a needle in a haystack for the haystack itself is against us. The sonarman, who may be a 19-year-old boy aboard a helicopter, destroyer or killer sub has to figure out, says the Admiral, what is a whale, a school of fish, a bottom pinnacle, a figment of imagination, or really a submarine.

Tremendously important for the sonarman is the amount of pinging tune he gets in during a fleet exercise. This is actual listening time. And much depends on the sonarman's inherent ability, whether he has an ear for this music of the seas.

The difficulties involved in submarine detection and the classification of underwater sounds indicates the vastness of the tasks that lie ahead. And, of course, the Nation has not begun to comprehend the outline of the problem.

The task of public information confronting the Navy's ASW forces is similar to that which would exist if the Government did not believe that the Strategic Air Command needed either the latest radar or an efficient early warning system.

The Soviets have not yet begun to employ their submarine fleet in international black-mail maneuvers. Admiral Thach points out, however, that this fleet is a "versatile instrument for diplomatic pressure." When the Soviets commit this fleet, the United States must be prepared. It must have an effective undersea deterrent. There must also be surveillance of ocean areas.

"We must," says the commander of task force ALFA, "have detection measured in miles instead of yards. We must have instant assurance that what we detect is really a submarine. We must be able to keep close tabs on millions of square miles of oceans, to a depth of nearly 1,000 feet, round the clock. 7 days a week, in every area of the world where submarines could secretly position themselves for a surprise attack upon us or on our allies. In short, we must be able to show a consistent ability to place our weapons over every potentially hostile submarine, as the surest deterrent to hostility.

The admiral tersely concludes, "We can't do that today."

Some progress has been made in shore-based surveillance of ocean areas. The Navy will not discuss what it has in this respect. But it is known that some detection information is passed to the fleet from shore stations.

The Navy's real successes lie in the equipment and techniques developed for its mobile forces at sea. These will always be necessary, Admiral Thach declares. His argument is, "No burglar alarm ever caught a burglar."

Among the search devices are the airborne anomaly detector, which reports disturbances produced in the earth's magnetic field by the presence of large metallic objects such as submarines. The Navy calls this MAD hunting; echo ranging with bombs dropped from search aircraft; and the "sniffer gear," equip-

ment which chemically analyzes a submarine's exhaust.

The need for scientific contributions to ASW is enormous. Every field of science can contribute. For example, the MAD gear was developed by industrial firms searching for oil off the Gulf coast. One of the immediate technical needs is for an explosive charge, to be used in echo-ranging, that sends precisely the right frequency for sonar buoys.

Often, aboard the *Valley Forge*, it seems that dinner time in the officer's mess is merely a time for a brainstorming session—with scientists and engineers tossing around far-fetched ideas, or what the layman might so regard if he were ignorant of the need for radical new devices.

The conversations at Admiral Thach's table and in flag plot remind one how markedly naval warfare has changed in less than a generation. The basic ingredients are the same: Human courage, as in the case of the helicopter pilots who hover over a stormy sea as their dipping sonar on a cable probes the depths; and good judgment, as in the case of the operations officers who must take the clues furnished by combat intelligence and decide when to pursue and when to abandon a search.

Added to these ancient ingredients of successful naval warfare is the need for ability to grasp the technology of electronics and for evaluating ideas and theories. It is a tribute to the Navy that it has within its ranks men who combine the qualities of seamen and fighters and, yes, intellectuals (in the best sense of the word).

Sub hunting is like playing a kind of electronic chess. The master chess player is the task force's commanding officer, Admiral Thach. As a young fighter pilot in the 1920's, he flew with a demonstration squadron in which the wing tips of each plane were tied by a manila line to the next plane in formation. He was a Navy test pilot and an expert in gunnery techniques. As a lieutenant commander aboard the carrier *Lexington*, he developed fighter tactics that helped smash the Japanese at Midway and in other engagements in the Pacific theater in World War II. He planned and directed the final offensive air blows against the Japanese homeland.

During the Korean war, Admiral Thach commanded the aircraft carrier *Sicily* that provided close air support for the Inchon landing and the fight to the sea from Chosin Reservoir. Later came tours of duty in the Pentagon and in the scientific sections of the Navy. Admiral Thach has brought to his current assignment a passionate interest in the application of science to weaponry.

Unfortunately, the intelligence and enthusiasm of Admiral Thach and his team of officers in Task Force ALFA cannot make up for the tragic lag in U.S. oceanographic research. The nation that wins the undersea battle may well be the nation that best understands the secrets of the sea. To pry these secrets from nature the Soviets have 18 large, modern oceanographic research vessels at sea; the United States has 3 small vessels.

The most grave statement which I heard Admiral Thach make regarding the Soviet undersea menace is this: "I believe the Russians have made a greater contribution to the International Geophysical Year in oceanographic research than they have in space."

When one ponders on the significance of that declaration, the gravity of the ASW problem comes home with tremendous impact. If the Russians master the secrets of the sea—as, for example, the layers of temperature in the sea in which sonar efficiency is seriously reduced, then American advances in weaponry could be completely negated.

The United States cannot afford to be ignorant of the sea. In addition to basic research, a system must be set up whereby the fleet has an efficient undersea conditions reporting service—an undersea weather bureau, so to speak. Effective use of sonar requires that commands to know the salinity, density and other special conditions of waters in which they are operating. This means—to cite only a single need—regular sampling and analysis of sea water in all operating areas of U.S. naval forces. Knowledge of the weather beneath the seas is the key to successful ASW.

If lack of basic scientific research is a major liability under which the Navy's ASW forces operate, it is by no means the only one. Outmoded or inadequate equipment is another handicap to those who are desperately seeking ways and means of dealing with the Soviet submarine menace.

One need look no further than flag plot aboard the *Valley Forge* to see that the genius of America has not been lavished on ASW. The task of the staff officers in flag plot is to evaluate the information coming from combat intelligence and to decide what must be done about it. One finds in flag plot some very intelligently conceived status boards on which are listed ship dispositions and the progress of hunter-killer operations. These are valuable aids to understanding the overall work of the formation during war games or actual combat. But they are far short of what American science and industry should be able to supply. Reports are made to the flag bridge either verbally or on printed forms. Obviously, this is too slow a procedure in an era of push-button electronic warfare. Task force ALFA and other naval units committed to the defense of our country deserve the best in data processing and data presentation equipment. It is utterly fantastic that hundreds of non-essential American businesses should be equipped with electronic computers while the defenders of our shores should be without them.

This deprived condition of the fleet indicates another victory of the antimilitary propagandists over the defense need of the United States.

Nor is the electronic computer field the only area in which inadequacies of equipment exist. There is need for bigger and better search planes with more electronic equipment and improved data presentation for pilots. Today's helicopter, the Sikorsky HSS-1, is a fine piece of machinery. But search missions, which may last many hours, even days, require helicopters with longer range and greater endurance. Existing sonar can't be dipped into the sea to a sufficient depth. The weight and size of the cable necessitates a helicopter with greater weight-lifting capability and more room. Noise in the HSS-1 imposes too great a strain on the crew. The fact that the model now in service is not an amphibian makes hovering dangerous, creating a strain in the minds of the pilots and rendering night operations impossible. A turbine-powered amphibian helicopter has been developed, but it will not be introduced into the fleet until late 1961. Yet the need for such a helicopter is right now.

Even more serious is the general condition of warships in the Atlantic Fleet. Rear Adm. John C. Daniel, USN, commandant of the 6th Naval District, pointed out recently that of the more than 200 ships in the Atlantic Fleet, only 22 are less than 13 years old. The *Valley Forge* was built and paid for during World War II. So were the destroyers assigned to task force ALFA.

The *Valley Forge* lacks an angled deck. No surface-to-air missiles or modern rapid-

firing antiaircraft guns have been fitted in the flagship. The ship is without a forced ventilation system on the hangar deck. Similar inadequacies characterize destroyers in the fleet. Nor can they be overcome by piecemeal additions of equipment or patchwork repairs.

Too many ships in the fleet are too old; years of hard steaming have taken the life out of them. Furthermore, the needs of today's operations call for wholly new ships. Vastly increased speed, bigger sonar, improved communications, and defensive and offensive missiles and rockets are the requirements that must be met if the U.S. Navy is to fulfill its mission.

If our Government has been slow to furnish funds to the U.S. Navy for essential equipment, the Soviet Government has not treated their navy accordingly. Admiral Thach points out that the Soviet Union has devoted a large measure of its industrial productivity to the build-up of its submarine fleet. The Soviet undersea competition is serious, for many of the Red fleet's subs are the modern *Zebra* type that has ample cruising range for operations aimed at our Atlantic coast. In addition to the conventionally powered Red subs, some of which are equipped with air-breathing guided missiles similar to the U.S. Navy's *Regulus* missile, the Soviets are reportedly at work on five nuclear-powered submarines. These are said to be under construction at Severodvinsk, a port near Archangel. Furthermore, Soviet-type submarines are being built in Communist China.

The size, newness, and capability of the Soviet undersea fleet, coupled with the smallness of our ASW forces and their deficiencies in modern equipment, indicate that the national defense situation has a dimension of seriousness not recognized by the public. Further economizing at the expense of the military in favor of vastly increased foreign economic aid and other inflationary national and international subsidies will reduce our chances of gaining clear technical superiority over the Soviet undersea fleet.

Sagely, Admiral Thach says, "We cannot pack up our whole economy and go off chasing submarines." He notes, however, that "On the other hand, we can no longer shrug off the submarine threat."

The irreducible minimum for defense of American coastal waters and major submarine transit areas is four antisubmarine task forces. These are the essential mobile forces needed to provide any sort of effective deterrent to undersea aggression.

Beyond the immediate creation of such forces, however, must be prompt action to modernize the fleet. Replacements must be built for ships designed in the 1930's and built in the early 1940's—ships that more than paid for themselves in victorious action during World War II.

We must modernize our fleet and create the best possible task forces for antisubmarine warfare. Such action is absolutely necessary unless we are prepared to surrender control of the ocean depths to the Soviet Union and abandon our supremacy on and under the seas surrounding this island continent of North America.

¹ Editor's Note.—The fact that the Soviet military threat to our country is far greater today than the Soviet economic threat was shown conclusively by H. W. Balgooyen, executive vice president of American & Foreign Power Co., chairman, Inter-American Council, in his brilliant article "Soviet Offensives: Real and Illusory" for U.S.A. magazine, vol. VI, No. 10, May 22, 1959.

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I hereby submit for the information of the Members some thoughts on the steel management lockout that reveals some forgotten facts. It includes a letter and resolution from Local 1011, United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO, East Chicago, Ind.:

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA,
LOCAL 1011.

Indiana Harbor Ind., August 7, 1959.
Representative RAY J. MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Enclosed please find copy of resolution adopted by local union 1011, United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO, East Chicago, Ind.

We definitely are of the opinion that action as stated in the resolution is needed if we are to achieve stability of employment in the steel industry.

Sincerely yours,

RENO MUSSATT,
President.

JACK WHITESIDE,
Recording Secretary.

STEEL INDUSTRY REGULATORY RESOLUTION

The steel industry's arrogant and selfish attitude which has forced its employees to strike for the fifth time since World War II only reflects their past disregard and contempt for their employees.

In 1892, at Homestead, Pa., their hired thugs and goons smashed the employees' attempt to gain union recognition. In 1919, they again resorted to force and violence plus the blackballing of hundreds of their employees to smash the employees' attempt to gain union recognition. They further demonstrated their disregard for their employees by being the last of the major industries to adopt the 8-hour day.

In 1937, they again resorted to force and violence to smash their employees' attempt to gain union recognition. They further showed their contempt by discharging hundreds of employees for merely belonging to a labor union, a right guaranteed by our Constitution and restated, by now, by the National Labor Relations Act of 1935.

Steelworkers have been forced to strike to gain social and economic benefits which other industries have granted their employees through the medium of peaceful collective bargaining; namely, pensions, insurance, wage increases, shift differentials, weekend premiums, vacation, etc.

The history of the steel industry is one of crisis after crisis, instability in employment and utter disregard for the welfare of the employee.

Their present attitude only sustains the late President Philip Murray's theory that the steel industry is only tolerating us, not accepting us, and is only biding its time to revert back to the laws of the jungle.

Their spokesmen have publicly stated that without government intervention the steelworkers would not have been granted the gains they presently enjoy.

It is no secret that government intervention has played a major role in the settlement of every strike since 1937. It is the responsibility of government to protect the welfare of its citizens.

The enactment of the Railway Labor Act, by the U.S. Congress in 1926, has done much toward stabilizing good management-labor relationship in an industry which was in constant turmoil.

Steel is basic to our economy and the welfare of our Nation depends upon its continued peaceful and fruitful operation. The control of such a vital industry must not be left entirely in the hands of people whose very history and records show contempt and disregard for their employees: So, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Local Union 1011, United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO, call upon the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and Secretary of Labor James Mitchell to immediately explore the possibility of proposing regulatory legislation to bring to an end the ever reoccurring crises in the steel industry; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to President David J. McDonald, Director Joseph Germano, Senators Estes Kefauver, Paul Douglas, Vance Hartke, Homer Capehart, Congressman Ray Madden, the Hammond Times, and the Gary Post-Tribune; be it further

Resolved, That President David J. McDonald distribute copies of this resolution to all striking local unions of the United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO.

Last Chance for a Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, congressional control of Federal spending has never been needed more than at present, when we end a fiscal year with the largest peacetime deficit in our history, and we see requests for raising the debt limit presented to the Congress, and at a time when we must continue tax measures intended for wartime to prevent even greater deficits.

During the last Congress H.R. 8002 was adopted and become Public Law 85-759. This measure would put into effect the Hoover Commission's plan for accounting in the Federal Government, if it is implemented by the President and the Congress. Unfortunately very little has been accomplished thus far. The following editorial appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Friday, June 26, 1959. I hope that this editorial will point up to all Members the need to implement this law, to return fiscal control to the Congress:

LAST CHANCE FOR A TEST

Congress has one more chance at this session to test an important budget reform it approved less than a year ago but so far seems to have almost forgotten. This is the Hoover Commission's plan for annual accounting by Federal departments and agencies of all appropriations carried over from previous years.

Senator KUCHEL, of California, reminded the Senate this week that nothing has been done as yet to comply with President Eisenhower's request that the so-called accrual-accounting system be tried out in six departments and agencies. Efforts of supporters of governmental economy to include in

several appropriation bills a provision for such accounting have met with rebuffs either in committee or on the floor.

However, Congress has a last chance to give the plan a test, although in a rather small way. The Senate has voted to provide for such a tryout in the Panama Canal Zone. The authority was included in the Department of Commerce appropriation bill, now pending before a conference committee. We hope the conferees will approve the provision.

Why Congress has been so reluctant to adopt the new accounting method as a general policy is a mystery. Usually Congress is quick to seize any opportunity to exercise better control of Federal spending. And the Hoover proposal would give Congress a firmer grip on the pursestrings of the Federal establishment. As Senator KUCHEL succinctly put it, Congress then could tell the executive branch: "So much you may spend next year and not 1 cent more."

This Is a Modern Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therewith an address made by the distinguished Secretary of the Army at the annual meeting of the Association of the U.S. Army held here in Washington on August 5, 1959. The Secretary spoke on the subject "This Is a Modern Army." No American has worked harder to keep our gallant men and women of the Army capable of meeting the problems of modern warfare. His efforts are more and more being realized by Americans. The American Army is a modern Army, the American Army stands between communism, which is slavery, and freedom. In this fight for liberty, Wilber Brucker deserves the appreciation of our Nation and of the world.

The address follows:

THIS IS A MODERN ARMY

(Remarks by the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army, Association of the U.S. Army, Sheraton-Park Hotel, August 5, 1959)

Sgt. Donald H. Knigge (Ki-näg'-ē), tonight's soldier of the future, is presented by the U.S. Army Combat Development Experimentation Center, Fort Ord, Calif. He was selected to attend the AUSA meeting because of his outstanding bearing, soldierly qualities, and high performance of duty.

He is a squad leader of a combat engineer platoon, First Battle Group, 10th Infantry Combat Development Experimentation Center.

Sergeant Knigge was made a sergeant after only 19 months in the Army, during which he served in the Far East. He is 22, single, and entered the service at Wauconda, Ill. On two occasions he was named soldier of the month, and also was named driver of the month at Combat Development Experimentation Center. He has recently reenlisted for a 6-year period, having selected the U.S. Army for his career.

This is the new soldier of 1965.

Please take off your helmet, Sergeant Knigge.

You have seen this outfit many times during the last 3 days. I just wanted to prove there really is a man inside all that paraphernalia—a man with a heart and a mind, with the courage, initiative, aggressiveness, and discipline I spoke of earlier—a soldier.

Remember that whatever the soldier may wear, with whatever weapons he may be armed, he is still the eternal man who goes into battle alone, and holds in his two hands the security of the Nation.

Nothing is more important to the future of the Army, and the future of our beloved country, than a proper understanding of that fact. The Army is a living, progressive, indispensable part of American life, the embodiment and defender of American principles.

The contribution which this association is making throughout the country toward a better understanding of the high importance of our Army to the national defense is unique and highly significant.

When we compare the first annual meeting of this association in October 1955 with this meeting, we can readily see that the progress of the Association of the U.S. Army has been nothing short of remarkable.

Moreover, the program we have witnessed during the last 3 days, together with the tremendously impressive military and industrial exhibits, illustrates just how important these meetings have become. They provide us with the best possible forum for disseminating information and for obtaining the views and ideas of some of the best minds in our country.

Our Army has a truly global mission. This Nation is associated with 45 other nations in the most powerful system of collective security ever created. Army personnel are serving in more than 70 foreign countries and areas. It can be truly said that the sun never sets on the U.S. Army. It stands shoulder to shoulder with the troops of our allied friends around the world as a potent reminder that we are ready to honor our international agreements promptly, and to oppose any aggression with the full force of American military might if need be. Nearly half the strength of our Army is stationed overseas.

In the past few days you have participated in discussion with the experts on what is required to make a modern army capable of meeting such vast responsibilities. At a time when there is no letup in international tensions, when the responsibilities of the Army seem to increase, there is a tendency to dwell on our shortcomings and to overlook our great strengths. While the presentations and your discussions have quite properly centered on the more concrete requirements of a modern Army, I feel that our great, underlying strength is derived from such intangibles as morale and esprit de corps.

The Army today has one attribute which ranks in importance far above any new weapon, item of equipment, or concept—and that is the new, restless, and revolutionary mental outlook among its officers and men—an outlook which is constantly searching for something better and always looking for something more suitable to the requirements of the age. After all, a modern army is one which is equipped to perform its functions in a modern world, and one which stays modern. In my opinion, the greatest single asset we have today is this new attitude and habit of thinking—and I have seen it everywhere—which is ready to cast away any outmoded ideas while seeking with a high degree of originality and imagination to stay ahead in an age when technological advancements occur with breathtaking speed. Implicit in this kind

of thinking is the realization that we must not lose sight of today's task—that we must be ready at all times to fight with what we have, that we dare not let our present battlefield capabilities decline while dreaming up new ideas for the future.

That is the kind of thinking we have today. We have an Army that, first of all, is proud of its traditions and its 145 campaign streamers. While the Army is capable of waging war today with the weapons now in its hands, it is constantly thinking of new ways to use the information that science and technology are giving it. It is a proud army with its feet on the ground and its eyes on tomorrow.

As Secretary of the Army, I speak as the head of the Army family.

Proud to have such a large and enthusiastic family.

Illustration of Fisher family—father and seven sons.

When one was scratched all bled.
Honor to one was felt by all.

I want it to be like that with this Army family.

I want you to bleed with me and with each other when things go wrong for the Army. Feel pride with me and share your pride with each other about the Army's achievements.

ARMY-MINDED

Develop a loyalty to the Army which is personal and real.

This has been a splendid annual meeting, but to look back upon it merely as a pleasant occasion would be the gravest mistake you could make.

What you have received here, take with you and spread it throughout your individual spheres of influence.

In this audience are representatives of virtually every element in American life—active Army, Reserve components, ROTC, business and industry, the scientific community, Government, the press, and the civic leadership of the Nation.

Each has a vital and inescapable responsibility to make a dynamic effort to get the truth as we know it across to the American people as a whole, to make it our own individual guideline, and contribute in every way possible to the on-going of the Army.

You have heard a lot about the modern Army, and the new weapons and equipment which have been developed to bring it to a high level of technological superiority.

Without in any way discounting the immeasurable value of modernization along all lines, I would remind you not to forget that there are many old-fashioned things which will never lose their value—are as indispensable to the capability of the Army today as they ever were.

One of these is courage—good, old-fashioned American courage.

Foch's comment to Pershing: "Trouble with the American soldier, he has never learned to retreat."

He still has never learned to retreat, and I know he never will.

Initiative: Always a characteristic of the American soldier.

Aggressiveness: Has earned victory on countless battlefields.

Discipline: The invariable hallmark of quality and capability in any military organization from the legions of Rome to the Pentomic U.S. Army.

Requirements of modern warfare: Great mobility, wide dispersion of troops, small units self-sufficiency and initiative—all place far greater emphasis than ever before on the importance of these old-fashioned Army virtues. Never sell them short.

Good seeds from the past, planted in fertile ground, will produce a bountiful harvest. That is one reason we brought the Army flag into being. From the heritage of the Army's past, reaching across the years from Ticonderoga to Korea, comes the most potent and

enduring inspiration for new and even greater accomplishments.

When we examine some of the Army's elements of strength, we cannot help but think of personnel. The individual soldier will always be the ultimate weapon. In a sense, the individual soldier must also be modernized. Our manpower modernization can be accomplished in a variety of ways, greater emphasis upon our personnel policies, upon acquisition of skills, upon early recognition and selection of leaders, and upon recognizing psychological stability.

We have today the finest officers and enlisted men in the active Army, and by that I mean the National Guard and the Army Reserve, that we have ever had. The recent elimination of 72,000 ineffective and the authority to reject substandard individuals prior to induction, have contributed materially to the improvement of our enlisted personnel. Equally important is our success in retaining qualified and trained individuals in the Army. More adequate pay, prestige, and the opportunity for advancement are now provided, primarily by implementation of a comprehensive enlisted personnel management program, which includes educational development of interested and qualified soldiers, not only in our service schools, but also in our units and civilian training institutions.

Through the general educational development program, over 45,000 enlisted men during fiscal year 1959 achieved the equivalent of high school completion; 6,000 passed the four-part college level test which is widely accepted as equivalent to a year in college. Sixty thousand were enrolled through Army centers for study on a correspondence basis. College level enrollment alone totaled 50,000. In all levels of education, ranging from elementary instruction through advanced college work, a total of 360,000 individual courses were completed by 125,000 participants.

These measures are contributing successfully to the production of an elite corps of highly trained, responsible non-commissioned officers and specialists, which is so necessary for operation of our active units and for immediate expansion in the event of mobilization.

As one significant index of the Army's success in improving the quality level of its personnel, the number of prisoners in Army disciplinary barracks has dropped in 4 years from just over 7,000 to 1,188, and we have been able to close four disciplinary barracks. In the same period the number of soldiers confined in post stockades for relatively minor infractions has been reduced by more than 50 percent.

In the last 3 years while the strength of the Army was decreasing by 17 percent, the number of Army prisoners in disciplinary barracks declined more than 74 percent in the same period. This has permitted the closing of four of the five disciplinary barracks. Overall court martial rates in the Army have dropped 22 percent, while its general courts martial rate has declined by 67 percent. Significantly, AWOL rates have declined 38 percent.

More than ever the Army needs intelligent and resolute soldiers whose sense of duty and esprit is of the highest order.

Similar programs for educational advancement are offered for our officers. Also, foreign linguistic skills are being developed. Outstanding officers are being considered for accelerated promotion. Ineffectives are being eliminated, and the best qualified method of selection is now in effect for promotion to all grades above captain.

In line with the events of recent years and the expectations for tomorrow, the curricula, facilities, and policies of our service schools have been greatly improved. Army schools and colleges will continue to em-

phasize instruction which trains leaders to cope with the drastic reduction in battlefield reaction and decision time resulting from the new tactics of nuclear warfare. Today's tactical doctrine imposes more responsibility on the junior commander than was borne by many senior commanders in World War II. Decisions which, in the past, might have waited upon a staff conference, in any future war will have to be made within minutes, and on the spot.

You have seen here in the various displays and exhibits some of the new weapons and materiel we are developing for the modern Army. To mention only a few, the Sergeant and the Pershing missiles to replace the Corporal and Redstone now deployed with our forces overseas. The LaCrosse became operational in July with the issuance of equipment to the two battalions which were activated in June. The Little John, successor to Honest John, though not yet operational, is making excellent progress in development. The new Redeye shoulder-fired missile, which, in the hands of individual soldiers will greatly improve the low-altitude air defense of our combat forces, fills a need which has been felt since the beginning of World War II.

Do not think that we are being carried away by "glamour" weapons. On the contrary, we recognize that the ground soldier and the nonatomic weapons are still basic to the Army. We have just put into production the M-14 rifle and all the all-purpose M-60 machinegun, equipped to fire the NATO 7.62 cartridge. These will be made available to troops as rapidly as budgetary considerations permit.

Our new main battle tank, the M-60, which will be produced during the coming year, is greatly improved over the present M-48 series. The M-60 will incorporate a 105-mm. gun and a diesel engine. It will defeat any existing tank, and will enjoy a widely increased operating range. We are starting production of a new armored personnel carrier and are developing a new command and reconnaissance vehicle. Both of these are highly maneuverable, flexible in use, air transportable, and capable of swimming inland waters.

Diesel-powered trucks, also capable of crossing inland waters, are being standardized. These new vehicles will greatly increase the cross-country mobility of our combat forces and reduce the heavy requirements for ferrying and bridging equipment in river crossing operations.

The Army is doing the major portion of research and development in the fields of toxicological agents for national defense. Recently, a great deal of public interest has been shown in the possible military use of chemical agents which do not cause death or permanent injury, but only produce temporary physical or mental incapacitation. Although these agents have limitations, they suggest the ultimate possibility of a new concept of warfare for which we must develop adequate defense.

Our progressive, forward-looking Army has not concentrated solely on its men and weapons. It has conducted vast research and has developed a new military structure to employ both men and materiel effectively under conditions of either nuclear or conventional warfare. The first major change was the adoption of the Pentomic division in 1957, which has since been fully implemented. From it we have gained a great deal of experience. The first major improvements will be made shortly. The most significant of these is the increase in firepower brought about by reorganizing its artillery and providing an increase in the number of 155-millimeter howitzer. Now, harder hitting and more versatile organizations are under study. These will take full advantage of our increased firepower and improved air and ground mobility.

Of equal importance to firepower is the commander's ability to locate and identify enemy targets quickly, so that he can use the new and powerful weapons which have been put in his hands. Combat surveillance equipment now or soon to be in the hands of troops includes short- and medium-range radar sets for detecting moving targets in fog, smoke, or darkness. Drones carrying infrared, photographic, and other sensory devices have been flight tested. These drones will soon be in production for distribution to combat troops. Aerial cameras using infrared and other special film, and utilizing quick film-delivery and processing techniques, will be in the hands of troops during the coming year. This is all solid achievement.

Although some of the developments you are seeing at this meeting are not in quantity production as yet, I do not want to leave the impression that the combat readiness of the U.S. Army is dependent upon full issue of new weapons and materiel to every last troop unit. I must emphasize, that while the full production of this equipment will materially enhance our capabilities, our forces are combat-ready today. They are prepared for any type of aggression the Communists might initiate. The ability of our Army units to move on short notice to defend any part of the globe was amply demonstrated during the Lebanon crisis. In particular, the formation of STRAC—the Army's Strategic Army Corps—has added immensely to our Nation's deterrent capability. This ready force, poised to move out by plane or ship at an hour's notice if necessary to cope with Communist armed aggression anywhere in the world, is an indispensable element of our military strength in a period of tension. A year ago, you will remember, a large STRAC combat element from the 101st Airborne Division was deployed a distance of 1,740 miles overseas in only 16 hours and 40 minutes from first alert to final landing.

The progressive contributions to the ongoing of the Army made by each of the technical services have been remarkable. The Ordnance Corps, the Transportation Corps, the Corps of Engineers, the Quartermaster Corps, the Signal Corps, the Medical Corps, and the Chemical Corps, have done and are continuing to do a magnificent job within their specialized fields. Essential to the continuing evolution of a tough and aggressive ground combat force is our Army aviation. Developments are taking place in this area which are adding immeasurably to the Army's combat capability. The Women's Army Corps occupies a position of growing importance in the Army today. The past history of the Corps has demonstrated that in many essential Army assignments, women are both capable and willing to carry a man's load.

The relative proportion and makeup of land, sea, and air forces in the U.S. military structure is a dynamic thing and is, of course, constantly reevaluated with changing technology and a changing threat. To say that U.S. military power is today adequate to meet threats to U.S. security does not mean that this same structure will be adequate 3 years from today. The U.S. monopoly in atomic weapons ended some time ago, and the shift has been toward parity, a condition of mutual equilibrium. Even during that period when the United States had a monopoly on atomic weapons, Soviet leaders showed boldness. Today we face increasing risks. We have seen many indications of Soviet truculence in recent events such as at the time of the Syrian crisis last year, the Lebanon situation, the Taiwan Strait incidents, and the challenge at Berlin. All of these have been accompanied by blatant Soviet threats of nuclear devastation, such as Mr. Khrushchev's remarks in Albania in the midst of the Geneva negotia-

tions, and his recent so-called tough talk to U.S. citizens visiting the Kremlin.

We have considerable evidence in the reception recently accorded Vice President Nixon by the people of Poland and even the Soviet Union itself, that the man on the street behind the iron curtain does not share the belligerence of the Communist leadership toward America. We may hope that the success of the Vice President's mission, which he carried out with such outstanding success, is an indication that a day of better understanding between the free world and the Communist world will dawn in our time. However, no amount of optimism on this score should lead us into the folly of letting down our formidable guard in any respect.

If the United States keeps its own long-range nuclear attack forces protected, out of reach, continually modernized and at adequate strength—as we must do—we may be able to deter the Soviet Union from using their ICBM missiles against the United States. But in the era of this "balance of terror" the U.S. ability for massive retaliation must be accompanied by the balanced ability to deter limited war—the piecemeal aggression which, if not prevented, could ultimately leave the United States an island in the hostile world—a new kind of "Fortress America." The final decision may rest upon the basis of military capabilities for limited war. Hence, land forces have become increasingly important.

These are plain ideas, yet sometimes difficult to have accepted. When faced with any job, it is characteristic that our people try to find some way to do the entire job with machines. The modern equipment on display at this meeting demonstrates the Army's use of machines to help do the job. But the Army knows that there is no substitute for the heart, the nerve, the muscle, and the brain of men. Similarly, in the tough competition of power politics, while all forms of military power are essential, there can be no substitute for adequate land power, as the United States has learned time and time again. The inexorable logic of our times makes the Army more important today than it was yesterday, and more important 3 years from today than it is today.

A major responsibility assigned the Army, as part of the triservice air defense command, is that of organizing, training, and equipping air defense units for defense not only of the United States but also for the defense of overseas commands and our military forces in the field. This is the Army's time-honored role, since we have operated air defense weapons from their very inception. In this respect the immediate problem is to provide an effective defense against enemy bombers and air-supported missiles. In the near future we must also be able to defend against enemy ballistic missiles, both ICBM's and submarine-launched IRBM's. We must be ready to detect and defeat a sneak attack by any combination of missiles or bombers at any time or place it might strike. This defense must provide protection to our deterrent forces, vital industries, and large population complexes, so that we are able to retaliate immediately, and to mount an effective offensive with our own forces. Our air defense deployments are therefore our first line of battle, an integral part of our fighting capability. They constitute a shield fashioned to fit the requirements of our world position, the precise threat we face, and our mission to prevent war if possible, or to win it quickly if it should be thrust upon us. Without these defenses the United States would have only a "one-strike" strategic force.

The U.S. Army contributes very greatly to the Nation's air defense position. In the development of weapons systems for air defense, we have recognized from the outset

the changing nature of the threat and have had weapons systems operationally ready in time to meet the threat. As you know, the original Nike-Ajax was put in operation in 1953, and can destroy any enemy bomber existing today. Hercules, the second generation of the Nike family, became operational in 1958. It can destroy even more advanced enemy bombers and also destroy cruise-type missiles. Its actual presence—on site—here and now—in the air defense of the Nation at this critical juncture makes it a major factor in our Nation's security. The third generation of the Nike family, the Nike-Zeus, is the only U.S. guided missile under development to counter the intercontinental ballistic missile threat. Progress in all phases of the Nike-Zeus development is proceeding on schedule, reflecting the Army's stated confidence in the feasibility of providing an effective anti-ballistic missile defense. Like its now-proved predecessors, Nike-Zeus has reached a high state of development. At present we are convinced that because of the difficulty, if not the impossibility, of destroying enemy ballistic missiles prior to launching, the Nation must have a capability for anti-missile defense of vital areas. We are firmly convinced that the Nike-Zeus system can be placed in the field to provide this defense.

Since World War II, the threat to America has become more direct, and every man, woman, and child is in the danger zone. There is continued need for young men and women from all over the Nation to serve in the Army and it is becoming a more familiar element in every community, school, and home. For the first time in our history, for instance, Army air defense units are stationed—on a wartime footing—right in the midst of several of our most heavily populated areas. These units are not, as in the past, defending solely military installations or units from air attack. They are defending our homes and loved ones.

Heavy emphasis has been placed upon increasing the quality and combat effectiveness of our National Guard and Army Reserve units, and as a result, their level of readiness for active duty as full-fledged elements of "one fighting Army" is at an all-time high.

The state of training of individuals in the Reserve Components has been improved tremendously in the past 2 years through the provisions of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955. All non-prior service personnel enlisting in either the Army Reserve or Army National Guard now are required to undergo a minimum of 6 months active duty in the training establishment of the active Army. Thus the training status of our 400,000 National Guardsmen and 300,000 Army Reserves is the best in our history.

The Reserve Officers Training Corps is pouring a continuous stream of capable, young officers into the Army each year. I have seen these young men on many of my inspection trips, and I have nothing but highest praise for them. In the week just passed, the ROTC completed one of the most successful summer encampments in its history. Staff and college presidents who are invited to these camps have reported that they had never before witnessed such keenness as they saw among these 14,000 collegians who will one day serve in the ranks of our active and reserve components. Their alertness, fitness, and training progress was indeed gratifying.

This is all very heartening, because we must bear in mind that the important matters which have been brought up at this conference—that the Army's future—will one day fall into the hands of these young men who make up the major annual source of new talent for our officer corps. Some 800 of these men—distinguished military graduates—will be commissioned in the Regular Army. The remainder will be com-

missioned in the Army Reserve, about 4,000 of whom will serve on active duty for two years or more.

This Nation was indeed fortunate in having the splendid backlog of officers trained in the ROTC at the outset of both World War II and Korea. Without them, we would have been faced with an almost insurmountable obstacle to mobilization and training. We have not forgotten the lesson of those two wars, and our future course will be planned so that the Army can continue to make use of the best collegiate manpower available.

Wherever in the world a critical situation may develop—as in Berlin at the present moment—it is never something remote from the home towns of America, for it is our local Reservists, ready for duty if the call comes, who constitute the visible, deterrent evidence of our military organization-in-depth, the foundation of our staying power in the event of a war emergency. Our strength in Reserve, recognized by any potential aggressor, contributes immeasurably to the ability of the United States to stand firm in any crisis.

It is our golden opportunity to make the Army something truly fine and truly American. As the Nation's need for us grows, its understanding of our mission increases, and the people will appreciate more and more the grave and numerous problems involved in maintaining an adequate defense. This will be our opportunity for "telling the Army story" and for getting the support we need to build a fighting force of the highest possible quality. The people of America will be in the front lines of any future conflict, and you and I can take no greater step toward "modernization" than that of alerting the people to the contribution of the Army.

We have a similar task to handle within the Army—the achievement of a new spirit of unity throughout our various components, arms, and services. It is time for all of us—Regulars and Reserves, civilian and military, infantryman and engineer, active duty and retired—to close ranks and strive in fact as well as in theory for a unity of effort, purpose and identity which will galvanize the countless categories of units, components, and elements into one army.

We recognize the splendid traditions of each arm, service, and component. The infantry is just proud of its front-line role in every war. Paratroopers, tankers, and artillerymen find inspiration in their magnificent combat exploits in the battles of other years. The long and distinguished records of the various services furnish strong incentive for further and greater accomplishment. Many of our National Guard and Army Reserve units are heirs to a gallant tradition of service to the Nation which goes back in some cases to the War of Independence, and even before. We would preserve these invaluable traditions. We would do nothing to weaken or destroy these intangible sources of pride and esprit. Nevertheless, in order to keep pace with the increasingly grave requirements placed upon us, it is imperative that we bring about a true amalgamation of all arms, services, and components into one army with a slogan of "One for all, and all for one."

What does all of this mean?

Today we have the opportunity to reshape the Army into something more unified in spirit and in being because an evident threat and danger stalks among us, binding us together in the fellowship of common peril. In the past, this unity was achieved only during the actual months of battle when men shared the rigors, dangers, and accomplishments of war together. . . .

We shall continue to build along these lines, using the organizational material we now have at hand. We have only the neces-

sity to increase confidence and mutual trust among all components and branches of the Army and thus be able to replace the images of the regular and guardsman or the infantryman and artilleryman with the single image of the soldier. You shall hear more about our effort to achieve this. Next October, I intend to call a conference of the leaders of all Army components and branches to ascertain what can and will be done.

The ultimate product will be a stronger, integrated Army team, serving with professional and spirited efficiency within our larger triservice force, dedicated more than ever to the preservation of peace and the attainment of national objectives.

During the course of this inspiring annual meeting, you have seen a great many outstanding displays, heard expert discussion of the Army and its problems and progress, acquired countless items of information.

What you have gotten here should not be taken home and put in cold storage.

Spread the message everywhere and to everyone you meet. Be an active, full-time and enthusiastic advocate of the Army—a super salesman.

There is a rising tide of public opinion recognizing the need for ground forces. Give every ounce of added impetus you can to this tide.

Help to build up a momentum for the Army.

Object is not to sell the Army to the believers, but to convert the unbelievers, otherwise there is a great danger of becoming too "inbred."

AUSA chapters now number two. This is only a beginning. There should be a chapter in every good-sized city throughout the length and breadth of the land.

Old image of the Army as made up of foot soldiers slogging slowly along with rifles still held by countless people. It is up to you to see that the people get the image of the Army as it is today.

Since 1953, the era of the new look has been evolving which, in 1959, finds us in a new atmosphere. By the time we meet in 1960, we will be on the threshold of a new strategic concept for the defense of America.

Job Development Aid Legislation Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Record of Friday, July 31, 1959, commenting on Pennsylvania Gov. David L. Lawrence's remarks at a meeting of the Pennsylvania congressional delegation held last week in Washington on area redevelopment legislation:

JOB DEVELOPMENT AID

Properly enough Governor Lawrence, in an address before the Pennsylvania congressional delegation on Wednesday, in Washington, appealed for support of job development legislation. He stressed it as of paramount importance. In supporting his plea, he said that the State suffered severely during the recent recession and continues to suffer. He pictured unemployment in Pennsylvania as a chronic condition. In listing reasons, he said: "They bear on the shift of

textiles to the South; the depletion of our forests; the mechanization of our coal mines and coal's competition from other fuels; the automation process in many industries, notably steel; and the dieselization of our railroads."

The Governor did not minimize the problem. He placed unemployment as of May, the last month for which complete figures are available, at 364,000. The Governor volunteered that the State and its communities have done "a magnificent job" through local industrial authorities. This is borne out by the successful bidding for new industries in Luzerne County. It is also supported by the Pennsylvania Department of Commerce report released for publication yesterday.

A total of 136 new and expanded plant facilities was credited to efforts made during the first 6 months of this year with the total including 52 new manufacturing plants. Seventy-five of them reported that at full normal operations they will create 6,300 new industrial jobs with the remaining 61 accounting for a possible additional 3,000.

This is far from offsetting the estimated unemployment, but it shows that Pennsylvania and its communities are bent on helping themselves while asking for Government aid, Federal and State.

Trip Boosts Prestige of Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following Trendex poll:

TRIP BOOSTS PRESTIGE OF NIXON

(By Jack Boyle)

New York.—RICHARD NIXON's presidential prospects have been increased tremendously by his Russian visit, a Trendex poll made this week shows.

The poll was similar to Trendex polls made in November, 1958, and in February of this year.

They show Nixon's popularity almost doubled in the last 9 months.

He is now the favored Republican candidate of 71.5 percent of the people, the latest poll shows.

Here is a comparison of the three polls:

(In percent)

	November 1958	February 1959	July 1959
Nixon	37.4	51.8	71.5
Rockefeller	45.9	27.9	21.2
No choice	16.5	20.3	7.3

In all three polls, the question asked of a scientifically selected cross section of Americans was identical. It was: "As of right now, do you think RICHARD NIXON or NELSON ROCKEFELLER would get the most votes for presidency as the nominee of the Republican Party?"

All interviewed were invited to explain their answers.

It was in these explanations that the effect of Nixon's current visit to Russia became apparent.

HE STOOD UP TO KHRUSHCHEV

Phrases such as "He stood up to Khrushchev," "He's shown his ability in inter-

national affairs," "Proven diplomat," "Good appearance on television," "Experience in world affairs," "Now better known," and "More publicized than ever" recurred frequently in the reasons offered.

Here is a sampling of typical responses with party affiliations given:

An eastern truck driver, Democrat: "Nixon is doing a good job in Russia and winning nationwide good will at home."

A western factory inspector, Democrat: "He seems to be getting on well with the Russians, which impresses the voters."

A midwestern auditor, Republican: "He knows how to deal with the Communists."

An eastern chemist, independent: "He has a salesman's 'hep'. He has handled himself admirably."

A southern maintenance engineer, Democrat: "Rockefeller has slowed down."

An eastern engraver, politics declined: "Nixon stood up to Khrushchev."

VICE PRESIDENT LOSES GROUND IN SOUTH

Those favoring Rockefeller were no less pointed in their remarks, as this sampling shows:

A western Federal Government employee, Democrat: "Nixon is too much of a disturber."

A western trucker, Democrat: "All California hates Nixon."

A midwestern painter, politics declined: "We are due for a change."

A southern embalmer, Democrat: "His success proves what kind of a man he is."

A southern nurse, Democrat: "Rockefeller has money so he wouldn't have to be President just to get more."

A breakdown of the poll by regions shows that Nixon has lost some ground in the South. Here is a recapitulation of the three polls, by regions:

	East	West and Midwest	South	Total
Rockefeller:				
November 1958	54.5	36.2	48.6	45.9
February 1959	23.1	33.4	27.8	27.9
This week	16.7	25.9	44.4	21.2
Nixon:				
November 1958	30.3	44.0	37.1	37.6
February 1959	60.4	38.3	66.4	51.8
This week	73.5	70.4	55.6	71.5
No choice:				
November 1958	15.2	19.8	14.3	16.5
February 1959	16.5	28.3	5.8	20.3
This week	9.8	3.7	(1)	7.3

(1) Less than 1/2 of 1 percent.

Nixon Leads in Local Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the San Diego Independent:

NIXON LEADS IN LOCAL POLL

Vice President RICHARD NIXON proved the strongest candidate for the 1960 presidential election, according to the results of the San Diego Independent's poll.

San Diegans, chose him by a wide margin over the next leading Republican Nelson Rockefeller.

Senator JOHN KENNEDY was the choice of the Democrats as their candidate but Nixon outpolled any Democrat.

Gov. Edmund (Pat) Brown who has been showing strength on California polls, was not listed as a possible candidate because most of his strength is, so far, in this State.

The San Diego Independent's poll is made on a scientific sampling basis by professional interviewers. Each major area of Metropolitan San Diego is properly represented in the total sample. Half of the interviews are made with men, half with women. Only one interview per dwelling unit is permitted. Followup checks are made in a limited number of cases to insure that the personal interviews were accurately recorded.

The results were:

"National polls show Nixon, Rockefeller, Lodge, and Stassen to be the leading candidates for the Republican nomination for President in 1960 at the present time. Which one of these men would you like to see nominated?"

Total

	Percent
(1) Nixon	48
(2) Rockefeller	20
(3) Lodge	6
(4) Stassen	4
(5) None of these; don't like any of the candidates; can't suggest any others; Knowland	5
(6) No opinion	22
Total	100

Breakdown by sex

(In percent)

	Male	Female
(1) Nixon	48	43
(2) Rockefeller	19	21
(3) Lodge	6	3
(4) Stassen	4	1
(5) None of these	8	2
(6) No opinion	15	30
Total	100	100

Breakdown by age

(In percent)

	18 to 39	40 to 59	60 and above
(1) Nixon	42	38	80
(2) Rockefeller	20	23	9
(3) Lodge	7	3	0
(4) Stassen	3	3	0
(5) None of these	4	7	2
(6) No opinion	24	26	9
Total	100	100	100

"National polls show Stevenson, Kennedy, Johnson, and Kefauver to be the leading candidates for the Democratic nomination for President in 1960 at the present time. Which one of these men would you like to see nominated?"

Total

	Percent
(1) Kennedy	29
(2) Stevenson	19
(3) Kefauver	15
(4) Johnson	10
(5) None of these; Stevenson; Senator Byrd; don't like any of the candidates, can't suggest any others	6
(6) No opinion	21
Total	100

Breakdown by sex

(In percent)

	Male	Female
(1) Kennedy	35	24
(2) Stevenson	15	23
(3) Kefauver	15	15
(4) Johnson	11	9
(5) None of these	7	4
(6) No opinion	17	25
Total	100	100

Breakdown by age

[In percent]

	18 to 39	40 to 59	60 and above
(1) Kennedy.....	31	30	21
(2) Stevenson.....	23	15	20
(3) Kefauver.....	15	19	7
(4) Johnson.....	10	6	20
(5) None of these.....	1	9	12
(6) No opinion.....	20	21	20
Total.....	100	100	100

"If your choice of Republican candidates runs against your choice of Democratic candidates, who do you think that you will vote for?"

Total

	Percent
(1) Nixon.....	29
(2) Kennedy.....	16
(3) Stevenson.....	11
(4) Rockefeller.....	11
(5) Kefauver.....	7
(6) Johnson.....	2
(7) Lodge.....	2
(8) Stassen.....	1
(9) No choice made.....	21
Total.....	100

Breakdown by sex

[In percent]

	Male	Female
(1) Nixon.....	27	31
(2) Kennedy.....	21	11
(3) Stevenson.....	7	16
(4) Rockefeller.....	11	11
(5) Kefauver.....	7	7
(6) Johnson.....	3	2
(7) Lodge.....	1	1
(8) Stassen.....	1	1
(9) No choice made.....	21	20
Total.....	100	100

Notice of Hearings on Proposed Legislation Which Would Provide an Exemption From the Antitrust Laws To Authorize Cooperative Associations of Milk Producers To Bargain With Purchasers Singly or in Groups, and for Other Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and as chairman of its Antitrust Subcommittee, I wish to announce the commencement of hearings on S. 753 and H.R. 7191, to authorize cooperative associations of milk producers to bargain with purchasers singly or in groups, and for other purposes.

It is the Antitrust Subcommittee's intention to hold hearings on these bills August 20 and August 21, 1959. All persons who wish to appear and testify at hearings on these bills are requested to notify Mr. Herbert N. Maletz, chief counsel, Antitrust Subcommittee, room 230, Old House Office Building, telephone Capitol 4-3121, extension 4853, as soon as possible.

Tight Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a letter from a farmer and director of a small bank in New Jersey, as follows:

WHY DOESN'T THE FED DO SOMETHING ABOUT GOVERNMENT BOND PRICES?

A LETTER FROM A FARMER AND DIRECTOR OF SMALL BANK IN NEW JERSEY

FEDERAL RESERVE BANK, Philadelphia, Pa.

GENTLEMEN: As a layman, I was discussing the Government bond situation this morning. I was told that 1 year ago certificates of indebtedness were issued at 1½ percent to come due on May 15, 1959. Now these same certificates are to be exchanged for ones due May 15, 1960, at 4 percent and priced at 99.95.

It would seem to me that the Government bond situation has become quite disorganized. In the past it was my understanding that the Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve was set up to stabilize the Government bond market.

It would seem also that it is no wonder that it has become somewhat difficult for the Treasury to arrange its financing. The bonds have become a risk asset and not riskless as they have been in the past.

I am not an expert but I have been very much concerned for some time. It becomes very difficult for banks to handle their Government bond portfolio and more so for individuals.

What does the future hold in your opinion?

Very truly yours,

And a copy of the response:

DEAR MR. —: Your letter asks some vital questions which are of real concern to many investors like yourself, to public officials who are responsible for answering them, and to just plain citizens. We think they are so important that we are responding at some length. A better public understanding of the issues can give reassurance which in itself can help to solve the problems.

But before tackling your questions we hasten to make one point clear: This is an area of concern to the Treasury as well as to the Federal Reserve, and we cannot speak for the Treasury.

Your letter in essence raises four questions:

1. What's behind the decline in prices of Government securities?

2. Why doesn't the Open Market Committee support the Government bond market?

3. Have Government securities become "a risk asset and not riskless as they have been in the past"?

4. How can banks and other investors "handle their Government bond portfolio"? Let us look at each in turn.

What's behind the decline in prices of Government securities?

Your illustration provides a striking example of the change in the Government securities market in one year. It is true that the certificates issued in May 1959 at a yield of 4.05 percent refunded similar securities issued a year earlier (June 1958) at 1½ percent. It is also true that a similar issue was put out still a year earlier (May 1957) at 3½ percent.

These were rates that the Treasury judged necessary to attract sufficient buyers under the prevailing conditions. Why did the rates change so sharply? For a number of reasons:

First is the change in business conditions. In the spring of 1957 we were nearing the peak of a 3-year boom. In the spring of 1958 we were at the bottom of our sharpest postwar recession. And by now our economy has recovered just about all that was lost during the recession and has moved into new territory.

Second, these changing conditions brought about changes in the overall demand for and supply of credit—and, as a natural consequence, changes in interest rates, the price of credit. In the 1957 boom demands for credit were strong, the Federal Reserve was restraining the supply, so interest rates rose. The Treasury, one of the demanders, paid higher rates along with almost everyone else. Last year, in the recession, demands were not so strong and the Federal Reserve was liberally supplying funds; so interest rates fell. Now, once again, demands are rising, the Fed has not made possible an equal expansion on the supply side, and rates are higher.

Third, along with these developments affecting overall demand and supply conditions have been special factors which have influenced the supply of and demand for funds in the Government securities market. The Treasury's demands have depended largely on the budget situation. In fiscal 1957 the Government had a cash surplus of \$2 billion. But in fiscal 1958 it ran a cash deficit of \$1½ billion, and in fiscal 1959 ended up with a deficit of around \$12½ billion. This means that the Treasury has had to go to the market, in the past year especially, for large amounts of funds. In 1958 it was able to raise a substantial proportion by selling longer term issues. But more recently it has had to confine itself almost entirely to short terms. Consequently, the Treasury has been in the market almost continuously, either to get new money or to refund maturing issues.

At the same time, the supply of funds going into Government securities has undergone changes. Two years ago, in the 1957 boom, investors had ample investment opportunities. They looked at the rates available on other types of investments, such as mortgages, municipals, corporate stocks and bonds, business and consumer loans, etc., along with Governments. For the Treasury to compete successfully for these limited funds, it had to pay higher rates. Then came the 1957-58 recession. Investors had more funds available and turned more to Government securities, even buying a substantial amount of longer terms. Some of their purchases—we can never know how much—were motivated by speculative interests; many investors expected that as the recession proceeded, interest rates would fall (prices rise). Some bought to beat the expected price rise and their actions helped to bring about this very thing. But they made the market vulnerable to a turn-around in business conditions. As soon as the recession gave evidence of ending, speculators wanted to unload before rates rose (prices fell) again. Part of the rapid rise in rates last summer can be attributed to anticipatory and speculative activities. Since then, as business has recovered, investors have again looked at Governments carefully in relation to other investments as desirable outlets for their funds. And, in addition, some have been influenced by still another consideration—again, no one knows how much—namely, the fear of inflation.

¹ This whole period is under detailed study by the Federal Reserve and the Treasury. When the results are made public, you will be able to get a much more complete account of the developments.

tion and the desire to hedge against it by buying common stocks instead of bonds. Whatever weight you want to give these various forces, the result has been higher interest rates.

Well, this, in brief, is a rundown of the circumstances that produced rising rates 2 years ago, relatively low rates last year, and higher rates again recently. Now for the second question.

Why doesn't the Open Market Committee support the Government bond market?

Desirable as a healthy Government securities market may be, we all would lose much more than we might gain by having a pegged market. Many things about monetary policy are uncertain, but this isn't. We know with certainty what would happen because we have had specific experience that tells us. It may be helpful to review our experience in maintaining fixed prices and yields of Government securities.

During World War II, as part of the program of facilitating war financing, the Fed had an announced policy of keeping rates on governments from rising above certain levels and prices from falling below certain levels. This policy was continued until 1951 when the Federal Reserve and the Treasury reached an accord which restored flexible interest rates.

The consequences of that policy were, in one way, the same consequences that flow from a policy of pegging the price of, say, wheat. Just as the Government had ended up holding all the wheat no one else wants at the fixed price, the Fed ended up with the Government securities no one else wanted at the support price. The tremendous volume of Governments which financial institutions bought to help finance World War II looked too big to them when other opportunities opened up after the war. So lenders began to make mortgage, consumer, and business loans and to buy corporate and municipal securities. To get the funds, they sold Governments. To keep these sales from depressing the prices of Governments, the Federal Reserve bought the securities.

But this support policy had much greater repercussions, for when the Federal Reserve buys securities it pays for them with newly created money. Every time the Fed bought Governments to keep their price from falling, it injected new reserves into the banking system, permitting banks to expand credit and the money supply by several times the amount of new reserves. All this at a time when the supply of goods was still limited. As the Chairman of the Board of Governors put it, the Federal Reserve had become "an engine of inflation."

Moral: we cannot peg prices and yields of Government securities and at the same time combat inflation.

With this fact staring us in the face, we as citizens are forced to make choices: (1) Peg Government security prices and let prices of goods and services rise, or (2) peg Government security prices and hold down prices of goods and services by direct controls, or (3) let interest rates move freely and use monetary policy to combat inflation.

We in the Federal Reserve could not choose alternative number (1) because we believe the evils of inflation are much greater than any inconveniences of higher interest rates. We would not favor alternative number (2) in peacetime because direct controls are so contrary to the freedom we all like to exercise in our economic and political pursuits. In our view, the third choice is the only acceptable one. It is more important to have stable prices of goods and services than stable interest rates. This brings us to your third question:

Have Government securities, therefore, become a risk asset and not riskless as they have been in the past?

An obligation of the U.S. Government is probably the most riskless security you can

buy; you are certain of being paid 100 cents on the dollar when it matures. In this sense, Governments are just as riskless as ever.

But this doesn't mean you can always get par for Governments if you want to sell before maturity. Anyone who buys a marketable issue should realize that he can sell it only for what the market is willing to pay.²

So a marketable issue is not riskless in one sense—you are not guaranteed par if you want to sell before maturity. It never has been riskless in this sense, except when the Fed was supporting Government securities prices. Weighing alternatives, it seems to us in the best interests of the Nation not to encourage inflation by pegging Government security prices even though this may mean risks of market fluctuations. This leads to your last question:

Under such circumstances how can banks and other investors handle their Government bond portfolio?

We can't presume to tell you how to manage your portfolio. You know more about your situation than anyone else. But we do want to point out a fact of life: in a free market economy, any marketable security or other asset is likely to fluctuate in value. Many forgot this during the decade of pegs on Government security prices. Now that prices and yields are free to move, the investor must ask himself basic questions: How much income must I have? How much risk am I willing to undertake to get it? How much liquidity do I need? Can I get adequate liquidity by spacing maturities? How much short terms should I hold? Am I willing to commit myself, at the present yield, to holding a security until it matures, if necessary? etc. He must weigh risks of capital loss against the return on his investment and adjust his portfolio accordingly.

The answers will seldom be the same for any two investors. And they don't come easily—certainly not as easily as if Government security prices were pegged. In that situation the investor's job would be greatly simplified, for all Governments regardless of maturity would be equally liquid. But the Government probably would not pay you very high rates.

We realize that we have not solved your problem of managing your portfolio. And we realize that flexible interest rates make it harder for you to do so. But the thousands of investors whose lives become somewhat more complicated because of flexible interest rates help make for better lives for millions of people (including themselves) by contributing to a stable and growing economy. We can't hold everything stable and have a dynamic economy.

² The reason U.S. savings bonds are not marketable is to enable small investors to avoid the uncertainties of price fluctuations. If they need cash, they can redeem their savings bonds at a predetermined price regardless of the current level of securities prices.

Chronically Unemployed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of

Thursday, July 30, 1959, regarding the plight of the so-called hard core unemployed who have been out of work 15 weeks or longer:

CHRONICALLY UNEMPLOYED

With U.S. employment getting back to the record highs it established before the recession, we find a sharper light focussing on the hard core unemployed who have been out of work 15 weeks or more.

Some 900,000 fall into this category, and of them nearly 550,000 have been without jobs more than half a year.

The people in the hard core group are not faceless. Most live in areas that have become more or less permanent pockets of depression—coal mining sections in Kentucky, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, once thriving textile producing communities in New England, and so on.

The bulk of the chronically unemployed in this hard core are unskilled workers, traditionally the last to be hired, usually left by the wayside in all but the great booms.

Congress has not yet been able to manage effective aid to distressed regions. But any program would seem limited in promise which did not contain plans for lifting these people out of their unskilled status.

In this increasingly mechanized age, to be unskilled may mean not only being unemployed but being unemployable.

Veterans' Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the Gastonia Gazette, Gastonia, N.C., carried a very fine editorial on Thursday, August 6, 1959, regarding the non-service-connected veterans' pension bill passed recent in the House of Representatives.

The editor of the Gazette has helped clear up some of the misunderstanding surrounding the Teague bill. With the thought that my colleagues in the House might like to read the editorial, I, under unanimous consent, include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

VETERANS' PENSIONS

In recent weeks a bill has passed the U.S. House which purports to correct flaws in the present pension system for veterans. And though the bill is admirably designed to place the pension system on an equitable basis, opposition is beginning to develop in some quarters of the country.

It is well recognized that veterans' organizations on Capitol Hill have developed into very strong pressure groups.

For example, one such organization, the World War I veterans, have been lobbying for an across-the-board pension of \$100 a month for men and women who served at least 90 days in the First World War. Though the hearts of these graying gentlemen may be in the right place, still under such a provision a World War I veteran could get \$100 per month if he served in the war even if he were a millionaire. Clearly pensions should be meted out with genuine need as the primary consideration.

The present bill, however, sponsored by OLIN E. TEAGUE, Democrat, from Texas, seeks to establish a level of need for all pensioned veterans and their dependents, regardless of

which war they were a part of, whether it be World War I or II or the Korean conflict.

Under the present law, a single veteran is eligible for a pension if his income from all other sources does not exceed \$1,400 per year and a married veteran with one or more dependents is eligible if his income does not exceed \$2,700.

The trouble with the old system is that a single man having an income of, say, \$1,400 (the limit) would get as much as the single man with \$100 outside income. The real difficulty is understanding why such an inequitable system has been permitted to linger on for so long.

A further problem with the present flat rate pension for single veterans is that under the present law a single veteran receives the full pension if his income from outside sources does not exceed \$1,400, but if he has only 1 cent over the income limit, he receives no pension. A veteran now gets all or nothing.

Married veterans, too, are subject to the all-or-nothing fallacy. Rate of pension is the same for all regardless of outside income or number of dependents.

The Teague bill very sensibly sets up a procedure whereby a level of need is established and pensions increase as outside income declines. With such a system the pension will be higher where the need is greater.

Furthermore, the Teague bill raises all income limits so that additional pensioners now barred by lower income limits will be brought onto the rolls. The bill would give widows and orphans of World War II and Korean veterans eligibility for pension on the same basis as widows of World War I veterans by eliminating the requirement that the veteran at time of death must have had some percent of service-connected disability.

Those opposing the bill have circulated rumors that the bill reduces non-service-connected pensions, but a close reading of the bill reveals no such provisions.

In reality, the Nation owes a vote of thanks to OLIN TEAGUE, chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for supervising the fine job of draftsmanship.

Interested veterans will be glad to know that TEAGUE himself was quite a soldier. During World War II TEAGUE commanded the First Battalion, 314th Infantry, 79th Division. Although he was in actual combat for only 6 months, he was decorated 11 times, awarded the Silver Star with two clusters, Bronze Star with two clusters, Purple Heart with two clusters, Combat Infantryman's Badge, Army Commendation, French Croix de Guerre with Palm—among others.

This is not the kind of man to let veterans' affairs go without the closest and most devoted scrutiny. The Gazette is gratified that our own Congressman, BASIL L. WHITENER, himself a former member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, has lent his support to the measure.

Our hope is that the bill will receive quick approval as it now goes to the Senate.

statements and statistics designed to sustain the claim that our immigration laws and our immigration policy discriminates against immigrants from Central and Southern Europe as well as from countries behind the Iron Curtain.

It appears highly appropriate to invite the attention of my colleagues to a set of statistics published by a reliable and impartial organization, the International Catholic Migration Commission, having its headquarters at Geneva, Switzerland.

The studies made by the ICMC indicate that since the end of World War II, the United States has received a total of 1,820,278 immigrants from Europe, and only 23 percent of that number were natives of Northern Europe, the allegedly "preferred" area. The balance of our intake of immigrants from Europe came from central, southern, and Eastern Europe. Under unanimous consent, I include the figures published by the ICMC:

Immigration from Europe to the United States from 1946 until 1958

	Total	Percent of the total
Northern Europe:		
United Kingdom.....	282,360	15
Ireland.....	75,957	4
Norway.....	29,974	1
Sweden.....	22,362	1
Denmark.....	18,085	1
Finland.....	8,163	1
Subtotal.....	434,901	23
Central Europe:		
Germany.....	377,378	20
France.....	62,279	3
Netherlands.....	61,421	3
Austria.....	36,068	2
Switzerland.....	19,513	1
Belgium.....	19,142	1
Subtotal.....	556,401	30
Iron Curtain countries:		
Poland.....	209,312	12
U.S.S.R.....	60,945	3
Czechoslovakia.....	42,066	2
Latvia.....	40,634	2
Hungary.....	37,612	2
Lithuania.....	30,783	2
Rumania.....	21,489	1
Estonia.....	11,743	1
Bulgaria.....	1,342	1
Subtotal.....	455,926	25
Southern Europe:		
Italy.....	212,050	12
Yugoslavia.....	63,094	4
Greece.....	47,733	3
Portugal.....	15,162	1
Spain.....	9,641	1
Subtotal.....	349,680	21
Others.....	23,370	1
Total, Europe.....	1,820,278	100

¹ 1946-55 only.

in the Nashville, Tenn., Morning Tennessean of May 31, 1959, entitled "Woodbine Gets Sewage Flood":

WOODBINE GETS SEWAGE FLOOD—SEPTIC TANK PROBLEMS PLAGUE AREA—BUSINESSMEN SORRY METRO BEATEN

(By Eugene Dietz)

Sewage flowed down streets in Woodbine's major business district last week. Ray Harrington, assistant sanitation engineer for the county health department, reported yesterday.

"Regrettably, that was nothing new," said Harrington. "Still worse, there is no hope for much change for the better in the future unless a sanitary sewer system is developed. Septic tanks just are not keeping sewage underground."

Other sections of Davidson County outside Nashville, especially in the heavily built-up areas where 190,000 persons live, are encountering similar problems daily, said Harrington.

OWNERS COOPERATE

The public health official said that the owners and operators of the affected establishments in Woodbine "are cooperating fully with the health department and at considerable expense to themselves," to correct the septic tanks problem the best they can without sewers.

He said that sewage was running into Lutie Street, directly behind some businesses fronting on Nolensville Road, which is the main shopping district of the suburban community south of Nashville.

Efforts are underway right now to correct that temporarily.

C. Vance Hickerson, owner of Hickerson's Restaurant and Motel and also owner of buildings in the 2500 block of Nolensville Road housing other businesses, told a reporter:

"I have spent an awful lot trying to keep sewage underground here. A month ago, I bought a house and lot for \$10,000 at 315 Lutie Street. That lot will be used as an overflow for the septic tanks which serve my restaurant, an insurance office, a dentist's office, and a barbershop.

"That \$10,000 for an overflow field is pretty expensive."

Hickerson, who said he was one of the citizens to vote for development of a single, city-type government when defeated in a referendum last June, commented:

"It is time for us to start on one-government. The sooner we get started the sooner we will have some relief. There is no answer to our septic tank problems except sewers."

The overflow, Hickerson said, will serve his restaurant, Garrett's Barber Shop, the Fuqua Insurance Agency and the offices of Dr. C. V. Collins, a dentist. They are in a building in the 2500 block, owned by Hickerson, who said he found the \$10,000 expenditure, plus other septic tank costs, necessary to protect his \$170,000 investment.

Another Woodbine businessman, Magistrate E. B. Garrett, operator of two drugstores, told a reporter he would give \$10,000 if the Woodbine buildings he rents to house his drugstores were attached to sewer lines.

"It would be worth that to me," said Garrett. "I am spending about \$1,500 a year at the two stores in septic tank costs."

"LIMITS"

"There is a limit to how far a man can go on this. We made a mistake in not putting Metro into operation last year."

Garrett said he supported Metro.

Hickerson said he thought a major reason Metro was defeated last year was that some people who had never experienced septic tank problems had the idea that it could not happen to them.

Some, he said, have since discovered that it could.

Immigration to the United States From Europe, 1946-48

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, from time to time there appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD highly misleading

Poison in Your Water—No. 152

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing

Both Garrett and Hickerson said their septic tank problems have been with them for years.

And, Harrington said, "Their cases are not exceptional." "I guess," Harrington told a reporter while driving down Nolensville Road "that we could stop at just about any place along here and find septic tank problems."

Farmer Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal this morning carries on its front page an article entitled "Farmer Khrushchev." This goes to the roots of one great superiority our free enterprise system holds over the communistic system. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting this article in the RECORD, so that it might have the widest possible distribution.

The Russians may rival us in space probes and perhaps in some other achievements, but try as they may—and try they have for more than a quarter of a century—they simply cannot begin to match the productivity of America's farmers.

Mr. Speaker, the American free-enterprise system, in the beginning, was built upon a foundation of free and independent—and numerous—family operated farms.

Our continent was settled largely by people fleeing from the feudal estates, the baronial-operated farms, of Europe. Bigness did not produce efficiency and strength in a people under the feudal system, where the freedom and identity of the individual and the family were lost in the very size of the estates. In our own time we have the example now of the failure of collectivism on the farms of Russia, where the pride and productivity of family unit work and possession have been condemned and suppressed.

The article, "Farmer Khrushchev," should give to all of us a new appreciation of the farm families of America. We should thank God that they have made this a land of abundance and plenty, and we should resolve to protect and exalt the farm family as the continuing dominant unit in our agricultural economy and for its immeasurable contribution to our democratic society:

FARMER KHRUSHCHEV: HE HAD BETTER LUCK IN SPACE RACE THAN WITH MILK AND MEAT—RUSSIA'S HARVESTS GROW BUT STILL TRAIL U.S. OUTPUT—DISTRIBUTION IS A PROBLEM—TIPS ON HIS TRIP TO UNITED STATES?

(By Edmund K. Faltermayer)

KHARKOV, U.S.S.R.—"A rocket is not a cucumber," Nikita Khrushchev recently told a group of farmers.

Mr. K's terse aphorism carried a world of meaning for his Russian audience. For while the U.S.S.R. has awed the rest of the world by the way it has organized its scientific manpower for outer space probes and other breathtaking technological achieve-

ments, after more than 30 years of intensive economic planning it still hasn't been able to solve its farm problem.

Since Stalin's death in 1953, to be sure, sizable gains in agricultural production have been made. Grain, the backbone of the Russian diet, reached a record production rate last year of 139.4 million metric tons, compared with only 82.5 million tons in 1953. Sugar beets, potatoes, meat, eggs, and milk also are vastly more plentiful than they were in pre-Khrushchev.

NO SURPLUS PROBLEMS IN U.S.S.R.

However, unlike Ezra Taft Benson, whose problems are wrapped up in surpluses, Russian farm planners frantically center all their efforts on producing more. By Western standards the results are not particularly impressive. It takes about 45 million people—43 percent of the Russian labor force—to feed a total population of 209 million, while in the United States only 8.1 million farmers feed 175 million people. Moreover despite soil banks, acreage controls and other crop limiting schemes, the U.S. farmers grow about twice as much as their Russian counterparts. They fed more grain to livestock last year than the entire record Soviet harvest. And U.S. per capita meat consumption, at more than 150 pounds last year, was nearly double the 85-pound Russian average.

This gap between United States and Russian agriculture productivity is a matter of prime concern to Mr. Khrushchev, whose early career was spent in the wheat-producing Ukraine and who was called to Moscow in 1949 to take over reorganization of Russia's collective farm system. Significantly, well in advance of his visit to the United States next month, Mr. K already has made arrangements to visit Iowa, one of the Nation's top farm States, to observe United States farm techniques.

Particularly embarrassing to the ideologically minded Russians is the persistence of vestiges of individualism among the workers on Russia's state farms and collectives: An amazing 56 percent of the Soviet's dairy cows are still individually owned and provide more than half of the nation's milk production. The small private garden plots and poultry and livestock pens, operated in their leisure hours by farm workers, also account for a vital 40 percent of Russia's total meat supplies and a large portion of its fresh produce.

Even Russia's recent gains on the farm front can be attributed in no small part to the granting of more capitalist-style incentives to farmers. A year ago, for example, Mr. Khrushchev abolished one of the most hated institutions of the Stalin era, the system under which collective farms were required to deliver part of their grain and other crops to the state at exceedingly low prices. This "form of tribute," as Stalin himself called it, enabled the late dictator, by selling bread at a big markup, to obtain huge amounts of capital to pay for industrialization. Mr. K, in contrast, offered high enough grain prices that farmers willingly boosted deliveries to the state.

END OF THE TRACTOR STATIONS

Shortly before this, the present Soviet chief had done away with another unpopular institution, the more than 8,000 machine and tractor stations, and had permitted collective farms to acquire their own tractors and farm machinery for the first time. Nominally set up to do harvesting and other mechanized jobs for the farms in return for a share of their crops, the machine and tractor stations actually had been an instrument for Communist Party control over the peasantry.

For a look at the results, visit the 12,500 acre Bolshevik collective farm in the rich black earth country 40 miles west of Kharkov. In 1956, the last good harvest year before the price reform, the farm harvested 10,260 bushels of grain of all types, including

rye and corn. Last year, with higher prices as the incentive production mounted to 15,370 bushels.

"We're 730,000 rubles richer," exults the farm's director, ruddy-faced Nikolai Nerovny. He explains that in 1956 the farm got 120,000 rubles from the state for its grain while last year it received 850,000 rubles. (At the 10 rubels for \$1 tourist exchange rate, this was equivalent to \$85,000.)

Mr. Nerovny also is happy about the abolition of the machine and tractor stations units. "The tractor stations were all right in the early days," he says, "when the newly formed collective farms were too poor to own their own machinery." But, he adds, "as Comrade Khrushchev said, you can't have two nurses for one child." Under the old system, the tractor drivers from the machine and tractor stations were under their own agronomist—whose ideas on harvesting and cultivation often differed from those of the farm's own agronomist, often leading to intense disagreements. With the machine and tractor stations gone, Mr. Nerovny's farm now has, on its own, 16 tractors, 6 grain combines, 6 cornpickers and various other implements, most of them purchased from a machine and tractor station in the past year.

WORK BRIGADES

The Bolshevik farm takes in seven villages with a total population of 3,000. Each village is organized into a work brigade. These brigades till the 8,750 acres of the farm that is under cultivation; 1,250 acres are used for grazing and the rest of the area consists of forests and private garden plots. The farm, admittedly richer than average, has a prosperous look; alongside the dirt roads are many new brick bungalows and more modest whitewashed dwellings made from blocks of dried mud reinforced with straw—the traditional Ukrainian farmhouse, complete with thatched roof. We have our own brick factory right on the farm," Mr. Nerovny boasts. "Last year we turned out 500,000 bricks."

Since the mid-1930's when Stalin liquidated the holdings of the "kulaks," or more prosperous peasants, over 99 percent of the Soviet peasantry has been enrolled in two types of socialized farms. One is the so-called state farm or "sovkhoz," in which the land belongs to the state and peasants are paid straight cash wages, just as in a factory. The 5,900 state farms today comprise about 27 percent of the land under cultivation and have about 4 million workers.

The more predominant farms, however, and the ones that have given the regime the most trouble, are the so-called kolkhozes or collective farms. There are nearly 80,000 of these and they have about 41 million workers. Theoretically a "voluntary" cooperative, formed by all the peasants in a given village or group of villages, the collective farm belongs "in perpetuity" to all its members and not to the state. Pay, in the form of cash and produce, is determined by the collective itself at the end of the harvest season, and depends on the size of the crops.

FORTY-THOUSAND-ACRE FARMS

Smaller than the huge state farms, the collectives average about 5,000 acres under cultivation, not counting woods and pasture land. The state farms average a stupendous 20,000 acres. Many of them are in the virgin lands of central Asia where 90 million acres have been put in use in recent years, contributing markedly to Russia's increased grain production. Here, the size of the state farms run as high as 40,000 acres, or about 62 square miles.

The state farms supposedly represent a higher form of socialized agriculture and are supposed to set a standard of efficiency for the collective farms to emulate.

Despite all the post-Stalin reforms, it is clear there is no real intent on the part of

Mr. Khrushchev to retreat to some form of individual farming.

The government, for example, has given peasants on state farms a deadline of 2 to 3 years in which to give up their privately owned cows. It also is using "gentle persuasion" on peasants in the collectives to do likewise. So far, there is no national program to compel them to give up their privately raised pigs and poultry and the garden plots themselves.

However, it is no secret that this is part of the eventual scheme of things that government planners envision. In the model collective farm at Kalinovka, the village near Kursk where Mr. Khrushchev was born, the peasants already have "voluntarily" sold their cows and the size of the private gardens is to be reduced in the future from three-quarters of an acre to only three-eighths. And at the "Vladimir Ilich" collective, just west of Moscow, the deputy chairman, David Babilonok, says that "eventually the private plot will be cut down to just trees and a flower garden, so that it will be very pleasant to come home in the evening."

But the process will be a slow one. Even now peasants still get about a third of their total income from their individual gardens. An overnight takeover of these tiny household farms, on a national basis, would court open rebellion in the countryside and almost inevitably would precipitate a serious food shortage in the cities as well.

The government also is engaged in a gradual, concerted program to enlarge the size of the collective farms by mergers into what Khrushchev hopes will become eventually quasi-industrial, state-owned "agro-cities." Before the war there were 250,000 collective farms; now there are only a third as many. However, when the "agro-city" idea was first broached in 1951, it got a noticeably cool reception from the peasantry, mainly because the scheme involved their giving up their private garden plots.

Mr. K., of course, still has enough unsolved problems without tackling new ones arising out of ambitious "agro-city" ventures. For one thing, despite increased production, the grain problem has been solved, he says, "only in a relative sense, because the population of the cities is growing all the time and demand for grain is increasing." A bothersome headache is the continuing shortage of grain elevators. "Literally millions of bushels of last year's record crop," Mr. Khrushchev said, were lost because the grain had to be dumped on the ground "where it is pilfered by rats and birds and scattered by storms."

MISSING MILK

Distribution bottlenecks plague the Russian farm system at nearly every point. Because of a shortage of pasteurizing and refrigerating facilities, only 22.1 million tons, or 37 percent, of last year's record 57.8 million ton milk output actually found its way into the state trading system. In the United States, 85 percent of the milk produced is pasteurized and sold to city dwellers. In Russia, most of it is consumed right on the farm or bartered on the free or collective farm markets in nearby cities where peasants sell the produce from their private gardens. A shortage of canning and meat processing facilities causes similar scarcities of vegetables and meats in the state-organized store system.

Low crop yields are a perennial problem. Even in grain, its most advanced crop, Russia harvests at least a third less per acre than American farmers and two-thirds less than in Western European countries, where farming is very intensive. Soviet cows give only 58 percent as much milk per year as their American cousins. And there is a chronic shortage of fertilizer. Under the government's current 7-year plan, output of chemical fertilizers by 1965 is scheduled to rise to 35 million tons from last year's 12 million tons.

But even that won't be nearly enough, according to Western agricultural experts. Moreover, with its virgin lands program now nearly completed, from now on increases in Russian farm output will have to come almost entirely from higher yields.

Most of the virgin lands area, because of its location and climate, is unreliable for steady production year in, year out. Snow in some of the new wheat lands, in Siberia, came as early as August and the Soviets are lucky to get a good crop every other year. There is also some indication of the development of a "dust bowl." In 1954, when the plowing up of the lands began, the average wheat yield was 20 bushels an acre; last year, despite favorable weather, the per-acre average was only 15 bushels.

STAGNATION UNDER STALIN

Many of the Khrushchev agricultural reforms took place before Georgi M. Malenkov was deposed as premier early in 1955. The time was ripe for improvement, because agriculture had reached near-stagnation under Stalin. As Mr. K. disclosed in his famous "de-Stalinization" speech of February 1956, Stalin "never traveled anywhere" and "did not know the actual situation in the provinces. He knew the country and agriculture only from films. And these films dressed up and beautified the existing situation in agriculture * * * The last time he visited a village was in January 1928."

Almost immediately after Stalin's death, Soviet leaders revealed what Western observers already had deduced: Russian food production, per capita, was hardly any greater—and in some cases a good deal less—than in prerevolutionary 1913. Immediately measures were taken to boost peasant income. The cash payment per "labor day" work unit on collective farms was boosted from 1.4 rubles in 1952 to 3.8 rubles in 1956. Today, the "labor day" pay rate on Russian collectives is upwards of 5 rubles. Taxes on peasants' earnings from their private gardens also were reduced.

Also, the Government began pumping a lot more money into the agricultural system. Government investments, mostly for State farms and the machine and tractor stations, increased nearly 50 percent between 1951 and 1957.

A COMPLICATED SYSTEM

The present workday method of figuring wages, extremely complicated even for the peasants who use it, bears a marked resemblance to the differing pay levels found under capitalism. For weeding a field all day, a Russian farmer may get credit for only 1 workday unit while a milkmaid may be credited for 1.5 units for milking cows, and a tractor driver can earn as many as 6 workdays in a single day because his skilled services are more highly valued. The average peasant logs about 350 workdays a year, or about 240 actual days.

Despite a near tripling since 1952, yearly cash earnings of collective farmworkers are still extremely low, by Western standards, averaging less than \$250. Even when payments in produce and earnings from private garden plots are added in, the total probably doesn't come to more than \$400. These wage estimates do not include food the peasants produce and eat themselves.

However, there are indications that these cash payments already are becoming too high for the meager amount of consumer goods available in the villages and country towns, thus posing an inflationary threat.

Mr. Khrushchev recently blasted the "kulaklike mentality" of some of the richer collectives, which pay comparatively high wages to the farmers who then hoard the cash. The farms should be spending less on wages and more on new equipment and communal facilities, he said. One reason for abolishing the machine and tractor station

units and letting the collectives buy their own equipment may have been to soak up some of this excess cash that would otherwise have gone into wages.

A Century of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, August 1, thousands of people watched a colorful parade organized and directed by Parade Marshal Walter L. Smith in celebrating 100 years of history in my home county of Wyandotte in the State of Kansas.

Because of congressional work in connection with the labor reform bill, which kept me in Washington, it was impossible for me to participate in this great, picturesque parade of pomp and pageantry.

During the centennial week, of which the parade was a part, hundreds of people visited the old Huron Indian Cemetery, the one and only historical site of any significance that remains intact within Kansas City, Wyandotte County, Kans.

Before becoming a Member of this body, a law was enacted authorizing the sale of this ancient burial ground. Since my arrival in Washington, my every effort has been directed toward the repeal or modification of this law and to the preservation of this Indian cemetery, so rich with history of days long past.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to have this burial ground of the Wyandots designated as the "Huron Indian National Historic Site" in a final effort to retain and preserve for Kansas City and Wyandotte County a little plot of ground which is so dear to the hearts of so many people in my community. It consists of less than 2 acres, is in the very heart of the business district, and is replete with Indian lore of times gone by.

If so designated and preserved for future students of history, this site will attract people from all over the world and will in itself be an education to them regarding the early beginnings of the real America. The Huron Indian burial ground of the Wyandot Nation is situated on Minnesota Avenue, the principal thoroughfare of Kansas City, Kans., and is just a few miles from the famous Truman Library on the east and even a shorter distance from the Agricultural Hall of Fame on the west.

Letters have been received, Mr. Speaker, from interested persons in every part of the country and from authors who are writing of the Wyandot Tribe and of the Huron Indian Cemetery. All urge that it be preserved for posterity, and it is often pointed out that its value cannot be measured in dollars.

As part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include the editorial which appeared in the Kansas City Kansan, the leading

newspaper of my home city, on Tuesday, August 4, and I know that those who were among both the paraders and the spectators are praying that the Indian bones which have rested for so many years in Huron Cemetery will never be disturbed:

A CENTURY IN PASSING

Estimates are in wide variance as to the number of persons who viewed Saturday's mammoth centennial parade on Minnesota Avenue. Police thought there may have been 25,000 spectators. Walt Smith, the parade marshal, estimated that the number might have been around 80,000.

Persons who have had close contact with past events are inclined to doubt the claim that Saturday's was the largest number of persons ever assembled in the city. In 1936 when President Roosevelt campaigned here it was claimed that 50,000 persons lined the streets to see and hear him. His was a long route, however, extending from the Santa Fe railroad station in Argentine to Minnesota Avenue and return.

And there was the Pageant of Progress parade of 1934 which packed them in. Photos indicate there was a heavier concentration of spectators along lower Minnesota Avenue that day than there was last Saturday.

The weather undoubtedly cut attendance of the centennial parade. Standing or sitting 2 hours in the hot August sun was an ordeal that many thousands of persons preferred to avoid. The hot weather also was a test of endurance for some of the elderly and extremely young participants in the parade. But they stood up to it like hardy Kansans usually do.

But regardless of how many saw it, the parade was the best ever staged here. Long after the last sunbonnet has been put away in the attic and the last chin whiskers have fallen before the razor, vivid memories of the centennial parade will linger. In point of color and numbers taking part it was one of the most successful community events ever seen in Kansas City, Kans.

It was the longest and contained a most interesting and varied assortment of floats. It is not quite true that every organization in the metropolitan area which could walk or ride got into the parade. But there were more than 200 different units.

While there were many modern entrants in the main it kept the centennial spirit and the beginnings of Wyandotte County. Never before were citizens enabled to see in one roundup so many bushwhackers, sunbonnet belles, pioneers, trappers, suffragettes, prospectors and their mules, the town's first banker, direct descendants of the Wyandots, the Tiblow cabin where dogs had treed a coon, an early day schoolroom, the oldest churches, several town jails and marshals, old cars, a cavalcade of old fire engines their sirens going full blast.

Indeed, the only thing noticeably missing was the Shawnee Prophet. But there were two Lincolns.

Historical Euclid, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the city of Euclid, Ohio, which it is my honor

to represent, is observing the 150th anniversary of its founding as a community. The people of this great city on the shores of Lake Erie have justifiable pride in the tremendous growth and development that has made their community one of the largest suburbs in the metropolitan area known as Greater Cleveland. During the past 21 years, under the dynamic and progressive leadership of its mayor, Kenneth J. Sims, and his administration, Euclid has seen its greatest period of industrial, commercial and residential expansion. May the city of Euclid continue to grow and prosper along the well-chartered course it has set.

I include the following article compiled and written by Leonard B. Voorhees, chairman of the Historical Society of Euclid:

HISTORICAL EUCLID, OHIO

EARLY HISTORY OF INDIAN TRIBES AND SETTLERS

Long before Euclid became a community, the format of its history was being written by pioneering adventurers who believed in reaching beyond their grasp into the unknown. It began when King Charles II of England granted to Connecticut (through Governor Winthrop) the Northwest Territory. This was identified as a strip of land 60 miles wide along the south shore of Lake Erie and extending westward to the unexplored Pacific. About 3,600,000 acres were in what became the State of Ohio.

Early treaties with the various Indian tribes were made and broken from 1701 to 1796. For the most part these tribes—Eries, Ottawas, Chippewa, Seneca, and Wyandots—roamed this area without establishing permanent year-round villages. It was a land teeming with fish, buffalo, deer, turkey, and wildlife in abundance. The tribes relinquished their heritage slowly and with much bloodshed. In 1796 a final treaty was made with the Iroquois Nation to give all lands east of the Cuyahoga River to the white man. At this point the newly formed Connecticut Land Co. commissioned one of its directors, Gen. Moses Cleveland, to lay out and establish a capital of the "Western Reserve."

Early in the spring of that year, 1796, General Cleveland and 66 qualified surveyors and helpers journeyed westward to carry out his company's orders. At Conneaut Creek a camp was made and 41 men remained on that site while General Cleveland and the others proceeded west to the bank of the Cuyahoga River where a community site was laid out for settlement. The trip westward required 18 days to achieve and was blazed through an untracked wilderness. Paths of the red man and the buffalo were the major routes to follow. During this 3-week trip, the men at Conneaut Creek camp became dissatisfied and mutinied. They demanded considerations not specified in their agreement. General Cleveland, acting without written authority, laid out a township of 25 square miles and sold it to these men at \$1 per acre. Each man was granted lakefront property as well as a farm back in the rocky hills and plateaus.

LIST OF ORIGINAL SETTLERS: 1797, 1798, 1799

The following list is taken from the "Directors Account Book" of the Joshua Stow papers, dated September 1796. Land claims were allotted in relatively equal acreage beginning on the westerly boundary (approximately Colt Road, East 140th Street) and moving eastward following the Lake Erie shoreline and giving every man lakefront property. In addition, each man was al-

lotted a square of land as identified on the township map.

LAKEFRONT PLOT

1. Machintire.
2. George Proudfoot.
3. Francis Grey.
4. Samuel Farber.
5. Elysha Gunn.
6. Moses Warren.¹
7. R. Stoddard.
8. Amos Little.
9. Stephen Benton.
10. Amos Barber.
11. Samuel Hungerford.
12. William Hall.
13. Samuel Davenport.
14. Asa Mafan.
15. Amazi Atwater.
16. Joseph Tinker.
17. Michael Coffin.
18. Ayers.
19. Harris.
20. Norman Wallace.
21. Timothy Dunbar.
22. George.
23. Shadrapp Benham.
24. Samuel Agnew.
25. W. Sheppard.
26. David Beard.
27. John Durant.
28. Titus Munson.
29. Joseph Landon.
30. Job Stiles.
31. Charles Parker.
32. Ezekiel Marby.
33. Nathaniel Doan.
34. Amos Spafford.¹
35. Milton Hall.
36. Luket Hanchet.
37. James Hachet.
38. James Hamilton.
39. Seth Pease.¹
40. Rice.
41. Locke.

Seth Pease, Moses Warren, and Amos Spafford met the requirements of settling in the year each was responsible for with an accompanying quota of men. Their instructions included the building of a cabin and the sowing of 2 acres of wheat. One can scarcely visualize the backbreaking work necessary to clear 2 acres of land (87,120 square feet) of the huge trees and glacial rocks that were rooted deeply in the soil. Thus the new township became officially settled in 1797—1 year after the town of Cleveland was laid out and settled. In the early organizational proceedings the men involved named the township "Euclid" in honor of the Greek mathematician and patron saint of surveyors.

The original boundaries encompassed landmarks identified as "Gray's Hill," "The Salt Springs, etc., which later were changed to more permanent markings. Thus we find the western boundary beginning at approximately East 140th Street or Colt Road and the lake, proceeding directly south for 5 miles to what is now Cedar Road; eastward to the present Cuyahoga County line, and north from that point to the lake, a total in excess of 25 square miles. A significant part of what is now West Lake County and a part of Willoughby was included. The present county line boundary was established when Lake County was formed out of Geauga and a part of Cuyahoga Counties in the year 1840.

Among the first settlers was Joseph Burke, a native of Vermont and a drummer boy in the Revolutionary Army. His name is not listed as one of the original 41 men although he settled in 1798 by building a log cabin on the main road which had been opened from Cleveland to the Pennsylvania line.

Another early settler and probably one of the first permanent landholders was David

¹ Responsible for the first settlements.

Dille, who built a log cabin (1797) in the vicinity of Dille Road, presumably on the west bank of Euclid Creek. Some years later he built the first sawed lumber or clapboard house just west of the present cemetery on Euclid Avenue. Mr. Dille was actively engaged in border wars and was with the ill-fated Colonel Crawford when nearly all his command was massacred and he was burned at the stake near Upper Sandusky. After Mr. Dille settled in Euclid, accompanied at intervals by his 5 grown sons, there were 14 additional children born and raised within the township. David Dille lived the remainder of his life in Euclid and when he died no man could say he had not done his duty as a soldier, pioneer, and parent.

One industry which grew out of both opportunity and necessity was that of fishing. Early in the spring a group of the settlers would journey to Rocky River either by land or water (Lake Erie). Pike and pickerel were in abundance and the hardy pioneers would return with barrels of fish to be preserved for summer use. Curiously enough the people believed only ocean fish could be preserved in salt and fresh water fish would not keep. When inquiry of an old Indian was made, the Redman replied—"Uh, no salt; put him on pole—make little fire—smoke him heap."

William Coleman's commonsense taught him that any meat, fish, or fowl could be preserved with plain salt, of which he had acquired a supply in exchange for his watch before leaving the Keystone State. The experiment of salting fish proved most successful and was soon copied by the other settlers.

In 1805, one Jacob Coleman, an uncle of William and a soldier of the Revolution, who had also served several years in Col. Wm. A. Washington's celebrated "Regiment of Horse" moved into Euclid. John Ruple, better known as Deacon Ruple selected a large farm just east of Nine Mile Creek (near East Cleveland "Y" at Collamer Avenue) and remained there throughout his long and eventful life raising a large and respectable family.

(This entire area which is now in the cities of Cleveland and East Cleveland, was once a part of Euclid community. It was in the original Euclid Township until secession from township government began just prior to the Civil War.)

The forests and rocks harbored another pet creature—the rattlesnake. Although no rattlers are around now to prove the records, the old settlers "ment" on the great numbers of these reptiles found in the ravines and rocky gullies. Deacon John Ruple, whose word was never questioned, killed 38 of these reptiles and became quite ill from the odor of the poisonous varmint. Luther Dille had a similar experience while killing 43 which he found in a nesting den near Collamer Avenue. Shooting snakes with bow and arrow was a particularly favorite pastime of boys who delighted in showing off their skill as they held aloft a writhing reptile before female "admirers" and then dispatching it.

RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES

All of the settlers' time was not occupied with work, hunting, or play; they brought with them a reverence for religion and for God. The first church built in Euclid Township, August 1807, was located in what is now East Cleveland. John Ruple was one of the first and most influential deacons. A just fear of their Creator and an inherent belief in right were the two principles which guided the settlers in their dealings with their fellowman. A man's word was his bond and any infractions were dealt with severely. Community responsibilities were assumed with a seriousness and determination to fulfill the law.

The trading of labor for usable materials was a common practice. In 1809 one Abraham Bishop of New York State came to

Euclid and built the first sawmill. It was located on the east branch of Euclid Creek on the site occupied later by Jonathan and Seth Pelton. It served the growing community for many years using for power the impounded waters of Euclid Creek. Much of the exchange was a verbal agreement and a man usually gave more of his labor than would normally be required. The mill owner prospered without much exchange of hard cash since hogs, chickens, livestock, produce, and labor were commodities valued by all. Many of the settlers could not read although they would "cipher" and total the amount in their heads. Measuring a bushel was by basket and not by weight. Thus we find each man dealing on the terms he could understand. Scales were for the fishermen.

When the War of 1812 broke out, many people in Euclid believed themselves to be in particular danger because of the armed British vessels on the lake and the possibility of Indian raids by land. A rumor spread that the British and Indians had combined in wiping out the white settlements. Several families hitched up their oxen, loaded their wagons, and headed east. They found the Chagrin River so swollen by floodwaters that crossing was impossible. William Coleman made two trips to Cleveland for news and found the threat was only Hull's forces in retreat after this surrender. The families returned slowly to their homes and land in Euclid. Again and again in their lives they found that what appeared to be a catastrophe turned out to be a blessing in disguise. Despite the war and its rumored threats, there were emigrants moving in from the Eastern States.

William Coleman was appointed the first Euclid postmaster in 1815. A territorial division is noted in the records with Euclid being a hamlet situated where Collamer now is and a smaller cluster of houses known as Euclid Creek identified as being near Chardon Road and Euclid Avenue where the old original creek flowed through the township. (The present creek bed is a dug one and not the original.)

No doubt the rapid growth convinced the rattlesnake that his era of influencing Euclid's history was at an end and he retreated to less populated parts. A stagecoach route was established between Cleveland and Buffalo and passed through Euclid on what is now Euclid Avenue, also known then as the Stage Road and the Buffalo Road. Two- and four-horse teams passed through Euclid daily each way and by 1830, it seemed the whole eastern world was migrating west. With the people came new ideas and one of these was building clapboard or sawed lumber houses to replace the log cabins. They were generally referred to as "frame houses." This made a marked improvement in the appearance of the community.

In 1840 a Capt. William Treat (also spelled "Trist") opened a shipyard at the mouth of Euclid Creek. Ships were built and launched Euclid Creek. Ships were built and launched. On one occasion the launching was made tragic by the crushing of a small boy between the chocks as the boat slipped down the rampway. Captain Treat would not allow the stopping of the boat to rescue the boy because of a superstition that any interruption in the actual launching of a boat would carry a sailing stigma or an ill-omen on the seas. Thus a small boy gave his life to preserve the strange tradition of boat launching and a sailor's ignorance.

Thus in a period of less than 50 years, we have passed through the highly interesting part of a township's life and growth, the era of its transmutation from an untracked wilderness into an agricultural community. The roots for growth were deeply embedded in the sticky Euclid clay soil and needed only time to evoke the buds of another and greater period of development. Change, the only constant factor in evolution, was begin-

ning to rear its industrial head. The balance of nature was broken; the generous home of the bear, deer, wolf, and deadly rattlesnake was being pushed aside by the advance of man.

In the far horizon were more deadly foes than those of nature. Man was allowing greed and avarice to elicit treason and slavery which were about to assail the country. Civil war with all its variations became a creeping cancer to the country's progress. Before hostilities broke out the States seemed to lunge forward, on a program of preparation. In Euclid alone, sufficient change was made to disguise the once peaceful township. The Lake Shore & Michigan Southern Railroad purchased the old C.P. & A. mentioned above and connected all branches to make a continuous run from Chicago to New York. Competing with lake shipping again proved the advantages of speed. Actually fresh oysters could reach Cleveland from Baltimore in a little over 24 hours. Ice and speed brought to the area a new appetite for the unusual. It enabled Euclid to ship its products to the eastern markets and give to them the rare treat of new produce. Both man and his products were on the move.

At last the rumbling of war was heard and Euclid gave of its young lifeblood along with thousands of others. Their quotas were filled and more. Some did not return and the militia law provided a stipend of subsistence for their families. The amount varied from \$2 to \$6 paid each month to 15 families—so recorded on June 27, 1863. Soldiers moved by rail and scarcely any could pass east or west without crossing a part of Ohio. Euclid saw far more than its share of men in uniform and the ravages of battle-torn regiments.

Following the war, new names and new events were recorded. Grapes became a prize commodity. Vineyards took the place of grain fields. Concord, Catawba, Niagaras, Delawares, and Martha grapes were greatly favored. Two major factors contributed to the grape-growing success: (1) Slatestone-clay soil produced a hardy good growth, (2) while the nearness of Lake Erie tempered the atmosphere and prevented damage by frost. Grapes were packed in 6- and 9-pound baskets and shipped west as far as Denver and east to the seaboard cities, particularly New York. Wine competed with the grape and enabled the grower to have a more stable year-round income. Euclid wines and Euclid grapes became nationally known because of the delicious and distinctive flavor drawn from the sticky clay soil. Thus again we find a blessing in disguise thrown at our feet.

Another prominent industry was developed in the stone quarries. About 1871, the McFarland brothers opened a quarry on the west side of Euclid Creek in an area known as Bluestone. Great slabs of stone were sawed out of the blocks dug from the quarry. The stone sawmill used gangs of steel blades with water and sand as a cutting agent. The slabs were squared for sidewalk use or made into coping for dressing out a stone wall or top of a building wall.

In 1873, East Euclid or Euclid Creek and later just Euclid, contained 1 church, a fine schoolhouse, 2 stores, hotel, steam basket factory, wagon shop, 2 blacksmith shops, and about 30 homes, all adjacent to the creek or Stop Ten, as it was known. Euclid built a commodious townhall of red brick and used it as only a growing community could in those postwar days. Wheat was still a common media of exchange, valued at about \$1 per bushel and used often in place of hard money. Even the minister of the Euclid Baptist Church was paid in wheat for his services.

Other churches were organized and are recorded here for the historical value. St. John's German Lutheran Church built in about 1852 with 12 families on the church

roster. About 2 miles northward was the growing community of Nottingham where a Presbyterian Church was organized and a frame building erected in 1870. There were only 12 or 13 members to sustain the church, but their zeal and enthusiasm was contagious. St. Paul's Catholic Church was organized in 1861 and an imposing frame building erected. Included in the church activities was a school for about 50 boys and girls with over 70 families enrolled from a large area including a part of old Collinwood.

SCHOOLS AND EDUCATION

The early records of Euclid Township gave little or no information except to record that a township meeting was held in the schoolhouse. The first mention of schools as a part of the community was made in 1828 when the entire township was divided into districts. It is noteworthy that with a rapidly increasing population of pioneering minded people there was a demand for the formal teaching of children. The first of these schools was known as a Blab School in which the loudest voiced pupil had every advantage. (Imagine what a boon that kind of school would have been to some of the grownups we know today.) Teachers were poorly trained and served on an itinerant basis, often boarding wherever the townspeople saw fit to provide.

Following the Civil War and the return of many volunteer soldiers to the area, the erection of "little red schoolhouses" progressed. Euclid Township had more than its share of these one-room, eight grades, teacher-janitor taught buildings. As late as 1900, there were 11 such buildings scattered strategically throughout the township. The list of districts is as follows:

1. Located on North Street (Chardon Road).
2. Located at corner of Babbitt and Lakeland (Noble).
3. Located at Lake Shore Boulevard and East 200th Street (Cut Road).
4. Located at corner Dille and St. Clair (Nottingham).
5. Located at Green Road and Euclid Avenue.
6. Located at Chardon Road and Richmond.
7. Located at corner Green and Mayfield Roads (South Euclid).
8. Located at Richmond Road and Mayfield Road.
9. Located at South Euclid.
10. Located at East 260th Street and Lake Shore Boulevard (Upson).
11. Located at Bluestone Road (Bluestone).

In 1868 a small class of six pupils was organized into a high-school unit. They attended on School Street (North Street) but no record is available on what happened to the group. There was only one teacher-principal-superintendent to assume all the responsibilities and no doubt little thought was given to the value of records.

A high school was erected in 1894, chartered in 1896 and graduated its first class in 1897. There were six in the graduating class who received diplomas: Oliver Callahan, Ella Honck, Will Houck, Libbie Pelton, Addison Verbsky, Loids Verbsky.

Will Houck was killed in the Spanish-American War, the others were alive in 1947 and several of them were present for recognition at Euclid Central High School on February 10, 1947.

FIFTY YEARS OF EDUCATION GROWTH, 1898-1947

Following the graduation of the class of six, the high-school course was extended by the superintendent, Everett L. Abbey, and his recently appointed assistant, A. Hawthorne Maves.

School census showed a total of 868 boys and girls eligible for school. The enrollment was only 45 in the high school. Superin-

tendent Abbey expressed a regret that more children did not avail themselves of the opportunity for a free education. Reports disclose that the average daily attendance was 418 in all districts. Absence and tardiness prevailed to a marked degree; in 1 year, 1897-98 there were 1,439 cases of tardiness. This was an average of about 3½ tardy marks per pupil and according to the superintendent, was 10 times more than necessary. However, walking was the chief means of transportation except for those who came some distance and they rode horseback or drove a horse and buggy. A tie-shed was used for the stabling of the horses. Parents were mostly indifferent to the educational needs of their offspring and frequently kept the children home to work or because the "cow was due to calve today." In 1899, Superintendent Abbey disclosed that there were 87 cases of whipping in 1 year; 5 of whom were girls. On this subject the superintendent states, "We are opposed to corporal punishment believing it should be banished to animals and slaves. The American boy, like the ancient Roman, should not be whipped. But so far, we are unable to avoid it altogether. It will be inflicted only as a last resort before sending to the reform farm."

In 1909 the first graduating class under the newly appointed Superintendent Joel O. Oldt had its commencement. Dr. Clement Martzoff, president of Ohio University, was engaged as the speaker. The class consisted of three girls and one boy—Juliette Harms, Emelie Harms, Leona Smith, and Carl Scheuring.

Many youth have since passed through the educational portals of Euclid's high schools—Central, Shore, and Euclid Senior High. Many were dropouts or early leavers and found satisfactory work in the tremendous growth of industry. Occasionally a class reunion brings together many of these graduates and quinquages. It is most inspiring to see and realize the progress these pupils of yesteryear have made of their lives and perhaps their opportunities. Among this large group numbering many thousands are some renowned individuals. They are to be found in the fields of science, medicine, law, industry, law enforcement, and in professional work of every kind.

Education has contributed not only to the youth within our community but to the collective community of Euclid and has been a bulwark in State and national defense and growth. It has proven the oft quoted axiom: "The future belongs to those who prepare for it."

TRANSPORTATION

Early means of travel going from Euclid to points east or west were frequently achieved by water. Originally the small canoe was used and later rowboats came into common use. The route led down Euclid Creek to the lake, and, if not too rough, canoe or rowboat carried the traveler to his destination. If the lake was dangerously rolling, the boat passenger took to the bank and "footed it" to his objective. This meant crossing small streams, climbing banks, and frequently cutting inland to the trail. Traveling Indians, roaming animals, and groups of wanderers had established this trail through constant use and years later the paths developed into accepted roads.

Increased use of the roads demanded that some means be found to make them passable in inclement weather. This led to plank roads being built, and since the builder usually assumed the cost, the road had toll gates at the limits of each builder's domain. State laws permitted the road owner to collect for travel over his section to help defray the expense of his investment. A toll gate was in use as late as 1903 and was operated by a Mr. Hazen who had only one arm. The gate was located just east of 212th Street, about half way to 214th Street. The

improved road ran west to the East Cleveland Y. and another section ran east to Wickliffe.

In the year 1881 the New York, Chicago & St. Louis (Nickel Plate) Railroad was built. Two tracks were laid and the train schedule was frequently referred to as triweekly—through 1 week and try to get back the next. Nevertheless, the coming of the railroad to Euclid was a milestone in the township's development.

The Nickel Plate was so nicknamed as a result of a pun by Edward L. Young, associate editor of the Norwalk, Ohio, Chronicle, who noticed that the initials NYCL could be pronounced "nickel." The process of finishing metals known as nickel plating was becoming popular at this time. Mr. Young coined the term "Nickel-plated railroad" and the pun caught the public fancy. It was reprinted in other papers, including New York and Chicago dailies.

Several years later, when the Vanderbilt interest purchased the railroad from its founders, Mr. Vanderbilt remarked: "It should be nickel-plated at the price we paid for it." The term has been commonly used for over half a century.

Earmarking of livestock was common as late as 1851 and records were kept on file in the township clerk's office. Some of the so-called brands were:

"Lewis Dille's do A crop off the left ear transfer to John West."

"Calvin Dille's do A swallo fork in the right ear and under bit in the left."

"Samuel Mollrath's do A crop off of the left ear and a slit in the end of same."

"Elihu Richmond's earmark is a square crop off the left and two half pennies out of the underside of the right ear."

"Robert Young's is a hole in each ear."

Lack of stockproof fences made this means of identification necessary.

National elections played a rather exciting roll in Euclid, especially in the year of 1860 when Abraham Lincoln ran on the newly organized Republican Party against Stephen A. Douglas on the Democratic ticket.

Official Euclid records disclose that the Lincoln-Hamilton team received 255 votes; Douglas-Johnson team received 104 votes; and the Breckenridge-Lone team received 7 votes.

GROWTH AND INCORPORATION AS A VILLAGE

Many factors enter into the growth of a community. Harbors and water transportation played a most important part during the 19th century. Had Euclid received the grant for the Ohio Canal, Cleveland would probably have been a suburb of Euclid. However, the harbor facilities and potentialities of the Cuyahoga River favored Cleveland's growth over any other port along the south shore of Lake Erie. But, some means of rapid transportation of coal to steel and a dispersal of the resultant products was needed. The railroad belts furnished this essential.

Euclid is still growing, largely because of the strategic location of railroad facilities coupled with the foresight of its leadership, both past and present. Between the two railroads is a manufacturer's paradise for development. Few communities are so ideally favored. Industry, both heavy and light, has found that Euclid is partial to industrial development. This means homes, schools, churches, and local government must meet the demands of growth.

The feeling of growing into a village resulted in more than the required 30 electors signing the petition "praying to incorporate the territory described in said petition into a village." Election was set for February 14, 1903, voted upon and tallied as follows:

For incorporation.....	130
Against incorporation.....	126

A true copy of the minutes—in part—of a meeting called by the president of the board of trustees, dated February 17, 1903, is recorded in the village council proceedings,

volume No. 3, pages 338 to 340. Thus Euclid became a village.

The first village election resulted in the following persons being elected to office:

Office	Citizens ticket	Votes	Peoples ticket	Votes
Mayor	H. S. Pickands	61	Charles Harms	48
Clerk	H. S. Dunlop	63	R. R. Vogt	37
Treasurer	J. W. Smith	67	R. A. Hunt	37
Marshal	Wm. Covert	66	Wm. Hazen	35
Council for 2 years	H. Avery	58	J. J. Carey	38
Do	Willard Frissell	57	J. J. Murphy	37
Do	J. W. Bentley	67	J. Lilly	45
Council for 1 year	J. F. Cavanaugh	58	John Marzel	37
Do	W. M. Cope	60	O. Welch	40
Do	A. D. Lowden	61	Albert Lock	35

However, the township also continued to remain as an electorate and elected officers on the same date to the following responsibilities: Trustee, Henry Faust; treasurer, Chas. A. Lamb; justice of the peace, C. F. Knuty; constable, F. B. Rogers. Assessors: Euclid precinct, John Davis; South Euclid precinct, H. L. DeVoe; North Euclid precinct, J. H. Husong; Nottingham precinct, C. H. Voorhees. Eleven road supervisors were also elected.

In November 1925, Charles R. Ely was elected mayor on a platform of improved economy and abolition of the fee system. He faced a delinquency in tax collection attributed to the poor judgment in allotment improvements of previous years. One of his first acts was to obtain council approval to abolish the costly fee system and to appoint full-time men to handle the engineering problems. Rigid economy in street improvements was enacted, and only those streets of reasonable usage were further improved.

Industrial expansion became the program for development soon after Mayor Ely was inaugurated. The land between the two railroads was looked upon as an ideal location. The council adopted a liberal policy to encourage prospective manufacturing companies. Among the first large plants to choose Euclid facilities was Chase Brass & Copper Co. Addressograph-Multigraph Co. followed in 1930 after considering some 30-odd cities as possible sites. The main offices and the new plant were built and the business moved to Euclid from Chicago. Addressograph-Multigraph brought many of its personnel to operate the huge organization. Other plants followed, and today Euclid has one of the largest industrial areas in Ohio.

During the early years of the depression, a delegation of Euclid citizens and Mayor Ely applied in person to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in Washington for funds to finance a Euclid housing project. On October 3, 1933, a grant for housing expenditure of \$1 million was authorized by the Federal Government to be used in erecting individual homes. Government authorities claimed this was the first housing project approved by the Government.

In the summer of 1929, the old town hall caught fire and before sufficient equipment could arrive, this landmark was a roaring inferno and only at great risk were the original records rescued. The building loss was quite complete. The city government officials used the old hotel on Chardon Road as its headquarters. During this period plans were prepared for a new administration building or city hall, and under WPA authorization the new building was completed in 1938.

The population in 1920 was officially recorded as 3,303 and in 1930 increased about 400 percent to a total of 12,751. Since Eu-

clid is one of those communities built lengthwise rather than square, the problem of adequate transportation was imperative to the residents and factory workers. A municipal bus line was placed in operation in the year 1935.

Kenneth J. Sims was elected mayor in November 1937 and took office on January 1, 1938. The end of the depression was not in sight and the unusual demand for relief was a major issue in the first few months of his administration. However, by inspiring a cooperative attitude and enlisting the support of the schools, churches, American Legion, Kiwanis, and various other civic organizations, the problem was effectively met. People did not go hungry even though the luxuries of previous years were not permitted.

In 1942 the Thompson Products Co. purchased a site of 120 acres fronting on both East 222d Street and Euclid Avenue, on which was erected a \$13-million plant for the production of aircraft valves. This division of Thompson Products was christened Tapco. Government orders justified a further expansion through the finances of the Defense Plant Corporation and Tapco added facilities nearly equaling the original plant. The manpower schedule called for at least 7,000 workers. Other expansions included Cletrac, Cleve Aero, Cleveland Hobbing Machine, Euclid Electric, Euclid Case, and a large number of smaller industries of sufficient diversification to insure a rather steady employment demand.

The expansion of industry brought about an acute housing shortage for the defense plant workers. A survey was conducted by the Federal Works Agency and a defense housing program was deemed essential to national defense. Two units were recommended, 1 of 500 homes built on East 200th Street (known as Euclid Homes), and the second a unit of 800 homes built on property facing Babbitt Road and known as Lake Shore Village. The first unit was completed in 1942 and the second in 1943. Both were immediately filled to capacity and had a long waiting list of applications.

Growth of the city brought new demands on utilities as well as protection against fire, traffic hazards, and the need for added police facilities, together with school expansion.

In 1947 a Federal grant of \$50,000 was achieved through the untiring efforts of Congresswoman BOLTON whose vision for the community and influence in Washington, enabled the city of Euclid to avail itself of the provisions of Federal assistance. Euclid has thus met these demands in a manner which convinces people that Euclid city is a good place to live.

"On the strength of past achievements the future holds promise and fruition."

LEONARD B. VOORHEES.

Restoration of Freedom to Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution which I hope will receive the approval of Congress before we adjourn this session.

This resolution calls for an affirmation by Congress that it is the intent of the Congress of the United States that the people of the captive nations of Europe be given a right to choose their own philosophy of government and their own rulers in a spirit of complete freedom.

I am enclosing an editorial which appeared in the Washington Star, commenting on the unprecedented reception given our Vice President by the people of Poland during his recent visit to that country.

The estimated 250,000 Poles who greeted the Vice President of the United States upon his arrival in Warsaw should demonstrate to the entire free world the very profound yearning and respect that these Polish people have for the United States and for the principles of freedom. This was not necessarily an expression for Mr. Nixon but, rather, it was the only way the Poles could demonstrate their admiration for America and their traditional hatred of communism.

As the Washington Star points out in its editorial of August 4—

Directly and indirectly, the people of Poland have said many eloquent things in the extraordinarily warm welcome they have accorded Vice President NIXON. In marked contrast to their lukewarm, if not sullen, reaction to Soviet Premier Khrushchev's recent visit, they have left no room for doubt that their heart belongs much more to the United States than to the U.S.S.R.

I firmly believe that the United States should now go on record, as categorically as we can, that we in this country and the people of the free world in general share with the people of the captive nations their longing for freedom.

The adoption of the resolution which I have proposed today would indeed be a heartening reassurance to these people that their great dedication to the principles of freedom, which they continue to maintain despite the fact that they have had to live under Communist rule forced upon them after World War II, is greatly respected by those of us fortunate enough to live in a free country.

I am one of those who views with great concern the pending visit of Soviet Premier Khrushchev to this country. I do not think that it will serve the purposes announced by those who have arranged this visit. However, since the Soviet Premier is going to be in this country, I

think that it is incumbent on the Members of Congress to make known to the President of the United States that when the Soviet Premier does come here, the President should firmly impress on him that this Nation must continue to view all Soviet foreign relations with suspicion so long as these captive nations are forcefully held in the Soviet orbit.

It should be made clear to Mr. Khrushchev that there is a true road to peace, and that road leads through the captive nations, which must be given an opportunity to choose their own government in free and unfettered elections supervised by the United Nations before tensions in Europe can be eased.

It should be made clear to Mr. Khrushchev that you cannot take the noble nations of central Europe and plunge them under communist rule against their will and expect lasting peace in Europe.

If the Soviet Premier sincerely wants peace, let him demonstrate it to the free world by releasing the captive nations from their forceful rule by Moscow and let these nations voluntarily pick their own form of government.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Star editorial, which I mentioned earlier, follows. I believe that it eloquently speaks out for the cause of a free Poland and all the other nations now being held captive by the Communists:

[From the Washington Star, Aug. 4, 1959]
CATALYST IN POLAND

Directly and indirectly, the people of Poland have said many eloquent things in the extraordinarily warm welcome they have accorded Vice President Nixon. In marked contrast to their lukewarm, if not sullen, reaction to Soviet Premier Khrushchev's recent visit, they have left no room for doubt that their heart belongs much more to the United States than to the U.S.S.R.

This is a fact that may be stated quite objectively, without any desire to draw invidious comparisons. The Poles and the Russians, after all, have been at odds for centuries, often in the most bitter way—under the Czars as well as under the Communists. Mr. Khrushchev himself, who presumably okayed the Warsaw regime's decision to invite Mr. Nixon, is too good a student of history to have to be told about this, and we may assume that he has not been particularly surprised by what has happened—hurt perhaps, but not surprised.

The truth is, of course, that there is a unique affinity—historical and affectionate—between our country and the Poles. Since that long-ago time when men like Pulaski helped George Washington to achieve victory over the British in the American Revolution, great numbers of these people, over a period of generations, have emigrated to the United States and played an important part in building it to its present greatness. Small wonder, therefore, that Mr. Nixon has gone through a sort of triumphal march in Warsaw.

But the plaudits of the great Polish crowds have been addressed not simply to the Vice President, but to our entire country and to the free way of life it stands for. Mr. Nixon in that sense, by his presence over there, has been a kind of catalyst. Just the sight of him has been enough to move the people—hundreds of thousands of them—to cry "Bravo, America!" and to make clear that years of Communist control (somewhat less stringent than in most satellite lands) have not succeeded in eradicating their love of liberty and their pro-American views.

Knowing the Poles as they do, Mr. Khrushchev and his colleagues in the Kremlin probably have not been taken aback by all this. Yet, since the same sort of mood prevails in varying degrees throughout their satellite empire, they must sometimes wonder most seriously about the loyalty of that empire and their ability to hold on to it. This is one of the subjects that Mr. K. is likely to be challenged on repeatedly, and at great length, when he visits our country next month.

Unrestricted World Travel by the People, as Well as Heads of Government, Can Only Bring About Better Understanding Between People Everywhere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, unrestricted world travel by the people, as well as heads of Government, can only bring about a better understanding between people everywhere in a world which has grown really quite small.

It is the people, and especially the young people, who can learn and who can profit from travel and from living for awhile, be it ever so brief, among other peoples and in other nations, for they will be tomorrow's leaders.

There can be no strangers in this world since there are no longer faraway places in these days of the jet transport.

The free world must welcome the opportunity which the Vice President has opened up for further development of exchanges of people and of cultural programs.

In his Moscow television speech, Vice President Nixon declared:

Both the exchange of persons and the cultural exchange programs should not only be continued but sharply expanded. The more Americans who visit and get to know firsthand the people of the Soviet Union and the more Soviets who do the same in the United States, the better understanding we shall have.

Both World War I and World War II grew out of basic miscalculations on the part of the leaders of Germany as to what the reaction of America and the free world would be. We cannot disarm, nor can we hope for peace until the leaders of the Soviet Union know America well enough to avoid similar miscalculations about our people and our iron purpose to maintain the freedoms which we consider essential.

The Eisenhower-Nixon policy of barnstorming exchanges between top Government leaders can be looked upon by the American people with approval if later developments do not indicate that it comes about only as a result of the failure of the Geneva Conference.

The gladhanding of top officials, however, can be misleading. We in the United States must remain firm as we calmly evaluate the newspaper headlines

reporting the outward actions and words of the candidates for national and world acclaim.

It is unfortunate that we cannot know what goes on behind the closed doors of secret diplomacy. There must be no more Pearl Harbors for the American people to regret.

It is interesting to note that a spontaneous movement to promote closer relations between teachers of the East and West has developed in Washington, D.C., at an assembly of the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession.

The New York Times of August 6, 1959, reports that the move came when delegates from several European nations offered to set up programs to exchange information with Asian representatives.

Dr. William G. Carr, secretary-general of the confederation, hailed the plan for exchanges. Dr. Carr, who is also executive secretary of the National Education Association, said that foundation support would be sought to make the exchanges possible. The organizations represented at the meeting in the Nation's Capital represents some 3 million teachers throughout the world.

I have recently introduced a bill, H.R. 7533, to amend the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956 to authorize the President to provide for participation by foreign governments and citizens of other countries in artistic and cultural activities in the United States.

This bill amends Public Law 860, 84th Congress. This legislation, first, would make the President's special international cultural exchange program a true two-way exchange program which it is not at present; second, provide for the inclusion of students of and teachers in educational institutions in the United States and abroad. The major if not whole emphasis of this program at present is on the professional. Van Cliburn was a product of the Juilliard School of Music; Jaime Laredo, who won first prize recently in the Queen Elisabeth of Belgium International Music Competition, was a graduate of the Curtis Institute, yet these and other great American artists have not been included in the President's special international program.

Another provision of this bill, H.R. 7533, would enlarge the present Advisory Committee on the Arts in the Department of State from 9 to 21 members. The 12 members of the Advisory Committee on the Arts first appointed under the provisions of H.R. 7533 must be appointed by the Secretary of State from among persons nominated by the following organizations: the Music Educators National Conference, the American Educational Theater Association, the College Art Association of America, the National Art Education Association, the National Council of the Arts in Education, the American National Theater and Academy, the National Music Council, the American Federation of Arts, the American Institute of Architects, the National Education Association, the American Council on Education, the American Council of Learned Societies, the Association of American Colleges,

This bill, H.R. 7533, also provides that the Commissioner of the U.S. Office of Education shall be Vice Chairman ex officio of the Advisory Committee on the Arts of the Department of State.

If this administration is really serious about expansion of the exchange of persons and the cultural exchange programs it will strongly support my bill, H.R. 7533, and similar legislation which is before the Congress at this time which has been introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] and Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, coauthors of the Humphrey-Thompson Act, Public Law 860, 84th Congress.

I include the text of my bill, H.R. 7533, a New York Times article, and an article by Doris Fleeson which appeared in the Washington, D.C., Evening Star of August 4, 1959:

H.R. 7533

A bill to amend the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956 to authorize the President to provide for participation by foreign governments and citizens of other countries in artistic and cultural activities in the United States, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 3 of the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 1992) is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 3." and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) The President is authorized to provide for participation by foreign governments and by citizens of other countries in activities in the United States similar to those provided for in subsection (a) of this section and section 12 of this Act, except that he shall not provide for the participation of industrial or trade exhibitors or exhibits in trade and industrial fairs in the United States under this subsection.

"(c) (1) Students of and teachers in, educational institutions in the United States who are sent abroad, either individually or in groups, under the provisions of this Act shall be selected through the Institute of International Education or a comparable organization which shall also arrange for their tours abroad and for their participation and presentations in festivals, competitions, and exhibitions abroad.

"(c) (2) Students of, and teachers in, educational institutions in foreign countries who are brought to the United States individually or in groups under the provisions of this Act shall be selected through an agency of the government of the country in which they reside, or through the Institute of International Education or a comparable foreign organization. The tours in the United States of such foreign students and teachers and their participation and presentation in festivals, competitions, and like exhibitions in the United States shall be arranged for by the Institute of International Education or a comparable organization."

(b) Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) (as designated by subsection (a) of this section) of section 3 of such Act is amended (1) by inserting "professional or nonprofessional" immediately before "creative", and (2) by inserting immediately after "groups" the following: "(including individuals or groups from educational institutions)".

Sec. 2. Section 2 of the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956 is amended (1) by inserting "(1)" immediately after "nations by", (2) by inserting "including cultural develop-

ments and achievements of students and teachers in educational institutions in the United States)" immediately after "people of the United States", and (3) by striking out "throughout the world;" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "throughout the world, and (2) facilitating the presentation in the United States of the artistic and cultural contributions and achievements of the peoples of foreign countries;"

Sec. 3. Section 5 of the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Not less than 20 per centum of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be expended to carry out the provisions of section 3(c)."

Sec. 4. (a) Subsection (a) of section 10 of the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956 is amended (1) by striking out "from among its membership and nine other members appointed by the Secretary of State," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "from among its membership, and a Vice Chairman ex officio who shall be the Commissioner of the United States Office of Education, and twenty-one other members appointed by the Secretary of State"; and (2) by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "including national educational organizations in such fields".

(b) The twelve members of the Advisory Committee on the Arts first appointed to the offices created by the amendment made by clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section shall be appointed by the Secretary of State from among persons nominated by such organizations as the Music Educators National Conference, the American Educational Theater Associations, the College Art Association of America, the National Art Education Association, the National Council of the Arts in Education, the American National Theater and Academy, the National Music Council, the American Federation of Arts, the American Institute of Architects, the National Education Association, the American Council on Education, the American Council of Learned Societies, and the Association of American Colleges. The term of office of three of the members first appointed to such offices shall be one year, notwithstanding the provisions of section 10(d) of such Act.

Sec. 5. Title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 is amended by inserting immediately after section 104 thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 104A. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1959, and for each succeeding fiscal year, from the foreign currencies which accrue under this title, not to exceed the equivalent of \$5,000,000 for financing the translation, production, and distribution of educational motion pictures and filmstrips abroad."

[From the New York Times, Aug. 6, 1959]

EDUCATORS PLAN WORLD EXCHANGE—OFFER OF ASIAN AND EUROPEAN DELEGATES INVOLVES BOTH TEACHERS AND PUPILS

(By Leonard Buder)

WASHINGTON, AUGUST 5.—A spontaneous movement to promote closer relations between teachers of the East and West developed here today at the annual assembly of the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession.

The move came when delegates from several European nations offered to set up programs to exchange information with Asian representatives. The exchange, first, proposed by the Netherlands teachers' organization, would involve pupils as well as teachers.

Dr. William G. Carr, secretary-general of the confederation, halted the plan. Dr. Carr who is also executive secretary of the National Education Association of the United States, the host organization for the assembly, said that at first the program would be limited largely to an exchange of correspondence and educational materials.

However, he said that foundation grants might be obtained later to make it possible for teachers from eastern and western countries to visit each other.

The confederation's resolutions committee met today to draft its report. It is expected to present a resolution tomorrow calling for condemnation of their treatment of teachers. The assembly ends tomorrow.

A special report submitted earlier to the assembly asserted that East Germany forced its teachers to promote communism in and out of the classroom and to spy and inform on pupils and parents.

The only Communist country represented at the assembly is Yugoslavia.

About 700 delegates and observers from 74 countries are attending the assembly, which is the first in this country since the world organization was established in 1952. The confederation represents, through its member groups, more than 3 million teachers.

Sessions are being held at the Mayflower Hotel and the headquarters building of the National Education Association.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Aug. 4, 1959]

CHANGE OF DIRECTION ON VISITS: INVITATION TO KHRUSHCHEV IS CALLED EMOTIONALLY DIFFICULT FOR SOME IN UNITED STATES

(By Doris Fleeson)

It was difficult to tell at his hastily summoned press conference whether President Eisenhower was relaxed and happy over his decision "to melt a little bit of the ice that seems to freeze our relations with the Soviets."

He spoke pleasantly enough, though showing a slight trace of irritation over the fact that so important a command decision should have been "one of the worst kept secrets of our time." This may have been only a reversion to his military days when such abundant leakage about so delicate a subject would have been unthinkable.

Certainly the President has had the green light from most political intersections for his exchange of visits with Soviet Premier Khrushchev. There can be little question that the people, not only of the United States but of the world, will go a long way in the name of peace. The new generations feel in their bloodstream the nuclear threat as older men and women cannot.

With the diplomatic instinct which served him so well during the war and can almost be said to have made him President, Mr. Eisenhower will see the major Western allies before the Soviet exchange. It was a commonplace at Geneva that General De Gaulle is happy about practically nothing touching upon the Soviet Union and that Chancellor Adenauer of West Germany is not far behind him.

Yet with all the Eisenhower support at home, and his sound intention of touching his bases before the face-to-face encounters with Khrushchev begin, the new project is one of those enterprises of great pith and moment whose currents may turn awry. The President has been a part of some great decisions that now can be defended only as a good idea at the time, such as allowing the Russians to reach Berlin first in World War II.

He also saw, and later became a part of, Republican use of the Yalta Conference failures in order to win elections at home. It is a wry irony, freely commented on in Congress after the President's announcement, that a Republican administration

should now be heading toward conferences with the Soviet Premier, both here and in Russia, without even the excuse of a wartime alliance.

To make this possible, Stalin and Franklin Roosevelt had to die. Only Winston Churchill of the Yalta decision makers lives on, a stout champion of its validity in the context of its time. It could even be that John Foster Dulles would have had difficulty in adjusting to the present pace of East-West relations.

The Republican right wing is already showing some sensitivity to cloakroom jokes about Vice President Nixon's "courtship of the Russians." This is the spot where the President's moves may be sourly regarded, but it is out of power in Congress and generally throughout the country.

Entirely apart from political considerations, there will also be Americans who find the change of direction emotionally difficult. Yet it seems clear that another watershed of history is here and demanding exactly the kind of direction the President proposes to give it.

The President emphasized that the Khrushchev exchange was for a "personal visit" and had no connection with a later summit meeting. He specifically disavowed negotiation and emphasized he could not speak for the Western Powers, only for the United States.

Yet in the light of the President's powers over foreign policy—the powers of which every President is most jealous—the Nixon journey is tourism and the Congress can do very little. And for his part, Khrushchev has repeatedly indicated that he would like to do a lot of business with the President of the United States.

Survey Highlights Willingness To Pay the Price for Public Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, no area of public concern is or should be greater than in that of public education. I believe parents—indeed the entire adult community—are willing to pay adequately for their children's education, including a tax increase, if that is necessary. I think this point is important to keep in mind when advocates of Federal aid to education claim that taxpayers are willing to assume further financial responsibility in the education of America's future citizens and leaders.

A survey, conducted in Culver City, Calif., a community within my district, bears out this contention. The survey, conducted by PAIR, Inc.—Predictive and Integrative Research, Inc.—likewise pinpoints that while there is a willingness on the part of parents—and the community in general—to assume their share of financial responsibility, including the payment of decent teachers' salaries, often the facts are not made known to them. This explains, for example, why in item 13 of the survey, the text of which follows, there is a large "Yes" vote on a willingness to vote for school bonds, but at the same time, "the realities of elections show that unless a cam-

paign is backed up by extensive preparation and adequate financing, it might fail."

Taken as a whole, this survey conducted in a typical American community offers illuminating data and presents the crucial areas in which obviously more attention must be given to achieve improved and necessary community understanding about the public school system and those who serve in this system. The concern is there—the need is to have better communication in and about all phases of public school problems and objectives.

The survey does highlight—and this is the point I wish to make—that the adult population is willing to pay the price for public education, if the facts are known.

The report on the survey follows:

REPORT ON SURVEY OF CULVER CITY EDUCATIONAL NEEDS

INTRODUCTION

PAIR, Inc., at the invitation of the Culver City Citizens for Public Schools, planned and supervised a survey of the community in regard to certain education issues. This is a report of the findings from this survey.

SAMPLE

The sample consisted of person-to-person interviews with 316 persons throughout Culver City. The sample was obtained from every precinct in the city on a random basis. Approximately 1 percent of the total Culver City population was contacted; this constitutes over 2 percent of the voters.

ITEM ANALYSIS

Item 1: Do you (or husband) work in Culver City? Yes, 30 percent. No, 70 percent.

This item reveals Culver City as essentially a residential community with more than two-thirds of its population employed out of the city. It is useful in providing socioeconomic baselines for further interpretation of the data, for, when this response is correlated with independent information concerning age grouping, we perceive that Culver City is primarily a community of middle and upper-middle class families, with the predominant age group that of the 30- to 40-year-old.

Other studies have proved that this age group considers education as the primary civic interest for them.

Item 2: Do you have children in Culver City schools? Yes, 65.7 percent. No, 34.3 percent.

This response further reinforces the observation made above that Culver City families are predominantly in the 30-40 age group.

Item 3: Are you able to take your vacations other than during the summer months? Yes, 55 percent. No, 45 percent.

This item has important significance for the future utilization of schools on a 12-month basis as a solution to ever-increasing financial problems. The fact that over one-half of the population now can take vacations any time of the year that they prefer, points to the feasibility of the 12 months school.

Item 4: Which of the following plans of organization do you prefer for our high schools? A. Three years of junior high school—followed by 3 years of senior high (or plan B). B. Two years of junior high school—followed by 4 years of senior high. Plan A, 51 percent. Plan B, 28 percent. Blank, 21 percent.

The response to this item would indicate that a majority of people would prefer retaining the present 3-3 plan. However, the large blank response indicates that many do not understand the pros and cons in-

volved and therefore it would seem wise for the board of education to engage in an extensive public education campaign before making any changes. If this is not done there is a danger of friction arising over any plan that might be chosen.

Item 5: Who is now on the board of education in Culver City? Seventy-eight and four-tenths percent could not name a single board of education member; 7.2 percent could name one member, 5.4 percent could name two members, 2.9 percent could name three members, 2.9 percent could name four members, 3.2 percent could name all five members. It is obvious from these statistics that members of the board of education are not well-known citizens. It perhaps suggests that public relations between the board and the community are weak.

Item 6: Do you think that the Culver City Board of Education is doing a good job? Yes, 74 percent. No, 6.5 percent. Blank, 19.5 percent.

Item 7: In what way?

Although 74 percent felt that the board was doing a good job, the vast majority could not state specifically in what way they were doing so. The responses of those who did answer item 7 seemed to cluster into the following categories which have been arranged according to frequency of response:

We like our schools.....	1
Good teaching methods.....	2
Culver City has the best schools.....	3
Have heard no bad reports on schools.....	4
Children's progress.....	5
Progressive-advanced school system.....	6

These responses indicate a subjective feeling of well-being in the schools which rebounds to the credit of the school board. It will be noticed, however, that three of the top four reasons given are not objective replies and the fourth (good teaching methods) indicates that the citizens do not understand the function of a board of education for the board does not establish the methods of teaching used—this is far removed from its domain.

On the negative side the responses were more specific usually having some relation to the individual's personal experience with the schools or the board. Some of these were: objections to split sessions; poor public relations; overcrowded classes; too conservative; low standards.

Another finding of significance is the fact that almost 20 percent of the population does not know enough about the board to voice an opinion either pro or con. This opens the question of whether the citizens really know how well the board is functioning and again points up the need for better public relations.

Item 8: Do you feel the superintendent of schools is doing a good job? Yes, 67 percent. No, 5.7 percent. Blank, 27.3 percent.

Item 9: In what way?

When asked specifically "in what way" the answers clustered as follows:

Good schools reflect a good superintendent.....	1
Heard good reports.....	2
The way the schools are run.....	3
High standards.....	3

Again we see evidence that the work of the superintendent, as that of the board of education, is not well understood in the community. The affirmative answers were almost entirely subjective in nature. This conclusion is supported by the large percentage of the population (27.3 percent) who were not sufficiently informed to voice an opinion either for or against.

On the negative side, as was to be expected, the responses were more specific. It is apparent that personal experience motivated individuals who reported: unpleasant experience; evasive; doesn't listen to parents, etc.

The implication of this item is that there is an obvious need for the superintendent to take steps to build an image of being the educational leader of the community at large. This implies an information program at the grassroots level with the people.

Item 10: Do you feel the teachers of Culver City are doing a good job? Yes, 85 percent. No, 6.5 percent. Blank, 8.5 percent.

Item 11: In what way? The specific responses to this item should prove extremely valuable to teachers for they contain both an enumeration of the teachers' strengths and guidelines for correcting weaknesses.

A rank ordering of the affirmative responses is as follows:

Individual attention given to students.....	1
Interest in the students.....	2
Good teaching methods.....	2
Children are learning.....	3
Heard schools are good.....	4
Parent-teacher relationships.....	5

The importance of good teacher-student relationships is quite apparent from these responses. Three of the first four items above are child centered and indicate that the community judges its teachers first and overwhelmingly foremost by their work with the child.

Furthermore, this item proves that the teachers constitute the most direct contact between the educational system and the community, for only 8.5 percent of the entire sample were unable to respond to the question: Are the teachers doing a good job? When this figure is compared to the 19.5 percent who could not commit themselves about the Board of Education and the 27.3 percent who did not know the work of the superintendent, this dramatically underscores the importance of the teachers in establishing a favorable reputation for the schools.

On the negative side are found certain comments which should alert the teachers to needs which are not now being met. Although few in number, again they were motivated by personal experience and should be given careful consideration: Lack of discipline; not enough basics being taught; poor reading techniques; expect too much of child.

Item 12: Are you in favor of reestablishing adult education in Culver City? Yes, 85 percent. No, 6.5 percent. Blank, 8.5 percent.

Evidently the community feels that an adult education program would be desirable.

Item 13: Are you willing to vote for school bonds to provide new buildings? Yes, 87 percent. No, 7.5 percent. Blank, 5.5 percent.

The large "yes" response may be misleading, for other studies, plus the realities of elections show that unless a campaign is backed up by extensive preparation and adequate financing, it might fail. (PAIR has found that unless the voter clearly understands an issue, he tends to vote "no" or leave it blank 60 percent of the time. A successful bond election requires a two-thirds affirmative vote.)

Item 14: Do you know what Culver City teachers salaries are? Yes, 23.5 percent. No, 74 percent. Blank, 2.5 percent.

Item 15: What is the average yearly salary paid to Culver City teachers? The average of all responses equaled \$4,970.

Item 16: What do you feel the yearly average of teachers salaries should be? The responses ranged from a low of \$4,000 to a high of \$24,000 a year. However, a salary range of from \$5,000 to \$9,000 was the median response. This range is consistent with the average income of Culver City residents and it implies that the citizens identify with teachers and are willing to pay them the same salary that they earn.

Item 17: Do you have as personal friends any teachers in Culver City? Yes, 29 percent. No, 68 percent. Blank, 3 percent.

This item was designed to determine to what extent the teachers are personally known in the community. It is interesting to note that 30 percent of the citizens count teachers among their personal friends. This strengthens the position of the teacher as a source of information about the schools.

Item 18: Are you in favor of providing increased counseling services in Culver City schools? Yes, 83 percent. No, 13.5 percent. Blank, 3.5 percent.

This figure is supported by nationwide studies which show that counseling and guidance programs are one of the chief concerns of parents.

Item 19: Are you willing to support a tax increase if needed? Yes, 86.5 percent. No, 12 percent. Blank, 1.5 percent.

This response looks favorable for raising needed revenues; however, the same limitations apply here as are noted in item 13 (Would you support a school bond?).

CONCLUSION

This survey does not purport to be an exhaustive examination of the Culver City School District and the educational needs of the community. It does hope to focus attention on a few crucial areas and to lay the groundwork for further factfinding activities. It is our belief that a thorough knowledge of the facts is essential before problem solving can begin.

Respectfully submitted,

PAIR, INC.,

FRANK J. BATES,

Director of Marketing Research.

courage, for they themselves are endowed with rare fortitude.

Although the people of Poland knew "Mr. America," as Mr. Nixon has been described in the European press, would arrive Sunday, they were not informed of the hour. But, that obviously did not stop them in their determination to extend to the distinguished visitor from the United States an unforgettable greeting.

After this turnout and the cries of love for America, there will be no question in the minds of Red leaders of where the Polish people stand in the struggle between the forces of freedom and slavery. There never was any question in the minds of Americans, but it was well to clarify the thinking of Moscow on this subject.

Poland has been through a frightful ordeal, but its ardor for liberty is undiminished. When the history of Poland is recalled, this is not surprising, for Poland has weathered crisis after crisis, one spanning more than a century. Never has its enemies succeeded in extinguishing the flames. The Reds will not accomplish what the Russian czars and Nazi Germany failed to do.

The fight for the liberation of Poland goes on at home and abroad. Let us hope the day will not be distant when Poland will be restored to its place in the family of nations as an independent country, not an enslaved satellite. With the spirit shown in Warsaw yesterday, the time may be sooner than many have thought possible. Nikita Khrushchev is sitting on a keg of dynamite in Poland and in other satellite lands. Perhaps this helps to account for his display of nerves periodically.

Poland Welcomes "Mr. America"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of Monday, August 3, 1959, which comments upon the welcome given to Vice President RICHARD NIXON by the people of Poland when Mr. Nixon was in Warsaw:

POLAND WELCOMES "MR. AMERICA"

The tumultuous welcome, given to Vice President Nixon by more than 250,000 Poles in Warsaw yesterday upon his arrival for a brief visit in Poland after his tour of the Soviet Union and conferences with its leaders, was notice to the world, particularly to the Kremlin, that the historic ties between the United States and Poland remain firm despite the dominating role Russia has played in the land of Pulaski and Kosciuszko since the end of the Second World War.

It is notice, too, that the love of freedom that burns so fiercely in every Polish heart has not diminished. The demonstration is one whose significance will not escape the Kremlin, for this was an outpouring of the people, not a reception stage-managed by a puppet regime.

Furthermore, it was a personal tribute to Mr. Nixon for the way he stood up to Nikita Khrushchev and letting the Red dictator and his lieutenants know the United States could not be pushed around. The Poles admire

Tribute to the Late Mrs. Mary T. Norton

SPEECH

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, those of us who had been privileged to serve in this body with Mrs. Mary T. Norton were deeply saddened to learn of her death on August 2. Together with the hosts of her friends and admirers in many walks of life, we are conscious of a great loss and are reminded of her outstanding character and accomplishments. Of Mrs. Norton's many virtues, I believe that devotion was the keynote of her admirable character and the mainspring from which her great accomplishments stemmed.

In her public life devotion to God and to her country activated all her endeavors, as devotion to her family directed her private life.

As the first Democratic lady ever elected to the House of Representatives, Mrs. Norton was destined to a brilliant career lasting more than a quarter of a century, during which she did many important things for which she will long be remembered. The decision to terminate her service in the House was made, not by her constituents, but voluntarily by herself on the occasion of her 75th birthday.

Even before coming to the Congress, Mrs. Norton displayed in local affairs

those facets of her character that brought so much success to her efforts here. Her achievements in behalf of the children of New Jersey brought recognition when she was selected as president of the Day Nurseries Association of Jersey City in 1916.

It was as a Member of this House, however, that Mrs. Norton's abilities were given full scope, and here she achieved her greatest public successes. Because of her devotion to her duty as a Representative of all the people and to their causes, she was not deterred by any current unpopularity of those causes. For example, early in her great legislative career she courageously introduced a resolution to repeal the 18th amendment when such a move did not enjoy the tremendous public support it later gained. The ultimate success of repeal owed a good deal to Mary Norton.

One of her greatest achievements in behalf of the workingman was the enactment of the Federal Wage and Hour Act. Many legislators and workers today who share the universal recognition of the value of that legislation either have forgotten or never knew the controversy that attended its enactment.

Twice during her service in the House her colleagues honored her—on the occasion of her completion of 20 years' service in 1915 and again on her silver anniversary as a Member in 1950. Perhaps the one honor that she cherished above all others was her well-merited selection as the Outstanding Catholic Woman of the Year in 1947.

Her colleagues remaining in the House will miss her as will her sisters and her innumerable friends. Our heartfelt sympathy is extended particularly to her sisters, Mrs. Joseph B. McDonagh, of Greenwich, Conn., and Miss Anne Hopkins, of New York.

Resolution of the American Legion, Department of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit for the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Department of West Virginia, the American Legion, at the concluding session of their 41st annual department convention on Sunday, July 26, 1959, at Parkersburg, W. Va.

In this resolution, the American Legion urges a firmer and more positive stand on the part of our country to prevent the continued spread of communism. I am heartily in favor of this resolution and respectfully call the attention of my colleagues to it:

RESOLUTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF WEST VIRGINIA

The following resolution was adopted at the concluding session of the 41st annual department convention of the American Legion Department of West Virginia, on Sunday, July 26, 1959, in Parkersburg, W. Va.:

"Whereas the department convention of the American Legion of West Virginia, was addressed by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo in a most forthright and enlightening manner, tracing the history of the progression of the Communist plan, proclaimed by them, and made possible by the weakening of the United States of America from its rapid postwar demobilization, and impliedly augmented by subsequent lack of decision on a firm policy of resistance at crucial times and points; and

"Whereas he pointed to and enumerated the many countries and hundreds of millions of people who have been overrun and enslaved by Communist rule, while the free world stood by, lacking strength and the willingness to sacrifice, necessary to save those free people; and

"Whereas from the history and pattern of the Communist aggression, it has become clearly evident that unless a firm and sacrificial stand is now taken and backed by adequate strength and determined resistance to every effort to spread the Communist sphere of influence, it will be inevitable that the remaining free nations will be gradually engulfed by the Red flood; and

"Whereas the American Legion deplors the seeming lack of understanding of and indifference to the meaning and dangers, inherent in these facts, by the average citizen, and particularly by many of our public officers responsible for formulating and implementing our foreign policy and an adequate national defense: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the American Legion, Department of West Virginia, in convention assembled, this 26th day of July, 1959, That with the guidance and under the everlasting supervision of Almighty God, that we call upon our representatives in the U.S. Senate and Congress to take a firm and audible stand on the issues involved in these alarming problems, to the end that a strong, vigorous foreign policy may be forthwith established, maintained and defended by every necessary implement of national defense and requisite cooperation with our allies; and

"That we call upon our public officers and representatives to discard all political expediency, and patriotically turn their undivided attention to problems inherent in saving our country, while there is yet time, from the fate of Rome and other great nations which fell because of indifference and weakness of their people and their leaders; and

"That we particularly call upon all members of the American Legion to fulfill the serious patriotic responsibility of bringing home to our people the truth of this situation and of aiding and stimulating our public officers in implementing of action required to meet this alarming necessity; and

"That this resolution be immediately released to the press and copies sent to the West Virginia representatives in the U.S. Senate and Congress and to Ambassador Romulo and the President of the United States. Also the Honorable Christian Herter, Secretary of State, the Honorable Neil McElroy, Secretary of Defense, and that it be forwarded for submission to the national convention at Minneapolis for action thereon, and a copy hereof be sent to each post in the Department of West Virginia."

I, Tommy E. Jones, do hereby certify that I am the duly elected, qualified and acting adjutant of the American Legion, Department of West Virginia, and that the above is a true and correct copy of the resolution adopted by the 41st annual department convention, at its concluding session, of the American Legion, Department of West Virginia, on Sunday, July 26, 1959, in Parkersburg, W. Va.

Given under my hand this 28th day of July, 1959, at Charleston, W. Va.

TOMMY E. JONES,
Department Adjutant.

Army Display Calls Tomorrow's Soldier Ultimate Weapon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Mr. Jack Raymond, which appeared in the New York Times on Tuesday, August 4, 1959:

ARMY DISPLAY CALLS TOMORROW'S SOLDIER ULTIMATE WEAPON (By Jack Raymond)

WASHINGTON, August 3.—The Army exhibited its ultimate weapon today—a fighting soldier of the future. At the same time, the new chief of staff, Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, forecast a "strategic nuclear disarmament of the United States and the Soviet Union."

General Lemnitzer said that nuclear missile deterrent power would always be needed. But realistically, he went on, other components would play the vital role in view of a big weapons standoff not too many years away.

General Lemnitzer spoke at the opening of a 3-day session of the Association of the U.S. Army at the Sheraton Park Hotel. In the lobby, guests were greeted by the "ultimate weapon—the soldier," dressed and equipped in futuristic fashion.

Billed as the "soldier of tomorrow," he was a rather awesome figure. He was covered from head to toe with material to protect him against smallarms fire and nuclear explosions.

From his helmet of plastic laminate protruded a tiny radio antenna, and within the helmet was a sending and receiving set. Attached to the helmet, ready for use, were goggles with infra-red lenses to enable him to see in the dark.

Another feature of the uniform was a "jump belt," with two exhaust pipes extending down the soldier's sides. The belt, with solid-fuel power attachments, which are controlled by squeezing a handle, gives the soldier rocket power for leaping as much as 30 feet, from cliffs and across streams.

His face was protected by a mask against nuclear effects. His equipment included two long, thin cylinders, like broomstick handles, containing explosive charges for digging foxholes.

All the equipment and uniform, exclusive of an M-14 rifle, weighed 24 pounds. An Army announcement expressed hope for a lighter rifle.

Not all the items of uniform and equipment exhibited by the soldier of the future have been received for the troops, although they have been tested by a manufacturer, said an Army spokesman.

GREEN CASH NEEDED, TOO

Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, head of the U.S. Army command, said bluntly, "we need the green light and the cash."

This, indirectly, was the theme of General Lemnitzer's speech, "Why We Need a Modern Army."

It was his first major speech since he succeeded Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor last month. General Taylor has said that he retired because of his frustrations in trying to modernize the Army.

General Lemnitzer, who was General Taylor's vice chief of staff, made it clear that he holds the same strategic views as his pred-

ecessor. However, he used fairly mild language today in outlining these views.

He reiterated what has become a favorite Army theme in these words:

"In the coming ICEM era, we can anticipate a day, not too many years away, when our missile retaliatory resources can and must be made so numerous and relatively invulnerable that no missile or other attack upon them, even by surprise, could possibly eradicate them all.

"This means that our response to the attacker would be absolutely so devastating to him—so clearly that it would be senseless for him to attack in the first place.

"When that times arrives, it could bring about, in a curious way, what some have characterized as the equivalent of strategic nuclear disarmament. We shall always want, as a vital component of our military power, the invulnerable missile deterrent needed to maintain this situation. With this in being, the situation will then mean, realistically, that the other components of our power will play the vital role in coping with the tactics and strategy of communism short of the threat of great nuclear war."

General Lemnitzer also reiterated another major Army theme while interpreting strategic needs. He stressed the importance of continuing a forward strategy. This would place United States and allied military forces as close up to a front line as possible, to halt an enemy before his attack could gain momentum.

"The alternative for us would be to withdraw within our own borders, adopting a so-called fortress America strategy which, by its exclusive defensive character, would be completely negative," the general went on. "Consequently, it would be doomed from the outset to ultimate failure."

Some 3,000 Army men, active, Reserve, or retired, attended the meeting and panel discussions. Also present were many representatives of defense manufacturers.

There were many exhibits in the lobby and in the exhibition hall of the latest types of Army equipment. Also displayed were some types that defense industrialists had perfected and wanted to demonstrate.

These included missiles, communications systems, light aircraft, and a variety of radar devices. The radar display included a new portable central system, now being used by the Army abroad, that can direct anti-aircraft missile fire automatically against enemy planes that swoop low over battlefields.

In addition to the exhibits some 65 defense companies had hospitality suites where their representatives entertained those they wanted to interest in their products.

An official said that there appeared to be far fewer such hospitality suites this year than in previous years at military service conventions. He speculated that the company officials were sensitive to recent publicity concerning munition lobbies.

Many of the officials of defense contractors are retired officers, it was pointed out. They are members of the association as well as company representatives.

They were said to be sensitive to intimations that might develop about their association with old friends in the service, although these retired officers might have no selling mission.

Recognizing Sea Power's Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit for

the RECORD a tribute to the Congress which appeared on August 1 on the editorial page of the San Diego Union.

In a few short paragraphs it places in proper perspective the vital importance of sea power to the security of this Nation. Quite properly, I think, it commends this Congress for recognizing, in its action upon the Defense Appropriation Act for this year, the indispensable attributes of modern seapower. In providing the initial funds for construction of a nuclear powered carrier plus an appropriation for a Marine Corps of 200,000 the Congress has clearly recognized the Nation's need for the mobility and versatility which only seapower—the Navy-Marine Corps team—can bring to bear across the whole spectrum of modern war.

Very plainly, as the editorial points out, our action constitutes clear notice to any potential enemy as well as to our friends, that this Nation does not intend to, and will not, tie itself solely to defense forces capable of only two reactions—massive retaliation or ignominious surrender.

I commend this brief, but clearly reasoned endorsement of congressional belief in seapower to the attention of all Members of the Congress:

CONGRESS SERVES SECURITY—RECOGNIZING SEAPOWER'S ROLE

Congress has recognized the role of seapower today. A conference of House and Senate Members has agreed to funds for another nuclear attack carrier and to restore the Marine Corps to 200,000 men.

The United States is a maritime nation and tied to its major allies by open seas. Control of the seas, by which our allies can be helped and supplied, is essential to us and to them.

There has been much confusion on the requirements for the security of our country and for the support of our allies. It was Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, who presented the case for seapower to Congress, in support of President Eisenhower's request for another attack carrier.

Admiral Burke's forceful presentation of the Navy's case confirms the wisdom of retaining him as Chief of Naval Operations.

Admiral Burke made the points that a basic strength in attack carriers will be essential to our security as far as we can see into the future; mobile bases on the high seas are less vulnerable than fixed bases ashore; 14 modern attack carriers are required for deployment in the Pacific and Atlantic-Mediterranean areas, and carriers are vital in anti-submarine warfare.

Mobility is the key to survival in the nuclear age.

Admiral Burke said the attack carrier striking force is indispensable for coping with limited war situations, and may be the country's only effective means of dealing with this type of action in many areas of the world. And "in the event of a nuclear general war, U.S. naval striking forces dispersed at sea may be the only U.S. forces which survive the initial onslaught with sufficient combat power and organized ability to tip the balance of power in our favor."

Congress sensibly and logically is turning back to assuring balanced forces, for defense and offense, and not staking the future of the United States on any single weapon or single weapons system.

The United States needs and must have massive missile power, on land and sea. But it also must have the ability to meet any kind of a military challenge, from a nuclear exchange down to a policing action. The move to raise the Marine Corps back up to 200,000

men would assure a ready landing force that is indispensable to mobile striking power.

There is one thing sure, as Congress seems to have recognized. To fall back onto this continent, with a capability only of massive retaliation, would be to surrender our allies in advance, and imprison us in the terrible dilemma of having to choose between doing nothing or an all-out nuclear war of annihilation.

To place the United States in such a position would be an act as devastating as any an enemy could wish.

No Khrushchev for Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the editorial staff of the Cleveland News has long enjoyed a reputation for clarity and objective thinking. Under leave obtained, I insert an editorial which appeared in the Cleveland News August 4, titled "No Khrushchev for Us":

The President of the United States under pressure and unable to resist it further, has issued an invitation to the president of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to be his guest. That would be Nikita Khrushchev. And Mr. Eisenhower, in turn, has accepted an invitation to visit Moscow later in the fall.

Here can be sighted politics and diplomacy at the highest level, but the propriety of U.S. action is already in controversy.

Cyrus Eaton, distinguished Clevelandier with vast property interests who has expressed sympathy for the Soviet position in respect to peace offensives, trade, and economic coexistence, has said he will invite the Soviet Premier to be his guest at his estate in Northfield, near Cleveland.

Criticism now obviously will not upset these state visits. Invitations have been issued, have been accepted. The deed has been done. Premier Khrushchev some time next month will be the guest of this Nation.

This is a political and propaganda triumph for the Soviet Premier that goes beyond anything he ever achieved, or perhaps ever expected to achieve. About all that is left is for him to tell the President of the United States to his face in the White House that his (Eisenhower's) grandchildren will be living under socialism.

Whether the Soviet Premier should be welcomed to Cleveland as a guest of this community is a matter that calls for thorough consideration. We are of the belief that he would not be wholeheartedly welcome here. If Mr. Eaton wants to entertain him, that is his personal business, and the responsibility is his.

Cleveland is a city with a background of love of liberty and hate for tyranny. Its cosmopolitan population is made up of all kinds of people, including thousands of descendants and kin of Hungarian, Czech, Rumanian, Russian, and Bulgarian patriots and refugees.

Among them there is no respect for Mr. Khrushchev or for what he or his rule stand for. Khrushchev is stained with the blood of Ukraine peasants, and more recently with the blood of Hungarian men and women whose rebellion was crushed with savage brutality.

Let us not invite Nikita Khrushchev to be a guest of Cleveland.

An invitation to the United States is a recognition for which Mr. Khrushchev long has been angling. This gives him a respectability and a world position that he has been seeking anxiously.

It has also been Kremlin theory that if Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchev could get together by themselves, they could make a deal, perhaps a deal by which they could divide up the world—and then there would be peace, quiet, contentment, and prosperity.

Mr. Eisenhower, of course, has no such thought. He is committed to close association and communication with America's allies. Any agreements or arrangements will have to be on a four-power basis, which means inclusion of Britain, France, and all the NATO states.

An advantage of the exchange of Khrushchev-Eisenhower visits is that a showdown on Berlin is delayed. Maybe, flushed with victory and full of confidence, Khrushchev will condescend to grant some concessions. And perhaps the Soviet Premier will allow himself to be convinced of America's real strength, durability, and unity against the aggression that he and his cause represent.

Statement of Andrew J. Biemiller, Director, Department of Legislation, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, Before House Judiciary Committee on H.R. 73 and H.R. 575

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following statement made by Mr. Andrew J. Biemiller on the subject of congressional districting:

The American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations considers the subject dealt with in H.R. 73 and H.R. 575—congressional districting—to be of the greatest importance, for we recognize that the entire complexion of the House of Representatives depends directly upon the degree of fairness by which congressional districts are composed. Congressional district lines drawn solely on the basis of partisan political considerations must inevitably result in an unrepresentative House. District lines drawn with the idea of achieving fair and equal representation for all of the people will lead to a representative chamber. The members of the committee, in considering this legislation, must choose between these two alternatives.

The question of congressional districting concerns the AFL-CIO primarily because, as Americans, we are concerned over the fact that unequal representation of the people in Congress poses a threat to the basic concepts of American democracy. We are disturbed because the existing lack of equality in the populations of districts makes some Americans many times more powerful than other Americans in the election of Members to the House of Representatives. But in addition to the concern which we feel as Americans, we of the labor movement have a special concern in this problem—a concern stemming from the fact that a large part of our

membership resides in urban suburban areas of the Nation. It is precisely these areas—in almost every State—which are most severely underrepresented.

Urban and suburban underrepresentation is one of the most notorious and shameful facts in American political life today. It exists at the congressional level, and it exists—in a much more severe form—in almost every one of our State legislatures.

Because of urban underrepresentation—because a city vote is worth only a fraction of what a country vote is worth—the severe, pressing problems of urban and suburban America are being neglected. There should be little cause to wonder why so many of our legislative bodies seem so ill-equipped to deal with the complex problems which arise in our increasingly urban-suburban civilization. The answer is that our legislative bodies are so frequently dominated by rural legislators, who, in many cases, neither understand nor are particularly concerned with urban problems.

America is, today, an urban nation. A majority of the people of the Nation live in urban centers and their immediate environs. In such a nation, the rural domination of our legislative chambers is an anachronism deliberately maintained by those forces in society which have a vested interest in urban underrepresentation.

While, as previously noted, urban underrepresentation is most severe at the State level, it can be easily demonstrated that, in the drawing of congressional district lines, rural-dominated State legislatures have consistently drawn lines in such a way as to cause rural areas to be overrepresented, and urban areas to be under-represented.

The attached table illustrates this point. The table indicates that in every State except three, where there are both urban and nonurban districts (the exceptions being Arizona, Arkansas, and New Jersey), the urban congressional districts have larger populations than the nonurban districts. In many of the States the difference is very great. In 11 States—Alabama, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Kentucky, Oregon, Texas, Utah, and Washington—the gap is more than 100,000. In four other States—Indiana, Michigan, Oklahoma, and Tennessee, the gap is almost 100,000. In averaging the figures for the 33 States which have both urban and nonurban districts, one finds that nonurban Congressmen represent almost 63,000 fewer people than their urban colleagues from their own States.

A further indication of the underrepresentation of cities in the Federal House of Representatives is the fact that the 11 most populous congressional districts in the Nation are all located in cities and their environs: Dallas, Tex., Atlanta, Ga., Indianapolis, Ind., Birmingham, Ala., San Antonio, Tex., Columbus, Ohio, Dayton, Ohio, Detroit, Mich., Miami, Fla., Fairfield County, Conn. (an area containing both suburban communities and the city of Bridgeport), and Hartford, Conn.

In 13 of our States—Texas, South Dakota, Michigan, Florida, Georgia, Colorado, Ohio, Alabama, California, Indiana, Connecticut, Kansas, and Maryland, representation has become so unequal that the most populous congressional district in the State has a population more than twice as great as the least populous district. Indeed, in South Dakota the ratio is more than 3½ to 1.

In addition to districts of unequal population, the other evil with which both H.R. 73 and H.R. 575 attempt to deal—the gerrymandering of congressional district lines—is also one which finds its victims most frequently in urban areas, where the shifting of a district line by one or two city blocks frequently can predetermine the outcome of an election contest.

The AFL-CIO believes that the objectives of both H.R. 73 and H.R. 575—equal representation of all the people in the House of Representatives—is greatly to be desired, and we support the basic aims of both bills. It is our feeling, however, that the 10 percent variation permitted in H.R. 575 is more than ample to allow for special situations which make districts of exactly equal populations difficult to compose. We feel that H.R. 73 which allows a 20 percent difference from the average population of districts in a State would still permit far too great a variation, and would, therefore, not be nearly as effective as H.R. 575, in achieving the objective of fair representation.

However, it is our feeling that the enforcement provisions of H.R. 73 are preferable to those provided by H.R. 575. We believe, on the basis of past performance, that the Congress would be extremely reluctant to employ the power given to it under H.R. 575, to deny a seat to a representative elected from a district whose population varies from the State average by more than the statutory percentage limit. We feel, therefore, that it would be far more effective for the Congress specifically to grant to the Federal courts the power to enforce legislation of this nature.

This Nation was founded because our forefathers resented taxation without representation. Today, in America, we have taxation without fair representation—an evil only one step removed from the one which caused Colonial America to rise in righteous revolt.

On behalf of the majority of the American people—those who live in our cities and suburban areas—the AFL-CIO appeals to this committee, and through it, to the whole Congress, to enact legislation to do away with unfair congressional districting and to reassert the fundamental American principles of majority rule and political equality.

Average population of urban and nonurban congressional districts in each State, 1959

[In the following table, urban districts are those which are located wholly or partially within cities with populations of 100,000 or more]

State	Average population of urban districts	Average population of nonurban districts
Alabama	433,479	263,551
Alaska	(1)	—
Arizona	331,770	417,817
Arkansas	283,437	325,215
California	359,955	343,614
Colorado	415,789	303,100
Connecticut	422,165	318,621
Delaware	(1)	—
Florida	426,580	298,390
Georgia	454,241	369,512
Idaho	(2)	—
Illinois	348,965	347,966
Indiana	407,467	316,148
Iowa	350,784	324,327
Kansas	403,954	274,348
Kentucky	454,615	351,436
Louisiana	373,542	297,337
Maine	(1)	—
Maryland	337,257	331,825
Massachusetts	344,966	313,565
Michigan	408,488	310,386
Minnesota	354,596	312,820
Mississippi	(2)	—
Missouri	358,487	335,370
Montana	(2)	—
Nebraska	311,641	327,956
Nevada	(1)	—
New Hampshire	(2)	—
New Jersey	338,195	358,314
New Mexico	(1)	—
New York	352,791	324,471
North Carolina	360,318	336,510
North Dakota	(2)	—
Ohio	371,360	321,809
Oklahoma	438,069	341,553
Oregon	471,537	349,935

Footnotes at end of speech.

Average population of urban and nonurban congressional districts in each State, 1959—Continued

(In the following table, urban districts are those which are located wholly or partially within cities with populations of 100,000 or more)

State	Average population of urban districts	Average population of nonurban districts
Pennsylvania.....	353,249	347,033
Rhode Island.....	(1)
South Carolina.....	(2)
South Dakota.....	(2)
Tennessee.....	413,215	327,772
Texas.....	425,835	307,405
Utah.....	402,310	286,532
Vermont.....	(1)
Virginia.....	369,025	322,579
Washington.....	358,375	325,960
West Virginia.....	(2)
Wisconsin.....	435,524	330,421
Wyoming.....	(1)

¹ No districts.

² No urban districts.

³ Urban districts only.

Voice of the Midwest Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN V. CARTER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, on June 26 of this year a nationally known farm commentator appeared on his last 6:45 a.m. broadcast over radio station WHO in Des Moines, Iowa. For nearly 15 years Herb Plambeck's voice had traveled over the airwaves at that early morning hour. During that time he got to know the farmer well. He became intimately familiar with his many problems and through the literally thousands of letters he received was able to observe his struggle for survival during good times and bad. During his last morning program Mr. Plambeck talked about the farm subsidy. This was not a man voicing an opinion on a subject with which he was not familiar. Nor was it a man who allowed self-interest to color his remarks. This was a man whose thoughts came from his heart and which most assuredly reflect the feelings of the midwestern farmer. I commend the following script to the attention of the House membership and strongly urge that it be carefully read and considered. One does not have to read between the lines to see the disillusionment and frustration of the farmer—disillusionment and frustration caused by a Department of Agriculture which, while insisting it is helping him, has merely confused him by failure to act in his interests.

The above-mentioned follows:

WHO FARM HIGHLIGHTS

(By Herb Plambeck, WHO radio farm director)

Thank you, Bob Graham. Good morning, friends.

This is the last time you will hear me on these morning "Farm Highlights." Because according to present plans, this is my final program with you at this hour I'd like to make it one to remember.

My topic this morning is easily the toughest of the many from which I might have

chosen. Before we deal with it let me say I leave this broadcast hour with much reluctance. You listeners have been exceedingly kind. Our sponsor has been most considerate. The station has been eminently patient. However a realignment of some programs here in which WHO the sponsor and I are all agreed. Moreover, the change will give my able, and young associates—my boys—a golden opportunity, and one I am sure our listeners will appreciate.

Ordinarily, on a concluding broadcast of 12 or 15 years standing, the temptation is to reminisce. You can be sure the temptation applies this morning. Similarly, I would love to have stressed some favorite projects—soil and water conservation, work of good neighbors, June Dairy Month, 4-H and FFA programs, and a camp for Iowa's crippled children. All of these things would be enjoyable and easy to report compared to what I feel impelled to discuss—a question every American seems to be asking and every farmer must face.

I speak, of course, of the subsidy question, and I speak as an individual. In other words, I am absolving station WHO and our sponsors of any blame. Whatever the consequences, this matter must be dealt with. We are fast reaching the point where the misunderstanding between farm and city people will seriously injure both—and both have much to lose.

This topic is not new. You have heard references to it time and again on this and other WHO programs, and in many other ways. The impact of it, however, is rapidly becoming greater—and more dangerous. This was indelibly impressed on many of us the past few weeks when Life magazine, the Reader's Digest, and other widely read publications have gone all out headlining what they describe as the "Incredible farm scandal"—implying, in effect, that every rural resident is a parasite and a thief. It came forcibly to my attention at national meetings in the South and East last week. When I walked into a New York hotel, I was quickly advised that NBC wanted someone from the farm side to deal with this penetrating question. It was not an easy assignment. Since then there have been many more hours spent on this matter, talking it over with farmers, long distance calls, studying, researching bulletins, and reading letters from listeners.

Two things must be said before I go further. One is that I am not so conceited or misled as to feel I can, in a few minutes' time, answer all the questions posed by those keenly intelligent writers, broadcasters, and other accusers, who have tremendously powerful forces on their side. Yet, I feel emphatically that even a few feeble voices, such as yours and mine, must be raised or else we are, in effect, pleading guilty.

Secondly, for the record, I do not personally want, nor have I ever accepted, farm or other subsidies. In my own small farm operations, I accept no Government aids directly. Yet, I readily admit indirectly I have been affected, and so have you my friend, perhaps in more ways than you realize and the time may come, if marketplace values drop still further, where some form of Government help will be necessary to save even those of us who now are accepting any.

Most of us concerned with this program are interested in the family farm. To lose it could mean disaster, not only to farming as we know it but equally so to many segments of our great and thriving American economy as well.

Subsidies are one part of big government. Anyone who has seen total big government in action, as I have in Russia and Siberia, is gravely fearful of it. We pray this will never happen here. Yet there is no denying price supports and other Government aids have become an integral part of our economy here in this bastion of freedom. However,

the big publications, numerous broadcasters, some chamber of commerce leaders, many key Government officials, some farm spokesmen, and many others seem determined to make the American public believe subsidies go only to agriculture. This we bitterly resent. They would have America and the world believe farmers alone accept Government help. Nothing could be further from the truth. Nothing could be more unfair. Let me state a few facts, as I have them, and as I believe them to be true.

First, subsidies, to which Life magazine and a lot of the rest of us take strong dislike, are not limited to farm price support payments. Tariffs, as enacted by our First Congress back in 1789 to protect American business. Special postal rates for magazines are subsidies and this Nation's publishing industry has attained at least a part of its wealth and stature because magazine publishers seem quite willing to accept this subsidy. Cost plus is a subsidy; and when war materials were needed, no one in his right mind would have stopped the wheels to provide our troops with what they had to have. Depletion allowances on oil and mining industry taxes are gigantic subsidies, but we never hear about this as I tried to point out in the broadcast from New York; farm people resent being singled out, of being accused of being alone in taking Government handouts. Rarely do we hear about the part Government plays in other facets of our economy.

I don't recall Life, in its scathing denunciation of agriculture, saying much about the \$9 million or more it has received, in a single year, in the way of the postal rates subsidy. Nor does Reader's Digest say much about the \$5 million it has accepted. Seldom is something written about the \$38 million in annual subsidies estimated for just 14 of our major magazines, to say nothing of the hundreds of others.

I am not saying this is wrong. I like to read America's fine magazines as well as anyone else. I am glad millions of Americans can afford them. I know about the value of advertising, and how magazines and newspapers, along with radio and TV messages, help Mr. and Mrs. America to a higher standard of living. I recognize the educational value of all the publications. I write for some fine newspapers myself. Certainly I do not want to change all this.

But, speaking as an individual, it seems to me that if the magazines are going to condemn agriculture, as criminals, for accepting Government help, then the publishers who condemn us ought to have the decency to admit to the same crime.

Similarly, the businessman who condemns farm price supports is not in the best position to do so. Business reconversion payments, which is still another subsidy, over the past 20 years or so, have totaled \$43 billion or more.

The oil people and mining people alone have gotten \$23 billion.

Railroad presidents, airlines officials, families accepting housing or other help, military leaders, politicians, laborers, person after person who points to farm price supports as being shameful has every right to do so, provided he or she is equally willing to point the same finger at himself or herself for having not only similarly accepted Government help, but for having accepted 10 times as much in total as that which has gone to agriculture. The figures I have quoted are not mine. I have taken them from a U.S. Government bulletin, entitled "Government Subsidy Historical Review," printed in 1958.

I know two wrongs do not make a right, and that this sounds like the pot calling the kettle black; but I feel people who live in glass houses, even if they are on Times Square, have no right to criticize agriculture and to make whipping boys out of farm peo-

ple, when they themselves are also accepting Government help, provided by you and me—the taxpayer.

There is much more to be said. I haven't even touched on some other unfair accusations, such as charging school lunch programs, foreign aid programs, and much else against agriculture, when it really should be charged at least part, to the Health, Education, and Welfare Department, the State Department, and so forth.

And there's been no time to mention the subsidy to the American consumer, by way of the cheap food agriculture is providing in the marketplace. Cappers Farmer estimates this to be \$70 billion. No housewife seems to want to change that even if Government subsidies have helped guarantee the overabundance and the staggering surpluses that make America the best and most economically fed nation on earth.

Nor have I touched on the endless ramifications of a prosperous agriculture and what it means to feed manufacturers, food processors, machinery and auto makers, business, labor unions, and to the retailer, wholesaler, truck driver, store clerk, butchers, bakers, candlestick makers, and the millions of others who benefit from a farming populace that has money to spend.

For me to quote the benefits all America gets from a prosperous subsidized agriculture might give the impression I favor subsidies. As emphasized before, I personally dislike Government help. Like most everyone else, I treasure the freedom that has made America great. In no way do I favor trading liberty for subsidy. But let's be fair about it. If it's wrong for Agriculture to have accepted \$5 billion to \$10 billion in subsidies over the past 25 years, isn't it equally wrong for the rest of the economy to have taken \$50 billion or more in that same period?

As for you, and everyone else in America, you must make your own decision. It is not my place or purpose to condone or condemn Government aid but as one U.S. citizen, identified with an industry I believe to be basic, namely, agriculture, I ask by all that's fair and right and decent that our accusers tell the whole truth—truth that might hurt because the fact is of all the Government help that has been accepted the last 25 years agriculture has received only a small part of the total. Let's tell the whole story, fully and honestly, in the tradition that has made America—your land and mine—so great and so wonderful.

The United States and the Challenge of the Underdeveloped Areas of the World—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the Congress and of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, I realize that much of the future lies in the underdeveloped areas of the world. The Honorable Francis O. Wilcox, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, made an excellent speech on this subject in Detroit, Mich., on May 1, 1959.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including this speech which con-

tains good material for the Congress and the people of the United States:

THE UNITED STATES AND THE CHALLENGE OF THE UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS OF THE WORLD

(Address by the Honorable Francis O. Wilcox, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, before the Wayne State University conference on the prospects for democracy in the underdeveloped areas, at the Institute of Arts, Detroit, Mich., Friday, May 1, 1959)

I can think of no city more appropriate for a discussion of the underdeveloped countries of the world than Detroit.

Your city is a major nerve center of the vast industrial, business, and financial complex of the Middle West. This one-time frontier trading post today has become the Nation's third largest industrial center. It is the world's biggest producer of export products, and the Detroit River carries more tonnage than any other river in the world.

These achievements are making an invaluable contribution to the advancement of the newly developing nations which are struggling to mobilize their own resources. The development of trade between nations, in which Detroit has played so important a part, is, to a large extent, responsible for the exchange of ideas and technical know-how between nations. This exchange has helped to make us great. And the export of our capital and technical know-how, whether it be through trade or foreign aid, is helping the newly developing countries, on whose friendship and cooperation we depend, to make their way. I am convinced that it is one of the most effective ways of helping pressures of communism.

them to resist the phony premises and harsh In the underdeveloped areas of the world live 1,300 million people who are striving to establish or maintain ways of life which successfully combine economic progress with human liberty. The continued survival of the United States as a free and independent democracy may well depend upon the success of their efforts. As this Nation could not long have survived half slave and half free, so would the failure of these peoples jeopardize our own liberty.

THE CHALLENGE OF NATIONALISM

Indeed, I would go so far as to say that the greatest challenge to free men in our time is the yearning of the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America for a better way of life.

Since World War II, 22 new nations and a quarter of the population of the world—more than 700 million people—have emerged into independence and are fired with the spirit of nationalism. They are seeking economic progress, freedom, and democracy. Their average per capita annual income is only \$75.

They are not alone in this deplorable state. Add to them those peoples who gained independence earlier but whose economic status is little or no better. Add to this the further fact that population throughout the world is increasing at a fantastic rate. It may reach as much as 6 billion people by the year 2000. Most of these people will be born in the underdeveloped regions of the world.

We are witnessing a revolution in these poor but populous nations which is no less genuine than our own American Revolution. Peoples who had once been isolated from the main currents of modern western techniques and economic progress have now become alive to the possibility of progress. They know now that economic and social progress is the prevailing trend, rather than stagnation. Having the political independence for which they have striven, their hopes have been aroused for the alleviation of the poverty, disease, and ignorance which still overshadow their lives. They insistently de-

mand of their governments that these aroused expectations be fulfilled.

To many of these people the need for improvement in their lot is so imperative that they will choose progress through dictatorship if it seems to be the only way. No government can stand for long, unless it promises—and makes good on its promises—the progress its people seek.

THE ALTERNATIVES BEFORE THE UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES

What choice, then, have the governments of the underdeveloped countries? They can pursue the path of authoritarianism: regiment labor, expropriate property, stifle initiative, reduce consumption, and build up their economy from the forced savings of their people. This is the way of communism. Alternatively these governments can pursue the path of freedom. This means that they must build up their capital, at the same time allowing for increased consumption and economic liberties. Since they have such limited resources, they can only achieve these goals with outside aid. That is the crucial element in the formula.

It is precisely here that the challenge of the underdeveloped areas squarely faces the United States and the other economically more advanced nations.

In 1820, Thomas Jefferson wrote: "In an infant country like ours, we must depend for improvements on the science of other countries, longer established, possessing better means, and more advanced than we are. To prohibit us from the benefit of foreign light is to consign us to long darkness." Our economic progress could not have been as rapid as it was—despite our vast wealth of natural resources—without the skills and capital which Europe furnished our young Republic in such great measure. Are we prepared to deny to others what proved so essential in our own development?

WHY U.S. ASSISTANCE

This is not a purely rhetorical question and should not be given an emotional response. There are many strong and valid reasons why we should help the underdeveloped areas with our skills and our capital. Let me recall some of these reasons.

First, we cannot continue to progress in the United States with much of the rest of the world standing still. Our needs for raw material and other imports, and for export markets make it absolutely essential that we assist stagnant economies to become dynamic. Moreover, history has demonstrated that advanced countries expand their trade with the countries whose economies they help to industrialize.

There is a Danish proverb which says that "you may light another's candle at your own without loss." In this case it seems to me, the net result of assisting other countries is to make our own economic candle power stronger and brighter.

Second, our national security clearly depends on a strong defense establishment and a vigorous and productive economy. We are rich in raw material resources but we are by no means self-sufficient. At present we import all of our natural rubber and tin, 85 percent of our bauxite and manganese and 64 percent of our tungsten. In fact, we have to obtain 10 percent of all the raw materials we use from overseas sources. Many of them come from the underdeveloped countries. Our own automobile industry, for example, depends on a wide range of raw materials—nickel from Canada, hides from Argentina, chrome from Rhodesia, mica from India, tin from Malaya, and tungsten from Bolivia.

Third, our entire economy depends on foreign trade to a far greater extent than most of us realize. Today our export trade amounts to about \$20 billion a year. Nearly 5 million of our people are employed in foreign trade.

I might also point out that foreign trade is equally important in keeping the free nations strong and united. The principal reason why some of them have not been absorbed into the economic bloc of international communism is their flourishing trade with the United States.

Fourth, foreign aid creates jobs right here in this country. Thus, the funds spent under the mutual security program in 1957 resulted in the employment of over a half million people in the United States.

These are but a few of the reasons why I have no patience with the glib label of "give-away program" as applied to our foreign aid activities. To me this phrase has a ring about as true as that of a lead nickle.

The great differences in the living standards of the economically advanced countries and the underdeveloped areas provide a fertile soil for envy, distrust and potential conflict. It is not good for our own national welfare that such great differences should exist. There is considerable discussion of the widening of this gap between the developed and underdeveloped countries because of the different rates of their economic progress. I am not, myself, so much concerned about the widening of the gap as I am about the rate of progress in the underdeveloped areas. I am concerned over the fact that this progress in many parts of the world is painfully slow. What is needed is a rate of progress which, even if it is less than that of the advanced countries, results in tangible benefits to human welfare and which can, in time, be quickened.

In this connection we must never forget that we are faced with a deep moral challenge. We cannot stand by with a clear conscience while hundreds of millions of our fellow men face daily their endless rounds of poverty, disease and ignorance. We must assist them in their struggle to clothe their aspirations with reality. We must meet this moral challenge. As Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, Douglas Dillon, said recently, "If we fail to respond adequately, we shall stand accused as a people who proclaim our satisfaction with the benefits of freedom but who are slothful in carrying the spirit of freedom to others around the world."

THE CHALLENGE OF SINO-SOVIET IMPERIALISM

The ideals of which this and other free nations were founded were those which our founders believed would ultimately achieve worldwide acceptance. Today over 1 billion people are now living and progressing under democratic institutions. This is a situation which the Sino-Soviet rulers have found intolerable.

They have challenged the free world on every front: military, political, and economic.

The challenge is the most formidable threat that freedom has known. In addition to its scientific and military capabilities, the U.S.S.R., in 40 years, although at a huge cost in human misery has grown from an agrarian nation to the second industrial nation in the world. It has utilized its increased economic power as a potent political weapon. In its dealings with the newly developing countries, the Soviets lose no opportunity to cite their own rapid economic growth as proof to these new nations of an easy shortcut to rapid industrialization. Many of these nations which are attempting to telescope centuries of change into less than one generation are looking for just that sort of shortcut. Therefore, the Soviet experience is not lost on them, particularly when it is followed up with offers of economic and technical assistance.

This Soviet economic offensive has ominous implications. Unhampered by the built-in checks and balances or the pressure of an effective public opinion in free democratic societies, the U.S.S.R. can use its economic

power to penetrate and subvert these new states. Already, they are attempting to do this on a carefully selected basis.

Since 1954, the Sino-Soviet bloc has conducted an intensive program of economic and military assistance as part of their campaign of subversion and penetration. Up to last year, these programs amounted to nearly \$2.4 billion, largely in credits. Of this amount, some \$782 million were for arms. In the last 6 months of 1958, approximately 4,000 Sino-Soviet technicians were sent to 17 underdeveloped nations, an increase of 65 percent over the same period in 1957.

In addition, some 2,900 technicians and students from the underdeveloped nations have gone to the Sino-Soviet bloc countries for study and training during the past few years. As in the case of Sino-Soviet credits, their technical assistance programs are concentrated in specially selected nations; about 85 percent of the technicians involved are at work in Egypt, Syria, India, Indonesia, and Afghanistan.

Though the Communist rulers speak of "the peaceful competition of socialism and capitalism," we may well ask whether their real motivation is not still the destruction of democracy—as it was with Lenin over 40 years ago. They speak of world capitalism, but they mean the destruction of liberty and democracy as well. They attempt to blacken our motives by referring to us as imperialists. In reality they are the forces of a new and vicious kind of imperialism. We are the forces of liberation: liberation of man from ignorance, disease, and poverty, and this under free and democratic institutions.

ANSWERS TO THE CHALLENGE: U.S. AID PROGRAMS

What is our answer to these challenges? By what means and to what extent are we helping the underdeveloped areas to raise their standards of living? There are, first of all, the activities of our people as private citizens, either as individuals or as groups. Every dollar of productive private investment in these areas helps produce additional income for them and is usually accompanied by an exchange of skills and knowledge as vital to them as is the capital itself. Then there are the many private institutions—the church organizations, the health groups, the charities, the universities, the foundations. Their number is large and their record of aid is impressive. In talking about what we do as a Government, we must never lose sight of the fact that our activities as private citizens are part of our first line of defense in the cause of freedom and progress.

The needs of the underdeveloped areas are, however, so great and so pressing that we have also organized to meet them as a government. The best known of our programs of assistance are those carried out under the mutual security program. President Eisenhower has called the mutual security program a powerful and indispensable tool in dealing with the realities of the second half of the 20th century. It is the main vehicle through which we, as a government, have extended military, economic, and technical assistance to the underdeveloped areas. As you know, the President has requested the Congress for \$3.9 billion to carry out this vital aspect of our foreign policy in the next fiscal year.

One may ask whether this massive amount of money is not ample to do the job. The answer is that, standing by itself, the mutual security program is not nearly enough. It has important supplements: both bilateral and multilateral. One supplement is the Export-Import Bank which, over the last 10 years, has made development loans to underdeveloped countries in excess of \$3 billion. Another important source of aid has been our program of surplus agricultural commodities. By the end of 1958, the United States had made over \$1 billion in devel-

opment loans and grants of local currency receipts from such sales. The availability of these commodities and the loan or grant of the sales proceeds has been of great help to the economic development of such countries as India, the world's most populous democratic nation.

Most of these programs that I have been discussing are carried out on a bilateral basis—between our Government and a foreign government—and they are essential instruments of our foreign economic policy. But we are simultaneously engaged in a variety of multilateral endeavors to help raise the living standards and preserve the freedom of the underdeveloped areas. The importance and variety of these multilateral programs is not always fully appreciated. I should like to spend some time on them with you.

Before turning to that question, however, we should recognize that there is still some misunderstanding in this country over the necessity for a foreign aid program. In spite of the lessons of the past few years, some critics still argue that unless foreign aid is terminated fairly soon, our country will face serious economic danger. These critics further contend that foreign aid inflates the national economy and that it encourages rather than holds back the spread of communism. Some even call for an end of the foreign-aid program.

This is not the time nor the place to refute these misleading arguments. They have been so grossly overstated as to reduce themselves to an absurdity. It appears to me, however, that if this kind of advice were to be followed, the United States would be taking a short cut to national suicide.

Such a shortsighted policy on our part would deprive the underdeveloped nations of the one chance they have to make that degree of progress which is so essential to their survival as free and independent nations.

It would throw them directly into the arms of communism even though it is clear they have a strong dislike for that kind of government.

What we need to do is to determine here and now as a nation that it is in our national interest to continue our foreign-aid programs at a substantial rate and over a fairly long period of time. Advance planning in this area is every whit as important as it is in the automobile industry where blueprints of new models are ordinarily drawn up several years in advance of their production.

Chicago and Cook County Building and Construction Trades Council's 50th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to call the attention of my colleagues to a speech delivered last Saturday by Mr. Earl J. McMahon, who is president of the Chicago and Cook County Building and Construction Trades Council.

Mr. McMahon spoke at the 50th anniversary dinner celebrating a half century of profound contributions by the building trades industry toward the spectacular growth of Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, I was indeed fortunate to be able to participate in this dinner and to hear from Mr. McMahon and other speakers of the tremendous contributions which the building trades unions have made in the growth of my city.

Mr. McMahon's remarks take on particular significance at this time when the Congress of the United States is debating legislation affecting the future of this Nation's labor-management relations.

We here in Congress have been bombarded from all sides by descriptions of only the shortcomings and abuses in the labor-management field. Few people have stopped to consider the great amount of good that organized labor has done not only for the city of Chicago and the Nation as a whole, but also for better understanding throughout the world.

It is indeed fitting that the president of the Chicago and Cook County Building and Construction Trades Council should call attention at this particular time to the great force for good and progress that his organization has been in raising the standard of living for all Americans.

This 50th anniversary banquet demonstrated how, in a relatively brief time, when you measure it in terms of world history, the leaders of the building trades movement have helped raise the position of millions of Americans to one of dignity and respect in contrast to the complete exploitation of the American worker 50 years ago.

There is no question in my mind that the legitimate trade movement of America has played one of the most significant roles in raising the standard of living in our country to the highest in the entire history of the world.

God grant that those who would today want to recklessly destroy the aims of honest trade unions ponder the remarks of Mr. McMahon.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. McMahon's remarks follow:

REMARKS DELIVERED BY EARL J. MCMAHON, PRESIDENT, CHICAGO AND COOK COUNTY BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION TRADES COUNCIL AT 50TH ANNIVERSARY DINNER OF THIS ORGANIZATION'S EXISTENCE AT THE AMBASSADOR WEST HOTEL, AUGUST 8, 1959

Tonight you are assisting us in celebrating 50 years of existence as a building trades council, and I wish to extend a warm and cordial welcome to all, coupled with the thanks of the officers of the council and the thanks of our affiliated organizations.

There is some evidence that a building trades council existed in Chicago in 1883, and the records indicate that the first building trades council was organized in our city on November 22, 1890, and was incorporated under the laws of our State on March 14, 1892. It was formed for the same purpose then, as it is now. (To secure collective action on problems affecting the building tradesman.)

From the beginning, the history of the Chicago Building Trades Council is replete with strife, and the officers must have had many a sleepless night, but in spite of the difficulties within and without, the council prospered, and made great strides before any organized group of employers entered the field. In these early days meetings were held in the Briggs House during the years from 1893 to 1900.

From 1900 to 1909 more confusion existed, and during this period there were as many

as three building trades councils in our city, and all operating at the same time.

Early in 1909 some sanity returned to the leaders of the trades, and much of their personal ambitions were set aside, and a united building trades council was formed. A charter was applied for and received on August 7, 1909, and from this date our building trades council existed.

The new council functioned under many leaders, all of whom did a good job. Because of the evolution of materials, and their methods of application, and a desire for unity, the leaders of the trades realized they needed someone with initiative and daring to lead the council. After much persuasion, Patrick F. Sullivan agreed to assume this responsibility, and in the year of 1925 he was elected to the office of president.

The council progressed under the leadership of President Sullivan. Much of his success was due to the cooperation of the Builders Association and the Building Construction Employers Association, and the trades, because they knew he was a man who was working hard for the good of the tradesmen, as well as a fair deal for the employer.

In November of 1938 the department added the word construction to our title and we are now known as the Chicago and Cook County Building and Construction Trades Council.

From 1925 to 1958 our Chicago Building Trades Council passed from the days of confusion and doubt, to the present day of confidence and trust. We have the confidence of our employer groups, and the trust of our membership, with the result we are proud to state there has not been a major stoppage of work in 30 years. The foundation for this type of relationship was laid by that very capable leader who had to leave us for a better world.

International unions, recognizing the training of our Chicago officers in labor relations, are constantly raiding our official family to take over positions of trust in the offices of international unions. This is also true of other unions outside the building and construction field. Chicago is a good training ground for officers, and an exceptional training ground for apprentices.

The duties of officers of a building trades council are varied and definite. Our council is recognized as the official arm of the building trades department, and we are always in the position of a "buffer" between the labor union and the employer, the public and the labor union, the labor union and the other labor union, all of which sharpens your intellect, so you will know which way to jump. You must take an active part in legislation; sponsoring bills that are good for the people and condemning bills that are bad. You must protect the public against faulty construction. You must be ready to experiment with innovations in building construction, and have the courage to condemn innovations that are not proven sound.

You must be in a position to give service to other segments of our American labor movement, and in your spare time take an active part in local, State, and national civic affairs which strive for the common good of our American people.

These are a few of the reasons why it is necessary for building trades councils to exist. The complete history of our council is interesting, educational, and progressive. We have moved forward with the times, and in the years to come we have every intention to broaden our scope of operation, and with the continuous support of the leaders of our affiliated organizations, we will maintain our place in the sun.

We have a glorious tradition left us by our predecessors. A history of trials and tribulations, all of which were met with fortitude, and courage by the pioneers of our

council. We will have a full time job following their footsteps, and knowing my associates in the council, I am confident we will rise to greater heights in the years to come.

Pennsylvania Badly Needs Federal Assistance in Combating Chronic Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of transmittal from Mr. William L. Batt, Jr., secretary, Pennsylvania Department of Labor and Industry, and an editorial from a recent edition of the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot, concerning the urgent need for congressional passage, this session, of legislation to aid depressed areas in Pennsylvania and in many other areas throughout the Nation:

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRY,
Harrisburg, Pa., August 3, 1959.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: The attached editorial from a recent Harrisburg Patriot in support of S. 722 will be of interest to you.

Your support for the House Banking and Currency Committee's version will be a great help to the community and State efforts to solve the chronic unemployment problem in Pennsylvania.

Yours very truly,

WILLIAM L. BATT, JR.,
Secretary.

HOUSE LOGJAM, ANOTHER LIKE VETO—A NEW DEPRESSED AREA BILL HAS TWO HURDLES TO CLEAR

"Our State and our communities have done a magnificent job through local industrial authorities. But the Federal Government has failed to assume its share of the responsibility in chronic area unemployment in the United States for far too long. It is our hope that this will end with the implementation of S. 722." (Governor Lawrence, addressing the Pennsylvania congressional delegation.)

The bill for which Pennsylvania's chief executive was arguing in Washington this week is aid-to-depressed-areas legislation, now bottled up in the House Rules Committee.

It would provide the long overdue Federal help to areas of chronic unemployment and would bolster self-help efforts by localities and State government. Pennsylvania, which has more of these depressed areas than any other State, is vitally concerned.

Commonwealth Congressmen of both parties should rally to the Governor's call for a practically unanimous front in moving this legislation out of the committee roadblock.

Senate bill 722, passed in March, calls for \$389 million, most of it in loans. A House committee already has trimmed the figure to \$251 million, bringing it closer to the \$275 million bill that President Eisenhower vetoed last year. There is no reason for the Rules Committee to keep the House from voting on it again. And there is every reason to believe the House would pass a depressed areas bill again.

What President Eisenhower will do to such a bill if it reaches his desk again is another story.

The administration's suggested program is \$53 million, a sum that is inadequate to meet the realistic needs of these areas. Even as staunch an Eisenhower supporter as Pennsylvania's Senator HUGH SCOTT has criticized his 1958 veto and urged at least a compromise \$200 million bill.

There are far more arguments in favor of this legislation than against it: It has nothing to do with fighting any temporary recession. It's always recession time in the hard-hit distressed areas.

It isn't really a giveaway, with more than three-quarters of the money going into revolving loan funds.

A concentrated effort at other governmental levels has helped, but the added economic boost of a Federal program seems to be the only way to shove the areas back into some semblance of prosperity.

No token program, such as the President advocates, can do the job.

A concerted effort by Pennsylvanians and representatives of other States with chronically depressed areas should assure passage of a reasonable program in the House. Then differences with the Senate bill can be ironed out.

This time, the President should review the reasons for his veto last September, listen to the bipartisan arguments in favor of the legislation and breathe new hope with his signature on the bill to areas that continue to dim the national picture of economic recovery.

Herter's Good Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, August 9, 1959, the Pittsburgh Press ran an editorial entitled "Herter's Good Job." Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this editorial so that my friends in the Congress and the good people of America may read it:

HERTER'S GOOD JOB

In all the excitement about the forthcoming exchange of Eisenhower-Khrushchev visits and Vice President Nixon's tour of Russia and Poland, there is danger that the man primarily responsible for the conduct of American foreign policy has been forgotten.

That man is, of course, Secretary of State Christian Herter—who succeeded the late John Foster Dulles last April.

It has been Mr. Herter's misfortune to have been out of the limelight in recent weeks. He has had to spend most of his time since mid-May at Geneva—at a frustrating foreign ministers' conference now superseded by the Nikita-Khrushchev talks.

After only a weekend at home, he will be off tomorrow to Santiago, Chile.

When he returns from that conference, Mr. Herter barely will have time to pick up his laundry and accompany President Eisenhower to Europe in advance of Khrushchev's arrival here.

The life of a Secretary of State in the middle 20th century is not a quiet one.

It is unfortunate that Mr. Herter has not been able yet to make more than a bare acquaintance with the American people in his new job.

Our people, however, should not forget that the patience and forbearance with which Mr. Herter sat through 9½ weeks of fruitless talks at Geneva are important aspects of the conduct of foreign policy—not so glamorous or exciting as other events, but just as necessary.

We welcome Mr. Herter home—even for only a few hours—and want him to know his difficult work in the cause of peace is not unrecognized, even though it makes few headlines.

Foreign Aid and Sound Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the following article points out a great threat to the United States—a threat that this Congress can and should do something about:

[From the Commercial and Financial Chronicle]

TIME FOR U.S.A. TO HUSBAND ITS FINANCIAL STRENGTH

(By Paul Einzig)

(The United States no longer needs to support Western Europe financially and should, instead, concentrate on husbanding its own financial strength—for the sake of the free world's defense. To this Dr. Einzig explains why the dollar must not come under suspicion. He advises stopping financial aid and foreign investment beyond the immediate resources available for that purpose so as not to add to the gold outflow on that score. The London writer notes France's apparent ability to repeat the 1871 and 1926 remarkable recoveries, Western Germany's recuperation far beyond that predicted after the war, and the recovery in general of Western Europe.)

LONDON, ENGLAND.—The Economic Commission for Europe in Geneva paints in its latest bulletin an optimistic picture about the economic situation and prospects of Western Europe. A recovery from the recession of the last 2 years seems to be well on its way in most countries. There is now a higher rate of expansion in Britain and in Western Germany, and the Economic Commission expects this to react favorably on the economic situation of the smaller Western European countries.

News from France is also distinctly more favorable. It is reported from all sides that since the advent of General De Gaulle the French economy has greatly benefited by political stability. France is no longer the "sick man of Europe." Production is increasing, the balance of payments has improved, the gold reserve has increased. There are still weak spots in France's economic situation, but on the whole the picture is distinctly one of improvement and stability.

ECONOMIC MIRACLE IN FRANCE AND GERMANY

It is possible that we may witness a French economic miracle comparable with the Western German economic miracle staged in the early fifties. Today Germany has resumed her place among the leading countries, not because of the 12 divisions which she is going to contribute to the armed forces of NATO, but because she has succeeded in combining economic stability with economic expansion. It is the size of the Western German gold reserve and not the

size of the Western German armed forces that has secured power and prestige for that country far beyond anything that could reasonably be anticipated after its defeat in 1945.

The emergence of an economically and financially powerful France within the next year or two is well in the cards. The economic recuperative power of the French people surprised the world on more than one occasion. When in 1871 victorious Germany imposed on France a huge war indemnity it was expected to cripple France for generations. In fact, France paid off the indemnity in an amazingly short time. Again when in 1926 France was on the verge of economic chaos and collapse, political stability under Poincaré's government led to a complete recovery in 2 years, enabling France to accumulate a large gold and foreign exchange reserve which completely changed the international balance of power.

It would not be surprising if there occurred a repetition of history. As soon as recovery and stability in France is able to inspire confidence among French people there is bound to be a wholesale repatriation of French funds from the United States and other countries, and a wholesale dehoarding of gold. As during the years that followed Poincaré's measures, France will accumulate a very strong gold reserve and its influence in the international economic and political sphere will increase accordingly.

The recovery of Europe, if it is accompanied by a continued expansion in the United States, is bound to reverse the unfavorable trend that has been in operation in the raw material producing countries during the past 2 years. Between them the Western European countries represent a very considerable purchasing power that can have a decisive effect on the economies of underdeveloped countries. We have grown used to regard American demand for raw materials as the decisive factor in world economy, because it represents the demand by a single country. But if we regard Western Europe as an economic unit its combined demand is fully comparable with that of the United States.

It has also become a habit to regard Western Europe as being in need of American economic assistance. Beyond doubt in the absence of Marshall aid Europe would not have had its chance to recover to anything like the extent to which it has recovered. But that is now past history. Western Europe is now quite capable of standing on its own feet; more than that, she is in a position to join forces with the United States in assisting economically weaker countries of the free world.

EUROPE CAN PAY FOR ARMS

Europe is still in need of American military aid, but most Western European countries are now in a position to pay for the arms delivered by the United States. What is gratifying is that it is no longer in need for dollars that provides the main link between Western Europe and the United States. NATO has become an alliance between independent nations quite capable of supporting themselves, economically, even if they need the support of American military power.

The United States is thus relieved of the necessity of supporting Western Europe financially for the sake of the defense of the free world. It is indeed time for the United States to concentrate on the husbanding of its own financial strength. During the next 2 years the dollar is liable to come under pressure. The greatest service the United States could render to the free world would be the reinforcement of the defenses of the dollar. It is of the utmost importance from the point of view of the prestige and power of the United States that the dollar should not come under suspicion. Even though the United States is likely to lose

more gold between now and the presidential election next year, such inevitable losses should not be aggravated by an untimely generosity in respect of foreign financial aid or by foreign investment beyond the immediate resources available for that purpose without adding to the gold outflow.

SAVING U.S. STRENGTH

From the point of view of the countries which stand to benefit by American financial aid and by the export of American capital the maintenance of the strength of the dollar is of paramount importance. A temporary decline of dollar aid would be for them a smaller evil than a weakening of confidence in the dollar. Now that Europe is becoming stronger it should be able to carry a large and increasing proportion of the financial burdens of the free world, and it can afford to do without American support that was so essential in the past.

Ignoring Some Monetary Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the New York Times on August 2, 1959, as follows:

IGNORING SOME MONETARY FACTS

When William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, appeared before the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, he found the Democratic members virtually united in criticizing one basic policy of the Reserve System. This was its so-called bills only policy, which means that in its conduct of open market operations it confines its purchases and sales of Government securities almost exclusively to those in the very short term category.

In short, they stood with Representative HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin. Representative REUSS is the author of an amendment to the administration's proposal for eliminating the prevailing ceiling of 4½ percent on the coupon rate for Government securities with maturities of 5 years or over. The Reuss amendment would establish it as the sense of Congress that the Federal Reserve, while cleaving to its principal mission of conducting a sound monetary policy, should, when appropriate, buy Government securities as an alternative to the technique of reducing the member banks' required minimum reserves. The basic objective, when one removes the frills from this suggestion, is the always politically popular one of achieving cheap money by increasing the money supply.

Since this is what the proposal boils down to, nonparticipants in this controversy may be excused for wondering about a strange omission on the part of Mr. REUSS and his supporters. We refer to the fact, so spectacularly ignored by Mr. REUSS and his fellow advocates of cheap money, that Congress passed and sent to the White House only a few days ago a bill that would liberalize drastically the amount of reserves that member banks are required to maintain under the present law. This would be achieved by permitting the banks to count their vault cash in the form of currency and coin in computing their reserves. It would provide

the banks with an estimated additional reserve of \$2,447 million (based on the figures as of the last week in June). This could permit a sevenfold expansion of bank credit, or roughly \$17 billion. Mr. REUSS and his colleagues seem to think that this legislation isn't worth mentioning. We doubt that many nonpolitically minded followers of this controversy would share their point of view.

Mine Challenge Must Be Met

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of Saturday, August 1, 1959, concerning the serious flooding problem of the anthracite coal mines in Luzerne County, Pa.: **COMMUNITY CRISIS—MINE CHALLENGE MUST BE MET**

Harold B. Wickey, vice president of Glen Alden Corp., left no room for doubt in the minds of directors of the Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce at their monthly meeting in Hotel Sterling yesterday afternoon that a grave crisis faces the community, as well as the anthracite industry, in the flooding of mines in the wake of the Knox disaster. During the next week or 10 days, momentous decisions, affecting the lives of thousands of local residents, as well as the future of Wyoming Valley, will be made. The situation is expected to be clarified at a meeting of Governor Lawrence and his staff with representatives of local coal companies on the resumption of pumping if and when the financing of the project can be arranged.

What is at stake roughly is \$40 million being pumped into the local economy annually in the form of payrolls, supply purchases, taxes and miscellaneous expenditures, stemming from the employment of 7,500 men in Glen Alden operations. If Glen Alden mines are flooded, these jobs will be lost, with attendant repercussions in many spheres of activity. Mr. Wickey advised his audience that the threat is not being exaggerated and his company is not crying wolf.

Water always has been a major factor in local mining. Pumping has been costly, but so long as there was cooperation levels have been maintained in the pools in the Lackawanna and Wyoming Valleys. The Knox disaster precipitated a crisis for which the Glen Alden was not prepared, as its plans were based on developments that would follow the expiration of existing agreements a few years hence.

So long as the Pennsylvania and Lehigh Valley pumped their own water, there was no threat to Glen Alden which, of course, pumped its own. But when the Pennsylvania and Lehigh Valley withdrew after the Knox flooding swamped their operations, Glen Alden has been confronted with a threat to its existence, since in a matter of weeks or months reservoirs above Wilkes-Barre will be filled and they will overflow first to Hudson mines and then into the Glen Alden. Once the water reaches Glen Alden operations, it will be too late to act because of the limitation on pumping and the added expense.

Therefore, the problem in simple terms is to keep the water from the mines in the upper Wyoming Valley and possibly from the Lackawanna field below the levels where it

will endanger Glen Alden mines. The Glen Alden, as Mr. Wickey stated, is not afraid of water and is capable of taking care of its own, but it is not in a position to take care of the water in other operations. But with the cooperation of the State and Federal Governments, the companies involved and the community itself, he feels a practical solution is possible to protect the public interest as well as Glen Alden.

That sounds logical and fair. The important point is the obvious need for action, as the water is rising every minute of every day. Time is of the essence, for once the reservoirs are filled above Wilkes-Barre it will be too late.

The chamber of commerce, as a public agency, is properly concerned and is ready to lend a helping hand to stave off the greater disaster that impends. The solution is available—pumping. What choice is there but to act promptly, the stakes being what they are to all concerned—the country, the Commonwealth, the community, and the industry?

Tribute to Jule Styne in Recognition of His 25 Years as Top Producer and Composer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the Friars Club, along with leaders of show business, initiated a commemoration of the Jule Styne 25th anniversary in show business—a year-long commemoration of this noted composer's multiple contributions to the world of entertainment. I am grateful for the opportunity to bring to the notice of my colleagues some of the great accomplishments of Jule Styne and invite them to join with me in paying tribute to a man whose contributions to the American cultural scene are most deserving of such an honor.

Jule Styne's name looms large and strong in the annals of show business. His current noteworthy musical contribution, "Gypsy," starring Ethel Merman in the musical-biography of Gypsy Rose Lee, auspiciously launches Jule Styne's 25th anniversary in show business.

The genius which is Jule Styne will live long in the hearts and minds of people everywhere, for his art has made impact in all branches of show business—motion pictures, television, radio, recordings, ballet and the stage. He has achieved success as a producer as well.

The life story of the man who gave music to millions to sing and dance to is as dramatic and stirring as any of the shows he has produced or composed for. He was born in London, England, on December 31, 1905. His musical inclinations came to the fore at the age of 3, when, sitting with his parents in a music hall in London, he jumped to the stage from a box seat to join Sir Harry Lauder in singing "I Love a Lassie." As a child entertainer, he danced and sang at parties and small shows.

In 1913, Jule and his family came to America and settled in Chicago. He was 8 years old and rapidly becoming a fine classical pianist. Jule won a scholarship to the Chicago College of Music, where he won the Mozart Award. Later he appeared with many symphony orchestras as a child prodigy.

His interest in popular music was awakened when he found the kids in school clustered around a jazz pianist who played very badly, but who played what the kids liked. Jule went to a music store and bought some popular songs to learn. Not having the money to pay for them, he worked out a deal to play at the store on Saturdays to pay for the music. The store was owned by Jack Kapp, later to become one of the greats of the recording industry. Learning to play popular music was the turning point in his musical career.

He matriculated at Northwestern University, but soon had to drop out because of financial difficulties at home. Later taking a job making metal coat hangers, he almost lost a finger as a result of an accident on one of the machines. He could not play for a year, practically losing his musical technique. Turning to pop music, he formed an orchestra, a success shortly in Chicago, the orchestra then became in demand throughout the country. Such greats as Bix Beiderbeck and Benny Goodman played in his bands.

While in Florida with Arnold Johnson's band, he wrote his first song, a beautiful melody called "Sunday." That night, at the Hollywood Beach Hotel, where he was appearing, Al Jolson and Irving Caesar called him over after hearing the song and encouraged him to pursue the songwriting career.

He came to New York and became a coach for singers and a writer of special material. Jule wrote for Sophie Tucker and many of the other vaudeville greats of the time. Soon he became musical director for Harry Richman and made his first trip to Hollywood. There Darryl Zanuck hired him to coach at 20th Century-Fox Studios such stars as Tony Martin, Shirley Temple, Alice Faye, among others. After a year of this, he told Zanuck he wanted to be a song writer. Zanuck said "fine, but not here." He sent him to Republic Studios. Cy Feuer gave him a job there at a salary of \$150 a week, he had been making \$950 a week at 20th Century-Fox as a music coach. Determined to make it as a song writer, he teamed with Frank Loesser and soon he was on his way. Loesser and Jule went to Paramount where their first effort was the smash, "I Don't Want To Walk Without You Baby." When Frank Loesser went into the Army, Styne teamed up with Sammy Cahn, and in 9 years this great team wrote over 500 songs. Fifty of them were on the "Hit Parade," of which 20 songs achieved No. 1 status.

Jule Styne, looking to new fields to conquer, then turned to theater. His first show in 1947, "High Button Shoes," he did with Sammy Cahn. Later he teamed with Leo Robin to write "Gentlemen Prefer Blondes." In 1950, he wrote "Two on the Aisle," with Betty Comden and Adolph Green. Back in

Hollywood soon after, Zanuck hired him to do the score for a Betty Grable picture, "Meet Me After the Show."

He came back to Broadway after this film chore and won the drama critics' award with his revival of "Pal Joey." Following this, Jule produced "Hazel Flagg," "Will Success Spoil Rock Hunter," and brought Sammy Davis, Jr., to Broadway in "Mr. Wonderful."

Starting in 1943, Styne, along with various lyricists, was responsible for most of the Sinatra hits.

With Sammy Cahn, he wrote the memorable song, "Three Coins in a Fountain," title song of the 20th-Century Fox picture, and which won for the noted team the coveted Academy Award "Oscar."

Styne has many hobbies, most of which he works at. He is an excellent cook and delights in preparing unusual meals. An "80" golfer, he does not get a chance to play as often as he would like to. He is a fine rider and someday plans to have a horse breeding farm here in the East. Jule's vocation is writing songs and his avocation is producing shows. He gets a great deal of satisfaction in helping young performers, composers and lyricists.

Jule Styne has two sons, Stanley, 28, who is employed as a publicist at Columbia pictures and Norton, 18, who is a student at Syracuse University.

This is the brief life story of Jule Styne, who, currently at the peak of his career, maintains the same enthusiastic attitude toward show business he had during his struggling years. Success has not dimmed his ardor nor his talent. The world will have many more songs, music and shows from this man, truly one of the greats of all time in show business.

Over the past 25 years, this versatile and talented American—Jule Styne—has written hundreds of songs, many of them which will long remain a permanent part of the American culture. He has composed the musical scores for many great American musical shows which, too, have become a permanent part of Americana: "High Button Shoes," "Gentlemen Prefer Blondes," "Two on the Aisle," "Hazel Flagg," "Peter Pan," "Bells Are Ringing," "Say, Darling," "Gypsy."

He has written the musical scores for the following ballets: "Wallflower," "Side Show," "Cops and Robbers Ballet."

He has won many great honors for his accomplishments as a producer, including the Donaldson award and the New York critics' award for "Pal Joey." As a producer, Jule Styne gave to the American theatrical world the following noteworthy productions: "Say, Darling"; "First Impressions"; "Make a Wish"; "Pal Joey"; "In Any Language," coproduced with George Abbott; "Hazel Flagg"; "Will Success Spoil Rock Hunter?"; "Mr. Wonderful."

Among the many motion-picture scores Jule Styne composed are the following: "Anchors Aweigh," "Tonight and Every Night," "The Umpire's Daughter," "Two Guys From Texas," "It's a Great Feeling," "The Kid From Brooklyn," "It Happened in Brooklyn," "The West Point

Story," "Two Tickets to Broadway," "Don't Fence Me In," "Macao," "Pink Tights," "My Sister Eileen," "Living It Up."

Jule Styne's songs, which have brought happiness and great entertainment to peoples everywhere, include the following: "I Don't Want To Walk Without You, Baby"; "I Said No"; "Come Out, Come Out, Wherever You Are"; "I've Heard That Song Before"; "There Goes That Song Again"; "Saturday Night Is the Loneliest Night"; "I'll Walk Alone"; "Poor Little Rhode Island," official State song; "Three Coins in the Fountain"; "Five Minutes More"; "Let It Snow, Let It Snow"; "What Makes the Sunset"; "I begged Her"; "I Fall in Love Too Easily"; "The Charm of You"; "It's Been a Long, Long Time"; "Can't You Read Between the Lines"; "Every Day I Love You"; "Fiddle Dee Dee"; "It's a Great Feeling"; "Time After Time"; "I Believe You"; "You Love Me"; "Papa, Won't You Dance With Me"; "I Still Get Jealous"; "You're My Girl"; "Bye, Bye, Baby"; "Diamonds Are a Girl's Best Friend"; "The Closer You Are"; "The Worry Bird"; "That's the Tune"; "Baby, You'll Never Be Sorry"; "You Kill Me"; "Talk to Me Tomorrow"; "Ocean Breeze"; "Catch Our Act at the Met"; "There Never Was a Baby Like My Baby"; "Give a Little, Get a Little"; "Hold Me, Hold Me, Hold Me"; "Everlasting"; "So Far, So Good"; "If You Hadn't, but You Did"; "How Will He Know"; "How Do You Speak to an Angel"; "I Feel Like I'm Gonna Live Forever"; "Salome"; "Think How Many People Never Find Love"; "You're Gonna Dance With Me"; "Willie"; "Money Burns a Hole in My Pocket"; "A Little More Heart"; "My Wild Imagination"; "Every Street's a Boulevard in Old New York"; "Everybody Loves to Take a Bow"; "Laura De Maupassant"; "Captain Hooks Waltz"; "Distant Melody"; "Never, Never Land"; "Wendy"; "Just in Time"; "The Party's Over."

Jule Styne has been termed a virtual "Christopher Columbus" of show business—inasmuch as he has been responsible for discovering new talent. It has been a project close to his heart to reach out and search for young artists and give them their opportunity to make good in their chosen profession of show business. Jule Styne's great interest in finding new stars of the future and giving talent and opportunity has contributed many present-day stars to the entertainment world. The list of people he has helped in this way include Doris Day, Nanette Fabray, Carol Channing, Sheree North, Jayne Mansfield, Sandra Church, among others.

The lives of Americans throughout our land as well as the lives of people throughout the corners of the world have been enriched by the artistry and genius of Jule Styne. As an American, he has bought great credit to his country—the United States of America.

It is, therefore, fitting and proper for his fellow Americans to pay tribute to Jule Styne on the occasion of his 25th anniversary in show business. His accomplishments have been great—the position he holds in the hearts and minds of his fellow Americans is just as great.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in the past several weeks I have received a great deal of mail from teachers in my district with respect to H.R. 22. I particularly welcome this correspondence at this time, when our great newspapers are devoting increasing space to the dangers of inflation, and when our people are becoming progressively more indignant at the wanton extravagance of the Federal Government.

H.R. 22 would add fuel to the raging fires of inflation by further destroying the value of the dollar under a smoke-screen of care and consideration for our schoolchildren and their teachers. I submit that, if the bureaucrats have any love at all for our youth and those who guide them scholastically, then they will take their greedy hands out of the Federal Treasury and make more tax money available to those who earn it. Our States and communities are finding it difficult to meet expenses for schools and all necessary services primarily because taxpayers are being victimized by a voracious bureaucracy that drains off so much income that there is little left for meeting local costs. Instead of proposing new schemes to expand Federal agencies and offices, Congress should dedicate itself to reducing expenditures in every way possible in order that embezzlement through inflation will be discontinued and the economy will be returned to a sound fiscal basis.

I have pointed out that interest alone on the national debt amounts annually to more than the total revenue collected from 20 million taxpayers each contributing the sum of \$400. Congress can make its greatest contribution to the economic stability of this Nation by trimming expenses wherever possible and applying such savings to reducing the national debt and cutting taxes. A 10 percent reduction in the debt, with a subsequent savings on interest, would make more than \$800 million available each year to taxpayers for building schools, increasing salaries of teachers, and for whatever other uses the citizenry would choose to make of it.

H.R. 22 would have a directly opposite effect. Further inflation would boost interest rates and lessen the buying power of everyone's dollar—the parent, the teacher, the butcher and the baker. Retired teachers and other pensioners would find means of subsistence even more elusive, what with their monthly checks having less and less value.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to allow the Federal Government to exact tribute for another expensive activity that would add to our already excessive tax burdens. Furthermore, we cannot afford to allow the Federal Government to get a foot in the door of our local schools. Subsidization breeds control,

and anyone familiar with bureaucratic ambitions and operations recognizes that the threat of Federal management of our educational system is inherent in H.R. 22. The Federal Government has already usurped too much power and responsibility. We must be alert to any attempt—regardless of how innocuous it may appear—to nationalize our public school system.

H.R. 22 is inimical to the national welfare. As for its treatment of individual States, Pennsylvania taxpayers resent the provision that would require us to contribute millions of dollars to the schools of Texas and other States currently enjoying a far greater degree of economic prosperity. H.R. 22 would take a total of \$313,824,000 from Pennsylvania in the specified 4-year period. In return Pennsylvania would receive \$267,450,000. However, the State of Texas would pay in \$186,292,000 and take out \$270,450,000. Is there any justification for this inequitable arrangement? With this great flow of revenue siphoned out of Pennsylvania in return for the lesser contribution of the Federal Government, our State and our communities would find less and less money available to carry out our responsibilities to our schools and teachers.

Mr. Speaker, the whole philosophy of this program is so irrational that it should never come to the floor of this legislative body. Our major domestic responsibility at this time is to reduce Government expenditures and return this country to a safe fiscal status. Under the guise of aid to education, H.R. 22 is nothing more than a raid on education. It should be rejected by everyone who values our schools and respects our teaching profession.

San Diegan Cut Redtape for Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, Vice President Nixon's recent trip to Russia uncovered the unusual talents of his press officer, Herbert G. Klein, a friend and constituent of mine from San Diego.

Herb has made many friends in the press through his intelligent handling of tough situations. He has the respect and admiration of all of us who are privileged to know him. For this reason, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent Associated Press story detailing his activities:

[San Diego Evening Tribune, Aug. 3, 1959]

SAN DIEGAN CUTS REDTAPE FOR NIXON

WARSAW.—Herbert G. Klein, Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON's calm-under-fire press spokesman, says it takes "a pretty forceful approach" to deal with the Russians.

A resourceful San Diego newspaper editor-on-leave, Klein spearheaded an invasion of the Soviet Union by more than 70 U.S. newsmen accompanying Nixon.

A veteran of political campaigning in the United States with Nixon, he found himself in a country that is not used to such tactics or such an entourage of newspaper correspondents and photographers.

HE AIDS NEWSMEN

"It was difficult getting a meeting of minds," said Klein drily.

If his boss had tough going with Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev, Klein in a way had it even tougher.

He had to placate not only the Russians, but also harassed and rushed American newsmen and fighting bad telephone lines, inadequate cable communications, language misunderstandings and noncooperation from Russian bureaucrats. And a touchy political-international situation as well.

He did it mostly without raising his voice, remaining quietly calm even after days and nights without much sleep.

I TRY TO CURE ANGER

Klein, 41, is a wiry, soft-spoken blue-eyed dark blond with a slow-curling, humorous smile, and a ready joke. He says he's a generally calm personality: "I try not to get angry, and to make a point of not showing it when I am angry unless I have a reason for wanting it to show."

They're saying that Klein, editor of the San Diego Union, will be Nixon's Jim Hagerty if the Vice President makes it into the White House.

There's similarity in the way the two men handle themselves newswise, but Klein hasn't a sign of the raring Irish temper that sometimes takes hold of Hagerty, who is President Eisenhower's press secretary.

REPORTERS LIKE HIM

Klein's Russian mission has given him further stature among newsmen because he fought down-the-line for them with his Russian counterpart, Press Officer A. V. Popov.

He even went to Soviet First Deputy Premier Frol Kozlov for the lifting of a ban on films, to get newsmen into closed-off areas of Siberia, to ease censorship and to smooth a ruckus over television showing of the debate between Khrushchev and Nixon at the U.S. exhibit.

The Russians wanted to limit newsmen going into Siberia to just 12 of 100 accredited correspondents and photographers—United States and others. Klein talked the Russians into letting everyone go.

VICE PRESIDENT PERSUADES

When he thought it necessary, Klein got Nixon himself to bring pressure on the Russians to ease their requirement that they must look over films to see that no objectionable photos went out of the country.

Klein said dealing with the Russians was complicated by language difficulties and a different concept of the press—"its purposes and its rights."

He said it was a constant battle, but in the end he was "pleased with the way things went."

Klein and Nixon first met in 1946, when Klein, reporter for an Alhambra newspaper, was assigned to cover Nixon's campaign for Congress.

HE'S USC GRADUATE

He helped Nixon campaign for the Senate in 1948, and in 1952 worked on his first vice presidential campaign. He was assistant press secretary to Nixon in 1958, full-time press secretary for a time later that year, and came to Washington in June to take on the job again, possible through the 1960 election campaign.

Born in Los Angeles, Klein was graduated from the University of Southern California in 1940 in journalism.

He worked on several California newspapers until World War II, when he spent four years in the Navy, coming out as a lieutenant.

ant senior grade. He now holds the rank of commander in the Reserve.

BIG BREAK TOLD

After the war, he went back to work on the Alhambra Post-Advocate, a Copley paper with a circulation of 15,000.

His big break came when he was assigned to cover the atomic bomb tests at Bikini Atoll in the Pacific in 1946. From there he progressed to the San Diego Union, another Copley newspaper. He is married and has two daughters.

Labor Reform Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal Star of August 7, 1959:

LABOR REFORM ISSUE

(By C. L. Dancey)

The bitter House fight looming over labor legislation, and President Eisenhower's decision to take to the airways on that issue clearly establish it as a major issue in 1960.

It is an issue on which many politicians are going to find themselves vulnerable, and labor's own reaction to it may have a tremendous effect on labor's future role in the United States.

It is a peculiar situation that faces the American people. For years the McClellan committee has been documenting sworn evidence, proving this series of abuses and demonstrating that they not only exist, but have been widely practiced in a vicious manner.

There is no argument about this. Even the opponents have been forced to admit it.

The AFL-CIO has itself, in the face of these evidences, established a written moral code for unions—and admitted the failure of their action to bring about observance of that code.

Now the President and a group of legislators simply propose, in effect, to put "teeth" into the things labor leaders have admitted are right and just.

However, all else has become academic in the face of an actual proposed law to do these things. An actual fact is not wanted by the labor bosses, and they oppose it.

They have no arguments but technicalities. The facts are too clear.

They are reduced to opposing it with naked political force rather than any persuasive arguments, and the grounds for their reasons are also a plea, not to justice, but to power for themselves. They do not want their power limited.

The appalling thing is that in these circumstances we have sworn representatives in our top elective offices in Congress who feel so enslaved by either the cash contributions or political potency of labor unions that they are ignoring the evidence, ignoring the facts, and ignoring their obligation to the people and so serve merely as representatives of the labor bosses.

This is going to be a hard record to defend nationally.

The American people have never liked stooges and never approved of political cowardice.

Organized labor itself needs to be less shortsighted. It needs to take a good look

at its true role in our free society—which is to protect individual freedoms, not override them.

A less shortsighted and arrogant view might reveal to labor leaders that many of the people they label "antilabor" and as enemies are trying far more sincerely to act in the best interests of organized labor than the political stooges whose watchword is: "Support the labor bosses, right or wrong."

After 30 years of great power, labor's desperate need for its own sake is a display of sound basic responsibility to the country, the system, and the general public that have bestowed on labor its privileged position under our laws.

Dancey in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the 16th article of a series by Editor Charles L. Dancey appearing in the Peoria Journal Star:

MATCHBOX WORDS JUST PROPAGANDA

(By Charles L. Dancey)

On the Don River—I boarded the river boat Yuri Krimov at Rostov to start a period of the most sheer pleasure and fun that I was to have in the Soviet Union.

It was a modest boat with a bridge, then the de luxe or first-class deck with a handful of tiny private cabins, then the second-class deck with a number of larger cabins each housing eight wide boards hinged to the wall as beds. They filled these cabins without regard to age or sex.

Also aboard were many, many deck passengers with no staterooms or bunks at all.

Not a soul aboard spoke English, and there were no silk-shirt Russians among them. There were a number of middle-management people in the first-class deck.

A little restaurant on the stern has three tables. Most people carry food, or pop off at villages to buy.

After a lonely first night in which everyone was wary of me, I began to make friends at breakfast. Once the ice was broken, it seemed they were all friendly. My first friends were Alexander Dmitri, Ivan and Leonid. After them came Lida and Alla. Then, all sorts of people.

The first rural village we passed was a scattering of unpainted houses around a large ruined building with a shattered dome. Along the dirt bank were a row of boats with high prows.

The river is not as wide as the Illinois in the Peoria area, but roughly comparable to the Illinois 20 miles north of Peoria, and it is a very slow, peaceful stream with steep banks and much tangled woods on the sides. Fishermen in their boats are common—also along the bank from time to time.

I saw a great many ferries, but not a single bridge along the Don River for 2 days of travel.

We played dominoes, and talked. All the usual questions about costs, and what things we have in the United States. They were curious about my cigarette lighter, nail clipper, foaming shaving cream, ball-point pen, and anything else I could think of to show them of my limited equipment.

We had endless conversations on capitalism, communism, methods, Germany, and war. Again the expression that there is good

and bad in every country, and all should change and improve. No Communist doctrine here to speak of as against "adjusting" management and incentive systems in Russia.

However, in one respect these people strongly supported Khrushchev. They want no united Germany.

They asked why the Communist Party is outlawed in the United States. I denied that it is, and said people are free to think and talk as they please so long as they depend on persuasion and the will of most of the people—but that when anyone tries to run things by force, we smack them down, and that advocacy of war on our own people rather than votes by the Communists caused us to put 50 of them in jail after lengthy, fair trials.

Another scrap of conversation: I was reading the writing on a Russian matchbox, and couldn't understand it all. I showed it to Alex, and told him I understood "this and this and this but not this."

With the usual combination of other words and sign language he conveyed the meaning of the word that had roadblocked me.

The whole business on the box was a boost for the 7-year plan, saying how much they have now and how much it will be increased in 7 years.

When we finished this business, Alex waved his hand at the matchbox message and said: "Propaganda."

Kaiser Producing Sheets of Gold-Colored Aluminum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the Kaiser people have achieved another "first." It is not new for this progressive west coast organization to be the first in many fields but it is a source of pride to the people of Alameda County, Calif., where the Henry J. Kaiser started and where the home offices of the many Kaiser subsidiary companies are located in Oakland.

I salute Henry J. Kaiser and his sons, Edgar and Henry J., Jr., and the high echelon of the organization who direct its policies for not only being competent, efficient, and first-class industrialists but industrialists with a social outlook. Kaiser is concerned with the welfare of his employees and people in moderate circumstances as witness the Kaiser's great contribution to medicine in the form of the Permanente Hospital System.

Alameda County is proud of the Kaiser enterprise.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the following article from the Daily Metal Reporter of August 8, 1959:

KAISER PRODUCING SHEETS OF GOLD-COLORED ALUMINUM

Nonfading gold-colored aluminum sheet, a development of Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp., is now commercially available from the company as a standard product in a broad range of sizes and embossed finishes.

Designated "No. 80 Architectural Sheet," the product differs from other gold-colored

aluminum in that source of the color is inherent in the alloy itself, rather than achieved through the use of dyes or other coloring agents. In the Kaiser Aluminum process, the color is brought out by anodizing under readily controlled conditions using standard anodizing equipment and techniques.

The product has been under extensive development and testing for several years by the company's department of metallurgical research. As part of this program, it has been applied to selected buildings including the Kaiser Center which is nearing completion in Oakland, Calif., as world headquarters of Kaiser Aluminum and other Kaiser companies.

Opinion Polls a Poor Guideline in Seeking the White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared August 6 in the Northern Virginia Sun. It contains some interesting comment in regard to the 1960 Presidential campaign.

Friends and intimate associates of New York Governor Rockefeller are giving newsmen at the Governors' Conference in Puerto Rico an informed idea of the Governor's political plans and strategy regarding the 1960 Republican convention.

What it boils down to is this: Mr. Rockefeller will seek the nomination if the public opinion polls show that he can win and Vice President Nixon cannot.

The test he will use, friends say, in guiding his candidacy is how he and Mr. Nixon stack up comparatively against such top Democrats as Adlai Stevenson and Senator JOHN KENNEDY.

This is a mighty poor standard by which to decide whether or not to seek the highest office in the Nation and perhaps the most important office in the world.

There appears to be no consideration here as to whether Governor Rockefeller feels he is more qualified for the job than Mr. Nixon or the other possible contenders for the nomination. Nor do ideological considerations appear to enter into Mr. Rockefeller's thinking, i.e., a difference of governmental philosophy or outlook between him and other contenders, such as appeared to exist, especially in foreign policy, between Senator Taft and General Eisenhower in 1952.

Rather than be guided by the contribution he might make to the national welfare, Mr. Rockefeller prefers to have his decision governed by the momentary opinions of only 2,000 to 4,000 persons, out of a total population of 175 million.

Even if this extremely small sample were considered representative, how valid or permanent are the results? The opinions they reflect are expressed in response to questions about a hypothetical political contest between men whose views and personalities may be only dimly known to the responders. At best, these opinions are based on surface impression of the two men, rather than on the basis of a campaign between them, in which the issues are debated.

Moreover, as the polls themselves point out, the ratings shift from month to month.

This could put Mr. Rockefeller in a peculiar position: what if he should lead Mr. Nixon in the polls one month, and tosses his hat into the ring, only to find in a subsequent poll that Mr. Nixon has regained the lead?

Finally, public opinion polls are, by their own admission, somewhat approximate at best. The Gallup organization says that "a survey which predicts an election within 5 percent is generally regarded as amazingly accurate." What if Mr. Rockefeller should make his decision on the basis of leading Mr. Nixon by, say, 2 percent? The admitted margin of error in the polls could well render meaningless the conclusion that Mr. Rockefeller is more popular than Mr. Nixon.

The sort of reasoning implicit in the reports of Mr. Rockefeller's strategy is not worthy of the fine name he bears or of the reputation he and his family have built for themselves. If he thinks he has a contribution to make by running for the Presidency, then he should run, regardless of what the polls say. For the national welfare should be the criterion of any man's candidacy for the White House.

H.R. 8575

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER BOWLES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to express in greater detail my concern over one aspect of H.R. 8575 which was passed this afternoon. The Appropriations Committee's action in denying funds in this bill for new barracks at the naval submarine base in Groton, Conn., came as a shock and a surprise to all of us who have followed this situation closely.

Probably no single weapon in America's arsenal of defense is more promising and more vital to our position in the free world than the Polaris missile and the nuclear submarines which will carry it. This Congress has consistently recognized the value of the Polaris weapons system. Time and again we have cut through confusing and conflicting interservice rivalries to grant the highest priority to the Polaris concept. The Congress has shown the way to a reluctant Executive by increasing administration recommendations for Polaris authorizations and appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, the item deleted by the Appropriations Committee is the very heart of this program. It would have provided for the men who will give life to the Polaris program. Specifically, it would have provided housing for the hundreds of skilled submariners who will constitute the two crews of each Polaris submarine.

To eliminate this item, previously requested by the Navy and authorized by the Congress, simply does not make sense.

The Polaris program, as advanced as it is, cannot be put into operation without men. These men will be trained at the submarine school of the naval submarine base in Groton, the most advanced school of its type in the world. In May of this year the Navy announced

that it considered the training of Polaris crews of sufficient importance to assign two crews to each Polaris submarine instead of the usual one. One crew will be in training ashore at Groton while the other crew is at sea. This precedent-shattering move indicates the importance the Navy attaches to the Polaris program. Yet the committee action in deleting funds for housing for these men will seriously hamper the entire training program.

Mr. Speaker, when the authorization bill for this construction was before the Armed Services Committee earlier this year, there was no question as to the importance of this item. When the House passed the authorization bill there was no question as to its importance. Now, apparently, because of a feeling that the Navy might be able to use Government-owned land in the Groton area for this construction rather than acquire additional land, the entire item has been deleted. If the Appropriations Committee's action is ultimately sustained, we shall have seriously stalled one of the most important phases of our national defense.

It has been suggested, Mr. Speaker, that sectional rivalries for the site of the Polaris training school entered into the decision of the committee. I am sure this is untrue.

As every Navy man knows, Groton, Conn. is the submarine capital of the world. Officers and men from every one of our allies which maintains a submarine force have been trained there. It represents a concentration of facilities and know-how unduplicated anywhere on the globe.

The Navy, itself, has long since acknowledged the preeminence of the Groton base.

I am sure that the committee's action was well intended and in keeping with its traditional diligence in assuring American taxpayers with the maximum return on their tax dollar. Nevertheless, I am also sure that this action could only have resulted from a failure to realize the consequences to the vital Polaris program. I think it is essential that the full amount of \$2,269,000 be restored before H.R. 8575 reaches the President for approval. If not, we will have unwittingly struck a seriously damaging blow to our national defense.

Herbert Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, today, August 10, we are observing the birthday of a great American. Former President Herbert Hoover is 85 years old today. Mr. Hoover has given generously of his time and his vast energies and talents in service to his country in so many capacities, and has thoroughly earned the

countless plaudits that are being bestowed on him.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a poem honoring Mr. Hoover written by Mrs. Helen Fay Hanke, of Chehalis, Wash., which is an expression of the feeling of a grateful nation. The poem follows:

HERBERT HOOVER AT 85

Among the great, our beloved statesman stands
Among the great of these and many other lands;
So happily a tower of service and of wisdom still—

Devoted courage and undaunted will:
What matters greatness, did you say?
Oh, but we honor him today
With thankful hearts that he helped stay
The hand of those who would destroy
Our Constitution and our peoples' destiny
And falsely build without integrity.
We honor him that he dared fight for truth
As still he does to build a right for youth,
And honor him for all his years of toil
For tolerance and peace here and on foreign soil.

For humbleness of heart and virtue true
For faith to rise above the shadows that he knew.

And all his mighty power of mind to organize
Each situation as it may arise.
But few who rise to service, serve so long
With dedication that is like a song
Of hope for all a world in need,
A song of challenge to both hurt and greed.
Not all can pass to worthy sons so rich a heritage,

So wise a counsel in this troublous, perilous age,

We can but pray his vision may long inspire freemen.

God bless you, Mr. Hoover, as your birthday comes again.

—Helen Fay Hanke.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following is my newsletter to constituents dated August 8, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

AUGUST 8, 1959.—The floor fight of the year in the House of Representatives is approaching: the subject—the controversial labor bill. Historically, the evolution of collective bargaining from countless local employer-employee agreements to nationwide and industrywide negotiations, from private settlement of differences of wages and working conditions to the mandate of Federal labor law, from a union resolution mailed to a legislator to all-out campaigning for and against lawmakers—all this and more will be a part of the debate. Unions have grown due to a recognition, by all, of workers' legitimate needs; but with that growth has come power and the not infrequent abuse of power. Growth often ended in monopoly, above and beyond reach of the Nation's laws—ended in cruel and greedy control of working people by dictatorial bosses. These facts and trends have been

pointed up over and over again, beyond all dispute, by the McClellan committee hearings.

So what did Congress do? Last year, a weak and therefore worthless Kennedy-Ives bill was passed by the Senate and killed by the House. Later, politicians used their support or rejection of this bill to explain their position on labor legislation. The public, more curious than aroused, listened and voted. Even more labor-supported candidates were elected to Congress. Now an indignant citizenry expects labor legislation to be passed which will correct the outrageous abuses pointed up by the McClellan committee. A somewhat stronger labor bill was passed by the Senate this year. The House Labor Committee, however, reported a watered-down version, which I will call the committee bill. Unsatisfied with this, some members of the committee set to work drafting a bipartisan substitute bill (Landrum-Griffin) with "teeth" in it. This bill meets several of President Eisenhower's earlier requests of Congress for corrective labor legislation. Now the question is, can enough votes be mustered in support of this substitute bill from the Republicans (total 153) and the Democrats (256) to make a majority of 219?

The differences between the committee and substitute bills can best be summarized in these five basic areas, none of which was adequately covered by the committee bill: (1) Rights of union members: The substitute bill restores the bill of rights to union members (free speech, secret vote, fair dues, etc.); (2) union finances: The substitute bill requires all unions to make financial reports (committee bill would exempt 70 percent of unions from this reporting), the lack of which has cost union members approximately \$10 million already in graft and corruption; (3) no man's land: Under present law many small unions and little businessmen with small troubles are denied access to the National Labor Relations Board and yet are prevented from seeking recourse to State courts or agencies. In this no man's land they can find no protection from racketeering elements; (4) blackmail picketing: The present unscrupulous use of picketing to (a) force recognition of a union which the employees themselves have rejected; or (b) force an employer to recognize one union while the law requires him to recognize another, would be barred by the substitute bill. Legitimate picketing would not be affected; (5) secondary boycotts (including hot cargo): Coercion by unions of other employees or firms, who are in no way involved in a labor dispute, in order to align them against a business with whom the union has a disagreement would be prevented by the substitute bill. Violence and racketeering are particularly prevalent in this field, but the committee bill is all but silent on the subject.

The substitute bill is not punitive nor in any way harmful to legitimate union leaders and members, but rather protective of both. In fact, this is a minimum bill. Anything less, such as the committee or Senate bills, would be worthless. The great danger is a whitewash of the abuses of monopolistic and dictatorial power. My own belief is that a measure such as H.R. 8003, which I introduced, placing unions under the same anti-trust sanctions applicable to everybody else, is necessary. (1) Restrictive trade practices, and (2) restraints of trade, forbidden by H.R. 8003, are areas only partially covered even by the substitute bill. Public pressure based on accurate understanding of the facts—facts that include: (a) The McClellan committee findings, and (b) the meanings of the various labor bills, and (c) the lobbying pressures on Congressmen—is necessary. As usual, the legislation that's passed will result from what the people want. It's up to John and Jane Doe now.

The adjournment date of Congress is still more uncertain, although it may be affected by Khrushchev's impending visit. Some Members of Congress, including me, do not welcome the thought of a speech to a joint session of Congress by the Communist boss.

Controversial pending legislation hangs in the balance. Some may be postponed to next year's session for action.

My True Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to submit the following essay by Miss Carol Osterhout, of Clinton, N.Y. Miss Osterhout was the New York State winner of the national My True Security contest sponsored by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce.

The depth of thought expressed and its timely message for Americans are worthy of the attention of all Members of the House:

MY TRUE SECURITY

(By Carol Osterhout)

I am a teenager and like other teenagers have done some serious thinking. Some people may say, "Eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow you die," but I and thousands of others can't. Something within us compels us to look toward the future, to search for the truth. The ageless question formed on the lips of philosopher, scientist, and peasant echoes within our minds. What is life—what is security? I have searched for truth and found God, the absolute truth. And thus I have found my true security. This security, one of God's most precious gifts, lies within myself.

The human being is a marvelous creature, for is he not created in the image of God? This "Two-legged Joker, Man," has fashioned with his own two hands and mind our mighty Nation, studded with cities, towns, and prosperous farms. Our early pioneers came to a country blanketed with forests, streaked with rivers, a country in whose heart lay vast natural riches. They put this raw material through the fiery furnaces of sweat, blood, and tears, and the mighty United States of America emerged. The symphony orchestras, the great libraries, the planes soaring through the heavens at speeds greater than that of sound, turbines generating electricity to light giant cities and remote farmhouses, atomic and hydrogen bombs—these are the products of man's toil, or his initiative—these are proofs of his resourcefulness, his reliance on God and himself.

Early Americans did not have our ready-made securities, a social security program, the latest in insurance policies, a well-organized police force, or even a strong, centralized government to prevent injustice—yet they did have security. Tom Jones, the fur trapper, ever pushing back the frontier, leaving behind a trail of trading posts; John Smith, the small farmer, tilling the soil to provide for his family; Bob Brown, the merchant, struggling to set up his own business in this new, promised land—they all had the same security we have today—that confidence and freedom from fear that come from initiative and self-reliance—that come from just plain hard work.

It is a wondrous thought that every man has a particular job to do. And my task cannot be done by you, nor your work by me. God has endowed me with some special ability. It is my job to work hard, to develop to the fullest my potentialities. Only in this way am I true to myself. I am secure in the knowledge that I have something to give that is my own. Many people go through life leaning on friends, chasing after fame, grabbing for wealth. They have forgotten their most precious possession—theirself. Antonius has advised, "Look well into thyself; there is a source of strength which will always spring up if thou wilt always look there."

Yes, in a very real sense my world is what I make it. If I am content to be just another voice crying, "Look at this world—injustice, anxiety, tension—there is no security," then I shall have no security. However, if I look life squarely in the face, see a job to be done or a problem to be solved, and on my own initiative, relying on God and myself, do what I can in the situation, then I shall have my true security.

"The world stands out on either side
No wider than the heart is wide;
Above the world is stretched the sky,
No higher than the soul is high."

"Two-legged Joker, Man," Carl Sandburg;
"Good Morning America," citation from
poem by Edna St. Vincent Millay, "Renaissance."

New England Road Builders Association Requests Support of Legislation To Provide Additional Revenue for High- way Trust Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following letter from the New England Road Builders Association, Boston, Mass., concerning the Federal highway program:

NEW ENGLAND ROAD BUILDERS
ASSOCIATION,

Boston, Mass., August 7, 1959.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LANE: On behalf of the New England Road Builders Association which represents more than 300 of the largest and most important roadbuilding contractors, material suppliers, and equipment dealers throughout New England, of whom more than 200 are located here in Massachusetts, we wish to express our deep concern regarding the present status of the Federal highway program and to request you to support new legislation to provide additional revenue for the highway trust fund so that construction of the Interstate System can be continued in accordance with the schedule previously authorized by Congress in the Federal Highway Act of 1956.

As you probably know, the uncertainty over continuation of the program has already caused more than 20 States, including 4 in our own area, to cancel all advertisements for bids and all future contract lettings until such time as the situation is clarified by new legislation. Connecticut has

canceled the award of contracts on more than \$20 million of work on which bids had already been received and has canceled the advertisement of bids on an additional \$5 million of new work. New York has canceled the receipt of bids on more than \$50 million of new work on which bids were scheduled to be received this month. New Hampshire and Maine have adopted the same policy. Our own Commonwealth will receive bids next week on several projects as scheduled but it is doubtful whether or not any additional work will be advertised thereafter.

From the foregoing facts I think it is apparent that a very real crisis confronts the roadbuilding industry, as few, if any, States are able to continue their construction programs without the assistance of Federal funds. The roadbuilding contractors and material suppliers whom we represent have invested tens of millions of dollars in new equipment and new plants within the past 3 years in order to increase their productivity and efficiency and make it possible to complete construction of the great new Federal highway system within the time limit established by Congress in the Highway Act of 1956.

Our members had every reason to believe that when Congress authorized this gigantic construction program in 1956, and authorized specific annual apportionments to carry it on until its conclusion, that sufficient funds would be provided by Congress to keep the program on schedule, as the act provided. Our members have no private business, no clients other than public agencies of the State and Federal Governments, and if the Federal highway program should be curtailed or cut back at this time many contractors would be ruined financially, forced into bankruptcy, and thousands of skilled construction workers, now employed at high wages, would lose their means of livelihood.

The curtailed program recommended by the House Committee on Ways and Means offers no solution to the problem as it involves a stretchout of the construction program for a period of 6 years, until 1965, and would reduce the apportionment of Federal funds for the next fiscal year, 1961 to less than one-fourth of the allocations during each of the past 2 years. For the six New England States combined, the allocation for fiscal 1961 would be only about \$39 million, as compared with \$161 million apportioned last year for fiscal 1960. Thereafter for a 6-year period, average annual apportionments would be nearly 40 percent below the allocations authorized by Congress in the act of 1956.

If the program recommended by the Ways and Means Committee should be approved, the construction of the Interstate Highway System, which has just gathered momentum, would be slowed to a walk, and many projects now scheduled for construction within the next year or two would necessarily be delayed for several years. There isn't any question but that the great new expressway systems being built throughout New England have met with public approval. A sufficient number have been built in our area so that the motoring public has had an opportunity to use them and learn their advantages—in safety, driving ease, lack of congestion, and absence of bottlenecks. The people like them and want them and, at least in this area, we believe they are willing to pay for them.

It is our understanding that the House Committee on Public Works has rejected the recommendation of the Ways and Means Committee for curtailment of the program by an unanimous vote and has recommended that construction of the Interstate System be continued at the rate originally established by Congress in the Highway Act of 1956, that is an annual apportionment of \$2.2 billion, and they have requested the

Ways and Means Committee to recommend a method of raising sufficient revenue to carry on the program at this level.

For all the reasons we have set forth herein we respectfully urge you to support the program proposed by the House Committee on Public Works, and to vote for any reasonable proposal which will raise sufficient additional revenue for the highway trust fund to permit the interstate construction program to be carried on at the original levels established by Congress in the Highway Act of 1956. In making this request we do not believe that our motives are selfish nor wholly self-serving. True, we do represent a legitimate industry with investments of millions of dollars which is wholly dependent upon continuation of this program and is confronted with financial disaster if it should be curtailed or terminated. Yet it should not be forgotten that a healthy, heavy construction industry is absolutely essential to our Nation's defense in time of war and if it is permitted to go down the drain at this time it would be extremely difficult to replace heavy construction machinery and restore its productivity in a time of national emergency.

We trust that you will be able to see some merit in our views on this subject and that you will give us your valued support by voting to carry on the Federal highway program at the levels previously established by Congress in the Highway Act of 1956 and to provide sufficient revenue to maintain it at such levels. We assure you that we shall deeply appreciate your assistance and your support. With sincere regards, we are

Respectfully yours,

NEW ENGLAND ROAD BUILDERS
ASSOCIATION.

WALTER J. REED,

President.

GORDON E. GAFFNEY,

Executive Secretary.

Jaycees Support Wilderness Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce, at its 39th annual convention in Buffalo, N.Y., June 15-18, adopted a resolution endorsing the wilderness bill and asking the Congress to enact legislation to preserve and give "appropriate recognition" to wilderness areas.

Favorable action on the resolution came upon recommendation of the national resolution committee that the statement in support of the wilderness measure be adopted. A representative of the Michigan delegation spoke in support of the resolution which had been recommended for consideration by the Jaycee National Conservation Committee. Some 8,000 delegates and their wives represented the 50 States and the District of Columbia at the convention.

The resolution committee recommended study and future action on proposals to limit applications of insecticides that destroy wildlife, strengthen the Federal Pollution Control Act, prevent drainage of wetland habitats through Federal subsidies, and protect fish and wildlife re-

sources threatened by dams licensed by the Federal Power Commission.

Earlier this year the national conservation committee of the Junior Chamber submitted and gained adoption by the national Jaycee board of directors of a long-range conservation-education project for use of its local groups. This program, which provides for demonstrations to point up critical conservation needs of each local community, was developed by the committee in cooperation with Federal, State, and private conservation agencies, including the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Forest Service, and the National Wildlife Federation.

Ben Butler of Progressive Farmer magazine, Birmingham, Ala., has served for the past year as chairman of the Jaycee national conservation committee. Fred Sturges of the Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission, succeeds him as the newly appointed national chairman for the next year.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION—PRESERVATION OF WILDERNESS AREAS

Whereas the needs of the expanding U.S. population include recreational and educational opportunities of the type to be found only in wilderness areas; and

Whereas certain important wildlife species and ecological relationships can be preserved and used for recreational and scientific purposes only in wilderness-type habitat; and

Whereas properties already under Federal ownership and/or management contain appropriate areas in numbers adequate to satisfy anticipated public needs for wilderness resources in the foreseeable future: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce, in convention assembled at Buffalo, N.Y., on June 17, 1959, does hereby endorse the basic provisions of S. 4028, as introduced in the 85th Congress and known as the wilderness bill, and petition the 86th Congress to adopt legislation to preserve wilderness areas and to give appropriate recognition, place, and stature to wilderness and associated resources in the total Federal natural resources program; and, be it further

Resolved, That the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce direct copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, all Members of Congress, and the Secretaries of the Departments of Interior and Agriculture.

Transfer of Nuclear Parts and Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I wish to insert in the RECORD two articles which deal with the transfer of nuclear parts and information. Although all but one of the nuclear transfer agreements have gone into effect, the debate on the advisability of our action does not recede, but grows stronger. I hope that the President will reconsider the entire ques-

tion of nuclear armaments to the NATO nations. The writer of one of the letters is a great physicist, Herbert Jehle; the other is a distinguished columnist, Marquis Childs:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 7, 1959]

SECRECY CURTAINS ATOMIC MANEUVERS (By Marquis Childs)

With virtually no debate in Congress and little discussion in the country, far-reaching agreements providing America's NATO allies with nuclear weapons know-how and equipment have been approved.

It would have taken a resolution by both Houses of Congress to reject the agreements submitted by the President. Among a minority there was a deep-seated fear that the agreements would freeze a pattern of nuclear armament throughout the NATO alliance. This would make it impossible in the event of a serious new effort at disarmament to try to work out a nuclear free zone in central Europe.

Only a few Members of the House expressed their doubts. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy held secret hearings and approved the agreements. At the request of Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee also held a hearing behind closed doors. Despite HUMPHREY's urging, the testimony was not released even in censored form.

To observers who have watched the constricting coils of secrecy close around areas of great public concern this seemed another sign that fear and distrust had prevailed over frank discussion of the consequences of providing European allies with know-how and equipment for using nuclear weapons. The next step, it was feared, would be to amend the basic atomic energy act to give them the actual weapons. This cannot be done under present law.

With new members of the nuclear club—whether their card of admission was a gift from the United States or by forging their own initial weapon as France is doing—the problem of control of testing becomes much greater, if not impossible. The 9 months of effort to come to an agreement with the Russians at Geneva on the control of nuclear tests has also been shrouded in a secrecy blanket.

Powerful forces, principally within the Atomic Energy Commission, have sought to frustrate any agreement. The AEC is conducting a costly experiment in a Louisiana salt mine to prove that it will be possible to cheat on any agreement that covers underground as well as atmospheric testing. Eventually this experiment may provide for moving of a volume of earth equivalent to 5 to 7 football fields—a vast undertaking—to show that a 50-kiloton explosion could be smothered by a process known as decoupling.

A kind of underground debate has gone on within the Government itself over the merits and demerits of a comprehensive agreement as compared to one which would ban only atmospheric tests. Because it has far greater resources of money and influence, the AEC has tended to dominate this subterranean debate. Recently Chairman John McCone flew several Senators to Geneva to impress them and the public with the AEC viewpoint.

While the public is unaware of it, those in Government favoring an overall agreement on testing have been arguing their case, too. This reporter has seen a confidential memorandum which states that the Soviets at Geneva have been forced to make the vast majority of concessions both of minor and significant consequence in the efforts of both sides to reach common ground.

The memorandum points out that this was in part at least because the initial stand of

the Soviet Union was basically unrealistic and unreasonable. Yet it adds that the Soviet moves could properly be viewed as an indication of their willingness to reach a reasonable accord on the matter of halting tests. The memorandum, based on the most thorough official knowledge of the talks at Geneva, also points out that actually within the current negotiations they (the Soviets) have to date accepted every U.S. requirement concerning control with the single exception of considering new data on underground detection.

With the impending visit of Premier Khrushchev this analysis—the other and largely submerged side of the debate on testing—takes on special importance. When he sits down with President Eisenhower, Khrushchev will not be content to talk friendly generalities. He will want to bring up details of the Geneva discussions and it will be well for the President to be forewarned with not merely one but both sides of the argument.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 7, 1959]

TO LIMIT NUCLEAR FACTS—VOTE BY BOTH SENATE AND HOUSE ON TRANSFER AGREEMENTS PROPOSED

(The writer of the following letter is professor of theoretical physics at George Washington University.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

On July 26 the transfer agreements for nuclear weapons systems with Germany and other NATO countries went into effect. This momentous step in the history of the nuclear arms race, providing for an irreversible spread of the nuclear weapons potential, passed Congress.

The opposing resolutions had been endorsed by Congressmen WILLIAM H. MEYER, EDITH GREEN, RANDOLPH S. HARMON, BYRON L. JOHNSON, GEORGE MCGOVERN, CLEM MILLER, ROY W. WIER, and LEONARD G. WOLF. It was only on the occasion of authorization of appropriations for such transfers that these Congressmen with CHARLES E. BENNETT and FRANK KOWALSKI succeeded in having the matter brought on the floor of the House. Out of 198 Congressmen, 61 objected to allocating funds for the transfer agreements.

The transfer of nuclear weapons systems will mean the nuclearization of the respective NATO armies. Nuclearized armies are useless without the possession of nuclear warheads. The wholesale transfer of nuclear weapons systems will therefore soon put the United States into the predicament of being cornered into surrendering nuclear warheads to these foreign military establishments, or seeing them make an extra effort to produce weapons-grade plutonium themselves, or even seeing them obtain it on a nuclear black market.

These transfer agreements make other countries doubt whether the United States is seriously trying to preserve peace, while at the same time a great many more military establishments are given a chance to start world war III. In fact, the transfer agreements play thus into the hands of the most suspicious and irreconcilable men in the Kremlin—and at the same time into the hands of the worst men in Bonn.

INTERNATIONAL ACCORD

These agreements actually amount to much more than a treaty. Nevertheless, neither in the House nor in the Senate was there debate and a vote. The fate of the United States and of the world hinges upon whether an international accord can be reached—under United Nations auspices and control, as repeatedly urged by W. Sterling Cole, U.S. Director General of the International Atomic Energy Association—an accord which has the effect of curbing the spread to more and more countries of the possession of nuclear weapons. The present transfers achieve the opposite.

Some Members of Congress have argued that it makes no difference whether some European countries develop their own nuclear weapons or whether we sell them to these countries. This argument touches an important point. It seems to the present writer that the cardinal issue of the nuclear age is the moral responsibility for the nuclear holocaust which threatens us all. Every country preparing nuclear weapons and, still more so, every country which spreads these weapons over the globe becomes guilty of the eventual nuclear avalanche whose actual start will be more or less a matter of accident—technical or diplomatic or by communication default.

The practical steps which should be taken now are, on the negative side, to see to it that the United States is not going to surrender in due time nuclear weapons to complete the weapons systems. If the administration is made aware of the fact that the American public will not stand for such a surrender, our administration might go slow in the actual transfer of nuclear weapons systems. So we may, for quite some time, be spared an irreversible conversion of NATO armies entirely dependent on nuclear weapons systems—plus nuclear weapons.

CONGRESSIONAL VOTE

On the positive side—and this seems to be most important in the long run—a revision of the July 1958 amendment of the Atomic Energy Act (Public Law 85-479) should be introduced. Facts of the type represented by transfer agreements of nuclear weapons systems (if they are made to be looked upon as not having the character of actual treaties) should at least fall under the category of executive agreements which become effective only if approved by affirmative votes of both Houses.

Furthermore, they should go through the Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs Committees. The present veto provision with a time limit of only 60 days has proved an easy way by which the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy itself can bring such far-reaching agreements into effect, which is ill considered for an issue which implies basic foreign policy decisions.

It would be good if we would stop hanging our fate on straws of unrealistic policies of shortsighted expediency. Rather we should remember that the United States was founded by men whose conscience and concern for humanity gave new life to the Western world.

HERBERT JEHL.

WASHINGTON, July 31, 1959.

The House of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the disclosures by the McClellan committee in regard to union management and attendant corruption impel legislative action. We see the bad with the good, the debased with the sound and vital. Our job is to eliminate the bad without impairing the good.

Several bills have been introduced in the House which set forth programs for union reform. After the House Committee on Labor recommended a bill which carried out some of the basic re-

forms in the administration of labor and provided for rights of members and duties of union officials, two of the Members introduced a bill which was inspired by hate, is punitive in nature, and seeks to tear down the House of Labor in order to repair some corroded beams. This bill is known as the Landrum-Griffin bill. This bill sets up certain rights for union members, imposes duties upon union officers, limits powers of officials, and restricts the holding of office by disqualifying ex-Communists and ex-convicts from holding union office. This bill requires financial reporting of all unions, large and small alike, without regard to the burdens and the capacity to conform. Severe penalties are provided for false filing and incorrect filing. In addition, the bill goes beyond much-needed reforms for unions and seeks to amend the Taft-Hartley law by outlawing and banning "hot cargo" provisions between management and labor and outlawing organizational and recognition picketing. The latter two provisions are retaliatory in nature and have the effect of destroying the gains extracted by labor through sacrifice and struggle throughout the years.

The second bill is the Elliott bill, which has reform provisions, affects the majority of union organizations without burdening the small union organization and sets up prohibitions against "hot-cargo" provisions and organizational or recognition picketing under certain circumstances. A third labor bill is the so-called Shelley bill, which is designed to eliminate dishonesty in union management, contains the ban against secondary boycotting as contained in the Taft-Hartley law but deletes the provisions with respect to the ban on "hot-cargo" and organizational or recognition picketing. These bills are so lengthy and so detailed that people must rely in the main upon summaries of their provisions. Much heat is thrown off without much light or understanding. Clarification of the provisions is necessary for a proper understanding of the provisions of the various bills. One of the best articles, which I have seen, treating of the various provisions of these labor bills was published in the New York Times of Sunday, August 9, by Joseph A. Loftus. It clearly indicates that the crux of the labor bills, apart from the internal union reform, rests in the pickets and boycotts and that the measures in Congress point up the differences in approach. I believe interested readers would profit materially from reading a keen analysis by this feature writer, Joseph A. Loftus, of these labor bills. A copy of the article follows:

CRUX OF LABOR BILLS: PICKETS AND BOYCOTTS—TWO MEASURES IN CONGRESS POINT UP DIFFERENCES IN APPROACH

(By Joseph A. Loftus)

WASHINGTON, August 8.—The legislative struggle to curb power excesses spotlighted by the McClellan committee for 2 years has been reduced essentially to two bills now before the House.

That does not count the Shelley bill, which a small band of labor hundred percenters would like considered in the race. Experienced House Members, however, tend to rate the Shelley bill's chances with the snowball in August.

That leaves the Elliott bill and the Landrum-Griffin bill. There is nothing quite so meaningless, and so emotion packed as the labels that are being plastered on these bills. However, for purposes of identification and oversimplification, it can be reported that the conservatives think the Elliott bill is much too soft on the labor leaders, and the labor leaders think the Landrum-Griffin bill is outrageously hard on legitimate unionism.

NO MAN'S LAND

For purposes of further identification, the Elliott bill is the one that more closely resembles the Kennedy bill, which the Senate passed on April 25.

These simple distinctions may be worthless within a week, since the House may well take the Elliott bill and make it look tougher than its chief rival without changing its name. The House is not limited to two or three alternatives. The ground rules for the oratorical slugfest starting Tuesday provide for amendments unlimited.

Under the heading of oversimplification, it may also be reported that the real, hard, last-ditch differences between the two bills and their champions are boycotts and picketing and what to do about them.

President Eisenhower also attached high importance in his broadcast to a third issue—the so-called "no man's land," which is a catch phrase for labor relations problems that are not processed by either Federal or State agencies.

The curious thing about all three of these is that they are Taft-Hartley law matters. They figured in the McClellan committee disclosures of power abuses in a secondary way, but they were not the spectaculars that brought the committee its fame or aroused the public clamor for a law. The committee's 21-point indictment of James R. Hoffa this week contains no mention of these three points.

COMMITTEE SHOCKERS

The McClellan committee shockers dealt with violence, old-fashioned embezzlement and some plain and fancy forms of financial irresponsibility, all of them violations of State law. The next most outrageous practice shown by the rackets committee was a disregard of union members' democratic rights by autocratic union leaders. Some of these abuses were violent in form and therefore subject to local police powers. Other abuses were subject to the civil remedies of State courts.

If the States had enforced their own laws and applied their exclusive police powers competently and incorruptibly, the McClellan hearings might never have been held or, at most, they would have been gone and nearly forgotten by now.

It is now proposed, indeed virtually agreed, that the Federal Government shall undertake all these State functions. Remedies for all these abuses and many others are now prescribed in various forms and degrees in all the pending bills. They have been all but forgotten in the heat of the conflict over the three Taft-Hartley proposals.

All three issues—boycotts, picketing and Federal-State jurisdiction (no man's land) figure in the union-management power struggle. In this sense they are traveling as reform measures.

The boycott, in origin and practice for many years, was accepted by society as a civil rebellion against injustice.

SECONDARY BOYCOTT

Today's problem is a development, if not a corruption, of the old-fashioned consumer boycott. It is called a secondary boycott because, by definition, it involves a secondary employer, who is attacked, by strike or other economic pressures, as a way of punishing the primary employer. That is, if you can get one (secondary) employer to stop buying materials from another

(primary) employer, the primary employer may come to terms with you.

The secondary employer sometimes, but not always, is an innocent victim. President Eisenhower offered the simple example of the furniture factory whose employees voted not to have a union in the plant so the union pickets the stores that sell furniture made by that plant. This conceivably could force both the store and the factory out of business.

This practice is already outlawed by the Taft-Hartley Act, so much so that where it occurs the National Labor Relations Board must seek a court injunction.

A sophisticated union would not picket the store in a case like this. Union agents would go into the store and hint to the owner that he could avoid labor trouble by discontinuing the controversial line of furniture. This practice is legitimate under present interpretations of law. It is the loophole that the Landrum-Griffin bill would close.

In the President's example, he neglected to say whether the furniture factory management was neutral in the election, or whether it coerced its employees to vote against the union. It would be naive to assume that all managements are neutral on these matters.

Coercion of employees is an unfair practice under Taft-Hartley, but the coercion is not always easily proved and when you have the proof it may take 2 years or more to get a decision. In that period, the union's nucleus tends to evaporate. In these circumstances, union sometimes take shortcuts and put pressure on secondary employers.

EMPLOYER CAUGHT

The Landrum-Griffin bill would attempt to cut off all uses of the secondary boycott. The Elliott bill strikes only at the "hot cargo" version—the one commonly used by the Teamsters. Truckers who hold common carrier certificates from the Interstate Commerce Commission would be prohibited from agreeing with Teamsters to refuse to handle goods the Teamsters decide are "hot" because they come from, or are destined for, an unfair employer. The Landrum-Griffin adherents argue that this limited prohibition might be interpreted by the courts as congressional approval of all other kinds of boycotts.

The President's example of blackmail picketing—a phrase apparently coined by Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell—dealt with a case where the union insisted on recognition by the employer without a showing of interest by the employees or any attempt by the union to persuade the employers to accept the union, other than to throw up a picket line.

The Landrum-Griffin bill would stop that picket line after 30 days unless the union actually petitioned for an election in that period. The petition, of course, would have to be accompanied by some evidence of employee interest. The Elliott bill apparently would not interfere here, but where an election had been held, the rejected union would be barred from picketing for 9 months.

COSTLY PROCESS

Where these problems involve small, local employers, the National Labor Relations Board refuses to process them because they would bog down the Board's machinery and be very costly. The States are not allowed to process these cases. Hence the "no man's land" label. The President would let the States take over these cases.

The objection to using the States is the great lack of uniformity that would emerge. These are the issues for debate in the House come Tuesday. A decision is expected by Friday.

All hands agree that the race is extremely close. The Elliott bill, supported by Speaker RAYBURN and his organization, appeared to

have had a slight advantage prior to the President's speech in behalf of the coalition bill. Now the issue is more in doubt. That speech may have made the difference. Democratic leaders, however, theorize hopefully that the speech may harden party lines. If that be so, the Rayburn forces will win.

Why I'm for the Shelley Bill, a Labor Reform, Antiracketeering Measure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD T. FLYNN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, I speak out to call attention of the House to the fact that powerful lobbies, aided—I trust, unwittingly—by the President of the United States, are trying to stampede this body to legislate against the democratic rights of America's working men and women.

The "tough labor bill" under the guise of putting an end to abuse which all of us oppose, is a cynical attempt to take from union members some of the essential tools of democratic unions.

"Secondary boycott" has become an infamous phrase in the hysterical lobbying which inundates the Congress today; but what are the facts about secondary boycotts?

It is already illegal under the Taft-Hartley Act, section 8(b) (4) (A), for employees of one firm to strike or refuse to work to force their employer to stop doing business with some other employers.

But some employers and unions have signed agreements which, in effect, say that the employer will not insist that his employees work on goods which come from an employer who has a dispute with the union. Is this wrong?

Abuses of these "hot cargo" clauses have been one springboard from which the tough labor bill has been launched.

The tough bill pressure groups spew out scare words and cite examples of "extortion" or "blackmail picketing." But they do not stop at urging us to pass a law which outlaws these practices. The fact is the Shelley bill and the Elliott bill, as well as the Griffin-Landrum bill, specifically outlaw these practices and provide heavy criminal penalties for violators. The Landrum-Griffin bill, however, exploiting the deep concern of the American people about the abuses widely publicized by the McClellan committee, goes beyond the correction of abuses; it abridges basic rights of working people: The right to bargain freely, the right of a worker to refuse struck work, the right to peacefully picket a struck plant.

It seeks to limit legitimate collective bargaining agreements where no abuses have been cited.

In the needle trades industry, for example, union workers and employers commonly agree not to do business with sweatshop subcontractors. By outlawing such agreements, the Griffin-Landrum bill would deprive honest, clean democratic union people of this most

proper and time-tested device to improve working conditions in that industry.

It forcees strikebreaking by innocent workmen against their will.

The Supreme Court has said that employees of one firm may refuse to do work farmed out to them from a struck firm. Under the Landrum-Griffin bill, however, this right of workmen is removed except in cases where the second employer has a contract to perform the work for the first employer and the refusal is limited to services which would ordinarily be performed by the striking employees. This requirement bores a loophole in our labor law big enough for every strikebreaking employer to completely evade the intent of this section of the Taft-Hartley Act. The Griffin-Landrum bill, in this particular, is clearly an instrument to coerce workers to help employers break strikes in situations in which even the Taft-Hartley law now protects them from this degrading servitude. It legalizes collusion between employers to break strikes while outlawing the most fundamental human act in the democratic labor movement—the refusal to join the boss in punishment of other workmen.

It outlaws fundamental picket action in a primary labor dispute. The most vicious effect of the Griffin-Landrum section 705 will result from its elimination of concerted conduct from the concept of the secondary boycott. Under Taft-Hartley, what is outlawed is inducing concerted action by employees not to perform work. Under Griffin-Landrum if a striking worker appeals to a single other worker not to cross the picket line, he violates the law. Gentlemen, no Member of Congress can at once be devoted to the American system of collective bargaining and subscribe to this strike-breaking language.

I should like to call your attention to the fact that the Senate, in its consideration of the bill, earlier this session rejected a provision substantially the same as the one here proposed by Griffin-Landrum.

Griffin-Landrum outlaws union's free speech educational picketing.

On the ground that retailers of products from a struck firm were being restrained, a union could—under Landrum-Griffin—be deprived of its right to urge the public through newspaper ads, radio, and the mails, not to buy from a struck firm. Here again the remedy goes far beyond the correction of coercive practices and indeed goes so far as to take rights away from workers to the detriment of the institution of American industrial relations.

I believe that every friend of labor in this House, and there are many of us, who will take the time to look behind the scare words and the extreme example of the tough bill proponents—and read the bill—will recognize that this section deprives workers of rights. It does not protect them or the public from racketeering or collusion. It was not written here to punish crooks, but to hobble labor.

Landrum-Griffin will encourage collusion between corrupt management and union leaders.

Mr. Speaker, as I read section 705 of the so-called tough labor bill, I am appalled to find that the authors of the bill have become so reckless in their get labor binge that they have written an unmistakable invitation to the racketeer and the unscrupulous employer to join together to prevent honest unions from organizing.

Organizational picketing is prevented where the employer has lawfully recognized another labor organization or where a valid election has been held during the past year. What this means is that either by agreement or the device of a quickie election, the employer can influence the choice of a union for his employees, then for a 12-month period a legitimate union cannot legally picket to begin its organizing campaign even though it was not involved in the previous election. At the end of the 12-month period, without one day's time given to the intervening union to organize with this traditional technique, the employer and his union can be almost certain of continuing this relationship.

I say to the tough bill proponents on this one, your motives are showing. You are cooperating with management and labor crooks, you are outlawing the honest organizer and giving the green light to the most corrupt agent exposed by the McClellan committee—the union boss who will sell out the workers to sign a dues collecting contract with the boss.

Mr. Speaker, there are other ways in which the Griffin-Landrum bill exceeds the just demand of the American people for labor reform. I am not going to describe all of them, but any one of these punitive sections I have described should be enough to turn this Congress away from this measure. This bill—to the extent it goes beyond the Shelley bill—will not protect workers or their unions; it will steal from them their legitimate tools of organizational bargaining.

Unfortunately, moderates and liberals in the House, recognizing on one hand the clamor of the American public for labor reform and, on the other hand, the readymade position of labor's enemies to easily exploit this sentiment, have seen fit to bring out a bill which, although it is not nearly as punitive as the Landrum-Griffin bill, nevertheless, makes concessions to the enemies of labor in an attempt to appease and accommodate and, let us be honest, to legislate. I do not impugn the motives of the sponsors of the Elliott bill. I believe they are friends of labor who believe some sacrifice of honest labor's interests must be made as a price for sufficient support for passage of labor reform legislation in this session of Congress.

Tactically, these good colleagues may be right. I hope they are wrong. But, on principle, they cannot be right. It is a dishonor to the House to pass legislation nominally written to protect labor but which, in fact, is in part written to punish labor as a price for its support.

The Elliott bill is inequitably easy on employer reporting; it foolishly invites misuse of union membership lists and effects no democratic reform or other advantage for the list giveaway; it restricts organizational picketing and "hot cargo"

clauses, although not nearly as dangerously as does Landrum-Griffin, still unnecessarily. Without principled correction of the weaknesses or assurances that these failures can be taken care of in conference, the House should not support this bill.

The Shelley bill does not go to excess. It does the job of labor reform and does not do a job on labor.

I implore the House: Do not let the antilabor lobby din make you misread your mail. The American people want labor reform—there can be no argument about that. But the American people want strong unions—able to do the job workers built them to do. The American people are not hysterical on this issue. They write us to tell us to "get tough with the crooks"; and I agree we should do this. But they expect us to keep a level head, to make the law meet the abuses, to legislate for corrective action, not punitive action against the innocent democratic labor movement which these same American people embrace.

The need is for antiracketeering legislation. The Shelley bill is 69 pages of just that. Most provisions are the same as those proposed by the Senate committee and by last year's Kennedy-Ervin bill. It is an honest, unemotional bill, tough on crooks but respectful of the democratic American free labor movement, the same labor movement which has made such a significant contribution to the greatness of America and has, moreover, led the Congress in waging war against Communists, corruption, and racketeers by cleaning its own ranks by exposures and expulsions.

Associated Pennsylvania Constructors Petitions Congress To Continue Interstate Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of transmittal from Mr. A. E. O'Brien, executive secretary, Associated Pennsylvania Constructors, and a resolution adopted by the association on August 5, 1959, with regard to the interstate highway program:

ASSOCIATED PENNSYLVANIA CONSTRUCTORS,
Harrisburg, Pa., August 5, 1959.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Some of our members in Luzerne County contacted me this morning requesting a resolution from our association be sent to you.

I understand you discussed this problem, as well as the resolution, with your good friend Attorney John Cotsack, of Hazleton.

We hope that this resolution will assist you in carrying out your desires, as well as those of our entire industry in Pennsylvania.

We also wish to extend our sincere thanks for your cooperation in our behalf. The continuation of this program is vitally important not only to Pennsylvanians but to the people of all the other States.

Very truly yours,

A. E. O'BRIEN,
Executive Secretary.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD, Congressman from Wilkes-Barre, Pa., earnestly supported the accelerated highway program passed in the 1956 session of the Congress; and

Whereas Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD has continuously been an advocate of safe, adequate highways, both from a national standpoint and particularly for the State of Pennsylvania; and

Whereas Congressman FLOOD is vitally interested in the Keystone Shortway, which traverses the State east and west, and the Anthracite Expressway, which traverses the State north and south, intersecting in Luzerne County, these two interstate highways being the most important part of the new Interstate System in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; and

Whereas the continuation of the interstate program as established in the 1956 act is extremely vital to both individual and corporate taxpayers of the State of Pennsylvania; and

Whereas the highway-construction industry and all of its segments, both in the State of Pennsylvania and throughout the Nation, including contractors, material producers, equipment manufacturers, equipment distributors, banks and insurance companies, engineers, and highway departments, have geared themselves to do the job required under the 1956 act of Congress, involving tremendous amounts of money, equipment, and organization; and

Whereas Pennsylvania as the world's largest producer of steel and cement would be seriously affected by any reduction in the use of these products by reason of curtailed highway construction; and

Whereas it is vitally important to the national economy that the Interstate System be completed in accordance with the original schedule linking together the principal centers of population and industry; and

Whereas it has an importance to the overall economy which is of even greater magnitude than the direct benefits to highway users; and

Whereas in this period of prosperity and record personal income now is the time to provide an adequate highway transportation system; and

Whereas the National Safety Council estimates that a 1-year delay at this stage in the construction of the Interstate System would result in the loss of 5,700 lives, and it is further estimated that the 6-year stretch-out plan would mean a loss of 17,100 lives; and

Whereas the uncertainty with regard to the future Federal apportionments, along with the situation brought about by the 1960 Congress Appropriations Act, has led highway departments in 25 States to suspend all contract letting; and

Whereas the Pennsylvania Department of Highways is no exception and the Federal aid ABC and Interstate programs will be further delayed; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Associated Pennsylvania Constructors on this 5th day of August 1959, That we petition Congress, through Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, to do everything in its power to continue the interstate highway program annual apportionments as established in the 1956 act of Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress provide the necessary additional taxes, plus other moneys, to

replenish and sustain the highway trust fund with funds sufficient to carry out the program as established in the 1956 act.

ASSOCIATED PENNSYLVANIA
CONSTRUCTORS,
A. E. O'BRIEN,
Executive Secretary.

The Khrushchev Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. MOELLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I share with millions of my fellow Americans a feeling of profound disturbance over the press acclaim which has been given to the decision by President Eisenhower to invite Nikita Khrushchev to this country and to pay him a return visit later this year. I am more than disturbed, but I do not wish to be intemperate in addressing the Congress and so I will not reveal the full depth of my feelings when I think of this disgraceful affair.

I will try to be objective and to list dispassionately my reasons for opposing the plan to welcome the Soviet dictator as an honored guest of an American President. I do not say the guest of the American people, because in my heart I am convinced that the majority of Americans will not welcome him and that they wish wholeheartedly that he had never been asked to come here.

First, Khrushchev in his own person and as the representative of Communist terrorism comes to us with bloodstained hands and all of his smiles, his buffoonery, and his peasant charm will never cleanse them. The blood of Hungarians, of Poles, of Ukrainians, of Tibetans, of Germans, of the Baltic peoples, of Koreans, of Chinese, and of countless others will not wash away. Every American who looks upon him while he is here should take a good look at those hands and in his mind's eye picture them newly stained with our blood and that of our children, which is the avowed aim of his regime and of Khrushchev himself. This is the man we are asked to greet as a representative of a friendly people. Let any Russian peasant or Russian worker come and we would welcome them for they too have suffered, but let us not be asked to extend the hand of friendship to their tormentors. The blood will inevitably cling to us from such a handshake.

Second, this invitation and this visit are a sign of a craven yielding to blackmail and nothing more. When Khrushchev voiced his threats against the free people of Berlin and their American, French, and British protectors the citizens of this country did not quiver in fear. It appears, however, that in spite of the brave words voiced by our leaders at that time there was some quivering among them. How else can we explain this evidence of irresolution? It will certainly be as plain to Khrushchev as

it is to me and to any thinking American that when our President asked him to come here it was not because he was welcomed as a friend, but that it was to treat with him as a blackmailer who threatened our security. How much success do you think you would have in persuading a man with a loaded gun at your head to come to an agreement on your terms? Commonsense tells us that you must first disarm him or face him with an equally dangerous weapon before he will agree not to pull the trigger. This man is more dangerous than any common robber. Why have we invited him into our house instead of locking the doors against him until he is able to convince us that he has reformed?

Third, this invitation is an act of betrayal of the captive peoples of Europe and Asia. They will look on it as nothing less and I look on it as nothing less. As each of these nations has fallen under the domination of the conspiracy in the Kremlin, we have promised them that America would never desert them and that we would take every possible opportunity to help them regain their independence. Again, these were brave words but how much brave action has been taken in their support? I do not speak of military action, for none of us want to precipitate a war. But I do speak of morally strong, diplomatic, economic, and social action. I speak of imposing sanctions against every move which appears to perpetuate Communist domination over the once free peoples of Europe and over the Asiatic nations who have lost the opportunity given them by the Western World to chart their own futures. Instead of that kind of sanction our sweet talk to their Communist rulers can only be taken to mean that we are now sanctioning continued despotic rule over these peoples by their most bitter enemies.

Fourth, this unilateral action by our President and his advisers can only drive a further wedge between us and our Western allies and the democratic regimes which we support in other parts of the world. A face to face private talk between Khrushchev and the President, at the President's invitation, is something different from a multilateral conference in which our strongest friends have active participation. The press has made a great show of ex post facto approval by the governments of these countries in support of this social get together. However, what lies behind the scenes? We know that with the possible exception of Great Britain there was no great enthusiasm in Europe even for a so-called Big Four summit meeting unless and until the Soviet Union had clearly demonstrated a willingness to recede from its aggressive stance. What happened at Geneva was just the opposite of this. Then how can we justify to the friendly nations of Europe, to their leaders and their citizens, this sudden about-face action on our part? Certainly it will create serious apprehension among them at the very least. I sincerely hope that the President on his coming visits to them will be able to allay their fears. More important, I hope that when he faces

his unwelcome visitor in September he will not be taken in to the extent of agreeing on any action which will cause them further fear and lead to open distrust.

It is, of course, too late to retract this ill-timed gesture on the part of the President. I could wish that Mr. Khrushchev might be stricken with the same type of second thought which caused him to change his recent plan to visit the Scandinavian countries. However, this is too much to hope for in view of the great tactical victory he has achieved in being invited here. This being the case, I suggest that it is up to the American people to make clear to him just what our attitude to him and to his cohorts is, and just how strong is our determination to oppose his godless philosophy and his inhuman system at every turn. This is no time for egg throwing and insults, which show only an immature response to the great issues with which we are faced. The proper way to receive this man is in cold silence. I hope and pray that no great crowds will turn out to greet him with cheers and flag waving. I shudder at the thought that the streets of our Nation's Capital might be hung with the hammer and sickle as he is paraded before us. Let him see instead the Stars and Stripes of this great citadel of freedom. Let him see displayed at every hand the flags of the nations he and his kind have brought under the heel of the most despotic dictatorship in the history of mankind. Let him not see smiles of welcome but the stern faces of a people determined that freedom and democracy will triumph over brutality and oppression no matter what the cost.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Austin Girl Covers Press Talk by Ike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for 6 weeks this summer, Representative HOMER THORNBERRY, of Texas, and I had the pleasure of having work in our offices six intelligent young high school students from Texas who had been awarded REA-sponsored Government in Action scholarships.

One of these, a young lady named Miss Jane Morton, who received the Peder-nales Electric Cooperative scholarship, attended a Presidential news conference during her visit to Washington; and she has written her impressions of it.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled, "Austin Girl Covers Press Talk by Ike," from the Austin American of August 7, 1959, appear in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUSTIN GIRL COVERS PRESS TALK BY IKE (By Jane Morton)

WASHINGTON.—Today was the most exciting day of my 6 weeks in Washington. I went to the President's press conference.

At 9:30 this morning I was at the northwest entrance to the White House, fumbling around in my purse for my driver's license. I thought the guards weren't going to let me in. After about 5 minutes a list of press conference guests was delivered, and I was admitted to the White House grounds.

A policeman took me down the drive to a one-story wing set apart from the main building. I went in and was given an engraved card stating that the President had invited me to his press conference. Since I was an hour early, I waited in a reception room. Photographers and reporters were going in and out—once I saw Mr. Hagerty pass through the room.

A little before 10 I went across the street to the Executive Office Building. The conference was to be held in room 474. When I got there a line of reporters was outside the door. Just a few feet ahead of me I saw a short, redheaded lady. She was Sarah McClendon, a correspondent for the Austin American-Statesman.

Miss McClendon, who is actually Mrs. Sarah McClendon O'Brian, took charge and got me a seat next to her. We were sitting on the second row just about 6 feet from the President's desk. The room was very hot and full of people sitting on folding chairs. The television lights made it even hotter. There was not a very large room, but it was very ornate. Unfortunately, it was not air conditioned.

Before the President arrived, a man came around taking pictures with a movie camera. Miss McClendon and the other reporters

started scribbling very fast in their notebooks. The man with the camera took pictures of them writing.

When I inquired about this, Miss McClendon explained that shots of the reporters writing were dubbed into the film of the press conference, so it would appear they were taking down everything the President said just as fast as they could.

We waited for about 15 minutes, during which time Miss McClendon pointed out columnists and reporters: Frank Van Der Linden, of the Nashville Banner, whom the President has called the man with the red hair; Ed Koterba, United Features Syndicate; Jerry O'Leary, of the Washington Star, who has been writing Washington news for many years; Clark Mollenhoff, of the Des Moines Register and Tribune, who has often made the President mad; May Craig, of the Portland (Maine) Press Herald, who appears frequently on "Meet the Press." About 300 people were crowded inside the room.

At 10:31 there was a sudden hush and the President walked in, followed by Mr. Hagerty. A very bored looking Secret Service agent sat up front in a corner of the room. The President was sunburned; he looked much healthier in person (just 6 feet away) than in pictures. He stood throughout the conference.

Mr. Hagerty and an assistant sat behind him. During the conference every one of us—including the President—suffered from the heat, except Mr. Hagerty, who somehow managed to look cool and serene.

The press conference lasted for only half an hour: Miss McClendon said it was quite long enough. As a guest, I was not permitted to ask questions, but I don't think I could have got one in, anyhow. The moment the President finished answering one question, at least 10 reporters would jump up like jacks-in-the-box and say, "Mr. President."

I don't know how he chose between them, but the President would finally recognize one, who would give his name and paper, and then ask a question. Miss McClendon said later that one reporter tried for 2 years before he ever got recognized.

The President answered questions so easily and naturally and seemed like such an ordinary, middle-aged man, that every now and then I would have to poke myself mentally and say, "Jane, pay attention—it's the President."

Naturally, the President was pleased about the election of Republicans in Hawaii. He thought Nixon was doing a good job in Russia, and was displeased that Congress seemed determined to cut \$700 million from his foreign aid bill and \$68 million from his budget for the space program.

Miss McClendon, who treats reporting very matter of factly and isn't intimidated by anyone, asked the President to make an appeal to the voters to ask their Congressmen to vote for a strong labor bill, referring to the Griffin-Landrum bill, now before the Congress.

The President seemed a little irritated, explaining that he had already expressed approval of the bill, but he finally said, "I'm for it." He didn't want to make any comments on the steel strike, although he was very definitely against a provision of the TVA self-financing bill which would give Congress power to modify the TVA budget while permitting the President only the authority to make recommendations.

The President got mad at Mr. Mollenhoff when he made a reference in a question to the "administration's secrecy policy." The President said, "You start your question with an implied fact that is not a fact. You say the administration's secrecy policies. There has been no administration—." Mr. Mollenhoff got up to say, "But, sir * * *," and the President said, "Please sit down." Mr. Mollenhoff sat.

When Mr. Koterba asked him very earnestly, with a lot of sirs, about his plans after leaving the White House, the President grinned at him and said, "You sound just like a West Point plebe."

At 11 Mr. Sterling F. Green of the Associated Press said, "Thank you, Mr. President," and the President walked out. A moment later the room erupted as reporters jumped to their feet and dashed toward the exits.

Miss McClendon and I dashed, then rode across town to the Capitol where I sat in the Senate press gallery and tried to put down my impression of the press conference for a news story. When I told her I was very sorry that my idea of what the President had actually said was rather vague and my main impression was that of a very hot room, Miss McClendon said, "Don't worry, honey—we all feel that way."

Then we hurried to Speaker RAYBURN's office, because he usually holds a short, informal press conference at 12 o'clock. A group of reporters was gathered around his door.

I heard someone say, "The Speaker can say more in a few grunts than anyone else can talking." Mr. RAYBURN didn't hold his conference after all, and I missed the opportunity of judging for myself whether he was as articulate as all that.

New Directions for Textiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK M. COFFIN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Cotton Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture opened hearings on H.R. 4033. The subcommittee encouraged discussion not merely on the legislation before it, but also on all present and future problems facing the cotton textile industry.

I took advantage of the opportunity to take a long look ahead at this industry. With the thought that my remarks may help stimulate a new vigor and new directions in our efforts, I am inserting at this point the testimony which I gave to the Cotton Subcommittee this morning:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to dwell for a few moments on what I think is the true significance of these hearings on the cotton textile industry. It lies not in the specific provisions of the legislation being discussed

today. Nor does it lie in the mere fact that the cotton textile industry is beset with grave problems, which can be clearly seen behind the current flurry of welcome activity in rebuilding inventories.

The deepest significance in these hearings, in my opinion, lies in the fact that in cotton textiles the United States faces its first postwar challenge to one of its traditional industries. I am not speaking of such temporary challenges as that which the influx of small cars has posed to the automobile industry. Nor am I speaking of potential threats posed by resurging European industry. I am referring to an existing, permanent capacity in cotton textiles, which will inevitably multiply itself in the next decade.

Not only do we face fierce competition from Japan, Hong Kong, England, Italy, and India, but we are on the verge of dramatic starts in this industry in scores of the countries taking their first steps toward industrialization. Moreover, the textile export potential of the six European countries forming the Common Market (European Economic Community) is estimated to undergo dramatic growth.

In short, we are feeling the first impact of world industrialization in cotton textiles. The real question lurking behind the statistics is: How should this challenge be met? The answer is critical today for cotton textiles, and it is vital for many other industries in the years ahead.

The time has come to shake off complacency, to be dissatisfied with temporary expedients, to take a long look ahead, to clarify feasible objectives, and to follow such policies, in business and in Government, as will help us achieve these objectives. This, I submit, should be the charter and the philosophy of the new Textile Advisory Committee.

These are the areas in which we should be doing basic factfinding, thinking, and policy formation:

INFORMATION: WORLD SUPPLY AND DEMAND

First, since our U.S. cotton textile industry does not operate in a vacuum, it is only the heart of commonsense to get a clear and detailed picture of the state of cotton textile manufacturing throughout the world, including projected trends over the next 10 to 15 years. This would place in perspective our own industry and its prospects. In other words, what do we face? This kind of information is essential to sound business decisions and sound government policy. The obtaining, analysis, and diffusion of this information can only be done by the Federal Government.

Equally important is a picture of the present and prospective markets for cotton textiles throughout the world. This is vital in order to help us analyze the potential threat to us of increasing world capacity. It is also important for us to be on the alert for new markets overseas for our own products. This kind of information should not be gathered only once, but should be kept up to date, and placed at the service of our industry. We ought also to know more about the cotton production and manufacturing capacity of Red China. We should not be afraid to explore the effect of expanded trade in food and fiber between ourselves and our allies and Red China. The importance of greater diversion of Japanese and Hong Kong cotton textile products to the Asian mainland is obvious.

The Textile Advisory Committee should imaginatively seek legitimate ways in which our Government apparatus can help spark a new, systematic, and aggressive exploitation of new world markets. For example, through cooperation between the Departments of Commerce and State, it could, from time to time, bring together design and sales experts in the industry and eco-

nomic attachés from our many diplomatic posts abroad to discuss market opportunities, style and design preferences, etc.

RESEARCH

Our second requirement—after we know more about present and probable world conditions of supply and demand—is to possess more knowledge about domestic supply and demand, and about the uses of textile products. The sixth recommendation of the Pastore report is pertinent and thought-provoking on this point:

"6. It is evident that the textile industry needs and wishes to have an expanded research program. The dilemma facing the industry has been how to finance the additional research that is needed in the face of dwindling earnings. We recommend that some proportion of customs duties collected on textile products entering the United States be used to finance research—especially basic research designed to find new end uses for textile products, and economic research which would aid the industry in planning its future production program. Some of this research could be conducted by existing Government agencies. But grants could also be made to universities and other research organizations capable of effectively assisting the textile industry. There is a need, for example, for sound projections of the future industrial and consumer demand for textile products; for a well-conceived and carefully executed program of market research and for an expanded program of basic research to develop new industrial and consumer uses for fibers and fabrics. The Textile Interagency Committee mentioned in our first recommendation could be assigned the responsibility of supervising the program of research activities suggested here."

Although basic textile research should be stepped up, there is also a need for utilizing the fruits of existing research. It seems to me worth some exploration to look into the extent to which there are useful but unused ideas which have been the subject of patent applications, both successful and unsuccessful. The Small Business Administration publishes a monthly bulletin of newly patented products in which small business firms might be interested. It would seem to me a wholly legitimate function for Government to help its "crisis industries" to the extent of improving the dissemination of useful ideas.

COSTS

The third major area of attention—and perhaps the most obvious—is that of costs of operation.

The cost of plant and equipment can be made less burdensome—in effect, can be reduced—by more realistic depreciation rates to reflect the customary three-shift operation. Again, I can do no better on this point than to quote the seventh recommendation of the Pastore report:

"7. Depreciation rates now contained in Bulletin F of the Internal Revenue Service are obsolete. These rates are based on the assumption that textile machinery is operated on an average of 2,000 hours per year. With three-shift operations, much textile equipment in this country is operated at 6,000 hours per year, and the useful life of such equipment is correspondingly shortened. The current, long-term depreciation rates are hampering investment in an industry which must step up its modernization program if it is to remain viable. We recommend that at the earliest opportunity the Internal Revenue Service publish a revised schedule of depreciation rates, taking into account current industry practices which would permit a more rapid writeoff of new equipment for tax purposes."

The most glaring, and most indefensible, shackle on the cotton textile industry is the present two-price system under which all overseas mills can purchase our cotton at a 34-percent discount, which is denied the domestic mills. The gap between prices of cotton to foreign and domestic mills has recently widened. I doubt that, in the long run, it is wise to give such a discount, merely to aid the movement of our cotton crop. Present legislation, passed last year, is intended, over a period of years, to remove the two-price system. In the meantime, so long as there is any differential, there is an acute injustice being committed every day to our cotton industry. Its very existence is justification for the kind of countervailing duty to compensate for the differential, as described in the 9th recommendation of the Pastore report, and for H.R. 4033 and S. 314.

The first order of business of the new Textile Committee should be to find ways and means to expedite termination of the two-price system, and interim methods of compensation to the industry.

Apart from plant, equipment, and materials, the third major item of cost is productivity. This, in the last analysis, depends greatly on the efficiency of equipment and method. Private and governmental research activities, of course, lead to this end, as well as more effective dissemination of existing knowledge. There will be, increasingly, another source of ideas and techniques tending to improve productivity. It is the techniques employed by other countries. Although much of textile production techniques may remain shielded by the cloak of trade secrets, much of it—as in this country—is commonly known and often published. Again, the Textile Committee would perform a valuable service if it could enlist the efforts of the State and Commerce Departments in the systematic collection and distribution of all relevant information.

TRADE POLICY

A sensitive administration of quotas by categories, fluctuating according to changing conditions, would seem to be increasingly necessary during the next 5 years, unless the industry's share of the domestic purchasing dollar greatly improves. Perhaps more useful than the quota itself is the certainty that it would be promptly applied to avoid a massive invasion of a category or drastic price disorder. That is, if a manufacturer in country X were to know that overemphasis by him in a particular line would predictably bring the imposition of a category quota, the possibility is that he would not make too heavy an investment in tooling up for a short-lived venture. Hence, it may be well for the Textile Committee to frame a statement of policy which, if adopted by the Executive, would serve notice on other countries that there would be no bonanzas for overconcentration on particular lines.

A modest but helpful achievement would be the faster processing of escape clause and peril point cases. There is some merit to certainty about such matters, whether a decision is favorable or not.

FOREIGN AID

The fourth recommendation of the Pastore report was restrained and reasonable. It did not call for purchase of all textile commodities in the United States. What it said was this:

"4. What we suggest is that careful study be made of the long-run consequences of further expansion of world textile capacity before additional grants be made to other countries to expand their own textile production for the international market. There

need be no fear of a lack of other investment outlets. And while the textile industry is attractive to underdeveloped countries because of the large number of jobs created per dollar of investment, there are numerous alternative investment opportunities which would provide new job opportunities and rising income in those countries."

As the result of two amendments to the Mutual Security Act which I sponsored last year, no development loan can be made without a consideration of the impact of the loan on our domestic economy. Moreover, studies must be made of the impact of our entire mutual security program on our economy. There have been, in Sudan, and Ethiopia, loans approved for the establishment of textile mills. In accordance with the new loan criterion, the possible impact on our economy was carefully considered. However, what was not considered was (1) whether, in the foreseeable future, the country in question could be a customer of the United States or any of our competitors; and (2) how such a country fitted into the worldwide picture I have mentioned before. That is, if India could be expected to supply Sudan in the next decade, or if Sudan eventually could be a cash customer of ours, or of India, or of Japan, then it is not far-sighted to assist such countries to enter the industry. Nor is it a favor to them.

It may therefore be appropriate for additional and very stringent criteria to be invoked whenever U.S. assistance for competition to our crisis industries is sought.

On the positive side, Public Law 480 should not be abandoned as a useful means of assisting the industry. Last year Congress added cotton textile products to the list of goods which could be sold overseas for local currency. In the case of textiles, local currency could be received as payment for only the raw material part of the cost. The remainder had to be paid in dollars. The Department of Agriculture, it is only fair to say, did not view this amendment with approval. It has never made serious efforts to make this provision helpful. It has not surveyed markets to see if a deal for part local currency, part dollars would appeal to a buyer.

It may well be that more careful and sympathetic exploration of the possibilities of Public Law 480 would be fruitful. For example, resort to Public Law 480 could be conditioned on a depressed condition in textiles. It could be viewed as a counter cyclical weapon.

STABILITY IN THE INDUSTRY

Recently the industry has experienced 2-year cycles of prosperity and depression. Let me quote from page 10 of the Pastore report:

"One factor contributing to the periodic variations in textile output is the poor state of knowledge in the industry about the inventory situations at a given time and its effects on future prices. This is due to the lack of reliable and timely statistical data on the general state of the market; i. e., the relationship between production and inventories or the flow of goods through the production and marketing pipelines. Some industry spokesmen testified that there is need for greater discipline within the industry, and suggested that improved statistical data would permit mill managements to gear production more closely to the current level of demand."

Not only could the Textile Committee initiate the collection and publication of this data, but it could itself, by virtue of its meetings and discussions, be a major stabilizing force, a source of discipline voluntarily acted upon by the industry. At least the effort seems well worth making. Naturally, all possible antitrust implications would have to be thoroughly studied.

Only in the context of a determination to take the long view and to help textiles survive and prosper in a new world of omnipresent competition does a bill such as H.R. 4033 or S. 314 make sense. Without attention to these other matters, the industry faces a future of the most vigorous competition, ill prepared to meet it. The export subsidy of H.R. 4033 would help slow down the rate at which the boat sinks.

Mr. Howard Troutman, vice president of the Bates Manufacturing Co., has described the current relationship between Uncle Sam and the textile industry as a fairweather partnership. I have attempted to describe a relationship between coach and player. There are certain things Uncle Sam can do to prepare the cotton textile industry for its toughest competition. It can help get and spread the facts of life today and tomorrow. It can help stimulate basic technical and economic research. It can dramatically lower costs of operation through realistic depreciation rates and abolition of the 34 percent discrimination against domestic plants in cotton pricing. It can more sensitively administer the safety valves of quotas, and escape clauses. It can help acquire and distribute information on foreign markets and foreign techniques. It can exercise restraint when asked to add to the world's textile capacity by loan or grant. It can, particularly in times of textile depression, distribute textile products under Public Law 480 to needy peoples. And it can aid the disciplining of the industry by the collection and analysis of production, sales, and inventories data.

No one of these things can be called a crutch. There are other industries and economic pursuits where much more in the nature of Government assistance is both asked and received.

Let these things be done, however, and watch our cotton textile industry enter the lists without despair. But, first, take the shackles off its feet.

Fraternal Order of Eagles Supports Youth Conservation Corps Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, an excellent article explaining the proposed Youth Conservation Corps was published in the August-September 1959 issue of the Eagle magazine. Author of the article is the originator of the Youth Conservation Corps bill, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. As a cosponsor of Senator HUMPHREY's proposal, I heartily endorse the sentiments expressed in his article. When we consider the great gains for conservation made by the Civilian Conservation Corps under Franklin D. Roosevelt during the 1930's, we can realize that the Youth Conservation Corps in our own time faces a similar challenge and necessity.

It is appropriate that the periodical of the Fraternal Order of Eagles should publish this article by Senator HUMPHREY, because the Eagles have crusaded

for many other causes such as social security and jobs after 40. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, entitled "Why Not a Youth Conservation Corps?" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY NOT A YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS?

(By Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

Senator, these boys just have nothing to do. They live in the street, they are bored with life, and about the only thing they have to look forward to is the next "rumble."

The man who said this to me knows what he is talking about. He is the pastor of a large church who has studied the mounting problem of juvenile delinquency and has devoted a good part of his life to helping underprivileged youngsters. He has not gained insight into juvenile delinquency by merely reading newspapers, reports, and studies. He has been educated in this field by spending long and heartbreaking hours beside the desk sergeants, the juvenile court judges, and the superintendents of reform schools. He has learned firsthand of the awful waste of young minds and bodies, and he is frightened.

"Too often we take the easy course of punishment and confinement, and so compound the tragedy rather than to strive for solutions which deal with the root of the problem. We must find them something to be proud of, some work so that at the end of the day they can have a feeling of accomplishment—a feeling they have contributed something worthwhile and that they are needed," my friend said.

He was right, of course, and from that moment on I have been seeking means to aid these youngsters who are doomed to useless lives unless they can be shown the correct path.

No one knows better than myself that I do not have all of the answers, but after a good deal of thought and consultation with authorities in the field I do have a plan I think would be of invaluable assistance to these boys and, at the same time, be of lasting benefit to our country. It is a plan which would aid in halting not only the erosion of the moral fiber of our young people, but also the forces which are constantly eroding and destroying our forests and plains.

My plan, which I have laid before the Senate as a bill, calls for the establishment of a pilot Youth Conservation Corps of approximately 150,000 young men. They would be enrolled in units of 50 boys and assigned to Federal conservation agencies. Recruitment, overall budgetary control, responsibility for the maintenance of minimum standards for working hours, and health and educational programs would be vested in a director under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Essentially, these are the provisions of the bill:

1. Young men who have reached their 16th birthday would be permitted to enroll in the program. They would receive food, lodging, clothing, transportation, and be paid on a scale identical to that of any Army private.

2. They would be put into on-the-job training situations throughout the conservation field, receiving vigorous work under careful supervision.

3. In addition to the training they would receive from professional conservation people, 20 percent of their time would be devoted to other vocational and academic training.

Our objectives, as was mentioned previously, are two fold. First, we want to help

these young men by giving them an opportunity to work on useful, constructive, and lasting projects. This, together with guidance and a chance to get some education which otherwise might not be available would be their therapy.

The Nation itself would benefit immeasurably, not only by regaining the usefulness of these young citizens, but we could do much to preserve our natural resources by taking steps to halt the destruction taking place in our vast public lands. Each year fires which could be prevented, floods that could be eradicated are laying waste to thousands upon thousands of acres of forest and fertile plains—all this at a time when the Forest Service predicts our future needs for lumber and wood products will be far greater than estimated yields.

No one who walks today through the green young forests—which in the early thirties were barren, burned-over tracts of waste—can fail to recognize the wonderful contribution made at that time by the boys who worked in the Civilian Conservation Corps. No one who visits our national parks can deny credit to the young men who, 25 years ago, did so much to beautify and preserve these areas which are now enjoyed by millions of Americans each year. The relatively small investment we made in the CCC has returned handsome dividends even though we were not aware of the many advanced methods of conservation now available.

The Youth Conservation Corps could do much more by utilizing modern scientific methods in checking duststorms, floods, and forest fires. These young men could make vast contributions to future generations by adding to our ability to produce the food, fiber, shelter, water, and recreational areas our ever-expanding population will demand. I am convinced that, if given this chance, thousands of the boys who now roam the streets—unemployed and with nothing but time on their hands—would welcome the opportunity to spend a year or two in the great outdoors.

I am happy to say that this proposal has been received with enthusiasm from persons in all walks of life.

It has been most gratifying, and I am determined to press forward in my efforts to acquaint as many people as possible with what I believe is the vast potential of this proposal. If we can do this, I am sure that support for the program will be widespread.

The opportunity is here—not only to solve the "just nothing to do" statement of my pastor friend, but to strengthen the moral and mental fiber of our troubled youth and to enhance our Nation's natural resources as well.

Letter in Support of Equal Pricing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following letter from Mr. Roy Clapper, a businessman from Lincoln, Ill. Mr. Clapper has written Mr. George Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business in support of my equal pricing bill, H.R. 2729, which is before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

It is a pleasure to bring Mr. Clapper's views on this legislation to the attention of this body:

CLAPPER'S,

Lincoln, Ill., August 3, 1959.

Mr. GEORGE BURGER,
Vice President, National Federation of Independent Business, Washington Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GEORGE: I have just finished reading your statement of July 21, 1959, regarding H.R. 2729. It leaves me breathless. It is a masterpiece. I wish every independent businessman in the United States were forced to read it or pay a \$1,000 fine, or go to jail for 2 months, or both.

To me, the passage of H.R. 2729 is as vital to the future of independent business, as each individual's heart is to him.

What can we do in the field to help move H.R. 2729 into law? I would like to have quite a few copies of the printed hearings.

Cordially yours,

ROY CLAPPER.

Appointment of Douglass Cater to the Chair of Journalism at Princeton University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate Princeton University. It has founded a new chair of journalism and public relations, and the first occupant of that chair will be one of the most distinguished and perceptive Washington commentators, Douglass Cater.

I have known Doug Cater for many years. In common with most of my colleagues, I have developed a high respect for his abilities and for his thoroughness.

It would have been difficult for Princeton University to have found a better man for this assignment.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article from the New York Times concerning Doug Cater's appointment.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 11, 1959]
PRINCETON OFFERS FIRST JOURNALISM—NEW COURSE TO START IN FALL—CAPITOL CORRESPONDENT TO CONDUCT SEMINARS

PRINCETON, N.J., August 10.—Princeton University will offer its first course in journalism and public relations in the coming academic year.

Following a 2-year study by a special faculty committee on how such a course could best be integrated into a liberal arts institution, the university has established a chair in journalism and public relations. It utilized bequests totaling half a million dollars.

The professorship honors Edwin F. Ferris, and his widow, M. E. Cornelia Ferris, former residents of Dunmore, Pa., whose estates left the funds for it. Mr. Ferris was an 1899 graduate of Princeton. He had served as

financial editor of the New York Herald and as business manager of the Scranton Truth.

OTHER SEMINARS PLANNED

Douglass Cater, 36-year-old Washington correspondent for the Reporter magazine and author of "The Fourth Branch of Government," will be the first incumbent of the chair.

He will serve during the first term of the coming academic year and conduct weekly seminars under the auspices of the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs. Other journalists will conduct subsequent seminars on temporary appointments in the initial stages of the program. Eventually a permanent appointment will be made.

The three-member faculty committee that made the study consulted a number of practicing journalists who were familiar with Princeton to get their ideas. According to J. Douglas Brown, dean of the faculty, the seminars "will explore intensively the manner in which the modern-day journalist assists in the process of policy formation and execution in both the legislative and executive branches of the Government through the communication of information and the reflection of public opinion."

PRINCIPLES SET FORTH

The faculty committee outlined these basic principles for consideration in the new program of instruction:

"That the [journalism] profession needs, and needs desperately at this time, young men who have a sound training in liberal studies, with a specialty such as economics, politics, public affairs, or natural science;

"That such young men should also have been made aware, through their Princeton education, of the great current events in their historical perspective;

"That they should also have had training in the writing of compository prose which would emphasize the necessity for lucid definition and apt analogy and would enable them to engage and hold the interest of the public in abstruse subjects."

In its initial stages, the public-relations aspects of the Ferris program will supplement courses already in the curriculum, including those in the Wilson School as well as those in the departments of English, politics, and psychology.

The Labor Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, today this body begins debate on one of the most controversial and emotionally charged problems that we have had to face thus far—the consideration of labor-management reform legislation.

It is perhaps the most important as well, not because of the fact that there exists flagrant abuse of power on the part of certain labor leaders; it is important because the type of labor-management reform legislation we pass will affect every person in these United States.

It is because of the widespread effect such legislation will have on the daily lives of all our citizens that we must avoid extremes in this field.

Labor-management reform proposals have been supercharged with emotion. Extremists, thinking only of their own areas of special interests, have promoted one proposal above another.

The principal purpose of this legislation is to eliminate the corruption, the racketeering, the gangsterism, the misuse of funds, the coercion, and all the evils that have been brought to public attention through congressional committees. Its principal purpose is not, nor should it be, to impede the growth and function of legitimate unions, or to destroy the rights the working man has gained over the past years in one sweeping, ill-considered, and hasty action.

A New York Times editorial in the edition of Saturday, August 8, 1959, expresses serious thought along these lines, and I should like to bring it to the attention of this body by inserting this editorial in full.

The editorial follows:

THE LABOR BILLS

There is hardly any field of legislation more difficult than that dealing with the regulation of labor unions. We have passed in about a quarter of a century from a stage in which it was deemed necessary to protect the basic rights of labor to a stage in which great labor organizations not only can bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, but command powers comparable with those of the greatest of our corporations and of our industrial organizations. In the situation which exists today we have to redefine the rights of the individual, whether the individual is a member or prospective member of a union, whether he is an employer or member of an employer's organization, or whether he is one of those ironically rare creatures who truly represent the general public.

The President on Thursday evening gave his support to the most drastic of the pending labor bills. He called the Landrum-Griffin measure "a good start toward a real reform bill containing many of the corrective provisions I have urged." To George Meany, AFL-CIO president, this same bill is unacceptable because, as Mr. Meany argued in his own radio speech, it penalizes legitimate practices of legitimate unions.

It would be folly for any layman to endorse any of the pending labor bills as 100 percent perfect. What we can do is to indicate objectives. These might be listed as follows: first, a requirement of financial integrity and open accounting on the part of union officials; second, honest and frequent elections to make certain that labor leaders, like political leaders, are held responsible to their constituents; third, that the bargaining processes be orderly and their results made public; fourth, that innocent parties be protected against secondary boycotting and against what the President calls black-mail picketing, or any other kind of unfair coercion; and, fifth, that labor be guaranteed against the intrusion of crooks and gangsters into its unions.

This is, as Mr. Meany said in his opening sentence, a critical moment in the history of American labor. It is also a critical moment in our society, for this is an issue of power in which the rights of the individual and the rights of the community are involved. We would not reduce organized labor to the relatively weak position it occupied 25 years ago. On the other hand, we must be sure that economic power is reasonably well balanced, and that it is wisely and humanely used—and this principle applies to the great employer groups as well as to the great labor groups.

We think the pending bills should be re-examined, and particularly that the provisions of the Landrum-Griffin bill ought to be put under the microscope to make sure that in penalizing the wrong practices of some labor leaders they do not interfere with any right and proper practices of the great majority of honest and conscientious labor leaders.

The South Is the Negro's Best Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate an article appearing in the State, of Columbia, S.C., dated August 9, 1959, entitled "The South Is the Negro's Best Friend," written by Isaiah Hennie, a Negro teacher born in South Carolina and living in South Carolina.

Mr. President, this article can hardly be improved by my comment, other than to say it is one of the finest presentations of general conditions in the South regarding race relations and the opportunities of Negro citizens that I have ever read.

To quote from the author:

"The Negro's progress is virtually unlimited in the South."

I ask unanimous consent that this article together with the editor's note giving information concerning the author, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editor's note were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the State, Columbia, S.C., Aug. 9, 1959]

THE SOUTH IS THE NEGRO'S BEST FRIEND

(By Isaiah Hennie)

There have been scores of books which have attempted to depict the plight of Southern Negroes. Some authors have scratched the surface, some probed deeply, while others have grossly exaggerated, yelping "wolf" when there was actually no "wolf." Notwithstanding the fact that everything has not been peaches and cream for Southern Afro-Americans, things are not as bleak as some might have you believe, not by a long shot.

Periodically, there might occur in isolated places minor flareups and misunderstandings between the races, but Southern Negroes are really living the good life. They aren't merely existing as are some of his fellow men in many of the large, metropolitan cities, where everything is hustle and bustle; where no one seems to have his neighbor's welfare at heart; where nobody seems to care when you're ill, broke, ill clad, poorly housed, destitute; in short, where no one gives a hoot about you.

WHITES ARE FRANK

There is but one major factor which has brought about such progress for Southern Negroes: Southern white people. Yes, you heard right. I said Southern whites. For they are the Negro's best friend. Better thinking whites are sympathetic, patient, and

possess a deep compassion for the less fortunate. Let us get the record straight now, once and for all: Southern white people do not pretend. If they don't like you, you'll soon know it. They don't put on a false face, as I've been told some do in the big cities; they don't smile at you as a ruse and get closer to stab you in the back, but are frank, right to the point. And that is no mean compliment, for nothing is as low as deception.

INCIDENTS

I should like to cite some incidents to substantiate my contention that the average right-thinking southerner has deep compassion for his fellow man, Negroes included.

Several years ago, in Anderson County, S.C., a group of Negro boys were swimming in a creek, when suddenly, one started drowning. The others yelled frantically for help, which attracted a white man, driving a furniture truck, who stopped, ran toward the bank. "Don't worry, son, I'll save you," the white man hollered, pulling off his clothing. Unfortunately, both went under; they drowned. I didn't learn whether the stricken boy grabbed the white man in a vital spot, while in his death throes, or whether the rescuer was stricken. But I do know that this was one of the most outstanding feats of heroism in the annals of human history. Tears streamed down my cheeks as I read of the tragedy, for I could well visualize a young man, about 30, just beginning to take his place in life, with a brilliant future before him, suddenly losing his life. But the manner in which he lost his life was more important. A national organization gave his family a posthumous citation for his vain effort.

In another remote section of South Carolina, a white couple raised a Negro boy, whose parents had died. His name was Willie; the couple developed a very keen interest in little Willie; there wasn't anything Willie wanted that they didn't try to get for him. Willie was treated as one of the family, and, when he reached school age, he was enrolled, and attended regularly. When about 12 Willie violated a school regulation, for which the principal punished him severely, leaving several welts on Willie.

When Mr. —, Willie's adopted father, learned of this, he made a beeline for the school. He was infuriated. He gave the principal such a scolding the latter beat a hasty retreat, that very day. The white family contended that they sent little Willie to school to become educated, not to be unmercifully manhandled by a hotheaded principal. It was the white family's desire to make a doctor of Willie. However, Willie became a little bored with school, and, after finishing high school, was married, to the family's dismay. They still loved little Willie though, for they bought him a fine six-room bungalow adjacent to theirs. They even set Willie up in a fine grocery business. Willie, now fully grown, with a family, is still embedded within the hearts of his white benefactors.

SOUTH MISREPRESENTED

No, you don't have to go afar to find white southerners who are kind, Christian-hearted, sincere in their undertakings. They are right around you, everywhere; you seldom read about them because the South's enemies aren't interested in this; but propaganda to the contrary, which would picture the South similar to one of Hitler's concentration camps, during World War II, as far as Negroes are concerned.

I worked in a cafe one summer as dishwasher. The chief cook was a buxom Negress named Carrie. The proprietors, native South Carolinians, were very fond of, and devoted to Carrie, calling her Big Mamma. She had nursed and practically raised all of their three children, Mary,

Charles, and James, who gave Carrie great respect, apparently more than they gave their own parents.

I recall a scolding Carrie gave Charlie one morning for his not making up his bed and cleaning the room. About a half-hour later, Carrie went upstairs to check the room. There was a look of anger on her oval face when she returned to the kitchen. Charlie was busy raiding the refrigerator in the pantry. To my utter surprise, I saw Carrie pull Charlie across her lap, slap him across his posterior anatomy about a dozen times. When she let him loose, Charlie went whimpering into the dining room, where his parents were eating breakfast.

"What's the matter, son?" the father inquired.

"Big Mamma spanked me," he whined, wiping his face. "I didn't make up the bed and clean my room on time."

"Well," the mother interjected, "you must remember to do as Big Mamma tells you; she's been taking care of you for all these years, and I know she wouldn't tell you anything wrong."

Charlie, a husky 17-year-old, made a hasty exit and made his bed.

Big Mamma was highly respected by these whites. What she said was usually gospel final. And, when she died, her employers took her passing as seriously as Big Mamma's immediate family.

WHITE HELPERS

Enroute from Orangeburg, S.C., last spring, I had car trouble. All of a sudden, the motor ran hot. I stopped at a service station, thinking the motor had developed trouble because of a crack in the motor, caused by the severe freeze the past winter.

"No wonder it's overheated, fellow," the attendant said. "The fan belt's broken. I'm sorry, but I don't carry them; but I'm sure you will find them at the next station, about 4 miles up the road."

I was amazed at the very keen interest this young white lad had shown; he didn't know me from Adam's house cat. But he seemed to have been reared in a Christian atmosphere. He even tried to get a man with a truck to push me to the other station, but to no avail.

Being very cautious, I finally made it to the station. The belt was available, all right; but there was no one to put it on. The only one on duty at the time, was a settled white lady, who said her colored attendant was off Wednesday afternoons. However, I waited, hoping someone would come along who'd help me. I didn't have to wait very long, for soon, three white men arrived. They bought cold drinks and cigarettes. The proprietress seemed to know one. She said: "Listen, Mr. Alford: This man bought a fan belt, but he can't put it on. I wonder if you'd put it on for him."

"Sure," he said. He finished his drink, lit a cigarette, rolled up his sleeves, then raised the hood. I could readily see that he knew something about an automobile. Five minutes later, the fan belt was on. I asked him what did I owe him, and he answered: "Not one dime," I'm glad I could help you."

"Oh, no sir," I replied, reaching into my shirt pocket. I pushed a dollar bill in his pocket, and just as quickly as it takes you to say one, two, three, he rammed it right back into my pocket.

"Like I said," the white fellow said, wiping his hands, "I'm glad I could be of help to you. I may be on the highway needing help some day; you never can tell, you know."

I've related this good deed any number of times to groups, classes, and fraternal gatherings. My contention is that you will find

kind, Christian-hearted, God-fearing people everywhere you may go, geographical barriers being not a determining factor.

PENNSYLVANIA VISITOR

I was recently in the company of a visitor from a large town in Pennsylvania, who was obsessed with all kinds of propaganda about our dear old South, lynching parties, laughing barrels for Negroes, and a myriad of other falsehoods which she'd heard about the South. Well, it was my duty and pleasure to straighten her out.

I began by giving her a nice lecture on the southern Negro's progress: Excellent schools, churches, clubs, colleges, and homes. I summed it up by taking her on a sight-seeing tour of Columbia, our capital city, showing the modern, spacious, well-designed homes of Negroes, many of which are equal to the best in northern elite districts.

My host was utterly surprised at what she'd seen. I told her that she'd only seen the surface; to observe more would have required much more time.

I emphasized that the South is the Negro's promised land. The Negro's destiny lies in the South, where his welfare is at heart, where he can pursue anything which he feels capable of undertaking, where there is virtually no limit to the heights to which he can ascend, the only prerequisite being thrift, honesty, courtesy, and minding one's own business.

PROSPEROUS NEGROES

That's is, in a nutshell. It is no hidden secret that some of the most prosperous farmers among Negroes are located in what is known as the Deep South. Look through any national Negro publication and more than likely you will read something about this or that Negro farmer who won such and such a prize for poultry or livestock. Moreover, scores of Negro farmers own their farms.

Financially, economically, and socially, the southern Negro is making tremendous progress, is vastly in the lead of his northern counterpart, for far too many Negroes in the North are merely existing, not living enthusiastically, as are southern Negroes. The overwhelming majority of northern Negroes have their noses to the grinding stone, so to speak; they are continually on the go, ripping and romping; it's work, work, and more work; but very high rent, groceries, and fuel, keep them on a treadmill. It's forever "tote that bale," "hue that stone," "root little pig, or die." There is lacking in the large northern cities that serenity, peacefulness, contentment, and vigor which southern Negroes daily enjoy.

TENSION RELIEVED

Another point, on which I should like to talk briefly, is to attempt to prove my assertion that our southern white friends have a warm, affectionate feeling toward Negroes. In a mill town in the Piedmont area of South Carolina, a series of racial disturbances occurred during the last war period. On successive Saturday nights, Negroes had been manhandled and roughed up severely by some white rowdies. Feeling was tense; there was much talk of mass retaliation by Negroes. The mill president, a very wealthy man, who'd risen from obscurity to become a millionaire, saw the urgent need for intervention.

The majority of whites and Negroes worked for him, which was very important. He went on the air at the local radio station, admonished that anyone caught molesting Negroes, or disturbing the peace, would be fired immediately. There were no more incidents, and soon everything returned to normalcy.

These are the kindly deeds which are done so frequently all over the South, about

which so many people never learn. To the stern critics of the South, I should like to remind them of an old adage: "There is so much bad in the best of us, and so much good in the worst of us, that it ill behooves any of us to talk about the rest of us."

Yes, there is so, so much bad in the so-called liberals, from points North; the bulk of them are false pretenders; maybe there are some who are not, but compared with the hypocritical type, they are like a lost ball in high weeds.

Our good southern white people are frank, nondeceitful, won't act as though they like you if they don't, which is so vitally important in our everyday relations.

IN CHICAGO

In Chicago, some 3 years ago, a Negro, a Korean veteran, moved into a predominantly white housing project. There was a tremendous protest from the whites, who resented the Negro's presence. Windows were broken, pickets patrolled the area; the Chicago Police Department had to dispatch over 300 police to prevent violence upon the Negro family. Police patrolled around the clock.

This is a vivid picture of the hypocrisy of the so-called liberals. This incident would not have occurred in the South. Conversely, I know of many neighborhoods, in our dear South, where whites and Negroes are neighbors. This is not said to condone this practice, but rather to show that conditions are not half as bad as they are pictured by some radicals, who try to picture the South as some uncivilized, backwoods place, where everyone is ignorant.

Over 90 percent of our Negro leaders and educators are southern Negroes. Two of the foremost, and most financially powerful Negro insurance companies—namely, the North Carolina Mutual, of Durham, and the Pilgrim, of Augusta, Ga., were organized and established in the South. I could go on and on, naming successful business organizations, and Negro individuals, who have reached the pinnacle of success right here in the South.

There are no barriers to prevent Negroes who are progressive and have insight from rising.

PROGRESS IN SOUTH

The Negro's progress is virtually unlimited in the South. I personally pity those who continually migrate northward, for most of these migrants eventually will end up in some slum area, some become wards of the welfare departments.

The mass exodus continually goes on uninterrupted, night and day, year in and year out, to giant industrial cities, which are already overcrowded, with housing facilities way below par; exorbitant rents, caused partly by the Negro's wanton disregard for property.

Unfortunately, my people have, generally, a tendency to deface property. And there would seem to be justification for steep house rent, when the occupants persist in destroying the property. I should know, for, as a teacher, I have to be ever on the alert, lest some teenager should carve a desk with a pocket knife.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—Isalah Hennie, a Negro, is teacher of history at John Ford High School in St. Matthews. He is a native of Columbia and a graduate of Booker T. Washington High School and Allen University. He lives at 1521 Harden Street in Columbia. His wife, Irene, teaches at Kirkwood Elementary School in Kershaw County. Hennie's avocation is song writing. Two of his songs have been published and played on national networks. "Leave It to Me" was recorded on Wings records (subsidiary of Mercury) by the Griffin brothers. "I Want To Be the Only One" was recorded under the Derrick label by Kip Anderson, a senior at Benedict College in Columbia.

Dancey in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the 17th and 18th articles of a series by Editor Charles L. Dancey appearing in the August 5 and 6 issues of the Peoria Journal Star respectively:

EVEN REDS ENJOY MARINE HYMN

(By Charles L. Dancey)

ON THE DON RIVER.—By the second day I became a privileged character of the "Yuri Krimov" steaming up the Don.

Among my new friends was Dmitri, who was a party member and who presented me with a little leather pocket book of rules for the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

He also handed the officer of the watch a bottle of beer after which we two enjoyed the privilege of going up to the bridge whenever there was anything of interest to see.

At one point he remarked to me that he was an "official" of some kind—or perhaps the word was "officer"—(they are similar in Russian and both almost like their word for "waitress") and he added: "You don't have any friends in my kind of work."

He seemed like a fellow who needed a friend. I don't think anyone can propagandize human nature out of existence.

As we passed from the Don into the Volga canal (cameras strictly forbidden on deck from this point on) a group gathered in the bow with one young fellow playing his accordion, and they sang songs.

They would take turns entertaining, also. "Say something in English," they said. And then they would all lean over to hear the words they didn't understand.

Finally, "Sing an American song," they urged.

I looked out across the dark waters, at the huge statues ahead flanking the gates of the first lock into what they proudly call the sea that Stalin made, and sang one chorus of the Marine Hymn.

"Take off your glasses," they urged.

I took them off and pretended I could hardly see.

They laughed, and shouted jokingly, "Kraseev, tak kraseev" (So handsome.) and other joshing remarks. I turned to a huge portrait of Khrushchev reaching from the deck floor to the bridge deck above, still squinting without glasses and said: "Kto eo?" (Who's that?)

They roared with laughter, the picture was so huge and so close.

"Ah!" said I, slowly, "Eisenhower."

Reactions tell you a lot. They laughed twice as hard.

"Yuri Krimov" I tried. More laughter, cries of "Nyet!"

Finally, "Oh, Nikita—Nikita—what's his last name?"

And that closed out the "shutka" (joke) with gales of laughter. I didn't have the guts to say "Leon Trotsky?" And I can't help but feel that if it had been a picture of Stalin it wouldn't have been funny.

Finally, Lida, a teenager now working as an assistant librarian in Rostov (and a member of Komsomol, the Communist Youth organization—I know because she offered me her Komsomol pin) wrinkled up her forehead and asked: "Why are Negroes lynched in America?"

Dmitri swung angrily from the rail to her and said that same word that Alex had tossed out the day before, only Dmitri barked it at her: "Propaganda."

FLOWER BREAK STARTS DON DAY

(By Charles L. Dancey)

ON THE DON RIVER.—I got up at dawn (5 o'clock) in time to see Masha, the poor girl whose job is it to scrub decks in the early morning and clean up cabins later in the day, let out a squeal from the deck below and run from our boat across a barge and over onto the bank of the river.

There she was gathering wild flowers. She dashed back aboard with an armful as we pulled away again. From the upper deck I watched her arrange them into a large and a small bouquet.

Three hours later when I returned from breakfast, there was the large bouquet in the main salon—the small bouquet in my little cabin on the tiny desk there.

At that breakfast I remarked that I was hungry—just conversationally, and the waitress brought me an omelet that was tremendous, lapping all sides of the plate.

Most of my friends aboard now call me "Char-lee"—they simply cannot manage "Chuck" at all—and occasionally I find one of them using the familiar form of the word "you" instead of the more polite form "vwee" or "vash."

One of the men remarked flatly in conversation that "capitalism and communism are just words" and the question is how do we "get things done" in America.

Forty-two years of carefully controlled one-sided information has created a people here, judging by those on the boat with reasonable amount of education, who are ravenous in their curiosity—about books and movies that are modern and that they are not allowed to see.

One person told me I ought to go to Siberia where big things are being done.

"Your Government won't let me," I said.

"Oh!"

Another said I ought to go to Latvia and see the beautiful city of Riga.

"Your Government won't let me."

I overheard a mechanic from the boat crew speculating that I was not a real tourist but as near as I could make it out some sort of a spy or saboteur—and the others quickly talked him down.

Meanwhile, we climbed up through a series of locks into the manmade sea. "Stalin said build it, and it was built." Then started to climb back down to the Volga through another series of locks.

Again we sat up until after midnight talking.

At one point, I was talking to four fellows and they were talking pretty much about politics, and about Germany, too (one of them was a major of tanks who fought at Stalingrad) when a policeman in uniform came up and sat down very near by. (He may have boarded at one of the stops.)

One of the men gave a kind of a "jiggers, the cops," warning gesture and word, and another fellow looked up—I think it was Dmitri, and announced loudly what he thought about the nosey, blankety-blank police.

The uniformed officer got up in embarrassment and walked away.

As we approached Stalingrad, Ivan gave me his pocket pencil, and Lida and Alla came up and pressed on me a book by Turgenyev.

When the Intourist guide appeared at the dock, boarded, and approached, these friends quietly melted away.

They were the only people I felt I had really gotten to know and like, and I hated to see them go and to return to the forbidding miles ahead.

A Mess of Pottage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the question of Federal aid to education is the subject of a controversy which demands the attention of every citizen of this country. The dangerous effects of such a program must be judiciously considered by every person who believes in fiscal responsibility and is opposed to dictated conformity upon people of divergent views.

One of the outstanding educators of my State of South Carolina, Dr. James C. Kinard, has discussed the issue of Federal aid to education with rare prospect and objectivity. As a former president of Newberry College in Newberry, S.C., Dr. Kinard is eminently qualified to alert the citizenry to the dangers inherent in an extensive program of Federal doles and resultant Federal control. It is for this reason that I ask unanimous consent that the editorial of Dr. Kinard, appearing in the August 6, 1959, edition of the prominent Aiken Standard and Review of Aiken, S.C., be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Aiken (S.C.) Standard and Review, Aug. 6, 1959]

A MESS OF POTTAGE

(By Dr. James C. Kinard)

The National Education Association has won a well deserved position of prestige. Its membership is composed of administrators and teachers from the largest to the smallest schools. Steady pressure is constantly exerted to bring into the organization all who are engaged in the teaching profession.

It seems to be generally accepted that the primary purposes are to raise teacher salaries to adequate levels, to improve educational standards and to strengthen the physical facilities for the training of our youth. With such worthy objectives there can be no quarrel.

But there are open to serious question some plans now apparent being ardently advocated. Many thoughtful citizens are concerned over the emphasis being given toward securing Federal grants for public school education. They fear the inherent prospect of Government control over our schools.

The proponents of this program try to assure us that there will be no such danger. But actual experience with other activities subsidized by Federal funds shows that Washington is not in the habit of appropriating tax money without having a hand in regulating its expenditure. It stands to reason that those who are held responsible for such grants will feel under obligation to supervise the spending. As an indication of the present trend there is talk of a "national curriculum." This very clearly implies a standardized course of instruction for all schools and all pupils, regardless of local needs and adaptability. The whole process of education is doomed to farcical failure if we come to the point of attempting to

put diplomas on an artificial mechanistic basis like automobiles rolling off the assembly line.

In many communities today there are abandoned schools, once the centers of local pride and interest, which stand as pitiful monuments to the current effort to measure the genuine worth of education in terms of big numbers. Mass production in education will not automatically provide a better trained citizenship for tomorrow.

Let us not like Esau, sell our birthright for a mess of pottage, in this case the glamour of Federal money.

Khrushchev's Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat concerned at the immense and massive security measures that are being forecast for the visit of Premier Khrushchev to the United States in September. I would hope that the conduct of this Nation of Americans will be formal and correct toward the visitor.

There are considerable risks in the President's invitation. Our national security policies are subject to reappraisal everywhere by our allies and the neutrals in the light of our behavior. The prospect of emotional reaction, either favorable or unfavorable, could upset the pattern of international relations without any gain for peace.

But, coming as he does upon the invitation of our President, the Premier is entitled to a chance to view this great country, its people and their accomplishments, without harassment or violence. I do not believe that the vast majority of the American people will look with favor on discourtesy and rudeness, even though they fully recognize the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism.

The citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to those who love freedom and justice on every continent, as the President himself said in proclaiming Captive Nations Week last month. The best way all Americans can show their strength and firmness in support of this change in our national policy is by meeting this guest with formal dignity and responsibility.

I would also like to call to the attention of the House, and request unanimous consent to do so, an editorial from the Hartford Courant called "Suddenly, the Summit," which I believe to be a fine, objective presentation of the issues herein.

SUDDENLY, THE SUMMIT

With President Eisenhower's announcement yesterday that Mr. Khrushchev is coming to this country, and extraordinary change in the cold war takes place. There have been springlike hints, but now suddenly it is real. We must welcome this change, with high hope. But we must be realistic about it. This exchange of visits, and all that goes with it in the way of the President's

visits to our allies abroad, may avoid world war III. But it cannot lessen the struggle between freedom and communism.

Last November 27 Mr. Khrushchev issued his famous ultimatum on Berlin. We soon became aware that a Soviet attempt to force us out of Berlin might set off world war III, even without anyone's intending it that way. The Geneva Conference, where Mr. Gromyko was unbending—plainly at Mr. Khrushchev's bidding—underlined the threat. Now all is smiles. Mr. Nixon, highest ranking in a whole stream of official and unofficial visitors to a once tightly sealed Russia, is allowed to speak our thoughts to the Soviet people uncensored. On top of that the impossible has happened. Mr. Khrushchev is coming here, and President Eisenhower is going to Russia.

What does it mean? It does not, and cannot, mean that the cold war is beginning to end. Mr. Khrushchev says he will bury us, and that our grandchildren will live under communism. Even without that, we should know enough by now to realize that Soviet Russia and communism will continue to threaten freedom and democracy throughout the lifetime of all now living, even yesterday's babies. But this thaw in the cold war's deadly climate can nevertheless mean something extraordinary, something without precedent in the history of the world.

Always, since the beginning, man has formed himself into rival, armed groups. It was so between Athens and Sparta, and indeed long before that. It was so among the medieval barons, not only in Europe but in Asia. It was so among the kings who in the end won out over the barons. It was so again with the nation-states that came with Napoleon, right up to the time the 20th century great powers fought the world's two greatest wars. The common thread was an armed rivalry that sooner or later, whether by calculation or by accident, always exploded into warfare.

With the invention of the hydrogen bombs there came something new. Now it doesn't matter who is aggressor and who the intended victim. As long as the two sides are in readiness, once the big ones are let loose there follows mutual destruction. It is even possible that such a war might, through its fallout and other after effects, end all life on this planet.

The leaders of both sides in the cold war's armed rivalry are well aware of this. As long ago as 1954 President Eisenhower told us, "There is no longer any alternative to peace." Therefore it now becomes possible, for the first time in history, that both sides may seek to achieve the ends hitherto always sought in war by peaceful means. Von Clausewitz's famous statement was, "War is an instrument of policy. . . . The conduct of war . . . is therefore policy itself, which takes up the sword in place of the pen." Now we may reverse that, and take up talking in place of firing ICBM's.

There are those who oppose the Russian dictator's coming. But surely the overwhelming proportion of the American people will go along with the President. No one has to go out and cheer, or even to see our visitor, who doesn't feel like it. But surely we are not so small of mind, so shrunken in our hearts, that the only way we can express ourselves is by giving ourselves over to a hatred that can end only in killing. Man reaches for a gun only when he faces problems too big for him to solve.

Are we so small, so poor in mind and spirit, as that? President Eisenhower's invitation to the Soviet dictator is an act of affirmation that we are not.

Well, then, what can come of it? The President made it clear in his extraordinary press conference yesterday that this is no meeting to negotiate on Berlin or any other outstanding East-West difference. He does

not conceive of it as a summit conference at all. And indeed it is not a summit meeting, in the present sense of four-power talks by heads of government to settle special differences. This is, however, a summit meeting in the sense used by Mr. Churchill earlier in the cold war, when he invented the idea of talks "at the summit."

Mr. Churchill had in mind the wartime meetings of the Big Three, in which they coordinated the strategy that won the war. Now, as Mr. Nixon puts it, we are not going to convert Mr. Khrushchev to freedom, any more than he is going to convert us to communism. But in addition to the first great hope—educating Mr. Khrushchev in American realities by what he can see for himself—talks between the two national leaders will achieve the ultimate in talking things over instead of fighting them out.

All this is positive, and hopeful. But lest the American people with their habit of great shifts in sentiment go too far in the other direction, let us be utterly clear in our minds about one thing: Mr. Khrushchev is never going to relax his determination to win the world for communism. No true Marxist ever can. They are dedicated to their dictatorial system, including its ultimate brutality, with a passion like that which sparked the religious wars between the Crusaders and the infidels. It is in the nature of communism to advance and retreat, to zig and to zag, but never to give up its determination to communize the world.

The big difference in Mr. Khrushchev is this: Ever since his famous speech of 1956 to the Twentieth Party Congress, in which he debunked Stalin, he has preached the novel doctrine that communism might win by peaceful means instead of in the Marxist mythology's inevitable final war with a dying capitalism. He still boasts of his rockets and his H-bombs. He still says that communism will fight if we want war. But he also talks of outstripping us economically, and of beating us in the admiration and affection of the world's people.

This visit should help us to see if this may be. If so, the cold war may continue cold indefinitely, perhaps without ever becoming hot. Either way there must be an unyielding struggle for supremacy. But it is now possible that there may be a choice between peaceful competition, and the grim futility of mutual destruction. The President's move shows that we are ready for the peaceful way, if we can have it.

Oregon Juvenile Judges Association Endorses Youth Conservation Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Oregon Council of Juvenile Court Judges, meeting in convention in Eugene, Oreg., during the week of July 27 through July 31, 1959, passed a resolution to provide youth with an opportunity to work which endorses S. 812, to create a Youth Conservation Corps, which I am cosponsoring in the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that this indication of support for the YCC program be printed in the Appendix of the Record for the information of the Senate.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE YOUTH WITH AN OPPORTUNITY TO WORK

Whereas the lack of opportunity for employment and the lack of educational provisions for boys are significant factors in the ever present and expanding problem of juvenile delinquency; and

Whereas the establishment of such a program would develop and conserve the natural resources of our country and would give boys and young men an opportunity to work in the open and to develop physical fitness and character; and

Whereas the initiation of this program provided in Senate 812 now pending in the U.S. Senate for the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for males between the ages of 16 and 21 inclusive: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Oregon Council of Juvenile Court Judges in convention in Eugene, Oreg., That it supports and approves the principle involved in Senate bill 812 and urges that the Congress of the United States take favorable action on said Senate bill 812 or other appropriate legislation to establish this program.

The Constock Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. A. THOMPSON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, development in the field of petroleum has meant much to the success and economy of our Nation. Particularly has it added to the economic growth of the gulf coast areas where far-sighted and competent development of our petroleum industry has been undertaken at great risk of invested capital. In evolving the many processes much assistance has been given in furnishing jobs for those who have been forced to leave the farms or for other reasons have been displaced in our changing economy.

The Continental Oil Co. has been one of those which has added immeasurably to my areas of southwest Louisiana by its faith in the future of our resources. Rather than being satisfied with the production of oil and gas, I am informed by my good friend, Orville Fisher, vice president of the Continental Oil Co., that they have looked beyond our own use of natural gas. The company has developed a method whereby much of this resource, which is normally wasted or unused, can be reduced to liquid and carried in containers much smaller than the potential numbers of cubic feet when in gaseous state, making it possible to be shipped to those in need of fuel. The following is Mr. Fisher's explanation to me as to how this pioneering accomplishment has been brought about. I think it to be sufficiently noteworthy as another "America first" to be commended to the attention of the membership:

OUTLINE OF THE CONSTOCK PROJECT FOR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON

Constock International Methane, Ltd., owned 50 percent by the Continental Oil Co. and 50 percent by the Union Stockyard & Transit Co. of Chicago, has been engaged for several years in all phases of a program to liquefy and transport natural gas. The basic idea of the project is to utilize natural gas which is in overabundant supply in many areas of the world, such as the Middle East and Venezuela, but is shut in or flared to waste for want of accessible markets. When liquefied by refrigeration to a temperature of minus 258° F., the gas is reduced in volume 600 times and will be carried without pressure in this highly concentrated form in specially constructed tankers to energy deficient areas of the world such as Western Europe and Japan.

Due to the extremely low temperatures and intricate technical problems to be solved, shipment of liquid methane by sea has never been attempted before. By early 1959, Constock had spent over \$14 million in developing techniques and equipment for the liquefaction, transportation, and storage of liquid natural gas, and was recognized as the leader in this field throughout the world.

Work on the project really originated as far back as 1951, when Mr. William Wood Prince, then president of the Union Stockyard & Transit Co. of Chicago, started the Chicago Stockyards Research Division on a plan to liquefy natural gas in the southwestern portion of the United States and transport it by barge up the Mississippi to Chicago, where the idea was also to make use of the refrigeration contained in the liquid in the meatpacking operations surrounding the stockyards. Under the direction of Mr. Willard L. Morrison, the stockyards research division commenced construction of liquefaction equipment, mounted on a barge for the sake of mobility, capable of liquefying approximately 7 million cubic feet per day of liquid natural gas, and a transportation barge capable of carrying 35,000 barrels of liquid in 5 tanks of 7,000 barrels each. This activity, carried on for the most part at Pascagoula, Miss., attracted fairly widespread attention, and through a report issued by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development was brought to the notice of the British Gas Council, who, as a major potential customer for imported liquid methane, followed developments closely from this stage on.

In 1954, before completion of the work referred to above, the Continental Oil Co. made a thorough investigation of the progress achieved, and as a result joined the Union Stockyard & Transit Co. in forming the Constock Liquid Methane Corp., for the purpose of developing the whole project on a commercial basis. The Mississippi barge scheme was dropped in favor of large-scale overseas movement of liquid natural gas from countries where natural gas is a surplus commodity to energy deficient countries where there are little or no native supplies and which cannot be supplied by pipelines. It has been concluded that liquid methane cannot for many years compete with pipeline transported gas in the United States nor the fuel oils, but will find its use in the expanding energy market of the European and Asian countries, replacing gas manufactured from coal or oil.

Constock employed expert consultants in all the specialized fields involved in such a new and complex engineering concept. Two tanks on the transportation barge, lined with balsa wood, were completed. The liquefaction barge was completed, and operated successfully throughout 1956. Invaluable experience was gained during this period in the techniques for processing, storing and

handling of large volumes of liquid natural gas. Further, a prototype ship's tank, approximately one-third the size of that visualized on a large tanker, was constructed and tested with liquid nitrogen (at minus 320° F.) simulating insofar as possible on land every conceivable condition that could occur at sea. After the successful conclusion of these tests, the British Gas Council, as a prelude to large-scale importation of liquid methane into Great Britain, indicated their willingness to participate in conversion of a small ship which would make several trial shipments to England in order to demonstrate the feasibility of the novel transportation system developed by Constock.

In the latter half of 1957, the MV *Normartt*, a Cimavi-type dry-cargo vessel of 5,000 deadweight tons, was purchased by Constock. Conversion of this vessel to carry 32,000 barrels of cargo, according to the plans and design drawn up by Constock and its naval architects, the J. J. Henry Co., of New York, was performed under conditions of the strictest secrecy by the Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co., of Mobile, Ala. The ship, renamed the *Methane Pioneer*, was completed in October 1958, after which all its special features were thoroughly tested with liquid methane during sea trials in the Gulf of Mexico. The climax of nearly 7 years of research and development occurred when the *Methane Pioneer* left Lake Charles, La., on January 28, 1959, on her historic maiden voyage to England, carrying a full cargo of 32,000 barrels of liquid methane. This voyage was a complete success: the ship arrived at Canvey Island, situated on the River Thames, near London, on February 20, without incident, and the cargo was discharged without incident into the British built receiving facilities.

Methane, the largest constituent of natural gas, had never before been transported as a liquid by sea; and unlike conventional L.P.G. ships which carry a mixture of propane and butane (or bottled gas) under pressure in heavy metal cylinders, the *Methane Pioneer* is designed to carry liquid gas at atmospheric pressure and minus 258° F. in special aluminum tanks which are installed within heavily insulated holds of the ship. It is impossible to hold methane as a liquid under pressure above its critical temperature of minus 115° F., while the critical temperature of propane and butane is plus 206° F. and 306° F. respectively. Constock's system of transportation of low temperature liquid gas without pressure may also be successfully applied to L.P.G. (propane and butane) and is more economical than the present conventional pressure method of shipping these materials.

The *Methane Pioneer* is owned and operated by British Methane, Ltd., a Bahamian corporation formed jointly by Constock International Methane, Ltd., and the British Gas Council. At the time of writing (June 9, 1959), the *Methane Pioneer* has completed two round trips to England, and will make a number of further trial runs before a decision is made to go ahead on a commercial program. Gas for the experiment is supplied by Constock from the barge mounted liquefaction plant and loading terminal located on the Calcasieu River near Lake Charles, La. Constock's land storage tank, the largest of its kind in the world, has a capacity of 35,000 barrels of liquid for transfer to the ship.

At the unloading end, the British Gas Council has constructed a terminal at Canvey Island, which is situated on the north bank of the River Thames, between Southend and London. Here, two land storage tanks, each capable of holding 15,000 barrels, have been built to store the liquid methane until it is vaporized to gas under pressure and delivered by direct transmission line to the North Thames Gas Board's

works at Romford, about 20 miles away in the direction of London. At Romford, the methane gas is mixed with off gases from the Shellhaven Oil Refinery and reformed to town gas before delivery to the board's consumers in the London area.

For years oilmen have been eyeing the tremendous wasted and unusable supplies of natural gas throughout the world, and have been dreaming up ways and means of supplying this gas economically to other inaccessible countries which nature has not so richly endowed. The significance of the achievement in the *Methane Pioneer* is that it has now been demonstrated that it is possible to establish a link (which is more flexible than a pipeline) between these areas of over and under supply.

Constock has been negotiating for long term-gas supplies throughout the world, since gas for the long range program would not come from the United States. It has also developed markets other than Great Britain and within a few years expects to have a full fleet of tankers carrying energy in highly concentrated liquid form at low temperatures serving the gas hungry nations of the world at a price which is cheaper than that of gas manufactured expensively from coal or oil.

Selection of Houston and Dallas Public School Systems for Experimentation With Advanced Mathematics for High School Seniors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, high honor has been bestowed upon two of Texas' proudest cities, Houston and Dallas. The Houston and Dallas public school systems have been chosen as the two school systems in the Nation for experimentation with advanced mathematics for high school seniors.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Dallas Chosen in Math Study," from the Dallas Times Herald of August 4, 1959; an article entitled "Students To Get Advanced Math," from the Houston Chronicle of August 4, 1959; and an editorial entitled "Making Students Work Harder," from the Dallas Times Herald of August 5, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dallas Times Herald, Aug. 4, 1959]

DALLAS CHOSEN IN MATH STUDY

(By Al Hester)

The Dallas school system has been chosen as one of two public school systems in the Nation to take part in a pilot program in advanced mathematics for high school seniors, school leaders said Monday.

Jesse F. Cardwell, coordinator of secondary education for Dallas schools, said Monday the district will begin the program this coming school year. The program is under the sponsorship of the School Mathe-

matics Study Commission of the College Entrance Examination Board, he said. It will give selected high school seniors advanced instruction which will better prepare them for college math work, Mr. Cardwell said.

By spring, 1960, first classes will be set up under the new program. The course will be called elementary functions and analysis and will be open to selected seniors in their last semester of work. The National Science Foundation and Yale University are helping to set the program up.

The advanced math program will be similar to the widely known Physical Science Study Commission's "Massachusetts Institute of Technology science course." Dallas schools have also pioneered in making the MIT physics course available to high school seniors. The course emphasizes new concepts in science and new methods of making material meaningful to students.

Mr. Cardwell said Dallas was selected for the pilot math program because of the work the schools have done to strengthen mathematics teaching.

"I understand Houston schools are the only other schools chosen for the project," he said.

Selected Dallas mathematics teachers will attend supplementary training courses at Southern Methodist University this fall to better prepare them to teach the new math course.

Mr. Cardwell said the course will ready high school students for college calculus courses. It will not be a part of the college-level honors math courses already offered, Mr. Cardwell said.

"We hope to further emphasize the meaning and understanding of mathematics, rather than just the work necessary to do problems," Mr. Cardwell said. He said the approach to teach the meaning of math is now being used throughout the 12 grades in Dallas schools.

School Supt. W. T. White said the pilot program is a significant step in providing a more complete education for youngsters.

"The more varied the curriculum can be in regard to the interests of students the more complete the educational program is," Dr. White said.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Aug. 4, 1959]

STUDENTS TO GET ADVANCED MATH

The Houston public school system is one of two systems in the Nation which will be offered a program of advanced mathematics to prepare high school seniors for college.

John McFarland said the program, which would go into effect in the spring of 1960, must receive approval of the board of education.

Dallas plans a similar program.

The program, set up by the National Science Foundation and Yale University, would be an elective course here, McFarland said, and open to high school students who already have completed 2 years of algebra, trigonometry and plane geometry.

McFarland said he believes Houston was chosen because of the schools' work with Dr. Lincoln Durst, professor of mathematics at Rice Institute, who is helping to write a special textbook for the advanced course.

Outstanding mathematics students in Houston public schools have been taking a course in advanced mathematics at Rice during the summer months.

[From the Dallas Times Herald, Aug. 5, 1959]

MAKING STUDENTS WORK HARDER

Public education in this country has grave shortcomings, but fortunately it is not static. School leaders and the public they serve have open minds where improvements are suggested. In Dallas, especially, the at-

mosphere seems conducive to policy alterations and promising innovations.

Two years ago our district became one of the first in the Nation to adopt the plan of special classes for extra-bright students. Now Dallas is to become one of the two school districts in the Nation that will experiment in offering advanced mathematics instruction to gifted seniors.

It is well to challenge the abilities of gifted students to the fullest. Our Nation needs all the outstanding leaders in every field that it can produce. No less important, however, is that student bodies as a whole be goaded to work harder than they have been.

Foreign exchange students almost invariably remark at how easy it is to breeze through public schools in the United States. They note that our children are permitted to take too many soft nonacademic courses and that they are not expected to study hard. The ease of acquiring educational certificates and diplomas, of course, extends into many of our colleges and universities.

If education in our country is to meet its responsibility, all students, not just those with exceptional aptitude, must discover that going to school is no picnic. If they do not, they and the Nation will be cheated. It is not enough that only our ablest students be expected to work as diligently as they can.

Twenty-Part Series Helps Amateur Weathermen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to include an article from the Gannett, a publication of the Gannett newspaper chain, on a recent service inaugurated for people of Hartford in the Hartford Times, one of the outstanding papers in my district.

The service concerns an effort on the part of the newspaper to make available to its readers a better understanding of weather forecasting and the day-to-day communication of what our forecasters know into useful information around the home.

We need, of course, much more effort in this direction. The funds provided this year for a study of a National Institute of Atmospheric Research is a valuable start; so is the increased attention being given around the country to the scientific effort needed to know more about the climate and atmosphere in which we live.

One of the most difficult problems in any scientific area, as we on the Committee on Science and Astronautics have reason to know, is the translation from the scientific language in which this work is done. That is why an aggressive journalistic effort such as that of Times reporter, Harland W. Warner, and Managing Editor Richard J. Hartford is welcome.

TWENTY-PART SERIES HELPS AMATEUR WEATHERMEN

Last Christmas, 5,000 barometers were sold in Hartford stores and delivered, gaily wrapped, as presents. Local weather fore-

casters immediately reported floods of telephone calls from new owners of barometers, asking how to set the instruments, how to read them, and how to use the information.

This and other indications called to mind the hoary saying that everyone was talking about the weather. In July, the Hartford Times set out to do something about it. On assignment, Harland W. Warner spent several weeks learning to be an amateur weather forecaster. He emphasizes that he didn't become a meteorologist. "All you need," he says, "is a barometer, a thermometer, a radio or television receiver, a daily newspaper that carries a weather map and a good pair of eyes. The only thing that's really necessary is the pair of eyes."

With his study completed, Warner wrote a 20-part series inviting readers to join him in amateur forecasting and giving instructions incorporating the training he had received.

Titled "Weatherscope," and starting July 20, Warner's series also introduced a new, exclusive presentation of published weather information. Designed in part to compete with graphic, visually-attractive television weather presentations, the new Times charts, maps, and tables give information the amateur forecaster can use.

Key to the new weather presentation is a special map prepared for the Times by the Travelers Insurance Co.'s Weather Service, one of the top independent services in the Nation. The accompanying layout also incorporates data provided by the U.S. Weather Bureau at Bradley Field, some 12 miles north of Hartford.

The map, charted each morning on latest information available, is a "status map," showing fronts, present conditions, and trends. With the instructions in Warner's "Weatherscope," readers will be able to analyze weather fronts. Matching frontal analysis with information in tables carried in the Times, observation of the simple instruments, visual observation of weather tell-tales such as cloud formations, and the information presented periodically on radio and television, they'll be able to forecast for themselves.

In "Weatherscope," Warner explains the new type of published information, explodes or substantiates old wives' tales about weather, includes pieces on clouds, winds, precipitation of all kinds and emphasizes analysis of weather fronts.

He also pinpoints Hartford's status in the world of weather. The city has the Travelers Service and the U.S. Weather Bureau. In addition, Pratt and Whitney Aircraft, East Hartford, has been awarded a multi-million-dollar contract for development of a nationwide electronic forecasting network. And a summer institute, first of its kind, is being conducted locally by the American Meteorological Society for high school students.

When the series is completed, Managing Editor Richard J. Hartford sees extensive possibilities for followups. Readers who have submerged themselves in forecasting will probably want and need more information. Weather bureaus now receive hundreds of letters requesting weather information, and diversion of many of these to the Times is foreseen. Possible use of "Weatherscope" in booklet form in school classes is anticipated by Hartford, who also is considering printing forecasts of staff members.

And the boom on barometers next Christmas may be an accurate measure of reader interest.

THE GANNETTEER.

Military Airlift as Important as Airpower in Defense Setup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am delighted to see the increased interest exhibited in the Military Air Transport Service, which has been evidenced concurrent and subsequent to the debate in the Senate at the time of our consideration of the military appropriations bill. Two excellent columns have been written by the perceptive columnist, Holmes Alexander, on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Alexander's column entitled "Military Airlift Lags Because of Competition and the Budget," which appeared in the Greenville News, Greenville, S.C., on July 17, 1959, and his column entitled "Military Airlift as Important as Airpower in Defense Setup," published in the July 21, 1959, edition of the Greenville News, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the columns were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News,
July 17, 1959]

MILITARY AIRLIFT LAGS BECAUSE OF COMPETITION AND THE BUDGET

(By Holmes Alexander)

SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE, ILL.—There is a daily carrier plane which flies between Frankfurt and West Berlin with American soldiers and civilians. Until I went there a few weeks ago, I had assumed that this flight, over enemy territory in the most hotly contested area of the cold war, would be accomplished with the best and newest American planes. But this ticklish mission is carried out by the C-47 a two-engine DC-3 which has been a good old Dobbins in service since the early 1930's. Why this famine ration in military aviation? Why put the armed services, of all our American facilities, on an austerity program?

There are five divisions of the American Army in West Germany, and they are well armed, well trained, fit for whatever is to come. If a European war turns into an all-out thermonuclear war (as President Eisenhower says it almost certainly must), then the American troops will die in the general holocaust without giving much of an account of themselves.

But if, as we must consider a possibility, there is a limited war in Europe, or a series of limited actions around the world, we are going to need the biggest, the best, the swiftest, the most reliable airlift armada that American industrial capacity can produce.

But this sort of airlift we do not have. The American troops in Europe do not have the best chance we can offer them of being reinforced on time, in force. Again—why short rations for the military machine? Again—what's this rubber-tire midriff which business, labor, and the general population are wearing at home, while the armed forces

are subsisting on retread aircraft and promises?

The intercontinental and the transcontinental airlines are flying payloads in the new jets, the Boeing 707, the Douglas DC-8, and the Convair 880. The official armed service airlift called MATS (Military Air Transport Service) does not have a single jet transport. The only three-passenger jets in military use are for the use of very important persons in the civilian government. How come Pan American, American, TWA, United, and Delta are today better equipped, and are several years ahead in orders, training, and experience, than our military airlift?

MATS is a round-the-world system which carries military passengers wherever they are supposed to go. MATS also carries missiles and rockets, generally manufactured in the West or on the Pacific Coast, to the test sites at Cape Canaveral and to overseas bases in Britain and Germany. The military passengers and cargoes are far more urgent and critical than anything carried by the big airlines. But the vital military payloads are being toted in hand-me-down aircraft which the commercial lines are discarding.

The internal airlines like Capital, Ozark, and Western are going in for the propjet planes, the Viscount, the Fairchild, and the Lockheed versions. MATS is beginning to get a few of the big propjets—there are only 24 in operation today—for the missile supply missions. But virtually the whole military airlift today is made up of yesterday's planes—which operate at greater cost, lesser efficiency, poorer economy each year. MATS in size is the second largest airline in the world. The biggest airline is the Soviet equivalent of MATS—the Aeroflot, which recently brought Comrade Kozlov nonstop from Moscow in something over 11 hours.

There are a couple of answers to the questions raised above, and I doubt if the American people will like what they hear. For one thing, there is the spending which the Federal Government does to bolster the farm economy, to provide subsidized housing, to bid for good will with foreign aid—these things have made it necessary to slow up the program of aircraft procurement. Combat aircraft necessarily get priority over airlift, but this produces the anomaly of Strategic Air Command and Tactical Air Command flying two or three times faster than its supporting unit. This could bring about a situation where SAC and TAC might fly combat missions from overseas bases—and then be forced to wait several days for the next supply of bombs, fuel, and replacement part.

There is another reason, and a much less worthy one, why MATS is an obsolete airlift, and is falling further behind in the state of aviation as the months go past. There is a petty and avaricious jealousy on the part of the commercial airlines toward MATS. Theoretically, if MATS were dissolved, the commercial lines would get the business of flying military passengers and cargoes overseas. Actually, the personnel would probably be sent by ship, and be out of circulation that much longer. Much of the cargo is too dangerous and cumbersome for aviation handling. Moreover, MATS last year spent about \$71 million buying supplemental airlift from several dozen airline firms, most of which fall in the field of small business. There are 80-odd airline companies bidding for the MATS dollar.

The Federal budget and commercial competition, then, are the two main reasons why our military airlift is lagging. On the

other hand, there is every reason in the free world why MATS should start modernizing tomorrow.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, July 21, 1959]

MILITARY AIRLIFT AS IMPORTANT AS AIRPOWER IN DEFENSE SETUP

(By Holmes Alexander)

ABOARD C-133 No. 62007.—"That's where we dumped yesterday," said S. Sgt. Ronald Carson (Albany, N.Y.) pointing to a spot in the Pacific Ocean. He meant that yesterday there was a propeller malfunction on this aircraft, requiring the plane commander, Capt. John Watson (Evans Mills, N.Y.) to discharge 30,000 pounds of jet fuel in order to make an emergency landing.

Nobody except this reporter seemed to regard this as much of an experience. "Standard operational procedures," said Captain Watson with the sang-froid of a 17-year Air Force veteran.

But this reporter has never been able to cultivate a bias attitude toward military aviation. Every mission has its own romance. This particular Air Force assignment calls for a journey of better than 6,000 statute miles, from California to Britain. We are carrying 67,142 pounds of support equipment for the Thor, a 1,500-mile missile to be delivered to a Royal Air Force station of classified location.

This morning before takeoff I saw the Thor projectile at the start of its journey in another aircraft of the transport fleet. Thor, an intermediate range weapon that is ideal for the distances of West Europe, has been exhibited at a number of static displays and is reasonably familiar to interested folks. But the ground support equipment of the Thor is about four times as large as the missile itself and is many times more secret.

The largest item aboard is a 33,000 pound liquid oxygen (LOX) tank. But for the most part the load is electronic gadgetry, not easily comprehended. It is enough to write that the U.S. Air Force is busy transporting critical material close to one-third of the distance around the world. Since the end of World War II, we have repeatedly risen to crises—in Berlin, Hungary, Korea, Formosa, Vietnam, Lebanon—by the handy use of airlift, rather than air power. It seems you can't have one without the other.

Like all normal Air Force transport flights, this one has a dual purpose. We are sending the Thor missile system to Britain, but are also training rookie airmen. Three of the seven crew members are instructors. Besides Captain Watson, there is Capt. Edward Fox (Port Jefferson, Long Island), pilot, and M. Sgt. John Roberts (Richmond, Calif.), an instructor-engineer. Capt. Allan Jensen (Attica, N.Y.) is on board to do some "stick time" as pilot. S. Sgt. Clarence Hertz (Easton, Pa.) is a student flight engineer. During most of the flight the cockpit is an attentive classroom.

Air Force flight crews are not unionized. Their duty-day is 21 hours. They seldom know when they report to Operations where the next trip will take them, or who their fellow crew members will be. All this is a far cry from the close camaraderie of wartime flying where crews stuck together for the duration and usually flew the same aircraft until it got shot down.

These are advantages which the Air Force has had to discard because of limited skills and equipment. Today, with flight crews and maintenance crews so specialized and individualized, a wholly new kind of morale and discipline must be developed. Instead of unit spirit, a man needs the inspiration of pride in work and sufficiency of family income. The 5 married men of this crew have a total of 12 children.

Among the specialists aboard is A2c Edward North (Camden, N.Y.), this aircraft's loadmaster. Airman North is a graduate of

two service schools. At Tachikawa, Japan, he studied weights and measures as applied to aircraft systems. He has the big job of supervising the loading and placing of the cargo, keeping in mind its weight and balance. He is also responsible for restraining the load during in-flight turbulence. In addition to knowing air freight in general, Airman North took a course at Sheppard Airbase, Tex., in the delicate work of loading missile systems. He studied the ability of Air Force planes to carry missiles.

This whole job of military transport is unglamorous and unsung—but there is no more important work throughout the Armed Forces.

Cardinal Cushing Explains Opposition to Invitation for Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include a statement, sound, logical and correct, made by His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing, of Boston, appearing in the Portal of August 8, 1959, setting forth the reasons why he feels an invitation should not have been given to Mr. Khrushchev to visit the United States.

As Cardinal Cushing well said, "His [Khrushchev's] only purpose of accepting an invitation to any country is to propagate communism."

How well and pointedly he calls attention to the people of big, strong and proud America of the actions of the people of Scandinavian countries when he said, "The Scandinavian countries knew that and their people protested with such vigor that Mr. Khrushchev canceled his visit."

What a contrast between the peoples of the small but proud and brave Scandinavian countries and our own.

CARDINAL EXPLAINS OPPOSITION TO INVITATION FOR KHRUSHCHEV

In the light of my addresses and writings concerning atheistic communism, I could not favor an official invitation to the leader of that international conspiracy to visit the United States.

It can be said that communism is a fruit of the materialism of the world and a judgement thereon.

Like all of us, the Communist leaders fear another war. They say that it is possible to live together peacefully. But actually their ideologic war, a third world war, has already started, and their intention is to bring it to victory.

Khrushchev is a dedicated man. Therein lies his strength. But he is dedicated to a godless ideology, leading to slavery. That is what makes him so dangerous. Men like him have been won to nobler beliefs and have become their greatest champions. But whoever thinks that we can influence Khrushchev merely by showing him how our democracy functions and how well off we are, has no conception of the passionate, hate filled contempt for our way of living which possesses Khrushchev and company. We cannot change him. Day and night, in thought and in deed, he is working with cunning determination together with his as-

sociates for the worldwide victory of communism. Every problem or situation—Berlin, Geneva, friendly visits, cultural exchanges—used to further one primary purpose—world revolution. Are we ourselves so completely without passionate faith in our ideals that we cannot believe others capable thereof?

I recall Mikoyan's visit. It was pitiable to see with what supreme cleverness he made use of the whole gamut of emotions—idealism, love of peace, sentiment, simple-mindedness, vanity, business acumen, mammon. If we were taken in by him, what can we expect from Khrushchev's visit?

Ideologically disarmed, we lay open our country, through an invitation to Khrushchev, to the planned offensive of an ideologic elite force. That is like opening our frontiers to the enemy in a military war. It is unwise. What is more: If the United States opens her doors to the Communist world revolution dictator, we fall the struggling people of the countries behind the Iron Curtain. But if we refused to open our doors, we shall strengthen their courage; and the young nations of Asia and Africa, who are standing at the crossroads, anxious to learn about us will see in the path of democracy a new and clearer light. Having invited Khrushchev how can we fail to invite the other dictators—the head of Red China et al.

But there is a more important aspect. The Soviet Union is an ideologic power arsenal. In a short space of time it has revolutionized 900 million people. We seem to be ideologically impoverished, possessing only little of the love of God and country that characterized our forebears. We have fallen for the idol of materialism. When we get into contact with the Russian thought power arsenal, the current runs toward us, not the other way.

But the current can be turned. The United States can become a moral ideologic power arsenal of such potency that the current will pass from us. Too long have we been content with pleasure, luxury, wealth, and lukewarm Christianity. Every Christian prays: "Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven." It is nonsense to pray like that without seriously desiring what we are praying for. If I really want it, then I must stand up for it, in my own life and in the life of others, in the life of the Nation and in the life of the whole world, with all that I am and have, led by God, in community with others who feel the same obligation. Then indeed the miracle will be achieved and other nations and peoples will be impressed. They will follow genuine moral leadership not material progress.

That is ideology. That is Christianity. That is moral strength. If we do not choose this way and live it, as individuals and as nations, we choose communism, as Khrushchev wants us. His only purpose of accepting an invitation to any country is to propagate communism. The Scandinavian countries knew that and their people protested with such vigor that Mr. Khrushchev canceled his visit.

Excellent College Facilities Serving the City of San Antonio, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on August 4, 1959, the San Antonio

Light published a memorable article entitled "A World of Knowledge." This article outlined in detail the excellent college facilities serving the city of San Antonio. I ask unanimous consent that the article appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the San Antonio Light, Aug. 4, 1959]
A WORLD OF KNOWLEDGE AT HIS FINGERTIPS
(By Joe Rust)

Books are the gateway to learning. Of them, Sir Francis Bacon once penned: "Books are ships which pass through the vast seas of time."

Books to worldly writers and philosophers have been "wells of living waters," "compasses, telescopes, sextants, and charts," "the chloroform of the mind," "sepulchers of thought," "the soul of the past," "dead laurels of the dead."

But, to the average college student, a book has little such philosophical connotation. To him, books are guides, aids to learning, often necessary evils.

As to the great men of literature, books are to the college students instruments to be lauded, loved, hated, denounced.

Colleges today, rather than persisting that the student develop a love only for venerable works, orientate the student toward using books to fill that ever-present gap between experience and education.

That is, books are not ends in themselves, but means to ends. Critical reading of even the most revered of the classics is emphasized today in colleges across the Nation.

San Antonio's four major colleges and two universities support this critical education program. Each has extensive libraries of resource materials, as well as the great works of literature.

Thomas Carlyle was perhaps near the truth when he defined a university as "a collection of books."

But, just to what extent must a student penetrate these books to become educated? It has been said that the educated man knows not the answer to every question, only where to find it.

Then, the true value of college is the true value of books—a guide and an aid to learning.

How many books does a student read during 4 years of college? Naturally, the answer depends on a student's major field of study, and, to a great extent, the student himself.

One would expect an English major's reading load to be more voluminous than that of a mathematics major.

Too, just what length must a work be before it becomes a book?

Despite these limitations, several San Antonio educators have supplied qualified answers. The conclusion—the average college student penetrates at least 400 complete books while in undergraduate work.

San Antonio's six institutes of higher learning offer a variety of paths in achieving this average, through both liberal arts and specialization.

The Alamo City ranks high on the listing of Texas college towns. The city's six colleges should reach peak enrollment of near 13,000 this fall.

St. Mary's University, the city's largest senior college, is a school for men, but is co-educational in the law school. The 108-year-old school will enroll near 2,200.

The school, under the administration of the Society of Mary, offers the B.A., the B.S., the M.E., an industrial engineering degree, a law degree, and the B.B.A.

San Antonio's other university, Trinity, is privately supported under the auspices of the Texas synod of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A. Trinity will enroll some 1,700.

Trinity, which boasts of its 107-acre skyline campus overlooking the city, confers the baccalaureate degree in 24 fields; the graduate, in 10. These are through the bachelor of arts, the bachelor of science, the bachelor of medicine, the master of arts, the master of science, and the master of education.

San Antonio has two junior colleges, San Antonio College and St. Phillip's. Both are supported from urban tax funds and State revenue.

The former, the largest separate junior college in Texas, will enroll a total 6,000 in day and evening classes this fall; the latter, 1,100.

St. Phillip's specializes in vocational-technical training.

Our Lady of the Lake and Incarnate Word, both privately endowed women's colleges under the auspices of the Catholic Church, will register approximately 750 and 950, respectively.

Incarnate Word offers the bachelor of arts, the bachelor of science, the bachelor of medicine, the master of arts, and the master of education; Our Lady of the Lake, the bachelor of arts, the bachelor of science, three music degrees, the master of education, and a social work degree.

Following an undergraduate degree plan is not a matter of taking only courses in one field of study. Each major degree field must be supplemented with a general arts and sciences core.

For instance, a major in English takes only one-third of the required degree hours in English courses. The remainder is taken with natural and social sciences, languages, and background courses.

Liberal arts courses, especially English and history, carry stiff reading loads. An English graduate of Incarnate Word make the following estimation: 400 books in English; 250 in her minor field; 180 in general education courses; 20 in languages; 20 in professional courses; more than 500 reference works.

Dr. Marjorie Morrison, head of the Trinity English department, said an English major is required approximately 200 pages of critical reading per week per course.

She said reading load varies as to the type of course—literary personality, literary types, and survey courses.

A history major will read from 17,000 to 27,000 pages in his major in college, according to Dr. Frances Hendricks of Trinity.

Contrasted with an English major, a music major does not carry a heavy reading load. But, as was pointed out by Dr. Frank Hughes, Trinity music director, emphasis in music study is switched from the printed page to printed sheet music.

In this relation, the music major reads as much as does the English major. Too, the two must have the same liberal arts background.

Also, Hughes pointed out that 50 of the 68 hours required for a music degree for teaching in public high school must be in music theory, history, and teaching methods.

Too, such a major must take 24 hours of education in order to receive a State teaching certificate. Such a requirement must be met by any potential secondary school teacher, regardless of his major.

Education courses require two to three textbooks per course, each book approximately 650 pages in length, pointed out Dr. Felix Ullrich, of the Trinity education department.

He said potential teachers are urged to read extensively from more than 80 professional magazines and are required to become acquainted with many reference works for research papers.

Another field requiring extensive reading in periodicals, Government documents, and journals is that of social work. Said Sister Mary Immaculate, director of the Worden School of Social Work, Our Lady of the Lake College:

"We strive to teach our students to ensue intelligent, orderly use of study material references rather than texts."

Worden, the only private coeducational school of social work in Texas, utilizes a basic library orientation program for all students. Sister Mary Immaculate said also that each student is encouraged to build his own library of basic social workbooks.

Our Lady of the Lake also is outstanding in speech therapy. Outside materials also play a great role in this field, Speech Clinic Director Sister Mary Arthur said.

She pointed out that the therapy major must have a broad background in phonetics, languages, and anatomy. Much time is spent in actual on-the-job clinical training rather than in specific texts. Sister Mary Arthur added:

"By supplying our students with a lengthy bibliography of materials, we strive to teach them learning through their own initiative. This encourages and stimulates them to do their own reading."

Still another field where professional manuals are extensively used is business administration. St. Mary's University boasts the largest business library in south Texas.

Brother Paul Goetz, S.M., estimated a business major penetrates more than 150 books in his major alone during 4 years of undergraduate work. He said there are more than 50 outstanding professional periodicals recommended to all business majors.

One major in which extensive use of required books is practical because of the cost of texts is science. However, a graduate student in chemistry at St. Mary's said an undergraduate in the science must purchase up to eight books in each of nine chemistry courses.

Chemistry requires long hours of technical reading in quantitative and qualitative analysis and thermo-dynamics from large volumes, he said.

Brother Charles Cummins, S.M., head of the St. Mary's chemistry department, said the average chemistry major reads approximately 150 books in his field.

Science reading is also heavy in medical technology, Sister Mary Daniel, professor of chemistry at Incarnate Word, said. The college is known for its nursing, medical technology, radiologic technology, and medical record library science programs through the Santa Rosa hospital.

Incarnate Word also is acclaimed for its work with teacher training for exceptional children, the mentally retarded, and the physically handicapped.

Even fields of industrial education require heavy reading loads. Some 22 books and 11 manuals are used annually in the study of auto mechanics alone. Oscar Eason, director of industrial education at St. Phillip's, said.

Professional fields in graduate work require the heaviest reading loads. An average law student reads some 37,000 to 40,000 pages of case books and law reviews during 3 years of work, it was estimated by Dean Ernest Raba of the St. Mary's law school.

Institutes of learning today need increasing educational facilities to meet increasing enrollments and demand for expanded subject fields. This means new college construction projects almost yearly.

San Antonio schools are keeping up with the construction tide. New projects include:

Trinity: The new \$500,000 Marrs McLean Science Center; new \$100,000 Cobb-Racey Science Auditorium; \$145,000 Olympic swimming pool; \$61,000 tennis stadium.

St. Mary's: New \$400,000 faculty residence; \$375,000 student residence hall to be constructed.

Our Lady of the Lake: Pacelli hall, women's residence hall; Anchilla-Domini Hall for Nuns; Harry Jersig Memorial Speech Clinic.

SAC: Groundbreaking for new \$880,000 science building.

St. Phillips: New \$23,000 warehouse to house sheet metal and welding classes; new 100-car parking area; two new \$30,000 tennis courts.

Incarnate Word: New student center and residence hall; Katherine A. Ryan Center for Mentally Retarded Children in planning stage; plans for new chapel underway.

Renewed evaluation of books and upswing of construction in San Antonio schools must be coupled with the increasing excellence of school faculties. Trinity now boasts of a 42 percent doctor-of-philosophy faculty with 1 teacher for every 15 students while St. Mary's recently inaugurated a "Great Teacher" program.

Count of faculty in the six schools now stands as follows:

Trinity—105; SAC—146 part time, 106 full time; St. Mary's—49 full time from Society of Mary, 57 full time lay, 47 part time.

St. Phillip's—22 full time, 50 part time; Our Lady of the Lake—72 full time, 21 part time; Incarnate Word, 74.

Any final analysis of how well educated a student may be after college rests with the student himself. To say that the Storch Memorial Library of Trinity University has loaned some 125,000 books over the past 4 years is not to say that these books were evenly distributed among the students.

Some students read only what was required of them, some read more. Those who read more will probably carry the habit with them into their homes. They are searching for new ways to push back the frontiers of knowledge.

Reading is not an enterprise which ends with college. Good books are a prized possession of any home. Marcus Cicero, the Roman orator, was a perceptive man. Once he said:

"A room without books is a body without a soul."

Halfhearted Action Hurts Justice Code Statute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include here a distinguished article from the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal of August 8. The Journal has been the spokesman of the services since 1863. The subject of military justice has been vital since the beginning of military forces. It warrants our attention when the Journal propounds its views on the present state of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. These views I hold correct. The editorial follows:

HALFHEARTED ACTION HURTS JUSTICE CODE STATUTE

The Department of Defense between now and January should make up its mind if long-sought revision of the Uniform Code of Military Justice is important. If the answer is affirmative, as it has been for more than 4 years, then the Pentagon should go all-out to obtain favorable congressional action.

As the case now stands, defense leaders advise Congress each January that military morale and combat effectiveness are being hurt by certain provisions of the Uniform

Code of Military Justice—one of which, for example, requires enlisted men to be court-martialed in circumstances where officers are not required to stand trial. Having presented is annual quick brief on the need for amending the complex law and strengthening the discipline authority of commanding officers, Defense leaders then retired to their Pentagon chambers, away from the inevitable controversy that will be provoked by changing the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

This hit-and-run approach certainly has done nothing to gain a proper hearing for the proposed changes. Worse than that, the annual statements concerning its shortcomings have damaged the stature of the code throughout the fighting forces.

If the Pentagon decides that Uniform Code of Military Justice changes are not important enough to fight for next year, or that they cannot be attained in an election year, we advise silence on the problem come January. But the half-documented story that has been made available to date indicates clearly enough that the administration of military justice would be served well by a comprehensive congressional inquiry into the changes that, up to now, have been suggested so earnestly and advocated so ineffectively.

Financial Aid to Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I received a very fine article in the Oregon Business Review, published monthly by the University of Oregon Business Research, written by Prof. Edward W. Reed, professor of finance at the University of Oregon, entitled "Federal and State Measures for Financial Aid to Small Business."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregon Business Review, May 1959]

FEDERAL AND STATE MEASURES FOR FINANCIAL AID TO SMALL BUSINESS

(By Edward W. Reed, professor of finance, University of Oregon)

The financing of small business has long been a problem in America. Large and long-established businesses are generally able to obtain equity capital and long-term funds from the sale of stocks and bonds through organized capital markets. Small firms have, however, had difficulty in obtaining funds through the capital markets, and, if they are able to do so, the cost is almost prohibitive. A study made by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System early in 1958 indicates that adequate credit is available to small business from banks and private sources; but recent testimony in Congress regarding the financing of small business points to the inadequacy of facilities for providing long-term loans and equity capital.

This problem has been partially met over the years by local industrial foundations and in more recent years by State development credit corporations. Congress has struggled

with the problem for the past several years, and during the last session enacted legislation designed to promote and encourage the long-term financing of small business. This legislation had three phases. (1) The Small Business Administration was made a permanent agency with increased lending power and a reduction in the maximum interest rate it may charge borrowers (the Small Business Administration was established as a temporary agency in 1953 for the purpose of making short and intermediate loans to small business). (2) The tax obligations of small firms were lightened. And (3) the Small Business Investment Act was enacted to make funds available to specialized investment companies. In this article we are concerned primarily with the latter legislation.

The Small Business Investment Act is unique in that greater emphasis has been placed upon private enterprise and local initiative than on direct government aid. The act is designed to augment ownership capital indirectly by providing for Federal along with private funds to investment companies, which in turn will invest in and make loans to small businesses. It is hoped that this legislation will result in the organization of small-business investment companies, which will attract large amounts of private capital and channel them into the small businesses throughout the country which have need for additional capital.

Small-business investment companies may be organized under the general incorporation laws of the various States. If, however, the Small Business Administration determines that such companies cannot be chartered under State law and operate in accordance with the purposes of the act, they may be chartered by the Small Business Administration under Federal law. However, they must be chartered under State law after June 30, 1961, when the chartering authority of the Small Business Administration will terminate. By that time States will have had an opportunity to provide for the formation of such small-business investment companies and the chartering function by the Small Business Administration will therefore be unnecessary. Termination of chartering authority by this agency will have no effect upon the continuing activities of any of the small-business investment companies previously chartered.

A minimum of 10 stockholders may organize a small-business investment company under Federal law. These stockholders may be individuals, partnerships, corporations, insurance companies, and financial institutions, including banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Insured banks, however, may not hold shares in such companies and in amount aggregating more than 1 percent of their capital and surplus. There is no requirement regarding the minimum or maximum amount of stock that a stockholder must or can hold. Theoretically, one stockholder could supply virtually the entire amount required to start a small-business investment company. A bank, for example, with a capital and surplus of \$15 million could organize such a company as a subsidiary; in fact, this has already been done.

A small-business investment company must have a paid-in capital of at least \$300,000 before commencing business. At least half of this must be provided by the stockholders; the remaining 50 percent may be invested by the Small Business Administration in the form of subordinated debentures. Subordinated debentures are evidences of long-term debt which rank ahead of common stock but behind other indebtedness in case of liquidation. The \$150,000 secured from the Small Business Administration cannot exceed a term of 20 years and will carry an interest rate of 5 percent. In addition to the

\$150,000 provided by the Small Business Administration as a part of the original capital, an investment company may borrow an amount equal to 50 percent of the paid-in capital and surplus from the same source. This loan will also carry an interest rate of 5 percent and will have a maturity of 20 years. Thus it is possible for the stockholders to derive \$300,000 from the SBA in the formation of a small-business investment company with assets of \$450,000. Small-business investment companies will also be able to borrow from private sources and will probably borrow up to \$4 for every \$1 of capital and surplus. The \$150,000 loan from the SBA is authorized to encourage the formation and growth of small-business investment companies until they have been able to build up sufficient capital of their own.

Small-business investment companies will be, it is hoped, of assistance to small business by making long-term loans and by purchasing convertible debentures. Loans can be made to both incorporated and unincorporated small-business concerns which have need for funds for sound financing, growth, modernization, and expansion. Loans may be made directly or in cooperation with other lending institutions on an immediate or deferred basis. Loans are limited to a maturity of 20 years unless an extended maturity, not exceeding 10 years, "will aid in the orderly liquidation of such loans." The rate of interest charged by the company on loans will be established by the company, but cannot exceed the limit set by the usury law of the State in which it is incorporated. If there is no legal limit, a limit will be established by the SBA.

Small-business investment companies may make capital available to small business by the purchase of convertible debentures. These debentures will bear a rate of interest established in the same manner as are loans. Debentures may be callable on any interest-payment date upon 3 months' notice at par plus accrued interest. They may be convertible at the option of the company or a holder in due course into the stock of the small-business concern. Before providing capital in this manner, the small-business investment company may require a small-business concern to reneance any or all of its outstanding indebtedness so that the investment company will be only holder of debt. The small-business concern must also agree not to incur further indebtedness without the approval of the small-business investment company and to give the company an opportunity to finance such additional indebtedness. A business concern securing capital from a small-business investment company in this manner is required to become a stockholder in the investment company in an amount equal to not less than 2 nor more than 5 percent of the capital provided. The amount that a small-business investment company may lend to any one small-business concern is limited to 20 percent of its combined capital and surplus, unless otherwise approved by the Small Business Investment Division of the Small Business Administration.

The Small Business Investment Act created a fund of \$250 million to be made available to small-business investment companies. These funds will have to be repaid in time. This amount of money will act as a revolving fund to be made available to other investment companies as it is repaid. There has been widespread public interest in this new legislation, and a number of individuals, banks, and other financial institutions have applied for charters to establish small-business investment companies. Nineteen of these applicants have been asked to proceed with their organization even though licenses have not been completely approved. Two licenses have been issued. The companies that have already received a

license are the First Minneapolis Investment Co. and the Citizens & Southern Small Business Investment Co. of Atlanta, which is an affiliate of the Citizens & Southern National Bank. Though there has been some interest expressed in Oregon, no investment companies have been chartered. Most of the interest has been in Portland, where two groups are seriously considering the formation of a company.

In addition to the funds that are made available to small-business investment companies, Federal funds are also available for a specific purpose to State and local development companies that are already in operation. The Small Business Administration is authorized to make loans to State and local development companies for plant construction, conversion, or expansion, including the acquisition of land. These loans may be made directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate on an immediate or deferred basis. Such loans are designed to assist an identifiable small-business concern and are limited to \$250,000 for each identifiable small business, such as one cannery or one foundry. These loans are made for a period of 10 years plus such additional period as is estimated may be required to complete construction, conversion, or expansion. However, this period may be extended for an additional period not to exceed 10 years if such renewal or extension will aid in an orderly liquidation. In agreements to participate in loans on a deferred basis the Small Business Administration's participation is limited to 90 percent of the balance of the loan outstanding at the time of disbursement. The authority to make such loans to local development companies expires June 30, 1961. There are at the present time 17 local development companies in Oregon which could take advantage of this provision of the Small Business Investment Company Act.

The Small Business Administration is also authorized to make loans to State development companies exclusively. The funds that may be advanced to State development companies will be made in exchange for obligations of such companies, and the amount available is limited to an amount equal to the amount borrowed by it from all other sources. These loans will be made for a period of 20 years at 5 percent interest and the funds may be used for any acceptable purpose.

During the recent session of the Oregon Legislature a law was enacted which permits the formation of State development credit corporations, which when organized will be eligible to take advantage of some of the provisions of the Small Business Investment Company Act. The objective of the Oregon act is to promote the industrial, agricultural, and recreational development of the State. A corporation organized under this statute will have the authority to borrow money from various sources, including individuals, financial institutions, and the Federal Government and to lend funds and purchase shares in business and industrial corporations in need of financial assistance. It will also have the power to hold, lease, and transfer property. Such a corporation may be organized by nine persons for a capital of not less than \$25,000. In addition to the stockholders, provision is made for membership in the corporation. Members of the corporation may consist of such financial institutions as commercial banks, trust companies, savings and loan associations, mutual savings banks, insurance companies, and union health and welfare funds. These members will have no voting rights, but may lend funds to the State development credit corporation. Banks, trust companies, savings and loan associations, and insurance companies may lend an amount equal to 3

percent of their capital and surplus to the credit corporation; mutual savings banks may lend 3 percent of their guarantee fund; and union health and welfare funds may lend up to 3 percent of their funds. Those members who agree to lend to the corporation will be called upon to lend when the needs arise and the call will be prorated among the members on the same proportion that the maximum lending limit bears to the aggregate maximum lending limit of all members. The credit corporation is required to set aside 10 percent of its net earnings in a surplus account each year until this surplus amounts to one-half of its stated capital for losses and contingencies. State development credit corporations organized under this act are exempt from the corporation franchise tax and the State income tax.

The act permits the State bond commission to invest moneys from the various funds under its jurisdiction in the bonds of State development credit corporations. However, not more than 3 percent of each fund may be invested. State development credit corporations will be examined by the division of audits of the office of the secretary of state.

The act states that the department of planning and development "shall encourage and promote the formation of State development credit corporations where it determines that their formation is in the public interest." The department may also consult with, advise, and give technical assistance to persons interested in organizing such credit corporations.

Whether or not the program will be successful will depend on many factors. Basically, the success will depend upon the enthusiasm expressed on the local level for such a program, and the provision of a portion of the capital required. It seems that a certain amount of civic pride and responsibility will be necessary for the operation and success of a small-business investment company. In addition to this very important factor is the level of management of the small-business investment companies. It will be management at the local level that will evaluate the requests for financial aid and extend credit and equity capital rather than just another agency located in Washington.

In Oregon a small-business investment company could be formed under the general incorporation laws of the State. The recently enacted legislation permitting the formation of a State credit corporation was not absolutely necessary; however, there are certain advantages in this legislation. In the first place, the legislation places the State legislature and the Governor on record that they recognize the long-term financing problems of small business and are hopeful that someone will do something about it. Second, the legislation permits certain financial institutions which will serve as a source of funds and possibly very valuable advice to take part in a program that has as its objective the industrial, agricultural, and recreational development of the State. Third, the legislation also permits the State bond commission to invest a portion of its funds in a program designed to help small business. Fourth, the legislation creates an organization that can take advantage of that portion of the Federal laws which permits a State credit corporation to borrow from the Small Investment Division of the Small Business Administration an amount equal to all of its other borrowings. Finally, the State legislation permitting the creation of State credit corporations opens up more avenues for funds than is found in the creation of a small business investment company.

Both the Federal legislation and the State act offers a tool to private investors to earn a return on their funds as well as to help

small business; then programs should eventually result in the increased incomes and profits, the basic ingredients of a higher standard of living. It is certainly a new frontier to small-business financing.

Young Champions From New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, Delaware Township, in Camden County, N.J., is a growing community which finds itself, day after day, engulfed in a continued effort to head the list of other communities grouped in the same classification. Delaware Township is one of the most civic-minded localities in the United States and permits nothing to stand in its way in striving to improve itself and its citizens. This American zealotness has resulted in many accomplishments for which its residents may justifiably claim the right to "hold our heads high."

Among these accomplishments is the attention given to the youth of the municipality insofar as concerns the development of sports and sportsmanship. Adults, men and women alike, have given unceasingly and ungrudgingly of their time, exertions, and knowledge to aid in properly directing the energy and the acts and the hopes of their boys and girls. Local businessmen, industrialists, and individuals have generously and repeatedly supplied financial aid and support. The children, themselves, have recognized the advantages which are being offered and have wisely and wholeheartedly seized the opportunities which have thus been developed.

In Delaware Township, no program is given greater attention than that of the baseball Little Leagues and Babe Ruth Leagues. Literally starting from scratch several years ago, the men and women developed a Little League organization to the point where there are today two complete and separate leagues wherein a total of over 900 boys annually, between the ages of 8 and 12 years, are taught the fundamentals and the fine points of baseball and, more importantly and more intentionally, are impregnated with the worth and the value of American patriotism, citizenship, morality, and sportsmanship. In addition, a Babe Ruth League is now closing out its sophomore year of activity with more than 100 boys in the 13- to 15-year-old age group having participated each year. The guidance and development of these Babe Ruth League boys can and must have only a good, healthy, and healthful effect in the neighborhoods, in the towns and cities, in the States of our United States, wherever the boys eventually establish their own homes and businesses and professions.

All this is wonderfully exemplified here in our Nation's chief city during this week of August 10 to 14, 1959. In Griffith Stadium, the Middle Atlantic regional

games in the National Babe Ruth League tournament are being played. Among the competing teams is the tournament team from Delaware Township in Camden County as the representative team of New Jersey. The boys on this team come from homes involved in all walks of life—some of their families may be less wealthy than others; some of their families may be less educated than others; some of their families may be less fortunate than others—but Delaware Township League defies anyone to identify the boys on the field as coming from one or another of such classifications.

In 1955 and 1956, Delaware Township created a precedent when its team played in the final game of each year in the Little League world series at Williamsport, Pa., and no group of boys ever earned a warmer spot in anyone's heart as they lost out in the last game by one run in 1955 and by two runs in 1956. Now, after only 2 years of membership in the Babe Ruth League, nine of these Little Leaguers have formed the nucleus of a team which has scored triumph after triumph in the State of New Jersey to earn the honor of carrying that State's name into the regional competition right here in the District of Columbia. Because they recognize that they are but a part of a team, these nine former Little Leaguers know they can be successful only if the entire team of 15 players can continue to coordinate their abilities and talents and to conduct themselves as a unit in their drive to get to California later this month where they expect to fulfill this year's goal—the winning of the 1959 Babe Ruth League championship.

The following is the list of the boys on this Delaware Township Babe Ruth League team which is representing the Garden State of New Jersey:

Name	Age	Address
Warren Andress....	14	Clover Ave., Haddonfield post office, New Jersey.
Sidney Baker.....	15	428 Garden State Dr., Merchantville post office, New Jersey.
Edward Becker....	15	103 Spring House Ct., Merchantville post office, New Jersey.
Robert Brush.....	15	127 Lenape Rd., Merchantville post office, New Jersey.
Edward Butler.....	15	32 Moore Ave., Haddonfield post office, New Jersey.
James Cooper.....	15	22 McPhelin Ave., Haddonfield post office, New Jersey.
David Dubin.....	15	1522 Berlin Rd., Haddonfield post office, New Jersey.
Roy Hayman.....	15	43 Curtis Ave., Haddonfield post office, New Jersey.
Ian Kent.....	15	56 Grant Ave., Haddonfield post office, New Jersey.
Gerald McNeen.....	14	11 Elmhurst Ave., Haddonfield post office, New Jersey.
Wilbur Robinson.....	15	27 Moore Ave., Haddonfield post office, New Jersey.
John Rose.....	15	Kresson Rd., Haddonfield post office, New Jersey.
Henry Singleton.....	15	73 Berlin Rd., Haddonfield post office, New Jersey.
Ronald Starrett....	15	11 Massachusetts Ave., Haddonfield post office, New Jersey.
Thomas Young.....	14	Burnt Mill Rd., Haddonfield post office, New Jersey.

¹ Their individual hobbies include baseball, swimming, football, bowling, basketball, voice and instrumental music, photography, camping, dancing, stamp collecting, fishing, and skating.

Little League tournament records

1955 opponent	Own score	Opponent score
Bellmawr, N.J.	6	0
Pyne Poynt, N.J.	11	8
Pennsauken, N.J.	7	0
Haddon Heights, N.J.	13	0
Hammonton, N.J.	2	1
Morristown, N.J.	9	0
Easton, Md.	13	1
Carlstadt, N.J.	1	0
Alexandria, La.	4	2
Auburn, Ala.	6	4
Morrisville, Pa. (champion)	3	4

1956 opponent	Own score	Opponent score
Westmont, N.J.	4	2
Haddonfield, N.J.	1	0
Pennsauken, N.J.	10	1
Maple Shade, N.J.	14	0
Barrington, N.J.	7	2
North Trenton, N.J.	11	1
Morristown, N.J.	6	2
Frederick, Md.	11	4
Englewood, N.J.	6	4
Tuckahoe, N.Y.	9	8
Colton, Calif.	2	0
Roswell, N. Mex. (champion)	1	3

1959 Babe Ruth tournament record (as of Aug. 10, 1959)

1955 Opponent	Own score	Opponent score
Haddonfield, N.J.	6	3
Pennsauken, N.J.	3	1
Westmont, N.J.	9	2
Pennsgrove, N.J.	9	4
Vineland, N.J.	7	3
River Edge-Oradell, N.J.	3	1
Bordentown, N.J.	19	4

The 1955-56 Little League teams were managed by Elmer Bauer and were coached by Ray Strohmeier and Bacon Trotman.

The 1959 Babe Ruth League team is being managed by Tod Lyon and is being coached by Harry Fischler and Irving Dean.

The 1958-59 Babe Ruth League officials are: President, Harry Young; vice president, Tod Lyon; secretaries, Larry Kent and Harry Fischler; treasurer, Thomas J. Fallon.

Bureau of Reclamation Program in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in 1955 the Congress granted the Secretary of the Interior continuing authority to investigate and report on the water resources of Alaska.

In the current fiscal year, the Bureau of Reclamation, which carries out these studies, is bringing to completion two important reports. One is a feasibility study of the Crater-Long Lakes Division of the Snettisham project, which would furnish hydroelectric power for industrial and municipal uses in the Juneau area. The other is a feasibility report

on the Devil Canyon project, Susitna River, a major project that may prove to answer the need of the State of Alaska and the Federal Military Establishment for low-cost power in the Fairbanks and Anchorage areas and along the Railbelt connecting those cities.

On August 7, 1959, at the annual convention of the Alaska Rural Electric Association, Inc., at Fairbanks, an address prepared by Daryl Roberts, Alaska District manager of the Bureau of Reclamation, was read by electrical engineer George Benesch. It provides an excellent summary of the current and projected studies being made by the Alaska District of the Bureau.

I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF DARYL ROBERTS, ALASKA, DISTRICT MANAGER, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, GIVEN BY GEORGE BENESCH, ELECTRICAL ENGINEER, AT THE ANNUAL ALASKA RURAL ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION, INC., CONVENTION, AUGUST 7, 1959, AT FAIRBANKS, ALASKA

I am pleased to discuss with you the present and contemplated activities of the Bureau of Reclamation in the development of the water resources of Alaska. I am personally convinced that water is probably the most important natural resource in the State. Its orderly development and use should be the concern of every individual.

Public Law 322 enacted by Congress in 1955 granted continuing authority to the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report on the water resources of Alaska. Prior to that time such authority was made on a year-to-year basis. The Secretary has in turn appointed the Bureau of Reclamation to carry out the studies for the Department. Therefore, the Bureau's work in Alaska is not governed by the Reclamation Acts. There is no prerequisite for Alaska to become a reclamation State for this work to continue.

Our Alaska program is now in its 12th year. The early years were spent not only in completing a comprehensive overall study of Alaska's water resources, but in building the much-needed Eklutna project. This hydropower development went into operation in 1955 and is currently supplying 159,400,000 kilowatts of energy annually in the Anchorage area. It is, incidentally, returning \$1,600,000 in revenue each year to the payment of interest and retirement of the Federal investment. House Document 197, better known as the Alaska Reconnaissance Report, published in 1952, was the first all-inclusive report made on Alaska water resources. It cataloged such notable potential power projects as Ramparts, Yukon-Taiya, Wood Canyon and Devil Canyon. It lists, with a few minor exceptions, all of today's known potential projects having a capacity of 5,000 kilowatts or greater.

We have been asked why we did not update this valuable report. This might be in order, if it were not for the fact that for most of the streams no new water supply information is available. To reevaluate power potential without basic water supply data contributes little. We believe funds are better spent in obtaining basic information which is contained in the feasibility reports on specific projects. These reports are usually necessary before Congress considers authorization of water resource projects and we hope to have two completed by the end of this fiscal year.

The principal function of the Alaska Reconnaissance Report, on the other hand, was to evaluate and call attention to the poten-

tial water resources of Alaska. In addition, it provided a basis for selecting projects for detailed studies. We believe it has accomplished this purpose.

Those of you who have studied hydroelectric developments in Alaska are aware that lack of water supply information is still a major problem. We are seeking to remedy this deficiency by providing funds to the U.S. Geological Survey for establishing new stream gaging stations. This continuing program has already proven its importance to our water resource studies.

During the past fiscal year we established a stream gaging program on the Chakachamna River. This year one will be established on the Skwentna River.

We anticipate and are planning on the basis that the Bureau's future overall program in the State will keep pace with Alaska's economic growth and need. Proper development and use of your water resources are keys to this growth, and we want to help in any way possible. In fiscal year 1960, we plan to study Vee project on the Susitna River and Chakachamna project, located about 90 miles west of Anchorage. Following completion of the Vee project investigations, we plan to study Watana project unless higher priority work develops. Other studies will follow on tributary streams to the Susitna River and elsewhere in Alaska as the need arises. I want to emphasize that hydropower is only one benefit which can be expected from water resource development in Alaska. Our studies are concerned with ways and means of obtaining the maximum use of the available resource for all purposes.

Presently, the Bureau's activities in Alaska are directed to studies of the Matanuska Valley, the Snettisham project, and the Susitna River. The Matanuska Valley project study is on sprinkler irrigation. It is a cooperative endeavor conducted with the Soil Conservation Service and the State Agricultural Experiment Station to determine benefits derived through use of irrigation in Alaska. Results of last year's work showed potato yields increased 35 percent, carrot yields by 70 percent, and a substantial increase in timothy production. We plan to continue these studies and believe they will demonstrate the importance of irrigation in Alaska.

Our Snettisham project study is directed toward bringing about a source of relatively low-cost power for industrial and municipal use in the Juneau area. The investigation comprises two separate studies, the Crater-Long Lakes Division and the Speel River Division. In the past fiscal year, we have completed studies and have prepared a feasibility report on the Crater-Long Lakes Division. This development would provide an installed capacity of 48,000 kilowatts. Since industrial development in the Juneau area is dependent on a power source, early action on authorization and construction is important in the future.

We also expect to complete a feasibility report this fiscal year on the Speel River Division which will further augment the power supply in the greater Juneau area when constructed. Depending upon other feasibility findings, this may be a natural sequel to the Crater-Long Lakes development.

The Devil Canyon project study on the Susitna River is the first in a series of programmed comprehensive studies to be made on power potential of Alaska's fourth largest river.

Recently compiled data gathered from water supply records, field survey, geological investigations, and other basic data indicate a greater potential than was previously anticipated in the development of this river. Design of the Devil Canyon project in the basin points up some very interesting possibilities. We have been conducting a comprehensive investigation of this project for

the past 3 years and also expect to complete a report on its feasibility before the end of the current fiscal year. The project includes the Devil Canyon power site and the Denali Reservoir site. The firm power potential of the project would be about 3,300,000 kilowatt-hours annually with an installed capacity of 500,000 kilowatts. Current cost estimates indicate that this power can possibly be delivered in both Anchorage and Fairbanks for about 5 to 6 mills per kilowatt-hour. This power rate is made possible by the upstream storage provided at Denali. Development of the Devil Canyon project would be the initial step in an overall basin development. The basin concept of development has long been recognized as yielding the greatest benefits. Such a development of the Susitna River has several desirable characteristics. Two additional power sites, Vee and Watana are located between Devil Canyon and Denali. As each of these is developed, better upstream regulation is provided. This in turn decreases the necessary drawdown in Devil Canyon Reservoir permitting its operation at a higher average head. The result is not only the power added to the system by the new plant but also a greater output from Devil. Completion of the fourth dam on the Susitna would provide complete regulation above Devil Canyon permitting that reservoir to be maintained full continuously. The firm potential estimated for the four-dam development is in excess of 7 billion kilowatt-hours. The system cost of this block of power including transmission costs is estimated to be less than 5 mills.

A second desirable aspect to such a development of the Susitna is its location. The four sites discussed are about equal distance from Anchorage and Fairbanks. They could supply the entire railbelt with a minimum of line loss.

One of the more attractive features of the Susitna is its adaptability to area load growth. In speaking of power costs for large projects, we are prone to base them on the assumption that all power will be utilized immediately. This provides a common denominator for comparison with other projects but it may not prove to be very realistic. We should be cognizant of the fact that the cost of power can be greatly influenced by how early and how fully a project's generation capacity is utilized.

The stage development effect of adding power dams one at a time on the Susitna River can be geared to meet the load growth of the entire rail belt area. The initial transmission grid from development of Devil Canyon will provide an early tie between generating facilities in Anchorage and Fairbanks. Availability of emergency capacity, interchange, nonfirm power use and other power pool benefits would accrue to both major load areas.

Because of its ideal location, large power potential and adaptability to meet any pattern of load growth with low cost power, the Susitna River could play a vital role in Alaska's development.

Address Delivered by South Carolina
State Senator L. Marion Gressette

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on June 23, 1959, South Carolina State Senator L. Marion Gressette of St.

Matthews, S.C., addressed the State and local officers of the Citizens' Councils of the State of South Carolina. Senator Gressette has served with ability and distinction in South Carolina as chairman of a special State committee on public schools. In his address to the officers of the Citizens' Councils, Senator Gressette ably reports the situation in South Carolina on a most vital question to the people of not only South Carolina, but of the entire South and Nation as well. I ask unanimous consent that the address of Senator Gressette be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS OF L. MARION GRESSETTE TO THE STATE AND LOCAL OFFICERS OF THE CITIZENS' COUNCILS OF SOUTH CAROLINA, AT COLUMBIA, S.C., ON JUNE 23, 1959

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure to be with you today. I have been looking forward to this opportunity. When approached by your affable and efficient executive secretary, Mr. Farley Smith, in reference to a meeting of this kind, I was delighted. I welcome the chance to discuss with you the problem that is our mutual concern.

Before undertaking to brief you to some extent on the work of our committee and what the State is doing to protect the rights of its citizens, permit me to say that your organization is playing a most important part in this fight. You are rendering a great service to the people of our State, the South, and the Nation. After all is said and done, we are concerned primarily with only one thing and that is to restore constitutional government. You are helping to do that. It is good to know you are organized and that your influence and support can be depended upon to crystallize the right sentiment and attitude on the part of our people. It is important that this be done. They should know that they will be called upon to make sacrifices, and that it is going to take the support and understanding of the people in order to preserve the American way of life.

We live in a time of great trouble and trial, neither of which is a stranger to our people. We are assembled here in the cause of individual liberty and popular freedom, both of which I hope and believe are uppermost in the hearts and minds of our people.

We do not propose to foment political rebellion, nor is it our purpose to bring about a social upheaval which would hurt all of our citizens and benefit none of them.

On the contrary, it is our purpose and our firm resolve to prevent such a rebellion and to temper such an upheaval to the end that all of our people, regardless of race, color or creed may continue to make progress in a political and social atmosphere that is conducive to the individual's making the most of his talents and his opportunities.

Contrary to some of the libels which have been perpetrated against us, we of South Carolina are determined to guarantee equality of opportunity—not just for one race or creed, but for all. We are determined to protect the rights of all citizens, and not just those who happen to enjoy the favor of a particular group of self-seeking politicians and professional do-gooders who temporarily occupy positions of power and influence.

Because it is thrust upon us from every side, we cannot ignore the race issue, but let us forget it for a time. Our primary concern is on a much higher plane. It has to do with the preservation, nay, the reestablishment of constitutional government in our country.

It has to do with the preservation or the loss for all time of the real rights of the individual. The radical agitators have chosen to place emphasis on a rather sordid sort of issue, but it is not the real one. If these people can succeed in depriving the citizen of the rights of freedom of association, if they can destroy the power of the States to order their internal affairs as they see fit, then the end of all individual rights and all powers of the States is clearly in sight.

And with that the sorry fate of the Republic will be sealed. What really is at stake in all of this turmoil is the right of individuals to decide who shall be their governors and the right of sovereign peoples to govern themselves.

We here bear a noble ancestry. Our forefathers entered this country and cleared the land and erected their homes, overcoming many obstacles. They produced generations of soldiers and statesmen. They were in the forefront of the fight for independence of the tyrannical British Crown, and they contributed much to the writing of the Constitution of the United States.

To the extent that all citizens and all branches of Government have obeyed and properly interpreted that Constitution, it has been the cement which has held the Union together. It is only when the Constitution has been misinterpreted and perverted by evil men for their own purposes that the safety of the Union and the solidarity of the American people have been threatened.

Our grandfathers, in the War Between the States, fought for the principles upon which the Union was founded as they saw those principles. They did not in their day apologize for what they did. Even less so is there reason for apology for what we have done in our day to uphold those same principles, the rights and powers of the States and the proud and honorable culture that is ours.

Our region, especially South Carolina, is the last citadel of really free conservative thought left in the United States. And true conservatism, as opposed to radical liberalism, is the final line of defense between freedom and the insidious encroachment of a highly centralized government that would destroy all liberty and pervert the minds of men.

If we fail, our country will go the way of the Greeks and Romans. The ancient republics fell when the people were more interested in security than they were in opportunity, when they placed comfort ahead of responsibility and when they preferred bread and circuses over the satisfaction of self-government. When these things happened, the Greeks and the Romans ceased to be free, and they were never free again.

It can happen here. The signs are evident in our own country. The attitude of the U.S. Supreme Court, a long line of decisions which have been accepted by many as absolutely binding precedents and the abdication by some Members of Congress of power held in trust for the people are contributing to our downfall. Unless we can reverse the trend, and the initiative rests with the South, I shudder to think what the future holds for our Nation. What now passes for government could become either dictatorship or anarchy.

In the face of this trend, South Carolina has made its position clear. We are not defying the "law of the land" we are fighting for a return to the law of the land. They call us reactionaries and racists, but we are neither. The true reactionaries are those who would subject the law to the whim of those who happen to be in power at a given moment. The real racists are those who would set neighbor against neighbor in an effort to gain false goals and who make enemies of friends in the name of "equality."

For the best part of a decade I have had the privilege of serving as chairman of a

committee of citizens created by the general assembly to offer advice and counsel on how best to meet the problems created by the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in the school cases. The committee is composed of five senators, five representatives and five laymen. There have been no changes among the laymen, but the legislative membership has changed in direct proportion to the changes in the general assembly. All of this has given us the benefit of the thinking of a broad cross section of the people of our State.

Since its formation, the duties of the committee have been enlarged so as to cover all phases of the segregation problem, not only the public school system, but all other public facilities. It acts in an advisory capacity only, advising the Governor and the general assembly as to what course of action it feels should be taken to meet any actual or anticipated situation. The members of the committee do not receive any special pay for their services, they are only allowed per diem expenses as any other legislative committee. Authority is given to it for the employment of such clerical and technical help as may be needed.

I cannot heap too much praise on my fellow members of the committee. They have proven themselves to be men of the highest calibre, truly great South Carolinians and Americans. All meetings are well attended and absentees are the exception rather than the rule. They have been diligent and fearless in carrying out their assignment, and I commend them and their patriotic service to you.

It should be remembered that South Carolina was the first of the 17 States who recognized segregation as a matter of law, to organize a committee to guide the Governor, the general assembly, and the people through such difficulties as might arise if the U.S. courts should nullify the laws providing for separation of the races.

After consultation with many citizens in many walks of life, and with all of the public officials concerned, and after exhaustive study of the laws, the court decisions and events in other States, the committee has made certain recommendations. Without exception, they have been adopted by the general assembly and accepted by the public.

It is gratifying to be able to report that we have had peace and tranquility among our people, even while we were making amazing progress in the development of our schools. There is no longer any excuse in South Carolina for anyone to grow up illiterate, and no one can say he is being denied an equal opportunity for an education. Those who are suffering most are the white children in our more rapidly growing communities who are faced with the prospect of double sessions and overcrowded classrooms.

South Carolina has acted in good faith in providing equal educational opportunities as between the races. We have worked very closely with the educational finance committee to that end, and we think a vast majority of the colored people are satisfied with their schools, and would prefer that they be operated on a segregated basis. There is no discrimination in this State between the races, as both white and colored have good, equal facilities. This has been accomplished by the willingness of the people to pay their tax money for the support of the schools.

There is separation of the races by choice, and so long as this continues no one can be heard to complain—unless it is some out-of-State do-gooder, either individuals or organizations, and they can shed as many crocodile tears as they care to, so far as we are concerned. The people of South Carolina intend to operate their schools in accordance with their own wishes so long as

they are allowed to do so, and when this right is denied to them they will close the public schools and seek some other method for the education of their children.

This position on the part of our people is made crystal clear by the laws that were enacted following the obnoxious U.S. Supreme Court decision in 1954, when the general assembly of this State passed, and Governor Timmerman approved, a bill to the effect that if any child is transferred, pursuant to or in consequence of an order of any court, from one school to another, all appropriations for the school to which and from which he is transferred shall cease and become inoperative. The purpose of this legislation is to squarely bring into play, as between the Federal Government and the State government, the right of the State to operate its own public school system. We do not believe the U.S. Government, by its courts or otherwise, has any right to say how money appropriated by our general assembly shall be spent in South Carolina for public education.

From its very beginning, our committee has said the 1954 decision of the U.S. Supreme Court was both illegal and immoral. The general assembly has said as much in a statement of public policy interposing its sovereignty between the people and their elected school officials and the tyranny of the Federal Government. We have said that we would not recommend any course of action that would force white children to attend Negro schools or Negro children to attend white schools.

If this policy is violated, resulting in the closing of any school in South Carolina, it will be because of a decision of a Federal court, and not by any act of the General Assembly of South Carolina. The laws of the State of South Carolina so provide and we make no apologies about it.

Up to this time we have been successful, because—and solely because—we have had the approval and support of the overwhelming majority of the people of our State. Our people have shown that they prize educational opportunity above dubious social experimentation demanded by persons of questionable integrity and background. We hope that attitude will continue.

There is nothing more indicative of the progress we have made in our efforts to solve the existing problem than that the relationship between the races in South Carolina is good. Our colored people do not want their children to attend white schools nor do they want to attend white churches or to bring about a mongrelization of the races which would mean the downfall of our Nation. If there is one thing that we have tried hard to do, it is to cultivate a proper relationship between the races.

It is important that we keep the line of communication between the races open. We feel that we have accomplished a good bit in that direction, in that we are providing our colored children with equal school facilities and doing everything possible to maintain good relations among the people of the State. Each of you can help tremendously in the promotion of good relations. Frequently I have colored people call at my office and they are frank in saying that they do not go along with the NAACP and other misguided associations and individuals for integration of the races, that they are satisfied with our southern, and American, way of life and that all in the world they want is good will on the part of their white friends. This relationship should be encouraged and I am sure you are conscious of its value and will help to promote it, so that the State of South Carolina can continue to be free and clear of any racial disturbance.

The events of the last 7 years have done much to destroy communications between us and our colored friends whom we have sought to help and who have helped us.

These people are the victims of a system of intimidation and oppression such as even the Dark Ages failed to produce. In an effort to alleviate that situation an old law has been brought to the front. It is known as the crime of barratry, which simply means that no person will hereafter be permitted to solicit or incite another to bring, prosecute, or maintain an action at law or at equity, in any court having jurisdiction within this State. Putting it another way, no person without or within the State can solicit or prevail upon another person to bring an action in any court having jurisdiction in the State of South Carolina. This will prevent organizations such as the NAACP from promoting lawsuits and inciting members of the colored race to bring suits for any purpose in the State of South Carolina.

Any corporation or unincorporated association found guilty of the crime of barratry shall be forever barred from doing any business or carrying on any activity in this State and shall be subject to a fine of not more than \$5,000, or imprisonment of not more than 2 years, or both.

We think this law will have a wholesome effect on those who would incite and foment trouble among the good colored people of the State of South Carolina. We feel that we owe them this protection and this law will be strictly enforced in order that they may be protected against our common day carpet-baggers and scalawags.

We have been blessed in that we have had none of the ugly incidents which have occurred in some of our sister States. But we must face the fact that every interracial crime makes our task all the more difficult.

Our good fortune is due to a sound and healthy public opinion. You of the citizens' councils have had a lot to do with that, and you have an even bigger job in the future.

Here's the challenge:

Our committee and the general assembly and the Governor have gone as far as we think we should at this time. We are prepared to go further and we are studying every development that occurs and every idea that is advanced. But we do not pretend to know all of the answers. We think we are on sound legal grounds, but who can predict a decision of the Federal courts these days?

We need the active advice and assistance of organized groups throughout the State, whatever may be their name or origin. We need organized groups who are prepared to present ideas and to prevent lawlessness. We are a God-fearing and a law-abiding people. We do not propose to act otherwise. But there is a restlessness in the land that should disturb us all.

We in South Carolina do not intend to surrender our right to run our schools as we see fit for the best interests of all of our people. But we also intend to see to it, in our own way, that all of our people have equal opportunities. We feel that we are on sound legal ground and intend to resort to every legal means at our command to support the position we have taken.

You know we hear a great deal about contributions to NAACP from individuals, foundations and other organizations for the purpose of financing suits for integration in the South. Intelligence of this kind fails to frighten us. We have one of the best staffs of lawyers that can be found anywhere and we intend to utilize its services to the fullest in order to see that the rights of the people of our State are protected.

We are prepared, ready and willing to meet them in any legal forum at any time for the purpose of defending our position in this fight. We have no idea of permitting any lawsuit to go by default. It is our intention to protect our school trustees and other local and State officials in carrying out their duties and no one, be it individual or organization, shall ever deter us in doing so. We

ask nothing more than that the laws of our land be carried out as intended by the Constitutions of our State and of the United States. We cannot be coerced or intimidated and we intend to pursue the course we have charted with the knowledge that right is on our side and that it will prevail.

We must go on with our program of better schools and with our efforts to provide greater economic opportunities for all of our citizens. Given time, those two things alone may solve most of our problems.

But we must also work for public acceptance of these ideas and precepts. This calls for the active participation of every citizen, and I ask you to take the lead in that. It will require the best efforts of our best leaders.

Finally, we can take heart in the fact that there is arising here and there over the entire country a new appreciation of our position. The cause of States rights and the right of individual self-determination as to his associates and his way of life is far from being lost. I am hopeful that we have allies where we didn't know they existed.

Meanwhile, let us not lose sight of the fact that the basic issue is a showdown between government by the people and a dictatorship of the worst sort.

Time will not permit a full discussion of the applicability of other laws that have been enacted, such as the amendment to the State constitution eliminating the provision for a public school system for all boys and girls between the ages of 6 and 16 years, the repeal of the compulsory attendance law, the granting of almost unlimited powers to the local boards of school trustees, increased powers to the Governor, and other measures. But suffice it to say that they are geared to protect what we conceive to be the constitutional rights of the people of South Carolina and to defend true constitutional government from those, from within or without the State, who would tear it down.

In closing, it is my earnest hope that your organization will continue to grow—and if the need should arise for action on your part you will be ready and willing to step in and act.

I tell you there is no time for indifference and lack of interest, or the feeling that someone else will attend to the job. It is the concern of everyone. We are reminded of this daily when we read our newspapers or listen to other news media.

Places where strong public sentiment did not exist have surrendered with little or no opposition. On the other hand, where public opinion for sound government exists, our enemies have made little or no headway.

Edmund Burke, that great English champion of American liberty said: "When bad men combine, the good must associate; else they will fall, one by one, an unpitied sacrifice in a contemptible struggle."

Ours is not a contemptible struggle, nor do we propose to become an unpitied sacrifice. But our cause is great enough to merit almost any sacrifice.

We need to stand together as our forefathers stood at other crucial times, in the defense of our individual rights and liberties, in order to succeed.

This can be done if we share the responsibility—as I feel certain, we will.

Operation Bootstrap, Indian Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to

insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the August 7, 1959, issue of Congressional Quarterly on my program, "Operation Bootstrap, Indian Style."

The author, Helene Monberg, has presented an excellent analysis of the need for the program, its success in Puerto Rico, and its potential on the Indian reservations in the United States.

The article is as follows:

OPERATION BOOTSTRAP, INDIAN STYLE

The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico (population 2.3 million), oldest Territory under the American flag (it was discovered by Columbus in 1493) is offering a helping hand to the oldest inhabitants of the United States, the American Indians (pop. 535,000).

Under the leadership of Gov. Luis Munoz Marin, the Puerto Ricans in 1946 embarked on Operation Bootstrap, a program to industrialize Puerto Rico, then known as the "poorhouse of the Caribbean." It has succeeded so well that leaders from all over the world have come to the tiny Caribbean island (35 miles wide, 100 miles long) to learn the Puerto Ricans' magic formula. Puerto Rico's Operation Bootstrap has intrigued leaders of the American Indian, for the industrial age in America has swept past reservation Indians living in remote areas. Many Indians are permanently on relief because their reservations, based on an agricultural economy, cannot support the rapidly increasing Indian population.

BACKGROUND

In 1958 the House Interior Committee, including Representative E. Y. BERRY, Republican, who lives in Standing Rock Sioux territory in South Dakota, took a first-hand look at Puerto Rico's Operation Bootstrap. After long talks with Munoz Marin and Puerto Rico's Resident Commissioner in Congress, Antonio Fernos-Isern, who "gave me great encouragement," Berry told Congressional Quarterly, he decided that Operation Bootstrap could be tailored to meet the needs of the American Indian.

BERRY introduced a bill (H.R. 7701) on June 12, 1959, which he calls "Operation Bootstrap, Indian-style." Similar legislation (H.R. 8033) has been introduced by Representative ODIN LANGEN, Republican, of Minnesota. BERRY told Congressional Quarterly that H.R. 7701 had evoked more nationwide response than any other legislation he has ever introduced, particularly from Indians, mission priests, and church groups. Among those who have already announced their support of the Berry Bootstrap measure are the Governors' Interstate Indian Council made up of Indian tribal chairmen in 18 States ranging from New York to Washington, the North Dakota Indian Affairs Commission, the Board of National Missions of the United Presbyterian Church of the USA and four Indian agency superintendents in South Dakota and Oklahoma. BERRY told Congressional Quarterly he anticipates a "generally favorable reaction" to the bill from the Administration. Chairman WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Democrat, of Colorado, of the House Interior Committee has promised to hold hearings on the Indian Bootstrap measures early in the next session of Congress.

PUERTO RICO'S PROGRAM

Puerto Rico's Operation Bootstrap is designed primarily to industrialize and diversify the Island's rum-and-sugar economy by encouraging new industry to locate there. The U.S. Congress gave the Island a major assist in this regard in 1950. Under the Commonwealth Act of July 3, 1950, (Public Law 600, 81st Congress), Puerto Rico was exempted from U.S. individual and corporate income taxes, excises, estate and gift

taxes and permitted to retain proceeds from its customs duties. Thus, under Bootstrap, Puerto Rico is able to exempt new industries from municipal, corporate, partnership, and personal income taxes for 10 years; from taxes on dividends or profits for 7 years; and from taxes on property from 5 to 10 years. The Commonwealth government will sell or lease a plant on a long-term basis to new firms and offer them technical assistance. These exemptions go to industries never in operation in the Island prior to June 2, 1947, to 34 specified industries ranging from animal feed to tinware manufacture which can utilize the skills and resources of the Island, and to tourist and commercial hotels. Some 600 industries have located in Puerto Rico under this plan.

Operation Bootstrap has made profound changes in Puerto Rico. The island has risen from a burden on the U.S. Treasury to sixth place as a major customer of American goods. Puerto Rico now buys more from the United States, on a per capita basis, than Canada. Since 1940 the annual per capita income on the island has increased fourfold. Life expectancy of the average Puerto Rican has increased nearly 20 years. Infant mortality has been halved.

INDIAN BOOTSTRAP PROPOSAL

BERRY reasons that if the U.S. Congress will allow the same tax exemptions on Indian reservations as it has allowed the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, some industries, notably small manufacturers who would utilize the manual dexterity of the Indian, will move to Indian reservations. His bill would authorize Indian tribes to set up corporations empowered to construct plants to sell or lease to an industrial firm on a long-term basis, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Interior. These plants could be built with tribal funds, Federal loans, or through commercial loans to the tribal corporations. Industries moving onto Indian reservations would receive complete exemption from Federal, State, and local taxes for 10 years, the right to amortize property eligible for depreciation on a 5-year schedule, a deduction for 5 years from any Federal tax in an amount equal to three times the annual welfare payments paid to an Indian prior to his industrial employment, and Government aid in conducting on-the-job training for Indian employees.

BERRY believes that the American Indian, like the Puerto Rican, "will lift himself up by his own bootstraps if given freedom of opportunity" and assistance in developing resources on and bringing industry to his reservation. Currently, about 80 percent of the reservation Indians in this country have no incentive because they have no opportunity, BERRY holds. Most of those on relief "would gladly swap a Government relief check for a weekly paycheck," BERRY told Congressional Quarterly.

Bootstrap comparisons

	U.S. total	Indian	Puerto Rico	
			Pre-bootstrap	After bootstrap
Per capita income.....	\$51,639	(9)	\$121	\$480
Literacy..... percent.....	91	50	68.5	83.8
Life expectancy..... years.....	69.6	63.6	46	68
Death rate per 1,000 population.....	19.3	28.7	18.4	17.3
Infant mortality rate per 1,000 births.....	28	55.1	112.5	55.1

1 All 1930-40 figures.

2 1936 figures.

3 Unknown.

4 1957-58 figures.

5 Estimated.

6 1955 figures.

Distaste for Communism Felt by West German People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a few days ago, I received a letter from Dr. Walter Becher, of Munchen, Germany, a member of the Bavarian Landtag and secretary general of the Sudeten German Council. The letter contained two clippings from the official Press-Bulletin of the West German Government, and Dr. Becher's translations of these articles into English.

I feel that the letter and translated articles, Mr. President, express much of the devout love for freedom and strong distaste for communism that are felt by the West German people. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the items may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUDETEN GERMAN COUNCIL,
Munchen, July 1, 1959.

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I take the liberty to call to your kind attention two articles published in the official Press-Bulletin of the German Federal Government. The one is picturing the last communication measures in the German Soviet Zone, indicating that the Communists never intend to give up their zone voluntarily and that they wish only a reunification with West Germany in communism. The other article is a radio speech made by the Honorable Dr. Hilger van Scherpenberg, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the West German Republic, which is an able summary of the German standpoint regarding the last Soviet proposals.

I enclose the original Press Bulletin as well as the English translation of the most important places of the article. I would be deeply grateful if you could kindly consider the insertion of the translated portion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We greatly esteem the RECORD, this unique publication of your Congress, and know the importance of what is published there. I believe the enclosed article is of interest now, when the Geneva conference reopens.

I planned to visit the United States in June and July and hoped also to have the honor to meet you and to ask you personally to kindly make this RECORD insertion. For different reasons I had to postpone my U.S. trip and so I take the liberty to send to you my polite request in this form.

We, the German expellees, fully endorse the policies of the Free World and of the West German Government. What we can do, is to support the policies of the free governments and good and sound ideas here in our country as well as in other nations.

I would greatly appreciate if you most kindly would put the enclosed translated material into the RECORD.

With my best personal wishes.

Yours very sincerely,

DR. WALTER BECHER,

Member of the Bavarian Landtag,
Secretary General.

[Bulletin, No. 83, p. 804]

The Investigatory Council for Questions Pertaining to the Reunification of Germany, in the Federal Ministry for All-German Questions, convened in Berlin on May 4 and 5, 1959, under the chairmanship of its president, Dr. J. B. Gradi, a deputy of the Federal Diet. At the end of the session the following communique was issued:

"Last year, the SED Party already began to conduct an extermination campaign against the remnants of private enterprise in a particularly ruthless manner. Compulsory fusion into cooperatives in agriculture and handicrafts, the formation of semi-state enterprises in industry and the conclusion of commission contracts in the retail trade are the main measures resorted to in order to exterminate the middle class.

"The number of private industrial concerns that have been obliged to accept state participation has increased, from 440 at the end of 1957, to 2,638 in the first quarter of 1959. The share of the private concerns in industrial production has decreased from 12 percent in 1957 to about 8 percent at the end of 1958, and by the end of 1959 it will barely amount to 5 percent.

"Up to the end of 1957, the handicraft enterprises were able to maintain their independence almost completely. But then, however, they were forced to form production cooperatives. By the end of 1958, practically one-tenth of the persons engaged in handicrafts were employed in these cooperatives.

"In agriculture only a little over half the arable area is at present still cultivated by independent farmers. The number of agricultural production cooperatives has increased from 234 in 1956 to 3,000 in 1958. By the end of March 1959, the agricultural production cooperatives numbered 378,000 members and controlled more than 39 percent of the arable area.

"In the retail trade, 14 percent of all the private retailers and restaurant proprietors already have commission contracts with the state wholesale trade or TO which make them employees of these state institutions."

[Bulletin, No. 71, p. 677]

In a talk broadcast on April 15, 1959, in the series of programs, "Problems of Germany's Policy," of the Hessen Broadcasting Corp., Dr. Hilger van Scherpenberg, Secretary of State in the Foreign Office of the Federal Republic of Germany, said:

"The relation of the West to the Soviet Union will in the end be determined by the question as to whether communism is prepared to renounce its domination plans. The West is well aware of the fact that, so far, there have been no convincing signs of any such renunciation and that its principles of freedom and its way of life thus continue to be endangered.

"In any case, the Federal Republic has a very definite conception as to how far it may make concessions without endangering the freedom-loving way of life of its subjects and without rendering a reunification of Germany in freedom impossible. It is thus logical that a confederation of the two German states is out of the question. In the opinion of the Federal Government, the restoration of Germany's unity can only be effected on the basis of the principles of freedom.

"The right of self-determination of the peoples is a basic principle of the Charter of the United Nations, which was also signed by the Soviet Union. Free elections alone can insure the free right of all Germany to decide her constitutional order and her foreign political relations. For this reason, the Federal Government does not feel that it can recognize the so-called German Democratic Republic.

"A peace treaty could only be negotiated and concluded with a government responsible for the whole of Germany. The draft made by the Soviet Union clearly expresses the intention of the latter to legalize the existing situation in Europe, to isolate the Federal Republic and to expose it later on to an attack on its internal freedom-loving order. Since the problem of Germany is only the expression but not the cause of the international political tension, an isolated treatment of a peace treaty with Germany would not be in keeping with political reality. The Federal Government is convinced that the suggestions of the West must be put forward as a complex whole at the coming Foreign Ministers' Conference. It is further of the opinion that a general, controlled disarmament would represent an important step toward an easing of international political tension and, at the same time, a step forward in the German problem.

"No one can deny the Federal Republic the right to see to it that its security and also that of its allies is guaranteed. In view of the overwhelming military superiority of the Soviet Union, the Federal Republic sees itself forced, as was so far the case, to rely on the Western defense community for its security. And this seems all the more advisable since all the suggestions made by the Soviet Union so far with regard to disarmament and security have, in principle, aimed to strengthen the power and the positions of the Soviet Union and, whenever possible, to undermine the defensive strength of the West. It is the endeavor of the Soviet Union to pick out the military aspects to its advantage out of the entire complex of disarmament and security questions and effect an isolated solution in this respect, whereas such burning political problems as, for instance, the reunification of Germany, are to remain unsolved indefinitely.

"In this connection, certain suggestions which provide for a detachment of the Federal Republic from the Western defense system must be regarded as extremely dubious. Any plan which creates a political power vacuum between the two great power blocs will not lead to an easing of tension, but, on the contrary, will only aggravate the unrest and insecurity and thus endanger peace still more.

"It is essential for the security of the Federal Republic that the original legal statute of Berlin should be maintained, since it represents the legal basis for the presence of the troops of our allies in Berlin and thus for the freedom of Berlin."

The Need for a Modernized Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL WEAVER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, we have reached a point in history which, if we are not extremely careful, may become a point of no return. In our defense planning we may be reaching the point of stalemate with any potential enemy in which we may in actual fact, be in a state of disarmament because neither we nor any enemy would hazard a nuclear exchange which conceivably could destroy both our Houses and perhaps every human on earth.

In such an impasse lies the danger of a sudden military adventure by a potential aggressor using conventional arms. Therein also lies the danger of constant probing, and constant thrust by an enemy to find soft spots around his perimeter for further expansion and consolidation.

There are many such exposed places in the free world. We are hearing a lot about one of them—Laos—at the present. We are likely to hear of other such spots, perhaps Iraq or Iran or Turkey in the not-too-distant future.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the House should pay most careful attention in next year's budget to the growing need for modernization of the Armed Forces, particularly our tactical troops whether in the Army or the Marine Corps. These men need new weapons and new fighting strength which must be forthcoming if we are to protect the free world from the threat of these potential military adventures on the part of world communism.

Perhaps one of the best studies of this problem I have seen in recent weeks was contained in an editorial in the Washington Post on Sunday, August 9. I would like to bring that editorial to the attention of my colleagues now. It covers the subject well, ably, and succinctly. The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Aug. 9, 1959]

THE PERILS OF STALEMATE

The new Army Chief of Staff, Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, has forcefully restated the Army case for modernization. He warns sternly against the false security of an atomic stalemate based upon weapons for mass destruction. The warning comes at an appropriate time, when Congress has provided some four times the sum for modern Army equipment which the Pentagon apparently will be allowed to spend under the tight Budget Bureau defense spending ceiling.

As General Lemnitzer has put it, the coming era of stalemate (already seemingly recognized in diplomacy), with each side possessing relatively invulnerable deterrent nuclear striking power, will be equivalent in some respect to a nuclear disarmament. Each side may, in effect, be disarmed by its own unwillingness or political inability to accept the wholesale destruction which would accrue to attacker and attacked alike in a nuclear war.

Such a situation clearly would invite the more reckless use of conventional arms in the pursuit of limited objectives, once it had become unequivocally clear that a nuclear war was truly out of the question. Communist military pressures and adventuring in Eastern Europe and in southeast Asia could in such circumstances be effectively deterred only by the counterpoise of a modern and balanced armed force, consisting of land, sea and air units equipped to fight localized battles with weapons suitable for the purpose. Such fighting might occur on the soil of nations friendly or allied with the United States, and it could be seriously contemplated only if a defense were realistically possible that would not result in utter devastation.

For the cost of a relatively few big missiles, with supporting installations, the preparedness of the Army could be greatly enhanced. Attention to this neglected aspect of defense might go far toward repairing the

widespread demoralization of servicemen of which Hanson Baldwin writes in shocking terms in the Saturday Evening Post. Modernization of the forces for limited wars—and provision of adequate air transport for them—can no more be postponed to the day of an actual engagement than can preparedness and maintenance of the general war deterrent. The country faces what appears to be a long-term, sustained outward pressure from the Communist bloc—pressure that must be met, deterred and resisted, if need be, on an equally sustained basis.

Short of a nuclear war, the West could lose many and perhaps irretrievable battles to determined Communist forces before it could create and bring to bear adequate limited war strength. Since the Nation's diplomacy already recognizes a condition of virtual nuclear stalemate, is it not time to recognize the same facts in military planning? General Lemnitzer's call for a strengthened and modernized limited war defense can be ignored only at the risk of serious Western losses or the invocation of a general war which is becoming increasingly unacceptable as an instrument of national policy.

International Cooperation in Attack Upon Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on July 22, 1959, Senator HUMPHREY called for an international cooperation in the effort to find a cure for cancer. He expressed hope that the combined research of scientists in many countries could lead to full medical understanding of cancer, its causes and its cure. The Wichita (Kans.) Beacon of July 24, 1959, commented editorially on Senator HUMPHREY's proposal. I ask unanimous consent that the Beacon editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WAR THAT MAKES SENSE

In the midst of horrendous speculation about nuclear war, at last comes a suggestion for a war that would make sense.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, wants the United States and the Soviet Union to declare war, not against each other, but against a common enemy—cancer.

Cancer, the Senator pointed out, killed 250,000 people in the United States last year. The Soviets also counted a quarter of a million cancer deaths last year. All over the world, 2 million people died of cancer last year.

This number, the Senator said, is equal to the population of West Berlin.

"If the major powers cannot agree politically on Berlin, let the leaders of the major powers at least agree on trying to save the lives each year of as many people as live in Berlin."

A global assault on cancer is so obviously sensible that it might seem impossible in a world where nonsense often rules.

But some progress already has been made. In his January 1957 State of the Union message, President Eisenhower invited the Soviets to join in an all-out offensive against

cancer and heart disease. There have been some efforts at cooperation.

Translation of scientific journals has been a major step. Our National Cancer Institute has arranged to translate the principal Soviet cancer research journal into English. It is also sending to Russia many of our own journals. A few scientists in the two countries have exchanged information and findings.

There are excellent cancer researchers in America. There are others in the Soviet Union. And still others scattered throughout the world.

There are, HUMPHREY says, "clues to the cause and cure of the mystery of cancer . . . all over the world."

The United States already has stated its eagerness for a worldwide hunt for the worldwide killer. Surely there should be no "nyets" from the other side of the Iron Curtain.

On Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to bring to the attention of the Congress an editorial "On Guard," that appeared in the Advocate of August 6. This is the official publication of the archdiocese of Newark, N.J., and diocese of Paterson, N.J.:

ON GUARD

For some time it has been evident that an invitation to Russia's Khrushchev to visit America was in the making. So many public figures—Senators, Governors, the Vice President—were talking of it that it was obvious that the American people were being prepared—softened up, one might suggest—for it.

The only surprising thing, therefore, about Monday's announcement was the timing. It proved to be a faster sell than had been anticipated. Can it be that we have been too complacent, too slow in letting our servant-officials know what we want and what we do not want? About 2 years ago a buildup for a visit by Yugoslavia's Tito aroused so much popular opposition that the proposal was dropped in great haste. Have we been so well brainwashed in so short a time?

We cannot help feeling that a visit by Khrushchev is a horrible mistake on our part, an insult to decent-thinking people everywhere, a grave danger to our national security, a dark stain on our national honor. It will surely bring deep discouragement to the captive nations to whom we solemnly dedicated the week of July 19 last.

We are realistic enough, however, to acknowledge that what we think or say will do nothing to call back the invitation already extended. Accepting a most regrettable fact, we venture to offer comment on the presence of the Kremlin killer in our midst.

We trust that our Government has given adequate consideration to the potential dynamite in the matter of Khrushchev's security while here.

It is one of the glories of our America that we have in recent years admitted thousands of refugees; the vast majority of them have been the victims of the very tyranny headed by our guest. It surely must be accepted as well within the realm of possibility that not a few of them, carried away by national

patriotism or personal hatred, may seek revenge for the wrongs inflicted by Khrushchev's minions on themselves, their families, their nations. He would not be the first gangster to get a bullet in the back.

Have we honestly been able to give Khrushchev assurance of safety, of complete protection? Or are we going to demean ourselves still further by calling upon the Russian secret police? Or have we already degraded ourselves by submitting to the arrogant demands of the Soviet dictator that he be watched over by his own bodyguards?

It is, indeed, devoutly to be hoped that Khrushchev will not be assassinated on our soil. It is equally desirable that our reception of him be kept strictly official, cold and formal. He is the de facto head of a government (irrespective of the means by which he seized and holds power) and should be treated as such. He is, at the same time, so detestable a person, so vicious an enemy, that anything that even hints at cordiality should be rigidly excluded. Let there be no ticker-tape parades, no fawning industrialists pressing invitations to luncheon and dinner, no society leaders clamoring for the distinction of entertaining so incredible a guest.

One of the strongest reasons advanced during the "sell" for inviting Khrushchev to come here was that it is important that he get to know America. Let us not be taken in by such nonsense. The Soviet espionage system has been so active here for so many years, and we have been so careless (if no worse) about it, that there can be little, indeed, that Khrushchev does not already know. Above all, let us never lose sight of that fact that he knows what he wants; that what he wants is to bury us (the expression is his), to achieve world domination for communism; that he is driving relentlessly toward that goal. His visit to America is designed in some way to contribute to its attainment. Let us be on guard as never before.

The Great Diplomatic Struggle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the battle for the minds of men today lies largely in the skirmishes of the cold war. And, Mr. President, it is in this area that we have been somewhat negligent.

We have had great difficulty in our years of existence in training a diplomatic corps of dedicated career men. The tradition for this sort of work is not what it should be in this country. For centuries the diplomats of some of our allies have been members of this kind of corps.

Yet, the United States of America has had leadership of the free world thrust upon her. We must rise to the occasion.

One step in this direction, Mr. President, would be enactment of a measure to establish a Foreign Service Academy. Such a proposal was made last January by the junior Senator from Missouri. It is regrettable that no action has been taken by the Senate thus far.

Most of us had the opportunity in recent days to read in *This Week* magazine an excellent discourse written by

the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri. Thereafter, Mr. President, the Fort Wayne Journal-Gazette, one of the truly great newspapers of my home State of Indiana, published an excellent editorial in support of Mr. SYMINGTON's bill.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fort Wayne (Ind.) Journal-Gazette]

THE GREAT DIPLOMATIC STRUGGLE

The great struggle known as the cold war is to win the minds of men around the world.

The United States is deeply committed in this war. If she loses it, her glory will have departed.

If she loses it, freedom will have to surrender to dictatorship.

America cannot win the cold war without the best and most highly trained diplomatic service in the world.

Dollars alone will not perform miracles. Our country spent \$60 billion since the end of World War II trying to prop up and save the free nations.

Because Americans who were handling this aid program were not properly trained for their jobs much of this money has been wasted.

This costly experience has shown that we need trained diplomats as well as dollars—men who know what they are doing and how to do it.

Of such wise and skillful foreign service America is in short supply.

It is imperative that we increase the supply.

One of our most far-seeing statesmen in the field of national defense is Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri.

Senator SYMINGTON has fought year in and year out for an adequate military defense and to see that the American citizen gets more value from his defense tax dollar.

But Senator SYMINGTON knows that military defense is not enough—that the cold war must be won by brilliant diplomacy which only highly trained men and women can provide.

That is why he introduced in the Congress last January a bill which would provide for a Foreign Service Academy—a West Point of diplomacy—to train the Nation's ablest young men and women for diplomatic jobs in the cold war.

Senator SYMINGTON has pointed out that 50 percent of those now serving us in that capacity do not speak a foreign language. In addition, they often know little or nothing of the culture and economics of the country where they serve.

This, of course, ought to be corrected.

Inability to speak the language sets up a barrier between the American Foreign Service personnel and the people of the countries where they are assigned.

Those selected for the proposed Foreign Service Academy should be the cream of the crop. They must be young men and women who can take the intensive training. They must have good commonsense as well as high academic ability.

Part of the faculty for such a school could be composed of successful retired diplomats who would be able to give the students the benefit of their rich experience. For the training must be realistic.

It is of vital importance that we have the best diplomats in the world because the Soviet Union is giving this sort of training of its prize students the highest priority.

America cannot win with a second-best effort.

In the past our Government has filled diplomatic posts in payment for political debts here at home. There was a time when the country could stand such a haphazard system. But not today.

The American way of life is at stake in the cold war. We have to win it. There is no other choice. Let's give our Foreign Service the best training that the world of diplomacy has ever seen.

Our Men on Okinawa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article by Francis Vivian Drake which appeared in the August 1959 issue of Reader's Digest. The article entitled "Our Men on Okinawa—Why We Must Keep Them There" follows:

OUR MEN ON OKINAWA—WHY WE MUST KEEP THEM THERE

(By Francis Vivian Drake)

(This Island outpost is more than a mighty airbase; it is a showcase for American resolution and integrity. As such, it is being watched by the entire Orient—slave and free.)

Today and every day a group of young men wait in a corrugated-iron hut on the island of Okinawa, in the East China Sea. They are engaged in preventing a war. In their room are unshaded lights, shelves of cheap reprints, a blanket-covered poker table, metal cots. Over their olive-green overalls the men wear G-suits, and the ankle pockets are stuffed with checklists and pencils. Never more than an arm's length away is a brown leather briefcase blazoned in white letters with the words "top secret." The contents specify precise military missions in case the Communists attack areas in the Pacific under our protection.

There is an atmosphere of constant tension. At least once a day, at a moment never known ahead of time, the red-enamelled "hot line" telephone rings and a voice from headquarters utters the words, "scramble" followed by a coded number. A klaxon sounds. The pilots dash out. Each F-100 is already armed, checked, linked to its starting unit. As the pilot's left hand flicks across the panel switches, his right signals to the starter crew. The connecting lines snap free, the canopy crashes down, the throttle goes forward and the jet tears toward the runway Time: 3 minutes.

Destination depends on the code number that the followed the word "scramble." It may be: return to parking pad. It may be: go to 50,000 feet and await orders. Or it may be: Follow defensive war plan. The pilot never knows. His plane is always ready, always under maximum security; not even the commanding general may approach it—only the pilot and crew chief known by sight to its armed sentry.

It is young men like these, ashore and afloat, and not the speeches, the diplomatic notes, or the forbearance of an enemy, who have saved Formosa from invasion and the United States from a big war. The Communists have screamed of American "Paper Tigers" and threatened world war III, but month in, month out, they have been gazing straight down the muzzle of a gun and they know it. Throughout the free Orient their stock has fallen, and that of the United

States has risen. There it will remain—unless we are ever insane enough to surrender the great fortress of Okinawa that blocks Red aggression.

Four hundred miles from the nearest point on the Chinese mainland, Okinawa lies at the center of a 900-mile circle rimmed by the major cities of the Orient: Tokyo, Shanghai, Seoul, Taipei, Hong Kong, Manila. It is the forward bastion of our complex of islands, ships, planes, troops and bases throughout the Pacific, designed to keep the peace and prevent war from touching the United States. From Okinawa's rockbound shores all the forward bases in Red China which could launch a war of aggression are within close range—so close that retaliation could reach the aggressors before our forces farther back were halfway to their targets.

A major factor in Okinawa's importance to us is that our forces there are always instantly available in case of emergency. At our bases in Japan, the Philippines, Morocco, Spain, France, England, we must ask the local government's permission before launching a counterattack to aggression. Not so on Okinawa. No leftist legislature, no Communist threats, no ruler's indecision, could bring about a last-minute cancellation of our rights to use our runways and missile sites. It is largely for this reason that in Okinawa's red-soll valleys, between its pine-clad hills and around its curving beaches, we have constructed more than a billion dollars' worth of the most modern defense facilities of our time.

Item: two tremendous air bases, with runways capable of handling the fastest supersonic planes in existence. Item: a naval supply base, to support the ships of the Seventh Fleet constantly cruising the East China Sea. Item: a Marine Corps unit consisting of men, guns, tanks, trucks, helicopters and transports, all in readiness to move to any trouble spot at an hour's notice. Item: a big Army supply base, through which are funneled the arms, supplies and food needed to maintain our total force of 50,000 men and their 20,000 dependents on the island.

This great complex is defended by fighter fields, missile bases, radar stations, submarines, surface ships and early-warning radar planes. It is linked by radiotelephone with Formosa, Japan, Guam, the Philippines, Hawaii; even its supply needs go out from radio transceivers that trigger IBM machines in the United States and start replacements flowing over the Pacific. Atom bombs could destroy all surface life on Okinawa; but even they could not knock out Gibraltar-like caves capable of housing retaliatory missiles able to reach the length and breadth of China and make any attack upon the free Orient an act of suicide.

It is no wonder that the Communists are straining every nerve to break our grip on this island, to achieve by words what they are powerless to achieve by force. Communist propaganda is busy telling the world that Okinawans live like slaves, forced to labor under our Armed Forces, that their land has been taken from them without payment, that they are unable to vote for political candidates they want. None of these things is true, but the propaganda has had an effect; even in the United States doubt has been aroused regarding the wisdom of our remaining on the island. It is because of this violent propaganda that we need to know something about a place which is a vital part of our outer defenses.

Okinawa is the largest of the Ryukyu (Rye-uke-you) Islands. It is administered by a U.S. High Commissioner. The 837,000 Ryukuan citizens are fully enfranchised, elect their own legislature and mayors, appoint their own police. So, far from being slaves, they are free men and women, working at any trade they choose. Out of the total labor force of 316,000 on Okinawa,

about 158,000 work at farming or fishing, about 154,000 work in industry, and of these last about 40,000 work on tasks connected with our base systems. Less than 1 percent are unemployed.

Before the war, Okinawa had been built up as a steppingstone for the Japanese march to the Philippines and Australia. Then, on the morning of April 1, 1945, the island was invaded by the United States (10th Army, the Marines, and the Navy). The battle that followed was one of the grimmest of the war. Japanese losses exceeded 250,000, including many Okinawans. We lost 12,000 killed and 37,000 wounded. When it was finished, the entire south end of the island, the heavily populated part, was completely devastated. Not a house, a vehicle, a tree, even a growing crop was left; only smoking craters and walled-in caves containing thousands of Japanese bodies.

Today the same walled-in caves rim the bustling capital city of Naha and its modern office buildings, multifloor department stores and factories, handsome Ryukyuan government buildings. The city's 210,000 people frequent supermarkets, camera stores, beauty salons, movie theaters. The busy streets are equipped with traffic lights, and some 20,000 automobiles (imported from the United States) are controlled by white-helmeted traffic policemen. Taxis weave in and out of traffic jams; the bus system sold 70 million tickets last year. The airport boasts a modern \$250,000 terminal served by four scheduled airlines. The island has 328 schools, teaching approximately 211,000 children, and the University of the Ryukyus, established with our help in 1950, has 2,000 students. The whole transformation has been the miracle of the Pacific.

The Okinawans are cheerful and friendly people. They dress in Western style; their children sport blue jeans, bicycles, and hula hoops. The Okinawans have been quick to learn modern ways and complicated tools, and, although our money has helped pull the island up from the depths, the people have done the work themselves.

The farming areas of the country are typical of the same emergence from poverty. Each village is generally grouped around the community well, the tiny post office and two or three general stores. The store shelves contain the standbys of the farmers—rope, wire, tools, sacks of rice, bread, soy, and the dried meats and fishes with which orientals flavor their rice; but these staples are now mixed with American and Japanese canned goods, cigarettes, cady, beer, and drugstore items.

To be sure, there is not yet enough electric power; nor are there enough vehicles or fertilizer or even roads. Life is hard—the grinding labor of the Orient done by men often working with inadequate tools and ancient methods. But there is hope. The gross national product has risen from \$70 million before the war to \$170 million in 1958; the Bank of the Ryukyus has accumulated \$81 million in assets, and the U.S. dollar currency used on the island can be freely exchanged for any currency in the world. If all this be tyranny, it is what the Okinawans want more of.

Not all this progress, however, has been accomplished in sweetness and light. The United States has caused plenty of resentment in the past and has made many mistakes. The most serious of these concerned our handling of landowners. To an oriental, the little piece of land that belonged to his ancestors is the be-all and end-all of his existence. In the early years after the war we seized land arbitrarily and paid for it at far too low a valuation. To make matters worse, the money was passed in one down-

payment and when the farmer had spent this he was penniless and had no land to live on. There followed real hardship, real resentment.

Today the whole picture has changed. In 1958 U.S. authorities and the Ryukyuan government sat down together voluntarily, and a whole new system of payments was worked out, roughly five times higher than before, and made retroactive. In addition, payments are now made in annual installments, and the farmer remains the legal owner of his land. At one stroke these reforms changed the Okinawans' attitude toward our administration.

Only one thing clouds this bright picture: the incessant efforts of Communist China to cripple the Okinawan Government and kick us out. The Okinawans have come to despise the Communists, whose candidates have recently been roundly defeated at the polls. Faced with a flop in their efforts to steal independence from within, the Communists are now concentrating on trying to bring about a reversion of the island to Japan. Although the peace treaty with Japan accorded Japan residual sovereignty over the Ryukyus, it specifically reserved to the United States complete administrative and occupational authority as long as tension remained in the Far East. It is this right that is now being challenged by leftists in Japan. "Go home, Americans" is a favorite Communist cry.

If we permit the island to revert to Japanese control, the whole fortress could conceivably become useless as a deterrent to war, because a Japanese Government could control our use of our bases. Under menacing threats from Peiping or Moscow it could forbid us to use runways and missile sites. This is what the Communists want. Our men would still be there, but they would be hamstrung. The Communists would then be entitled to call our great bastion, now so powerful in the Far East, a paper tiger.

The fact is—and the present Japanese Government appreciates it—we need Okinawa. Not for money, or exploitation, or selfish imperialism, but simply to help us preserve peace and save one of the most strategic areas in the world—including Okinawa itself—from Communist domination.

Since Okinawa is thus a vital element in our defense setup, we should do everything possible to clarify and make smoother our position there. First, the U.S. Government should declare that it intends to retain its rights on the island as long as it deems necessary, as provided in the peace treaty. Second, the provisions of a bill introduced into Congress by Representative MELVIN PRICE should be carried out. The bill authorizes the Treasury to set aside a sum not to exceed \$6 million a year out of Federal income taxes received from Americans employed or stationed on the island, and to allot this money to the Government of the Ryukyus for urgently needed public works. These would include dams, roads, electric plants, fertilizer factories, hospitals, schools, and loans to approved industries.

These basic improvements are sorely needed to help the Ryukyans achieve an independent economy. The cost would be repaid to us a hundredfold by creating a prosperous partner, bound to us by economic ties rather than military power. It would be a tiny sum to pay to help maintain our great fortress, and it is a wonderful chance for the United States to show what can be accomplished in freedom rather than under Communist fear. Okinawa has become a sort of showcase for American resolution and integrity. It is being watched intensely by the entire free Orient. It is up to us to keep the showcase window clean.

The Status of Foreign Ministers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EUGENE J. MCCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Status of Foreign Ministers," written by Doris Fleeon and published in the Evening Star of August 4, 1959. This column contains some comments on the status of American diplomacy, and particularly on the role of Secretary of State Herter in connection with diplomatic activities.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATUS OF FOREIGN MINISTERS—GENEVA AFFAIR VIEWED AS WEAKENING POSITION OF NATION'S FOREIGN CHIEFS

(By Doris Fleeon)

Republicans left Congress so they could go to the airport and give Vice President NIXON a hero's welcome. Within hours, Secretary of State Herter dragged in from Geneva where for 3 weeks he has been sitting on what he knew of his own knowledge were china eggs.

The contrast is of the same sort as that between the propaganda aspects of the new moves and their shaky diplomatic underpinnings. Dispatches from Europe emphasize the latter, and the picture drawn in them of Uncle Sam is not flattering.

For it cannot be concealed that the Soviet Union has won a diplomatic victory at first-sale prices. Khrushchev gets the trip to the United States and the attentions from President Eisenhower to which he has so long aspired. The President has abandoned the substantial progress conditions he earlier laid down for such a meeting.

All the foreign ministers at Geneva are in the position of the acrobats who opened the old vaudeville shows. It is held further that they were compelled to warm up the stage for an unconscionably long time, weakening to them personally and debasing to their status. The President's inadvertent reference to Geneva as one of the "much lower levels" at which the plans were developed is widely quoted.

It appears difficult at this point to do much to gild Secretary Herter's role, even if that is recognized as desirable. In the first place, he will unpack only to repack for a hard week of fence-mending in South America.

An appointive and not an elected official, he lacks the resources to come back on his own, even if he had the temperament for it, which he has not. A strong flavor of shadowboxing also was imparted to the Vice President's role when he was disclosed as having been taken into Mr. Eisenhower's confidence at the last minute only so he wouldn't accidentally mess things up in Moscow.

Yet, with the politician's art, Mr. Nixon is managing to stage a triumph at home and win substantial though by no means universal approval abroad.

The State Department sees so much work piled up for Mr. Herter during the futile weeks at Geneva it does not expect him to accompany the President to Europe or even play much part in the delicate task

of arranging the Khrushchev journey across the United States. Members of Congress sympathize with him but cannot help him.

The Eisenhower decisions as such have a wide range of acceptance, ranging from enthusiasm in Great Britain to caution in Italy. Yet even the British are making light of his explanations and describing almost flippantly the course he took prior to crossing the great divide.

It appears that Europe's once complete faith in the soldier-President has been replaced by hope and not too much charity. This is the press preview as he takes up the tasks which lie immediately ahead in Europe and in Russia.

And everywhere the cautionary note is strong: Don't sell Khrushchev short; he is smart and tough.

The Grievous Economic Justice the American Farmer Is Suffering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, too few people in America who are not farming for a living recognize the grievous economic injustice the American farmer is suffering.

One of the rare exceptions is the Daniel F. Rice Co., New York Stock Exchange members, with principal offices in Chicago. In a recent commodity letter, the Rice Co. speaks out as follows:

Agriculture has fallen on evil times. In the midst of unprecedented national prosperity, agricultural income has fallen to continually lower levels. The outpourings of farms have exceeded the capacity of the Nation to consume. Legislative action needed to solve the problem has not been taken. At this critical time when the problem of falling farm income gets worse and worse we are about to see Congress adjourn without any new legislation. One bill was passed and vetoed. The problem is not impossible of solution; all it takes is a program that faces the problem of too much production squarely and attacks it directly by taking the steps necessary to reduce production. But it takes a little courage; the Congress has to call its shots and let the chips fall where they may. They cannot have it both ways, riding off in all directions.

The contribution of the executive branch of the Government is to give up on the current solution of the problem and turn on agriculture with the violence of a wounded bear. The office of the Secretary of Agriculture continually furnishes biased and exaggerated statistics to the urban press for its increasing attacks on the farmers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this compassionate, thoughtful, and disinterested expression for farming, by a business organization, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMODITY LETTER

DANIEL F. RICE & Co.,
Chicago, Ill., August 5, 1959.

A major problem of growing old is that, as one looks backward, as we all sometimes

must, we can see only so far. Not only can one remember too much but also the same issue has been met so many times that one's decisions become somewhat ossified into a pattern and a set of principles by which one thinks he lives. We do not think that we are the last leaf on the tree, but as we look about us, our being out of step with general thinking suggests that indeed we may have become old.

The first belief to which we like to think we ascribe is that everyone is equal and should have a competitive shot in the sphere in which he chooses to work—without advantage or disadvantage. Equality before the law and equality in the economic world of business are the keystones of this belief. The inalienable right of equality carries with it the responsibility for preserving this right. The first responsibility in preserving this right is to take a careful look at issues, to call one's shots and to let the chips fall where they may. We try to do this. Our long history as a commodity investment firm has taught us to do so. Ours is not a business that forgives mistakes or accepts alibis.

Within this bigger belief one of the things we hold uppermost is that a virile and progressive agriculture is essential to the well-being and prosperity of the Nation. Throughout its history the United States has accepted and supported this belief. Note the land grant college system, the county agent system of farmer education, the Soil Conservation Service, and the vast research work of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. For 30 years the Federal Government, and the Congress in particular, has recognized the unusual problems of farmers and has tried to assist them in obtaining a fair share of the national income. This assistance to agriculture does not arise only from a sense of fairness; it is absolutely essential to the progress of the country. Three or four million commercial farmers produce the food and fiber needs of the country. At the birth of the Nation three-fourths of the population was engaged in farming. How much industrial progress could have been made without agricultural progress? How far can we go in the future without agricultural progress?

Agriculture has fallen on evil times. In the midst of unprecedented national prosperity, agricultural income has fallen to continually lower levels. The outpourings of farms have exceeded the capacity of the Nation to consume. Legislative action needed to solve the problem has not been taken. At this critical time when the problem of falling farm income gets worse and worse we are about to see Congress adjourn without any new legislation. One bill was passed and was vetoed. The problem is not impossible of solution; all it takes is a program that faces the problem of too much production squarely and attacks it directly by taking the steps necessary to reduce production. But it takes a little courage, the Congress has to call its shots and let the chips fall where they may. They cannot have it both ways, riding off in all directions.

The contribution of the executive branch of the Government is to give up on the current "solution" of the problem and turn on agriculture with the violence of a wounded bear. The office of the Secretary of Agriculture continually furnishes biased and exaggerated statistics to the urban press for its increasing attacks on farmers. The anti agriculture propaganda of the Department of Agriculture is very well illustrated by a recent editorial in Life magazine. We have repeatedly called your attention to this dereliction of duty on the part of the incumbent Secretary.

Our second belief is that organized exchanges, especially futures markets, are an essential part of an effective commodity marketing system. They have built an im-

portant place for themselves in their more than 100 years of operation. They should serve farmers first and the public second, but they must be operated for the benefit of the public too. They will succeed and last only so long as they render real service. Within the limits of the exchanges all parties must have an equal and competitive shot. At the present time this statement is especially applicable to speculators. We make no case for individual speculators and ask for no favored treatment or quarter for them. They are in about the toughest competitive business in our whole economic system and if they cannot compete they do not belong in the business.

We see some things about futures markets that we think are wrong. And we have called a spade a spade. We have to do our part to make these markets competitive.

In the field of Government regulation of agricultural marketing, we find the Commodity Exchange Authority, the Warehouse Administration and other important agencies controlled by single individuals who are in a position to dictate basic policy. We strongly advocate that these Government controls be administered by Commissions consisting of at least six individuals with two representative of the farmers' interests. To achieve this aim, we urge that either Congress or the Secretary of Agriculture immediately take the necessary action to end one-man rule of agencies and revert to a commission plan. This would give farmers, the public, and the grain trade a voice in their own fate.

DANIEL F. RICE & Co.

Youth Need an Opportunity To Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Robert D. Maclean, secretary-treasurer of the Oregon Juvenile Judges Association, with an attached resolution in support of the Youth Conservation Corps bill, of which I happen to be one of the cosponsors.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON JUVENILE JUDGES ASSOCIATION,
August 4, 1959.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are forwarding for your information a copy of "A Resolution To Provide Youth With an Opportunity To Work," as was resolved by the Oregon Council of Juvenile Court Judges, in convention in Eugene, Ore., during the week of July 27 through July 31, 1959.

Yours very truly,

ROBERT D. MACLEAN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

A RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE YOUTH WITH AN OPPORTUNITY TO WORK

Whereas the lack of opportunity for employment and the lack of educational provisions for boys are significant factors in

the ever-present and expanding problem of juvenile delinquency; and

Whereas the establishment of such a program would develop and conserve the natural resources of our country and would give boys and young men an opportunity to work in the open and to develop physical fitness and character; and

Whereas the initiation of this program is provided in Senate bill 812 now pending in the U.S. Senate for the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for males between the ages of 16 and 21 inclusive: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Oregon Council of Juvenile Court Judges in convention in Eugene, Oreg., That it supports and approves the principle involved in Senate bill 812 and urges that the Congress of the United States take favorable action of said Senate bill 812 or other appropriate legislation to establish this program.

Dirty Deal in District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the campaign for home rule for the District of Columbia is being supported by newspapers throughout the Nation. Last Tuesday, August 4, the St. Louis Post Dispatch printed an outstanding editorial calling upon Congress to support legislation to democratize the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post Dispatch, Aug. 4, 1959]

DIRTY DEAL IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

I deem it my duty to again call your attention to the condition of the District of Columbia. Is it not just to allow them at least a delegate in Congress?

So spoke President Andrew Jackson in his annual message to Congress in 1831. It was but one of the many official notices over the years that have called attention to the denial of the rights of citizenship to the residents of the national capital.

Until 1802 the city of Washington was governed under the statutes of Maryland. In that year Congress granted Washington its first charter and provided for a city council of 12 members to be elected annually. It also provided for a presidentially appointed mayor.

In 1820 Congress went all the way in home rule and gave the residents of Washington the right to elect their mayor as well as the council members. This was how the District of Columbia was governed until 1871 when it was reorganized by Congress on what amounted to territorial lines. Although the 1871 plan changed the chief executive official from an elected mayor to an appointed Governor, the council continued to be popularly chosen.

Then in 1874 came the swing away from all semblance of home rule. In that year the residents of the national capital were deprived by Congress of the right to vote and otherwise of any say in the conduct of their governmental affairs. In essence, this has

been the plight of those who live in the District of Columbia for 85 years.

Today with a population of approximately 1 million, Washington is one of the country's major cities as well as its capital. It has more population than 15 States, each of which has two Senators and up to three Representatives in Congress. Yet the District of Columbia is voteless and must look to Congress to be its city council.

The 15 States each with smaller populations than the District of Columbia include four New England States, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont and Rhode Island, and six Western States, New Mexico, Utah, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming and Nevada. The others are Delaware, both Dakotas and the two new States, Alaska and Hawaii.

The time has come to do something about our disfranchised national capital. The Senators and Representatives from the smaller States ought to be taking the lead in seeing that justice is done in the current session.

Capital Times Pleads for World of Love on 14th Anniversary of Hiroshima

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on August 6 the Madison Capital Times wrote editorially about a letter of prayerful love from a group of Japanese citizens to the Air Force major who dropped the atomic bomb and whose resultant guilt complex has so shaken his sanity that he is now a patient in a mental institution. This editorial is remarkably revealing for what it tells of the human qualities of the plane commander, Maj. Claude Eatherly, the compassionate Japanese, and the Capital Times of Madison, that published the editorial. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLAUDE EATHERLY AND HIROSHIMA 14 YEARS LATER

Recently a group of Japanese citizens wrote a letter to a patient in an American mental institution which read as follows:

"We wish you to know that we regard you as a victim of war in much the same way as those who were injured in the war, and are praying for your complete recovery and that the day shall come when you will join the forces of good will, forgiving any wrongs of the past on either part and work for establishing a peaceful world, a world of reconciliation and love. May God bless you, hasten your recovery and help you so that you may decide to devote your life to the cause of peace."

The letter was written to Claude Eatherly, one of the most tragic figures of our time. Mr. Eatherly's name means nothing to most people but he played a key part in one of the saddest and most significant moments in modern history.

An August 6, 1945—14 years ago today—an American bomber based on the Island of Tinian in the Marianas, made its bomb run on Hiroshima, Japan, and dropped the first atomic bomb, killing more than 100,000 men, women, and children.

The commander of the plane was Maj. Claude Eatherly.

In the years since then Major Eatherly has been haunted by the memory and driven into mental illness by an acute guilt complex. He believes the Japanese are "after him," seeking revenge for the Hiroshima holocaust.

Whether the letter he has received from Japan will help to cure him, no one can say.

But the spirit of forgiveness its discloses and the plea it makes for a "world of reconciliation and love" is one that needs to be noted on this 14th anniversary of Hiroshima.

In this spirit lies the hope that there will be no more Hiroshimas and no more Claude Eatherlys living in the darkness of haunting guilt.

Harold L. Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news story and an editorial dealing with the death of Harold L. Cross, a distinguished lawyer and fighter for freedom of information.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 10, 1959]

HAROLD L. CROSS, FOUGHT SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT

Harold L. Cross, the attorney who led the fight of the American Society of Newspaper Editors against secrecy in Government, died of a coronary occlusion yesterday at his summer home in East Boothbay, Maine. He was 69.

Mr. Cross was one of the Nation's foremost authorities on newspaper law. For 25 years he was counsel for the New York Herald Tribune.

He wrote "The People's Right To Know" in 1953 while counsel on freedom of information for the ASNE. It soon became the standard legal source for newsmen and others engaged in obtaining information from local, State, and Federal agencies.

WITH NEW YORK FIRM

Mr. Cross, a graduate of the Cornell University Law School, was with the firm of Brown, Cross & Hamilton in New York.

He was professor of libel law at the Columbia University School of Journalism from 1937 to 1950 and associate dean in 1949 and 1950. In 1943, on leave from Columbia, he opened China's first graduate school of journalism in Chungking for the Chinese Government.

Mr. Cross became counsel for the American Society of Newspaper Editors in 1951. He called attention to abuse by Government agencies of a 1789 statute authorizing Federal officials to have custody of their files and papers. The ancient housekeeping statute, Mr. Cross discovered, was cited more often than any other as an authority for withholding information.

UNITED STATES CODE AMENDED

The attention his book and speeches focused on this distortion of the law led 2 years ago to the passing of an amendment to the United States Code. It said the statute was not to be construed as an authority for secrecy.

Mr. Cross, despite the fact that he officially retired last year, still was sought by news-

papermen and others throughout the country for his advice.

He recently was summoned to Washington to counsel the special Government Information Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations. He also was asked frequently for testimony by House and Senate committees in the field of civil rights and Government information generally.

Mr. Cross was awarded the Peter Zenger award at the University of Arizona in 1958 and was a distinguished achievements fellow of Sigma Delta Chi, the journalism fraternity. He was awarded an honorary doctor of laws degree by the University of Maine in 1950.

Mr. Cross is survived by his wife, Elaine; two sons, Malcolm A. Cross of Danville, Va., and Schuyler F. Cross of Denver, Colo.; two brothers, Arthur and Adam Cross of Morris-town, N.J., and eight grandchildren.

Funeral arrangements have not been completed. The family asks that flowers be omitted and contributions made to the Herald Tribune Fresh Air Fund. Mr. Cross was vice president and a director of the fund for many years.

TRIBUTES TO MR. CROSS

Other leaders in the fight for freer access to Government information paid tribute to Mr. Cross last night.

Representative JOHN E. MOSS, Democrat, of California, of the special Government Information Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, said:

"Dr. Cross was a man who had a special understanding of a most fundamental right of the American people, the right to know and be informed. I personally and my associates will miss his very wise counsel."

V.M. Newton, Jr., managing editor of the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune and chairman of the freedom of information committee of Sigma Delta Chi, said:

"It is very unusual in our modern society for a lawyer of Harold Cross' eminence to go all out for the principle of freedom of the press. He is honored and revered throughout the ranks of our profession."

J. R. Wiggins, president of American Society of Newspaper Editors and vice president and executive editor of the Washington Post, said:

"Mr. Cross' contribution to the right of American citizens to know about their Government was greater than that made by any other person working in the field. He furnished the leadership and legal research that has been made in the last 8 years."

"He was the architect of information statutes that have been adopted in more than 30 States and the mainstay of those engaging in trying to improve Federal statutes."

James S. Pope, executive editor of the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal and the Louisville Times and a member of the American Society of Newspaper Editors' Freedom of Information Committee, said:

"Mr. Cross was not only a man with a brilliant mind. He was a man with a heart and spirit and wisdom of a truly great editor; a man who made us see the scope of our own job, who reacted powerfully against tyranny, petty or otherwise; a man who comprehended the real meaning of freedom and its perils; a man who got up mad every morning because of the injustice he knew had been hatched overnight."

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 11, 1959]

HAROLD L. CROSS

With the death of Harold L. Cross the public has lost one of its most effective and tenacious advocates in the constant struggle for freedom of information. The longtime campaign of Dr. Cross against unjustified suppression and restraint, particularly in his role as general counsel for the American Society of Newspaper Editors, was unquestionably the stimulus for the formation of the House Government Information Sub-

committee which has done such useful work. In turn the instances of unnecessary secrecy pointed up by this subcommittee and the companion Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee spurred legislative reform in the amendment of the housekeeping statute, the requirement for disclosure of essential data about foreign aid and new scrutiny of the operation of the Administrative Procedures Act. Dr. Cross also helped bring about new laws covering access to public records in many States.

No one knew better than Dr. Cross that the battle is never ending, not because public officials are tyrannical by desire, but because the emphasis of big government is toward concealment for convenience. This soft-spoken, scholarly New York lawyer and Columbia University professor attacked the legal basis for withholding information. His 1953 book, "The People's Right to Know," remains a bible for those interested in this essential aspect of American freedom. Much of Dr. Cross' immediate labor on access to information was on behalf of newspaper groups, but he never lost sight of the larger purpose. That purpose was not to gratify editors, but to inform adequately the constituents of democracy so that they could make intelligent decisions. Dr. Cross' belief deeply in the ultimate wisdom of an informed public, and he was in a real sense the people's counsel in this important area of relations with government.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a copy of my newsletter released yesterday:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

The big news in Washington is the proposed exchange of visits planned by President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev.

Some people have expressed strong opposition to the forthcoming visit of Mr. Khrushchev. They believe we will in effect be rewarding Mr. Khrushchev to calm down the Berlin crisis—a crisis which he himself manufactured.

Mr. Khrushchev's attitude toward the West presents one of the most serious threats to peace. Ignorance of just what we want in the world is a big factor in this attitude. Also involved are fear and envy.

It seems to me that giving Mr. Khrushchev an opportunity to visit this country might help to overcome his present attitude. I am sure his misconceptions about "capitalist slavery" will be corrected.

The exchange of visits will not solve the world's problems. Certainly we have no intention of dividing up the world into two spheres of influence.

The great hope of the visits is that Mr. Khrushchev will discover that many of his fears about the United States are groundless and that Russians can live in peace without any fear of attack by us. Equally important, he may learn that his sabre rattling is not scaring anyone and that through a miscalculation he can touch off a war.

HOUSING BILL TRIMMED DOWN

The Senate Housing Subcommittee is working on a new housing bill. It is hoped

that a bill acceptable to the President can be passed by Congress.

One thing is certain—Congress cannot adjourn without passing a housing bill. If it should, then the Federal housing mortgage guarantee program will come to an end. This would mean a virtual halt of home construction.

It was not many years ago that FHA was considered a dangerous invasion into private enterprise. Yet the years have demonstrated that this Federal program under which repayment of a major part of a home mortgage is guaranteed by FHA has proved to be a big boon to the housing industry.

The mortgage guarantee program is self-supporting. A fraction of 1 percent is added to the interest charges. This money goes into an insurance fund from which any losses are paid.

The bill which the Senate committee plans to bring out will not give the President everything he wants but it should be acceptable.

Prevailing Mood in Latin America One of Optimism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I read an article which was published in the Eugene Register-Guard on Tuesday, August 4, 1959, entitled "Educator Reports Prevailing Mood in Latin America One of Optimism."

As the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations which deals with Latin-American affairs, I found the article very helpful. I should like to have it printed in the Appendix of the Record, because it is a newspaper story of a report given by the chancellor of the Oregon State System of Higher Education, Mr. John R. Richards, based upon his recent tour of Latin America. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the newspaper article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATOR REPORTS PREVAILING MOOD IN LATIN AMERICA ONE OF OPTIMISM

(By Ralph Olive)

John R. Richards, who has just returned from a tour of Latin America, reports that optimism, caused by economic expansion, and the promise of population growth, is the prevailing mood of the people.

Richards, chancellor of the Oregon State System of Higher Education, toured 10 countries on a State Department-sponsored trip. He talked with ministers of education and other government leaders, inviting them to a UNESCO Conference in Denver, September 28 to October 2. The purpose of the Conference is to discuss education in Latin America.

Among the countries that particularly impressed Richards with their growth potential were Brazil, Argentina, and Mexico.

Many businessmen in Brazil believe the country, now with a population of 60 million, will soon have as many people and as much strength as the United States had in the 1930's, Richard said.

SHARP DIFFERENCE

The chancellor, who was accompanied by Mrs. Richards, was also impressed by the air of democracy in Argentina, which was so recently a dictatorship.

"Now, to all appearances, it is completely democratic, with a press that gives all sides of political questions," Richards said.

The university system in Latin America differs sharply from that in the United States, Richards explained.

"Most students, and many of the professors, are on a part-time schedule," he said.

The students work, and have to fit classes into their job schedules. Faculty members are mostly professional men, who take time out for classes, usually at no pay.

The faculty generally acts as the governing body, too. There are full-time administrators, however.

EUROPEAN MODELS

Richards explained the system caused some financial difficulty. The universities receive either a percentage of the gross tax or the income from a special tax. The program has to fit the money available, and there is seldom hope of getting any more, if the cost should exceed the tax income.

There is also a difference in emphasis, Richards explained. The humanities are considered all important. The universities are generally patterned after European models, and educators there are often critical of the United States for its stress on technological training, Richards said.

Most Latin American countries send future engineers to the United States or Europe for their specialized educations, Richards said. This comes after study of liberal arts at home.

However, the applied sciences are taught, although there is some difficulty finding enough faculty members.

EXCEPTIONS NOTED

"There is little capacity to support the higher cost of teaching the exact sciences," he explained.

There are exceptions. In Uruguay, Richards found a scientific institute doing significant work on antibiotics, including a number of original experiments.

Educational opportunity is definitely restricted in Latin America, Richards said. In many areas the average person has little more than 2 years of formal schooling.

But the people are anxious to study, he said.

"The whole educational process is characterized by the fact that the people place more value on education than we do, but have a smaller capacity to support it," he explained.

DENVER CONFERENCE

Next to religion, Richards said, the urge for education is perhaps the most prevailing theme in the Latin American's life.

About 2,000 persons will attend the Denver conference to discuss these areas of Latin American education: Scientific development, cultural advances, educational practices, interorganizational work and social studies.

In addition to Latin American officials, university presidents and administrators from the United States will attend. Industries that do business in Latin America will also send representatives.

Richards is chairman of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO.

In addition to his official duties, Richards said he enjoyed the opportunity to practice his Spanish, and observe the different way of doing business. In most Latin American countries, he said, little work is done until the afternoon, at least among businessmen and executives. After a leisurely midday meal, they settle down to business, and work late, finishing with a dinner at about 10 p.m. Business is often intermingled with social activity, he said.

Richards visited the following countries: Mexico, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panama, Colombia, Peru, Chile, Argentina, Uruguay, and Brazil.

Our Refugee Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the disaster of the European refugees and escapees is not only a European problem but our refugee problem as well, a responsibility we acknowledged by our undertaking of participation in the World Refugee Year which began last month. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the second of series of articles on Europe's refugee camps which appeared recently in the New York Daily News, stressing the very human aspects of a situation which has too long been with us.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Daily News, July 21, 1959]

DP'S WITH A PASSPORT TO SICKNESS, DESPAIR
(By Kitty Hanson)

(Second article based on tour of European refugee camps)

The Western democracies appear to be throwing away their most effective weapons against communism: the men and women who know its tyranny at first hand.

The refugees who languish in camps and slums in Western Europe, and those who risk their lives every day to cross frontiers to freedom, are the world's most ardent anti-Communists. But if the free world does not soon adopt some positive program for them, they will become useless—to the West as well as to themselves.

Talking with refugees fresh from the border, one feels the drive, the strength and vitality of these people who still are fired with a momentous decision to leave homes and families for an idea.

And talking with other refugees who have been waiting as long as 10 to 14 years for admission to some free nation, you can not escape the sense of futility and resignation that surrounds them. Initiative has succumbed to inertia; physical strength to weakness. Camp existence has taken its toll.

There are, in Western Europe today, nearly 1,800 refugee camps. They were never intended to be more than temporary quarters for men and women who, through no fault of their own, had been made homeless by Europe's two wars; the hot and the cold.

DRUNKENNESS, PROSTITUTION

I spent days in some of these camps in Italy, Greece, Austria, and Germany and came away marveling that these people could keep their faith in democracy after such a disgraceful sample of life in the free world.

In the worst of the camps there is drunkenness, prostitution, and a disintegration of moral values; in the best, illness, disillusionment and a numb acceptance of being surplus population.

There is a depressing sameness about refugee camps. Whether an internee is housed in a dreary barracks, converted stable, a one-

time factory or a former concentration camp, his living conditions are the same.

PRIVACY SOMETHING THEY LEFT BEHIND

He and his family live in cramped cubicles along corridors where other families live in cramped cubicles, separated by partitions of the thinnest wood, some not even reaching the ceilings. If the refugee is single, he or she lives in a dim and fetid dormitory.

The only running water is in the community washroom; the only toilets are community toilets; and usually one must share the cooking facilities with others or use a community mess hall.

Internees live with the living sounds of others in their ears. Privacy is something they left behind in Yugoslavia or Hungary or Poland—along with their home, perhaps their family, and everything they ever owned.

GIFTS FROM AMERICANS

If you are a refugee, you are not only without a country, you are without possessions. You escaped in your everyday clothes, perhaps just walked away from work, so as not to be conspicuous. You arrived in the nearest border country without a toothbrush, comb, or razor—all incriminating evidence should the police pick you up.

You sleep on mattresses which have been slept on by thousands before you, and if you have a sheet or blanket, it probably is a gift from the U.S. escapee program. The clothes you wear came from the United States too—used clothing contributed by Americans to church clothing drives.

(This produces some odd effects. It's startling, for instance, to talk with refugees dressed in bright and vivid resort clothes or to see young men in bowling shirts bearing the names of alleys from coast to coast.)

In Italy and Greece, the camps lie arid and lifeless in the blazing sun, the refugees wasted by waiting and drugged with idleness. The two poorest countries in Western Europe, Italy, and Greece, do not allow refugees to work, since thousands of their own citizens are still unemployed. Refugees who work "work black" (illegally) and constantly run the risk of being picked up by police.

DREARY BARRACKS SCAR COUNTRYSIDE

In Austria and Germany, shrubs, trees, and often flowers blur but do not hide the outlines of the endless rows of dreary brown barracks that scar the countryside. Refugees are permitted to take jobs, but many do not because they feel they are "temporary."

Of all the camps in Europe, Camp Valka in Bavaria, and San Sabba at Trieste probably rate as the worst.

A broken-down section of what was once a huge meeting hall for the annual Nazi Party Congress, Valka's foul-smelling barracks have, since the war, housed more than 30,000 persons.

It looks it.

The rooms are smelly cubicles in which, for many, the bed is just a moldering mattress flung on the floor in one corner. Garbage is thrown out the windows and the stench from the common toilets at the ends of corridors demands a strong stomach.

Men and women are housed together in the same barracks. Venereal disease is rampant, pregnancies frequent. Days are filled with idleness; nights with drinking, fighting, and sex. Police and doctors make frequent calls at Valka.

Valka's residents are the saddening remnants of what once were decent, healthy men and women with a strong love of freedom and the courage to risk much in order to find it.

They have not found it in Valka, the only screening center in Germany for incoming refugees. Here they wait to be granted political refugee status which will allow them to work, move and regain their self-respect. Valka is a transients' camp, but some of its residents have waited in transit for 6 years.

THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTY FOUR IN EVERY MONTH

Approximately 350 refugees arrive every month at San Sabba, a former Nazi concentration camp near Trieste, in northern Italy. You can smell San Sabba long before you see it.

Part of the stench is from the place itself; part from a nearby oil refinery. An almost unnoticeable relic of Nazi efficiency is a railroad track which runs down the center of the camp street.

On one side, in cardboard-partitioned, poorly ventilated compartments, live San Sabba's families. On the other are the dormitories. Single men and boys are quartered on the second floor; single girls on the first. They are told to stay where they belong.

But San Sabba's life of enforced idleness, frustration, dirt, and poverty is a breeding ground for immorality. Many of the young refugees are away from their parents' guidance for the first time in their lives and, more important, most of them have no money.

Although the Italian Government forbids the refugees to work, most of the men in camp find ways to pick up odd jobs and pocket money. For refugee girls in need of money there is prostitution.

Similar conditions exist in other Italian camps, in varying degree. Idleness produces depression and indifference. For a man, this can mean the wearing away of his moral fiber and the desire to stand on his own feet. For the women it can mean sex experiences of the most degrading sort, a new concept of morality, and often a new profession—the world's oldest.

In nearly all the Italian camps, wine is sold on the premises, and drunken free-for-alls keep the police busy.

HAS PASSPORT BUT NO TAKERS

Much of the blame for these conditions can be placed on the Italian authorities. Much must also be laid at the door of the rest of the free world, which accepts fewer and fewer refugees while more and more pour into Italy. Today, escape to Italy is an escape to regimentation, confinement, and neglect.

In Greece, refugees are about as well off as many Greek citizens, who are desperately poor. Refugees cannot be assisted without raising their living standards above those of a considerable number of natives. As a result, most refugee work is conducted by voluntary agencies with a large assist from the U.S. escapee program.

At Lavrion, Greece, refugees are housed in a converted stable which, though grim, is cleaner than most of the camps I had seen. I arrived just as a busload of refugees was leaving for Sweden, which had accepted a number of hardship cases.

THE GODS, HE SAYS, DON'T TALK TO HIM

When the bus finally left, there were tears on both sides. Standing silently at the roadside were several camp inmates who had been rejected. One of them turned on me fiercely as the bus disappeared.

"Everybody say outside communism is free," he blurted, tears glistening, but his mouth sullen and angry. "In camp is not free. I have passport to leave Greece, but no country takes me. I do not know why. The gods don't talk with me."

It would have to be "the gods" who told him, because no one ever tells a refugee why he has been rejected. The lucky ones know only that they are going; the rejected only that they must remain behind.

Some eventually succumb to Commie pressures and return to their homelands. Others continue to wait and hope and to dissipate the very strength and courage which had led them to escape in the first place.

In either case, the free world loses a citizen and another round with Communist propaganda.

Bakersfield Californian Outstanding Conservation Newspaper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I recently issued a statement commending the Forest Service for the steps it has taken to implement recommendations on fire control made last year by a special subcommittee of the House Interior Committee. The Bakersfield Californian then followed up with a fine editorial commending the work of this committee of the Congress. Now in turn I want my colleagues to share with me this gratifying reaction to the work and deeds of a committee of Congress as reflected by the editorial.

During my long service in the State legislature and in Congress, I have found the management and editorial staff of the Bakersfield Californian dedicated to the sensible cause of conservation. It has been a privilege to meet and know Mrs. Bernice Harrell Chipman, president of the corporation; Mr. Walter Kane, publisher; Mr. James Day, managing editor; and Mr. Ralph Kreiser, editorial writer. The cause of conservation is capably advanced by their efforts.

I ask unanimous consent to have my statement of May 18 and the Bakersfield Californian editorial of May 21 printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWS STATEMENT

Senator CLAIR ENGLE, Democrat, of California, announced today that the Forest Service has taken steps to implement recommendations on fire prevention and control made last year by the special subcommittee he headed as chairman of the House Interior Committee.

"The steps taken by the Forest Service are a real contribution to better fire protection in southern California," Senator ENGLE said. "Much remains to be done," ENGLE added, "but I am delighted to learn of the constructive measures the Forest Service has taken as a result of the committee's findings."

In October 1957, ENGLE took an eight-man subcommittee to southern California to see what could be done about preventing and controlling the disastrous forest and brush fires that have plagued that area. An 8-point program of prevention and control resulted from the committee's investigation and study, pointing up the need for—

1. More funds and year-long programs for southern California.
2. More advance measures preparatory to fire suppression, such as access roads, firebreaks, helicopter ports.
3. Improved employment conditions.
4. Better protection of forest and brush cover.
5. Newer and improved equipment and techniques.

6. Exclusion of heavy residential concentration from national forests.

7. More liberal authorization for postfire emergency treatments on denuded watersheds.

8. More active use of the Armed Forces trainees on national forests.

In a recent letter to Representative WAYNE ASPINALL, Senator ENGLE's successor as chairman of the House Interior Committee, the Forest Service stated that "several projects of the Forest Service recently undertaken are aimed at accomplishing some of the recommendations of the subcommittee," and that "overall, the committee's findings are particularly constructive, lending us helpful support in our efforts to cope with the many difficult problems involved."

EDITORIAL

PRaise FOR FOREST SERVICE WORK

Prompt and energetic action on the part of the U.S. Forest Service to improve fire prevention and fire fighting techniques and strategy has brought warm praise from Senator CLAIR ENGLE, who conducted an investigation a few years ago as chairman of a special subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior Affairs, following a disastrous blaze that cost several lives in southern California.

The steps taken by the Forest Service, Senator ENGLE said this week, are a "real contribution to better fire protection in southern California." He declared he was delighted with the constructive measures taken by the service as the result of the findings of his subcommittee.

After interrogating witnesses, studying evidence and examining the situation from all angles, the committee came up with the following recommendations; more funds and the establishment of year-round programs for fire suppression, such as more access roads, firebreaks, helicopter ports and other means; better employment methods for fire-fighting crew recruitment and maintenance, better protection of forest and brush cover, newer and improved machinery and techniques and other equipment, the exclusion of heavy residential concentration from national forests, a more liberal authorization for postfire emergency treatments on denuded watersheds, and more active use of the Armed Forces trainees on national forests.

These recommendations embodied thoughts that had been expressed many times by experienced foresters who somehow had been unable to convince Congress of their desirability until Senator ENGLE, then chairman of the House Interior Committee, began to explore the subject. Many of these ideas had been included in reports by regional foresters as applicable to all forests having problems similar to those that are present in the southern California region.

Given the green light by the House committee and the encouragement of Senator ENGLE and others who are aware of the problems and needs of the Forest Service in its tremendous job of protecting the Nation's timber, grazing, watershed and recreation areas from destruction, the Service has moved forward with skill and ability to accomplish as many of the objectives listed in the committee recommendations as possible. Forest Service leaders have expressed warm appreciation of the work of the committee, declaring that "overall, the committee's findings are particularly constructive, lending us helpful support in our efforts to cope with the many difficult problems involved."

It may be pointed out that local support could also be extended to the Forest Service along these lines in order to assist in its important work of protecting and developing the areas so important to the State's economy and progress.

A Tribute to Joe Weingarten, of Houston, Tex., and to His Dream: Teaching World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it sometimes seems mankind is devoting so much money and time devising ways of destroying people that peace plans are receiving nothing but lip service.

Recognizing the need for understanding between people, Mr. Joe Weingarten of Houston has advanced a new idea for furthering world peace: establishment of a world university to teach peace and setting up institutes or chairs for world peace in various present institutions of higher learning. "We must start learning to live together or be prepared to die together," he says.

Mr. Weingarten says this idea has the endorsement of a number of noted educators and religious and political leaders. But the teaching of peace would be divorced from governmental and political influences, he adds.

With typical energetic activity which has long characterized his leadership in civic affairs, Mr. Weingarten is already looking toward establishment of an organizational steering committee.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a number of articles and editorials on Mr. Weingarten's plan:

First. An article by Nathan Broch from the Houston Post for Tuesday, July 21, 1959, entitled "Weingarten Drafts World Peace School."

Second. An editorial from the Houston Chronicle for Thursday, July 23, 1959, entitled "Weingarten Has Peace Plan."

Third. An editorial from the Houston Post for Wednesday, July 22, 1959, entitled "Joe Weingarten's Plan: Educate For Peace."

Fourth. An article by Editor George Carmack of the Houston Press, printed Saturday, July 25, 1959, under the title "Man With a Dream—Don't Bet Against It Becoming a Reality."

Fifth. A resolution of the Texas House of Representatives of the 56th legislature.

There being no objection, the article, editorials, and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston Post, July 21, 1959]

WEINGARTEN DRAFTS WORLD PEACE SCHOOL
(By Nathan Broch)

Joe Weingarten said Monday that the appointment of an organizational steering committee will be the next step toward the actual creation of a World Peace University.

"The men to serve on this committee will come not only from the United States," he said. "They will be drawn from areas all over the world."

Weingarten is chairman of the board of the Houston-based J. Weingarten, Inc., supermarkets. He has just completed a world tour highlighted by talks with governmental and educational leaders.

The Weingarten concept for cementing world peace through special educational institutions was first formulated in full-page newspaper advertisements on New Year's Day, 1958. This message was headed, "We Must Start Learning To Live Together, or Be Prepared To Die Together."

New Year's Day, 1959, Weingarten published another full-page message, telling of the response his appeal for establishment of a World Peace University has received.

Monday he reported to representatives of news media during a Houston Club luncheon on his talks during his recent world tour.

He explained the two major phases of the plan:

1. Establishment of a central World Peace University, possibly in Geneva, Switzerland.

2. Formation of peace institutes at major universities throughout the world. ("If I have my way, the first such institute will be established right here in Houston," he said.)

Weingarten said about 95 percent of the letters he has received so far favor the project. The remaining 5 percent are not opposed but express the feeling that existing university and college facilities should be improved before money is spent on an entirely new venture. He said the heads of the University of Houston and the Rice Institute have expressed approval of the project.

He cited the approval of Dr. Grayson Kirk, president of Columbia University in New York, who liked the idea very much. The head of the University of Chicago also was impressed with the idea.

"He took me to a window and showed me the tower of a building," Weingarten said. "He told me, 'That's where the atom bomb was born. And sometimes I can't sleep so well at night when I think what I may have done to the human race. A chair for world peace at the university here may help the human race not to destroy itself.'"

He found equal interest at the University of California in Los Angeles. The University of Hawaii felt the world peace university should be established on its campus, because they felt they were at the cross roads between East and West.

The response to the Weingarten project also was favorable in Japan. "Over there, they know what nuclear war is," he pointed out. He added that the head of the University of Hong Kong "was all hepped up over the idea."

"They thought it would be good to have the world peace university right there, because of the proximity of Red China," he said.

Favorable comment also was heard in Thailand and India. The vice president of India told Weingarten that Parliament recently approved the Gandhi Institute for Peace to be established at New Delhi in memory of the Indian leader. "They will keep me advised on their progress," Weingarten said.

In Israel, the Weingarten plan also was well received. Weingarten met with Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion. It was his fourth visit to Israel. Jerusalem previously had been suggested as one of the possible sites for the proposed world peace university.

In Switzerland, Weingarten found a famous surgeon-educator who offered to work for the world peace university. "He told me he operates in the mornings, but if we could get this university established, he would devote his afternoons to it for the rest of his life," Weingarten said.

In Rome, Weingarten was received by the Pope. He handed the pontiff a letter about the university project and copies of his published messages. "I talked to the Pope through an interpreter," Weingarten said. "But he told me, in Italian, that during my next visit he hoped to be able to talk to me in English. He said he was taking English lessons."

Summing up the problems and promise of his project, Weingarten made these points:

1. A top educator of international reputation will have to be found to head the university.

2. A climate for world peace must be created.

3. The task of financing the proposed institution won't be too hard a job once we get something started to produce some results.

4. The university would have to be run by a worldwide board of trustees, backed by a faculty representing a cross section of educators of the world.

Weingarten observed finally, "People seem to have a defeatist idea about world peace. They think only in terms of Ike, or Khrushchev or the United Nations. But I think there is a third force—public opinion."

Weingarten's statement about the next step toward implementation of his plan was made to a Post reporter following the luncheon.

[From the Houston Chronicle, July 23, 1959]

WEINGARTEN HAS PEACE PLAN

In seeking to get an organization started for his plan to promote world peace, Houston's Joe Weingarten is showing sound judgment in wanting to keep his plan completely disassociated from any existing organizations which have political aspects or implications. He wants his plan to be implemented by the people of the world who sincerely crave peace.

Weingarten, board chairman of J. Weingarten, Inc., food stores, has just completed a trip around the world to promote his plan. He said he received enthusiastic support for it from educational, political, and religious leaders in many countries.

Weingarten wants to have established a central University for World Peace, possibly in Geneva, Switzerland, and institutes of world peace in universities all over the world. He wants to reach young minds and, through them, to influence the governments of the world toward peace.

The Houstonian is well aware that if his plan becomes associated with any ideological movements, it will be seriously impeded from the start. Freedom is an essential ingredient of peace. A plan which exalts a free way of life is likely to be more attractive to the peoples of the world than a program which seeks to buy their friendship with money and goods.

[From the Houston Post, July 22, 1959]

JOE WEINGARTEN'S PLAN: EDUCATE FOR PEACE

Joe Weingarten, a practicing altruist, has a vision of universal peace, and a practical concept for its realization. He envisions the founding of a central World Peace University, perhaps in Geneva, Switzerland, which is a sort of world peace capital, and the establishment of peace institutes at leading universities throughout the world.

On a recent world tour, advancing his project, Mr. Weingarten received strong encouragement from distinguished educators and government officials. They recognized the basic principle behind it, which was expressed in full-page newspaper advertisements on January 1, 1958, explaining the plan for a University for Peace: "We must start learning to live together or be prepared to die together."

Men have emphasized the need of educational training in the sciences which produce the nuclear weapons of war. We have government-operated academies for training youth in the bloody arts of war. There is a United Nations for the settlement of troubles between nations after they develop. But nothing to train men for peace. Surely the conduct of many nations has demonstrated the need for some such training.

Why not a Peace University?

Joe Weingarten has worked long and selflessly in pursuit of his humanitarian vision. He has spent much time and no little money on it, and every ounce of energy spent, every hour of time, and every dollar, have been for the good of mankind. The next step will be the appointment of an organizational steering committee. Then the actual translation of the vision into reality will begin.

There is a great, worldwide need for some force, some agency, to condition people for peace on earth. No one has ever before offered a practical plan or made a major effort to effectuate one. Maybe Joe Weingarten has it. May he enlist the support necessary to put it into effect.

[From the Houston Press, July 25, 1959]

MAN WITH A DREAM—DON'T BET AGAINST IT BECOMING A REALITY

DEAR PRESS READERS: Here's my nomination for the Houston Man of the Week: Joe Weingarten.

Make no mistake about it, this world was made by the dreamers.

We're where we are because a few men in every generation had the imagination to foresee a project of staggering size—and then were such idealists that they set out to accomplish what the so-called practical men of little courage would say was impossible.

I was privileged to sit in on a little meeting of newspaper, radio, and TV men this week to hear Joe Weingarten in his quiet, modest way tell about a trip he has just made around the world.

Joe wasn't just going around the world on a sight-seeing expedition—though when you hear Joe talk you know he kept his eyes completely open and saw plenty.

What Joe was really doing was carrying an idea around the globe.

As has every man in this day of the A-bomb and the H-bomb—the guided missile—and the armed satellite—Joe has been doing a lot of thinking about the horrors of modern war.

As all of us acknowledge, no gift on earth can compare in value to the simple gift of peace.

But where there are millions of us who think of the horrors of modern warfare—and pay lip service to the ideal of peace on earth and good will to men—there are only a handful of us who have ever thought that we could do anything much about it.

Joe Weingarten is one of that little band—an idealist—a crusader, if you please, who has decided that he—Joe Weingarten—a business man here in Houston, Tex.—just one man—and far removed from the places where men of high rank in government and diplomacy ordinarily gather to play the chess game of war and peace—that he might come up with the idea that would tip the scales to peace when the decision to go to war or to try to work out the problem by negotiation hangs in dread balance.

WORLD-PEACE UNIVERSITY

Joe first made public his idea back on New Year's Day in 1958—in a full-page advertisement in the Houston Press and other Houston newspapers and in newspapers in other cities where there are Weingarten stores—thus talking to homefolks.

The ad was headed: "In This New Year of 1958—We Must Start Learning to Live Together Or Be Prepared to Die Together."

In it he broached the simple idea of establishing a worldwide university dedicated to the search for world peace with chairs for world peace in universities in every section of the globe.

One paragraph and a portion of a second paragraph of Joe's original message carried the heart of what Joe wanted to ask thinking people everywhere—

First, said Joe:

"Why not start a worldwide university dedicated to the search for world peace—to be established by one of our great religious seminaries—Protestant, Catholic, Jewish—because faith in God must be wedded to science and research—if we are to find the Lord's true answer to peace and friendship among nations? The alternate will be war and destruction."

Then, ever the practical man and knowing that even the greatest project must take a first short step, Joe added:

"Why not make even a modest start right now in one of our great schools right here in Texas by setting up a 'Chair for World Peace' and naming an outstanding educator to head it?"

OFFERING A PRACTICAL HOPE

Joe's idea not only hit a nerve of worry in hundreds of people—it also struck many of them that here was a man who not only saw the problem but was offering a practical hope that something could be done about it.

Hundreds of people wrote Joe Weingarten. And this encouraged him to do more.

So, Joe set out to be a part-time salesman of the idea—or maybe the word "missionary" would better describe his role. Wherever business took him, Joe took time out to talk with top people—particularly leading educators—about his idea. And most of the people who heard him were immediately intrigued.

But still Joe wasn't satisfied that this was enough.

Earlier this year he and Mrs. Weingarten decided to take a trip around the world, and as Joe says:

"When we had decided to go, it occurred to me that this was a marvelous opportunity to see how others in other lands felt about this idea."

I am not going to recount Joe's experiences on this unique "Trip Around the World With an Idea." Jack Mohler, Press staff writer, did that in Tuesday's Press and I certainly want to give a word of praise to Jack. I thought he did one of the best jobs of reporting and writing on this that I have read in a long time.

Let it be enough to say that Joe saw great educators, government leaders, newspaper editors, and men of influence and ideas in Hawaii, Japan, Hong Kong, Siam, India, Israel, Turkey, Italy, and Switzerland.

And to climax the trip—and to give you some measure of Joe's determination and ingenuity and how doors seem to open almost miraculously for a man with a real idea—Joe got a semiprivate audience with Pope John XXIII and was able to give the Pope the gist of his dream and leave some material with him for further consideration.

WOULD BET AGAINST HIM

We don't know whether or not Joe will ever see come into being his great world university dedicated to the cause of peace—

It may be that he will never get his chair, or institute, of peace in even a single university—

But knowing Joe Weingarten—and particularly after hearing him tell in his quiet, modest way what had already been done and what men around the world think about it—I wouldn't want to bet that Joe's idealism will not some day turn this "impossible" dream into a "practical" reality.

And no matter what comes of it in a physical way, the dream already lives—much has already been done—even the thought that Joe Weingarten has spread is a ray of light added to the little beam of hope that shines—even though dimly—wherever there are men who know that all mankind must not be cremated in the fiery furnace of the H-bomb.

We said at the start of this letter to you that the world we know had been made by the dreamers.

That same world will have to be saved by the dreamers.

And Joe Weingarten is one of that goodly company.

HOUSE SIMPLE RESOLUTION 36 OF THE TEXAS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Whereas a distinguished resident of Harris County, Tex., Mr. Joe Weingarten, has just returned from a trip around the world on which he, as a private citizen, strongly advocated the cause of world peace in personal contacts with governmental and religious leaders in Japan, Hong Kong, Thailand, India, Israel, Italy, Switzerland, and other countries; and

Whereas Mr. Weingarten encountered a warm reception wherever he traveled; and

Whereas this highly successful Houston businessman has proposed a twofold approach to the spreading of good will, including, first, the establishment of a new university devoted to world peace, and, second, the endowment of professorships in world peace at existing universities in all parts of the globe; and

Whereas Mr. Weingarten envisions this educational program as a movement of people, rather than of governments: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, 56th Texas Legislature, That Mr. Joe Weingarten be recommended for his active interest in the cause of world peace; and be it further

Resolved, That, although public funds are not available for such a project, the house of representatives invites the attention of all concerned to the desirability of establishing, by private donations, the aforementioned international University for World Peace within the borders of this freedom-loving State; and be it further

Resolved, That the idea of privately endowed professorships of world peace at public and other institutions of higher education, to be established in strict consonance with the policies of the various colleges and universities, is hereby enthusiastically endorsed by this house; and, be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Mr. Weingarten with the congratulations and best wishes of the house of representatives.

The President's Commendable Recognition of Inequities of Retired Military Officers' Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

MR. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, continuously since this 86th Congress convened, I have joined with others in pointing out the inequality of the current pay plan for certain retired military officers. I am cosponsor of a bill to equalize the pay plan.

The President has recently said he favors equalization of the retired officers' pay. I would like to commend the President for this statement and for his recognition of an inequity which we have been laboring to correct.

The military pay bill, passed in 1958, provides that members of the Armed

Forces who retired after May 31, 1958, will receive pensions based on a percentage of the current pay of persons on active duty. This is higher than the straight 6-percent increase which was granted those who retired prior to that time. The bill which I am cosponsoring to correct this, carries out the recommendation of the Cordiner report and has been endorsed by an overwhelming number of veterans' groups.

The convention of the Department of Texas of the American Legion recently unanimously adopted a resolution on this subject submitted by Roy A. Pennycook, commander of Business and Professional Men's Post No. 10 in San Antonio, Tex.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution passed by the American Legion, Department of Texas, assembled in convention at San Antonio, Tex., on July 26, 1959.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, has announced publicly on July 20, 1959, that he favors the equalization of retired pay for all members of the Armed Forces, and plans to include that appropriation in his budget to be submitted to the Congress in January 1960; and

Whereas the passage of such legislation will serve to restore and bolster the morale of our members of the Armed Forces: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion, Department of Texas, in convention assembled in San Antonio, Tex., on this 26th day of July 1959, That President Eisenhower be publicly commended for his action in this matter, and that all Members of the Congress from Texas be presented with a copy of this resolution.

Further Diversion of Water From Lake Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Friday of last week, a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Public Works held its final hearings on H.R. 1 and S. 308—to authorize an additional diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second from Lake Michigan. I appeared before the subcommittee in opposition to these bills, and it is my sincere belief that the bills to authorize temporary diversion of more water from Lake Michigan are merely an excuse for more and a permanent diversion of such waters.

I believe that the water diversion bills are unjustified and without merit. The Chicago Sanitary District, which has continuously been pleading for increased diversion from Lake Michigan in order to meet existing sanitary needs, has in recent years undertaken a tremendous territorial expansion program, which by necessity makes the present

sewage treatment plant inadequate. The sanitary district has increased its territory 81 percent from 1954 to 1958 and because of the resultant fall in sanitary efficiency, Chicago wants more water and is now coming to Congress for aid. But more water diversion from the lake is not the solution. Despite all of Chicago's diversionary tactics it is obvious that more and better plants are the only answer.

I believe that Chicago Sanitary District's argument lacks merit both in law and in equity. And since a special master was appointed by the Supreme Court on June 28, to consider the facts in this case, I believe that it would be ill-advised to authorize diversion of additional water at this time, since such diversion would alter the facts in the case. An additional diversion will be contrary to the best interests of all other Lake States, and the use of lake waters for the flushing of sewage will certainly be an uneconomic and unsound utilization of this gift of nature.

I ask unanimous consent that a telegram sent to Senator KERR, chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee, by Mr. Zeidler, mayor of Milwaukee, and by Messrs. Harry Slater, deputy city attorney, and Harry Brockel, municipal port director, voicing Milwaukee's opposition to any further diversion, be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 7, 1959.

HON. ROBERT S. KERR,
Public Works Committee,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We join with our Honorable Senators ALEXANDER WILEY and WILLIAM S. PROXMIRE in vigorously protesting the passage of H.R. 1. Their able and valiant fight on behalf of millions of people who oppose additional water diversion is enthusiastically supported by the city of Milwaukee. Issues have been clearly defined in brief filed with your committee by Senator WILEY.

Although the opposition of Canada to the passage of legislation having for its purpose diversion of additional water from Lake Michigan by Chicago is already evident and passage would have an effect upon our relationship with our neighbor, it is strikingly evident that the internal opposition to that same legislation which would divest many millions of people of their fundamental rights to equal use of a natural resource which is held in trust for all as against a small segment of the population should motivate both the committee and the Senate to reject this bill.

The old tune which Chicago constantly plays on the heartstrings of anyone who will listen concerning their dire need for diversion, rather than accept their municipal responsibilities to deal adequately with their own sewerage problems, has lost all sense of merit or melody. It is unfair to the busy activities of Congress and to the millions in opposition to repeat this theme constantly in the hope that a lack of alertness to the evils of this type of legislation may succeed in giving one area an inequitable and unfair advantage over an entire region relying heavily upon the advantages which this great natural resource affords in navigation, fisheries, commerce, water supply and recreation. All these vital fields of public interest would be trespassed upon by this bill. The Great Lakes States and 50 million people resi-

dent in the Great Lakes watershed rely upon the Senate to protect their Constitutional rights and to reject the special privilege demanded by the State of Illinois for the benefit of a few.

For more than 50 years, Milwaukee and the State of Wisconsin have fought to preserve the vital water resources of the Great Lakes for the general good of our great country and our neighbor. Increased diversion of water from the Great Lakes, if sanctioned by the Senate, will impair the efficiency of navigation and of harbors; will threaten the limited fishery resources remaining in this area; will frustrate recreational uses; and above all will detract from the full use and operation of that great international navigation and power project, the St. Lawrence Seaway at a time when many hundreds of millions of dollars have been and are being expended to make this great facility as beneficial as it can be to the great region which it serves. It is unseemingly that efforts would be made to impair its full usefulness through further water diversion.

It should be pointed out that the principal demand for diversion comes from municipalities and governmental agencies in the Chicago region. If their desire for diversion is to flush raw or untreated sewage down the Illinois waterway, this will create a nuisance and a health problem for all of the municipalities and communities along this waterway, probably as far as St. Louis. It is curious to us that the great State of Illinois should be insensitive to the needs of the communities along this waterway by promoting diversion for sewerage purposes. Rather public officials and the State itself should demand that the Chicago area treat its sewage in the most modern and efficient methods possible, stop dumping sludge and meter the water supply of Chicago so that the sewage problem will be greatly reduced.

If a precedent is established and sanctioned by the Senate permitting one locality to take more than its equitable share of water from the Great Lakes, the flood gates will then be open to any and all communities to make similar demands. Where will this then stop, and how will it be stopped if the precedent for further diversion is approved? We are fighting to preserve the Great Lakes as an international water resource. This fight is not only for the present, but the future generations. Many incipient demands for extraction of water from the lakes are being formulated at this very moment, and courageous action must be taken to safeguard this resource for present and future generations.

We will appreciate full text this statement being incorporated in record of hearing on H.R. 1.

FRANK P. ZEIDLER,
Mayor.
HARRY G. SLATER,
Deputy City Attorney.
HARRY C. BROCKEL,
Municipal Port Director.

Attention, Congress: Consider the Death of Roy Underwood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, as we start our deliberations on the labor bill, I can think of no better reading than

"Attention, Congress: Consider the death of Roy Underwood."

This is the leading article in the Reader's Digest for August. It is the story of a union member, highly considered in his union, who, in the end died for the right.

Mr. Speaker, I know that it will be objected that this is an exceptional case. The reply to this objection is that in a free country such as ours exceptions like this should not exist. In a time when our whole philosophy is on trial we cannot afford to allow such exceptions to be shown to the world.

This Congress has a great opportunity to pass a strong and just labor bill. The American people expect and want just that.

Mr. Speaker, in the words of our great President, who is not easily provoked: "I want that sort of thing to stop."

ATTENTION, CONGRESS: CONSIDER THE DEATH OF ROY UNDERWOOD

(By Lester Velle)

On a windy hill outside Philadelphia early last April, an undertaker's assistant scattered the still-warm ashes of Roy Underwood. Thus ended in tragic martyrdom the life of a valiant union man who had merely dared to seek for his fellow workers, a few basic civil rights. His tragedy is a scathing indictment of Congress, of the National Labor Relations Board, of the courts, and of the good unions for their current apathy—for their failure to provide protection for the members of a few bad unions against repression by their leaders.

Roy Underwood was a spectacled man in his early fifties, full faced, and ample of girth. Had he been a printer, or a plumber, or a member of some equally upright union, he would undoubtedly have been one of America's important union leaders, for he was a dedicated union man and the sort of man other men follow. But Roy Underwood, a crane operator, was fated to be a member of the Operating Engineers. And so he was doomed to make the most frustrating of all struggles: the fight against evil masked as unionism and defended by men commanding entrenched power.

The things which Underwood laid down his life to win were things all of us take for granted: the right to assemble and speak out freely; the right to elect those who will rule and tax us; the right to seek redress against injustice. In the debate now raging over labor reforms, his story becomes exhibit A in the case for urgent action to win for union citizens the rights they presumably enjoy as American citizens.

I first met Roy Underwood 5 years ago when I was piecing together the fantastic story of Joe Fay, the Operating Engineers vice president who had gone to jail for extortion but continued to rule his union empire from prison. Underwood was then the picture of the happy warrior. He was in a fight, and his round face exuded the confidence of the born leader. His international president, a crony of Joe Fay, had booted him out of his job as president of a local, and out of the union. The international president had then plunged the local into a species of union martial law known as "supervision," and Underwood was suing in the Philadelphia Federal court to win reinstatement for himself, plus self-rule and an election for the duespayers.

Underwood had come to Philadelphia in 1937 and into a topsy-turvy Operating Engineers world. In the local, as ruled by Fay—and as was spelled out in McClellan committee testimony—wrong was right and right was wrong. It was right for business agents to extort 3 percent weekly assessments (over and above dues) from the members; it was

wrong for the members to ask about this at meetings—thugs patrolled the aisles and beat them up. It was right for Fay to make "soft," conniving deals with employers; it was wrong for the members to have a voice in the kind of contracts they would work under. It was also wrong for them to elect their own officers, because the union had been under "supervision" as long as the oldest member could remember—and Fay was the supervisor.

Underwood formed a "Committee of Liberation" in 1945, and soon learned his first bitter lesson about trying to right wrongs inside a corrupt union.

He found that he must exhaust every means of obtaining justice within his own union before he could appeal to the courts. This meant that in the Operating Engineers he had to appeal to the men who were responsible for his plight. For it was with the connivance of Fay's crony, the international president, William Maloney, that Underwood's local remained under supervision. And, under the Operating Engineers' constitution, it was Maloney to whom petitions for relief had to be addressed.

When Underwood's committee of liberation tried to get members to sign petitions, Fay's toughs beat them up and tore up the petitions. When Underwood's men got the petitions signed anyway—at clandestine night meetings in members' basements—Maloney ignored them.

After several months Underwood and his followers obtained a lawyer and, in 1947, sued for union self-rule in the Philadelphia court of common pleas. Miraculously, they got away with their suit—for a while. Maloney was in no position to fight, because Joe Fay, to whom he had entrusted the lives and fortunes of the 2,000-odd men in the Philadelphia local, was on his way to jail. Fay and his henchmen had kept no records of an estimated \$3 million collected in assessments and permit fees. Written contracts with employers had said one thing, but (as subsequent arbitration hearings proved) verbal agreements resulted in softer conditions. It was a system of built-in corruption in which the local's business agents got paid off for overlooking the contract.

To avoid airing this mess, Maloney settled with Underwood. The rank-and-filers could have their union back provided they didn't sue Fay and his boodlers for the missing money. So, in a court-supervised election, Roy Underwood was elected president of the local. He proceeded to bring back clean unionism.

Underwood and his regime were living on borrowed time, however. President Maloney could no more permit free rule in Philadelphia than Khrushchev could permit freedom in Hungary. For Underwood's local was an island in a sea of union corruption: two of Maloney's locals in Chicago had been under union martial law for 23 years; the New Jersey local was still under the thumb of Joe Fay, although Fay was in prison; the Long Island local was run by one William DeKoning, Sr., who was soon to go to jail for extorting from his members.

Restive members in these locals might get ideas from Underwood's free union. Worse still was Underwood's threat to the rotten fabric of collusive agreements between Operating Engineers officials and favored employers.

When Underwood tried to make one big contractor live up to the Philadelphia-area agreements, he got an angry call from Maloney. "Stay away from him—the contractor"—the international president ordered, according to McClellan committee testimony. "He is a friend of mine, and that is all I should have to tell you."

When bitter wrangles over the contracts Fay had left behind him exploded into a prolonged strike over wages and conditions, Maloney stepped in and took the union away

from Underwood and the members. Underwood was tried by a union board controlled by Maloney and dependent on him for union jobs. Under provisions of the union constitution, he was fined \$3,500 and suspended from the union for 6 years. Union martial law returned.

What broke Roy Underwood's heart now was the system of union and legal custom which gave him and his men no forum in which they might hope to win justice. As rebels, many of the Underwood men could no longer get work—jobs were largely controlled by the union hiring hall and by the supervisor's business agent. So, first, they complained to the NLRB. For a workingman who lives from paycheck to paycheck, however, justice that takes 2 or 3 years to get is no justice at all. And in the end only a handful could win their NLRB cases. How can you prove that a business agent has put pressure on a boss to keep you off a job? Where are you going to get the witnesses?

Underwood tried the Federal courts. Here there were 5 years of delay. His followers fell away. His wife had to go to work. The other side had no such problems. From the parent union's \$15 million treasury, contributed by the members, came ample money to hire lawyers. Against these, Underwood had but one lawyer, Abraham Freedman, who neglected his regular practice, gave his time free, and even dug into his own pocket to defray occasional expenses.

Underwood's day in court crushed him. He listened as the judge praised the local that he, Underwood, had run, and excoriated the terrorists who had taken over. But the court would not interfere in a union's internal affairs, provided the union gave complaining members a fair trial. And Underwood, said the court, had had a fair trial.

Underwood didn't know whether to laugh or cry. Fair trial? Was it a fair trial when the union boss whom he fought—William Maloney, who, as Senator McClellan told his committee, had risen to power with gangster guns—had tried him with his own executive board? Was it a fair trial when the charges were that he had spread defamatory literature—the papers in his suit against Maloney? Even more, should Underwood have had to stand trial by his union at all—for going to court to prevent Maloney from intervening against his own members in a strike?

"It is crystal clear," the judge summed up, "that under the leadership of (Supervisor) Hunter P. Wharton . . . there will never be a chance for decent operation (of the Philadelphia local)." But the judge held: "The courts do not look with favor upon interference by the courts in the internal workings of any . . . labor organization." In effect, the judge ruled: There is a grievance, but I can't help you.

"When Roy came home from the court," his wife told me, "he looked like a licked man. 'All those years of fighting, and where do you wind up? I'll never believe there's justice in the courts,' he said."

Now, alone in his home, Underwood brooded. Evil seemed to be inheriting the earth—and legally.

Joe Fay, out of prison, had been rewarded by his old local with a lifetime pension of \$10,015 a year—after taxes. To give him additional cash, some locals also bought their limousines through him.

William Maloney had quit his presidency rather than face questions by the McClellan committee about the contents of 11 secret safe-deposit boxes. But no civil or criminal suits followed. Now he lived in happy retirement on his estates outside Chicago and in Florida.

Hunter P. Wharton, supervisor of Underwood's Philadelphia local, who had been excoriated in court and before the McClellan

committee as a harbinger of terrorists, continued as the local's boss. More, he was elected secretary-treasurer of the parent union on a clean-up slate.

"Never fight the rackets as I did," Roy Underwood said to his 16-year-old son, Roy, Jr., on the morning of last April 3. "You can't win."

These were among the last words he uttered. When his son had left for school, and his wife for work, Roy Underwood methodically burned the bushels of papers, clippings, legal documents that had accumulated during his 14-year fight. He typed a note to his wife, and his hand shook so with exhaustion that he couldn't sign his name. Then, utterly defeated, he went into his garage and shot himself.

I went to Philadelphia after Roy Underwood's death and made my way, uninvited, into a meeting of his old local one night. Some 600 men had crowded into the basement auditorium of Philadelphia's Town Hall to hear the wages and conditions that the supervisor and his business agents, none of them elected, had accepted from the contractors.

There had still been no election after 9 years, for on the rostrum was a chairman whom the supervisor had chosen, presumably for his leather-lunged ability to shout down the heckling from the floor. The same old crowd that had been involved in brutal beatings of Underwood's men still dominated the proceedings on the floor. All around me men grumbled to each other about the terms of the contract hurling occasional four-letter epithets at the chairman. But, when the time came to be counted, few stood up to indicate their opposition openly. The old fear of antagonizing men who hold your livelihood in their hands prevailed.

I talked to a remnant of Underwood's followers and found that the old pattern of discrimination against "troublemakers" was still making it difficult for them to get work. And a union member who had briefly held office as a business agent disclosed that the old system of built-in corruption in which employers paid off for their relief from the hard provisions of a contract still flourished, too. When the ex-business agent, an honest man, sought to confer with a contractor about his labor needs on a new job, he found the contractor closeted with the local's acting supervisor, then under indictment for extortion, and now dead. Employer and acting supervisor worked out their own deal for conditions on the job.

"Don't stick your nose into things that aren't your affair," the ex-business agent was told by the acting supervisor.

It was as if Roy Underwood had never lived.

But can Americans let the Underwood story end this way?

"The International Union of Operating Engineers stands out as an ugly example of ruthless domination of workmen through violence, intimidation and other dictatorial practices," the McClellan committee reported a year and a half ago. The committee's declaration that "democracy within this union is nonexistent" and that "there has been extensive collusion between union officials and management" went to the AFL-CIO's Ethical Practices Committee for investigation. The AFL-CIO has before it a report that has been gathering dust since August 1958.

It is this kind of apathy, delay and postponement that destroyed the hope, the fight and finally the life of Roy Underwood.

AFL-CIO leaders argue that no written guarantees are needed to protect the rights of the union man. His own union constitution—enforceable as a contract in court—protects him, they say. This the life and death of Roy Underwood contradict.

A bill of rights for the union man is urgently needed. How long will Americans stand by without establishing this protection?

U.S. People and Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column written by Mr. David Lawrence which appeared in the Washington Star on Thursday, August 6, 1959:

U.S. PEOPLE AND KHRUSHCHEV—CITIZENS' DISSENT AGAINST VISIT BY DICTATOR HELD CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT

(By David Lawrence)

Do the people of the United States really want Nikita Khrushchev to visit this country? President Eisenhower assumes that they do. The Governments of Sweden and other Scandinavian countries recently issued a similar invitation, but the Soviet Premier, after accepting it, decided not to go there because it was evident the people didn't want him to come.

What happened in Sweden between the time the invitation was extended and the announcement that Khrushchev had given up the idea for the present? A letter from Dr. Bela Fabian, written from Geneva a few days ago, tells the story. He is chairman of the Federation of Hungarian Former Political Prisoners and was in Sweden at the time of the planning for the visit of the Soviet Premier. Dr. Fabian writes:

"Naturally, Major General Zacharov, deputy chief of the Soviet security police, knew that the August committees were preparing mass meetings and demonstrations. In Sweden 10 meetings were to be held simultaneously on August 13. The one thing he did not know was whether the Swedish people would demonstrate by ostentatiously staying at home, so that the streets would be empty and there would be no one there except the police, or that there would be enormous crowds who would turn their backs on Khrushchev."

Dr. Fabian writes that the August committees contained a large number of members, among them prominent intellectuals, several Nobel Prize winners, university professors, and writers. Many student organizations were represented.

Already there are varying points of view in this country as to what the reaction of the American people will be in the cities to be visited by Khrushchev. Certainly any disorderly demonstrations would only result in worldwide criticism on the theory that the Americans were not as courteous to the Soviet Premier as the people of the Soviet Union have been toward Vice President Nixon. But inside the United States—unlike the situation in the Soviet Union, where everything is controlled by the Government—the people have a right under the Constitution to speak. They have a right to picket peacefully, if they like, with placards expressing their ideas.

If the Scandinavian plan were put into effect in the United States by boycotting the parades or by viewing in silence the public events where Khrushchev makes his appearance, an orderly protest could be registered.

There may be some in this country who are willing to "let bygones be bygones," but

among the hundreds of thousands of Americans who came here originally from the lands which now are held captive by the Communist dictatorship there will be no suppression of emotions. Their point of view toward the Moscow autocracy which has ordered the murder or exile of so many innocent people in the last several years is deeply rooted. They cannot forget.

It is true that after wars are over friendly feelings toward former enemies often are developed. But the governments which ruled in Nazi Germany, in militaristic Japan, and Fascist Italy have been removed and free governments established. No such change has occurred in Moscow, where the same kind of regime is in power today as the one that broke the pledges given at Yalta in 1945 and at Geneva in 1955.

"Khrushchev's criminal record exceeds all," wrote Dr. L. E. Dobriansky, professor of economics at Georgetown University, in a letter to President Eisenhower dated July 31. The Georgetown professor was the originator of the resolution adopted by Congress to proclaim Captive Nations Week. Expressing the hope that Khrushchev would not be invited to America, Professor Dobriansky added:

"It is patently naive to believe that a visit by the 'hangman of the Ukraine' would add anything to what he already knows about our country. . . . Moral principle alone should dissuade us from conferring respectability and legitimacy to a dedicated enemy, the attributes he desires in order to extend his empire."

There is talk now of arranging a parade of hearses in each American city where Khrushchev appears. On each hearse would be placarded the statistics of the number of persons murdered or exiled from each of the 14 captive countries in recent years. This is one type of orderly demonstration.

Another which is being suggested is that memorial services be held throughout the Nation to carry out the spirit of the resolution in behalf of the captive nations adopted overwhelmingly last month by both Houses of Congress. Nationwide prayers for the liberation of the captive peoples, as well as memorial tributes to the many who have been enslaved or killed by the ruthless Communist dictators, would at least let the rest of the world know that, however polite the Government has to be to any visitor, the people here have the right of free speech. They can express their dissent from the position of their Government, which has invited to free America at this crucial time the man who has threatened war unless the Western forces surrender Berlin and who has never withdrawn that threat.

State Income Taxes on Out-of-State Corporations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced legislation to prevent States from levying an income tax on a company that solicits business in the State but has no stock of goods there.

I am pleased to note that just last Thursday the Senate Finance Committee approved a bill similar to the legislation I proposed. I sincerely trust that the House Ways and Means Committee will

also give prompt attention to this legislation.

A recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court makes it imperative for the Congress to act. This decision sanctioned the application of a State income tax where no office is maintained in the State.

This decision, Mr. Speaker, threatens business and industry with a chaotic condition unless it is corrected. It means that the door has been opened for all the States to amend their tax laws to assess income taxes on out-of-State corporations even if the corporation's sole activity consists of the solicitation of orders.

It is difficult to think of almost any type of business which could escape this new form of taxation.

The implications of the Supreme Court decision are far reaching. It needs to be studied carefully. Senator BYRD has said he regards the bill reported out by his committee as stopgap legislation while Congress carefully reviews the problem and all of its ramifications.

I sincerely trust that the Congress will not adjourn without dealing with this serious yet little understood problem.

Tribute to Former President Herbert Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday Herbert Clark Hoover, the 31st President of the United States, celebrated his 85th birthday.

Throughout the Nation, well-deserved tributes were paid to the former President in recognition of his long and honorable career.

Although there are conflicting views on his Presidency, even those who disagree with him maintain a high respect for the honesty, intelligence, and devotion with which Mr. Hoover has continued to serve his country.

I well recognize, of course, that it is not possible to summarize in a brief statement his 85 years of service to our Nation.

During his lifetime—as a mining engineer, expert organizer, businessman, and humanitarian—however, Mr. Hoover has made highly significant contributions to our country's progress and foreign policy.

As an example of his work, we recall that in recent years the special commissions headed by Mr. Hoover have made unique contributions to promoting efficiency and economy—as well as savings—in operation of the Federal Government.

Recently, a bill, S. 1711, was reported by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to establish a fund for peace program. Among the great forerunners of

this idea of utilizing our food for humanitarian purposes, not only in this country but abroad, were the programs headed by Mr. Hoover. During World War I, he served as Food Administrator in the United States. After the armistice, he took charge of the American Relief Administration, which delivered millions of tons of food to Europe and saved thousands of lives.

These are examples of only two of the magnificent ways in which Mr. Hoover has devoted his time and energies to worthwhile programs.

Although he served as the Republican President—during which he significantly took the unprecedented action of "voluntarily cutting" his salary by about 20 percent—he has continued to serve his country in a bipartisan, statesmanlike manner under both Republican and Democratic administrations.

Yesterday, August 10, 1959, the New York Times published an article on how the ex-President—a man who has never retired—is carrying on active work and interests in a wide variety of fields. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 10, 1959]
TOO BUSY FOR ILLS AT 85: HERBERT CLARK HOOPER

Herbert Clark Hoover reaches his 85th birthday today, alert to the problems of the world, the standing of the baseball clubs, and intent upon substituting work for pills. He has made one concession to his advancing years. He rises now at 7 a.m. instead of 6. The years have been kind to the former President. His silver hair has thinned somewhat, and his worsened hearing has made him dependent upon a hearing aid, but his general physical appearance has changed little in the last few years. His step is steady, his shoulders square.

Headquarters for Mr. Hoover's many activities is a 31st floor suite in the Waldorf Towers, a combination of offices, stacked with filing cabinets, and quietly luxurious living quarters.

WORKS WITH STAFF OF SIX

A staff of six women, all under the command of Miss Bernice Miller, who declares she "never tells the chief what to do," helps the former President handle his correspondence, carry on the duties that go with "active" membership on many boards of directors, and do the research necessary for Mr. Hoover's seemingly endless literary output.

Despite his concern with many serious projects, Mr. Hoover has never lost his interest in sports, both as a spectator, and as a participant.

In reporting on the uncompleted tasks before him at a pre-birthday interview last Friday, he listed among them "attending baseball games." And the next day he attended one, as a guest of honor of the Yankees—the annual Old Timers' baseball game.

His interest in baseball dates to sandlot days in West Branch, Iowa, where he was born, and in Salem, Oreg., where he lived in his teen years.

When he entered Stanford University, he confesses, it was with the hope of getting a berth in the varsity nine. After his first game, the coach told him, "You'd make a better manager than a shortstop," and his professional career ended there.

FISHING FOR RELAXATION

Mr. Hoover has not been trout fishing this year. But he got in considerable bone fishing on his yacht, *Capitva*, during a 2-month vacation in Florida last winter.

Such excursions are only interludes in the otherwise busy life of a man who never retired.

"Those who retire without some occupation can spend their time only in talking about their ills and pills," he says. "And the other fellow wants only to talk about his."

As a former engineer, one of Mr. Hoover's chief concerns is that the country is falling behind in the training of engineers. He keeps tab on comparative figures and is alarmed at the larger number being trained by the Soviet Union. He, reportedly, suspects that part of the problem is created by high schools under the spell of "progressive" education.

In recent years, the Boys Clubs of America movement has become one of the former President's chief interests. He is proud that under his leadership the number of units working with boys, mostly from underprivileged surroundings, has grown from 130 to 526. He is the board chairman of the organization.

An average day's mail brings in about 250 letters, which will include several requests to speak at public gatherings. Many of the letters are returned by Mr. Hoover with his reply jotted on them. He has curtailed his public appearances somewhat but has made between fifteen and twenty major speeches in the last year.

WRITES OWN SPEECHES

One engagement he accepted was as President Eisenhower's representative at the World's Fair in Brussels. He writes out his speeches in longhand.

The former President works at a large mahogany desk in a corner of a 40-foot living room. Scattered conveniently about are trays crammed with large kitchen matches, which he uses to keep his pipe lighted. On an end table beside his favorite chair for relaxing is a rock almost as big as a football. It serves for scratching matches and knocking the dottle from his pipe.

On a wall, catercorner from his desk, is an oil portrait of Mrs. Hoover on which his undimmed blue eyes often fall as he glances up from his work. When she died in 1944, she left a letter reminding her two sons, Herbert and Allan Henry, of their good fortune in having Mr. Hoover for their father. Both sons will be among the small group today that will help the Republican patriarch mark the midpoint of his eighth decade of life.

Address Delivered by Alex Cairns at Convention of International War Veterans' Alliance, Crookston, Minn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, during the first part of this month, the International War Veterans' Alliance held its annual convention at Crookston, Minn. This organization is composed of veterans from Canada and the United States and is dedicated to promoting comradeship among the representatives of these two great countries

who fought together in the common cause of freedom.

At this convention, which was attended by many delegates from my State of North Dakota, Mr. Alex Cairns, a prominent Canadian, delivered an inspiring and meaningful address attesting to the friendship and common understanding which exist between his country and the United States.

Mr. President, I think that Mr. Cairns' remarks are so noteworthy that I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS GIVEN BY ALEX CAIRNS,¹ OF WINNIPEG, MANITOBA, CANADA, AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION BANQUET OF THE INTERNATIONAL WAR VETERANS ALLIANCE AT CROOKSTON, MINN., ON AUGUST 2, 1959

Following the First World War, American and Canadian war veterans living close to the international boundary, instituted the practice of paying fraternal visits—at the same time to cooperate with each other in memorial services. Sometimes these meetings would be for social and sporting events. As a result of that practice the International War Veterans Alliance was organized.

It was in the summer of 1937 that Col. Ralph Webb, then mayor of Winnipeg and president of the Canadian Legion in Manitoba, received an invitation from C. D. Loughlin, commander of the American Legion at Grand Forks, an invitation to attend an annual rally of the American Legion posts in North Dakota, and, asking Colonel Webb to address the gathering—and to bring with him a few Canadian exservicemen. The invitation was accepted and he arrived in Grand Forks accompanied by over 500 Canadians who had chartered a special train and several buses—and, of course, a large number went by auto.

Following the memorial service in the stadium a joint meeting was held in the Dacotah Hotel, the outcome of which was the unanimous decision to form an international organization of war veterans from North Dakota, Minnesota, and Manitoba. It was found on examination that the ideals of the organized war veterans in Canada and the United States were identical and it was felt that the genuine friendship and good will existing between the two groups as exemplified in such a united international organization would serve to influence all English-speaking people to the end that they would work toward that cherished goal—world peace. Its main purpose, however, was and still is the furtherance of the friendship and associations of United States and Canadian war veterans and the promotion of friendly relations between the English-speaking peoples of the world. That objective is now being brought closer by the march of world events as today we find the world divided into two armed camps—one

a solid land mass stretching from the Baltic to the China Sea—frankly organized for world domination. The other—made up of freedom-loving peoples working for peace—but united and determined to defend themselves against all aggression.

The struggle before us now is fundamentally one for men's minds. Much of the force now is the force of ideas which appeal to the aspirations of men's souls but with such ideas we can be free from panic and fear. The greatest mistake of the whole Communist idea is not its demand for new territories or spheres of influence—but rather its ruthless attacks on the freedoms of life and the liberties of the human spirit. You who have fought to preserve those liberties know full well that any force or idea which seeks to obliterate them cannot long survive.

After two catastrophes in our own time we look forward to a lasting peace and the world had the right to hope that there would now be some respite from conflict. In the Yalta agreement of February 1945 the following statement was made: "Only with continuing and growing cooperation and understanding among our three countries, and among all peace-loving nations can the highest aspirations of humanity be realized, a secure and lasting peace which will, in the words of the Atlantic Charter, afford assurance that all men in all lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want." The three countries referred to were the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union.

There was nothing much said there regarding political theory and certainly there was no direct definition of democracy. The inspiration lay in the word "freedom," and the allies were fighting against a people who threatened them with slavery. They were more concerned with what they were fighting against than what they were fighting for and the crusade word was democracy.

I am reminded of the story told of a party of old crooks used as pioneers who were sent to an isolated point during the last days of the war and had no rumors of proceedings until armistice morning, when the young officer in charge received the all important message. He at once fell in the party, adjusted his monocle and read the news in a very grave and impressive tone. After he had finished there was a heavy silence, then an old Cockney sergeant stepped forward, "Beg pardon, sir," he said, "but 'oo's won?"

Well—now we know that in war today—no one wins. Somewhere, somehow there must be another approach to this whole problem of human survival, but such an approach will only be found in a willingness to common understanding throughout the whole world, a frame of mind which, unfortunately, is entirely unacceptable to the majority of mankind today. Our problem is one of words, thoughts, honor, and morality against the reeking tube and iron shard.

The world has become far more dangerous than it was when World War II ended. We now have mightier powers and deadlier weapons than were even thought of then. Disarmament has been proved a snare and appeasement a delusion and we must therefore build our security on preparedness, for the assault, should it come, will be swift and devastating, and we in Canada are not unmindful of the fact that in such an assault, we will be in the middle.

Today a deeper darkness lies upon the world, a confusion in which spiritual values and moral sense seem almost lost to whole nations. We now live in an age which is more responsive to the impact of ideas upon whole groups of people than ever before, and the world now appears to be in the midst of one of these great confusions which change the history of mankind every few hundred years. We are now reminded of the message

of King George in August 1945 when he said, "From time to time in a nation's history it is given to a few brief generations of men to determine the fate of their civilization. On their judgment and action depends the future of society for centuries to come. To the nobility of high endeavor, or back on the road to the barbarian from which they sprang. Today an immense responsibility is ours, we are the custodians of the future, we live in the beginning of a new age, an age that will fulfill the high aspirations of mankind, or another era of strife and discord in which the forces of evil may yet triumph. In many respects we find the tasks of peace even heavier than the burdens of war and only by unity can we conquer the anarchy that threatens the world at all times."

Every nation on earth therefore had a stake in the recent discussions of the foreign ministers at Geneva. There was little expectation that the Conference would reach agreement on any of the major issues concerning the future of Berlin, the reunification of Germany or European security, but it was felt that the talks could clear the way for future discussions by heads of state to reach a system of operation between East and West.

It is therefore significant of the times that such a movement as the International War Veterans' Alliance should be born among the exservicemen, a movement which should indicate to the world at large that the men who know what war actually means are moved to action in the interests of world peace, and if it be true that the fundamental cause of war today is economic, one cannot overrate the importance of an organization such as this. Modern war is nonetheless terrible because it is no longer waged to satisfy a monarch's pride or the injured dignity of certain classes of people and any scheme which would banish it from human life is worthy of the best efforts of the world's best men.

Not so long ago we cherished the hope that a new era had dawned upon the world, wherein a nation's signature to a treaty would be held as something sacred, and the international wrongdoer would be promptly suppressed by the collective power of those who lived within the law, but a survey of the world today suggests that this was merely a dream of man in his sanest mood and the indication is that might still dominates right and the only strength that can command respect from nations who venerate nothing else. At long last we realize that democracy must be strong if it would survive but tardiness in learning the lesson has been responsible for much humiliation in the past few years.

There is no need for our two countries to be beset by a narrow nationalism—we are too young in history for that sort of thing. Both the United States and Canada are inhabited by peoples who had their origins in older lands—but who have contributed to the development of their respective countries—and who—over the years—have merged in a great melting pot of human endeavor. Not limited by narrow national aspirations but searching out and maintaining all that is best of the old—and developing the new and wider outlook which results from pioneering in the wide unlimited spaces of new lands, lands in which a full reward for expended effort can be obtained. Uninfluenced by the history of past generations we have been permitted to establish a new heritage of which those who follow us can be justly proud.

Three times in our own generation the United States and Canada have stood side by side in repelling the tide of aggressive militarism—twice in conflicts of worldwide dimensions. Their objective was not territorial gain but merely to be able to walk upright in the sun—to speak freely—and to

¹ Mr. Alex Cairns was born in Scotland. Emigrated to Canada in 1907 at the age of 17. Served in World War I with the Yukon contingent in France. Commissioned to 12th Manitoba Dragoons in 1920. Was provincial secretary of the Canadian Legion from 1930 until retirement. Enlisted in World War II April 1, 1940, with rank of captain. Served in Newfoundland, Washington, and Great Britain. Was deputy assistant adjutant general in 1941, and, was made assistant adjutant general in June 1944. Is presently president of the Manitoba and Northwest Ontario Command, Canadian Legion. Was the first president and one of the founders of the International War Veterans' Alliance.

maintain our own way of life—a condition simply defined in the word "freedom." It is true that we have conflicts of opinion on many matters of international import—but the very fact that we are able to have those differences and discuss them in a friendly and cooperative spirit is an indication of that freedom and way of life that we have fought to maintain.

When we think of these things it is increasingly clear that these annual meetings of the International War Veterans' Alliance hold a particular significance. We have so much in common. All members have served in the armed forces of their respective countries and it seems right and proper that men who had been willing to fight for the same principles—and experienced the same priceless comradeship should get together in this way and thus prove to a perplexed and frightened world that it is possible for countries living side by side to honor and respect each other—in spite of differences of opinion. We are aware, of course, that there is still a lack of knowledge regarding Canada in some parts of the United States. Canada is no land of the midnight sun—half British, half American—populated chiefly by Indians, Eskimos, the mounted police and trappers on snowshoes; and, governed by the British Parliament in London.

The British North American Act of 1867 is the basic document of the constitution of Canada and through the years up to 1931 she developed toward full nationhood. First there was the gaining of equal status within the empire, followed by the statute of Westminster in 1931 which declared the British dominions to be equal in status, and in no way subordinate to the mother country in any aspect of their domestic affairs. Modern Canada is a child of the last century, of free trade and liberal institutions. It is not a carbon copy of any other country. It shapes its course autonomously but it must at all times integrate it with the world policies of the United States and the United Kingdom. It is in Ottawa—not London—that the course and character of the Canadian people are shaped. Like the other dominions in the commonwealth she controls her own political and commercial systems. Britain has no power of veto over her laws and no power of taxation. She is under no compulsion even to remain in the commonwealth and if Canada goes into a war it is by the free vote of her parliament. She is part of the commonwealth and remains in it because she wishes to do so and because the British Commonwealth of Nations expresses the type of political society in which she desires to live. The statute of Westminster formally recognized the United Kingdom and the dominions to be autonomous communities within the commonwealth, equal in status, in no way subordinate one to another in any aspect of their domestic or external affairs though united by a common allegiance to the Crown and freely associated as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

When the Queen came to Canada to open, with President Eisenhower, the St. Lawrence Seaway, which is another example of international cooperation further uniting the interests of our two countries, she came as Queen of Canada and she received the acclaim of loyal Canadians wherever she went, but perhaps the most significant event in her tour was her visit to Chicago where a few years ago a certain mayor of that city promised to punch the King of England on the nose if he should appear in Chicago. He must have turned over in his grave when the union jack alternated with the stars and stripes in the streets and an U.S. Marine band played "Rule Britannia" when our Queen landed. Yes, in Canada we honor and respect our Queen. Don't ever let anyone tell you otherwise, and, we appreciate too that hers is a position of responsibility

rather than privilege for she is the tie that unites in common ideals the people of all races and creeds that make up the commonwealth. The monarchy is a symbol, and symbols are important, as organized religion has learned—and even outside religion and politics we adopt symbols from the past which we find convenient, though they have long ago lost in practice their original meaning.

The difficulties of cooperation between independent states is not a new story. It is as old as the failure of the Greek city states to achieve it. It is obviously one of the most difficult of all the tasks undertaken by men and if human experience anywhere gives any hint of forces which would help toward success in that task we ought to be ready to use those forces.

It was Bismarck, the Iron Chancellor of Germany who said that the most significant factor of the 19th century was the fact that Great Britain and the United States spoke the same language, and even today, the fact that the language spoken in the United States and in all self-governing dominions of the Commonwealth is the same, is still the most potent force in world politics. When Washington and London speak there is no chance of misconception or ambiguity in the exchange—and there is an understanding that can avoid hazards and lead to cooperation, while Canada stands side by side with both and helping in every way possible to establish freedom and peace in the world.

In closing this report to the annual convention of the International War Veterans' Alliance here in Crookston, Minn., on this 2d day of August 1959, I would like to give you this quote from an eminent American citizen, Dr. Ralph Bunche: "None can speak more eloquently for peace than those who have fought in war. The voices of war veterans are a reflection of the longing for peace of people the world over, who within a generation have twice suffered the unspeakable catastrophe of world war. Humanity has earned the right to peace. Without it, there can be no hope for the future, and without hope, man is lost. The voice of the people must be heeded. They aspire to a richer life in freedom, equality, and dignity, as in things material; they pray for peace. Their will for peace and a better life can be, must be, crystallized into an irresistible force against war, aggression, and degradation. The people have had to work and sacrifice for wars. They will work more willingly for peace. Let there be a dedicated effort, a greater crusade than history has ever known, for a world of peace, freedom, and equality."

Exchange of Top Level Visits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of August 4, 1959:

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times-Leader of Tuesday, Aug. 4, 1959]

DIPLOMATIC OFFENSIVE—EXCHANGE OF TOP LEVEL VISITS

Confirmation in Washington and Moscow of reports that President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev will exchange visits in the fall will be received with mixed emotions.

Frankly, the American people do not relish the idea of playing host to the Red dictator whose record of ruthlessness, duplicity, and demagoguery has nauseated them.

On the other hand, the practical aspects of international politics would seem to make it necessary to deal with the Soviet leader without regard to personal feelings. That obviously is the view of the President who, there is reason to believe, regards it as duty rather than a pleasure.

If the results justify the experiment, no serious objection can be raised despite the American public's abhorrence of communism and its principal spokesman at the moment.

Whether or not the Eisenhower administration wants to deal with the Kremlin, it is left with little choice in view of the role the Soviet Union is playing in world affairs and the current tension. It is well to recall in this connection that this is not a matter of partisan politics, since it was Franklin Roosevelt a quarter century ago who opened the doors to the Moscow regime by extending recognition. The Democrats, therefore, cannot make political capital out of the exchange of visits on this score.

Burying personal feelings as far as possible and weighing developments on the scales of diplomacy, there is much to be gained from such an exchange of visits and possibly much to be lost if the Americans are not wary and if Khrushchev runs true to form.

There is no question Khrushchev wanted this invitation more than any other and pulled every conceivable string to accomplish his purpose. His immediate aim apparently is the prestige it will give him, enhancing his stature at home and in satellite lands. We may be certain he will exploit propaganda advantages to the limit. Washington cannot be unmindful of these pitfalls.

To offset these disadvantages, we can hope for a number of developments. One is that a visit to America will open Khrushchev's eyes as to the strength and peaceful attitude of the American people as a whole, discounting the possibility of adverse effects of untoward incidents or hostile demonstrations by certain groups who understandably hate the Red leader and everything he represents. Then, too, there is the hope personal contact will accomplish what formal diplomacy to date has failed to do—open the door of understanding.

While the spotlight is on Khrushchev's trip to America, the visit of President Eisenhower to the Soviet Union is equally important. He is no stranger there, and received a hero's welcome in Moscow after the war. The Russian people will be able to discover again that he is not the ogre he has been painted by Red propagandists.

In the wake of the huge success of Vice President Nixon, who will may succeed to the White House in 1960, the President's forthcoming mission should have a most salutary effect. The only cause for concern is the toll the heavy schedule, including preliminary conferences with our allies, will take of his health.

Coming on top of the obvious failure of the Big Four foreign ministers to agree on Berlin and Germany, the sudden outbreak of exuberant goodwill might be viewed as an unexpected, highly welcome ray of light.

But the Berlin affair is working out as predicted by those familiar with Soviet ways. Khrushchev issued an ultimatum. To carry through on it would have been a grave risk. To back down would have been awkward. What better solution than to leave the whole matter up in the air while Khrushchev lingers about the United States trying to look like a pigeon of peace?

It would be foolish to expect miracles as a result of this exchange of visits, knowing Red tactics and ambitions. Whatever benefits accrue, if any, will be a gain if Soviet traps can be avoided.

One thing is certain: This is not to be construed as appeasement under any circumstances. There will never be another Yalta or Potsdam, even though the alternative be nuclear warfare.

The Better Tilton Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, one of the great characteristics of the American way of life is the spirit of initiative and self-reliance which leads people to rely on their own efforts and their own skills as they seek to improve themselves and their communities.

This spirit was recently put to work in an effective and revealing fashion in Tilton, N.H., through a "Better Tilton Contest." I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Concord Monitor of July 28, 1959, describing the Better Tilton Contest and outlining its achievements.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Concord (N.H.) Monitor, July 28, 1959]

TILTON CONTEST SHOWS BENEFIT—IDEAS TO IMPROVE AREA GET IMPETUS—PUSH WILL BE CONTINUED

TILTON, July 28.—The Better Tilton contest was sponsored May 15 to July 1 by the Tilton Park Commission as a means of inducing residents of Tilton and Northfield to develop ideas of improvement which would be of benefit in producing more eye appeal for Tilton and Northfield.

Tilton and Northfield will be gaining great opportunity for expansion with the new Federal defense highway due to reach Tilton and Northfield in 1960-61. Tilton and Northfield are located in a section of much natural beauty, but the park commission felt that the two towns had gradually been slipping in a run-of-the-mill category for small towns. That is why the Better Tilton contest was sponsored. Neither Tilton nor Northfield has a daily newspaper, but the contest was greatly supported by nearby daily and weekly newspapers which kept the contest in the public eye.

Governor Powell was quoted as saying "I would like to state that the local residents and the Tilton park commission are setting a fine example with their volunteer citizens' action program for community betterment. You are encouraging the property owners as well as business and industry to undertake successful projects to beautify and increase growth in your town."

The park commission also made personal contacts with Tilton and Northfield residents. They answered questions and introduced new facts about the contest. Judging was kept on a very impartial basis, and judges did not know whose letter they were reading. The prize of a \$25 savings bond was presented to William Lawrence at an informal coffee hour held at the Tilton Inn. Mr. Lawrence is first vice president of the Tilton Chamber of Commerce and has a real insight on what improvements could be made for Tilton and Northfield.

At present extensive work is being made to carry out the ideas presented by Mr. Lawrence in this Better Tilton contest entry. The park commission sincerely hopes that the citizens of Tilton and Northfield will be as responsive to the new Better Tilton contest which will be sponsored sometime next year, as they have been in the past. The commission is doing its utmost to make Tilton a better community in which to live, and a more attractive place in which to settle, or even start a business.

A Threat to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues an editorial entitled "A Threat to Peace" appearing in the latest issue of Prevent World War III—No. 54, summer 1959—published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., a nonprofit educational organization located at 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

This editorial deals with the unlawful action of the Egyptian Government in blocking and seizing Israeli cargo going through the Suez Canal. As the editorial rightfully points out, the Egyptian action has implications of international significance for, if Egypt is allowed to violate international agreements with respect to one nation, all other maritime nations, large as well as small, may find themselves in the same predicament. Needless to say, such lawlessness on the part of the Egyptian Government not only flouts international law and the U.N. Charter but heightens tensions in the Middle East and is therefore a threat to peace.

The editorial follows:

A THREAT TO PEACE

Two world wars have demonstrated that peace cannot be preserved by passivity. It demands an active vigilance; i.e., the ability to anticipate and to act promptly at those major points of friction, large or small, which have the potential of suddenly igniting the world.

It is precisely this principle of "fire prevention" that is so fundamental to the purposes of the United Nations. Thus, it behooves the U.N. to take remedial measures wherever and whenever international developments loom as a threat to peace. The need for such action is again unmistakably indicated by the latest moves of the Egypt Government at Suez.

The immediate point at issue involves Egyptian interference in the shipment of Israeli cargo through the canal. In itself this action may appear to be "small potatoes" to a world now engrossed in the central European crisis. However, the Egyptian seizure of these cargoes has implications of international significance. Unless halted, it will set in motion a chain reaction which could touch off a world catastrophe. It is this awful prospect that is our basic concern.

To many nations, regardless of size or status, the Suez Canal is almost synonymous with their survival. The fact that it lies within the territorial limits of Egypt does

not detract one iota from its international character. Block the Suez and you may find it easy to strangle the lifeline of many nations. Free passage through this vital artery of world commerce is therefore an imperative transcending the petty conflicts between individual states.

The recognition of this fact is at the core of the Convention of Constantinople of 1888 which laid down the basic policies on the operations of the canal. The treaty stipulated, "The Suez Maritime Canal should always be free and open, in time of war or in time of peace, to every vessel of commerce or of war, without distinction of flag." The convention provided that the canal should remain open "in time of war as a free passage, even to the ships of war of belligerence . . ."

The principles of the Constantinople Convention have been accepted ever since by all users of the canal and have more recently received the endorsement of the United Nations. On September 1, 1951, the U.N. Security Council ordered Egypt "to terminate the restrictions on the passage of international shipping and goods through the Suez Canal wherever bound." The Security Council also made it clear that Egypt's harassment of certain ships visiting Israeli ports "represented unjustified interference with the rights of nations to navigate the seas and to trade freely with one another, including the Arab States and Israel."

In 1954 the Egyptian Government, itself, told the Security Council that it did not interfere with the passage of Israeli cargoes, nor did it violate the Constantinople Convention. The Egyptian representative gave these assurances to the Security Council which had been considering new complaints against Egyptian interference with shipping through the Suez Canal. In October 1956, following Nasser's seizure of the canal, Egypt reaffirmed its support of free passage in a statement to the Security Council. At the same time, the Security Council adopted six principles which opposed any kind of discrimination of shipping through the canal and emphasized "that operation of the canal should be insulated from the politics of any country."

The following year (1957) the Egyptian Government enunciated its policies with respect to the operations of the canal. Once more Egypt reaffirmed its "determination to respect the terms and the spirit of the Constantinople Convention of 1888 and to abide by the Charter and the principles and purposes of the United Nations." It is significant that up to February 1959 Israeli cargoes had freedom of passage through the canal. Since then, the Egyptian Government has undertaken on its own to block passage of ships carrying Israeli goods and to confiscate them. Thus, at the whim of Nasser, the U.N. Charter no less than the specific pledges made by the Egyptian Government have been brazenly violated. The attitude of the Egyptian regime was summed up by one of its top men, Aly Sabri, Minister of State, who said that freedom of passage would be blocked to Israeli cargoes regardless of "any actions taken by the United Nations, the World Court, or the big powers."

This is the bitter fruit of policies which have made it possible for Nasser to exercise a stranglehold over the Suez Canal. In 1956, when Nasser deliberately set off demolitions in the Suez, the United Nations as well as the United States came to his rescue. At that time, the United Nations organized a powerful salvaging operation which cleared the canal. The greater portion of the moneys spent for this purpose came from the U.S. Government.

More recently, the United States leased the giant hopper dredge *Essayon* to the Egyptian Government for improving the facilities of the canal. Egypt will pay \$1,600 less for the

use of the dredge than would be the charge to an American company. As the Christian Science Monitor noted, "The daily charge to the UAR will be less than when the dredge is in transit or out of operation for any reason" (Jan. 12, 1959). This is by no means the extent of Western generosity. In May it was announced from Cairo that the World Bank had offered "the first installment of a \$40 million loan for Suez Canal development" (Reuters, May 26, 1959). It is important to bear in mind that the World Bank loan would not be made unless the U.S. Government consented in view of the fact that it holds 35 percent of the Bank's voting stock. Thus, more aid and money will be poured into the Suez, and additional revenues will flow into Nasser's coffers, while he flaunts the authority of the United Nations.

In his attempt to find a "legal" justification for his pirate-like assault against shipping through the Suez, Nasser speaks about Egyptian "security" and the state of war against Israel. Aside from the fact that his persistence in maintaining a state of war against Israel violates the U.N. Charter, it is a convenient cover-up for his real motive. The authoritative Egyptian newspaper *Al Jumhuriyah* revealed the game when it wrote that the reason behind Israel's "insistence on claiming the right of passage through the canal is that it wants to increase its trade with the Afro-Asian countries and develop its economy." As though this were a crime. In short, the Nasser regime's blockade at Suez is aimed at sabotaging the development of international trade and commerce—another basic principle to which the United Nations is dedicated.

In the larger context, Egypt's interference at Suez is a grave challenge to the delicate fabric of international law. If Israeli shipping can be subjected to this arbitrary blockade, who can tell when other states will be victimized. There is no such thing as a little lawlessness. International law, like international peace, is indivisible. Let it be broken in one place and the whole structure will ultimately crumble and the ensuing flood will surely engulf those who regard themselves as onlookers. On the occasion of Egypt's acceptance of the six principles laid down by the Security Council to govern the Suez Canal, President Eisenhower declared: "... We should not assume that, if Israel withdraws, Egypt will prevent Israeli shipping from using the Suez Canal or the Gulf of Aqaba. If, unhappily, Egypt does hereafter violate the armistice agreement or other international obligations, then this should be dealt with firmly by the society of nations" (President Eisenhower in address to American people, February 20, 1957).

Will the United States now call upon the society of nations to deal with Nasser's brazen challenge?

Will the United States make it clear to the Nasser regime that piracy at Suez, regardless of how it is camouflaged, will not be tolerated?

Will the United States insist that financial aid for Suez be withheld as long as Nasser flouts the basic tenets of international law and the U.N. Charter?

The prestige and power of the United States, both in and out of the United Nations, presents our Government with a unique opportunity to take a bold initiative in defense of peace. There must be no equivocation on the part of the United States. The time for action is now. Unless the President's words are translated into prompt and effective action, the United States will not be able to deny its share of responsibility in a crisis that threatens to explode.

Steel Strike Example of Union Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as a further example of the need for unions being placed under antitrust law, related to my remarks during debate today, I would like to point out that the current steel strike emphasizes once again that organized labor has the ability, whenever it wishes, to force the national economy to its knees. In this instance the Steelworkers Union has shut down the steel industry, cutting off production of this vital commodity in a time of serious military tension and throwing hundreds of thousands of men out of work.

Never in our history has any group wielded such life or death control over our industrial economy. The industrial trusts of the last century were puny weaklings in comparison with the power of labor unions today. The alarming fact is that this tremendous power is concentrated in the hands of a small number of men who head the national labor unions and control the policies and actions of those unions. In the steel situation reliable public opinion polls show that the overwhelming majority of the members of the Steelworkers Union and their families do not want the strike and, in fact, feel that the wage increases demanded by the national union officials would simply mean corresponding increases in their living costs. In spite of this the top officials of the union forced the strike on the steel industry and upon its rank-and-file members.

The question now facing us is whether the people of the United States are going to permit the continuation of this absolute power in the union officers. Shall we allow them to force continual inflation upon us, to price American products out of world markets, to cut off interstate commerce at will, and rip apart the structure of our economic existence? Many serious and thoughtful people are now convinced that unless labor unions are put under the kind of reasonable restraints that are imposed upon business organizations by the antitrust laws, we are in for drastic times ahead.

On June 29 of this year, I introduced a bill, H.R. 8003, to limit and prevent concerted activities by labor organizations which obstruct or interfere with free production of goods for commerce and the free flow of goods in commerce. This bill was carefully drafted with a view toward providing proper protection to the public interest without restricting unions in the pursuit of their lawful and legitimate objectives. Among other things, this bill would prevent the national union officers from imposing dictatorial control over the bargaining policies and activities of the local unions.

It would restore bargaining power to the local unions where it properly belongs. In this way the rank and file union members would have a direct voice in decisions to strike and other matters which vitally affect their welfare.

Under this bill the current steel strike could be enjoined as an illegal interference with interstate commerce resulting from an unlawful combination or conspiracy brought into existence by the national union officers to enforce industrywide wage demands and other conditions which would substantially affect the production and cost of steel.

I urge that each Member of Congress give serious consideration to H.R. 8003 the need for protection against restrictive trade practices and restraint of trade herein provided, as an amendment of this long overdue labor bill.

Proposed Constitutional Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a resolution adopted by the Department of Mississippi, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in support of Senate Joint Resolution 116, providing for an amendment to the Constitution, introduced by me—for myself and other Senators—on July 2, 1959.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas on June 29, 1959, the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Kingsley International Pictures Corporation v. The Regents of the University of the State of New York* denied to the State of New York the right and power to prohibit the public exhibition of a motion picture which admittedly presented adultery as a desirable, acceptable, and proper pattern of behavior; and

Whereas this decision clothed the advocacy of adultery in motion pictures with constitutional immunity and renders both State legislatures and the U.S. Congress helpless to legislate in this area for the protection of the people on questions of decency and morality; and

Whereas this decision opens wide a gate where the State is helpless to protect its children against a mighty flood of obscene, indecent, lascivious, and immoral pictures, books, and magazines; and

Whereas the Veterans of Foreign Wars organization believes that democracy begins in the home and that it is not only the right but the duty of the State and local community to protect the public generally, and the children particularly, against the exhibition and sale of pictures and printed literature that are contrary to the common standards of morality and decency as recognized by a local government; and

Whereas Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND has introduced in the U.S. Congress a resolution (S.J. Res. 116) providing for an amendment

to the United States Constitution which will insure "the right of every State to decide on the basis of its own public policy questions of decency and morality and to enact legislation with respect thereto, shall not be abridged;" and

Whereas Senator EASTLAND has called on all decent and right-thinking citizens to give every possible aid and support for the quick passage of the resolution through Congress and its ratification by the requisite number of States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Department of Mississippi, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, at the regular called meeting of its council of administration on August 2, 1959, wholeheartedly endorse the purpose of the proposed constitutional amendment and urge its speedy adoption; and be it further

Resolved, That the commander, Department of Mississippi, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, is hereby instructed to present the above resolution to the delegates attending the 60th convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in session the week of August 30 to September 4, 1959.

LOUIS POST, Jr.,

Commander, Department of Mississippi, VFW.

Attest:

CURTISS MEEKS,

Adjutant, Department of Mississippi, VFW.

Statement of Former Senator Knowland on the Khrushchev Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I included a statement made on August 4, 1959, by former U.S. Senator and former Senate Republican leader, Hon. William F. Knowland, on the invitation issued by President Eisenhower to Mr. Khrushchev to visit our country.

While one of the strongest Republicans of the country, Bill Knowland's patriotism is above reproach.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
AUGUST 4, 1959

The invitation to Khrushchev to visit the United States will have a devastating adverse effect upon the captive people behind the Communist Iron Curtain.

It is a victory for Soviet diplomacy which has angled for such an invitation for the past several years.

Khrushchev is still the "Butcher of Budapest." Three years does not outlaw murder of an individual or a nation.

Communists the world over will make massive propaganda use of the red carpet treatment in New York, at the United Nations, in Washington, and on the grand tour throughout the United States.

Whether we intend it or not, they will by word and picture, convey the idea that this gives to the Kremlin's leader and to the Soviet Union the moral support of the free people of the United States and their leaders.

An invitation to Hitler or Himmler while Denmark, Norway, Belgium, Holland, and a part of France was held in Nazi subjugation would have shocked the conscience of the free world.

Blood on the hands of Khrushchev is neither less red than that which covered Hitler's nor are his threats to bury us, meaning the United States and the free world, faded by the passage of a few months.

What is morally wrong can never be politically right.

The admonition of II Corinthians still stands: "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers, for what fellowship has righteousness with unrighteousness and what communion has light with darkness."

Mines for Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Sunday Dispatch of Pittston, Pa., on August 2, 1959:

MINES FOR DEFENSE

There has been much said during the past few weeks about what is going to happen to the coal mines of the Greater Pittston region.

Looking at it from the standpoint of the defense of the United States, the Federal Government has a big stake in keeping the mines of the region in operational condition.

Most of us can recall what happened during the recent World War II days. Gas and oil were rationed and difficult to obtain. Coal, still a major factor in space heating, was at a premium, and the supply was limited, even though anthracite producers mined three times as much coal then as is being produced today.

Should world war III come—and, like everyone else, we fervently hope it never will—we must be prepared for it. Production of coal is down to 17 or 18 million tons a year, and each year the total tonnage grows less through mine shutdowns and the abandonment of many operations. With no gas or oil freely available during another war, what will happen with no coal to fill the gap?

Just look at how many mines have been shut down since World War II in the Greater Pittston area—No. 9, Ewen, No. 6, Exeter, Butler, just to mention a few. And in addition to the mammoth Ewen and No. 14 breakers have been dismantled and removed. Now there are prospects that a half dozen other regional operations will be abandoned because of the Knox disaster—mines that will not be rehabilitated.

Now is the time for the Federal Government to look into the matter—not when the disaster of war strikes.

It is too late then. If the mines are allowed to fill up with water and literally become cesspools of debris underneath the surface, it would take years to get them back into condition suitable for coal production.

Another important part the mines could play is in the protection of citizenry in case of nuclear war to guard them from radioactive fallout. It is generally known that in case of nuclear war even remote parts of the country far from the bomb target will be endangered by the deadly radioactive fallout.

In support of this, the argument for using mines for protective cover in nuclear war, the Pennsylvania State University in its recent issue of the Industrial Reference Viewer

has an interesting article titled "Come Blast and Radiation Whither Shall I Hide Me?"

An excerpt from the article states:

"On the positive side, the coal mines of the State of Pennsylvania offer innumerable natural shelters of critical activity; they could be converted to emergency headquarters with little more than the installation of communications, subsistence facilities, and protected ventilation."

More and more intelligent thinking leans toward the vital importance of the mines to the defense of this country, and any expenditure by the Federal Government to keep the regional mines workable would be a sound, profitable investment.

Eisenhower's New Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, when considering the merits and demerits of the President's decision to exchange visits with Soviet Premier Khrushchev, today's lead editorial in the New York Times is well worthy of your attention:

EISENHOWER'S NEW LEADERSHIP

The magnitude of President Eisenhower's personal effort to unfreeze East-West relations and keep them from an explosive climax is vividly demonstrated by his unprecedented travel schedule. Beginning later this month he proposes to visit Bonn, London, and Paris to confer with Western statesmen, return to Washington for a meeting with Premier Khrushchev and then go on a return visit to Soviet Russia, with the possibility that he might have to go abroad again for an East-West summit meeting.

These travels, comparable only with President Roosevelt's wartime journeys, are a measure of both the new role he has assumed in world affairs and his determination to do his utmost for peace before leaving office. His efforts may not succeed, and there is even a certain risk in them. But if in the end they fail the world will know that the responsibility for failure will rest on other shoulders. Therein lies also the justification for the steps he is taking.

There is particular wisdom in his decision, before meeting with Mr. Khrushchev, to go to Western Europe, starting with Bonn. The Soviet dictator has made plain that the overriding issue he proposed to discuss with the President is Berlin and Germany, which means Europe. He has likewise indicated that he would like to settle this issue directly with the President and then impose the solution of the two super powers on the lesser breeds. He obviously expects to make a better deal that way since, as he argues, these two primary powers have neither territorial disputes nor other insoluble problems between them.

Mr. Khrushchev is, of course, mistaken. The United States is committed to defend not only its own territories but also the frontiers of freedom which embrace Western Europe, Germany, and Berlin. Likewise, while the President may explore the situation, he does not propose to negotiate on these issues behind our allies' backs. But since he will talk about these issues it is only right and proper that he should consult our allies both to get their latest views and to demonstrate Western solidarity. That he will initiate this demonstration at Bonn is

both a recognition of Germany's role in Europe and a pointed answer to Mr. Khrushchev's gibes at Chancellor Adenauer and the "Bonn-Paris axis," echoed in some Western quarters. The Western Big Three have become the Western Big Four.

Fortunately, as emphasized by Secretary Herter, on the East-West issue, barring minor nuances, Western solidarity is stronger than ever. Any Soviet attempt to split the West or sow suspicion among our allies is doomed to failure.

But the President will also be confronted by some inter-allied disputes which mar Western unity and even impair Western defenses. These include the latest contest between the European Economic Community and the British sponsored free trade area and President de Gaulle's pressure for a bigger role for France in world, NATO, and atomic affairs as well as for American support in the Algerian war. Important as these issues are to the nations concerned, their importance is obviously secondary compared with the Soviet challenge to all free nations. Certainly any attempt to use that challenge to wrest individual advantages for a particular ally is suicidal.

As these disputes concern not only the nations involved but the whole North Atlantic alliance, it must be hoped that President Eisenhower will be able not only to put them in proper perspective but also to employ his genius for conciliation to resolve them.

Louisiana Lesson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, recently—on page 12839 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 23, to be exact—I stated that the Gov. Earl Long story in Louisiana should serve as an urgent reminder to this Congress that we have not yet made provision in our Federal Government for the tragic eventuality that the competence of a President should ever come into question.

In those remarks I commented that the press, while giving Governor Long and his troubles full coverage, had neglected to emphasize what the Federal Government should be learning from Louisiana's situation.

I am now pleased to point out that the Washington Daily News yesterday moved to correct this oversight with an editorial which shares my views on the urgency for resolving the Presidential disability question, as has been repeatedly recommended by President Eisenhower.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this editorial, which follows:

[From the Washington Daily News,
Aug. 10, 1959]

LONG AND THE PRESIDENCY

Gov. Earl Long will attempt an extremely difficult legislative feat at a special session of the Louisiana Legislature.

The Governor wants to make it harder to commit patients to the State's mental hospitals. If his own case is a fair example, it is practically impossible to commit them now. He's been in two in the last several

weeks, one in his home State, and neither could hold him.

Governor Long's habitual behavior might be considered eccentric by ordinary standards, but obviously now he's a sick man, so considered by friend and foe alike.

And there doesn't seem to be anything in the legal machinery of Louisiana to take care of the situation. Neither is there proper national law to take care of the succession in case a President ever should become similarly incapacitated.

President Eisenhower several times has called to the attention of Congress the danger the country might face if a President ever were unable or unwilling to recognize his own disability. This has, in fact, happened at least twice in our history. President Garfield lingered, often unconscious, for 11 weeks after he was felled by an assassin's bullet in 1881. President Wilson was desperately ill for months following a stroke in 1919.

Drafting of legislation to cover such a tragic situation admittedly is difficult, but the passage of more years will not make it any less so. Congress might be reminded by events in Louisiana that the problem should be made an urgent order of business.

Spotlight on Nuclear Plane Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the August 3, 1959, issue of Aviation Week. The editorial entitled "Spotlight on Nuclear Plane Program" follows:

SPOTLIGHT ON NUCLEAR PLANE PROGRAM

The open congressional hearings on the military nuclear-powered aircraft programs sponsored by the Air Force and Navy have shed considerable light on the past performance, current situation, and future prospects of this security shrouded, budget-slashed program. The American people owe considerable thanks to the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy and the sparkplugs for these specific hearings, Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, and Representative MELVIN PRICE, Democrat, of Illinois, for their persistence in demanding a public accounting on this program.

The most important fact to emerge from these hearings is that, despite other indications to the contrary, the nuclear-powered aircraft program will be pushed at a moderately accelerated rate in the future and that considerable thought will be given to establishing a more effective technical direction of an overall program pushing both the General Electric Co. direct air cycle approach and the Pratt & Whitney Aircraft indirect cycle approach where major technical breakthroughs have resulted recently.

It is evident from testimony of Dr. Herbert York, Defense Department director of engineering and research, that considerably more emphasis will be placed on reactor and materials development and less emphasis on putting a flying testbed into the air to gain flight experience with nuclear powerplants.

Certainly there can be no argument with the thesis that major emphasis must be given to research on improved airborne reactors and the materials required for them. How-

ever, there is considerable difference of opinion on the abandonment of the construction of prototype nuclear-powered aircraft to gain flight experience with a complete system of this type. Dr. York and his scientific advisers argue that this would hardly be a useful exercise in advancing the state of the art. It is apparent from their testimony that this technical viewpoint also is strongly tinged by the current budget problems of the Defense Department, and it is often difficult to measure where the technical considerations end and the budget influence begins.

Maj. Gen. Donald Keirn, who has directed the USAF portion of the ANP program and whose experience in developing radically new types of power goes back to the first turbojet engines, takes the opposite view. He believes the experience gained from flying nuclear-power prototype aircraft with powerplants that it is technically possible to develop now, would provide valuable experience necessary to the ultimate development of a useful weapon system. General Keirn must find many of the arguments advanced against the nuclear prototypes very familiar as they are the same arguments advanced by many apparently competent technical experts in the thirties and early forties against the application of gas turbine power to aircraft. People with sufficiently long technical memories will recall that even such ordinarily sage advisers as the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics dismissed jet propulsion on the ground that it would hardly be useful unless aircraft speeds were over 500 miles per hour. And such speeds were obviously not in sight. But only a few years after that judgment was rendered the German ME 262 twin jet was fighting at speeds in excess of 500 miles per hour.

General Keirn must recall the difficulties involved in getting USAF acceptance of jet propulsion in the early forties when only the unwavering determination of the late Gen. Henry H. Arnold, overruling his technically timid subordinates, pushed the project through to successful completion with the help of General Keirn and others not so technically conservative.

It is also appropriate to recall in this controversy the case of the XB-15 and XB-19 experimental heavy bombers built by Boeing and Douglas, respectively. Only one of each was ever built, and they were too slow to be useful for combat. Yet the experience gained by building and flying these experimental giants laid the technical foundation for the development of the combat capable heavy bomber lineage of B-17, B-24, B-29, B-32, and the four-engine transport fleets that made U.S. manufacturers supreme in this field during the postwar decade.

It is easy for technical experts lacking the background in aircraft development problems to dismiss too lightly the need for experimental flight experience as a sound foundation for ultimate military developments.

There was considerable testimony submitted by such technically competent witnesses as Gen. Thomas White, Dr. Herbert York and his staff, Vice Adm. J. T. Hayward, General Keirn, Roy Shoultz of General Electric, and John McCone, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, who has had considerable experience both in aviation and nuclear developments. The conflicting viewpoints expressed by these gentlemen should be carefully considered in formulating a new and more solidly supported nuclear aircraft propulsion program.

In contrast, the testimony of some newcomers to the Pentagon scene should be heavily discounted as a mere parroting of the Budget Bureau party line.

It has been the sad history of the nuclear powered aircraft program that it has been the technical people who have been closest to the program, both in the military and industry, who have had the strongest faith in

its ultimate success, and it has been the politically appointed Defense Department officials and the bookkeepers of the Budget Bureau who have been most pessimistic and have tromped hardest on the brakes to slow its progress.

The congressional hearings have done much to clear the security-shrouded air surrounding this vital program. We hope that USAF, the Navy, and Atomic Energy Commission will join with General Electric, Pratt & Whitney Aircraft, and airframe constructors to formulate a technically vigorous program to drive ahead with maximum speed to produce militarily useful results.

ROBERT HOTZ.

Trade Policy Queried

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article entitled "Trade Policy Queried," which was written by my very good friend, Hugh B. Hester, brigadier general, U.S. Army, retired, and appeared in the "Letters to the Times" of the New York Times on Saturday, July 25, 1959:

TRADE POLICY QUERIED—DISAGREEMENT EXPRESSED WITH OUR STAND ON DEALING WITH SOVIETS

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Will Rogers used to say that all he knew was what he read in the papers. But apparently the trade experts in the Department of State don't even take the trouble to read. Just released is a reply to the more than 6-months-old questionnaire of Senator Fulbright concerning trade with the Soviet Union. In this reply the Department apparently revived the old, and by now thoroughly discredited, argument that increased trade with the Soviet Union might disclose scientific and technological secrets which would in turn strengthen our supposed enemy.

As early as 1954 Clarence B. Randall, then chairman of Inland Steel and head of a special economic commission appointed by President Eisenhower, reported that restrictions upon trade with Communist countries, especially with the Soviet Union were probably doing the West more harm than its intended victims. He cautioned that discriminatory restrictions on trade might accelerate technological development and economic independence in an area formerly closely associated with the West in trade matters.

These he viewed as injurious to the West; certainly dramatic events in rapid succession since have more than justified his fears.

OLD ILLUSIONS

Unfortunately, customs, folklores, and myths never die easily or quickly, and have a habit of reappearing long after they have been thought dead. The State Department's reply to Senator Fulbright's questionnaire is merely further evidence of the recurrence of old illusions.

This reply unfortunately could not have come at a psychologically more inopportune or politically inept time. It will now be most difficult, if not impossible, to convince the unaligned nations and peoples that the United States believes in coexistence and peaceful settlement of disputes, while maintaining what amounts to an almost total stoppage of trade with the Communist world. Cer-

tainly some of our closest allies do not agree with this policy. This is particularly true of Great Britain and West Germany, who are now increasing their trade with the Soviet bloc substantially.

Trade is a two-edged sword. It can be used as an instrument of peace or a weapon of war. And with the leaders of the Soviet Union at every level strongly urging increased trade with the United States, it is only natural for most of the world to suppose that the latter is using the stoppage of trade as a weapon of war.

The leaders of the underdeveloped countries know that economic warfare increases poverty and that discrimination, in whatever form, heightens international tensions; and any nation engaged in these practices must therefore expect to receive their disapproval.

DANGER TO IDEALS

In fact, the cold war, of which trade discriminations are an integral part, now threatens to completely destroy the world's former picture of a free and peace-loving American Government and people. Actually we are in real danger of surrendering our basic ideals of a free, cooperative society at peace under law; all in the name of national security.

As an old soldier, and one who has personally witnessed and known the horrible injustices of three great wars, I would like to offer a few words of caution to those who advocate economic warfare while constantly asserting, "Yes, we want peace, but only with justice." And my few words of caution are these: While it is certainly possible to have peace without justice, it is absolutely impossible to have justice without peace.

HUGH B. HESTER,

Brigadier General, U.S.A. (Retired).

PHILADELPHIA, July 16, 1959.

Interest Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, the question of interest rates is one in which the entire country has a vital stake. If interest rates continue to increase, just about every family in the Nation will be adversely affected.

For this reason, I trust that the House will not give its consent to a request by the administration for permission to remove the present ceiling of 4½ percent on the interest rate which the Government can pay.

If the ceiling is removed, the interest rate on Government bonds will go up immediately. And that will mean a significant increase in the interest rates which people must pay on the purchase of homes, automobiles, and appliances of all kinds.

Mr. Speaker, many respected economists insist that the Treasury Department does not have to have an interest rate increase to permit it to refinance Government bonds. This can be done, these economists tell us, by staying within the present interest ceiling.

Should this Congress permit the interest rate ceiling to be removed, we would be adding materially to the cost of living for millions of people.

I for one am not willing to approve such a move and if the issue ever reaches the House floor, I will vote against it.

TVA Triumphs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, August 8, there appeared an excellent editorial in the Washington Post entitled "TVA Unfettered," and as it relates to the recent signing of the TVA self-financing legislation, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

TVA UNFETTERED

The President and the congressional leaders of both parties deserve high praise for the ingenious and statesmanlike way in which they have resolved differences over self-financing legislation of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Mr. Eisenhower approved the bill after the legislators assured him that one feature which he felt to be an encroachment upon executive branch prerogatives would be eliminated promptly by passage of another law. Thus the important substance of the TVA bill was saved, and the Authority is assured adequate financing for its power modernization and expansion needs for the first time in many years. Moreover, TVA will now begin to repay the \$1 billion Federal investment in its power facilities, with interest.

The feature which for a time threatened to doom the bill was that which, in effect, gave Congress a veto over TVA's construction program but foreclosed any opportunity for Presidential control of the program. Although we thought that the arrangement made some sense because TVA is now "on its own" and not dependent upon Federal revenue, Mr. Eisenhower's feeling that the scheme transgressed upon his Executive functions and curbed his constitutional role in the legislative process was not without point. We think the solution adopted was the best one—the repeal of the provision for congressional review of TVA projects. Within the carefully defined framework of the self-financing authorization, TVA will manage its affairs without the interference of either Congress or the President. This seems to us to be the simplest and most businesslike way to handle the matter.

Mr. Speaker, now that this legislation has passed its last hurdle and has become law, I want to take this occasion to publicly express my appreciation for the signing of the TVA bond bill—the self-financing bill signed by the President. The people whom I represent have been greatly interested in this legislation for the past several years and the signing of this bill by the President represents a culmination of four years' work and effort. It means that TVA will remain unfettered and be permitted to continue to serve the six million people of its service area in the South.

TVA has had a most successful 25 years history and the approval of this bill which provides an alternative and additional method of financing—private

financing—will mean that this great Agency of the Government will have another 25 years of growth and service to the Nation.

I am pleased the President approved the bill.

I want also to commend the dean of our delegation from Tennessee, our friend and colleague, Congressman CLIFF DAVIS, and our colleague and friend, Congressman BOB JONES of Alabama, for their joint effort and leadership in the passage of this legislation. Both Congressman DAVIS and Congressman JONES have worked untiringly over the past several months and years to secure the enactment of this legislation. The bill has had a very rough chartered course at times but these pilots have brought the measure safely into harbor and they are deserving of our thanks and commendation and praise.

I would also express my appreciation to Speaker RAYBURN, our distinguished majority leader, Congressman MCCORMACK, and all of our colleagues who have voted for this needed legislation.

Among the many advantages of its enactment is the fact that we should have a recess from the annual recurring battles over TVA and the controversy which, in the minds of some, it invokes.

I congratulate all who have had a part in the securing of the passing of the TVA legislation and of course urge the passage of the pending bill to perfect this legislation.

**Address by Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer,
Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, at Annual
Meeting, Association of the United
States Army**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on Monday, August 3, 1959, Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, delivered a very able and informative address to the Association of the United States Army, at its annual meeting in Washington, D.C. The subject of the address is "Why We Need a Modern Army."

General Lemnitzer is one of the ablest men in the entire Department of Defense. His outstanding address will be of concern to people in this country and other countries who are interested in the United States maintaining a strong modern army. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY WE NEED A MODERN ARMY

(Address by Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, at the 1959 annual meeting Association of the United States Army, Washington, D.C., August 3, 1959)

In appearing before this audience today, I feel special pleasure and gratification. The

continuing and impressive growth of the Association of the United States Army, as strikingly demonstrated by this gathering, gives me extremely great satisfaction.

The task which has been assigned to me at the session this morning is to discuss the subject of "Why We Need a Modern Army."

In my opinion, there are a number of very clear reasons which emphasize the particular importance of a modern army today.

The first of these, which needs no elaboration before this audience, is the Communist threat. I shall merely remind you that it is relentless in its menace and massive in its strength. It is global in its geographical extensiveness. Furthermore, its versatility permits it to take forms which range across the entire spectrum of aggressive activity, from subversion and infiltration to general nuclear war. I think that it is most pertinent to note that the Soviet armed forces—and, in varying degrees, the armed forces of the other Communist nations—have been maintained in strength and have also been the subject of extensive modernization. This is especially true of the Soviet ground forces.

In citing a second reason, I want to take a look into the future. Present trends indicate clearly the direction which the development of long-range, strategic weapons is taking. In the coming ICBM era, we can anticipate a day, not too many years away, when our missile retaliatory resources can and must be made so numerous and relatively invulnerable that no missile or other attack upon them, even by surprise, could possibly eradicate them all. This means that our response to the attacker would be absolutely devastating to him—so clearly so that it would be senseless for him to attack in the first place.

When that time arrives, it could bring about, in a curious way, what some have characterized as the equivalent of strategic nuclear disarmament. We shall always want, as a vital component of our military power, the invulnerable missile deterrent needed to maintain this situation. With this in being, the situation will then mean, realistically, that the other components of our power will play the vital role in coping with the tactics and strategy of communism short of the threat of general nuclear war.

These considerations are of vital importance today. In any meaningful planning, we have to take into account, from the beginning, the long leadtime from concept to actual fruition. This requirement for leadtime is obvious in the field of hardware. The requirement for lead-time is even greater in developing the capability to carry out a changed doctrine or strategy. It is greater, because many additional factors are involved. Therefore, we must be keenly aware that basic decisions made this year—decisions on national strategy or decisions on the budget—will inexorably establish the parameters of our actual capabilities 5 and more years from now to meet the then existent threat.

Thus, in speaking of the importance of a modern Army, I am not speaking solely of its role today. I am speaking even more importantly of its role in light of the foreseeable nature of the power balance in the world during the next decade.

As a third reason for the importance of a modern army today, I should like to emphasize two of the key elements of our response to this threat. I refer to the concept of collective security, and to an essential concomitant to its effectiveness—a forward strategy.

The massive strength of the common threat to all free nations makes the need for collective security self-evident. This need is met by the system of alliances to which the United States strongly subscribes today.

As for our forward strategy, it is an inherent ingredient of any positive effort. Through a forward strategy, we are prepared to meet and halt an enemy before his attack can gain momentum. The alternative for us

would be to withdraw within our own borders, adopting a so-called Fortress America strategy which, by its exclusively defensive character, would be completely negative. Consequently, it would be doomed, from the outset, to ultimate failure.

A forward strategy is also important to the success of collective security. It provides our allies with firm assurance that we are determined to stand with them against attack. It provides them, moreover, with a sound basis for confidence that the alliance as a whole can successfully meet the military challenges which may confront it.

Land power—represented, primarily, by the Army—has a vital role in both collective security and forward strategy. You all recognize, I know, that an enemy using military means to extend control over free peoples—not merely to destroy all life indiscriminately—would necessarily base much of his effort on the seizure of land. Land forces are the only means through which, finally, land can be controlled and domination asserted over the people who inhabit that land.

To carry out our responsibility in this regard, the Army maintains forces deployed in strategic areas overseas. There, to our friends and our prospective enemies alike, these forces furnish realistic, visible evidence of our ability to hold firm against attack, not merely to liberate territory after its seizure by an attacker. A modern army is capable of conquering without destroying, of defending without reducing the defended land to radioactive waste. The physical presence of armed men on the ground can exert more effective and lasting control than the threat of megatons of firepower that may never be used.

In addition to maintaining operational forces, we have an obligation to help our allies to develop their own military resources to the fullest extent possible. This is a vital part of the U.S. mutual security program. The Army has a special responsibility in this program. In this connection, I should like to say a particular word about the splendid work being done by the members of the Army's military assistance advisory groups and military missions in 42 countries throughout the world.

In my opinion, it is no exaggeration to claim that they are doing an absolutely tremendous amount to give meaning to the entire concept of collective security. They are helping to develop the basis for effective allied military operations in case of attack. Beyond this important contribution to the free world's total military strength, they are helping to reduce or eliminate the possibility of attack through other than overt military means. In assisting the allied armies to expand their effectiveness, both through improved material and increased professional knowledge, our MAAG's and missions are contributing to a basic element of governmental stability in allied countries. Stable governments, with capable, well-equipped armies, are not open to successful attack by such methods as subversion, infiltration, coups d'etat, or revolution—all of which are methods which communism has sought to employ in pursuing its ominous goals. Thus, the Army is strengthening the free world not only by helping to develop a solid front of effectiveness, but also by helping to strengthen the individual elements of that solid front.

The reasons I have mentioned are, in my opinion, conclusive evidence of the importance of a modern army. However, there is another reason I want to cite, which in itself is sufficient.

Modern military operations are not restricted to any particular element. The Army must fight as a part of a team which includes forces of the other U.S. armed services and those of our allies. We are all well aware that land warfare is not conducted solely on the surface of the land. It includes the conduct of operations in the air above the land and in the waters contiguous

thereto. In order to carry out its responsibilities with the effectiveness to permit its fellow team-members to realize their own full potentials, the Army must be as modern in its functional area as the U.S. Navy, Marines, and Air Force are in theirs.

Let me turn now to discuss some of the key qualities which make an army modern.

In order to obtain maximum effectiveness in terms of the essential characteristics of firepower, mobility, and communications, a modern army requires, first of all, modern weapons and equipment.

That is, to employ firepower with discrimination, within its own resources, the versatility to deal with any of the enemy's capabilities which directly affect it. Army weapons have a number of special advantages which should be exploited to the greatest possible extent. One of these which I want to mention is their precision, both in terms of accuracy and of measured lethality. This gains added importance in the light of their reliability, which permits them to deliver their firepower regardless of the conditions of weather or visibility. Another special advantage, especially in view of an enemy's own destructive capabilities, is their mobility, which includes their carefully built-in ability to operate in the field, without elaborate installations or launching sites.

These characteristics permit us to apply an important principle of war—the principle of economy of force. They do so because their precision enables us to achieve destructiveness exactly appropriate to the need—that is, to employ fire power with discrimination—and because their mobility enables one unit to do the job of several.

In connection with the basic requirement for versatility, I want to emphasize that a modern army requires the capability to fight successfully in either nuclear or nonnuclear conflict. This does not mean, in any sense, that the army conceives of its role in modern war as being an unimaginative repetition of the methods of the past. What it does mean is that a modern army must have a fully adequate nuclear capability to meet and defeat an enemy with nuclear weapons. At the same time, however, a modern army's nonnuclear capability must be great enough that it need not feel compelled to use nuclear weapons as the only alternative to failure.

The second essential characteristic of a modern army which I mentioned as deriving from modern weapons and equipment was mobility. I have already suggested the value of mobility both for protection of our installations and for multiplying our effective capabilities. Beyond that, modern developments in this area represent some of the most important advances and most striking potentials in the entire military field.

Mobility, of course, has both strategic and tactical aspects. I shall make further reference to strategic mobility in connection with a modern army's requirements for flexibility. With respect to tactical mobility, however, I want to make particular mention of the various types of aircraft, both in being and experimental, which make up army aviation. What these and other developments in mobility mean is that we are on the verge of a situation which is drastically new. Throughout history, a major limitation on the freedom of action of land forces—and, consequently, on their effectiveness—has been the barrier of terrain. We can now foresee a time when mountains and rivers and other terrain features will cease to be obstacles or limitations. They will be meaningful chiefly as advantages to be exploited as the situation indicates.

The third area I mentioned in which hardware plays a particular part is communications. The great tactical dispersion to be expected in modern battle, due to increased ranges and effectiveness of firepower and to

increased mobility, greatly magnifies the requirement for efficient, reliable, extensive communications. Closely related is the need to locate targets at distances that permit us to exploit to the full the added range capabilities of our weapons.

Also related to the whole field of weapons and equipment, another requirement which is underscored by the complexity of modern equipment and the dispersion of modern battle is adequate logistical support. The problems of providing that support under such conditions are numerous and difficult. Nevertheless, for an Army to be modern, the specialized requirements of materiel and personnel must be met, the extended distances from the supplier to the users must be traversed, and the added vulnerability of supply complexes in this day of nuclear weapons must be overcome.

Before I leave the subject of weapons and equipment, I want to stress that an essential requirement for a modern Army is a program through which it can stay modern. That is to say, a program of research and development which continually explores new avenues of possibility. In this connection, I want to say a word or two about the importance to land warfare of our growing knowledge of space. Its exploration offers prospects of great benefits in fields of immediate concern to the Army. To illustrate, I need only mention the improvements which will become possible in communications, in geodesy, in meteorological research, in early warning, and in obtaining data which will facilitate our development of effective defenses against long-range missile attacks.

After modern materiel, a second major requirement for a modern Army is a tactical doctrine which fully exploits the capabilities of advanced weapons and equipment. Because technology is continually increasing these capabilities, doctrine must be constantly reexamined and revised as necessary. Exploitation of new resources brings increased effectiveness, but often raises new questions as well. The need to find answers emphasizes the importance of imagination, openmindedness, and originality, as well as thorough technical knowledge, about which I shall have more to say later.

Closely allied is the requirement for organization so designed as to make the employment of our modern tactical doctrine feasible.

Beyond the need for realistically modern tactical organization, there is a need for realistically modern organizational concepts for the overall employment of military forces, of which Army forces are an integral part. I have already referred to the fact that modern military operations involve the combined energies and resources of all services and allies, working as a team. Vital to the achievement of integration of our total military effort is the concept of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as now organized. Since the recent reorganization of the Department of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have exercised direct authority over the unified commands. These, of course, are the instruments through which integration of our military effort is now sought within any particular functional environment. To my mind, there is a particular advantage in the fact that each member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is the uniformed chief of his own service. With this composition, the Joint Chiefs of Staff as a body can act not only more authoritatively but also more realistically than if it consisted of officers removed from direct connection with their respective services.

Another major organizational requirement of a modern army is flexibility, which must be provided in several different ways.

One of these is that a modern army must be able to respond promptly and vigorously to threats in areas other than those in which Army forces are already deployed. To an

important degree, the function of providing this capability rests upon the Strategic Army Corps, which stands ready to move, at a moment's notice, to any area of the world where it may be needed. The employment of this force, of course, depends upon the availability of transport. In this end in providing sustained administrative and logistical support to overseas forces, strategic mobility provided by the other, responsible services plays an important role in making an army truly modern.

The other major element of Army flexibility through organization which I want to mention is the modern army's requirement for reserve components. These must be able to fill promptly any gap in active military strength resulting from a commitment of strategic reserves, and to expand Army strength to the degree necessary for sustained, general operations. This ability lends not only flexibility but also staying power to Army operations. The reserve components occupy a prominent and indispensable place in any assessment of a modern army's effectiveness.

In order to discharge these vital functions, it is clear that reserve component units need to be so equipped, trained, and organized that, with minimum additional training, they can promptly take their places beside the units of the Active Army. In brief, the reserve components of a modern army must also be modern.

The historically great value of our Army Reserve components has been enhanced by a year of truly remarkable achievement. I want to make special mention of the advances which have taken place in the level of training throughout the reserve component units, and of the successful reorganization of the units themselves.

Today, over 90 percent of the ready reservists, including National Guardsmen, have completed basic training. Almost a year ago, many of the reserve component organizations were able to eliminate basic training of individuals and concentrate exclusively on unit training. By the end of this year, all units of the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard will be engaged in unit training.

The achievement has been equally impressive with regard to conversion of reserve component divisions to the new organizational structure in effect for units of the Active Army. This reorganization, which was begun in the field only last January, was scheduled to be completed over a 2-year period. As a matter of fact, however, all but 1 of the 37 reserve component combat divisions had been reorganized prior to the annual field training this year. The remaining division will begin its reorganization next month.

Through these notable accomplishments, the Reserve components have achieved the highest state of readiness they have ever known in the peacetime history of our country. This is a striking tribute to the energy and devotion of their members. It is also a major and positive contribution to the strength and effectiveness of the modern concept of one army, united in its effort to serve the Nation to its utmost.

In describing the requirements of a modern army I have discussed weapons and equipment, tactics, and organization. There is, of course, a major requirement which I have not yet mentioned. The compelling necessity both to achieve and to capitalize on the advances in technology emphasizes the continuing importance—no matter how marvelous our mechanical and electronic devices—of people. Weapons, equipment, tactics, and organization can achieve their full potentials only when combined with the required numbers of people operating with skill, efficiency, and devotion. Indeed, since the inevitable price of the new capabilities is increased complexity, this magni-

fies the requirement both for maintenance and for the level of skill necessary to perform it adequately.

The requirement for skill is clearly brought out when we compare new with old items of equipment. Consider, for example, cargo helicopters and trucks. Helicopters offer many obvious advantages. They are not roadbound. They are less hampered by terrain. They are considerably faster, due both to their speed and their ability to move across country. They can get easily into and out of places where trucks can go with difficulty, if at all.

In replacing transportation truck units by cargo helicopter units in the field army, the basis of substitution is three H-34 helicopter battalions for four transportation truck battalions, because of a comparable capability to transport a given number of troops over a given distance in a given amount of time.

However, trucks require 1 hour of maintenance for every 12 hours of operation. Helicopters, by contrast, require 9 hours of maintenance for every hour of flight. For an equal time of operation, therefore, a helicopter requires more than 100 times as much maintenance as a truck. Thus, while the 4 truck battalions require only 108 maintenance personnel, the 3 helicopter battalions require a total of 800. Furthermore, to train a helicopter mechanic to an acceptable level of skill requires three times as long a time as to train an acceptable truck mechanic.

This same situation, in essence, prevails in all of our Armed Forces today.

As I have already mentioned, beyond the requirement of a modern Army for technical skill in its people, there is the necessity for judgment and imagination—for leadership. The leaders in a modern Army must have the initiative to take effective action in the widely dispersed conditions of modern battle. They must have the vision to see the extensive new capabilities of modern materiel as it becomes available. They must have the understanding to apply these capabilities, alone and in combination, to achieve maximum effectiveness. With all this, there has been no reduction in the eternal requirements for courage, determination, and character which have always been so essential to successful leadership in war.

The Army owes an immeasurable debt to the scientist and the engineer. In the final analysis, however, it is the soldier—men like you veterans in this audience—who must weigh and balance the many factors involved, who must determine the military ends to be served, who must decide on the course of action to be followed, and who—with vigor, courage, and devotion—must pursue that course of action to its victorious conclusion.

Our Army is modern in many vital respects. It is modern in its outlook and its thinking. It is modern in its knowledge, in its tactics, and in its organization. It is looking always to the future, and striving with all its energy to be ready for that future.

This is an effort which requires thought and devotion and persistence. It requires that concepts not only be envisioned but that they be promptly translated into existing reality. The Army does not balk at the requirement, because it knows that no matter how perfect a blueprint may be, no blueprint by itself ever took a hill, won a battle, or fired a single round.

The Army knows, too, that in the light of the existing threat, our national security, today and for the foreseeable future, requires a modern Army as an indispensable element of our Nation's military power.

The Churches and Family Farm Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, throughout American history the churches have added dignity and spiritual content to farming as a way of life. Our farm families have learned through the church the concept of stewardship of the land. They have viewed the results of their labor as the gifts of a bountiful Father.

I believe very deeply in family farming as a worthwhile way of life. Boys and girls, men and women, who have worked together as a family unit on the land have benefited from a wholesome, stabilizing environment that has contributed more than anyone can fully grasp to American institutions. Thomas Jefferson held throughout his life that the small landholders constitute the most precious part of the State.

The church has recognized from the first the spiritual and social values of good family farm living. Today with large numbers of Americans moving from the farms to the cities our churches both urban and rural have an increasingly difficult task in preserving community and family values.

The August 1959 issue of the National Union Farmer has an excellent article on the role of the rural church which I believe will be of interest to the members of Congress which I include at this point in the RECORD:

WHAT IS HAPPENING TO THE RURAL CHURCH?

Up to the recent past the rural church was of, by, and for farmers and their families. Towns and villages had their own churches and institutions, although they were shared to some extent by the families on neighboring farms.

This situation is changing drastically. Churches of the open country are consolidating with those in the villages and towns. Often the churches also run buses into the countryside to transport farm families to the village church. Frequently congregations have merged with those in town to provide a broader area of service.

THE NEED TO RETAIN RURAL VALUES

The application of Christian principles to farming as a way of life is a historic contribution the rural ministry has made in rural America. In modern terms, these principles spoke of stewardship of God's bounty, the role of family life, and the mission of farm people in the feeding and clothing of mankind.

These and other identifications have caused farm people to develop a keen feeling for the welfare of others, the brotherhood of man, the place of sacrifice, and awe for God through nature. A broader translation of these values into community churches, where both town and farm people congregate, can do much to deepen this understanding for people in all walks of life. The church must not lose this mission.

THE CHURCH'S CONTRIBUTION TO FAMILY AGRICULTURE

Family-type farming is an effort in which the entire family participates. The church

has recognized and continues to stress the vital relationship among the members of the family that this develops—working together, sharing together.

While needs may remain constant, the pace of farm life—specialization, complete mechanization, enlarged units of production, contract farming, vertical integration, and the impact of the consolidation of schools, churches, and services, as well as urbanization and all that it implies—makes necessary an almost daily "new look" at how best the needs of people might be served.

THE CHURCH'S ROLE IN THE COMMUNITY

Whatever the complexion of the rural America of tomorrow, the church does have the expanding challenge of bringing together the forces which make for a wholesome community. These are many—community councils, parent-teacher groups, farm organizations, cooperatives, service associations, and youth organizations.

Churches can provide the horizontal relationship so necessary if problems are to be solved and people of good will brought together in common effort.

FARMERS UNION BELIEVES

1. That the rural church can deepen its meaning for farm people in terms of world need for food and fibre.

2. That the church's concern for family-type farming can serve to preserve the family and community values inherent in a family-farm economy.

3. That churches have a major role to play in translating the unique spiritual values of living on the land into the practical everyday experiences of both rural and urban people.

4. That urban churches have a definite stake in the continued functioning of rural churches, in that farm youth, finding employment in business and industry, and farm families leaving the land, carry with them into city life the values and attitudes derived from active rural churches.

The Commander and Civil Affairs Military Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on July 4, 1959, Maj. Gen. Charles K. Gailey, Jr., the able former Chief of the Office of Civil Affairs, Department of the Army, delivered a lecture to the U.S. Army Congressional Command and Operations Group, USAR. The subject of the lecture was "The Commander and Civil Affairs Military Government." The lecture is a most informative and enlightening one, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the lecture was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMANDER AND CIVIL AFFAIRS MILITARY GOVERNMENT

(By Maj. Gen. Charles K. Gailey, Jr.)

I am very happy to have this opportunity of meeting and talking to you gentlemen of the U.S. Army Congressional Command and Operations Group, USAR, and to discuss with you the subject of "Civil Affairs Mil-

tary Government." My purpose shall be to present some interesting and challenging thoughts which I hope will indicate how increasingly important the subject should be to you as future commanders and key staff officers of our Armed Forces.

Let me make it immediately clear that I have no intention of devoting any great amount of the time allotted to me here to a consideration of the occupational aspects of CAMG. It is not that I consider occupational functions to be unimportant. Rather, it is because I consider the combat aspects of civil affairs military government to be of more immediate importance. In this respect it is sufficient to say that the thorough integration of the commander's CAMG responsibilities as an inseparable part of his combat mission will constitute a sound basis for the conduct of a successful occupation after the war has been won.

I do intend, however, to stress the responsibility of the commander for the conduct of civil affairs military government operations as one of his important means of facilitating and insuring the ultimate success of his combat operations and the attainment of U.S. policy objectives. I also intend to stress the means which you yourselves must employ as combat commanders or major staff advisers to effectively accomplish your mission.

Of all the ingredients of warfare, that which has been least understood is the factor of civilian populations. The ultimate aim of all military training is success in battle, yet that success can readily be jeopardized by the inability of a commander to cope with the problems that grow out of the inevitable presence of civilians in every arena of conflict and in those areas in which troops prepare for combat. These problems seldom show up in the course of military instruction.

The proper handling of military-civilian relationships can be a potent weapon in itself. Since the object of war is to impose our will upon the enemy, then it is sensible to exploit all means, in addition to force of arms, in the process of attaining this objective. Armed conflict may and will usually be required to crush the enemy's resistance, but success in battle does not always insure the winning of the peace. We have found from sad experience in the past that military victory is not always followed by complete peace.

There are numerous historical examples which prove that proper dealings with civilians constitute an indispensable factor in the success of a military operation. On the other hand, there are cases in which a military operation which might have otherwise been a success failed because of a lack of full consideration of the civilian factor. I would like to give you a few such examples in order to emphasize clearly the real necessity for the integration of civil affairs-military government planning and operations as a part of any military effort.

The Mexican War of 1847 was the first substantial experience of our country in civil affairs. Many of the policies and techniques then formulated are still in use. You will recall that as a result of our winning the war, Mexico ceded to the United States the area comprising most of the present day Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, Utah, Nevada, and California. This was achieved not by invasion of this vast land mass but by the seizure of Mexico City, the national capital.

Gen. Winfield Scott, placed in command of a small American task force, was sent to take Mexico City to force the capitulation of the Mexican Government. At the beginning of the operation he knew that he was faced with three major tasks. First, the conduct of a successful military operation with a limited force supported by a dangerously thin and lengthening supply line from Vera-

cruz. Second, the control and discipline of his troops in their relations with the civilians of an area not subject to U.S. civil law, as well as the control and discipline of the civilians themselves in their relations with the military; and, third, obtaining and maintaining the good will of these same civilians in order to achieve the aims of the war.

General Scott took positive action to insure the accomplishment of all three objectives. His famous General Order No. 20, made necessary due to the absence of international law governing the conduct of war and the inadequate articles of war governing the conduct of American troops on foreign soil, defined his powers for control of soldiers and civilians under what was termed martial law and established means of enforcing these powers. Soldiers and civilians alike soon recognized the firmness and impartiality with which transgressions were corrected and came to respect the firm justice upon which General Scott insisted. American forces paid in cash for material needs supplied from local resources. Proper respect was shown for the customs, laws, and religion of the country. Scott emphasized and published the fact that the United States was fighting the government of Santa Anna, and not the Mexican people.

General Scott risked his career on a principle of combined military and civil affairs operations. His beliefs and actions were proven correct. The friendliness of the Mexican people permitted Scott's long line of communications from Veracruz to operate without serious or prolonged interruption.

We all know the brilliant success of General Scott's operations. This is a story of successful action attained through the blending of military and civil affairs strategy into a mutually supporting pattern. There were many witnesses to the efficiency and humanity of Scott's administration. Among these was Ulysses S. Grant who said, "I question whether the great majority of the Mexican people did not regret our departure as much as they had regretted our coming."

During World War I, civil affairs activities predominantly concerned the French public and, accordingly, these activities were accomplished by the French Army Command in coordination with the French Government. The ensuing period of military government, however, in which U.S. forces exercised responsibility in Germany and Luxembourg, taught us an outstanding lesson. The occupation was conducted by combat forces which had proven themselves in battle, but these same forces were somewhat unprepared for the monumental tasks involved in the reestablishment and administration of government. Do not let me give the impression that the World War I occupation failed. It did not, but it was certainly attended by problems which could have been circumvented by clearer foresight and more adequate preparation. Col. L. I. Hunt, who was the civil affairs officer of the American forces in the occupation of the Rhineland, summed up his difficulties in a special report submitted to the War Department at the conclusion of the occupation. Hunt called attention to the utter lack of qualified personnel available to him for the proper conduct of CAMG operations. He closed this report with what was almost a prayer: "Never again should the American Army be permitted to undertake such a task without having first trained a sufficient number of officers qualified for the work of government and the special duties involved in it."

World War II saw CAMG elements operating in direct support of combat as well as in occupational functions in every area affected by war. Many varying problems were encountered and many varying organizations were established for their solution. Regardless, however, of whether the CAMG operations were joint in nature, as in the case of

the Mediterranean and European theaters, or conducted by either the U.S. Army or Navy, as was the case in the South Pacific and Far East, there was a similarity of pattern. Direct combat support required the control of civilians in the area of combat and the prevention of their interference with tactical operations. Minimum essential needs of war-affected civilians had to be met. Policies of the United States and of Allied countries had to be effectively implemented in order to insure the reestablishment of governments in enemy territories that were in accord with the objectives of the free world. The mission of CAMG elements in every theater was to assist the commander in the complete accomplishment of these objectives. Their effectiveness was attested to by Gen. George Patton in a statement made after the Sicilian campaign: "Military government furnished me with more replacements than the replacement command." Enlarging on this, he said: "It was necessary to drop off companies and platoons to take over occupied towns. Then along would come a military government officer with his team, take over the running of the town with a few trained people, and I would get back what to me were replacements, the release of my trained fighting unit."

The 16th of December 1944 will long be remembered by the Allied Forces of World War II. Seven Allied armies, 2 million strong, were moving or preparing to move into Germany. In the north was the British 21st Army Group. On its right was the American 12th Army Group composed of the 1st, 3d, and 9th U.S. Armies. To the south, the 7th U.S. Army and the 1st French Army composing the 6th Army Group were operating in northern Alsace.

On the morning of the 16th of December 1944, the 6th SS Panzer Army, spearheaded by the Adolph Hitler Division, began the Germans' last counterattack and the campaign now known as the Bulge was underway.

A careful appraisal of the record of the Battle of the Bulge reveals that important contributions to the successful termination of this campaign were made by the G-5 sections and the CAMG operational elements. Their efforts in preventing hysteria among civilians, in controlling circulation, in enforcing curfew and other security measures, in guarding against enemy agents and saboteurs, in stabilizing civil administration and reinforcing governmental operations, as well as in the evacuation of civilians where required, enabled the combat forces to proceed with a minimum of interference on their mission of halting the Nazi threat.

I would be remiss if I did not give you an historical case which exemplifies the result of failure to integrate fully the military and civil affairs operations. As the German armies rolled eastward across the Ukraine in the summer of 1941, their commanders had good reason to be pleased with the progress of the whole campaign. Especially encouraging was the attitude of the Ukrainian people. In town after town the German forces were greeted not as conquerors but as liberators. To the commanders, this situation promised an unhampered flow of men and materials, a minimum of security troops along the supply lines, and the prospect of obtaining at least some of their required supplies from local resources.

Within 10 months these great military advantages had vanished. The Nazi Government's policy of ruthless oppression, pillage and mass cruelty had converted the people's initial friendliness into a deep hatred that was soon being expressed in many concrete ways. German commanders were forced to divert frontline units to antiguerrilla actions in rear areas. Supply and communications lines, despite the heaviest defensive measures, suffered frequent disruption. The opposing Russian commanders began to ben-

efit from the increasing flow of intelligence on German plans and troop dispositions. These factors played a leading part in the eventual collapse of the whole Nazi effort in the East. The kind of civil affairs operations which the Nazi regime chose to employ helped to seal the doom of its armies in the Ukraine.

As a chapter in the history of civil affairs, the Ukraine story is a vivid object lesson of continuing value in teaching how the civil affairs functions should not be accomplished.

Gentlemen, these historical examples vividly point out to you as combat commanders that you must be cognizant of the importance of your CAMG capability and what it can do for you; how necessary it is for you to exploit this capacity to its utmost in order to successfully accomplish your mission. This has been true in the past and will be even more true in the fast moving, fluid type of operation that has been brought on by the advent of mass destruction weapons.

You as a commander must know the people with whom you must deal, know their historic background, customs and problems. You should know something of their social structure so as to be aware of areas of sensitivity and importance. You should know the general pattern of the economy so that you do not unnecessarily interfere with the livelihood of the people. You should have some appreciation of the general cultural, religious, and political background of the people, and, for purposes of day-to-day operations, you should acquire an understanding of the governmental structure to which the people are accustomed.

The commander should strive to indoctrinate his officers and men, from top to bottom, in the principles and techniques of CAMG. The degree to which they understand and apply those principles will have a direct bearing on the success of his mission. It must be firmly understood, however, that responsibility for civil relationships lies solely with command. Subordinates may be charged with specific assignments, or entrusted with specific missions, but it is the commander who sets the tone of such operations.

CAMG activities should begin with the initial planning for an operation and continue concurrently through all subsequent operations in which the force—be it Army, Navy, or Air Force—is engaged. The moment a commander moves into an area, immediate decisions must be made with respect to the civilian population. He cannot afford to wait or defer these decisions which, either through commission or omission, will affect the attainment of the objectives and aims for which the war is fought. CAMG planning cannot be delayed until the war is won. The commander's proper utilization of CAMG techniques and procedures contributes materially, and sometimes essentially, to the winning of the victory and later of the peace.

The commander's decision is influenced not only by the relative combat power of opposing forces but also by the characteristics of the area of operations. Accordingly, the commander makes decision with respect to his responsibilities to a population by carefully weighing the CAMG estimate of the situation in conjunction with the estimates of the other members of his staff.

CAMG planning must be timely, concurrent, continuous and in full coordination with other staff sections to determine the manner in which CAMG operations may best contribute to the overall operational mission. The coordination of CAMG activities with tactical operations is also essential in order to insure the capability of the commander's CAMG operations to cope with the civilian problems caused by war.

As the scope of warfare enlarges with the appearance of weapons of increased destruc-

tiveness, the scope of the commander's CAMG operational responsibilities becomes correspondingly intensified. Modern military operations, even if carried out with discrimination, will create tremendous problems. Let's briefly examine some of the problems arising from the presence of civilians which inescapably confront a commander in the conduct of his operations.

Civilians, in larger numbers than ever encountered before, will suffer the effects of war in personal loss, injury, deprivation and lack of the barest essentials of life. They will not have the guidance, assistance or control normally provided by the former local levels of Government. Continuing damage will contribute to mass hysteria and tend to convert the previously normal populace into an uncontrolled mob; a multitude of scared, hurt and disrupted people who seek only to flee further injury with whatever possessions as are intact and obtain, by any means possible, that which is necessary to remain alive.

From the commander's point of view, what is the effect of the problems posed by these civilians on his combat operations? The answer is not difficult to imagine. They clutter the roads and interfere with or prevent the essential movement of troops and supplies. They require amazing tonnages of military supplies merely to remain alive and can compel a diversion of combat troops to protect lines of communications and supply installations. They can require a similar diversion of troops to neutralize guerrilla action fomented by undetected enemy agents among them. They can do all this and more; they can all but stop a military operation in its tracks unless proper action is taken to anticipate and plan in advance necessary CAMG controls.

Thus, the commander's CAMG operations are required fully as much by military necessity as by the customs of war and the principle of humanity.

The commander's CAMG operations are not limited to civil control and relief. In coordination with CIC, civilians are screened to insure the detection of enemy agents and the prevention of sabotage and rear area disorders. Local civil defense and damage control activities are coordinated with those of U.S. forces. Steps are taken to enforce directives and maintain a condition of law and order among civilians. Public health and sanitation are kept under surveillance to insure the prevention of epidemic disease that might affect the combat effectiveness of our Armed Forces. Information media are exploited to inform the civil populace of the purposes and aims of U.S. effort and to improve the relations between our forces and the people of the country with which we are at war. Resources of the country are mobilized in support of military requirements as well as minimum essential civilian; and, certainly not least, the extensive CAMG organization, functioning constantly at the grassroots level, constitutes an effective source of information and intelligence of importance to the combat effort.

At this point, I would like to reemphasize what is presently being done to assist you as commanders in the discharge of your CAMG responsibilities and I would like also to remind you of my earlier stated intention of stressing the responsibility of the commander for the conduct of CAMG operations as one of the important means of insuring the ultimate success of his combat operations and the attainment of U.S. policy objectives.

First, what is presently being done to assist you as commanders in the discharge of your civil affairs military government responsibilities? The Office of Civil Affairs has been established within the Department of the Army General Staff level under the Deputy Chief of Staff for Military Operations. Presently for the first time between wars,

we are continuing the training of civil affairs military government personnel. A military government group and two military government companies are being maintained in a state of readiness at Fort Gordon, Ga.; a U.S. Army CAMG school has been established and is in operation at Fort Gordon for the training of your CAMG personnel; extension courses are also provided by the school at Gordon; CAMG doctrine has been developed and published in appropriate publications; CAMG departments have been established in U.S. Army Reserve schools; a CAMG branch has been established and is flourishing in the Army Reserve; a CAMG career specialization program has been developed for officers of the Active Army; CAMG staff sections and units are participating in Army maneuvers and exercises; plans for CAMG operations have been made an integral part of plans from the JCS to division level; CAMG reserve units have been organized to meet foreseeable contingencies; augmentation table staff sections have been provided for field Army and below; and, what is very important, CAMG doctrine and functions are being taught in Army service schools.

Now what must you do, as combat commanders yourselves, to insure that civil problems do not hinder or seriously interfere with your combat operations and that you gain the combat support assistance of which the area is capable of providing?

This is what you must do.

First, remember that you and you alone are responsible for the proper conduct of your CAMG operations as well as your tactical operations. Become fully familiar with all of the elements of your force. Organize your staff so that you get the full benefit of the advice and help of your CAMG element. Gain an understanding of CAMG principles and techniques so that you can employ your CAMG elements with the same facility with which you employ your combat arms and the technical and administrative services.

Second, insure that members of your CAMG staff are competent; that they plan continuously in complete coordination with all other staff advisers; and, that they are constantly alert to the requirement of keeping you accurately informed of civil conditions which assist or deter your military actions.

Third, issue orders which give clear requirements for integrated tactical and CAMG operations.

Fourth, require your CAMG staff to actively supervise the implementation of your directed actions and check on them yourself.

Gentlemen, your knowledge and application of CAMG policies, doctrine, and procedures are essential to the successful accomplishment of your operational mission. More than that, they will materially assist the conversion of a military success to an ultimate victory in a lasting peace.

TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Flint Journal, Flint, Mich., of August 8, 1959, which effectively points out some

of the many objectionable features which led me to oppose this legislation.

The editorial follows:

SATURDAY REFLECTIONS

Once again, public electric power has won out over you, the Michigan taxpayer. Your money will continue to pay for expansion of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which in turn will mean more cheap power for that area, which in turn will mean greater efforts to lure Michigan industry to the Tennessee Valley Authority's region with the promise of cheaper power. Truly a vicious circle.

It is regrettable that President Eisenhower saw fit to sign the bill in which Congress authorized TVA to issue up to \$750 million in bonds for future expansion. It is another sign of how firmly entrenched this public-power project has become in the minds of our representatives in Washington. It seems to be a case of "it's always been with us."

Michigan taxpayers are among the hardest hit by the public-power policy, because our State is one of the biggest Federal taxpayers.

When the TVA bill was before the Senate, leading Michigan figures implored Democratic Senators McNAMARA and HART to vote against it. They voted for it.

The next time they run for office, ask them how in the world they can justify spending your tax money to provide cheap power in another part of the country; cheap power which is used to lure industries from our State.

Public power, of course, has always been a darling of the Democratic Party, born in the early New Deal days when there was so much fuzzy thinking in Washington.

Now, however, it begins to appear that even some Democrats have decided to do some straight thinking on the subject. When the bill was before the U.S. Senate, the 12 Democrats in the Michigan Senate joined the 22 Republican Senators in offering a resolution demanding that U.S. Senators McNAMARA and HART oppose the bill.

The issue is as clear and simple as this: Your tax money is being used by the public-power interests to undermine Michigan industry. Think about that the next time you vote in a congressional election.

Labor Bill Demanded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., on the pending labor legislation:

LABOR BILL DEMANDED

The AFL-CIO leadership is against the Kennedy-Ervin labor reform bill in the amended form approved by the Senate. It is against the Elliott bill adopted by the House Labor Committee, a weaker bill than the Senate bill. It is against the Landrum-Griffin bill which will be proposed on the House floor as a substitute for the Elliott measure, a stronger bill supported by Republicans, some Democrats, and President Eisenhower.

President George Meany, of the AFL-CIO, carefully refrains from saying that he wants no bill at all. He proposes specific amendments, which will be most difficult to obtain

from the floor. But he rejects the thinking that the public demands legislation this session to cure the abuses in labor and management revealed so starkly by the McClellan committee. He says the public is not morose and will not accept legislation "which will hamstring free democratic trade unionism under the guise of getting at the crooks."

The meat of this is that the AFL-CIO leadership will not settle for anything except its own bill, and such a bill must contain no sections amending the Taft-Hartley Act to tighten "hot cargo," secondary boycott, and organizational picketing controls. Thus, the AFL-CIO has fallen into bed with the Teamsters Union which it kicked out on the basis of corruption.

The House of Representatives this week must decide whether it is an independent body or will bow to the superior judgment of the AFL-CIO and the Teamsters. Mr. Meany may not believe it, but the people do demand labor-management reform legislation. They may not understand all the fine print, but they want action. It would be advisable for Members of Congress to understand this. The reaction is not going to be good if Congress again fails to adopt a labor bill.

Government Should Appeal Dixon-Yates Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from a selection of editorials appearing in the July 27 to August 2, 1959, issues of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. The editorial entitled "A Loophole To Plug," follows:

If the opinion of the U.S. Court of Claims in the Dixon-Yates case is allowed to stand, Congress will have some urgent repair work to do on the conflict-of-interest law.

A 3 to 2 majority of the court awarded the Dixon-Yates group \$1,867,545 in damages for the Government's cancellation of its contract to build a powerplant near Memphis. The principal ground for the award was a finding that there was no conflict of interest in the activities of Adolphe Wenzell, who helped promote the contract, while simultaneously serving as consultant to the Budget Bureau and as vice president of the investment firm which hoped to finance the project.

We sympathize fully with the court majority's view that "there is something essentially cynical about the Government's Wenzell defense." The Eisenhower administration sedulously promoted the Dixon-Yates contract as a weapon in its campaign against the TVA. It hired Mr. Wenzell to advance that cause. Then when the contract got too hot to handle, and had to be canceled, the same administration tried to escape financial responsibility for its blunder by charging that Mr. Wenzell had been guilty of conflict-of-interest. "Cynical" is the right word.

Nevertheless the court majority puts a highly questionable interpretation upon the conflict-of-interest statute when, in an opinion by Judge J. Warren Madden it absolves Mr. Wenzell in these words:

"We see not the slightest conflict of interest in Wenzell's position. The interest which he shared with the President and the Bureau of the Budget, that the negotiations should produce a contract, was the Govern-

ment's interest, although it coincided with the sponsors' interest."

Surely this is a strange construction to put upon a law which quite plainly bars anybody with a pecuniary interest in the profits of a business entity from acting as agent of the Government in transacting business with that entity. The Court seems to say there was no conflict because the Government, Mr. Wenzell and the Dixon-Yates group all had a common interest in promoting the contract. They certainly did. But while Mr. Wenzell as a Government official could claim to be acting in the public interest as he saw it, he could not make the same claim as a vice president of First Boston Corp. And he promoted the contract while serving in both capacities. If that is not conflict, what is?

Retired Supreme Court Justice Reed, sitting with the Court of Claims by assignment, came much closer to the mark in his dissent. He remarks that even while Mr. Wenzell was busy in his dual role, the questionable legality of his activities was pointed out by the Dixon-Yates group itself, by Budget Bureau staff members, and even by legal counsel for his own firm.

First Boston's lawyers advised him to get out of the Government as soon as they heard about his dual role. On the strength of his dual role, they advised First Boston to accept no fee for financing the Dixon-Yates plant. Justice Reed says Mr. Wenzell's compensation at First Boston was based on the business he brought in, and thus he had a direct and positive pecuniary interest in putting the Dixon-Yates contract over. Justice Reed concludes:

"If the statute in question is to perform its intended function in the protection of the Government against prohibited actions that might influence contracts by public agents with private connections, courts must carry out the legislative purpose."

Senator KEFAUVER has demanded that the administration appeal to the Supreme Court, but we rather imagine the administration wishes it had heard the last of Dixon-Yates long ago. If no appeal is taken, then certainly Congress should set to work at once plugging up the hole this decision leaves in the conflict-of-interest law.

Polish Cultural Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Wednesday, August 5, 1959:

POLISH CULTURAL MEETING

With Poland in the limelight because of the official visit of Vice President Nixon, the convention of American Council of Polish Cultural Clubs, opening in Wilkes College this afternoon, takes on national and even international significance. It is a most happy coincidence for Wilkes-Barre because of the added interest in the sessions which will continue until Sunday.

Poland has a rich cultural background and has produced scores of internationally known figures in the arts through the centuries. It is the purpose of affiliated clubs, of which the Women's Committee of the Polish Room of Wilkes College is one, to preserve this heritage. The council itself coordinates these efforts.

In the preamble to the council's constitution, there is this brief outline of its role in American life:

"To perpetuate and develop the culture, created by our forefathers; to encourage higher education and scholarship among people of Polish descent; to foster in Americans of Polish descent a consciousness and pride of their own heritage; to enrich the forming pattern of America's great culture by weaving into it the best from Polish sources of inspiration, and of accomplishment, we associate ourselves together."

The council maintains a clearinghouse for the interchange of information and ideas, pertaining to the promotion of Polish culture in America. It suggests cultural activities and provides guidance to clubs for the fulfillment of their objectives. It encourages the formation of new clubs. It cooperates with other organizations and maintains close contacts with the creative forces of contemporary Polish cultural life. The council's principal task is one of initiative and inspiration.

Its projects have covered a wide range. They include the Norwid literary contest, the Marcella Sembrich Kochanska voice contest, and the Mickiewicz centennial. The convention theme this year is the "Millennium of Poland," the national observance of which will be ushered in here, no small distinction for the community as well as the organization. The public will become increasingly aware of this in the years immediately ahead, with the American Council of Polish Cultural Clubs spearheading the movement.

It is fitting that the 1959 gathering of this distinguished body should be held in Wilkes-Barre which has made so considerable a contribution of leadership to organizations of Americans of Polish extraction. Currently, Charles Rozmarek is president of the Polish American Congress and the Polish National Alliance and Dr. Joseph Kocyan is chairman of the board of the Kosciuszko Foundation, to cite two of many examples. Joseph Lester is an officer of the American Council of Polish Cultural Clubs and convention chairman. Nowhere could the council meet where it would be more at home.

It is a privilege to join with President Eisenhower and other notables in extending greetings to the city's guests for the next 5 days and wish them well in their efforts to enrich our national heritage.

Khrushchev's Meeting With Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following column by Mr. Drew Pearson which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Record of Friday, July 31, 1959.

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Record, July 31, 1959]

DREW PEARSON SAYS: KHRUSHCHEV TOLD NIXON THE TRUTH ABOUT SUPERIORITY OF RUSSIAN MISSILES; IRONICALLY, NIXON HAS URGED MORE U.S. MISSILE PRODUCTION; RUSSIA IS AHEAD OF US IN EVERY MILITARY DEPARTMENT EXCEPT SEAPOWER

WASHINGTON.—There was irony in the fact that Nikita Khrushchev's unprecedented and on the whole healthy public debate at the American Exposition in Moscow was staged with the man who has consistently urged more American concentration on missiles.

When Khrushchev threw in Vice President Nixon's face the warning "we have means at our disposal which can have very bad consequences" and again when he said; obviously referring to missiles, "but ours are better if you want to compete"—Nixon knew Khrushchev was telling the truth.

It was Nixon who urged a franker policy in telling the American people how far behind Russia we were when the first Russian sputnik was launched on Oct. 4, 1957. He was overruled by the White House. In the approximately 2 years since then, we have lagged even farther behind. And the real reason Foreign Minister Gromyko has been so tough at Geneva is because Russia is now ahead of the United States in every military department except sea power.

Here is the box score on Soviet versus American military strength, which both Nixon and Khrushchev had in mind when they debated in Moscow:

Intercontinental missiles: Russia suddenly resumed testing intercontinental missiles in March after a long lapse. From this, Secretary of Defense McElroy hopefully concluded that the lapse meant the Russians, like us, were having trouble with their long-distance missile. Other experts believe Russia stopped firing the big missiles simply because she was busy producing them.

In any event, there can be no mistaking the fact Russia has been blasting off about four missiles a month since March from her great test center northeast of the Caspian Sea. Our powerful radar eyes in Turkey have spotted the missiles take off; another radar station in the Aleutians has followed the warheads as they plunged back to earth. Only two of the big missiles have been hurled a full 5,000 miles. The remaining 18 which we were able to track went 3,500 to 4,500 miles. Whether these were test models or production models, however, remain a question mark.

Our own ICBM firings have been plagued by minor malfunctions. It is no military secret that we have tested 26 Atlas ICBM's, of which 11 have been successful, 6 partially successful, and 9 complete failures. In contrast, our monitor shows that 75 percent of the Russian ICBM tests have been successful. They have operated with alarming reliability. The first of our 5,500-mile Atlas missiles were supposed to be combat-ready in July. But five misfires in a row have delayed the operational date until September or October. It is doubtful that we will have the 10 operational Atlases that Secretary McElroy promised by the end of the year. Russia ought to have 10 times that number.

Intermediate missiles: Russia is known to have 750 medium-range missiles ready to launch against our overseas bases. They include both T-4's, which can shoot 1,000 miles and T-2's which can hit targets up to 1,800 miles away.

Our first squadron of 1,200-mile Thor missiles was delivered to England last winter and was supposed to be ready for combat by January. It didn't become operational until June.

This now gives us 15 intermediate missiles against Russia's 750. We should whip another 15-missile squadron into shape before the summer is over. Altogether, we will set up four squadrons in England. We also hope to locate four squadrons in Italy, perhaps four more in Turkey. But we have not even selected the launching sites.

Our present schedule also calls for halting production altogether after we have built about 200 intermediate missiles.

Underwater missiles: We have taken actual photographs of Soviet submarines equipped with vertical launching tubes. These are capable of firing stub-nosed Comet missiles from underwater hiding places at targets 700 miles inland. Russia has also stepped up its submarine activity in American waters during the last 3 years.

Apparently the Reds have even planted secret transmitters along the ocean bottom near our shores. These serve as homing devices to guide other submarines.

In contrast, we won't be able to launch underwater missiles until late 1960. These will be 1,200-mile Polaris missiles, which have fizzled in preliminary tests at Cape Canaveral, Fla. The test program will be stepped up for the next 12 months. Then the Navy may attempt a shipboard launching from a surface ship. If this succeeds, the Navy will try firing Polaris missiles from submerged submarines.

Of Russia's 600 submarines, an estimated 100 are equipped to fire missiles. The United States has only five missile submarines, all carrying winged Regulus missiles, which must be fired from the surface. Our total submarine fleet, counting 80 used for training or stored in mothballs, is less than 200.

Russian atomic subs: Thanks to Adm. Hyman Rickover, however, we are well ahead of Russia in designing and constructing atomic submarines. But the latest intelligence reports claim Russia will soon launch its first two atomic subs.

In atomic weapons, Russia has caught up with us in quality and is not far behind in quantity. We have picked up enough information from Russian nuclear tests to convince our scientists that Russia has developed compact hydrogen warheads better in some respects than our own.

In conventional weapons, Russia still maintains an overwhelming superiority. Her land army is still 175 divisions; ours has dwindled to 14 effective divisions. The Red Army also has better modern rifles, self-propelled assault artillery, armored personnel carriers, heavy tanks and grasshopping helicopters.

Russia still has about 20,000 combat jet planes to our 18,000. While her fighter planes are probably superior to ours, our Strategic Air Command is still considered a more effective bomber force. Russia has been testing a new, supersonic, bomber which might be the forerunner of the world's first atomic bomber. Her atomic aircraft program is believed to be ahead of ours.

On the high seas, we still surpass Russia in fleet strength. But the Red surface fleet is now second only to our own, while her submarine fleet is superior. Russia hasn't bothered to build any airplane carriers, perhaps because carriers may be as outmoded as battleships in this atomic age.

U.S. Art for Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Tablet of August 8, 1959:

U.S. ART FOR MOSCOW

(Text of a radio broadcast by Wheeler Williams, N.A., president, American Artists Professional League)

As an artist and as a Legionnaire, I am glad to have this opportunity to speak to fellow Americans on this latest fiasco in a series of well intended but mismanaged Government efforts to use American art as a bridge of understanding and friendship between peoples.

We are all indebted to Congressman FRANCIS WALTER for his alertness and courage in bringing the Red ratio of the roster so public attention.

In his address to the Congress, June 3, he revealed that a routine check of House Un-American Activities Committee files disclosed that: "of the 67 artists whose works have been chosen, 34, a fraction more than 50 percent, have records of affiliation with Communist fronts and causes," and that of these: "22, or one-third of the 67 artists have a minimum of 465 such connections."

The ratio as given is intolerable. That a slew of these are repeaters from one or more previous Government-sponsored exhibitions quite properly recalled or cancelled because their works were included, makes it even more so.

Let me assure you that, while it is true that the Communists have made the fields of our art a prime target for infiltration and subversion, they have not been successful to any such tragic degree as these figures would indicate. Ninety percent of our artists are still loyal Americans, including, one can hope, 90 percent of the abstract and other ism schools as well as those dedicated to the modern classic tradition of American art.

THE REASON

How then did this happen?

An organization known as the American Federation of Arts, dominated largely by museum directors, passed a resolution a few years back that art should be judged "on merit alone and not on the politics of the artists." No one objected to this as no one had ever concerned himself with the politics of the artist. It was as unanimous as a vote would be against the propriety of beating one's wife. Somehow this resolution got incorporated in instructions to the jury.

Unfortunately, some people confuse communism with politics and ignore the fact that in our country communism is not politics, it is subversion.

Once again in choosing a jury to select works of art, a Government agency failed to get professional advice from reputable bodies of professional artists. They ended up with a preliminary committee of seven citizens, four laymen, an art historian, an art educator, and the director of circulation exhibitions for the museum of modern art, which the New York Times magazine recently captioned as the "Awesome Taste Maker."

This committee chose the jury, chaired by a painter but including another so-called art expert, Lloyd Goodrich, director of the Whitney Museum, and another art educator. Then for sculpture, a teacher from Sarah Lawrence College was added. Judging by the example of his own work included and all but 4 or 22 selections in this field, he probably instructed in the making of welded wreckage constructions. Since these are not representations of living form they cannot, correctly, be considered sculpture.

As soon as the jury was announced, I wrote to the President my forebodings that the exhibition would be worse than the Brussels disaster.

When, at Congressman WALTER's invitation, I agreed to go to Washington as a witness at the committee hearings I was shown for the first time a full set of photos of the selections. Judged on merit alone the choices are, in my judgment, lamentable and with a few exceptions a discredit to American art.

Judged on the prerequisite of giving a true image of America, they are unpardonable.

At the hearing, I called some of the paintings and most of the sculpture "Childish Doodles" (not all as some newspapers misquoted). One painting I described as an amateur design for linoleum that my wife would never select.

A not inconsiderable proportion of the paintings I could only classify as lampoons

and social protest painting. Scenes of slum street corners with human derelicts, thugs, and prostitutes. A dismal, dreary, and technically trivial array.

On the brighter side there was a Wisconsin landscape, a lighthouse and a few other works by the same small group of conservative painters the artistic left always include to show they can tolerate traditional work. Better and more appropriate examples, even of these could have been chosen.

NOTHING WORTHY OF UNITED STATES

By and large there was nothing to give anyone some comprehension of all the natural beauty with which God has so lavishly endowed our land, nothing to honor its proud history, worthily portray its people, or the architecture of its great cities and rural villages. One thing should now be clear. No layman involved as a museum director, dealer, or critic should ever be allowed to serve on a jury.

You would not enter a horse in a show where the judge was manager of a stable with numerous entries. Goodrich has managed and purchased for the Whitney picture stable for years.

Naturally he must be pleased that five of the works for Moscow are from the Whitney Gallery and he boasts in the Journal American of July 18 that 37 of these artists are represented in the Whitney Summer Show drawings from its own collections. Incidentally three or more are to be given one-man shows at the Whitney this coming season. In the current show of the museum of modern art, reached by connecting doors are 32. Even the Met is collaborating by showing examples of some on the Moscow roster. The experts must stick together.

Much is made about how these selections will show the freedom the American artist has to paint whatever he wishes. How about the license of the jury dipping into the public's pockets to promote artists who are under Communist direction? How free are they? What about the laugh this exhibition will give the Red hierarchy who know better than the House committee which are the works of their stooges. They may well think they have captured control of American art.

This brings up a vital point. What is the Red policy regarding art? We in America wouldn't or couldn't believe that Hitler meant what he said in "Mein Kampf." The Reds are almost equally and brutally frank.

ART AS A WEAPON

Most of us now are fully aware that their first aim is to destroy peoples' faith in God. Few realize the importance they give to destruction of a nation's faith in its heritage of art and culture as a preliminary to subjugation.

William Z. Foster, Communist Party chairman, writing in the New Masses in 1946 said, "There must be a clear understanding that art is a weapon in the class struggle. Not only is art a weapon, but a very potent one as well. Moreover, rising revolutionary social classes instinctively realize the importance of art as a social weapon and have always forged their own art and used it to challenge that of the existing ruling class."

V. J. Jerome in his pamphlet "Grasp the Weapon of Culture" outlined it in greater detail and went to jail for advocating overthrow of our Government by force and violence. Picasso has written, "Art is not to decorate apartments, art is a weapon of revolution and my art is revolutionary art."

Rivera, a top Mexican Communist, whose mural including a portrait of Lenin for Rockefeller Center was quickly pointed out wrote: "The role of the artist in the revolution is not that of the fellow traveller, it is not that of the sympathizer, it is not that of the servant of the revolution. The role of the artist is that of the soldier of the revolution."

How do the Reds use "art as a weapon?" They deploy their revolutionary artists in three basic battalions.

The first is for "social protest." In this are: their front line shock troops who paint the dirty linen and garbage, of which even our land has its share, and rub it in people's eyes. Remember some of those WPA post office murals? Along with these are their political and social satirists who illustrate the New Masses and other Communist publications and alas, some less than cautious other magazines and papers.

In the second, they promote isms of the pseudo-modern schools spawned in Europe in the early years of this century. They were fortunate in enlisting all or almost all of the founders and heroes of these weird cults and have amassed a huge following of witting and unwitting practitioners and collectors.

The Red purpose with these is to destroy man's faith in his cultural heritage and, psychologically in his own judgment.

Finally, in the third, they deploy and promote the few artists of real talent they caught in their net during the depression days to act as door openers to the prestige and endowments of art societies and foundations.

Collaterally they have succeeded in placing their members or adherents of revolutionary schools of art in posts of influence as critics, as museum directors, and as teachers in our schools.

These are the same tactics they employed in Russia before the revolution and up to 1922. When entrenched in power Lenin outlawed revolutionary art. Since then only Socialist realism art has been permitted behind the Iron Curtain.

The USIA has not had the courage to admit failure and recall this Red-saturated exhibition, although the State Department and the USIA have recalled or cancelled a series of similarly, if less massively, polluted art ventures in the recent past.

They have, however, partially acceded to the demands of the Honorable R. L. Buell (a dear friend and old roommate of mine) in quickly collecting and shipping a fine collection of paintings by American masters from Stewart down to the early years of this century to give some idea of our rich national heritage of art.

The rubbish and junk pile shipped first should still be recalled and replaced with some proof that we still have fine artists who share their fellow Americans love of God and country.

Please write the President requesting that he so suggest to the USIA.

Space-Age Metals Bid for Missiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article "Space-Age Metals Bid for Missiles" which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Sunday, June 23, 1959. The author, Allen M. Smythe, points out new policy decisions by the Pentagon for the development of new defense production equipment that should be a great aid to the machine tool industry. The article reads:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, June 23, 1959]

SPACE-AGE METALS BID FOR MISSILES—BUT ARE PROBLEMS FOR TOOLMAKERS

(By Allen M. Smythe)

Greater emphasis is to be placed on developments of new processes and manufacturing methods for the new materials that will be used for missiles and spaceships according to top Pentagon officials.

Such new alloys and heat-resistant metals as titanium, molybdenum, zirconium, columbium and beryllium will need new equipment and processes before they can be used in the fabrication of ultrasonic weapons. Some of the processes will change the molecular structure to further improve the characteristics of these metals.

Defense Secretary Neil H. McElroy has indicated he expected additional funds for this purpose in the defense appropriation bill before Congress. He mentioned only one of the new materials, "aluminized plastic." Other Pentagon officials stated that metal-coated ceramics also are under intense development.

Defense metallurgists and equipment experts stated that in the future military contractors will use such processes as chemical milling, explosive forming, ultrasonics, cold-stretch forming, electric erosion and ultraspeed grinding. Many of these are past the early development stage but are not in general use.

Industry observers have stated that research and development of the new hard and lightweight materials for the spaceships of tomorrow have far exceeded development of processes to use them.

Pentagon procurement officials now indicate they will encourage defense firms and equipment makers to develop new and practical techniques and processes for these new metals.

The Navy states that their Bureau of Ships and the Bureau of Ordnance have tested a number of new processes. Air Force procurement officials at Wright-Patterson Field, Dayton, Ohio, say they have issued 114 contracts, valued at more than \$80 million to laboratories, equipment makers and defense firms to develop these new manufacturing methods. They have evaluated nearly 200 more.

The Defense Department has more than \$5,500 million of machine tools in Federal arsenals, contractors' factories, in standby plants and in storage. Many factors have made these obsolete. The trend from aircraft to missiles has moved many tools into storage. The 30-day concept of a nuclear war has largely eliminated the need for standby plans. The complexity and lethality of modern weapons have made their mass production costly and unnecessary.

Assistant Secretary E. Perkins McGuire has estimated that obsolete weapons and equipment will soon approach \$60 billion. He is working to save storage space and costs by distributing to other Federal agencies, foreign governments and technical schools all materiel that could be used. He would scrap the rest, which he believes might return \$1 billion or \$2 billion at scrap-metal prices.

Cuban-United States Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by Dr. Emilio Nunez

Portuondo appeared in Latin American Events of August 7.

Dr. Portuondo was president of the Security Council of the United Nations and is eminently fitted to edit Latin American Events.

This article was called to my attention by the Reverend Father Thorning, whose vast knowledge of Latin America is so well known that he has been called El Padre de las Americas.

The editorial follows:

This is our first newsletter which we shall send to you weekly. We believe it is unique in its field.

At the outset, I, as editor, feel it my duty to (1) explain the purposes of this letter and (2) to identify myself.

We on this continent—the United States, Canada, Central and South America—must stand together or be gobbled up separately by the Communist monster. Understanding between these nations will lead inevitably to better relations. We hope that this newsletter will create this understanding and if we fail to accomplish this purpose we shall have failed in the task before us.

Some segments of the U.S. press, as well as the Latin American press, are sending out garbled news dispatches about the Communist threat to this continent. They either do not want to understand this threat or they fail to grasp it. Consider what is happening in Cuba, to mention only one example. I could write a book on the misinformation coming out of Cuba, citing chapter and verse.

It shocks me—as it must millions of others in North and South America—that the New York Times, one of the greatest newspapers in the world would allow one of its correspondents, Herbert L. Matthews, to write a three-column glowing account of Fidel Castro's achievements. The truth is that Castro has achieved exactly nothing, unless you consider chaos and tragic unemployment as achievements.

In a recent editorial the Washington Post, another great newspaper, said of the killer Castro: "Patience is necessary while the new regime is working out its problems." Patience? Isn't 7 months sufficient time to judge the socio-economic trends in Cuba where the United States has almost \$1 billion invested and which the greedy hands of Castro are about to snatch?

Castro is a Communist, although I can't prove it since I have never seen his Communist card of membership in that infamous, worldwide tyrannical organization. I can't prove either that there are tigers in India since I have never been to India, but friends of mine who have been there have seen tigers and I have no reason to doubt them.

Despite what Castro says, he is a Communist. We judge a man by his actions and not by what he says.

Castro, furthermore, is a dangerous psychopath. Certainly, there is a dash of insanity in any man who rants and raves for a 6-hour period on TV. These ramblings are known in psychiatry as logorrhea, a form of mental sickness.

There is a similarity between Castro, Hitler, and Stalin. All three are cunning, ruthless, murderers, power hungry, obsessed with grandiose ideas, manic-depressives, long on promises and short on keeping them. All three tell (or told in the case of Hitler and Stalin) shameless lies in a brazen effort to hoodwink their subjects and remain in power.

Castro, who calls himself doctor, despite the fact that he has never practiced a day of law, told his subjects on his return to Cuba after his recent visit to the United States he had "put the fix in" so that Cuba's sugar exports to the United States would be increased, another one of his barefaced lies. Cuba today exports 8 million tons of sugar to the United States at about 6 cents a

pound, which is more than double the world market price.

In view of the social and economic turmoil in Cuba today, caused by Castro's erratic behavior, the U.S. Congress will not pass a sugar law this year, despite the understandable pleadings of U.S. sugar growers who want to make plans for next year.

If the present Communistic trend in Cuba continues next year, Cuba will be most fortunate if she is allowed even 1 million tons in the U.S. market. Castro seems to think that the United States needs the 3 million tons from Cuba, further evidence of his weird thinking. Brazil alone could send more than 3 million tons of sugar into the United States. Yet, Castro has the gall to tell his people that Cuba's sugar quota will be increased.

While I have dwelt at length on Cuban-U.S. relations in this first letter, my future dispatches will deal more in detail with the problems affecting Panama, Uruguay, and other Central and South American countries.

Mr. Frank A. English, President of Planters Nut & Chocolate Co., Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following news story and an editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Wednesday, August 5, 1959, upon the death of Mr. Frank A. English, president, Planters Nut & Chocolate Co.:

[From the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader, Aug. 5, 1959]

FRANK ENGLISH DIES, HEAD OF PLANTERS—BUSINESSMAN'S DEATH OCCURS UNEXPECTEDLY—NOTABLE CAREER

Frank A. English, 63, president of Planters Nut & Chocolate Co., and an active figure in community affairs, died unexpectedly this morning at 6:05 in Wilkes-Barre General Hospital. A resident of 555 Gibson Avenue, Kingston, he was admitted to the hospital last night at 7:30.

Funeral will be held from the family home Saturday morning followed by a requiem mass in St. Ignatius Church, Kingston. Friends may call Thursday night, 7 to 10, and Friday, 3 to 5 and 7 to 10 p.m.

In apparent good health, Mr. English had presided at the quarterly board meeting of Planters yesterday morning at the firm's offices on South Main Street, city. Although he suffered a heart attack about a year and one-half ago and several seizures since then, Mr. English had directed the company's business and was in his office each day.

On the advice of his family and business associates, Mr. English decided several days ago to go to the hospital for a rest. Last night he was admitted to General Hospital and it was assumed he would be a patient for only several days. He and his wife planned to go to Englewood, N.J., on Sunday to see their first grandchild, Francis X. Horrigan. The baby, born July 28, is a son of Mr. and Mrs. Brenda Horrigan of Englewood. Mrs. Horrigan is the former Elena English.

HEADED VAST CONCERN

Mr. English was named president of the firm February 15, 1956, succeeding the late Mario Peruzzi, Sr. He was the third president of the multimillion dollar company,

founded in this city in 1906, by the late Amedeo Obici and Mario Peruzzi, Sr.

Starting his career with Planters 43 years ago as a clerk-typist, Mr. English worked upward rapidly in all departments until becoming head of the internationally known business. When he joined the company in 1916, the offices were on East Northampton Street. The main offices were moved to South Main Street, city, in 1927.

After being associated with the firm's sales department a number of years, Mr. English was sent to Chicago, Ill., in 1920, to establish a sales branch there. His ability as an administrator and sales executive was recognized by his work in Chicago, and in 1932, he was elected to the board of directors and appointed assistant secretary.

Two years later, in 1934, Mr. English was named secretary of Planters and of the board. He also continued in the position of sales manager and as the years passed he took over more and more of the giant firm's administrative assignments under the guidance of Mr. Obici, and Mr. Peruzzi. In 1947, upon the death of Amedeo Obici, he retained the post of secretary and also was given the office of executive vice president. He also was appointed general sales manager of the firm.

Mr. English and his brother, M. J. English, formerly of Wilkes-Barre, now of Suffolk, Va., who is vice president and treasurer of Planters, had a total combined service of 81 years with the company.

Mr. English was active in the civic, business, and fraternal activities in Wyoming Valley. A founder of the Friends of St. Michaels, he served as honorary vice president of that group.

ON NUMEROUS BOARDS

Last month, Mr. English became a member of the board of trustees of Wilkes College. He also was a member and past director of Wilkes-Barre Rotary Club and a member of Westmoreland Club and Fox Hill Country Club. He served as a director of the Miners National Bank and of Mercey Hospital and was a member of the hospital building committee. He also was a governor of Wyoming Valley Community Chest, now the United Fund, and served as a director of the Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce.

A native of Wilkes-Barre, Mr. English was born September 20, 1898, a son of the late Anthony and Teresa Petrucelli English. The family resided many years on Park Avenue and Mr. English was a foreman for the Lehigh-Wilkes-Barre Coal Co. Educated in the elementary schools in this city, Frank English was graduated from Wilkes-Barre High School. In high school, he was a basketball star and later played with local amateur teams and the Planters Peanuts entry of the Industrial League. Later, he and his brother Mike, played with the semiprofessional team known as the Wilkes-Barre Independents.

A veteran of World War I, Mr. English served as a sergeant major in this country with the Air Corps. He was a member of American Legion Post 132. He was a communicant of St. Ignatius Church, Kingston, and of the Holy Name Society.

Surviving are his wife, the former Helen Connors; two daughters, Mrs. Brendan Horigan, Englewood, N.J., and Mariana, at home, a sophomore at Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart, Purchase, N.Y.; a grandson; a brother, M. J. English, Suffolk, Va.; two sisters, Misses Mary J. and Anne E. English, of Wilkes-Barre.

[From the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader, Aug. 5, 1959]

FRANK A. ENGLISH

The death of Frank A. English, president of Planters Nut and Chocolate Co., today was a shock and heavy loss to the community as well as to loved ones and business associates. This former Times-Leader Evening News

Little Merchant easily qualified for a place among Greater Wilkes-Barre's leading citizens. He belonged to that distinguished company that found its Acres of Diamonds amid the familiar scenes of the hometown, demonstrating that there is opportunity here for individuals, possessing initiative and ability.

Like so many self-made men who have scaled the heights in this community and in America, including many Presidents of the United States, Mr. English started life in modest circumstances. This humble beginning proved no handicap; if anything, it was an asset, for it provided him with added incentive to make good. We like to think that the training and discipline he received in the circulation end of this newspaper was a factor in his success.

Apart from the apprenticeship he served with this publication, his business career has been linked entirely with Planters and, more recently, with the Miners National Bank of Wilkes-Barre as a member of the board of directors. His steady progress at Planters until he finally headed the firm is a success story in the finest American tradition.

As one of the early associates of Amedeo Obici and Mario Peruzzi, founders of the firm, he was the logical man to succeed them when they passed on. For more than a quarter century, he had borne heavy responsibilities, as Mr. Obici and Mr. Peruzzi leaned heavily on him and were guided by his judgment. The fact that they delegated to him increasing authority was evidence of their confidence.

It does not detract in the least from the achievements of the founders to say that Frank English made a considerable contribution to the success of Planters which grew from a local into an international concern. Perhaps more than any individual, Mr. English was responsible for its modernization. He possessed both courage and foresight.

Greater Wilkes-Barre also knew Mr. English as a loyal son whose departure from the local scene will leave a void not easy to fill.

Speaker Rayburn's Talk on Labor Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, all of the legislative wisdom gained in his more than 46 years in the House of Representatives he so dearly loves was summed up last night in a most important address the Honorable SAM RAYBURN delivered to the American people.

The gentleman from Texas spoke on the eve of what is likely to be the most important debate of this session.

His plea was for justice and reason rather than passion and emotionalism in enactment of legislation for labor-management reform.

As the gentleman so aptly put it, "to cut out the cancer of corruption we use a surgeon's scalpel instead of a butcher's cleaver."

Unfortunately, however, there are all too many forces now at work using this serious debate on the subject of reform to mount a shortsighted attack on the entire collective bargaining structure.

They are using the broad cleaver recklessly. Instead of curing one cancer

they would create many more throughout the entire fabric of labor-management relations which has served this country so well.

If ours is to be a responsible legislative purpose in this debate, we must confine ourselves to efforts to cure corruption without harm to those honorable devices which decent working men and women have been using for years to improve their livelihoods.

In the hope that it will keep us on the path of responsible legislative purpose, I commend its reading to every Member of this House.

(For Mr. RAYBURN's speech, see remarks of Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, pp. 14201-14202 of House proceedings for today.)

Mark American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, at the request of my constituent, John J. Shaughnessy, I place in the Appendix of the RECORD his correspondence and an editorial from the July 4, 1959, issue of the Tablet, as follows:

BROOKLYN, N.Y., July 16, 1959.

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MULTER: Enclosed is copy of letter written by my son, one of your constituents, which is self-explanatory.

There is also a clipping of the editorial "Mark American Scandal," which appeared in the July 4 issue of the Tablet.

Inasmuch as there has been no reply or even acknowledgment in over 60 days, it is evident, as past experience has shown, that the White House staff will not permit this matter to be brought to the personal attention of the President. In fact I was informed that it was impossible to do so.

Actually the combined efforts of the Catholic War Veterans and the Ancient Order of Hibernians on a national level; segments of the American Legion from whom I was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal for Americanism, and the Diocesan Union of Holy Name Societies of this diocese have been unsuccessful in achieving this purpose.

Therefore, I respectfully urge you to insert both items in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or read the material on the floor of the Congress.

If you do, and I trust you will, I should like to know the cost of reprinting 1,250,000 copies of the tear-sheet(s) by the Government Printing Office as I have received thus far more than 1,200,000 communications.

Thanking you in advance,

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN J. SHAUGHNESSY.

BROOKLYN, N.Y., May 15, 1959.

Subject: John J. Shaughnessy, "Mark American," 2800 86th Street, Brooklyn 23, N.Y.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This is written without the knowledge or consent of the subject.

John J. Shaughnessy is my father, but even if he were a stranger I would have to

respect him. Right or wrong, wise or mistaken he set forth a course for duty and honor and no honest man can say he did not remain faithful to his trust.

Nearly 6 years ago you approved the unanimous declared policy of the Congress, evidenced in U.S. Senate Concurrent Resolution 40, 1st session, 83d Congress, which called upon all American producers and merchants to advertise American goods exported by affixing on all external containers, the phrase, "U.S. of America" in "indelible print of a suitable size."

At the same time you called upon your Commerce Department who was charged by the Congress with implementing this policy to request your entire executive branch to assist in giving it full effect. The record shows a deadpan view of fumbling, quibbling, and procrastination by all concerned.

Here is the story in brief: The Pentagon has not and seemingly will not affix the desired inscription on containers of the staggering quantity of American-made goods shipped all over the world for troop support. The foreign-aid agency, ICA, uses, in the main, a paper label originally designed by Paul Hoffman, with a central device "clashed hands" which was added by Harold Stassen. The Pentagon follows the same pattern on mutual defense cargo without the central device. This method was severely criticized in the official organ of the American marking industry as "worthless" and "a slick way to dupe the American people." The Department of Agriculture, custodian of our surplus food stocks does not require identification of American origin in accordance with the congressional edict on the surplus food sold or exchanged to foreign or domestic claimants. The only exception is the food donated or transferred to voluntary relief agencies, and even this is seldom properly identified because of the mandatory use of "clashed hands" symbol with the insignificant sized lettering and the similarity of the emblem to that of the one used by the Communists which the New York Times reported amazed the Germans.

What is the explanation for this? Look back a moment. Consider the key to the congressional "mark American" resolution. It simply provides for affixing the inscription "U.S. of America," in indelible print of a suitable size. It does not require the use of emblems or symbols which by their nature are expensive, and more important, in the testimony of experts worthless for the purpose intended.

Indeed, as I have is from my father, the requirements of the congressional resolution can be met without cost on all Government procured cargo if the Federal procuring officials would add a single line to the standard marking instructions calling upon vendors or suppliers to insert the phrase "U.S. of America" in bold, legible, and indelible lettering. This should be placed in an outstanding position on each container, unit, intermediate and master, preferably on both of the largest sidewalls.

This would permit complete adherence to the expressed intent of the Congress and save the taxpayers a tremendous amount of money which is presently being wasted by the Pentagon and ICA.

More than 3½ years ago my father was separated from Government service after long and faithful employment. The reason given was "economy." But he says the reason was that he refused to "desist" in inviting attention to the lack of proper action on the part of responsible officials to follow through on your orders to give full effect to the worthy measure to "mark American." He was upheld and your officials refused, as to the lack of implementation of the congressional resolution, after a hearing before the U.S. Senate Interstate and

Foreign Commerce Committee on April 10, 1956.

Yet, despite this confirmation of his veracity, his former employer, the Department of the Army, has failed to reinstate him although you are told they have made intensive efforts to do so.

Pointedly, the attached photostatic copy of a letter forwarded by the Army in reply to a letter addressed to you by the highly respected president of the Sportsmen's Club of Sheepshead Bay will give you an insight into buckpassing. The Under Secretary "has directed" it is said. Now you know and all of us who served in the military knows that if the Secretary issued a directive—that's it—period. There are no ifs, ands, or buts. So somebody is being kidded and since a copy of the aforesaid letter from the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel went back to you and more than 2 months elapsed without action, it has to be you.

May I urge you to take a long searching look into this?

Cordially yours,

JOHN J. SHAUGHNESSY, Jr.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., March 13, 1959.

MR. FREDERICK ALMOND,
Brooklyn, N.Y.

DEAR MR. ALMOND: I have been asked to reply to your letter to the President, dated February 21, 1959.

For a considerable period of time the Department of the Army has been making an intensive effort to find employment for Mr. Shaughnessy in the New York area. The problem is especially difficult at this time, since Army installations throughout that area are currently undergoing reductions in force. The Under Secretary of the Army has directed, however, that Mr. Shaughnessy be contacted with respect to any suitable vacancy that occurs in the future.

Your interest in Mr. Shaughnessy is appreciated.

Very truly yours,

R. H. WILLEY,
Director of Civilian Personnel.

[From the Tablet, July 4, 1959]

MARK-AMERICAN SCANDAL

If we've made no recent mention of the case of John J. Shaughnessy, of Brooklyn, founder of the congressionally approved campaign to mark all exports "made in the United States of America," it's not because we've lost interest. It's because there've been no new developments.

When the congressional resolution was "sabotaged by inaction," Mr. Shaughnessy said so publicly, and was told to shut up or else. When he refused, the veteran civil service employee found his job abolished in 1955 "for reasons of economy," and he's been getting the runaround from the Government ever since.

A long list of "phony" excuses and broken promises preceded the declaration of March 13, 1959, that "the Under Secretary of the Army has directed that Mr. Shaughnessy be contacted with respect to any suitable vacancy that occurs in the future . . . in the New York area."

On June 9, Mr. Shaughnessy was offered a job, if he were willing to move his family to Alexandria, Va., and accept almost \$50 a week less than he was entitled to. He branded the offer as a "fake" and insisted officials knew he would not accept before they wrote to him.

And so the scandal drags on, with the Brooklyn patriot having the support of every veterans, fraternal, and religious group which has investigated his case but, unfortunately, no support from the Government which he served with distinction in war and in peace.

Publishers' Second-Class Mail Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

MR. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I feel impelled to rise in reply to the recent remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES] entered in the Record on July 28, 1959, in support of H.R. 8433, introduced by him on that date to place an annual limitation on what he calls publishers' second-class mail subsidies.

The gentleman takes the flat position that the present second-class rate structure affords an unjustified subsidy to newspaper and magazine publishers.

I think it is only fair to call to the attention of the House, at the outset, the fact that the cost statistics which ornament the gentleman's remarks are supplied by the Post Office Department, itself.

The publishers have time and again demonstrated the illusory character of the Department's cost-accounting system. But it is not necessary to rely on the publishers alone for this demonstration.

A study of the record will show that this House has long ago learned that it must guard itself against so-called Post Office statistics.

As recently as 1954, the Post Office Department conducted a survey based on over 2,000 interviews, the questions asked being, in the opinion of Congressman DAWSON, of Illinois, chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, so framed as to bring out what the Department wanted to prove.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, that committee found, as stated in its 1956 report—House Report No. 2914, 84th Congress, 2d session, page 9—that "the timing of the survey to coincide with congressional consideration of legislation proposed by the Post Office Department to increase postage rates," and the circumstances surrounding its confection, "strongly support the conclusion that the survey was made and distributed" in direct violation of title 18, United States Code, section 1913.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not aware of the total unreliability of data supplied to the Congress by the Post Office Department, for he asserted categorically, in his remarks in support of his bill, that what he calls subsidies to the publishers—and I quote his own words—"are carefully hidden in the overall bookkeeping operations of the Post Office Department"—page 12377.

For my own part, Mr. Speaker, I am entirely satisfied that it is really the excess revenues received by the Post Office Department over the cost of handling second-class mail matter, which, in the words of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, "are carefully hidden in

the overall bookkeeping operations of the Post Office Department."

The system of accounting employed by the Post Office Department simply does not give appropriate consideration to the relatively low cost of handling second-class mail, which a proper accounting system would show.

For instance, the Post Office accounting system fails to take into account, the fact that, to save time, many publishers themselves transport a large part of their newspapers from the place of publication thereof, to delivering post offices; so that the Post Office Department, while collecting second-class mail rates for the entire transportation service, performs no part of it whatever except minimal ultimate terminal delivery.

It must be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that the present system of high zone rates on second-class mail matter, had its genesis in 1917, as a measure to raise revenue for the First World War.

That bill was not referred to the Post Office Committee of this House for consideration. It went to the Committee on Ways and Means, as a revenue measure.

As stated by one of my distinguished predecessors from Louisiana in this House, the Honorable J. Zach Sparring, of New Orleans, the 1917 postal revenue statute "was a war measure to seek additional income from any and every source possible, including the Post Office Department"; and he said that the publishers were to be commended for their patriotic attitude, because they "did not, at the time of the increases, make any complaint"—volume 69, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 5783.

But, Mr. Speaker, even at the time that the first of these measures to raise revenue through increases in second-class mail rates was being considered in this House, the principle of keeping those rates low to conform to our concept of a free press was being emphasized.

At that time, for instance, Congressman Mondell, of Wyoming, called the attention of the House to the fact that—

We have here established a rule common to all English-speaking people the world over, common to democracies the world over of treating the dissemination of news, of ideas, of literature differently from the manner in which we treat the transportation of cotton and bacon and ham. (55 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 2769.)

At the same time, Congressman Mann, of Illinois, pointed out (55 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 2765-2766):

We spend every year in the United States hundreds of millions of dollars in primary education and a very large amount in college education for the youths. But the great educational force of the country is in the newspapers and magazines. . . . Now, no one would suggest that we close our schools by taxation for this purpose and spend it on the war. . . . The circulation of the newspapers and magazines throughout the country, with their advertisements, has contributed more to the growth of business in this country, unparalleled in the world, than any other single factor. . . . We can raise sufficient money in other ways, without endeavoring to lay the heavy hand of taxation upon those influences which have worked from the start for the best interests of the country.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no question that proper accounting will show that present second-class mail rates, with their special zone rates on advertising, are substantially in excess of the cost of handling mail matter of the second class in the post offices of the country.

Advertising, Mr. Speaker, is the great force primarily responsible for the freedom and independence of our press from undesirable influences.

As conceded by the gentleman from Pennsylvania in his address to this House just a few days ago—page 13277—"actually, the subscribers to these magazines would eventually pay for the increased postage costs."

Mr. Speaker, it is the subscribers to the newspapers and magazines who are paying the tax presently levied in the form of excess second-class postal rates on the advertising content of publications passing through the mails.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this tax on advertising is an infringement of the freedom of the press guaranteed by our Constitution to those subscribers.

And I submit further, Mr. Speaker, that any contemplated increase in overall second-class postage rates, even in the guise of a limitation on so-called publishers' second-class mail subsidies, would be an aggravated infringement of the same fundamental constitutional guarantee.

Our Wonderful Giveaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the president of the National Federation of Independent Business, Mr. C. Wilson Harder, provides some views on the multi-billion-dollar foreign giveaway program that ought to be given attention by Congress and the taxpayers who foot the bills.

I am pleased to present these views by Mr. Harder:

In the days of Kipling's British Empire whenever some colonial galloped up to report "Sahib, sahib, the natives are restless," a battalion of the Right Royal Foot Fusiliers, or some such outfit would be rushed to the scene where it would be handled with no nonsense.

But the Empire has a much better way these days. If the colonial natives are not happy, the U.S. Treasury, supplied with dollars from taxes on American free enterprise, rushes into the breach to save colonialism and its profits for the Empire.

At least this is all indicated in the report for 1958 just published by the International Cooperation Administration, or ICA, the current name for Washington's huge foreign giveaway operation.

It is interesting to note that at the end of 1958, ICA listed over 11,000 employees of which more than 9,000 were overseas somewhere, and 143, classified as "unassigned complement" were presumably sitting around waiting for somebody to dream up a nice new boondoggle for them.

But this is not really the great paradox when the U.S. public seems to have accepted, at least by default, the fact that billions are being thrown around the world.

But what really throws the chicken feathers in the fan is the reported fact that ICA has people on duty in British Guiana, British Honduras, Jamaica, Surinam, and Trinidad. ICA also has some people in British East Africa. In addition, there are a sizable number in some of the French colonies.

Now there may be some excuse for American giveaway experts to be in Trinidad. Not many years ago it was understood the favorite song down there was rum and Coca-Cola. Now apparently there is no shortage of rum down there, but perhaps they need some free Coca-Cola.

Thus, the Nation comes face to face with one of the weirdest facts of all about the entire weird worldwide giveaway programs.

There is perhaps some excuse for helping out in a small, undeveloped independent nation that could use a friendly hand right now. But to go into other nation's colonies with ICA "fast buck" boys seems quite absurd.

The whole colonial system was based on the colonizing nation making a little profit out of the natives. If there was no profit, either the world power pulled out, or else sold to some other nation that figured it could do with the extra land.

In fact, the United States picked up considerable choice real estate this way such as the lands in the Louisiana Purchase, Alaska, the Virgin Islands, to mention some.

It is perhaps unfortunate this giveaway gimmick wasn't thought of many years ago, because if it had, Texas might still be a Mexican colony, Davy Crockett would have lived to kill more bear, and the Alamo would have been ICA headquarters to pass out fresh new U.S. tax money every time the natives got restless. It would almost seem the early leaders who made this Nation great were either short of vision, or short of cash.

The Blackmail Game Continues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues a penetrating analysis of a new twist in the propaganda put forth by Egypt's dictator, Gamal Abdel Nasser. This analysis appeared in the latest issue of Prevent World War III, No. 54, summer, 1959, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., a nonprofit educational organization, located at 515 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N.Y. Under the title "The Blackmail Game Continues," Prevent World War III reveals the shallowness and hypocrisy of Nasser's latest claim to be the great bulwark against Soviet infiltration in the Middle East. As all of us know, it was Nasser who, in furthering his Pan-Arabic ambitions, helped in no small way to open the Middle East to Soviet subversion. Now, he professes to be the great expert on Communist penetration and is trying to convince the West of his reliability. Meanwhile, as the article shows, Nasser continues his anti-Western propaganda and seeks to

discredit the United States and her allies both, in the Middle East and in Africa.

I believe that this article deserves to be studied by all security-minded Americans.

THE BLACKMAIL GAME CONTINUES

Under a full spread headline on its front page, the New York World Telegram and Sun carried a warning from President Nasser that the Soviet Union was out to swallow up the Middle East, Africa, and South America (April 16, 1959). Taking the form of an exclusive interview with Scripps-Howard correspondent, Henry N. Taylor, Nasser's sensational revelations were obviously intended to produce a maximum impact on American public opinion. Yet, we have the feeling that his bombshell turned out to be a dud.

The spectacle of Nasser assuming the role of the great expert on Communist aims and objectives, and educating the West on this subject is almost laughable. As though the West has been asleep all of these years while the tentacles of communism have reached out for new prey.

SUDDEN AWAKENING

Why this sudden awakening by Cairo's strongman? What brings him to the position that he must now pose as the great crusader against bolshevism after having spent so many romantic moments in Moscow's embrace? In a sense the answer is remarkably simple: Nasser is in trouble. His dreams of empire are beginning to lose their luster as his prospective victims seem to take on new strength. The Kings of Morocco, Libya, and Jordan, no longer appear to be trembling. He has been thoroughly repudiated and defied by Bourguiba, the President of Tunisia. His subversive adventures in Lebanon of last year came to naught as that proud people showed no intention of falling under Nasser's heel. Syria, the so-called northern province of the United Arab Republic, is a smoldering volcano. In repeated efforts to unseat Premier Kassim, of Iraq, Nasser found the way blocked at every turn. For this failure he has not only become the target of scorn and derision throughout Iraq, but his stature in the Middle East has also been drastically reduced. The would-be superman has become flesh.

Added to these fiascos is the souring romance with the Soviets. This can very well end the generous handouts that he has received from Moscow. As the New York Times (April 4, 1959) observed, "Nasser was the hero of the Arab world. Today he is virtually isolated."

It is precisely at this time that Nasser turns to the West—just like the peddler who fails to sell the coat that is shopworn, but turns it inside out hoping that it will now attract a new buyer. The anti-Communist line of Nasser is that and nothing more. For Nasser to pose as a friend of the West—as one who is very much concerned over U.S. interests in the Middle East—is the height of hypocrisy.

ANTI-U.S. PROPAGANDA

The organs of the Cairo propaganda machine are a most reliable indicator of Nasser's real attitudes toward the West. The hatred poured out by Cairo propagandists is in a class by itself. Indeed, many of the attacks against the President of the United States and the late Secretary of State Dulles, are so low as to be unprintable.

Because most Americans are "from Missouri" it is necessary to show them in black and white the boundless hate against the United States and the West which pours forth from Cairo. Here are some statements chosen at random.

Radio Cairo presents the United States to the Arab world as a venal Nation of colonialists. In this connection, the Wall Street

Journal August 14, 1958 quoted from the Egyptian radio commentator, Mohammad Sahaf, "Since the end of World War II the policy of the American Government turned against all liberation movements in all parts of the world, fighting against the free leaders of oppressed nations and killing those who showed a tendency of being a headache to the plans of American imperialism."

Another Cairo commentator, Mohammad Abdel Kader, described the United States as being "made of the refuse of all nations of the world molded together into a solid mass of crime and grafts and corruption." He described U.S. Middle Eastern policy as "the policy of political prostitution and vagrancy of those gathered in America from the scum of the earth."

NASSER SPEAKS

Nasser himself has displayed his venom against the United States on a number of occasions. In a statement to an Egyptian newspaper (Sept. 9, 1957), he denounced the United States and accused it of trying to dominate the Middle East under cover of the growing Communist danger in that area. "I experienced American policy for 5 years," he said. He concluded "that those 5 years taught him that the United States had one plan above all, that is, to convert the Middle East into an American zone of influence."

On February 27, 1958, Nasser delivered a speech harping on the theme that the Arab people were being sold down the river by a clique of Arab collaborators of imperialism. These so-called collaborators, Nasser screamed, were betraying their country so as to please their imperialist masters and the dollar.

On April 9, 1958, Nasser told a correspondent for the Columbia Broadcasting System that the United States was "giving itself rights which the old empires gave themselves when they asked countries which they dominated by force of arms, about everything they want in their towns and villages." Concluding his remarks in this particular interview, Nasser said, "the United States regards itself the natural heir to the colonialists in the Middle East." It should be noted that this interview with a U.S. correspondent took place just about a year before his latest statement on how concerned he was over the U.S. position in the Middle East vis-a-vis the Soviets.

On September 3, 1958, Nasser publicly denounced U.S. policy in the Far East and accused the United States of direct aggression against Communist China.

"All that America announces and all the reiteration of its propaganda machine in this respect are but a misleading pose and hocus-pocus. The statements made by Rountree and other American officials will not deceive us, because we have experienced American policy, its trends, and its crimes against us and humanity as a whole. . . .

"If we review the steps taken by Washington—namely, enabling CARE to offer meals to Egyptian students and resuming participation in the program to improve rural services—and also review the steps which we are supposed to take in return, we realize that these ridiculous moves should not be cited as a means of rectifying the many wrongs committed by the United States, which has caused aggression, war, bloodshed, and world tension." (Radio Cairo, Dec. 11, 1958.)

"Western imperialism has been the obstacle to peaceful coexistence." (Al-Gomhouriya, Cairo daily, quoted by Radio Cairo, Jan. 7, 1959.)

"It is expected that President Eisenhower will inform Mikoyan that the Western allies are not prepared to leave Berlin or make a neutral state out of Germany. This was a proposal submitted by the U.S.S.R., aimed at the unification of Germany and its transformation into a neutral state.

"This Western attitude is intransigent. . . . It confirms that Western policy is imperialistic and exploitative, and that it aims at the perpetuation of international tension which might lead to a clash and war." (Cairo newspaper, Ash-Shab, Jan. 12, 1959.)

We could go on quoting from Nasser's statements and from the Government-controlled press and radio where the United States is taken to task and smeared as the chief exploiter of the Arabs. However, we think the above quotes are sufficient to show the direction of Nasser's thinking.

AFRICA

Now that we have shown how deep rooted and bitter is Cairo's hatred toward the West in general, and the United States in particular, we can proceed to examine the essential points made by Nasser in his interview with the New York World Telegram correspondent. Nasser declared that the Communists were not only plotting to take over the Middle East and the virgin continent of Africa, but would employ these conquests as a springboard to South America and thus isolate the United States. As though our State Department has been unaware of Communist designs. While Nasser sheds crocodile tears for the fate of the United States, he has been conspiring to do the very same things which he charges to his erstwhile Communist friends.

That Nasser regards the continent of Africa as Cairo's special preserve is a notorious fact. Nasser has alluded to this in his own book, "The Philosophy of Revolution," and it will be found in other authoritative Egyptian sources. In the No. 52 issue of Prevent World War III, the society dealt at length with this subject under the title "Africa: Egypt's Dream of Empire." The sources cited in that article describe Egypt's plans to take over Africa under the guise of liberating the black man from white colonial rule.

Africa's place in Nasser's dream of empire was made clear by the authoritative Egyptian newspaper, Al Goumhouria, "Let Egypt breed and multiply itself. Egypt is destined to expand, to develop and to bloom. We have to look toward the future and not the present. Let us not forget that we live in an underpopulated Africa whose vast expanse with all of its economic potential will at some future time be in our possession."

The Cairo Weekly "Akher Saa" (February 18, 1959) wrote "the Territory of the Arab states can expand along the Nile into the heart of the African continent, and by way of Sudan they will be able to penetrate into those countries still under imperialist influence and help them throw off the foreign yoke."

The Cairo propaganda machine works around the clock inciting Africans against the white population. The incitements go beyond all the bounds of ordinary propaganda. They encourage murder, assassination, arson, and sabotage. It is significant, too, that this propaganda has more and more cast the United States in the role of chief exploiter of the African peoples. Here are some choice statements broadcast to Africa in Swahili, one of the most widely spoken of African languages.

"The European imperialist states have found that there is no way to repay their wealthy colleague, America, but to lower their poverty-stricken buckets down the African wells of riches and plenty. America is a real Jew in matters of lending and extorting usurious interest, and as the debt owed it by European states mounts daily and repayment prospects are slender, it has become necessary to make room for America in those parts of Africa dominated by European states which are indebted to America, so that Americans can take a hand in the companies' and governments' plans aimed at squeezing the wealth from Africa at the price of poverty for us Africans" (February 2, 1958).

In a broadcast in Arabic to the Middle East (December 1, 1958) Cairo propaganda contrasted the roles of the Soviet Union and Red China and that of the United States in Africa: "The events in the Congo should be an eye opener to other imperialists dominating the African countries. The outcome is known to these imperialist dogs who are always blaming communism to conceal their own domination. * * *

"Peoples of Africa, open your eyes, wake up, be united, make a joint step forward, wage war on the imperialists and wage war on the dogs who are sucking your blood and squeezing your wealth. Do not give in before the aggression of the white dog."

In another broadcast (December 8, 1958), the United States was denounced as the "spearhead" of imperialism. Discussing the African "liberation" movement, this broadcast said: "American imperialism has in fact begun to make serious attempts to dominate this ancient continent. For this purpose it has established war bases in many African countries and concluded agreements with its imperialist allies through which it will exploit the abundant oil wealth in the Algerian desert."

Thus, while Nasser sounds the alarm against Communist penetration in Africa, his own agents are moving forward and doing everything possible to defame U.S. motives in the eyes of the African peoples.

INTRIGUE IN SOUTH AMERICA

Nasser's concern for the U.S. position in South America is also phony. From time to time Cairo reports conditions of alleged exploitation in South America at the hands of the North American "imperialists." When Vice President Nixon was stoned by mobs during his South American tour last year, the Cairo propagandists could hardly contain their glee.

An example of how Cairo looks upon South America may be seen from a report in the newspaper, *Ash-Shab* (March 5, 1959). Discussing anti-U.S. demonstrations in Bolivia, this Nasser mouthpiece alleged that Bolivia is merely a military base for the Pentagon and dominated by "American monopolies." The newspaper further stated: "The people of Bolivia revolt in order to get rid of slavery, domination and American exploitation. In fact, the revolution of the Bolivian people is a part of the comprehensive revolution of all the States of Latin America, aimed at ridding themselves of the domination and exploitation of the United States. The Bolivian people will undoubtedly attain their aim. Neither America's military base nor its monopolizing domination will be of use to it. And this will not succeed in stopping the wheel of historical evolution. The people will inevitably be victorious and will lead a liberated honorable life."

The phraseology could have easily appeared in Moscow's *Pravda*. Nor is this all. Nasser hopes to embarrass the United States by trying to influence the oil policy of South American governments. Just as Nasser seeks to control the oil resources of the Middle East so as to place western Europe at his mercy, so does he envisage the day when the United States will be placed in the same position with respect to oil imports from South America.

As everyone knows, Nasser has been a violent opponent of the Baghdad Pact. At the opening session of the Union Council of the UAR in the fall of last year Nasser declared: "We thank God that this meeting has been convened at a time when the Baghdad Pact, which was created to sow dissension in the Arab nation, destroy it, and render it weak, has itself been destroyed." This is a typical Nasser diatribe against the pact. He has scorned at the idea that the pact was designed to prevent further Communist expansion. As a matter of fact, it

was precisely Nasser's fanatical opposition and intrigue against the pact that brought him into the good graces of Moscow. Ever since Moscow and Cairo have closely cooperated to undermine the foundations of the pact and so open the gates to Communist infiltration in the Middle East.

However, in his World Telegram interview, Nasser pretends to be very much concerned, lest the pact be seriously weakened by Soviet intrigue! Conveniently forgetting what he has told the Arab masses over the years, i.e., that the Baghdad Pact was primarily aimed against them, Nasser told his interviewer that the Pact's purpose was to "contain Communism within Russia, Eastern Europe and China." Only a facile tongue could portray the Baghdad Pact as a grave sin against the Arab people and then praise it as a bulwark against communism.

The interview in the World-Telegram is studded with pleas that the United States "meet Arab nationalism half way. * * * Does Nasser forget that it was the United States, above all, which supported his coup d'Etat in 1953? Does he forget that it was the United States who persuaded the British to leave Suez? Does he forget that it was the United States which played a decisive role in stopping the Anglo-French military action in 1956? Finally, does he forget that it was the United States which has contributed tens of millions of dollars in aid to Arab States, including Egypt?"

The fact is that the United States has been a consistent champion of the rights of the Arab peoples. The United States has more than met Arab nationalism more than "half way." But how long can any self respecting state submit to the blackmail concealed under nationalistic slogans? The brand of nationalism emanating from Egypt is soaked through and through with a ferocious hatred toward the West and the United States.

NASSER'S ECONOMIC HEADACHES

Just as he has become more isolated politically, so does Nasser find his economic position in difficult straits. As noted by the *Christian Science Monitor* (April 23, 1959), Cairo's foreign exchange resources stand in danger of being wiped out. Due to Nasser's commercial policies, Egypt has now been brought "very close to what, in the West, would be called bankruptcy." This, too, explains his sudden discovery of Communists all around him. It is a line with which he hopes to attract more American dollars.

There was a time when Cairo regarded American aid as the means by which countries have lost their freedom. Less than a month before Nasser gave his interview, one of his commentators declared "There is no difference between dollar and ruble slavery" (March 29, 1959). However, Nasser's financial difficulties have impelled him to swallow his "principles." He told Mr. John A. Kennedy, publisher of the *Sioux Falls Argus Leader* (New York Times, May 19, 1959), that he welcomed American private investment in Egypt. As regards needed funds for the completion of Egypt's 5-year development plan, Nasser said "we will take that money from anywhere we can get it."

The blackmail contained in this last statement is implicit. Indeed, in the New York World-Telegram interview, he declared that unless the United States showed more understanding toward Cairo, Communist and Arab policy would "very likely" coincide again. This gives the real game away. For Nasser, in his desperate situation, is willing to strike any and all kinds of bargains. Nevertheless, he is careful not to burn his bridges. Obviously, if he cut himself off completely from Moscow, his bargaining power with the West would become nil, just as his value in Moscow's eyes would be considerably reduced, were he to turn completely to the West.

It is an old and a most profitable game that has been played over and over again by unscrupulous dictators and demagogues.

WORKING BOTH SIDES

That Nasser knows how to work both sides of the street needs hardly to be demonstrated by this time. In 1958, during his visit to the Soviet Union, he told Khrushchev: "We have found friends in the Soviet Union, selfless cooperation without any conditions or obligations degrading our national dignity."

On January 1, 1959, Nasser sent the following cable in reply to a greeting from Khrushchev: "I have gratefully and appreciatively received your cable, which carried on your behalf and on the behalf of the Soviet Government the truest congratulations and noblest feelings on the occasion of the signing of the High Dam agreement between the Soviet Union and the UAR delegations. The Soviet Union's real assistance and appreciated effort in this respect is met by us with veneration and esteem."

As regards Soviet aid to Egypt, Nasser told the Indian magazine *Blitz*: "I can say without reservation that I do not remember any event in which they tried to exploit the hardships which face us."

Parenthetically, it should be noted that it was in this same interview with the Indian magazine that Nasser dusted off Hitler's pet libel against the Jews, the so-called protocols of Zion.

NASSERISM UNMASKED

It is an oversimplification to explain the present split between Moscow and Cairo on the basis of communism versus anticommunism. The slogans should not blind us to the fact that this is a power struggle between Soviet imperialistic designs and the empire builder from Cairo. When Nasser denounces Khrushchev for "interference in our affairs" he really means that the Soviet Premier has put a serious crimp in his plans to absorb Iraq. Yet, even in denouncing Khrushchev he complained that the Kremlin showed no appreciation for the fact that he, above all, prevented the establishment of Western missile bases "aimed against the Socialist world and the Communist world." On the other hand, in his interview in the World Telegram, Nasser chided the United States for failing to appreciate the fact that through his taking over of Syria, Communist domination of that country was averted. Thus, we find Nasser speaking through both sides of his mouth as only a dictator can do. The fact that Nasser can make these switches with such ease, shows how utterly bereft he is of principle.

The former commander of the Arab Legion, John Glubb, wrote "Colonel Nasser is personally charming. He is delightfully frank and sincere in appearance, but he is always telling lies."

It is in the nature of Nasser's leadership that he must keep the pot boiling. Those in the West who may be impressed by Nasser's latest crusade, ought to keep in mind a wise observation made not so long ago by Walter Lippmann with respect to Nasser: "The crux of the Nasser problem is that his position in Egypt and his influence in the Arab world would soon collapse if he agreed to negotiate and to abide by settlements with the Western nations. He must remain in rebellion against them, never for long allowing the conflict to subside. He needs the tension of international, indeed of interracial, struggle. He needs it to maintain among the Arab masses the image of himself as their champion. He needs the tension also for his political survival at home, to divert his rivals who conspire against him, and as a distraction for the people."

Appendix

Continuance of Interstate Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, there is growing concern in the State of Missouri over the failure of the Congress to provide legislation to assure the continuance of the interstate highway program. I have often expressed my own concern in press reports to Missouri newspapers and there has resulted a ground swell of public opinion which is reflected in many newspaper editorials published in Missouri newspapers.

This is, of course, a problem of national scope but I would like to call to the attention of the Senate the ever-mounting fear of Missourians that the dream of a vast system of high-speed, interstate highways is to be left to wither away. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several Missouri newspaper editorials.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Joplin (Mo.) Globe, July 30, 1959]

VOTE HIGHWAY FUNDS

It is to be hoped that Congress before it adjourns will get around to bolstering the highway-building fund so that construction of the Interstate System can proceed along the lines intended. If there is to be such a system built there should be no piddling around about it.

Already the failure of Congress to act has resulted in some disruption of road planning in Missouri, as in other States. For example, the State highway commission has canceled a contract letting scheduled for this week because the backlog of Federal funds is not sufficient to guarantee payment of the Government's share in the projects.

Results of such action could become very serious, and quickly. While present projects will be completed, the fact that no new ones will be started will disrupt planning by contractors and result eventually in a layoff of employees.

A direct result, too, and one that would affect Cape Girardeau would be the reduction in the demand for cement crushed stone and similar products used in highway construction.

Since Missouri has been at the front among the States cooperating in getting the Interstate system underway the effect of the dwindling Federal money supply is being felt earlier, but what has happened in this State will also occur in all the others.

This being true, then Congress ought to be doing something and not let the road program bog down. It is going to take a long time to finish it anyway and it ought not be

delayed by obstacles that can be overcome if the legislators are so minded.

[From the Cape Girardeau Southeast Missourian, July 29, 1959]

HIGHWAY SLOWDOWN IS HERE

Unless Congress acts speedily at this session to provide more interstate highway funds, projected construction work on the interstate route between Joplin and Springfield will be delayed. Also retarded will be widening and resurfacing of highway 66 from Joplin to the Kansas State line, on the primary system.

This sad state of affairs, to bring it down to the local effects, results from the stalemate in Washington. It is confirmed by William M. Robertson, a Joplin member of the State highway commission, following drastic action earlier this week by Rex M. Whitton, chief engineer of the highway department, in ordering postponement of upcoming contract lettings in all parts of the State, by authority of the commission.

It comes down to this situation. The Federal trust fund out of which comes appropriations to reimburse the States for the Federal road work is going broke. And, since the State cannot depend upon drawing future funds from it, the State must curtail Federal aid construction contracts. The situation is further complicated in Missouri because the recent legislature refused the highway department a gas tax increase, even though construction and maintenance costs have skyrocketed.

This does not mean that all road work will be closed down. Projects under contract will be carried on, including the urban job on West Seventh Street in Joplin. The State highway commission simply is taking the very sound position that it cannot spend money it does not have, or is not pledged. Therefore, it is ordering a drastic slowdown until it finds out where it stands financially. It could hardly do anything else.

President Eisenhower warned Congress as early as last January of the impending interstate road crisis, with depletion of funds, and recommended an increase of 1½ cents a gallon in the Federal gasoline tax in order to carry on. As recently as this week the House Ways and Means Committee turned this proposition down.

Whether the Congress will find an alternative financing plan in the remaining weeks of the session is uncertain. The interstate program as originally set up some 3 years ago was geared to a pay-as-you-go plan which was sound. Trouble is the revenues didn't meet the cost.

It is most regrettable, but it may be that the entire Federal-State road program will have to be slowed down and spread over a longer period of years. Locally this would mean that the Joplin-Springfield link in the Interstate System, originally scheduled for completion in 1962, would have an indefinite completion date, and that other primary projects in this region would be retarded.

[From the Sedalia (Mo.) Democrat, July 30, 1959]

A ROUGH ROAD AHEAD

With Congress now on the downhill side of this session, the major pieces of legislation still remain to be enacted.

This, of course, is not a situation that makes the 86th Congress any different from

its predecessors. And it is about this time that the President may begin applying a little pressure to the recalcitrant lawmakers.

Most important legislation in this session would seem to be in the labor-management field. All parties agree that some kind of bill is needed to control abuses on both sides. This item has been kicked about the Halls of Congress since it convened last January.

President Eisenhower himself, in an interview the other day, gave it first priority among three bills he said he particularly wanted from Congress.

While disclaiming that he has any plans of drawing up a must list for Congress, the President next mentioned a 1½-cent-a-gallon increase in Federal gasoline taxes to finance continued highway construction in the massive interstate freeway system. Previously Congress had been warned that a 9-month suspension of construction might be necessary if additional revenue were not provided for. It doesn't take much imagination to realize what such a suspension will mean in the employment field across the country let alone the impact on the construction companies which geared themselves to the long-range program of highway building by investing millions in roadbuilding equipment.

Sensible answers to this phase of the national economy must necessarily be found to keep the highway programs moving. But Congress so far has tried to find some way around hiking gasoline taxes.

Third on the President's extemporaneous list was the enactment of a farm program that would control surpluses, now bulging in multimillion-dollar amounts in warehouses across the Nation. This he termed "terribly important."

This is a knotty problem that no President or Congress has been able to solve. Congress has already passed two bills—one for wheat and one for tobacco—which the President vetoed, calling them harmful to the country.

The approaching dog days of August promise to make things hot in the Nation's Capital. And it won't all be from the weather.

[From the Cape Girardeau Southeast Missourian, Aug. 1, 1959]

THE INTERSTATE ROAD SYSTEM

Many people are puzzled as to why the Federal interstate highway building program, started off with a bang by Congress a year ago, seems to be in trouble now because of lack of enthusiasm by the legislators for it. If it was needed then, that need still exists. If Congress repudiates the program then what about the pledges made to the States, like Missouri, which already has called off one contract letting because of the lack of Federal funds?

Because of the growing interest in the program, the Missourian is pleased to present the following explanation from the Kansas City Star, which may help to clear the atmosphere:

THE GREAT HIGHWAY DREAM FADES IN CONGRESS

There is immediate danger that the great national highway program may turn out to have been a political hoax. As of now it seems to be as ephemeral as the hot air given the program on Capitol Hill.

One group in Congress appears to be quite ready to shut off all Federal highway funds for 1 year and to shut down construction on the Interstate System for 2 years. These are strict adherents of the so-called trust fund which was set up to limit construction to the revenue of certain taxes that were allocated to the fund.

As a recession measure for 2 years, Congress spent far more than current tax income which some Members regarded as drawing on the future of the fund. To restore the money now would require the long suspension of road building. After the suspension the allocated taxes would produce revenue for only a little more than half the current construction rate.

If these resistant Members of Congress have their way the Federal Government won't build enough to keep up with the annual increase in motor cars. They would show no progress against traffic congestion in our generation.

The chief hope is in another group of Congressmen that wants to push full speed ahead. Yet most of these Members have hesitated to vote highway taxes to support the full program. They would like to allocate more of present motor vehicle tax money to the fund or continue to draw on the future income from general taxes. All suggested alternatives to new taxes would have the end effect of increasing the national debt.

A third congressional group proposes a compromise between the alternatives of full-scale construction and a shut-down. Congressmen of this view would latch onto enough money to keep the program going at a seriously reduced rate.

At this stage, you can't count on anything. Congress has so far failed to produce the money to back \$500 million of commitments made to the State last year. If it doesn't produce the money the States will be unable to make prompt payments for some work now under construction. Not in the many years of Federal participation has Congress ever failed to deliver the money after funds had been apportioned. Presumably it will honor its commitments this time, but nothing is certain.

Where are the dreams of yesterday? Do you remember the fine fervor of Congress when it caught the vision of a great system of expressways that would connect nearly all U.S. cities of 100,000 population? Congress set out to build by the tax method highways as fine as any ever built by tolls. But even as Congressmen talked big they chiseled on the program. They accepted unrealistically low estimates of costs and made high estimates of the income that would be produced by the skimpy taxes allocated to the fund.

A year later the wide gap between costs and income became apparent and Congress was shocked. Congressmen talked and talked about the big program but consistently refused to vote new taxes. You can't build superhighways with hot air.

[From the Jefferson City (Mo.) Post Tribune, July 5, 1959]

HIGHWAY TROUBLE AHEAD

The Federal interstate highway program is not exactly bowling along, and the Washington lawmakers can't seem to get worked up about it.

When the program was established in 1956, one of the main ideas was that it should stand on its own two feet financially.

A highway trust fund was created, and into this pour various types of highway user taxes. The legislators even wrote a provision into the law forbidding the use of general government revenues for this purpose.

At the depth of the recession, however, Congress in its anxiety to promote recovery let the program briefly tap general funds to speed construction.

That left the program with the necessity of one day paying back the money to the general treasury. On top of that, advancing prices had materially enlarged that program's total long-range cost.

Faced with this pinch, President Eisenhower recommended an increase in the Federal gasoline tax to keep interstate road-building at full tilt. But the move brought quick protest from many sources.

Congress thus far has been sternly opposed to boosting the gas tax. This means that unless it allows the program to dip liberally into general funds, the highly touted interstate system is bound to suffer serious delays.

Even at the fastest pace, the program is in danger of being outdated by America's valuing traffic volume.

This prospect is real. Any inaction or shunting of responsibility which leads to major delay is likely to compound the problem many times.

The Crisis in the Caribbean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the able Ambassador of the United States to Mexico, the Honorable ROBERT C. HILL, recently delivered an address on the Caribbean crisis before the Rotary Club of Albuquerque, N. Mex. I feel that all the Members of Congress would be interested in seeing this address and I am placing it in the Record that it might be available to them.

Ambassador Hill has done an outstanding job in Mexico and has brought to an all-time high the good feeling and mutual confidence between these two neighboring Republics. He had previously served as Ambassador to Costa Rica and San Salvador, and as Assistant Secretary of State under the late great Secretary, Hon. John Foster Dulles.

Ambassador Hill is a close student of the Caribbean and all the Latin American States, and has become one of our Government's able advisers.

The address follows:

THE CRISIS IN THE CARIBBEAN

(Remarks prepared for delivery by the Honorable Robert C. Hill, U.S. Ambassador to Mexico, before the Rotary Club of Albuquerque, N. Mex., on July 23, 1959)

When I received your kind invitation to speak before the Rotary Club of Albuquerque, I accepted the honor with pleasure. I have had many warm associations, as you may know, with your organization. Last year I had the privilege of addressing the annual convention of Rotary International in Dallas, Tex. At that time, I sat on the speaker's platform looking out at the thousands of Rotarians assembled from every corner of the free world; I listened to the reports of Rotarian global plans and accomplishments. Then—more than ever—the full significance of your motto, "Service Above Self," became important to me. Since then, never have I seen a Rotary emblem or a Rotary notice that those inspiring words—"Service Above Self"—did

not cross my mind and make me realize my own responsibility.

I was pleased to accept this invitation because it gave me an opportunity to come back to the beautiful and progressive State of New Mexico, the home of the yucca flower, the road runner, and the piñon tree. Here is a State with the friendliest of ties and a close cultural background with the Republic of Mexico, where presently I have the honor to represent the United States. My knowledge of the State of New Mexico stems first from two good friends: Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON and Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ.

Being here in Albuquerque today also brings back pleasant associations I have had with the late Representative FERNANDEZ and with Representative DEMPSEY.

When I speak of your State, I must also pay tribute to the many men and women in New Mexico who in their defense work are performing dedicated service for the United States. I also congratulate all those responsible for having brought about the tremendous progress and expansion in your State since the war.

I owe sincere thanks to the Rotary Club of Albuquerque for affording me an opportunity to discuss with you a serious problem in the Caribbean. At the present time, many responsible people in the hemisphere are concerned about Communist infiltration in this important area.

It has been my good fortune to work in Latin America for several years. As a result, I have come to respect and admire this progressive hemisphere and its people. It is an area that has an unlimited future. All of us who live in the entire Western Hemisphere have unusual opportunities if past prejudices and mistakes can be forgotten.

The peoples of this vast and powerful part of the world should strive to walk the road toward the future together—united economically, united politically, and united in our common aspirations.

The United States must do its part in the hemisphere to take the peaks and valleys out of the economic picture. Latin American countries not only want progress, they are demanding it, and it is in our deepest national interest to recognize this and to find the means to cooperate to the mutual advantage of all hemispheric nations.

To some people it may appear as though Western Hemisphere problems are less urgent than others facing the free world. In my opinion, they are no less urgent. They are of critical importance and they must be treated accordingly.

For many years, the Communists have continued their constant efforts to creep into the inner structure of governments in this hemisphere. This is the same tactic used in their efforts at subversion in Europe, the Middle East and Asia. Anyone who knows anything about communism realizes that you must be forever vigilant against Communist attempts to undermine freedoms and claim legitimate revolutions as their own.

At the present time, there exists a grave situation in the important area of the Caribbean. It has so concerned the Organization of American States that this important organization has seen fit to call a meeting of the Foreign Ministers in Santiago, Chile, in August to discuss the mounting crisis. Some of us who have labored in the hemisphere have seen communism developing for many years. At the U.S. Ambassador's Conference held in El Salvador in April of this year, the conferees adopted recommendations which led to the successful action of the Organization of American States Peace Committee in reestablishing some degree of peace and stability in certain threatened areas of the Caribbean.

The Organization of American States—this great inter-American system for preserving the peace of the hemisphere and for work-

ing cooperatively together on mutual problems—has been often described as the most solid international organization of free peoples on earth. In my opinion, this international organization deserves the support of all of us in the Western Hemisphere.

You will recall that in 1947 the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, known as the Rio Pact, was signed in Brazil by the various member nations of the Organization of American States. This treaty provides for collective action to maintain peace and security within the hemisphere and to defend the Americas against any aggression from without. This pact was a striking demonstration of the trust and confidence enjoyed among the members of the inter-American system.

The inter-American system is based on certain fundamental principles, the most important of which are: the recognition of the sovereign equality of states, the duty to settle disputes by peaceful means, and the doctrine of nonintervention—that is, that no state shall have a right to interfere in the internal affairs of another.

However, we must all of us recognize that this problem of Communist aggression against our freedom and security is one that must be brought into the open. As you know, communism is an international conspiracy bent upon the domination of the world. There is an old saying that a hound dog can't chase two rabbits at the same time. Neither can a citizen of any country serve Communist interests and those of his own nation. I say a cooperative solution must be found for combating the inroads of communism without breaking faith with the great principles upon which our inter-American system is founded.

Recently, there has been a revolution in one of the Caribbean countries, a revolution which brought in its wake considerable unrest and turmoil throughout the area. The United States has recognized this new regime and desires the friendliest of relations.

The United States has no desire to interfere in the internal affairs of this, or any other nation. But in my opinion, all responsible leaders of the hemisphere should recognize the creeping danger of communism that is presently in evidence in the Caribbean and then do something about it.

The Russian people, too, once had a democratic revolution, a revolution which surged up from the people themselves. This took place in March 1917, only to be overthrown the following November by a small group of hard-core Communist conspirators. This last was not a popular revolution of the people; it was a naked seizure of power, a coup d'etat against the democratically oriented Russian republic born the previous March of an authentic popular revolution. No amount of Communist rewriting of history, no amount of Baron Munchausen fakery and lies can ever hide that fact. In place of the infant Russian republic was erected a monolithic Soviet state, a Communist system of existence dictated by unprincipled men mad with power.

You may ask why I dwell on these historical truths. After all, that was back in 1917, some 42 years ago. Ancient history, you might almost say. But that is the crux of the matter. As time goes by, people are prone to forget the facts and tend to accept the Soviet swindle that their so-called revolution erupted from the Russian people. History proves it did not.

Through the years, we have seen this pattern repeated in many countries, with the communists seeking to take over in any revolutionary situation springing from widespread public support.

The Mexican Revolution of 1910 was the uprising of an entire nation in mass discontent. It was a true democratic revolu-

tion because it was essentially an act of the people. Here, too, the Communists tried to take over. But their efforts were defeated by the strength of this revolution of the people. Mexico kept faith with its own revolution—not one exported from an alien land.

Next year, in 1960, Mexico will celebrate the 40th anniversary of her revolution of 1910—a bright landmark in mankind's struggle for liberty and individual rights. Today, the product of this revolution is a country democratically oriented and bent upon greater progress for its people coupled with freedom and social justice. A certain nation in the Caribbean might well recognize in the Mexican Revolution a significant example for itself to follow.

There is considerable sympathy in the hemisphere for the hopes and aspirations of these peoples who are struggling to achieve the fruits of liberty. However, in this driving urge for democracy, responsible leaders must not forget the dangers that are inherent in downgrading the communist conspiracy. The history of too many countries in the world today which have lost their liberty testify to this solemn fact.

Just the other day, the President of a Caribbean country urged the youth of that country to read anti-Communist books. He said he counseled them to do this "in order to prevent the revolution from being frustrated."

What did he mean? Did he wisely recognize the possibility that the same counter-revolution might happen in his country as happened in Russia in November of 1917. Today, by the way, he is no longer in office, having been forced to resign from the revolutionary government.

The conflicts which currently disturb the entire area of the Caribbean are not new. They have been developing over the postwar period in one country after another in this area. The entire world is passing through an era of unprecedented strain. The forces of conflict, on a global basis, are very often instigated, aided, and directed by the leaders of international communism.

The Soviet Union, in pursuit of its goal for world domination, aims relentlessly at the destruction of its principal adversary, the United States of America. Here is where geography comes in, because the Americans as a unit must first be divided if Soviet domination is to be accomplished. The point of division must be at the most vulnerable spot. Hence, the special interest of the Soviets in the Caribbean area.

Following closely the techniques of Lenin, international communism often disguises itself under spurious forms of nationalism and independence, pushing aside true nationalism and independence. It can take on the cloak of antidictatorship to suit its purpose, though it is itself the most cruel dictatorship ever known. It can seize control of turbulent movements for national liberation, land reform, labor organization, and political liberty—all sound and defensible ideals in themselves—in order to gain power.

Unless we realize that Moscow is the principal directing center of revolutions—more properly called counter-revolutions—all over the world; unless we note the presence of well-trained, well-supplied, and well-paid Moscow agents in the Caribbean; unless we expose to view the wider purpose of subversive Communist propaganda to split the Americas, discredit the United States and hold back the economic development of our friendly neighbors to the south; unless we strip off the false front of these hard-core Communists, we will not know how to deal with the dangers that confront us.

Recognizing this common peril, the Ministers of Government of five Central American countries—Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica—met only

last month and mapped out steps which their countries will take collectively to strengthen their defenses against communism. These steps will be against: The infiltration of Communist agents, circulation of Communist propaganda, misuse of identification documents, and foreign financing of revolutionary groups. These are weapons long used by the Communists across all border lines and all peace-loving governments must act together to combat them.

The governments of this hemisphere know well that there is no inter-American conflict which has not and cannot yield to peaceful solutions. But the common root of many current problems is not to be found in the Americas. It is to be found in Moscow. This we must first recognize if each country, by its own means, is to take measures to combat this evil foreign ideology intent upon usurping popular victories for its own imperialistic aims.

The United States as a nation is dedicated to certain principles of liberty, principles that remain as strong and bright today as when they were first conceived.

Yet, it seems to me, these days when we are locked in a great global war of ideas, sometimes—too often—many of us are inclined to approach each new conflict negatively—even fearfully—rather than drawing strength from those very basic concepts of freedom that we know are in themselves more powerful than any blustering threat emanating from the cocktail circuit of the Kremlin.

If anyone doubts the power of these democratic ideas, let him recall that these concepts brought about our own revolution and independence in 1776. These universal ideas helped spark the French Revolution in 1789, when the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity were proclaimed throughout the motherland of France.

These ideals of liberty have contributed to the independence of many nations throughout the world and continue to this day to exert their powerful influence for true freedom, true nationalism, and true independence.

A few days ago a famed Mexican philosopher, educator, and writer died. His name was José Vasconcelos. He was a man loved, respected, and honored throughout the hemisphere. The following significant lines of his appeared in a Mexican magazine called *Hoy* a few months before his death:

"The peoples of the New World live in a productive present, and know that they are destined to lay the pattern for the future of humanity—patterns of Christian morality, social justice, and freedom; that they have no need for Marxist cooperation, because they have already overcome the sterile materialism of the latter part of the 19th century, and we are all launched upon the conquest of a better future."

God bless you public-spirited people of Albuquerque. May we work together regardless of race, color, or creed for a better tomorrow.

Biography of James S. Hogg "Must" Reading for Texans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the name James Stephen Hogg has stood for progressive, crusading good government in Texas for over 60 years.

Jim Hogg served Texas as Governor for several terms, and in his time was regarded as a dangerous leftwing radical by many conservatives, and a conservative by some of the populists of the day.

But no label could be applied to this broadminded man of vision. His great qualities—tolerance, knowledge, and trust in man's free spirit, transcended political labeling.

The problems he faced 60 years ago are still confronting us now, and to my mind, it is as beneficiary as it is interesting to examine the ways in which he met those problems.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an Associated Press article of August 6, 1959, entitled, "Biography of James S. Hogg 'Must' Reading for Texans," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, with my qualification that it is "must" reading for non-Texans as well.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHY OF JAMES S. HOGG "MUST" READING FOR TEXANS
(By Dave Cheavens)

AUSTIN.—Robert C. Cotner's biography of James Stephen Hogg should be required reading for one group of Texans, recommended reading for another.

Hogg, the first native Texan to become Governor, set an example for integrity, forthrightness, and political courage that present-day politicians might well emulate.

The book should be required reading for all legislators, district attorneys, even judges, and Members of Congress.

In the recommended reading class would be all Texans interested in public affairs. Students with an eye for future State service, should study it, along with members of Republican and Democratic county and State executive committees and campaign managers.

Cotner's book is the product of more than 10 years of painstaking research into the personal and public life of Governor Hogg. Hogg made his name in Texas history as the foe of landgrabbers and securities crooks. He fought discriminatory rate and other practices by the powerful railroad interests of the 1880-1900 period of Texas growth. Hogg brought the railroads under State regulation and was the father of today's railroad commission.

Hogg has become almost a legendary figure in Texas government and politics. Cotner has spiced some of the legends and by careful documentation traced his career from through days as a farm hand, country editor, justice of the peace, prosecutor, State attorney general and finally Governor and big-time oil operator.

In the process, Cotner interviewed scores of persons who knew Governor Hogg in all phases of his life. He read and reread Hogg's public utterances and papers. He dug into court records and carefully scanned hundreds of newspapers. Cotner's greatest difficulty in putting the book together was eliminating the nonessential from the mass of raw material. The end product is both authoritative and interesting.

The Hogg biography follows Cotner's earlier publication, "Addresses and State Papers of James Stephen Hogg," published in 1951 by the University of Texas Press. The University of Texas history professor used it extensively in tracing Hogg's political career.

One passage in the book perhaps summarizes Hogg's political philosophy.

He was attacked by conservatives as a Communist—even in that distant day. And the left-leaning populists considered him to be an overcautious conservative.

In the heated campaign for Governor in 1892, Hogg summed up the issue: "Shall the corporations or the State control Texas?" in these words:

"Nugent [the populist candidate] is for Government ownership of railroads; Clark [the conservative Democrat] is for turning them loose. I want neither, but advocate their just control and regulation through the commission."

Hogg won in what Col. E. M. House, Woodrow Wilson's close adviser, called the first firm stand by "the people of any American State against the privileged classes."

Dancey in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the 19th, 20th, and 21st articles of a series by Editor Charles L. Dancey appearing in the August 7, 8, and 9 issues of the Peoria Journal Star, respectively:

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Aug. 7, 1959]

STALINGRAD TRACTOR PLANT OFF LIMITS
DESPITE CAT LETTER
(By Charles L. Dancey)

STALINGRAD.—A new city—a new guide—a new people. The guide's name is Luba and she greeted me in a very solemn fashion advising me immediately that it would be necessary to see the Intourist manager.

We went into the service bureau and met a little old woman with a grim face, who nodded, and said, "Follow me." We went through a couple of rooms, unlocked a door, and entered an office. She sat down behind a desk, motioned me to sit, unlocked a drawer, brought out an envelope and looking me grimly in the eye handed me the letter.

It was an airmail letter with Caterpillar Tractor Co. prominently identified on the envelope.

(I later learned that the Russians call their tractors "caterpillars" and not a Russian word meaning the same thing, but the English word "caterpillar" just as we say it but with the Russian accenting. It applies to wide-track tractors.)

Inside was a very gracious letter from Harmon Eberhard, the Caterpillar president, identifying the prominent Russians who toured the Caterpillar plant at Peoria a few years back, and suggesting that the Russians could return the courtesy by permitting me to tour the tractor works at Stalingrad (biggest in the Soviet Union).

I presented it to the manager who read it without batting an eye. She read it and inquired if I wanted to view the plant. By this time, I had acquired the philosophy that it is unwise to want such things, and the more interested you are in something the more suspicious they become and more difficult it is to be at all free and see what you want.

So, I said, that as a courtesy to Mr. Eberhard, who was a very important man, I would certainly like to make such a tour so that

I could advise him that the Russians had been courteous in the same measure that we had been—but that as for myself I knew nothing about production and had little personal interest.

She advised me that it not customary to permit tourists there, that I am not an official such as those who visited the plant in Peoria, and that arrangements would be very difficult, but that she would personally call the director of the factory and make every effort to arrange a visit.

Now, I'll cheat and telescope some of the days on my log to finish the story.

A day and a half later, I was again taken to the manager and advised that it was a shame I was in Stalingrad such a short time because it would be impossible to get me to the tractor factory during my stay there. They were very busy at the factory and could not be interrupted at this particular time.

The afternoon I left Stalingrad I lunched with the first foreigner I met in that city—an Englishman who had arrived that morning.

"Have you seen anything yet?" I asked. "Oh, yes," he said. "This morning they took me through the big tractor factory."

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Aug. 8, 1959]

THE FUR HAT RUNAROUND
(By Charles L. Dancey)

STALINGRAD.—I got the runaround twice in Stalingrad. Once, as told, regarding the tractor works. The second was a simple matter in which I really cheated myself, with a healthy assist.

My hotel window looked down on a rebuilt department store, or general store, and as I had been doing from the start of my trip, I grabbed the first chance to browse through it.

It was a three-story job, full of what we would regard as shoddy merchandise, and what was worse from my point of view—all commonplace items, unique only in being second rate, or third, or fourth.

This had been by problem all through Russia.

However, on the third floor, I found some of the typical Russian fur hats (even though it was summer). This, I thought, is the deal. Price: 75 rubles. Not bad, either. I was about to step up and buy, when it occurred to me that I was not able to cope with the size problem. It could wait a day while I checked on the Russian size system with my interpreter. (The hat was to be a gift).

So, I told Luba I wanted to buy a fur hat. She said, "I don't think there are any."

Well, this was interesting, so I kept my mouth shut, and simply said that I would like to find out, because I wanted to buy one—and did they have just small, medium, and large—or what was the size system—in meters? So I could translate it.

She said she would call the manager of the store and see if he had any (after all, it is summer) and if he did she would assist me in the purchase.

Next day, she said, she had contacted the manager and he was making an exhaustive search for the hats.

I thought this amusing and kept my own counsel.

The next day she told me there were no hats. I thought, "Ho, ho. When I get rid of you, old girl, I'll just stroll over and buy one."

When I strolled over, there was a big padlock on the door! This weekday was that store's Sunday, I guess. (They rotate days off). And I had to depart at 7 a.m. the next day. No fur hat.

Actually, I got even with Luba and Intourist in Stalingrad for these little incidents.

One thing that bothers them are unauthorized contacts with the local citizenry and

these just don't happen when you're with the guide.

But in Stalingrad, also seeing the sights, were many of my friends from the long boat trip up the river.

At the planetarium, a group of young people from the boat hailed me and flocked around which gave Luba quite a turn. Also there I met and talked with the waitress and two older folks from the boat.

At the museum, I met my boat companion who had fought at Stalingrad as a tank major, and we shook hands and talked briefly without the aid of Luba's interpretation.

Then, on the street, amid the newly built and building apartment houses, a cry of "Charlee" went up and Lida and Alla ran across the street and each grabbed a hand.

By this time, Luba was on the verge of a nervous breakdown. A few notes before leaving Stalingrad for Baku, in Azerbaijan.

Downtown Stalingrad has several parks, many statues to the battle heroes there, and the battle line marked (like Civil War battlefields in the United States.)

The Russian password there was, "There is no land beyond the Volga," and at one point the Germans reached to within 100 yards of the river, right in the heart of town—but no farther.

The basement where the department store I spoke of was rebuilt was German headquarters where General Von Paulus, commander of the doomed German 6th Army, was captured and surrendered what was left of that army.

So—on to Baku.

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Aug. 9, 1959]

STALINGRAD, LIKE PEORIA, FAMOUS FOR
TRACTORS

(By Charles L. Dancy)

STALINGRAD.—The famous city of Stalingrad is in many ways the Peoria of the Soviet Union. It has the largest tractor factory in the world making what the Russians call Caterpillars, plus great vodka distilleries, a steel factory, and farm equipment factory, and it is located on the waterway which, via the Don River, links the Volga to the great inland seas of Russia.

Peoria, of course, has its great tractor factory, steel factory, heavy machinery plant, and distillery, and is located on the waterway which links the Mississippi, via the Illinois, to the great inland lakes of America.

One could travel by boat from Peoria to Stalingrad given the time, the facilities, and the permission.

They did let me go past the heavy equipment factory, which got me zipped through the worker section of shabby homes. Even the new "private homes" built by State loans to workers are of shabby materials so that those still under construction are not attractive.

Then we passed through a series of huge ravines, very broad and quite deep, and each one jammed with shacks. Each of these was a cinder point much larger than our own has ever been.

I was, of course, assured, as usual, that all this was being torn down and new housing would be built, and I was reminded that Stalingrad was leveled during the war. Machines were at work in one ravine.

Stalingrad was a huge industrial park where the bulk of its industry is lumped together. (Again, no cameras allowed. Ever since leaving the resort area, the camera has been a problem.)

The told me there are 20,000 men employed at the tractor factory, that they work two shifts only, and that they make 100 tractors a day.

All I know is that there is an almost endless row of smoke-belching high chimneys in the industrial park.

They compensated me for the "failure" to see the tractor plant by letting me browse at the biggest hydroelectric project in the world. They are building a gigantic dam across the Volga River, to be topped by a highway, and controlled to provide the power for a great electric plant.

This is a city of 600,000, with great industrial development on the banks of the key Volga River—and yet there is not a single bridge across that river. The first will come when the dam is finished.

That will be a while. They use a lot of precast concrete, and I saw no continuous pour arrangement for concrete, although the dam is partially finished. They have mountains of earth to move, but the only heavy equipment picking away at it were small tractors with bulldozer blades.

A great deal of work is still being done by hand, and I saw no hand power tools at all, not even a rivet gun for the steel work. The heaviest equipment were a few huge cranes and one standard big triphammer.

But they are banging away at it, and efficient or not, it will be the biggest in the world, whenever it is finished.

One other item of interest in passing. They have a big planetarium here donated by the East Germans.

Its purpose, as Luba admitted: "To counteract religion with scientific propaganda."

At the museum, also, in this battle-torn city, they show a slot of bombs which are described as German duds, "proving that German Communists working in the factories were helping us." Here also were pictures of "Germans fighting against Hitler and with us at Stalingrad."

Once again, too, the line that, "of course, the bravest of the brave in the Battle of Stalingrad were the party members."

Dr. James E. Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the long and brilliant career of one of Nevada's most illustrious citizens came to an end on August 5, when Dr. James E. Church died in Reno at the age of 90. Dr. Church had served as a member of the University of Nevada faculty for almost 50 years, imparting to countless students the ageless wisdom contained in the classics of ancient Athens and Rome.

Dr. Church's versatility, however, led him to preeminence in a field far removed from the classics. Through studies he initiated early in this century, he became acknowledged as one of the world's authorities on snow surveying. He developed the method of determining the water content of snow pack in the mountains—a method that remains basically unchanged.

Dr. Church was invited to join scientific expeditions to all parts of the world, and during his long career he pursued meteorological and snow problems in Greenland, Russia, South America, and India.

As an alumnus of the University of Nevada and a former student of Dr. Church's, I believe I can speak the senti-

ments of all alumni in describing him as a gentle, kindly, and understanding professor, thoroughly devoted to his noble profession, and genuinely fond of those young men and women who gained so much from his warm philosophy and infinite wisdom.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record, an editorial tribute carried by the Reno Evening Gazette on August 7, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SCHOLAR AND SCIENTIST

It was in 1892 when an unassuming and mild-mannered little man arrived in Reno on the morning train. As he walked along Commercial Row, pistol shots exploded in a saloon, a man staggered out the door and collapsed dead in the gutter.

That was James Edward Church's introduction to Reno, and as he recalled in later years, it very nearly caused him to take the next train out. And when he saw a few buildings on a sagebrush hill that was Nevada State University where he was to be instructor of German and Latin, it was with considerable misgiving that he decided to stay for more than a semester or two.

But stay he did, and he achieved worldwide fame for himself, for the university and for the State. His interests were not confined to the classics. Attracted to the mountains, he explored the ranges around Reno, and his keen and inquiring mind was turned to the problem of the alternating droughts and flood seasons of this Western region. Summer and winter, he had climbed Mount Rose, and his mind associated the snowpack in the winter with the following summer's runoff, not in terms of snow depth, but in water content. And from that he developed the science of snow surveying that has been adopted all over the world.

And while Dr. J. E. Church gained international acclaim as a scientist, he was still "Prof." Church to generations of students who enrolled in his courses in the classic languages, and who learned not only the subject at hand, but absorbed some of the wisdom and philosophies of a true and devoted scholar.

His contributions to the sciences of meteorology and water forecasting assured him and enduring reputation to the world, but the memory of "Prof." Church also will endure in the city and State that was his home for nearly 70 years.

The Gigantic Farce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I wish to include a very truthful and forthright editorial that appeared in the Winthrop Sun-Transcript of Winthrop, Mass., recently on a very important subject matter and one to which all of us should be vitally interested in; namely, the President's invitation to Premier Khrushchev to visit the United States on September 15, 1959:

THE GIGANTIC FARCE

Usually we confine our editorial comment to matters of strictly local interest, but this week we feel compelled to speak out on an issue of international importance.

We're not vain enough to suspect that our opinion will influence the issue of the forthcoming visit of Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev to this country, but we can't let the opportunity pass without voicing our objection to this outrage.

The double talking "Mr. K." who, in recent months, has alternately donned the mantle of peace and the armor of a warrior, is about to receive a hero's welcome from the last place in the world where he should expect to receive it, America, "the land of the free and the home of the brave."

We contend that the warrior's sword and shield is this man's only true garb—and there are millions of enslaved people in other parts of the world who will testify to this. There is a captive Poland—bravely displaying its fierce hope for freedom by hailing our Vice President in recent days. There is a bloodied Hungary—whose valiant bid for freedom was crushed beneath the Soviet boot.

For many years now, even before the end of World War II, we have all known that the Kremlin and the men in charge there have been spearheading the international conspiracy of communism which abhors our freedom, derides religion, and hates our democratic way of life.

And now the No. 1 man of that evil den has been invited to come here "to see how we live," to dispel any misconceptions he might have about us and to convince him that virtue is its own reward.

How absurd. Are our leaders and ourselves that naive to think he hasn't "cased our joint" long before this? We're not going to prove anything to him that he hasn't known for many years.

This makes about as much sense as inviting a psychopathic killer into our homes to see that we're living happily and wouldn't want anything done to disturb our pleasant way of life. Mr. K. and his coconspirators are dedicated to domination of the world and submission of us all to their wishes. That they haven't already taken military steps to achieve this is due only to the fact that they doubtlessly feel they cannot achieve it that way at this time.

What Mr. K.'s forthcoming visit will do is provide him with a juicy item for propaganda—to show the rest of the world that the rape of Poland and the murder of Hungary were sad accidents and that, after all is said and done, he's just a peace-loving man who'll travel across the globe if it will do anything to put out the fire which he helped start and upon which he has continued to heap fuel.

If it is not already too late to put a stop to this farce, we pray that every Member in Congress stand up and be counted as opposed to this visit—to prove to our people and to the world that a murderer of nations can find no welcome in the land of the free.

Meeting the Communist Challenge in Education; Admiral Rickover Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover recently

visited in the Soviet Union and Poland and has returned with some interesting observations on the Communists' educational system.

In these days which, more than ever, try men's minds as well as their souls, we have come to realize how important education can be and how tragic the results may well be if we fail to provide the best training for our young people—to-morrow's leaders.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Leonard Buder which was printed in the New York Times for Sunday, August 9, 1959, entitled "Rickover Hails Reds' Education; Calls it Main Challenge to United States—Says His Tour of Soviet and Poland Showed Students Worked Hard and Long."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RICKOVER HAILS REDS' EDUCATION; CALLS IT MAIN CHALLENGE TO UNITED STATES—SAYS HIS TOUR OF SOVIET AND POLAND SHOWED STUDENTS WORKED HARD AND LONG

(By Leonard Buder)

WASHINGTON, August 8.—Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover said today that his recent visit to the Soviet Union and Poland had convinced him that "our really great race with the Soviet Union is in education."

"The nation that wins this race will be the potentially dominant power," he asserted in an interview. "Unless we in the United States can solve our educational problems, we will have difficulty in solving other problems."

Admiral Rickover, who is known as the father of the atomic submarine, was a member of the group that accompanied Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON on his 13-day visit to the Soviet Union and Poland. The group returned here last Wednesday.

Admiral Rickover reported that he had been greatly impressed by what he had seen and heard about Russian and Polish education.

"They are currently graduating more qualified scientists and engineers from their universities than we are," he said.

When Soviet students, who take the university-preparatory program, are graduated from high school at the age of 17 or 18, the admiral said, "they know as much as our students do at the end of 2 years of college."

All this, he went on, served to confirm his previous beliefs that there must be a vast upgrading of American education, with increased emphasis given to the basic arts and sciences.

The Navy nuclear scientist's frequent criticism of soft American school and college programs and his calls for a more rigorous system patterned after those in Europe have made him a controversial figure in education.

Admiral Rickover, who has often spoken out about what he considered frills in education, said today:

"I searched far and wide in Russia and Poland and could not find a single drum majorette. Nor did I hear of a single school where the principal was an ex-athletic coach."

Observing that both the Soviet Union and Poland were committed to demanding school programs, the admiral said that both educators and parents there regarded "teenhood as a period of preparation for adulthood and not as a period for just having a good time."

CITES SOVIET GRADUATES

In 1957, 1,600,000 secondary school graduates in Russia passed an examination, he asserted, "which only about 2 percent of

American high school graduates would have been able to pass."

American high schools graduated 1,639,000 students in 1959.

Education in the Soviet Union and Poland is provided free of cost to students, he noted.

"No student there is denied an education because of a lack of financial ability," the admiral said. "At the University of Moscow and elsewhere students receive living expenses as well as free tuition. The amounts given to students increase the longer they stay and the better they do in their studies."

Admiral Rickover said that he had been particularly impressed by the strong emphasis being placed on education in Poland.

"Here is a country that was devastated in war, which had 7 million people—25 percent of its population—killed," he said. "When the Germans marched in in 1939, they rounded up the leaders and the intellectual elite and sent them to concentration camps where many died."

"Yet, today," the admiral continued, "this country has its children going to school 6 hours a day, 6 days a week, 10 months a year."

Polish students, he said, work hard in school and have no free time or so-called study periods during the school day.

"They do not spend their time," he added, "collecting milk bottles or old newspapers or taking courses in 'How To Find a Mate.'"

LANGUAGE STUDY STRESSED

"Those who complete the 11-year course and are going on to the university," Admiral Rickover commented, "study one foreign language continuously for 6 years and another foreign language for 4 years. They also have had several years of physics, chemistry and mathematics."

Admiral Rickover asserted that "our educationists keep lulling the American people with the threadbare statement that 'our schools are the best in the world.'"

"They [the educationists] will not face facts, they will not answer questions," he said. "They simply malign those who take issue with them."

Admiral Rickover remarked that he was not advocating that "we copy the Soviet political system."

"But it seems to me," he declared, "that we in the United States who are so blessed with natural resources and have such a high standard of living certainly should be able to give the same emphasis to education that they do."

Mr. Nixon Merits Well Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union:

[From the San Diego Union, Aug. 7, 1959]
END OF A MISSION: MR. NIXON MERITS WELL DONE

Vice President Nixon's Russian visit was a success on all counts. It merits the "well done" he has received from President Eisenhower, his countrymen and a world thirsting for peace with honor.

It would be overstatement to say that Mr. Nixon's trip produced a big thaw in the cold war. But it is not amiss to say that his mission has produced a noticeable rise in

the room temperature of international relations.

Mr. Nixon's brass tacks diplomacy has cleared the air and given the world a breathing spell. True, the air can become befouled again and the straitjacket of tension can close in like claustrophobia. But if it does, it will be the fault of Nikita S. Khrushchev.

Mr. Nixon made it clear to Mr. Khrushchev and his people that we want peace, but not at the price of abandoning our principles. And he left no doubts as to the will of the United States to defend its interests, even at the risk of military force.

It must be remembered Mr. Khrushchev's shift to amiability means nothing in itself. He and his system are equipped with military, diplomatic, political, and economic automatic transmission for sudden changes. Now he smiles, now he blusters, now he frowns. The mood that suits his purpose is always the dominant one.

Mr. Nixon made a forceful exposition of this Nation's cold war objectives and policies. He gave the Russian people a true picture of our strengths, and the vitality of our political, economic and social system. He gave the Russians pause to reassess erroneous misconceptions about the United States and its people.

The big impression that Mr. Nixon left with his Russian hosts was that this Nation will always keep the door open for peace. We will talk together and try to understand each other. We have no reservations about pitting our system against the Soviet Union's in peaceful competition.

The Russians know more about us, for Mr. Nixon drew a lifesize picture. And we know more about them. All of this is useful in getting down to cases.

Nikita Khrushchev's impending visit to the United States will not shake his dedication to communism. It is too thoroughly ingrained. But it will serve to dramatize the facts that Mr. Nixon hammered home so brilliantly in Russia.

Mr. Nixon and Mr. Khrushchev understood each other because they are realists. If the Russians can transmit that realism to their international behavior, then perhaps there is a chance for peace.

They Foster Sound Farming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, an article from the Kaufman (Tex.) Herald of August 6, 1959, entitled, "They Foster Sound Farming," gives an excellent account of the value and importance of the typical farmer in America.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kaufman (Tex.) Herald, Aug. 6, 1959]

FARMER OF THE MONTH: THEY FOSTER SOUND FARMING

Mr. and Mrs. W. H. Foster, Jr., and their son, William Paul, are active farm residents who are leaders in many phases of agriculture.

Mr. Foster has been chosen by the Agriculture Committee of the Kaufman Chamber of Commerce as the Farmer-of-the-Month for July.

He has been living and farming in the fine Becker community since 1930. He moved to Becker from Arcadia, and began farming for himself in 1936—the year of the Texas Centennial.

Mrs. Foster is the former Verna Hardy. They were married in 1939.

First a row crop farmer, Mr. Foster gradually went in to the livestock business. He owns 340 acres of native and improved pasture and rents 50 acres of cotton land.

Last year he sodded 25 acres to Bermuda grass and cleared brush off 20 acres. He plans more sodding and brush control activity so that he can eventually run 60 to 75 cows.

He now has 45 head of cows and a registered bull. Thirteen of the cows are registered and the rest are grade. He is saving his registered heifers for herd replacement and expansion.

Mr. Foster has been mowing open pasture to control weeds. Next year he plans to use a combination spray program and mowing to keep down weeds.

He has conducted a fertilization demonstration in cooperation with the Extension Service and the Tennessee Valley Authority.

He had the first pig parlor operation in the county and could feed 48 head at a time. He does not operate it now, however, since he quit growing his own grain.

Mrs. Foster is active in the work of the Becker Home Demonstration Club. She has served as chairman of the County Council of Home Demonstration Clubs, council delegate from Becker, and as a member of the county 4-H Club planning committee.

William Paul served the Becker 4-H Club as council delegate, secretary-treasurer, vice president, and president. He received awards in soil and water conservation and civil defense. He was a member of the entomology team that placed third in the district.

He has served the Methodist Youth Fellowship as president and is now secretary-treasurer.

Upon entering Kaufman High School in the fall of 1957, he joined the Kaufman Chapter of the Future Farmers of America. He was a member of the Greenhand Chapter conducting team which placed third in the district and worked with the livestock team that entered contests in Houston and Commerce.

The Fosters appropriately foster good farming techniques and are busy people.

Blast Home Rule Bill Loose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the Members of the House a fine editorial which appeared in the August 1, 1959, issue of the Milwaukee Journal entitled "Blast Home Rule Bill Loose." It decries the fact that Washington residents have no voice in their government and points out that a discharge petition is currently being circulated to get the home rule bill out of committee.

The Milwaukee Journal is one of the many newspapers located in all parts of

the country which is lending its support to home rule legislation for the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent to insert this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Aug. 1, 1959]

BLAST HOME RULE BILL LOOSE

It is good to see four Wisconsin Representatives leading in the campaign to get home rule for the District of Columbia at this session of Congress.

Democrats FLYNN, KASTENMEIER and REUSS, along with Republican O'KONSKI, joined 35 colleagues Thursday in publicly urging House Members to sign a discharge petition on a home rule bill.

Such a petition, signed by 219 House Members, is necessary to dynamite the bill (already approved by the Senate) out of a House district subcommittee. It is kept buried there by the chairman, DAVIS, Democrat, of Georgia. The same committee has killed off four separate home rule bills in the last 10 years by refusing to hold hearings on them and refusing to report them to the floor.

The discharge petition action is a drastic one, seldom resorted to. However, as the letter of the 39 Representatives stated: "Whenever a majority settlement is frustrated, we believe members of that majority have no choice . . ."

It is a disgrace that in Washington, the Capital of this democracy, residents have no say about their government, no vote for our national officials, no voice in local affairs. It is ridiculous that Congress wastes hours and hours of time acting as a city council for Washington.

Washington should have home rule.

Patriotism in Contemporary Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, as we have so recently witnessed in the Senate of the United States, patriotism is no longer the great and moving force that it was in the early days of our Republic. It is indeed refreshing when we find instances and examples of great patriotism in contemporary times. It is equally refreshing to find in print public utterances extolling the virtues of patriotism and recognizing the virtues of that trait of character. For these reasons, the television appearance of Maj. Gen. Charles K. Gailey, Jr., former Chief of the Office of Civil Affairs, Department of the Army, in Red Mountain, Ala., on Independence Day of this year, should be most encouraging to those who appreciate the virtue of patriotism. I ask unanimous consent that General Gailey's remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Mayor, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I deeply appreciate the privilege of being present with you on this Independence Day. This fine celebration is certainly in keeping with the words of John Adams

when he wrote, "I am apt to believe that it (Independence Day) will be celebrated by succeeding generations as a great anniversary festival. It ought to be commemorated as the day of deliverance, by solemn acts of devotion to God Almighty. It ought to be solemnized with pomp and parade, with shows, games, sports, guns, bells, bonfires, and illumination from one end of this continent to the other." I believe that Independence Day also ought to be a day on which each one of us reaffirms his love of country and rededicates himself to the guarding of our way of life. It is about these things that I wish to speak briefly this afternoon.

A hundred and eighty-three years have passed since our forefathers mutually pledged to each other their lives, fortunes, and sacred honor in the signing of the Declaration of Independence. During this time, many enemies have challenged our freedom, but through it all our basic precepts of human liberty and welfare have been protected and preserved by Americans who were willing to sacrifice their lives for them. Our Nation's history is replete with stories of these dedicated people.

It is fitting here to recall that the 167th is the linear descendant of the great 4th Alabama Regiment which fought so bravely on the battlefields of Manassas and whose commander, Brigadier General Bee, is credited by some historians as passing on to posterity that great expression "Look at Jackson standing there like a stone wall" and pointing at that great leader, Gen. Stonewall Jackson. Also, there are other Medal of Honor winners in the great State of Alabama. As a matter of fact, the city of Leeds, United States of America, is the home of two Medal of Honor winners.

The exploits of the men of Alabama's 167th Infantry in Europe during World War I and the (31st) Dixie Division in the South Pacific during World War II, as well as many others, tell an eloquent story of men who loved their country. Among these were some whose devotion extended far beyond the normal call of duty. Such a man was Corp. Sidney Manning of G Company, 167th Infantry, and winner of the Medal of Honor. Corporal Manning earned this special form of immortality in the annals of the American fight for freedom on the European battlefield of World War I. He took command of a platoon when his leaders became casualties—and though wounded nine times during the action, he led his platoon on to seize its objective, consolidate its position, and hold the line for our freedom in combat with the enemy on the 28th day of July 1918.

Today we find ourselves again in times that try men's souls—Tibet, China, West Berlin. We are face to face with the most ominous challenge of our time. The Communist conspiracy has made crystal clear its intention of destroying us and seizing control of the entire world. They are constantly increasing their land, sea, and air power. They are ready to resort to brute force whenever they decide the time is ripe to use it. This is only part of the danger. Of equal importance is the fiendish Communist doctrine of hate, atheism, and intellectual perversion which is being used by their masters in an attempt to sap men's moral stamina, weaken their minds, and destroy their souls. The Communists know that they must defeat America to accomplish their dastardly aim of world domination.

Our American life of freedom is under attack. Only through eternal vigilance and unrelenting effort, on the part of each of us, can it be kept secure. This freedom of ours is not a prize that can be won and locked away in a trophy case. It is a living thing that must be fed by the toil and sacrifice of dedicated people.

I feel that many of the old things which enabled us to withstand past challenges to our freedom and which made this country great are too often not receiving due reverence in American life. There are the old virtues of religious faith, integrity and whole truth, self-reliance, thrift, and individual liberty. There are the old virtues of patriotism, real love of country and willingness to sacrifice for it. These ideas are old but certainly they are not out-of-date and if we let them slip, our cloak of freedom can also slip from our shoulders.

We must strengthen ourselves for the months and years ahead if the freedom, won for us by the Corporal Mannings of the past, is to remain cloaked about us. We must become builders rather than critics. When the Declaration of Independence speaks of the right to "pursuit of happiness," it means just that, the right to work out our own destiny. It does not mean that we can avoid all the unpleasantness of life. In God's economy there is no attempt to protect man against difficulties. In fact, He permits difficulties in order to temper men's souls.

If America were to have a choice, she would ask for the gift of patriotism from each of us on her birthday. She would have us pledge again our loyalty and service. Our country's soldiers have received many medals for courage and performance on the battlefields of past wars. Each of these is the symbol of the highest reward of service, the true goal of patriotism, the privilege of saying "I was there. I stood up to be counted. I served."

America has a greater need today than ever before for men and women who think in terms of what they owe the country—not what the country owes them. Let us pledge once again our allegiance to our great and growing Nation, inspired in the knowledge that with each moment of toil we are serving our country, and our friends, with patriotism that is honor.

Poison in Your Water—No. 153

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat & Chronicle of June 11, 1959, entitled "Pollution Said Major Factor":

DURAND-EASTMAN BEACH GIVEN CHANCE TO REOPEN—POLLUTION SAID MAJOR FACTOR

(By Stephen Hammer)

First hint the Durand-Eastman Beach might someday be reopened came yesterday from City Parks Director Wilbur E. Wright as scores ignored the signs and the fence to play on the beach.

The beach, officially closed since 1942, would warrant "another look," with a view toward reopening it, once a serious pollution problem of the lake in that area has been corrected, Wright said. He expressed hope that the current massive antipollution program in the Genesee River would relieve the health hazards in the lake east of the river mouth.

A pollution abatement program, spelling out steps to abate the flow of untreated industrial and sanitary wastes into the Gene-

see, now is in preparation by the State water pollution control board. The city already has begun an \$18-million sewage treatment modernization program toward the same end.

FIRST ACKNOWLEDGMENT

It was the first time that pollution of the lake has been acknowledged as one of the reasons for the continued closing of the beach. While Wright would not estimate when the condition might have been remedied sufficiently to warrant reconsideration, health officials have predicted that the results of their program should begin to show in about 2 years.

Wright's comments on the facility's future grew out of his statement that the beach would not be officially open this year, although recent lowering of the lake has exposed a 30-foot strip of sand. Asked whether there was any chance that Durand-Eastman, once among the most popular swimming spots in the county, could ever be opened again, he said:

SCORES IGNORE WARNINGS

"Right now the water there is pretty badly polluted. But the condition of the river is being corrected; they're working on it constantly." It's already improved, and it's getting better all the time.

"When pollution has been reduced to the point where there is no longer a health hazard, we'll have to take another look at Durand Beach."

Even as he discussed the conditions and warned against public use, scores of bathers were using the beach to escape from the city heat. Oblivious to pollution warnings, many were in the water.

Wright acknowledged that the enforcement of this ban is an impossible task. There will be no attempt to keep the beach cleared, he said, because of the practical obstacles to such a program.

He warned that anyone using Durand-Eastman Beach is doing so at his own risk. In addition to the health hazards, he mentioned the absence of life guards and treacherous washouts in shallow water, which could cause a swimmer to injure himself.

How Houston Became a Port

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Port of Houston magazine has published an article in its August 1959 issue, entitled, "How Houston Became a Port."

Because of the historical interest of this article, and because of the light it throws on the current difficulties of expanding urban areas, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Port of Houston magazine, Aug. 1959]

HOW HOUSTON BECAME A PORT

Mocking birds nesting in the tree top along the shady banks of Buffalo Bayou were flushed in terror as a sidewheel paddle boat, belching clouds of black smoke and making unheard of noises, invaded their solitary domain 50 miles from the Gulf of Mexico.

This venturesome boat nosed its way deep into virgin territory looking for a fabled town which had been named Houston in honor of the general who had led a small group of men to victory in battle to win freedom for the Republic of Texas.

As the sidewheeler *Laura* slowly plowed up the bayou, the captain and his crew, assisted by some of the passengers, were absorbed in a battle with the wild—pushing away alligators and blasting the matted limbs of willow trees which almost closed off the waterway. In their concentration, the town of Houston slipped by unseen on the port side.

The ship paddled noisily on and at the confluence of Buffalo Bayou and White Oak Bayou the water suddenly became shallow and the *Laura* went aground. The song of the mocking birds must have once more become happy as the ship's invasion was halted.

This was early in 1837, less than a year after Texas had won its independence at the historic battle of San Jacinto. Gall Borden, who later rose to fame in the milk business, surveyed and plotted the blocks and streets for a city on the land owned by the Allen brothers on Buffalo Bayou.

After laying out a city, the Allen brothers were anxious to sell their land, so they advertised far and wide about the big, new city being built on the banks of Buffalo Bayou in Texas. It sounded so prosperous that the owners of the *Laura* scheduled their ship to make a trip to Houston. The advertising had been so effective that the *Laura* was able to take on a full cargo as well as a complete list of passengers including Frank R. Lubbock, who was later to become a distinguished governor of Texas.

It's little wonder that the *Laura* passed up the "city," which was little more than a settlement of tents and a few hastily constructed wood buildings. But after going aground at White Oak Bayou, Captain Grayson turned his ship around and eased her downstream, searching the banks. This time they found their goal—Houston.

It was a great day for Houston because the *Laura* fired up the imagination of the Allen brothers. They knew that their city would grow if it could be served by ships. They were alone in their visions of making Houston a seaport, but they were also determined.

The owners of the seagoing steamer *Constitution*, which was in the commercial trade plying between Galveston, New Orleans, and Caribbean ports, was offered a bonus of \$1,000 by the Allens if they would bring the ship to Houston to prove the feasibility of making Houston a port.

On its next trip the *Constitution* was ordered up the Buffalo Bayou to Houston. This time the city of Houston was more easily located.

The *Constitution* proved the point for the Allen Brothers and in the years to follow many more ships worked their way up the narrow Buffalo Bayou to Houston. In moments of quiet, the crews on board could hear the beautiful song of the mocking birds which continued their singing as they became accustomed to civilization.

Although the *Laura* managed to reach Houston, it took many years of growth before the city of Houston could hope to support a port. After the Civil War, business in the Houston area started booming and on October 9, 1866, the Houston Direct Navigation Co. was organized for the purpose of improving navigation on Buffalo Bayou.

A contribution of \$200,000 from the city made it possible to have the bayou surveyed. Two years later it was decided to start dredging the bayou to a minimum depth of 9 feet. As a result, the Houston Ship Channel Co. was formed and capitalized at \$500,000. Controlling interest was held by the City of Houston and the remainder of the stock was sold to the citizens.

During this time, a strong agricultural economy was developing, based on cotton. In the season of 1868, a total of 150,000 bales moved from Houston into export.

One of the most ardent supporters for making Houston a port city was Commodore Charles Morgan, who had been bringing ships to Houston for years. He vociferously objected to the charges being made by the Port of Galveston so he had dredged a channel across Red Fish Reef in Galveston Bay to permit the entrance of his small ships.

With the backing of Houstonians, Commodore Morgan spent \$92,000 dredging a canal at the point where San Jacinto River ran into Galveston Bay. This has since been named Morgan's Point.

The first dredging was completed in 1876, and on September 23, the first ocean steamship moved up the ship channel. It was called the *Clinton* and appropriately it docked at Clinton to unload 60 carloads of freight from New York.

Commodore Morgan managed to gain control of the ship channel and to show his ownership he stretched a chain across the channel at Morgan's Point. Only after paying a toll would he permit ships to pass. He had selected this point because the U.S. Engineers had dredged the channel through Red Fish Reef to a depth of 18 feet in 1872. Commodore Morgan redug the channel even at that point in 1876 because its depth had been reduced by silting.

When Commodore Morgan died in 1878, the people of Houston regained control of the ship channel. Without a driving force, it was several years before the powers in Washington would listen to that voice from the wilderness of Texas. Finally on March 3, 1899, Congress approved a project calling for dredging the channel to a depth of 25 feet from the foot of Main Street to Bolivar Road in Galveston Bay.

The project was amended by Congress on February 20, 1900, calling for a depth of 18½ feet from Harrisburg to Bolivar Road. This did not satisfy the Houstonians who were demanding a deeper channel.

So enthusiastic was the local support that the Houstonians offered to split the cost of \$2,500,000 with the Federal Government if they would agree to a depth of 25 feet. The House Rivers and Harbors Committee and the Senate Commerce Committee had never received such a proposition before, but they decided to accept it and on June 25, 1910, Congress made its appropriation.

In the meantime, it was necessary to get the Texas legislature to pass an enabling act and the people of Harris County voted heavily on June 10, 1910, in favor of creating the Harris County Navigation District. The voters approved splitting the cost of dredging by a big vote in favor of a \$1,250,000 bond issue on June 1, 1911.

In December 1913, Mayor Ben Campbell named the first Harbor Board, a group of outstanding citizens who could advise the city government on how to get the port established. Jesse H. Jones was named chairman. Serving with him were John T. Scott and R. M. Farrar, bankers; C. G. Pillot, and N. F. Meador, businessmen.

The contract for dredging the channel to its 25-foot depth was let on June 12, 1912, and the job was completed on September 7, 1914.

The ship channel was formally opened on November 10, 1914, when President Woodrow Wilson pressed a button in the White House to fire a cannon to signal the opening of the Port of Houston. This was followed with a ceremony at the Turning Basin and big parade through the downtown area.

Now that Houston had a port, it had to go out after business. A group of Houstonians persuaded the Southern Steamship Co. to start a regularly scheduled service from

New York to Houston. The first ship to make the run was the *SS Satilla*, which was due on August 19, 1915, but due to a storm she was delayed until August 22, which we celebrate now as the date Houston became a port.

Republican View of the National Economic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Don Paarlberg:

REPUBLICAN VIEW OF THE NATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY

(Address by Don Paarlberg, special assistant to the President, at a dinner meeting at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., before the 1959 Summer Institute in Practical Partisan Politics, Monday, July 27, 1959)

I am happy to be your guest at this Institute in Practical Partisan Politics. This institute is unique in that it brings together, on a cooperative basis, the central committees of the Republican and the Democratic Parties of the State of Michigan, in association with the University of Michigan and the Ford Foundation. It is thus an eloquent expression of the public interest in partisan politics, voted through a great university, a private foundation, and the two political parties directly concerned. I acclaim this constructive and cooperative recognition of the public stake in political affairs.

Also, I welcome the title that you have given to this institute—Practical Partisan Politics. It is good to recast these words in the public mind, as you are doing, to provide a better understanding of the manner in which the public business of the United States is conducted. The word "partisan" is not synonymous with contentious as some seem to think; rather it means the grouping of persons of like views to clarify the issues and pose the alternatives. "Politics" is not the lowest common denominator for public affairs, as some seem to feel. It is the art and science of helping to formulate and administer public decisions. These are two good words and I am happy to see this institute recognizing this fact. I assure you that I shall be frankly partisan in what I consider to be the best sense of that word, and that I shall treat with deep-felt respect the political institutions by which this country is governed.

I have been asked to speak on the Republican view of national economic policy. I shall endeavor to distinguish between the Republican view and the views of the various members of the Democratic Party.

But before I do that, I wish to outline certain views of national economic policy which I think can be shared by everyone. We are faced, during the foreseeable future, with meeting the challenge of international communism and advancing the level of living of our citizens. This is a formidable challenge, indeed. It will take faith, strength, ingenuity, imagination, resourcefulness, and perseverance to achieve these twin objectives.

There are three economic goals, useful in meeting the challenge of communism and advancing our living levels, which most

people would agree upon as desirable. There are: First, a satisfactory rate of economic growth; second, a high level of employment; and third, reasonable overall stability of prices.

The differences between the two parties come in the priorities given to one or another of these objectives and in the policies through which they would be attained.

The Republican view is that economic growth, high employment, and relative price stability are mutually compatible goals; indeed, over any length of time the attainment of each is necessary to the fullest achievement of all.

Opposed to this view is a broad spectrum of economic ideology which emanates from various spokesmen for the Democratic Party. The most vigorous and most persistent of these views is that these three goals are unequal in merit and incompatible in their very nature. This view would place priority on the objectives of high employment and rapid economic growth. It would place little faith in the ability of a free economy to achieve these objectives without strong Government intervention. It would intervene with massive Government programs, the incidence of which would admittedly tilt the price level upward. Thus the objective of overall price stability would be subordinated to the objectives of economic growth and high employment.

The difference between the Republican view and the opposition view is not merely, as some would have you think, the sparring for a political issue. It is a deep-seated matter that involves our whole attitude toward the role of government, toward the capability of the individual, and toward the economic institutions upon which our Nation is founded. Don't let anyone tell you the differences are minor or of small importance.

The high regard for the rights and responsibilities of the individual held by the Republican Party is as old as the party itself. Abraham Lincoln, the founder of the Republican Party, thus defined the respective roles of the government and the individual:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do it all, or cannot so well do, for themselves in their separate and individual capacities. But in all that people individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

The same view is expressed in the Republican platform of 1956 in these words:

"The Republican Party has as a primary concern the continued advancement of the well-being of the individual. This can be attained only in an economy that, as today, is sound, free and creative, ever building new wealth and new jobs for all the people."

President Eisenhower in his Economic Report to the Congress of January 20, 1959, thus phrased his view:

"Our objective must be to establish a firm foundation for extending economic growth with stable prices into the months and years ahead."

Underlying these views are certain attitudes and articles of faith which have characterized the Republican Party from the first. There is faith in the ability of the individual to make wise decisions if he has access to the facts. There is belief that wise individual decisions are, when summed up, generally compatible with the broad public interest. This article of faith counts the individual as being of great worth, as meriting the high regard of his government, as being the source of most economic, political and social progress, as deserving the best education, as a worthy steward of material possessions, as the true unit of political and economic freedom.

The opposing view casts the individual in a far lesser role. It would resolve all doubts in favor of government programs and against individual responsibility. Indeed, it sometimes seems to doubt the capacity of the individual to make wise decisions.

By some unfortunate mislabeling of signposts, the Republican view had come to be known in some quarters as "reactionary." The Republican view is not "reactionary." It is, in fact, forward-looking. The future has always belonged to those with a high regard for the worth of the individual.

By some equally unfortunate mislabeling, the Democratic view has become known as liberal. It is not liberal because it does not stand for liberty. It stands for restriction. The labels and the signposts have become so confused that we need a new vocabulary.

Related to the high regard in which the Republican Party holds the individual is the high regard it holds for the capacity, resourcefulness and resilience of the enterprise system. By the enterprise system I mean a system based on the enterprise of the individual person. Its cornerstones are the right to choose the way in which to earn one's livelihood, the right of access to the marketplace, and the right to own property. In this system, people cast their ballots in the marketplace in the form of bids for goods and services to determine what will be produced and what consumed. It is a free choice system; the people themselves choose what work they shall do. They decide whether to buy or to rent, to pay cash or buy on credit, whether to increase consumption or to make savings.

The basis of the enterprise system is the individual. If one has high faith in the individual, he is likely to have high faith in an economic system based on individual decisions. The enterprise system has given us a measure of individual freedom which is the admiration and envy of people in every quarter of the globe. It has given us the highest level of living ever enjoyed by any people of any nation at any time in history. One wonders at the vigor of the attack on so fruitful a system.

This system does have its shortcomings, true. It has its uncertainties. It sometimes rewards people in a manner not properly associated with their contribution. It sometimes fails to allocate resources in a desirable manner.

The Republican view does not overlook the shortcomings of this system. Rather, it would seek to repair such shortcomings as do in fact exist. It would strengthen the enterprise system where it is weak, but it would do this without altering the fundamental character of the system. It would enlighten the people so as to enhance the likelihood of wise individual decisions. It would prune the tree of enterprise rather than uproot it.

When an economic problem arises, the Republican attitude is to see whether this problem can be met within the enterprise system. If it cannot, the next question is whether the enterprise system can be appropriately amended or strengthened. If this cannot be done, if the need is substantial, and if public action gives reasonable hope of success, then a Government program will be developed.

This attitude naturally leads to increased Government activity in certain areas. For example, there is the rural development program, a cooperative effort of private and public agencies, introduced by this administration, to open wider the doors of opportunity for the million and a half farm families at the low end of the income scale.

On the other hand, the Republican attitude means less governmental activity in other areas. To take another example from the field of agriculture, it means less Government activity in supporting farm prices, piling up Government surpluses and telling individual farmers what crops to plant.

The opposition view is to resolve all doubts in favor of Government intervention. This would steadily enlarge Government programs at the expense of the private sector. As marginal decisions were resolved in favor of Government intervention, economic areas once wholly private would become first marginal and then public. It is not difficult to predict the ultimate consequence of this trend.

Much of the controversy regarding the respective role of Government and individual traces back to the great depression. During the decade of the 1930's, the enterprise system suffered from a grave and prolonged malady. The Republican view is that this period was an interlude of economic malfunctioning, the causes of which are not yet fully understood even by the most capable scholars. The 150 years of national existence which preceded this interlude and the 20 years which followed it are considered by Republicans to be more representative of the true nature of the economy than was the period itself.

We have now recovered from this disaster, Republicans feel, and we have developed useful tools for preventing its recurrence. We should not be continually looking back over our shoulders in fear of a repeat performance. The Republican economic faith should appeal to adventurous, young, energetic, optimistic, and enterprising people.

The opposition view seems to be that the decade of the thirties, with its stagnation and unemployment, was truly representative of the capacity of an enterprise economy. This is a frightened, apprehensive, and negative viewpoint. It holds in low esteem both the individual and the economic system upon which our country is based.

Despite the high levels of economic activity which have characterized the past two decades, there are some who see in every quaver of the economy, in every ripple on the graph, the possibility of returning to the dark days of a quarter of a century ago. These are the people who propose huge Government housing programs when private housing is operating at a high level, who would unbalance budgets during a time of prosperity, who offer inflationary programs in an effort to stimulate economic growth at a time when the gross national product is running 11 percent above a year ago.

If by the word "reactionary" we mean one who wishes to return to an older order, and that is the dictionary definition, then the true reactionaries are those who would use in the 1950's the same kind of programs that they used in the 1930's.

The Republican view of economic affairs is that the Government has responsibility for creating a favorable climate within which the economy can meet human needs. This means a climate favorable to investment and savings, a climate favorable to enterprise and innovation. It means a climate within which adjustments can readily be made. It means the full development of our human resources, and this means regard for individual responsibility as well as individual rights. It means a fair place for everyone at the starting line; it does not mean that everyone should breast the tape at the same instant. It means safeguarding the value of the dollar. In short, it means Government oriented toward releasing the creative power of the individual.

The past 6½ years have been a period marked by the highest level of living ever attained by the American people, an eloquent tribute to the capability of our system.

The Republican view of economic policy provides for Government intervention of substantial magnitude when that is appropriate. Twice during the present administration the economic barometer started dropping. But the disturbances which ensued were rather mild. With sound Government policies these storms soon blew themselves out.

The recession of 1953-54 was met by substantial Government programs, including the biggest tax reduction in history. The administration demonstrated a capability for action which was truly impressive and remarkably successful. This downturn was relatively moderate and was quickly reversed despite widespread concern on the part of those apprehensive people who felt that we were about to repeat the disastrous experience of the 1930's.

Similarly, the recent business cycle illustrates the willingness and the ability of the Republican administration to intervene in the economic picture when and if that becomes appropriate. Equally important, it illustrates the desire of the Republican administration to withdraw from massive Government programs when the need for intervention has terminated.

In fact, the contrasting economic policies of the two major parties are vividly illustrated by the experience of the past 2 years.

When the recession began late in 1957, there was a shift in economic policy on the part of the Republican administration toward more liberal credit and toward augmentation of Government programs already in existence. As the recession continued, substantial actions were taken, some of them by the Republican administration, some of them by the administration with the concurrence of the Congress.

Extended unemployment compensation was provided on a temporary basis through the leadership of the Republican administration, to meet the needs of those unemployed people who had exhausted their benefits under the regular Federal-State insurance program.

The housing program was stepped up, with leadership provided by the administration, through the provision of additional insured loans.

Built-in stabilizers provided additional dollars of consumer income and kept other dollars in the stream of private spending.

The magnitude of the antirecession measures is indicated by the fact that they resulted in a Federal deficit of \$12½ billion. On the basis of the record, Republicans have run budgetary deficits when this could be helpful. They don't believe in making a habit of running deficits, and they strenuously resist running a deficit when a surplus would be appropriate, as at present.

While these Government programs were put into operation, other proposed programs were avoided. Huge public works were proposed and rejected. Had these proposals been adopted, work on them would have come at the time when recovery had already occurred. The result would have been to widen rather than diminish the fluctuation of the cycle. With great resolution, the Republican administration withstood these unsound proposals.

The Republican Party held, throughout the recession period of 1957-58, a strong faith in the recuperative powers of our enterprise economy. The people, by their behavior, proved that this faith was well-founded. In fact, the real strength during this period lay in the people, who did not panic, and in those of their elected public servants who reflected the confidence of the people. The greatest harm was done by those who had little faith in our individual citizens and little faith in our economic institutions, who advocated massive Government programs to overcome the adverse psychology which they themselves generated.

The faith and confidence of the private citizens won out. Recovery came about. Employment began to rise. Investment, which had lagged, again moved forward. Industrial production advanced and a broadly based recovery got under way.

The events since the first of the year contrast even more sharply the divergent economic policies of the two political parties.

The President recognized the signs of recovery. These signs, coupled with his faith in the enterprise system, led him to recommend a legislative program and a Federal budget based on the prospect of an improving economic situation. He felt strongly that with the achievement of recovery there should be a termination of the emergency programs which had been adopted to bring about recovery. This meant a termination of temporary extended unemployment compensation. It meant a pay-as-you-go basis for the highway program. It meant a housing program which took account of the high level of private building. Above all, it meant a balanced budget to combat the threat of inflation arising in part from the pressures generated by the recovery.

When the President announced this program, there was a great clamor from the opposition. Those who were mentally attuned to recession did not quickly recognize the signs of recovery. Those who would rather spend than tax were reluctant to see the termination of the rationale for deficit financing. They were at a loss to know what to do or how to conduct themselves. Their very astonishment reflects their lack of faith in the people and in our enterprise system.

Half a year has elapsed since the President's budget was first offered and since his legislative program was first recommended. This half year has seen the full justification of the President's appraisal of the economic outlook. Recovery is a fact. More important, this half year has seen a growing public understanding of the issues.

What we now observe in the economic sector is truly a heartening scene. We see a lusty, growing economy with rising employment and advancing economic growth. We see the success of Government programs undertaken to bring about this recovery. Those who held faith in the sound judgment of the individual citizen and in the recuperative powers of our enterprise system see their faith rewarded. We see a citizenry which increasingly insists upon sound fiscal and monetary policy. We see a growing willingness to terminate emergency programs now that the emergency is over. We see the further retreat of the outmoded idea that any economic downturn must result in widespread disaster. We see, and I think I am reading the record objectively, a victory for the economic system which has made our country great.

As a Republican, I take a great deal of pride in the fact that the party of my choice has, over the years, demonstrated a high degree of confidence in our economic system. I hope that over the years ahead the Nation's faith in this system will grow rather than diminish. I hope that when the historian of the future writes the history of our present times, he will say that the institutions of freedom were put to the test at home and abroad, and emerged triumphant. If we are good stewards of those principles of economic and political science which have made this Nation great, that is what he will write.

Economic Miracle of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, one of the great myths of Communist philosophy is that the United States is an imperialistic Nation which seeks

to exploit underdeveloped countries. And there is no myth which runs so directly contrary to the facts.

The distinguished and perceptive Washington commentator, Roscoe Drummond, has written an article on the economic miracle of Puerto Rico. He reviews the facts and finds that the hard work and initiative of the Puerto Ricans, combined with the understanding and sympathy of the United States, has produced a genuine showcase.

I ask unanimous consent that this fine article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Aug. 10, 1959]

ECONOMIC MIRACLE—PUERTO RICO SHOWS

WHAT CAN BE DONE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

SAN JUAN, P.R.—They said it couldn't be done—and Puerto Rico has done it.

Here is a little Caribbean island, much of its land unusable, overpopulated, underdeveloped, long neglected, and oppressed by some 450 years of Spanish colonialism—and today you have to see it to believe it.

Before Puerto Rico became a completely self-governing associated state in 1952, U.S. Senators used to come here regularly to investigate and glumly leave, convinced that this island's economic and social problems were impossible to solve. Even that inveterate planner and dreamer, Rexford Guy Tugwell, who served as governor here 13 years ago, held up his hands in despair.

They say that Puerto Rico has pulled itself up by its own bootstraps and they call its development program "Operation Bootstrap." The fact is, Puerto Rico didn't even have straps on its boots, but what it does have is the most antimanana complex you ever saw. What Puerto Ricans can't put off until afternoon, they add to what they do in the morning.

What they have done is to bring up their gross national products—all goods and services produced—300 percent since 1940. And over this same period, the island increased its net income by 286 percent.

If you are suspicious of percentages, then note that family income here is now over \$2,400 and that the average Puerto Rican family can buy nearly twice as much as it could 20 years ago. It is true that per capita income is still only half that of the poorest U.S. State, but it is the highest in the Caribbean area and the second highest in all Latin America, exceeded only by oil-rich Venezuela.

As the standards of living of the Puerto Rican people has advanced, the ability of their government to promote education and health and social welfare has expanded. Some 26 percent of the Commonwealth's budget goes to education. In 1940 Puerto Rico's schools could serve only 51 percent of the school aged; now they serve 84 percent.

When poverty and unemployment were rampant two decades ago, life expectancy was only 46 years; now it is 68 years—and the death rate is even lower than it is in continental United States. Bank deposits are up sixfold over 1940. The same with automobile registrations.

The most significant development is that in its effort to balance its economy, since farming couldn't possibly sustain its 2.3 million people, the Puerto Rican Economic Development Agency has brought about the establishment of slightly over 500 new manufacturing plants; most of these are now in private hands. Special tax exemption goes to manufacturing and tourism ventures which meet certain requirements. The government itself builds most of the new manu-

facturing plants and then either sells or rents them to private business.

It is for all of these reasons that Puerto Rico is today a radiant show-window of what an underdeveloped country can do.

It is a visible refutation of Soviet propaganda that America is imperialist, that American capitalism suffocates its friends, and communism is the only way an underdeveloped nation can rapidly improve its standard of living.

Puerto Rico chose its own relationship with the United States—sovereign self-government with common citizenship.

This island has completely free trade with the United States and each is the other's best customer. Both benefit.

Puerto Rico spends \$400,000 each year from its tiny budget to help others to see and believe—and to go and do likewise.

The Maytag Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN V. CARTER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I have the privilege of representing the Fourth District of Iowa. Located at Newton in the heart of the district is the Maytag Co., the major independent producer of home laundry equipment. It is with justifiable pride that I submit for the Record a series of five articles about the Maytag Co. which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor beginning August 4. I feel it is significant that a newspaper such as the Monitor, long recognized as a leader in the field of journalism, should pay tribute to the Maytag Co., one of the front runners in the highly competitive appliance industry. Newton, a city of 13,000 persons, is one of the most highly industrialized areas for its size in the Nation, providing more than 5,000 industrial jobs. Even so, it continues to actively engage in a program to attract new industry—typical of the cities and towns of not only the fourth district but the entire State of Iowa. I believe the following articles serve to illustrate that Iowa truly is the land where farm and factory can share prosperity:

DRUDGERY WRUNG OUT

(By Bernice Stevens Decker)

NEWTON, IOWA.—This, the story of the Maytag Co., should have equal appeal for homemakers and businessmen.

The women should be interested in it as the story of a company that has developed one product after another to take the drudgery out of washday. This has gone all the way from calico and the problems of a farm woman with no electric power to the modern city dweller who builds her family wardrobe around wash and wear garments.

On the sound business side, it is an account of a revolutionary management policy which has proved very successful in today's troubled and sometimes controversial appliance industry.

This 66-year-old firm has remained an independent specialist in a highly competitive age dominated by giant corporations with highly diversified lines of appliances.

PIONEER ROLE CITED

The Maytag Co. has been a pioneer in the manufacture of home laundry equipment. It is known for many firsts. Yet, company management has long taken a stand against planned obsolescence. It has not brought out new models each year, while most of the major companies did so. Yet, last year, while the industry as a whole showed a drop in sales, Maytag forged ahead.

Maytag started out producing farm machinery. Today it remains the major independent producer of home laundry equipment. This is noteworthy, because many old-time companies have disappeared or merged with giant corporations.

INDUSTRIAL AREA NOTED

Fred Maytag II, the third generation to actively direct the business, heads the company.

It's a matter of about an hour's flight from Chicago's lake-front Meigs Airport to Newton, the heart of Iowa corn country. The contrast is sharp and impressive. Everything is surrounded by cornfields—the airport, the town, the sprawling No. 2 Maytag plant, now just over a decade old.

Iowa's economy is based on agriculture. Yet here, as in many other agricultural areas, industrial development supports a major share of local residents. Newton, with a population of 13,000, is one of the most highly industrialized areas for its size in the Nation. It provides more than 5,000 industrial jobs. Some 4,000 of them are supplied by Maytag, which ships the equivalent of more than 500 trainloads of appliances a year to all parts of the country.

Newton is also a center for advertising specialties produced by three major companies, and is the home of an earth-moving equipment company. It is actively seeking new industries.

This is considered the washing machine capital of the world. Three other well-known name brands once had their headquarters here. Thus, the history of home laundry equipment has been closely associated with Newton and Maytag.

This made it logical for Maytag to sponsor "The Tale of a Tub," a permanent exhibit of the story of home laundering at the Chicago Museum of Science and Industry.

No researcher, as of far as is known, has put a finger on the first successful washing machine. The fluted washing board has been traced to 1844. A tumbler, a barrel-like apparatus turned by hand, was patented in 1850.

DEVICES DEVELOPED

Godey's Ladies Book pictured one version. A scrubbing frame that imitated the hard-working hands of the housewife appeared in 1869. A copper boiling vat, patented in 1874, "percolated" the clothes. In 1882, corrugated rollers were developed to get mechanical scrubbing action. Just a year later came a washer that pounded the clothes with gear-operated paddles.

FARM SALES SEASONAL

By 1890, the up-to-date housewife was using a suction plunger on a stick, an item still sold in the United States today. By the turn of the century, hand-operated wooden dollies were used to pull the clothes through the water. These mechanical gadgets helped, but the job was still laborious—a full day's work.

The modern home appliance industry, however, began with the introduction of these first hand-operated wooden tub washers. Typical of these was the first Maytag washing machine, introduced in 1907. At that time it was a sideline for a prosperous farm equipment business.

Farm machinery production goes back to 1893. The late F. L. Maytag and three associates pooled \$2,400, created the Parsons

Band Cutter & Self Feeder Co., and leased an abandoned stove works.

Their product, a grain thresher accessory, was a band cutting, self-feeding attachment, which released men from the dangerous task of hand feeding. It was the first of its kind, and the beginning of many firsts for the company.

For the first year, this was a sideline to the founders' other occupations. Then Mr. Maytag was made manager and took over full time. Within a few years, 28 different concerns purchased and sold the attachment for their threshing machines. A corn husker and shredder and other farm equipment were added to the output.

Sales of farm equipment were seasonal. A washing machine was added as an extra to spread sales and employment throughout the year. But soon the firm turned from improving the lot of the farmer to making life easier for his wife. A few years later the name was changed to the Maytag Co.

MAYTAG DEVICES BLAZED TRAIL

(By Bernice Stevens Decker)

NEWTON, IOWA.—It didn't take long for washing machines to become of major importance to the thriving young Maytag Co. In less than 15 years after the firm's first model appeared, it was to become the top producer in the United States.

The first washer, the Pastime, had a hand-operated cypress tub with wooden dolly that dragged clothes against its corrugated sides. In 1909 came the Hired Girl model, with pulley attachment, so that both washer and wringer operated by power from an engine.

FIRST "FIRST" IN 1910

In 1910 Maytag brought out what is regarded as one of its major "firsts." This was a swinging, reversible wringer, which could be swung into position over the tub. It meant the housewife no longer needed to move the water-filled tubs into position for the wringer.

In 1911, with electricity used in many parts of the home, electric motors were attached to improved models. The electric washer brought a demand for power-equipped washers on farms and in small towns where electricity was not available. In 1914, a one-half horsepower gasoline engine known as the Multi-Motor, was attached to the washer, and became another "first."

For many years it was the only engine-equipped washer especially designed for homes without electricity. It has been sold to more than 1 million users. The firm became the world's largest manufacturer of this kind of engine.

MILLRACE PATTERN USED

In 1917 a cylinder-type washer, with a cast aluminum cylinder in an attractive metal cabinet was announced. Its action was patterned after the old millrace wheel. Projections or scoops on the outside of a revolving cylinder forced water through the tumbling clothes and loosened the dirt.

This model included another innovation, the divided wringer. Its instant tension release, wide separation of rolls, and quick, easy replacement positions were efficiency and safety features that made it immediately acceptable.

There was a brief venture into the automobile business from 1909 to 1911. F. L. Maytag organized a separate company to produce first a two-cylinder, then a four-cylinder automobile known as the Maytag Mason. Although this venture failed, the original investors were repaid years later by Mr. Maytag.

In 1919, the firm solved many longstanding problems and produced a cast aluminum tub. Work was done by Howard Snyder, a man who joined the company many

years before due to his ingenuity at repairing and developing farm equipment. The new tub was put into production in a new model, a trim washer with square cast aluminum tub with rounded corners. A convenient and efficient wringer was set low above water level so that heavy wet clothing need not be lifted high out of the water to be fed to the rolls. Inside the tub, a novel cast-aluminum dolly turned back and forth under a flat aluminum lid from which much of the usual machinery had been removed.

HEIGHT MADE ADJUSTABLE

The tub was wide, and, because of its cone-shaped bottom, particles of dirt washed from the clothes fell to the center and were not rewashed back through the clothing. A special feature was the fact that its height was adjustable to the housewife's convenience.

This vastly improved and changed model was the forerunner to a line that was to speed Maytag to a high point of leadership in the washer industry. Until the twenties, washing machines had corrugated tubs against which clothes were scrubbed by pegs of a dolly.

In 1921, as the result of the continued experiments of Mr. Snyder, the firm came out with its most important single development. This was the gyrofoam principle of washing. Mr. Snyder had inverted the dolly, and replaced pegs with blades. He came up with an aluminum agitator, later trade-named the gyrotator. This sent efficient currents of soapy water back and forth through the clothes, washing them by water action alone.

MAYTAG TOOK TO ROAD

Since it was so revolutionary, it had to be sold. Mr. Maytag himself took the first hand-built machine on the road. He announced he wouldn't be back until he received a carload order. He staged demonstrations in four major western cities, but wasn't successful until he reached Oakland, Calif. That first carload order was the beginning of a volume business.

Factory production of the new washer began in April 1922. Work on all other products was halted. The entire facilities of the factory on night and day shifts were used. Eleven months later the first solid trainload of the new gyrofoam washers was shipped. It went to Philadelphia for dealers in the eastern seaboard States. This was, so far as is known, the largest single shipment of any household appliance up to that time. Another trainload was shipped in July, followed by an order for three trainloads.

By this time the factory was oversold and orders of this size could not be handled. Within less than 2 years Maytag had spurred to a position of world leadership in washer production.

By March 1926, production had increased, so that trainload shipments could be resumed. They became numerous, and many records were broken. In May 1927, the factory dispatched what is believed to be the largest single shipment of merchandise ever made of any kind up until then—eight solid trainloads of gyrofoam washers, valued at \$2,750,000.

SHIFT TO WAR OUTPUT

Numerous improvements, culminated in 1939 in the Maytag Master. These featured an improved roller on the wringer, enlarged tub, and faster and more efficient washing action. There have been variations of this model and, with additional improvements, it has remained the basic design for the firm's conventional washer today.

In 1941 the plant turned to war production. At the peak, 97 percent of output was for war. The balance was for washing machine repair parts made in a small sec-

tion of the plant. This kept most of the existing Maytag washers in operation for the duration.

The plant was converted from highly standardized mass production to manufacture of a great variety of intricate parts and items. Initial work was on tank track pins, shell adaptors and machine shafts, pinions, worms, and gears for gyroscopes.

The aluminum section was converted to exclusive production of heat-treated aluminum aircraft castings.

NEW MODELS PRODUCED WHEN ADVANCES WARRANT

(By Bernice Stevens Decker)

NEWTON, IOWA.—The postwar period brought a pent-up market for products of the entire home laundry industry. It saw a revolution in equipment.

The automatic washer is almost solely a post-war product, since only 350,000 of them were sold before. The automatic drier and combination washer-driers are entirely post-war developments. Production has become as highly complicated in many respects as that in the automobile industry.

Many changes also took place at Maytag. Since 1946, the first full postwar year, the firm has introduced several radically new products, and sales have risen to more than four times the prewar level.

More than \$35 million have been invested in two new plants and in modernizing the old one. The manufacturing plants were converted to what is probably the highest degree of integration in the home laundry field.

Before the war, the firm purchased many components. Now, it produces just about everything that goes into its products except electric motors, timers and controls, molded plastic parts, and some die castings. Thus, the firm is in a position to exercise a high degree of quality control over components and achieve many manufacturing economies.

R. & D. UNIT HELPS

Closely related to this has been the expansion of its highly specialized research and development division. This department goes back to the early inventive genius of Howard Snyder. Its procedures are closely linked to dominant management policy.

Unlike many firms in the industry, Maytag does not produce yearly models. Changes, more often than not, have not coincided with introduction of new models by other companies. Officials estimate that while one company turned out 28 different models, Maytag in the same period introduced 6.

Each new Maytag product is required to contain radical improvements and developments. This is further explained by Fred Maytag, president:

"We believe that progress involves change, but that change alone does not necessarily involve progress."

Mr. Maytag showed what he meant by demonstrating a new feature, an improvement introduced for an existing automatic washer model. He emphasized that this was an added feature and that the model was otherwise unchanged.

CHANGES SUPERFICIAL

"The approach, which I term artificial obsolescence," he states, "is typified by the manufacturer who introduces new models annually, come what may. Sometimes these represent significant improvements, but most frequently they embody only superficial face lifting."

"This approach may have been attractive to many appliance manufacturers because it seemed to work so well in the automobile industry for so many years. It made its appearance in the appliance industry in the early 1950's, was widely adopted, and is very nearly a standard practice."

"The other approach to this problem, true obsolescence, is really quite different. It is strongly rooted in the philosophy that model changes should represent significant improvements in the product. These should provide the dealer with distinct and demonstrable advantages to the customer."

"This does not tie the introduction of new models to the calendar. Rather, it insures that new models will be introduced whenever a new and better way has been developed for the particular appliance to perform a job for the housewife."

CHAOS CAUSED

Mr. Maytag is firmly convinced that the practice of planned or psychological obsolescence has not served to benefit either the consumer, the dealer, or the manufacturer. "Quite to the contrary," he said, "I believe that it has contributed in a marked degree to the chaotic conditions which have existed in the appliance industry, particularly during the past few years."

He charged that emphasis on annual models has "turned the retail marketplace into an oriental bazaar and transformed a prospective customer into an avid, price-conscious bargain hunter."

He sees retail dealers as the biggest losers, since annual models quickly obsolete their inventories and place great strains on their sales forces and merchandising methods. High tooling cost of annual model changes by the manufacturer, he contends, must either be absorbed by him or passed on to the consumer or the dealer or both in the form of higher prices or smaller profit margins.

DESIGNS IMPROVED

Mr. Maytag hastens to emphasize that the company does produce new products. "Here at Maytag three kinds of development are constantly in progress. First of all, we are continually studying the modification of present designs in order to eliminate all causes of product failure in the home, to improve our manufacturing techniques, and to reduce the cost of manufacture."

"Secondly, we are continually concerned with the development of new models and new features to meet the changing needs of the consumer. And, finally, we are continually working for the development of new constructions and entirely new products. This is our long-range development program."

True obsolescence, Mr. Maytag insists, motivates the customer to buy. He cites the rapid public acceptance of manmade fabrics and growing acceptance of "wash and wear" garments.

There is at least one in every family and they comprise as much as 10 percent of some wardrobes. They have made it necessary for appliance manufacturers to develop new automatic washers and new driers designed specifically to provide proper laundering procedures. These needs make old machines that do not do the job obsolete.

In answer to this demand, the Maytag All-Fabric Washer in 1956 was the first to offer a combination of cold water and rinse with slow speed agitation and spin. This provided the housewife with proper washing procedure for all fabrics formerly requiring hand washing, including manmade fabrics, fine woolsens, and cashmeres.

MAYTAG SPINS IN MODERNITY

(By Bernice Stevens Decker)

NEWTON, IOWA.—Practically all major post-war construction and expansion at Maytag has centered around plant 2, devoted to production of automatic washers and driers. Built in an area of what was a cornfield, it has more than doubled in size since 1949.

Located on a tract of more than 100 acres, the plant has its own waste-treatment system comparable to any in some of the Nation's largest cities.

Within more than 1 million square feet of floorspace are a giant two-furnace, porcelain-enameling facility, ultramodern electroplating department, and a central-service warehouse. More than 12,500 freightcars and trucks are loaded from the terminal of this warehouse each year.

One of the country's most modern and efficient assembly lines makes it possible to receive raw steel at one end and turn out finished, crated products at the other.

There are 8½ miles of crossing and crisscrossing overhead trolleys and floor-level conveyors that carry parts, subassemblies, and finished washers and dryers from one end of the plant to the other.

LINES CROSS

At one point these lines cross in four directions. With washing machines above, in front, behind, and all around, it resembles the California freeways.

The many and complicated steps in assembly include a number of inspection checks of each machine. These are first for mechanical and electrical performance, then through a sound room for excessive noise, and a final complete test before being crated.

Several machines are picked at random daily to be run for a 24-hour check. Automatic packaging machines include their own gluepots and sealing apparatus. Each is capable of packaging 1,200 appliances in an 8-hour day or 2½ a minute.

In this day of automation, it may come as a surprise to learn that there are still some 800,000 wringer washers sold each year. Maytag, one of the few firms still producing wringer washers, makes about a third of them.

HISTORIC AREA USED

Wringer washers are manufactured at plant 1 in the area where the first Maytag washer was put together by hand over a half-century ago. The bulk of manufacturing operations is in a five-story building which houses machining, sheet metal, welding, assembly, heat treating, tooling, and other allied departments.

Six million of the company's washers had been produced here by October 1949, before automatic-washer production began. Wringer washers still comprise an important part of overall production.

Auxiliary operations are carried on in another factory at nearby Hampton. This plant also makes replacement parts of discontinued models.

Maytag has a rigid policy regarding servicing of its products. There is a heavy budget and extensive training program for this purpose.

Officials are proud of the fact that the company's mailing list carries nearly 20,000 names for service literature, but only 16,000 for sales material. Over 1¼ million parts are carried on inventory. A repair and service department is equipped to renovate and rebuild appliances as much as 30 years old.

DURABILITY STRESSED

"We aim to build products that do not need to be serviced," states Mr. Maytag. "It is our stated goal to deliver a product which can be installed in the customer's home with confidence that it will require no major repairs for 10 years."

"We have not yet achieved this objective, but we know that significant and steady strides are being made toward that goal." He points out that evidence indicates that service costs on Maytag products are the lowest in the industry.

The firm has an unusual distribution pattern. It sells directly to 15,000 retail dealers instead of using the conventional procedure of going through jobbers. It manufactures no private-label merchandise and is associated with no large chain organizations.

Work of the research and development division is far-reaching in the home-laundry

field and other industries. Several of the major washing-machine companies have licensing agreements with Maytag for use of the firm's inventions.

During the past 10 years over 100 patents have been granted to members of the development division and approximately another hundred are pending at present. The company has been granted 40 patents on sealing construction which are used in other brand washing machines, water faucets, soft-drink dispensers, and gas valves.

SALES LEAD RETAINED—MAYTAG SIGHTS ON FUTURE

(By Bernice Stevens Decker)

NEWTON, IOWA.—The Maytag Co. has tenaciously clung to its position as an independent manufacturer and specialist in home laundry equipment. It has retained this through the difficult postwar period that brought major changes to the industry.

Before the war, Maytag was the giant of the home laundry industry. That was before large corporations entered the field. It has maintained its lead and independence, however.

Since the war, nearly all other independent producers of laundry equipment have either gone out of business or been purchased by or merged with larger companies. The remaining few have diversified their lines to include other appliances.

Since 1917 there have been 215 companies in home laundry equipment at one time or another. Today there are only 25. Their business, which includes sales of washers, dryers, and ironers, totals \$1 billion a year.

MAYTAG RATED AT TOP

A major share of this business goes to Maytag, which is rated as the top earner. The firm is reported to have the highest ratio of operating income to sales in the industry, as well as a better return on sales. It did the best job of climbing out of the 1957 and 1958 recessions. While the industry as a whole showed a decline of 2 percent in 1958 Maytag sales showed an increase of 7.3 percent.

The firm has manufactured and sold about 11 million washers since 1907, more than half of them since World War II. Fred P. Maytag II, president since 1940, attributes this continued growth to a policy of consistent management. He is the third generation and fourth Maytag to head the firm, with two serving in the same generation.

The Maytag Co. Foundation is administered by company members and outsiders. It supports a college scholarship program, with no restrictions on study program, open to children of employees and graduates of the local high school. A teacher enrichment program aims at helping the city of Newton attract better teachers.

Nearly 3,000 of the 13,000 residents of Newton work at Maytag. But Maytag officials are anxious that this not be considered a company town. They are just as anxious as the chamber of commerce to attract new industry here. Mr. Maytag is well aware that the firm is part of an economic change.

Iowa is a leading agricultural State, but for continued growth it is necessary to stimulate industrial development. Many employees commute, some as much as 150 miles a day. Some are part-time farmers. They are dependent on industry, industry on them.

ISOLATION POSES PROBLEMS

Operating so far from highly industrialized areas, Maytag must meet sources of problems of supply and markets. The company has to maintain two small passenger planes which are in constant use. Mr. Maytag himself is a licensed pilot. A U.S. map in his office pinpoints every city in which he has landed his plane, and there are 122 pins.

Executives have to make frequent trips away from home.

Maytag, the fifth largest industrial employer in Iowa, expects to share in the coming growth. It looks for its own growth in its present specialty products, washers and dryers.

Mr. Maytag sees a gradual growth for the industry as a whole. Some of this will come from new family formation. However, a large part will come from replacements. The present saturation of washing machines is estimated at 87 percent of homes. Since about half of these are still wringer washers, they will eventually be replaced by automatics.

Actually, three out of every five wired homes still do not have automatic washers. Seven out of eight are without dryers. The early automatic washers sold from 1946 to 1949 are beginning to be eligible for replacement. With the rapid increase in sales of automatics since 1949, this replacement market should grow rapidly.

Let Justice Prevail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, a subject of much concern to New Jersey has been the unfair tax burden which has been levied on New Jersey residents who work in another State. Clearly, the present situation wherein New Jersey residents who work in New York pay a heavier New York State income tax than New Yorkers is unjust and inequitable. It was encouraging, therefore, to note an editorial from the Newark Star-Ledger of August 9 that there now appears some basis for optimism that a remedy is in the offing. This encouraging news has to do with reports that New Jersey and New York are on the verge of entering into a compact. Such a compact would grant New Jerseyans several million dollars relief from discriminatory out-of-State taxation. In return, New Jersey would help New York collect taxes from New Yorkers.

The citizens of my State are eminently entitled to some measure of tax justice and I am hopeful that it will not be withheld too much longer.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial from the Newark Star-Ledger printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Star-Ledger, Aug. 9, 1959]

LET JUSTICE PREVAIL

The thousands of Jerseyans who are victims of the New York State income tax gouge were treated to some encouraging news last week. It is reported that New Jersey and New York are on the verge of entering into a compact on taxes.

The compact—which also might be called a deal—would grant the Jerseyans several million dollars relief from discriminatory out-of-State taxation. In return, New Jer-

sey would help New York collect taxes from New Yorkers who work in New Jersey and are ducking their obligations to their home State.

The second part of this deal would soften the impact on the New York Treasury in giving relief to the Jerseyans.

The Jerseyans, who work in New York and pay a heavier New York State income tax than New Yorkers, have been the recipients of many expressions of sympathy. But these have not prevented the continuation of the tax—not an increase in the rates.

The new rates make it even more imperative that the Jerseyans get the tax justice to which they are so eminently entitled and which has been delayed so long.

The indication is that the amount of relief afforded the Jerseyans will be determined by how much New York can stand to lose. New York has a three-man committee working out the details of the relief plan. The approach seems to be to devise a formula which will produce a predetermined loss figure.

This could well mean that there will still be an inequity. But New York undoubtedly figures it would be granting enough relief to quiet most the complaints.

Tax justice, however, should not be computed on the basis of what the gouger can stand to lose. Justice involves principles which are independent of a State's need for funds. Anything which would leave Jerseyans paying more than New Yorkers with the same income and expenses would be an injustice.

Commendation on Service at Dearborn Veterans Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following fine commendation by Mr. Edward Revolt of the treatment he received at the Veterans' Administration hospital in Dearborn, Mich., which is in the district I represent:

WAYNE, MICH., July 27, 1959.

HON. JOHN LESINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Recently I completed a 3-week confinement in the veterans' hospital at Dearborn, Mich. My case required certain tests, examinations, and surgery.

It was my first experience as a patient in an institution of this kind and I was pleasantly surprised at the excellent care and treatment I received.

Th doctors, without exception, impressed me with their patient interest, thoroughness, and professional skill.

The nurses and aids were solicitous, kind, helpful, and attentive.

The food was wholesome, well prepared, and tasty. The all-round efficiency, orderliness, and general conduct of affairs bespoke of excellent management and supervision.

It gives a taxpayer gratification and a feeling of pride that this much-needed Government agency is functioning on such a high standard of proficiency.

Respectfully yours,

EDWARD "TED" E. REVOLT.

One Modern Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in this day when our Armed Forces command such a sizable portion of our national resources, and when our very existence depends to a major extent on the capabilities of the Armed Forces, clear expressions by professional soldiers on the needs of the Armed Forces, or a particular branch thereof, should be studied with care by all in a position to exercise an influence on the shaping of our Armed Forces. On August 3, Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, commanding general, U.S. Continental Army Command, addressed the Association of the United States Army on the subject "One Modern Army." I ask unanimous consent that the address of General Clarke be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GEN. BRUCE C. CLARKE, COMMANDING GENERAL, U.S. CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND, TO THE ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY, WASHINGTON, D.C., AUGUST 3, 1959

It is indeed a great honor for me to address this annual meeting of the Association of the United States Army. In this audience are leaders of government and industry, distinguished soldiers of yesterday and military leaders of today and tomorrow. One of the principal objectives of this association is to insure power for peace through an adequate modern army. I support your purpose and commend your efforts.

My topic this afternoon is one which is very dear to me: The concept of "One Modern Army." Each word of this title is significant.

One, signifying unity and cohesiveness toward a common purpose—the will and skill to help defend the free world.

Modern. That vital element of military power so aptly covered by the Chief of Staff during the previous period, and

Army. That vital member of the triservice team in general war and the decisive element in limited war.

I shall cover three main headings:

What do we mean by one modern army?

Why do we need it?

How do we attain it?

WHAT DO WE MEAN BY ONE MODERN ARMY?

In battle there has never been anything but one Army. No victory in American military history has ever been won by a single arm, service or component of the Army. Victory in the field has always been the product of the combined efforts of Regulars, guardsmen, reservist, and Army civilians with all arms and services working as a combined arms team.

Ever since the French and Indian wars, the wars in which America has been engaged have fought primarily by civilian soldiers—the volunteers or draftees who were "in for the duration." Even today, a sizable proportion of our Active Army is made up of the noncareer soldiers who will return shortly to civilian life. It is, then, these "short timers" together with the Regular Army, the National Guard, and the Army reserve who make up our one modern Army.

To attain combat readiness we must weld these components together. The one Army concept must pervade all ranks. The ground soldier is not a guardsman, nor a Regular, nor a reservist, nor a selectee. He is simply the American fighting man on the one Army team.

Maj. George Fielding Eliot, in a recent article on this subject, stated this philosophy very well. He said " * * * the indispensable cement of a structure of military unity must be confidence and that confidence has its dwelling place in human minds and hearts. * * * It can be achieved when human beings * * * have a common feeling of belonging together, of sharing a common purpose and common ideals."

We must maintain a unity of purpose toward the common goal of preparedness. Within our modern Army there is no place for parochialism, jealousy, or friction. Defeat of our potential enemies requires the combined efforts of all branches and all components working together as a team. Every component, every arm and service, every element of civilian support—both within the Army and in industry—has a vital role to play before victory is attained.

That teamwork so necessary for victory has reached the highest point in peacetime history. There is yet more to be done.

The one Army concept will not be fully attained until:

Our Army is a force represented by the concentrated efforts of the Regular Army, the National Guard, and the Army Reserve.

Every member of that force considers himself as a member of that team.

Every member is trained and ready to fill his role, and

The Army is truly united in the eyes of the public as one cohesive whole.

WHY DO WE NEED ONE MODERN ARMY

The need for mutual comradeship, understanding and cooperation has never been greater. The announced intention of our potential enemies is world conquest. Their military capabilities for carrying out this intention are the strongest of any aggressor in history. Modern technology has sliced wafer thin our protective cushion of time and space. No longer do broad oceans and powerful allies grant us years to mobilize and train our forces. No longer do we have months to activate units and perfect teamwork within the Army after war begins. No longer do we have time to erase conflicting attitudes and complete the welding process before commitment to battle.

Selected divisions and supporting units of the National Guard and U.S. Army Reserve are earmarked and must be trained and ready for mobilization immediately following M-day. These forces are essential:

To replace without delay those Active Army forces moved abroad at the outset of hostilities.

To provide additional divisions—beyond those of the Active Army.

To fulfill our NATO commitments.

To man our air defense forces.

To enlarge our training establishments.

These units and individuals must maintain a high state of combat readiness. Combat knows no distinction whatsoever between combat ready units or individuals of the Active Army, the National Guard, or the Army Reserve. Granted there is a difference in the degree of combat readiness appropriate to a Reserve unit and an Active Army unit. But never has the difference been so small.

From the very outset of a shooting war—general or localized—all components and all arms and services will be involved. The unity of spirit and teamwork in performance so essential to combat readiness must exist throughout the Army before the first shot is fired. Today our Reserve components are

an integral part of our deterrent to aggression.

HOW CAN WE ATTAIN THE GOAL OF ONE MODERN ARMY

The first step in the attainment of such a goal is to insure that the concept of one modern Army pervades all ranks. There must be a realization on the part of each component of the vital role they and their teammates play in national security. There must be a profound respect by each component for their comrades in arms.

Our public information program must be based on the one-modern-army concept. The public must be informed of the vital role that Reserve components play in national security. They must realize that the Army is not a sect apart, but that the Army is truly a service of the people, provided by the people, and for the defense of the people. In the eyes of the public all Army personnel, regardless of component, must be considered as "soldiers" of the one modern army.

The second step in attainment of the one-modern-army goal is to increase the combat readiness of all our Reserve component forces. Each unit must be maintained at its maximum authorized peacetime strength with trained personnel. The Army Reserves must maintain a pool of trained individuals prepared to fill rapidly the vacancies in strategic forces and the training establishment. Each unit must maintain the plans and the ability to absorb these fillers and mold them into full-strength units with minimum delay. All commanders must be prepared to operate full-strength units. Commanders, staffs, and troops must be trained on modern equipment and in current concepts of operation. We must advance the tactical training of all components through the unit training phase.

The third step is to maintain this close mutual relationship between components of the Army. To achieve the required degree of combat readiness the same training and the same principles for guiding training must be applied to all. In addition, all components must be trained on the same types of equipment.

There must be an increased participation by all components in Active Army exercises and maneuvers. We must learn to work together and fight as a team.

More use must be made of the Active Army service schools and training courses by the Reserve components. Conversely such schools and training courses must consider the requirements of the Reserve components when preparing the scope and establishing the course lengths. Appropriate courses for commanders and staffs should be attended jointly by all components. Our commanders who are going to fight together must get to know and respect each other's capabilities.

There must be more participation by Reserve components in studies on reorganization and equipment, development, and research. Conversely, the special problems of the Reserve components must be thoroughly considered in such actions.

Finally, we should standardize, to the maximum extent practicable, our administrative procedures. We should strive for uniform and standard forms, reports, and evaluations.

These are difficult tasks.

I consider that we have made great progress toward attaining one modern army. The troop list of our National Guard and Reserve units has recently been revised to fill more adequately the force requirements for future combat. This was a major step in the right direction. These units are now being reorganized under the latest tables of organization and equipment.

The RFA program whereby the Active Army is training Reserve personnel for 6 months and returning them to their units is another big step. The Active Army

trained some 80,000 such personnel in fiscal year 1959.

Reserve component personnel and units are taking an increasingly active part in Active Army exercises, CPX's, training, and school courses.

Reserve component units have reached the highest peak of combat readiness in peacetime history.

But we still have a long way to go. The association and its individual members can assist in attaining this one modern Army. Congress must be made aware of the urgent requirement to provide all components with up-to-date facilities and equipment. Additional armories and weekend training sites must be provided. Units must be provided with modern and serviceable equipment to the extent that they can maintain it efficiently. We need the green light and the green cash.

We must impress upon the civic leaders and officials of every city and town the responsibility they have to support their local Reserve component units. Localities must take pride in these units. The units must be made attractive for the higher type of youths of the communities. The public must realize the vital part these units play in national security. They must be impressed that survival later depends upon preparedness now.

Again quoting from Major Elliot, "the illusion that hardware is everything and the soldier is a relic of Valley Forge and Gettysburg can destroy our country. No crystal ball . . . can tell us where, when, how big or how long lasting will be the next emergency our Army will have to meet. Of two things we may be sure—we will need ground combat soldiers and we must train them beforehand."

We must impress upon all members and components of the Army the serious nature of the duty they perform.

We must maintain high standards of efficiency in training and operation throughout all components of the Army. We must continually raise our standards, our educational level, and our technical proficiency.

We must weld all components of the Army together by mutual understanding and mutual respect. We must learn to work together so that all branches and all components of the Army are a balanced, cohesive entity whose continuing element is teamwork and whose ultimate objective is victory.

In short, our purpose is to approach unity and combat readiness of all components with the urgency appropriate to the gravity of the international situation. Our goal is to move all units faster toward combat readiness until all our components have become one modern Army—combat ready.

The American Predicament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Kiwanis magazine of May 1959 had an article "The American Predicament," by Dr. Perry Epler Gresham, president, Bethany College, Bethany, W. Va.

Dr. Gresham is one of the able educators in America, and he has a penetrating insight into the problems confronting our country. Bethany College,

of which he is president, is one of the most outstanding small colleges in the United States, and is the first church-affiliated school in the country, having been founded by Alexander Campbell who was the leading figure in the religious movement known as the Christian Churches. The original name of the school was Buffalo Seminary.

Bethany College emphasizes the building of character, along with training of the mind, and the success which this unique college has achieved is indicated by the large number of its graduates who have been successful in all walks of life—religious, business, and public. In addition, from the establishment of this small college sprang other colleges of similar types all over the country.

In order that the article by Dr. Gresham may be more widely available, I am placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE AMERICAN PREDICAMENT

(By Dr. Perry E. Gresham, president, Bethany College, Bethany, W. Va.)

A bronze tablet in Indianapolis records one of the wise and relevant remarks of a statesman and prophet: "Here February 11, 1861, Abraham Lincoln, on his way to Washington to assume the Presidency, in an address said: 'I appeal to you to constantly bear in mind that not with the politicians, not with the Presidents, not with the office seekers, but with you is the question: Shall the union and shall the liberties of this country be preserved to the latest generation?'"

This timely warning calls each responsible person to assess the nature of the present American predicament with an appraising eye and a clear head. Three massive facts appear. The State is already enormous and is continuing to grow. The individual is very small and growing smaller. Only a revolutionary action can recover the autonomy of the individual person and the values of private enterprise.

War multiplies the size and power of the State. National survival demands a dictatorship in a time of enemy attack or a time of international warfare. The two recent world wars have given most of us experience in totalitarian citizenship. The wake of World War II has continued the apparent necessity for powerful central authority to withstand the external threat of hostile communist powers. Consequently, the American State has taken on colossal proportions. Approximately four fifths of the enormous federal tax revenue goes to pay for wars past, present, and future. The Kremlin helps to enhance the size and power of the American Government.

Internal American strife has created larger and larger bureaus with more and more personnel spending more and more money. Big labor and big business require big government to serve as referee and arbitrator. Each time a labor union cries out for Federal help, as in the Wagner Act, a new bureau is formed with its retinue of vested interest career people and its bureaucratic needs. Each time an industry seeks special advantage through subsidy or legislation to improve its position for survival, or additional consideration in protection or profit from the various commissions, or seeks for regulation to avoid competition, new government agencies appear. As expenses mount, an army of tax collectors must be put in the field to divert funds from private to State use in order to meet the insatiable demands of Leviathan.

The state grows because it is committed "to promote the general welfare." This concept has come to mean a welfare state with

social security for the aged, unemployment compensation for the jobless, support and services for the indigent, and health services for the many. The needs of man outrun his supply, no matter how vast the provision. Pressure for more social security, more unemployment compensation, more pensions, more health services, and more secure and easy government jobs builds up until the Leviathan grows apace, whether his strange head resembles a pachyderm or a jackass.

Politicians must gain office and stay in office, or they are not politicians. The most inviting and the most venerable means of getting elected is to make promises. The exclusive formula for retaining office is either to keep the promises or to make bigger promises to obscure the failure of performance with reference to those already made. Since giveaway promises appear to get quick results, they occur to parties and candidates alike. The state grows in proportion to its programs of expenditure. With the colossal greed of military demands and the insatiable pressure for welfare programs, the state must arrogate to itself more and more functions, power, and proportions. Parties and persons who aspire to office out-promise each other in a race to feed the Leviathan.

Inflationary pressures encourage the growth of the state. Everybody wants inflation for himself, but not for anybody else. As pressure builds up for more and more wages, prices must go up. The same pressures build up with respect to profits. The parties pinched by inflation cry out for government help, and the sensitive politicians respond with the creation of new administrations, which involve more taxes, which require higher prices, which demand more wages; and the round repeats itself. The net result is more and more government.

Alexis de Tocqueville, noted French political scientist of the last century, described individualism as "a mature and calm feeling, which disposes each member of the community to sever himself from the mass of his fellow creatures; and to draw apart from his family and his friends, so that, after he has thus formed a circle of his own, he willingly leaves society at large to itself. Individualists owe nothing to any man, they expect nothing from any man; they acquire the habit of always considering themselves as standing alone, and they are apt to imagine that their whole destiny is in their own hands. Individualism is of democratic origin and threatens to spread in the same ratio as the quality of conditions." This creature of early American origin is little more than a museum piece. The individual features have become blurred in a collectivist world.

With "security" as a major aim for the earning motive and conformity as the principal consideration for the consuming motive, there is precious little individualism left. The virtues of Puritan American—honesty, industry, and frugality—are widely ignored as irrelevant. People who can attain security by belonging to the association, the union, or the party are not likely to knock themselves out by working and planning for it. Even wild birds prefer the feeder to the tent caterpillars in the forest. The responsibility to save for a rainy day has been turned over to Uncle Sam. Honesty, which once included payment of debts, has been delegated to posterity. The conditions of contemporary society do not encourage individual responsibility.

Keeping up with the Joneses has taken a new turn under the spell of mass media. It may be "keeping down with the Joneses," or "up," as the case may be, but it must be like the Joneses. Consequently, our coeds move their waistlines up or down, and our

cars get bigger and "finnier," or small and foreign. Our homes grow more automatic and our children grow more nervous in an effort to belong to the crowd. Deferred payments enable the newlyweds to conform to the pattern of their parents. Our music tastes level out to match our preferences in architecture, drama, and literature. We have variety without great difference. We prefer the organization man to the individualist. The dissenter, or the private thinker, is an inconvenience.

The individual is powerless against the political organization. Consequently the voter tends to join the consumer quest for the candidate who fits the norms of sincerity and federal generosity. Only the conformist can belong to the machine, and only the machine can elect. The responsible citizen is obscured. The campaign oratory becomes perfunctory and dull, since it has little bearing on the election returns.

The private enterpriser in learning has become lost in the crowd on the campus. The Benjamin Franklin formula of a lifetime of learning has been replaced with the "4 years and a degree" formula, with as little learning as possible. Individual thought on crucial issues is hard to come by. Executives read a few cult papers and a few mystery thrillers with very little else to stir up the neurons.

Even the last citadel of man—his religion—has become socialized. Instead of a vertical answer to God, man tends to give horizontal answers to the well-dressed and highly respectable congregation that has status. Private prayer has become beautifully professionalized. The multitudes huddle together in Jerusalem without much recollection of the lonely vigil on a mountaintop at midnight or the silent walk by the shores of Galilee.

As the state grows big, the individual becomes small. People huddle together to dispel their loneliness and increase their share in security and advantage. The family becomes weak as a social unit. The peer group outranks the parents in prestige for the young. The conditions that beget autonomous people have given way to conditions that encourage the mass society.

The recovery of private enterprise begins with religion. No person is an individual until he can say: "I must obey God rather than men." This is the moral basis for all private judgment. The individual human mind that operates in a divine influence transcends all society. This is no invitation to fanaticism or antisocial attitudes. It is rather the basis for autonomous self-realization and private enterprise in acts and letters, as well as in money management and citizenship. Robert Frost has a wise old Yankee farmer say: "I call you to a one-man revolution; the only revolution that is going to come."

The right to be wise is posted on the assumption that a person thinks privately. Education must be restored. Invention, creative art, new developments in the social order, and new ideas are the result of individual thought rather than educational conformity. The quest for wisdom is a highly individual matter. The appetite for learning is antecedent to intellectual achievement.

A one-man revolution in the economy begins when a laborer stands up against his union or an industrialist stands up against his association in behalf of some worthy moral principle. The man who resourcefully develops his business without running to Uncle Sam is a one-man revolution. The young man who earns what he can by hard work and spends what he can afford is a private individual. The young wife who buys what is practical and beautiful rather than what is popular is a true person. The executive or statesman who decides on the basis of

his best insight into the will of God rather than expediency has found himself.

The problem of the ever-growing state must be met if any sphere for individual initiative is to be maintained. There are two massive social forces that resist the encroachment of government. These are resentment against high taxes and resentment against the loss of individual liberties. The man of independent mind can encourage these forces by intelligent conversation and astute action. The employer has responsibility to make employees acutely aware of the tax that is diverted from his paycheck. He is responsible to dramatize the loss of liberty that comes with the overwhelming state. The intellectual, the clergyman, the worker, the homemaker, the common man in any vocation is involved in the struggle to recover the cherished concept of individual responsibility that is essential to personal fulfillment and the good society under God.

Need for Outstanding Personnel in Foreign Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thoughtful and searching letter about our foreign aid program, which was published on the editorial page of the New York Times for August 12, 1959.

Author of the letter is a warm personal friend of mine, Dr. Philip Selling of Portland, Oreg., who is presently assistant professor of medicine on the faculty of the University of Indonesia, at Jakarta, in that island nation.

I commend to my colleagues Dr. Selling's penetrating observations on the need for people of imagination, education, and originality to administer and operate our costly program of foreign aid, which is so vital to the future of the free world.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLANNING FOREIGN AID—LATITUDE IN RUNNING PROGRAM HELD MORE IMPORTANT THAN ECONOMIES

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The current congressional interest in the managerial aspects of foreign aid programs is worthy of some comment. Foreign aid can and does work, and we all agree that it is necessary. However, if Congress proposes to put more stringent controls over the administration of that program, it may run afoul of its own good intentions.

Technically, more stringent controls mean more paperwork, more Washington supervision, more contact with the various other agencies of Government, and possibly more rigidity of opinion by the administrators themselves. All of this takes more time, and the delays in activating a specific project are already so long in many instances that the timeliness of a project may be lost.

Furthermore, it will be difficult to draw up stricter rules which must be applied to widely different nations and circumstances. Control also tends to lead to preoccupation

with big projects, since little ones do not always appear worthy of so much fuss and bother. Yet it is the little programs which often bring the biggest rewards.

Each project in every country is, in one sense, an experiment; and it is in a field where we have little previous experience to guide us. Inherent in these experiments is the element of risk—the risk of failure. Congress may interpret the failures as waste, but they are also part of the learning process. Let us waste more, but let us waste it wisely. Latitude in planning without so many rules, freedom from projectitis, the willingness to try many small experiments in foreign aid are far more important than saving a few million in a budget of several billion.

Actually, as has been pointed out many times in the last year, the problem is not in the program but in the man who runs it. Let him have a reasonable modicum of administrative intelligence. But let him also have imagination, an interest in the people and problems of his area; and, above all, let him have the latitude to try to help these countries the way they want us to.

PHILIP SELLING,

Assistant Professor of Medicine,
University of Indonesia,
JAKARTA, INDONESIA, August 3, 1959.

Oneonta Star Urges Services To Eliminate Any Servant-Master System Found To Exist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, a special subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] of which I have the honor to be a member, has recently been examining the problem of manpower utilization and specifically certain charges that have been made that enlisted men have been used as servants for senior officers. If these charges are borne out as a result of the investigation, it is clear, Mr. Speaker, that the American people are opposed to such procedures and will insist that they be discontinued. Representative of the thinking of the American people on this issue is a thoughtful editorial which appeared recently in the *Oneonta* (N.Y.) *Star*, of July 28.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the editorial for the information of my colleagues.

[From the *Oneonta* (N.Y.) *Star*, July 28, 1959]

ARMY'S SERVANT-MASTER SYSTEM NEEDS CHECKING

A lot has been said recently before the House Armed Services Committee about military officers using enlisted men as servants. There has been testimony that these enlisted men cut grass, baby sit, cook, and perform other menial tasks.

Assistant Defense Secretary Charles C. Finucane denies this. He told committee members that such men were assigned as "personal staff" people to relieve officers of "numerous administrative chores." Repre-

sentative FRANK KOWALSKI, of Connecticut, who started the investigation, questioned the word "assigned." He wanted to know how many men carried on the books as clerk-typists, and so forth, were actually working for officers as general handymen.

The issue here is not one of semantics. Either enlisted men are being assigned to work as servants for officers, or they are not. The Department of Defense should be able to come up with a simple, direct answer to a simple question. And if the answer is in the affirmative, then steps should be taken to change a servant-master system of which most Americans strongly disapprove.

East-West Trade: Advantages and Disadvantages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the question of expanding trade with the Soviet Union promises to grow larger and larger as the exchange of visits between Soviet and the United States becomes more frequent. It is well known that Russia is anxious for more trade markets in the west, as Mr. Mikoyan and Mr. Koslov made clear when they were here. The question is: Would greater trade with Russia be valuable and profitable for us?

A very well-reasoned discussion of this subject may be found in an article written for the May issue of *Tradescope* by the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] who concludes that increased trade can, if handled wisely, "be a net advantage for the United States and the free world."

I ask unanimous consent that the article, "East-West Trade: Advantages and Disadvantages," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From *Tradescope*, May 1959]

EAST-WEST TRADE: ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES

(By Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

Since earliest times the interchange of goods between nations has exerted a profound influence on the political relations of the trading partners. Political commitments have in turn cast their shadow over trade. This two-way impact is illustrated in the relationship between the Soviet bloc and the free world today. Until quite recently, the leaders of the Soviet Union have avoided extensive exchange of goods with the non-Socialist world economy. On the other hand, the free world has been able to develop only as much trade as the Soviet state-trading system was willing to permit.

During the past 5 years, however, there has been an increasing drive on the part of the Soviet bloc to enter the marketplace of the world. Because of its sudden emergence, it has often been suggested that the current Soviet economic offensive is merely a drive for political advantage with the ultimate aim of dividing the free world. Pre-

mier Khrushchev is reported to have said that "trade is not economics, it is power."

In assessing the advantages and disadvantages that might result increasing East-West trade, certain considerations should be noted.

Russia's monolithic trading mechanism with all its geographic subdivisions can concentrate with telling effects on strategic objectives and thus challenge the West, precisely because Russia is not concerned with profits or taxes. Its state trading monopoly is in a position not only to sell but also to buy vast quantities of goods or raw materials at a politically propitious moment because price is no object and all attendant costs, such as transportation, are absorbed by the state. Russia and the satellites, who are part of her economic orbit, are not concerned with the wage and price problems of the free enterprise system. This preponderant advantage is strengthened even more because the free world is composed of trading competitors who are also maneuvering for a more profitable share of the world markets. Operating as individual units, they are not fully equipped to meet massive Soviet competition.

Increasing shipments from the West have the effect of assisting the Soviets to overcome weaknesses and deficiencies, and thus inevitably to strengthen their war potential. In the past, however, our refusal to lift the embargo on strategic trade items with the Soviet Union has not proved wholly successful in containing Soviet economic advance. Although our efforts certainly slowed momentarily the economic advance of the Soviet Union, we have failed to deter her. In fact, our limited trade policies have often served to stimulate the Soviets to accelerate development and expand production. This is exactly what happened when we refused to sell aluminum to the Soviet Union immediately after World War II. By concentrated efforts, the Union was not only able to construct plants, but to produce aluminum at sufficient capacity that she was able to place a large volume on the world market last year and break the existing price structure.

The current drive for the easing of restrictions of East-West trade is more in the direction of strengthening the industrial, military, and economic prowess of the Communist bloc. What the Soviet trade agencies want above all, of course, is goods that are strategically important, yet whose export had hitherto been prohibited under our Battle Act. Several of our trading partners have long been under pressure by their business communities to sell such goods to Russia. Thus, ships, power generators, machine tools, presses, mining machinery, communications and transportation equipment are now being sent behind the Iron Curtain as a result of the gradual relaxation of controls. In return the Russians sell and ship grain, fish, and raw materials such as lead, zinc, copper, hides, and fur, plus a small amount of machinery. Underdeveloped areas can use the development equipment, but any deal with the industrialized West always includes a request for capital goods.

OBJECTIVES OF RUSSIA'S TRADE OFFENSIVE

It seems as if the aim of Russia's trade offensive is to attract the smaller nations (underdeveloped areas with major raw material exports) into its commercial orbit, while at the same time undermining the competitive position of Western trading nations. Thus Russia has had enormous success in buying up the pressing surpluses of Finland, Burma, Iceland, Egypt, Uruguay, and Argentina. The West has been unable to step up its own small programs of preclusive buying simply because of the Russian advantage whereby its trade monopoly can engineer deals without regard to the usual commercial terms, prices, or quality. This

initial advantage and the willingness to engage in such large-scale buying have been pressed to the point of establishing commercial dominance. In the countries where aggressive export campaigns have been waged, Russia has succeeded in capturing a large percentage of that country's import market, notably Afghanistan 30 percent, Finland 20 percent, Egypt 20 percent, and Iceland 22 percent.

Trading relations with the industrialized West are beginning to resemble increasingly the trade between Old Russia and Europe—fundamentally, the exchange of Russian foodstuffs and raw materials for manufactured goods. Her enormous industrialization plan necessitates increasingly larger supplies of specialized machinery—for example, the colossal extension of her chemical industry depends on Western machinery. Trade in these items cannot depend on barter deals, but requires hard currencies and gold. To earn the hard currency the Russians are concentrating on the supply and export in very specific sectors—like scientific instruments for schools—of a quality and at prices that cannot be met by the United States of America.

The West may be willing to trade with the Soviets, but certain difficulties have to be overcome. Notably foreign customers' unfamiliarity with Soviet products; the West's lack of knowledge of Soviet suppliers; the problem of service and spare parts; the known Russian stand against the extension of commercial credit to private foreign buyers; the dependability of performance on deliveries; and finally the question of whether trade relations may not be severed at will by the Russian political leaders if they wish to switch to more promising markets in line with their political objectives.

THE VOLUME OF SOVIET TRADE

The Soviet Union is now making a conspicuous effort to increase its commercial range outside the Communist bloc. By deliberate policy, three-fourths of all trade is reserved for its Communist trade partners. Since 1953, trade with the outside world has been gaining in volume. Measured by the extra-orbit portion of her trade, Russia is not a very important trading nation. To cite one figure, annual exports to all free countries at present amount to about \$1 billion. In terms of rank among trading nations, this puts her in our hemisphere somewhat ahead of Argentina but behind Brazil. In Europe, the size of Russia's annual volume of exports, excluding the bloc countries, places her somewhat between Austria and Denmark.

Russia's largest trade partners outside the bloc are the following six countries: Finland, United Kingdom, Egypt, West Germany, India, and France. To the first of this group, Finland, the value of annual exports in 1957 amounted to \$150 million; to the last, France, \$67 million. With the United States, the volume of trade conducted in a negligible affairs. Soviet exports to the United States amounted to only \$16 million in 1957.

The important thing to note is that the Soviet Government has undergone a change of heart toward trade. It no longer considers it a strategic liability. In recent years, it has been able to expand its trade all along the three main lines of geographic distribution, namely with the bloc nations, with the industrialized nations of the West, and with the underdeveloped countries. The latter, it is true, are, for the most part, a new element in Soviet trade. Yet, as mentioned above, two of Russia's principal trade partners outside the bloc are underdeveloped nations, Egypt and India.

ADVANTAGES OF EAST-WEST TRADE

An important fact to bear in mind is that the movement of trade between East and

West continued as a fairly active race during the worst years of the postwar period. The natural resources of the East have always exerted a strong commercial pull upon the West. This is especially true in Europe. The East possesses a variety of raw material needed in the West. Russia and her satellites are in a surplus position in forest products, fertilizer, fuels, flax, a number of minerals, and they regularly export a wide variety of foodstuffs, ranging from grain to eggs.

At the same time, the countries of the East have always served as an outlet for industrial products from the West. In many areas of technology, especially in the less strategic industries, Western producers have always appreciated the opportunity to broaden their market potential by keeping open the door to the East. True, it is an extremely unpredictable market. They buy at the margin, and they usually buy basic types of production equipment on a one-shot basis, but even a single sale of this sort, from the standpoint of the manufacturer, can be a large, profitable transaction. Above all, a channel for cooperation in a peaceful field.

One aspect of this problem is often overlooked. Rising living standards in the Soviet Union, resulting from increased trade, or other factors, may make a contribution to peace and may ultimately help to moderate the Communist dictatorship itself. As consumer aspirations are increasingly realized, it will become more difficult for the Soviet people to accept as valid the official image of the West as their mortal enemy. They will be more inclined to see the United States for what it is. A growing professional-managerial class may be a force for moderation as it balances the power of the military and political elites. I do not believe in economic determinism, but I do believe that economic factors influence the character of political institutions.

In conclusion, I support an increased volume of East-West trade because, if handled wisely, I believe it can be a net advantage for the United States and the free world. There is little risk in expanding the volume of nonstrategic trade. In addition to the mutual economic values deriving from such an exchange of goods there are certain non-economic byproducts which may be even more important. Trade always means person-to-person contact, and sometimes means idea-to-idea contact, among the trading partners. Such contact may lead to greater political understanding. We should neither underestimate nor overestimate the contribution of international commerce to international peace, but in these days of serious conflict let us not arbitrarily close any door to the greater exchange of goods, persons, or ideas.

Must We Tax the Railroads Out of Business?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David A. Mackie, which appeared in the August 1959 issue of the Reader's Digest entitled "Must We Tax the Railroads Out of Business?"

MUST WE TAX THE RAILROADS OUT OF BUSINESS?

(By David I. Mackie, chairman, Eastern Railroad Presidents Conference)

On the edge of the Blackfeet Indian Reservation in Montana's Glacier County lies the town of Cut Bank, population 4,500. Surprisingly, this small community boasts a large and expensive airport; it cost about \$4 million of Federal Funds and it covers three times the area of New York's LaGuardia Airport. Only one carrier, Western Airlines, uses this field. In 1958 about two passengers a day boarded its planes there. But the townspeople feel an airport is so important that they are willing to pay for its maintenance by keeping its 1,703 acres off the tax rolls and assessing a special annual airport tax against local property owners.

On the face of it, this makes sense. If the citizens are willing to pay for an airport, well and good. But when you examine who paid what in this case, the logic becomes a little blurred. In 1958 the Great Northern Railroad, which runs through Cut Bank and is therefore a local taxpayer, was assessed \$2,530 as its share of the costs of this competing facility; in the same year Western Airlines paid \$41.17.

But if you should accuse Cut Bank of unfairness to the Great Northern, the city fathers could point out that in whacking the railroad hard with local taxes they were only following well-established practice. Some of our biggest cities—New York, Cleveland, Boston, Pittsburgh, to name just a few—are masters of this art, and thousands of smaller taxing bodies are also practicing it with a will. In 1958 the bills of all these State and local tax collectors added up to a railroad tax of \$400 million (in addition to \$550 million in Federal income and payroll taxes). More than any other single factor, it is this huge sum that is causing our railroads frantic concern over what a 1958 Senate report called the general decline of the railroads.

While the rails have seen their revenues increase less than 1 percent a year over the past decade, their State and local taxes have climbed at the rate of more than 3 percent annually. There are two reasons for the railroads' concern: the sheer size of the taxes, and the relationship between the railroads' taxes and those paid by their fast-growing competitors.

The first problem stems from the fact that the railroads are the largest industrial owners of real estate in the United States, with 386,000 miles of track taking them into 96 percent of our 3,067 counties. This means that their rails run through literally thousands of individual tax jurisdictions—States, cities, towns, villages and school districts—to which every year they must contribute. In New York State alone the railroads contribute to more than 6,000 taxing bodies.

If these taxes had some logical relationship to the railroads' earnings in each community, the system might make some sense. But there is no such relationship.

In New Jersey, the Pennsylvania Railroad paid \$5,800,000 in taxes last year while earning only \$700,000.

In Toledo, Ohio, the local newspapers and the chamber of commerce conducted a campaign to force the New York Central to build a new passenger station, though the old station was already running at a deficit. The Central did build a new terminal, at a cost of \$4,856,000, and the annual tax on it jumped from \$3,484 to \$48,799.

In Pittsburgh, the Pennsylvania Railroad spent \$9,500,000 in realigning its tracks and rebuilding its passenger shed as part of the city's Golden Triangle redevelopment program—and immediately got slapped with a

tax boost of \$31,000 annually on the improvement.

And whenever the construction of a new highway or the improvement of an old one necessitates building an overpass or changing a grade crossing—which happens hundreds of times every year—the railroad not only has to contribute to the construction bill but finds itself paying more in taxes for the improvement.

Exorbitant overvaluation of railroad facilities for tax purposes is a temptation that many local politicians cannot resist. Jersey City, N.J., a major rail center with vast yards, is a case in point. When one railroad serving this city sold 33 acres recently—just to cut down on its crushing tax burden—the land, assessed at \$621,296, sold for \$19,472.

One of the odd results of the multiplicity and overlapping of tax jurisdictions is that the railroad industry contributes more tax money directly to education than does any other private institution. Every year about 60 percent of the railroads' property taxes in Illinois go to education. In 1958, 45 percent of the Pennsylvania Railroad's \$32 million State and local taxes went to schools. In School District No. 7 of Lincoln County, Mont., the Great Northern pays 91.38 percent of all school taxes levied in the district—despite the fact that the railroad's property comprises only one-third of 1 percent of the land. Altogether, the railroads' State and local tax bill for education in 1958—an estimated \$140 million—was equal to almost a third of the Federal Government's contribution to the same school systems.

How the railroads' huge tax payments compare with those of their competitors is the other half of the picture. Here again the problem goes back to the fact that the railroads own so much real estate: stations in the hearts of cities, freight yards in their outskirts, and hundreds of thousands of miles of track from coast to coast. All this they build and maintain themselves, and on all of it they pay taxes.

But who builds, maintains, and owns the airports, the waterways, and the highways? By and large it is the Government, and the Government pays no tax. Nor, in any sense comparable to the railroads, do the airplanes, barges, and trucks that use these facilities.

The airlines and water carriers pay nothing at all toward the construction and maintenance of their rights-of-way and signaling systems. The trucking industry does pay taxes in the form of registration and mileage fees, and in fuel and equipment levies. But these are merely user charges, intended to do no more than contribute toward highway construction, maintenance, and administration costs. (In fact, the truckers insist that all Federal automotive excise taxes be earmarked exclusively for highway purposes.)

The railroads, on the other hand, without a cent of Government subsidy, pay the full costs of building, maintaining, and administering their rights-of-way, and it is the railroads, and the railroads alone, that must pay additional hundreds of millions of dollars toward the administrative costs of general government of the communities through which they run.

In New York City the railroads pay about \$9 million in taxes on their passenger facilities. How much of this goes to support the city's two giant airports, La Guardia and Idlewild, it is impossible to estimate. Certainly some does, since these two fields pay no taxes.

Boston's 2,000-acre Logan International Airport, which cost \$74 million of city, State, and Federal funds, is not taxed at all. But the New Haven Railroad's 31-acre South Station in downtown Boston pays the city over a million dollars every year in taxes—

about the same as the user fees paid by all the airlines using Logan.

In Illinois the railroads paid \$32 million in property taxes in 1955. The 244 trucklines doing business in the State, the 17 certificated airlines and the 65 barge and towing companies paid \$800,000.

The one encouraging glimmer of light for the railroads is the fact that more and more people are beginning to worry about this situation. Early this year a report to the governor of New York by his special assistant on transportation admitted that the State's treatment of the railroads was grossly unfair, and went on to say that this was actually costing the State money in the form of lost business and employment. As a result, the legislature has already enacted measures to alleviate the situation to some degree. In West Virginia railroad tax reform is likewise before the lawmakers.

At the Federal level Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS of Florida has conducted long and deep-probing hearings into the rail situation. The report of his subcommittee recommends that State and local governments reexamine railroad taxes to correct the "inequitable tax situation."

The problem is such a pressing one that the air is suddenly full of suggested solutions. Some observers suggest that railroad property used in connection with passenger service should be exempted from taxation since it is easily demonstrable that the railroads lose money on passengers. Others favor some kind of Government subsidy for the railroads, to offset the subsidies their competitors get. There are even some who think that the solution lies in slapping heavier taxes on the railroads' competitors.

All these suggestions ignore one basic fact. It is our national policy to treat our so-called highways of commerce—roads, airways, canals—as precious national assets and to keep them free of taxation. Why, then, should this policy not apply to the railroads? Certainly, in terms of the tonnage they carry, these are the most important transportation arteries of all. Why must they pay any property taxes?

Despite the apparent logic of such reasoning, nobody has yet dared to voice this suggestion. Property taxes are traditionally the province of the States, and who wants to stand up in public and ask the States to cut down the tree that rains \$400 million into their treasuries every year?

But somebody will have to start talking in these stark terms soon. For this tax shakedown is inflicting such deep financial wounds that the railroads' very existence is threatened.

Report by Senator Saltonstall to People of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the United States is a proud nation today—proud of its democracy, proud of its industry and especially proud of its people—of the rights of the individual.

Mr. President, we must remain ever on guard to see that this Nation remains interested in the individual and that we remain and grow as a nation of the thrifty and hard-working. Of recent interest has been the proposal to broaden

the number of those who are able to provide for their old age and declining years through their personal efforts rather than through Government means.

We now have industrial and corporate pension plans where in a perfectly proper way employers provide for the retirement of their employees—showing concern for them as individuals. But, Mr. President, we must show that same concern for those individuals not covered by corporate pension plans. Feeling as I do on this subject, Mr. President, I recently wrote a report to my constituents in Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

INDEPENDENCE—THE AMERICAN WAY

The foundation of the great democracy we enjoy in the United States is the respect our citizens hold for each other as individuals.

Starting with our Declaration of Independence representatives chosen by our people have sought to build upon that foundation.

Congress has always sought to keep the balance of equal respect for all individuals.

At the present time a source of unbalance is the law surrounding the ability of each individual to provide for his own security in later years.

The law now provides, for example, that employers may set up pension plans for their employees. An employer can deduct the annual payments as a business expense. The employee is not taxed until he receives the pension in later years. Thus the whole amount is not taxed to either employer or employee for an interim period. This legislation has led to the establishment of many corporate pension funds and even to a few set up by partnerships and individual employers.

But this law omits the person who works for himself. This man, independent and self-supporting, deserves equal treatment under the law, for his enterprise has contributed greatly to our country's growth.

Our self-employed persons are the backbone of the country. They include the highly trained professional people, many of the master mechanics, small businessmen who own their own commercial establishments, and some manufacturers. From these people come many of the ideas and efforts that help build our country.

At present they are not permitted tax deductions to set aside funds for their retirement even though they are, in essence, their own employers and might be doing it for their employees.

President Eisenhower recognized the problem when as a candidate in 1952 he said, "When this legislation was being considered, self-employed individuals were evidently forgotten, yet they get old and sick just as other people do." Later, in his state of the Union message in 1953, he stated that encouragement of pension plans for private individuals should be an important part of the legislative program.

Since then little has been done, unfortunately to put this request into effect.

A bill now before the Senate Finance Committee which passed the House of Representatives would correct a large part of this deficiency in the present law.

H.R. 10 provides that self-employed persons can set aside, in an irrevocable trust, up to \$2,500 per year. This amount will be deductible from gross income for purposes of income tax for the year the money was received, but will be considered taxable in-

come upon retirement. The rate of tax at retirement will probably be substantially less, since the individual will no longer have taxable earned income. The bill sets up certain conditions as to the type of fund into which the money is put and restrictions as to the conditions under which any of the funds thus set aside can be withdrawn.

The Senate Committee on Finance scheduled another hearing on this bill for August 11, and there is no way of determining at this time whether it or a similar bill will be reported by the Committee for Senate action. One reason for this has been the Treasury Department's opposition. The Treasury has been concerned that the tax relief offered will decrease the Federal revenue and put the budget out of balance.

It correctly believes that the inflation caused by the deficit financing arising from an unbalanced budget will in effect weaken the retirement programs of all of us—employed as well as self-employed.

I believe the Treasury must work to find a way whereby a positive approach can be taken to correct the inequity in our present law, as the legislation basically is extremely important and only fair to large numbers of our citizens. To avoid an unbalanced budget the Treasury Department must seek alternative revenue thereby avoiding deficit dangers.

The Treasury Department, in its opposition to H.R. 10 has stated that it believes: (1) that it might cost the Federal Government \$300 million in tax revenue the first year, (2) that the bill is not fairly written, for although it corrects some of the inequities in our present setup, it does not correct them all, (3) that if the inequities were corrected it might reduce Federal revenue as much as \$3 billion.

Advocates of the bill have stated that they believe it will reduce revenue by only \$100 million and that although it may not correct all of the inequities the opportunity to correct some of them should not be lost.

The principle of this legislation is too important to be lost through a difference over the way in which it should be put into effect. It may be possible that by judicious amendment of the present legislation much can be accomplished to correct many of the inequities.

As far as the loss of revenue to the Treasury is concerned, both sides are talking about substantial sums of money. To this a reasonable answer must be found. But since this matter has already dragged on for so many years, the best thing would be to get the principle of a self-employed retirement fund program established as soon as possible. The revenue loss to the Treasury could be arranged so that the Treasury would have a period of time to build up the alternative revenue sources.

The United States has too long depended upon its self-employed not to continue to encourage them today. The self-employed of this Nation are hardworking people. They will continue to be so but we must not discriminate against them.

I look forward to action on H.R. 10 or its equivalent, and hope that the Finance Committee can report a bill before the end of this session. Too much depends upon this matter of principle. The people have demanded it; an inequity exists that must be corrected.

The individual and individual opportunity have been part of our proudest heritage in this democracy. H.R. 10 helps fulfill this principle.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

We, the Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the remarks of Miss Mary L. Stevenson, of West Newton, Pa., who has written a very trenchant and timely speech entitled "We, the Public."

All too often in the complexities of political life a vast segment of our population known as the shareholders of corporations are overlooked. Their rights and the contributions they are making to the well-being of our society are inadvertently or purposely ignored.

In a capitalistic system such as ours the contributions which the shareholders of corporations are making to the total economy is important and significant. Without their equities there would be no expansion of business, no increase in jobs, no growth in our competitive system.

I regard myself as a friend of labor, and a strong supporter of labor's efforts, but we must not overlook or neglect the stockholder whose investments make possible capital expansion and the creation of more jobs.

The speech follows:

WE, THE PUBLIC—OUR RESPONSIBILITY IN POLITICS

(By Mary L. Stevenson, West Newton, Pa., delivered at the annual meeting of stockholders, Koppers Co., Inc., Pittsburgh, Pa., March 30, 1959)

I'd like to comment on some existing conditions and recent incidents which have been giving me grave concern. First, I want to make it quite definitely clear that I am not antilabor. Neither am I antimanagement. But I am becoming sick and tired of labor in capitals, as I am sick and tired of all pressure groups. I feel that divisive tactics aimed to advance power and prestige of individuals or the interest of a particular group they represent can be anything but salutary for the general welfare. In today's world, if we are even to continue to exist, we've got to maintain and foster all of the elements of strength within us. For stability and for survival we've got to get on a sound basis—moral, economic, political.

WHO IS THE PUBLIC?

Recently a prominent labor leader was quoted in the newspapers as demanding with a grin "Who is the public?" Did the grin mask a sneer? Did you feel affronted, as I did? In any event it would seem to be high time that we stockholders in this and other businesses, a very important segment of the public, find our voice, individual and collective, and let it be known to others than management, that we do exist. Let it be known that we have not only a stake, but a moral responsibility, a sincere concern for everything which makes and keeps America strong and true to the principles of our Founding Fathers. No flippant question as to our identity is going to cause us to disappear or to "lie down and play dead."

There are people who relegate "dividend" or "stock" to the category of dirty words. This I resent, even as I find grossly unfair the technical terminology of "unearned income" for dividends or interest.

I certainly worked for, earned, and saved the money with which I bought the first stock I ever owned. I was then, and have always been, proud to have even a small equity, a part ownership in the industry of America. I like to have even my limited share in furnishing the capital which "makes the wheels go 'round," which creates jobs, pioneers new fields, adds to our national wealth and strength.

EMPLOYEES AS STOCKHOLDERS

Employees are often also stockholders, and I think that is good, but all of us who own shares—individually and collectively—we are the real owners of our corporate industries.

The money we invest to buy machines, build plants, etc., is really risk capital. Any number of things may, and sometimes do, cause low profits or even loss or failure in some of our businesses. We invest with the hope of getting a reasonable return for the use of our capital, but we all know that when business is poor, dividends are reduced or "passed" completely.

Stockholders, as such, have no pensions, social security, unemployment insurance, "fringe benefits." Many older ones among us enjoy none of these things from other sources, yet if we have worked hard and saved, according to the good old accepted American way, if we have invested some of our earnings in order to yield us an income and remain independent, we so often find tax programs discriminatory against us.

PROFIT MISCONCEPTIONS

In this regard I think it most deplorable that there is such widespread misconception, such frequent misrepresentation, about profits. Many, many honest folk are confused, and their knowledge of economics does not go beyond the most elementary level. So profits for bargaining or bullying purposes, can become some sort of a whipping boy. We are told a corporation has made millions in profits, and to the unthinking this may appear as a big pie to be cut in little pieces and divided. Pie-in-the-sky, rather than realism, is the measure of too many present-day attitudes.

To make those millions, how many billions have gone into investment or capital outlay, how many billions of products turned out and sold in a strongly competitive market? But we will say that in spite of ever-increasing costs a corporation has still shown a profit. Along comes our Uncle Sam to pocket more than half in corporate taxes.

Please, Uncle, just use it wisely—defend us strongly, practice justice and humanity, but do not let the boys in Congress or elsewhere waste or cheapen our hard-earned dollars.

AUSTERITY IN GOVERNMENT

Some of your spendthrifts, Uncle, might be in better health for a small dose of austerity—and please, when it comes out of our pockets, we would like to know where our money goes. Won't you subject all your bureaus, bureaucrats, and Congress to strict accountability?

But to return to our assumption of some net profits left after taxes. Shall we pass it around and divide it all up, either among shareholders or between shareholders and employees? Who is so senseless or irresponsible as to advocate a regular binge of that sort for any small or large business which hopes to continue? There must be reserves set aside for a rainy day, to plow back for new plans, new tools, materials, etc., and

for research which becomes increasingly important—to find new uses, new methods, new products—which will mean new and continue! jobs in the production field.

Finally, our stockholder in a profitmaking corporation receives his dividend and is happy when he receives just a proper fair return on his investment. If he has ever thought of himself as the forgotten man he is soon disabused, because back comes Uncle for his income tax, there is frequently personal property tax at the local or county level, and the newly proposed tax program suggests a further considerable bite on personal property at the State level (Pennsylvania).

Where is our voice to protest prejudiced and discriminatory measures against our so-called unearned incomes?

STOCKHOLDERS BEAR TAX LOAD

Certainly the stockholders of business and industries, through invested capital, and taxes on the return thereon, are bearing their share of the load. While we are happy and proud to know this is so, we feel that anyone who does not know, or questions "Who is the public?" should be reminded that we are a segment of that public, that we have a considerable stake, not only in creation of production and employment, but in the best interests, not of a group or class, but of our whole country, its strength and continuance.

Another term which seems to have a dirty connotation or is the "boogey man" to some people, is automation. (Some 30 years ago there was technocracy.)

Automation exists. It is progress, but it may often be, at least temporarily, uncomfortable, or even seemingly a hostile or fearful force.

PAINFUL DISLOCATIONS

It seems to me we are living in a fluid period, one of change as was the early industrial revolution in England. There are some painful dislocations, and I believe both management and unions should share some responsibility to retrain and relocate displaced employees. (Two companies in which I had a small equity liquidated this year and I was very glad to note that one was making provision for carryover of job rights, pensions, etc., with the purchasing company.)

Man is the creator of machines, he tends and directs them, and he is still their master. While they can take over much that was tedious or routine, they open up new and varied avenues of employment. Research and training programs, by accepting the challenge, can pave the way to a better life.

There exists, in some quarters, a very real problem of unemployment, but it must be faced and worked out with both vision and realism, and to me it certainly seems no solution at all, simply to pay bigger wages or benefits to the lucky ones who are still employed. Higher and higher wages and salaries, unsupported by more productivity, more business, more real earnings, higher and higher prices, and still the two don't meet. And where do we go from here? And we so slap-happy, riding our spiral of inflation, that we are economically aiming for the moon and outer space, or can we keep our feet on the ground and anchor our present and future on sound values?

TRUST IN MANAGEMENT

We, as individuals or a group, do not sit around a bargaining table. We must and do delegate authority, and we must trust management. I believe that this management is trustworthy and that in general management today has an awakened social consciousness.

While we delegate authority, in management, in government, certain obligations and responsibilities remain vested in us as people, as citizens.

The wind of inflation can bear the seeds of disaster. When a Nation's currency becomes much cheapened by inflation, there seems so often a correlation with loss of moral integrity and stability, both on the part of individuals and governments. History gives us so many unpretty pictures of such decay in both ancient and modern times, and the unhappy fates of other lands are of record for us to heed.

Recent stories from Washington and elsewhere tell of waste and worse at the expense of citizens and taxpayers, and to the shame of all of us.

BUSINESS AND POLITICS

These things I have touched upon are of very real concern to everyone, and must be resolved with intelligence, reasonableness, integrity and courage.

And what do we do, we the public?

Current news stories relate proposals that, as labor is deeply involved, management too should become active in politics.

Whereas management, as a group, would doubtless become a target under such circumstances, we all, individually and collectively, should assume our responsibility in politics, which is the science of government.

I wonder whether we inform ourselves, seek and support worthy candidates, vote, make our wishes and displeasures known as they relate to our own interests, or the best interests of our country.

We are a part of the public which does exist and our role must be enlightened, active, honorable and responsible.

Hal Kelly Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Henry Hagans Kelly, a career public servant since 1923, is retiring from his post as director of the Office of International Travel, Department of Commerce. Mr. Kelly's record in behalf of travel and tourism, both domestic and international, is well and most favorably known. I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the July 20 issue of Holiday News Letter, paying tribute to Mr. Kelly and noting the loss to the Government's travel program, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H. H. Kelly, the Government officer who in the last few years has come to be looked upon as the U.S. official representative at all international meetings involving travel, is retiring from his post as Director of the Office of International Travel in the Department of Commerce.

His retirement from Government, effective July 31, will come as a result of a cut for the fiscal year beginning this month in the congressional appropriation of that Department's Bureau of Foreign Commerce, under which the travel office functions. With the financial facilities available under the reduced budget, Mr. Kelly, officials said, felt he could do more good for travel outside of Government than by trying to carry on his program under the curtailments which will now be necessary.

The slash in the bureau's budget, it is understood, amounts to about 10 percent of the appropriation for the past year. So sizable was it that it will mean a cutback in all of the bureau's various programs, including trade promotion, investment promotion, and travel.

Faced with this drastic change, the Commerce Department has called a special meeting of its Travel Advisory Committee for July 22. At that time it will discuss a revised program for the bureau. Its chairman, Henry Kearns, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for International Affairs, will preside. The committee consists of about 30 executives of the U.S. transportation and travel industries. Mr. Kelly is the drafter of the program on which the travel office has been working for the last 4 years. His efforts to strengthen it during this period had not proved successful.

Backed by 30 years' experience in the international transportation and travel fields, Mr. Kelly's name has long been prominent in travel circles. He came to Commerce in 1955, after 8 years' work in the Department of State. Prior to that, he mapped out and headed new programs for the Office of Defense Transportation, Interstate Commerce Commission, and Bureau of Public Roads. He has been active for many years as U.S. representative in numerous international organizations, among them the International Union of Official Travel Organizations, Pacific Area Travel Association, Inter-American Travel Congresses, and units of the United Nations. He has signed for the U.S. Government three treaties on travel facilitation.

In taking over as director of the Office of International Travel, Mr. Kelly prepared a detailed program of work which was well received by cooperating industries, Government departments and international organizations. It proposed intensified attention by Federal Government to such matters as reduction of barriers to international travel, cooperation with numerous United States and international organizations, cooperative committee work, technical assistance projects, improved statistical and informational services, development of two-way travel to and from the United States, and an adequate legislative program designed to help travel in general. Meanwhile, Commerce will continue to have a travel office. It will still function as a part of the Bureau of Foreign Commerce, under the supervision of Assistant Secretary Kearns and Loring K. Macy, director of the bureau.

The Commerce Department's travel office has always operated on a small scale in comparison with those of most foreign governments, due to the fact that private enterprise bears virtually all of the international travel promotion burden in this country. It is understood its budget has been well under \$100,000 and, although Commerce recommended an increase this year, the economy-minded Congress was not favorably impressed. The Randall Commission, in its report submitted to Congress by the President last year, recommended \$250,000 as an annual budget.

Why Wheat?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD F. MCGINLEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. MCGINLEY. Mr. Speaker, there are at least a few statements in this

much confused subject of agriculture and its present situation which can still be regarded as being axioms. One of them is that we presently have a tremendous surplus of wheat. Another is that of all the areas that raise wheat, western Nebraska is to be regarded modestly as being one of the best.

From time to time the theory is propounded that by reducing price, production will be reduced. It is a fine theory but does not work out in practice—not until the farmer's income is lowered to the degree that he is put out of business.

Why, then, does not the farmer switch to another crop which might be more profitable? The reason is that this wonderful land of western Nebraska is suited only to one crop—wheat.

In an attempt to learn if this usually accepted opinion is correct, the University of Nebraska College of Agriculture made an intensive study of the merits of raising only wheat compared to planting some other crops. This study not only produced an interesting answer to that question, it also provides proof that under the present situation, the best is none too good.

The result of this study was published in the Nebraska Farmer, a farm magazine now starting into its second century of publication; a fully responsible magazine dedicated to its namesake.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit this article and three very revealing tables for the consideration of my colleagues as an answer to their question, "Why wheat?"

Why do wheat farmers continue to grow wheat—in the face of a large wheat surplus—instead of grain sorghum, barley, or oats?

The reason is this—net returns per acre from wheat in southwestern Nebraska are higher than returns from any other crop.

According to a study made by R. D. Vlasin and A. W. Epp, agricultural economists with the U. S. Department of Agriculture and the Nebraska College of Agriculture, respectively, the wheat-fallow system brought superior returns to the operator for his labor and management than any other cropping systems tested. Assumed prices, costs, and yields were used.

Grain sorghum on both fallow and stubble showed the highest net return of the alternative crops. Ranking in order below grain sorghum were barley on stubble, proso hog millet on stubble, safflower on fallow, and oats on stubble.

Epp said the relative advantages of the various alternative crops as substitute for wheat are based on one set of prices and yields. He said relative prices and yields may differ in the future from those used in the study. Under conditions of changing price and yield relationships, the ability of alternative crops to compete with wheat is also subject to change. Farmers need to consider which crops will give the highest returns under these changing conditions.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY PRICES USED

The prices used in the study are the 1960 projected prices for Nebraska; wheat \$1.70 per bushel; grain sorghum, \$1.93 per hundred; oats, 70 cents per bushel; barley, \$1.06 per bushel; safflower, \$3.20 per hundred; and proso, 97 cents per bushel.

In order to estimate and compare the returns from wheat and from the alternative grain and seed crops, it was necessary to estimate the crop yields that reasonably can be expected.

A comparison between the estimated yields of grain crops for the study area and the averages of available county yields is shown in table 1. The area yields shown in this table were used in budgeting the alternative cropping systems.

The returns from wheat and from alternative cropping systems are compared by budgeting the various cropping systems. The budgets are indicated by numbers across the top line of table 2. Budget one is based on a wheat-fallow cropping system while budgets two through eight are based on wheat and alternative crops. The wheat in each of these budgets is produced on fallow. Grain sorghum and safflower are grown on both wheat stubble and fallowed land, while proso, barley, and oats are grown only on wheat stubble.

Each budget has a small idle acreage representative of the wasteland that cannot be farmed on this 1,440-acre unit. These budgets are compared for financial returns and for changes in the farm organization required in changing from the wheat-fallow system to each of the alternative cropping systems.

In budget one, the cropland was divided equally between winter wheat and summer fallow. This budget represents a situation of unrestricted wheat production. The farm organization in budget one was used as a basis for developing each budget for organizations containing an alternative crop. Changes were made in costs of production as changes were made in type and quantity of crops produced.

While some custom combining had to be hired to provide timely harvesting for the large wheat acreage in budget one, the reduction in wheat acreage in budgets two, three, and four is large enough to eliminate the need for custom combining. And the harvest periods for grain sorghums, proso, and safflower do not occur at the same time as the harvest for wheat. Therefore, the harvesting of these crops can also be completed with the owned line of machinery. However, there is a sizable increase in the operating costs for budgets two, three, and four as a result of the additional tillage and harvesting requirements for the alternative crop.

HARVEST CONFLICT

Although the wheat acreages in budgets five and six are also reduced, these cropping systems do not have the same advan-

tages as those in budgets two, three, and four. The harvest period for oats and barley may conflict with wheat harvesting in some years, which would require an increase in the amount of custom combining above that required in budget one. The operating costs in budgets five and six are increased as a result of the increased tillage requirements and custom combining.

In determining which of several cropping systems is best suited to farms in the southern Kimball County area, two things must be considered, the economists point out.

First, if possible, the cropping system chosen should give the largest average net returns.

PROTECTION AGAINST RISK

Second, the cropping system should provide some protection against the conditions of high risk in this area.

The financial returns from the cropping systems indicate that wheat production has an advantage over all other cropping systems tested. If, because of acreage restrictions, farmers are required to shift to one of the less profitable alternative crops, they should choose an alternative that will give the highest possible returns.

In order to realize the highest possible income, a farmer should try to choose an alternative crop that is not likely to drop drastically in price as more and more farmers begin to produce it. Any price adjustment will depend largely on the extent to which farmers shift from production of wheat to substitute crops. A widespread shift by Plains wheat farmers to any one of these alternative crops would probably have a sizable effect on the price of that crop. Minor adjustments by farmers probably would not seriously depress the price of the alternative crops.

In the case of safflower, one of the less profitable crops increased production might result in higher prices. Both the processors of safflower and the producers of safflower oil products are presently not sure of sufficient supplies to operate most efficiently and to provide consumers with a constant supply of safflower oil. Therefore, an increase in the supply of safflower might place it in a more favorable position as a substitute for wheat.

After budgeting the alternative cropping systems under one set of prices and yields for all grain and seed crops, a comparison of returns from wheat and from alternative crops was made under different prices and yields. A procedure was developed to determine the price and yield of an alternative crop necessary to give the same income as wheat at various wheat yields and prices. See table 3.

TABLE 1.—Crop yields used in budgeting alternative cropping systems for a 1,440-acre farm in southern Kimball County, compared with county average yields

Crop	Unit	Estimated yields for study area	County averages	
			Years	Yields
Wheat:				
On fallow.....	Bushel.....	14.0	1930-54	14.9
On stubble.....	do.....	7.6		
Grain sorghum:				
On fallow.....	do.....	20.3		
On stubble.....	do.....	11.0	1932-54	9.8
Safflower:				
On fallow.....	Hundredweight.....	5.01		
On stubble.....	do.....	2.76		
Oats on stubble.....	Bushel.....	13.2	1935-55	20.0
Barley on stubble.....	do.....	12.7	1935-55	14.5
Proso on stubble.....	do.....	11.2		

TABLE 2.—Estimated income and expenses with 1960 projected prices under various cropping systems, on a 1,440-acre farm, southern Kimball County¹

Budgets.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	Acres							
Organization:								
Wheat.....	698	465	465	465	465	465	349	349
Fallow.....	698	465	465	465	465	465	698	698
Grain sorghum.....		465						349
Proso.....			465					
Safflower.....				465			349	
Oats.....					465			
Barley.....						465		
Idle.....	44	45	45	45	45	45	44	44
Total cash income.....	\$15,722	\$15,971	\$15,397	\$14,417	\$14,283	\$15,996	\$13,177	\$15,492
Total cash expense.....	5,686	6,594	6,564	6,354	7,171	7,166	5,418	5,696
Net cash income.....	10,036	9,377	8,833	8,063	7,112	8,830	7,759	9,796
Depreciation.....	1,919	2,006	2,016	2,006	1,958	1,958	1,958	2,006
Net farm income.....	8,107	7,371	6,817	6,057	5,154	6,872	5,801	7,790
Interest on investment, at 5 percent.....	4,405	4,423	4,426	4,423	4,413	4,413	4,413	4,423
Returns to labor and management.....	3,702	2,948	2,391	1,634	741	2,459	1,388	3,367

¹ Farm expenses have increased since the study was made. This would reduce the net income of all systems. It is not likely that this has changed the ranking of the cropping systems.

TABLE 3.—Price of alternative crops necessary to give the same labor and management income as wheat (yielding 14 bushels on fallow), at 3 levels of wheat prices, for a 1,440-acre farm in southern Kimball County

Crop	Yield used in budgeting	Unit for price	Necessary price of alternative crop with wheat price at—		
			\$2.30	\$2.00	\$1.70
Grain sorghum on fallow.....	20.3	Bushel.....	\$1.52	\$1.32	\$1.13
Grain sorghum after wheat.....	11.0	do.....	1.59	1.41	1.23
Barley after wheat.....	12.7	do.....	1.65	1.48	1.30
Proso after wheat.....	11.2	do.....	1.59	1.41	1.23
Safflower after wheat.....	2.76	Hundredweight.....	6.38	5.63	4.88
Safflower on fallow.....	5.01	do.....	6.26	5.42	4.59
Oats after wheat.....	13.2	Bushel.....	1.58	1.41	1.24

Grange Projects Encircle the Globe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during recent years the advancements of science and technology have changed tremendously the interrelationships between people and nations around the globe.

Jet planes, rocket-powered missiles, satellites, and other developments are rapidly reducing time and distances as obstacles or barriers to communication, understanding, and association among people.

As a result, the nations, and people of the world, more and more, are realizing the advantages of working more closely together—wherever possible—for resolving problems and promoting progress.

Today, a great many international programs are Government-sponsored. However, it is always particularly gratifying when individuals or nongovernmental organizations assume a responsible role in this field.

The August issue of the National Grange Monthly contained a detailed article by Jack Jackson entitled "Grange Projects, Like a Satellite, Circle the Globe and Influence the Lives of People Around the World."

The splendid article outlines the numerous ways in which the Grange, through its international program, is making a constructive and commendable effort to promote people-to-people understanding and progress.

Representative of the kind of constructive nongovernmental initiative needed to further activities in this field, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the National Grange Monthly, August 1959]

GRANGE PROJECTS, LIKE A SATELLITE, CIRCLE THE GLOBE AND INFLUENCE THE LIVES OF PEOPLE AROUND THE WORLD

(By Jack Jackson)

What does your Grange have in common with a spaceship or satellite?

Spaceships and satellites are now circling the globe. They are a part of our program for encouraging world peace. They are helping keep the free world free.

The influence of the Grange also circles the globe. Through Grange projects, rural citizens of America influence the economic, political, and social lives of citizens around the world. Such projects contribute to world peace—they too help to keep the free world free.

What are some of these Grange projects? How do they operate? How do they influence the lives of peoples around the globe?

The international community service project, conducted in cooperation with the U.S. State Department, enables your Grange to act as host to visitors from many lands. A

group of from 5 to 20 visitors is assigned to each cooperating grange for a period of from 4 to 7 days. Guests may be agricultural leaders, educators, journalists, government officials, or from other walks of life. They may be from Europe, Asia, Africa, or Latin America.

Visitors are assigned by the host grange to homes of its members—one or two to a family. Guests become temporary members of the family, sharing in its everyday activities and obtaining firsthand experience in the American rural way of life.

Through this project, Granges of 12 States have served as hosts to 337 visitors from 71 countries.

State Department officials have indicated their interest in the project with promise to assist in making it possible for 800 foreign visitors to participate during the coming year. Granges interested in serving as hosts should contact their State master or Wilb Just, director of youth activities for the National Grange.

YOUNG FARMERS

The Grange's first international people-to-people type program was the young farmer's project, started in 1948. It was conducted in cooperation with the International Federation of Agricultural Producers, an international federation of farm organizations of the free world.

This project was for young farmers between 19 and 25 years of age. It was designed to give young farmers of other lands an opportunity to obtain first-hand experience with America's farming methods and with her farm, home, and community life.

One hundred and twenty-five men took advantage of this opportunity. They were from England, France, Germany, Switzerland, Norway, Denmark, Mexico, and Algeria.

TEENAGERS, TOO

The farm youth project was followed by a program for German rural teenagers. Through this program, the Grange, in cooperation with the U.S. State Department, afforded 374 farm boys and girls of Germany an opportunity to develop a better understanding of the American way of life. Each guest was assigned to a home with a teenager of about his own age, for 1 year. During his visit the guest shared all responsibilities and activities of his U.S. brother or sister. Thus, each participated in farm, home, school, church, youth organization, and other activities of a typical family of rural America.

ROME GRANGE

In cooperating with people-to-people type programs sponsored by the grange, members of Michigan's Rome Grange have served as hosts to 56 visitors from 27 countries. Chairman of the Rome committee arranging the visits was Ruby Yeutter, who is also chairman of the Michigan State Grange Youth Committee.

In recognition of her outstanding contribution to the exchange programs, members of her grange, this spring, awarded Ruby a 3-month tour of seven European countries. During the tour, she paid return visits to many of those who had been the guests of her grange.

JUVENILE GRANGERS HELP

In 1950, a project known as "the team" was initiated by the World Council of Churches in Greece. Operations of the team have since been expanded to other countries.

The team project encourages self-help by low-income families of remote European villages. Trained teams of young people from various countries and many church denominations live and work with the villagers. Members teach villagers to can, sew, cook, cultivate, select improved crop varieties, improve health and living standards, to use gifts from CROP and CARE to better

advantage, and otherwise to improve their family and community life.

LECTURERS CONTRIBUTE

Another people-to-people type program was initiated last year. The national lecturer obtained the names of several thousand foreign citizens interested in receiving letters and magazines from America. Through subordinate lecturers these names were offered grange members interested in corresponding with and providing copies of American magazines to citizens of other lands. The response was overwhelming. Thousands of grangers developed pen pal relationships with persons in many countries of the world.

Persons interested in participating should contact their local grange lecturer or National Lecturer Edward F. Holter.

NATIONAL GRANGE

Your National Grange is a charter member of the free world's only international federation of nongovernment farm organizations—the International Federation of Agricultural Producers.

Through this association, the grange encourages and influences the orderly discussions of international farm problems affecting the welfare of all people. Through such discussions the grange helps to improve the relationships between leaders of farm organizations throughout the free world—and may well influence programs and actions of other governments as well as our own. This is why your grange will be present at the annual meeting of IFAP in India this winter. It is why they will enter into orderly discussions of world farm problems with farm organization representatives from some three dozen other countries.

The National Grange also actively participates in the work of the food and agricultural organization of the United Nations and numerous other international organizations seeking to improve the social, economic, and spiritual lives of farmers around the world.

YOU AND YOUR GRANGE

Yes, there is a similarity of purpose between spaceships, satellites, and the grange. Each can serve to promote peace for the world.

The development of spaceships and satellites costs billions of dollars. Grange programs are developed by self-help style.

Many highly trained and skillful technicians are required to launch a spaceship or satellite—you can launch your grange on a program of service, the influence of which will circle the globe.

Old Glory Flies in Opening Battle of Ban on Flagpoles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Record of August 11, 1959:

OLD GLORY FLIES IN OPENING BATTLE OF BAN ON FLAGPOLES—JUSTICE MUSMANNO, ACTING AS VFW LEADER, SEEKS TO END RULING IN FAIRLESS HILLS

Old Glory fluttered briefly above Fairless Hills Post Office yesterday in the opening round of a battle by State Supreme Court

Justice Michael Musmanno against a ban on flagpoles and TV antennas.

The ban imposed by the builder of the 6-year-old community, in effect, has prevented flying of the American flag.

And that is what concerns Musmanno, who acted not in his role as judge but as a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

"I deplore the apparent lessening of enthusiasm for flying the flag, the symbol of our country," he said.

Musmanno and several area VFW officials went to present a 49-star flag that has flown over the Nation's Capitol to Mrs. Catherine B. Wright, the local postmistress.

She referred him to Leroy V. Greene, regional post office operations director in Philadelphia.

Greene explained by telephone that in all Government-owned post offices, or in those located in buildings completely leased by the Government, the flag is flown. In Fairless Hills, the Government leases only part of a building for the post office.

Musmanno went to see the contractor's representative. He wasn't in.

Musmanno and his associates then took the flag to the post office roof and held it on a staff there for 10 minutes "to set a precedent."

Then the flag was presented to Mrs. Wright, to have on hand should Musmanno win his case. Mrs. Wright accepted, noting there already is a flag in the post office lobby.

The supreme court justice said that today he would meet in Pittsburgh with Benjamin Fairless, retired board chairman of United States Steel Corp. Fairless Hills is near United States Steel's Fairless Works and many of its residents are steelworkers.

Musmanno said he was sure Fairless wouldn't stand for such a situation in a community named for him.

The ban was not, in itself, unpatriotic. Its aim was to keep the architectural and esthetic beauty of the community.

But that wasn't the way it turned out, in Musmanno's view.

There is one flagpole in town, near the shopping center.

Musmanno said it didn't even have a rope on which to raise the flag until last week.

Maybe Musmanno has already driven a wedge into the line of opposition. As he was leaving town, a flag was being raised on the lonesome pole.

Justice Musmanno said the situation at Fairless Hills first came to his attention from a speech made by Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD in the House of Representatives several weeks ago. When Justice Musmanno learned of the Flood speech, he contacted Flood and Flood purchased a flag he had flown over the U.S. Capitol for the specific purpose of having the same flag eventually flown permanently over the Fairless Hills post office. The flag was sent from the Capitol to Justice Musmanno and this was the flag he took yesterday to Fairless Hills and flew for a short time on top of the post office building. It was presented to the postmaster with the intent it will be the permanent flag for Fairless Hills.

Is Civil Defense Possible?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, a recent editorial, "Is Civil Defense Pos-

sible?" which was published in the Columbus Citizen, a member of the Scripps-Howard league of newspapers, on August 9, 1959, is worthy of careful study.

It offers an exceedingly clear commentary on the waste of taxpayers' money on the utterly useless and vague program of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

Don E. Weaver, editor of the Columbus Citizen, is an outstanding editor of one of Ohio's great newspapers. His column points out the complete absurdity of present evacuation plans and the urgent need for a commonsense civil defense program. It is another link in a long record of excellent public service.

I ask the unanimous consent that his column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I commend this to my colleagues in the Senate.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

IS CIVIL DEFENSE POSSIBLE?

(By Don E. Weaver)

We leafed through the 4½-pound manual issued by Civil Defense. It is a plan for evacuating a half million people from Columbus into 21 counties stretching from Delaware to the Ohio River, in event of atomic attack.

We can't make much sense out of it. After an educational campaign to be launched right away, each of us is supposed to know where to go when the alarm comes. Each one is supposed to head out the shortest way from wherever he is.

If papa is working at Westinghouse or Ternstedt he goes west. If mama and the kids are at home in, say, Linden, they are supposed to head northeast with whatever help neighbors can give.

What happens to the sick and infirm, the people in hospitals and prisons? We leave them here.

Presumably the bomb will fall at the center of the city, knocking out the central area and wreaking havoc in diminishing degree within a wide circle.

Civil Defense assumes a 2- or 3-hour notice to give us time to reach Athens or Zanesville or Chillicothe, out of harm's way. The theory is that the kindly people of the rural areas and smaller cities will do what they can to shelter and feed us.

The logistics of nuclear war and the qualities of human nature fall in our mind to fit any pattern of general evacuation. We feel that Papa will try to reach Mama and the kids, no matter where he is or where they are when the awful moment comes.

We feel, and hope, that a lot of us who have duties to perform will want to stay and perform them if we can. Are newspaper people, for instance, going to hit the pike for Zanesville in the face of the greatest news story of our time?

True, a bomb could well wipe out us and the presses too, in a flash. But if Columbus wasn't the target and nothing happened, we'd feel mighty foolish fighting our way back from Zanesville through the traffic to get back on the job.

How much gasoline is in your tank? If you were to start fleeing now, how far could you get? Buy gasoline? Perhaps. But suppose the gas station boys were evacuating too?

The normal morning and evening traffic is heavy. But it does not by far include all the cars in Columbus. Add all of them into a sudden mass evacuation, then multiply by the fright and panic of a real atom bomb threat.

The chaos makes us wonder whether joining an evacuation would be worthwhile, even if it were possible.

The Civil Defense traffic manual has every exit route meticulously listed. There probably are vehicles enough for everyone. Control posts, manned by previously instructed volunteers or police officers, would try to keep the evacuation flowing.

They might. But a collision could block a road for miles. A mass evacuation in itself would produce many casualties without counting the destruction a bomb would cause.

Human nature would express itself in many ways, if our community of half a million souls found itself in imminent danger of attack. The noble and unselfish would help others. The mean and delinquent would still be with us, foraging only for themselves.

If the Russians ever attacked us we can't believe a mass evacuation would help Columbus much. If a bomb hits Broad and High—or if a near miss hits Newark or Delaware instead—a lot of people will die. The trouble with mass evacuation is that you're never sure whether you're running in the right direction.

There are civil defense steps that could do a lot of good. Wherever a bomb hits, there is always a perimeter where its effect is less. If the center is total death and destruction, the edges are damage and injury that can and should be coped with.

Having predetermined plans, pretrained people, and preselected places for emergency aid makes sense. The general public has shown only monumental unconcern for civil defense plans so far. But medical and hospital people, police and sheriffs, and a few civilians who will pay attention could do a lot of good.

The trouble with civil defense is that we don't know when, or if, we will ever need it. It would be much easier to prepare for a known emergency next month or next year.

But the atomic emergency that civil defense is designed to meet may come anytime from tomorrow to never. And when it comes, evacuation plans may be as obsolete as the bucket of sand we learned to use in the last war to put out the kind of fire bombs rained on London in her hour of trial.

There Is Sorrow in the Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. Harry Golden which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent on August 9, 1959, in which he discusses the distressed economic conditions in northeastern Pennsylvania, and particularly in Hazleton, a city in Luzerne County of some 30,000 population. Mr. Golden is the noted editor and writer of the bestseller, "Only In America":

THERE IS SORROW IN THE VALLEY

(By Harry Golden)

The country trembled when John L. Lewis sent the simple telegram, "Come up out of

the mines." It trembled when he wired the A.F. of L. man, William Green, "We disaffiliate." Gone, gone are those days when a telegram from John L. Lewis made the Nation sit up and take notice and led Congress to ask the President for direction.

Now John L. Lewis' power is in decline. It is in decline not because of any reaction on the part of the miners, or because the labor-management problems are solved. John L. Lewis is in decline because coal is no longer king. From a high production yield of 62 million tons, anthracite has slipped to about 18 million tons. And this is not the bottom. On a recent trip to Hazleton, Pa., I found the folks are all using oil burners, a phenomenon that could not even be imagined in this famous anthracite region 25 years ago. With this decline, we close the book on one of the most turbulent eras in American history—John L. Lewis and the United Mine Workers.

But the story is not that simple.

In the heart of Pennsylvania, in Scranton, Wilkes-Barre, and Hazleton, there are thousands of men unemployed, miners who have been unemployed for years, and not only have the mines closed but there is little other industry which can absorb them. These miners glumly suspect they will never go back into the mines. Almost all mining now is stripping—taking the coal from the surface.

The women talk and say, "It's a funny thing, Min. When the floods hit the valley everyone pitched in overnight to help us. Unemployment is worse than the floods and yet it just drags on for years and years."

David Dubinsky and ILGWU have tried to help. There are dozens of garment factories and sewing shops in the coal regions. But this only mutes the tragedy. Miners and their sons stand aside while their wives, mothers, and sisters earn the living for the family. For the miner who has spent 20 years in the pits, the chances for employment are scarce. Any available job goes to the younger man. If the unemployed miner has silicosis (miners' asthma), and most miners have it in varying degrees, no other industry will touch him. All that he has left is the hope that if he keeps up his union dues—\$1 a month if he is unemployed—he will collect pension benefits at age 60. Even here he is disillusioned since these benefits were cut in half, from \$100 a month to \$50.

The new garment industry tried to bring these men in. But the miners were embarrassed at sitting in front of a sewing machine and their gnarled hands were clumsy and their fingers could not manage the fine work of an unfamiliar trade. Thus in Scranton, Wilkes-Barre, and Hazleton we have ushered in a new society, similar to the society we once had in the South. The society of the milledaddy.

A man who once was master of the house, who earned good money, now sits on the porch and listens for the lunch whistle and he goes into the house and comes out with his wife's lunch and takes it to her at the factory. He will drive her to work in the morning and call for her at night, and he tries to hide his face from his fellow miners who are doing the same thing.

And the responsibility for this heartbreak and poignant degradation of a strong workingman's spirit can be laid at the door of the shortsighted coal operators of the 1920's who opposed the coming of other industry that would drain off from their own pool of workmen. Let us look toward the anthracite region of Pennsylvania. Big, strong Americans; Americans who gave much to our country are being degraded and humiliated.

Mayor Dilworth Champions Urban Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the great mayor of Philadelphia, Richardson Dilworth, has a letter in this morning's Wall Street Journal explaining why Federal assistance for such purposes as urban renewal and slum clearance to our great cities is essential. This letter states the case so convincingly that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as follows:

TROUBLES OF CITIES

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

I read with great interest the editorial "The Fable of Federal Aid" (July 29).

The theme of the editorial, as I understand it, is that the problems of the cities are their own, that there is no good reason for the Federal Government to help, as the bill still has to be paid by the taxpayers; and, that if some cities cannot solve their problems, those cities will simply have to wither on the vine.

Your editorial ignores a number of facts: First, the cities are not free agents. They are the creatures of the States and have only such taxing powers as the States allow them. It is notorious that the State legislatures are rurally dominated, and cling to that domination by various devices. The result is that the States not only severely limit the taxing powers of the cities, they also collect a disproportionate share of State taxes from the cities.

The Congress likewise collects a disproportionate share of the Federal taxes from the cities. What's more, the Federal Government has arrogated to itself the only taxes which can yield large revenues. Two world wars, tremendous defense needs, and the burdens of the cold war have resulted in the Federal Government taking better than 75 cents of every tax dollar paid by our citizens, whereas 40 years ago the Federal Government took only 25 cents, leaving the balance for the States and the cities.

Today, some 150 great urban areas where more than two-thirds of our people live and where 75 percent of the Nation's income is produced, have less than 10 cents of each tax dollar with which to support themselves.

Second, the policies of the Federal Government have directly contributed to the tremendous problems which today confront the cities. One such problem is its concentration of bigness in this machine-atomic age. In addition, not only do nearly all of the immigrants from foreign lands settle in our cities; our cities have also become the centers of migration for nonwhites from the South. Our cities must assimilate these people and we are doing so, but the added cost for so doing makes our burden even heavier.

This brings us to the question of whether cities are necessary. Conservatives, like the writer of your editorial, delight in dreaming of the United States as it was in the decades immediately following the Civil War, when pioneers were opening up the West, with

sturdy farmers homesteading right behind them, and we were still essentially an agrarian Nation. Those days have gone forever. Despite the urging of Federal planners to decentralize, 95 percent of the 15 million increase in our population since World War II has settled in our great urban areas. And, it is estimated by the Federal Government that by 1980 more than 80 percent of our people will live in these great urban areas, where they will produce better than 90 percent of our national income.

It is the city which is the frontier of our modern civilization. The challenge which confronts us is whether democracy can succeed in a highly industrialized, urban civilization. In fact, it is no exaggeration to say that it is in the cities that the cold war will be fought.

The cities are straining their own resources to the uttermost to achieve this goal. But the cities cannot do it alone under our system of Government and taxation any more than the farmers can do it alone or than the rest of the free world can do it alone. The cities are asking for only \$300 million a year in urban renewal funds (little more than the Federal Government spent last year to support the price of potatoes), as against a total of \$8 billion which is spent annually on farm and foreign aid.

One of our first problems is to overcome the stubborn refusal by the executive branch of our Federal Government to face up to the fact that we are, and will continue to be, an urban people. Our very success or failure in the cold war in a large measure depends upon national recognition of this fact, and the taking of conservative measures to meet it. So we're fighting the good fight by our insistence on an adequate housing bill.

RICHARDSON DILWORTH,
Mayor, City of Philadelphia.
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Named a Papal Knight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Monday, August 10, 1959, which reports that Mr. Joseph H. O'Donnell, formerly of Sugar Notch, Wilkes-Barre, and now of Honolulu, T.H., has been named a knight commander of the Order of Pope St. Sylvester by Pope John XXIII for exceptional services to the Roman Catholic Church in Hawaii.

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times Leader, Aug. 10, 1959]

EX-SUGAR NOTCH MAN MADE PAPAL KNIGHT

A former Sugar Notch resident has been named a knight commander of the Order of Pope St. Sylvester by Pope John XXIII for exceptional services to the Roman Catholic Church in Hawaii.

Honored by the Pope was Joseph H. O'Donnell, business manager of the Diocese of Honolulu since 1946.

Mr. O'Donnell is one of two laymen in the Diocese of Honolulu to be named papal knights, the first time in the 18-year history of the diocese such an honor has been conferred.

The other recipient is Dr. John M. Felix.

An article about the conferring of the honor, accompanied by a picture of the two men displaying their medals of the order, appeared on the front page of the August 7 issue of the Hawaii Catholic Herald, diocesan newspaper.

Announcement and presentation of the decorations were made at novena services in honor of St. Joseph at the Cathedral of Our Lady of Peace by Most Rev. James J. Sweeney, Bishop of the Diocese. The emblems of the order are a gold cross and a silver medal inscribed with the image and seal of St. Sylvester.

For the last 13 years, Mr. O'Donnell has assisted Bishop Sweeney in building the comparatively new diocese. During this period, new churches and schools have been built and millions of dollars have been expended.

FORMER COLLIERY CLERK

Born in Sugar Notch, son of the late Mr. and Mrs. Patrick O'Donnell, he was the Sugar Notch correspondent for the Evening News. He enlisted in the Army in 1940 and was graduated from the Army War College in Washington, D.C., in 1941. He was assigned to military intelligence in Honolulu. Following his discharge from the Army, Mr. O'Donnell went to work for the diocese. Prior to joining the Army, he was the colliery clerk at Huber Colliery, Ashley.

A graduate of Sugar Notch High School and St. Bonaventure College, Bonaventure, N.Y., Mr. O'Donnell taught during the evening at the Honolulu Business College. He also is active in community affairs and is recognized as an outstanding speaker and master of ceremonies.

He is married to the former Eileen M. Clark, of Honolulu and they have two children, Eileen M., 14, and John Patrick, 5. The family lives at 3821 Mariposa Drive, Honolulu.

A brother, Rev. Charles O'Donnell, is assistant pastor of Our Lady of the Ascension Church, Williamsport. He also has two other brothers, Con, of Sugar Notch and William of Philadelphia and two sisters, Alice O'Donnell, former supervisor of nurses at Midtown Hospital, New York City, and Mrs. Richard Riley, both of Sugar Notch.

A Magnanimous Foreign Policy Backfires on U.S. Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the public demand continues to increase for favorable action by the administration on the petition filed with the Secretary of Agriculture by the National Cotton Council for relief under section 22 of the Agriculture Adjustment Act. Some of the demand is reviewed in a column entitled "A Magnanimous Foreign Policy Backfires on U.S. Workers," by Holmes Alexander, published in the Greenville News, of Greenville, S.C., on July 23, 1959. I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MAGNANIMOUS FOREIGN POLICY BACKFIRES ON U.S. WORKERS

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—"I fail to see the necessity," reported Voltaire when told that a certain rather stupid fellow must, after all, be allowed to live. It is a quotation which often haunts your reporter as he ducks in and out of the hearing rooms of the debating halls of Capitol Hill. There are times when the stupidity of American policy is so dense that the Voltairean query is shouted aloud—Do we deserve to live through the periods and challenges of the mid-century?

For example:

A labor spokesman, Solomon Barkin of the Textile Workers, was imploring a Senate subcommittee (a very slumberous Senator was the only member present) to take a look at what we were doing to the industry which clothes our population.

American know-how went abroad, as everyone knows, for two purposes—to help the stricken nations in World War II to regain production and to help the "underdeveloped" nations to make better use of their raw materials, including their workers. But look what has happened. Has American know-how been confined to the revival of the war victims and to suiting up the loin-clothed peoples in modish apparel? Not at all. Our designers and technicians, taking advantage of cheap foreign labor and the newest machinery, are invading the American shores as no military conqueror has done since the War of 1812.

"Most large retail merchandising organizations," testified Solomon Barkin, an AFL-CIO factfinder, "have representatives abroad who are constantly searching for manufacturers who will produce items specifically for the American market. When necessary, they help in the design and evaluation to assure its appropriateness for the American market."

Mr. Barkin is not talking in a vacuum. He gave the subcommittee a list of almost 30 American textile-connected companies taking part in this invasion. He remarked that American-aided firms in Japan, Hong Kong, Italy, and other low wage areas are saturating our stores with scarves, shirts, blouses, children's dresses, men's suits, men's slacks, shoes, and Wilton carpets. He asked for legislation to set a safeguard level of American production and action by the U.S. Tariff Commission to stave off the American-aided foreign invasion of our markets.

An industry spokesman, Charles Stewart of the Machinery and Allied Products Institute, gave the same subcommittee some information from management's side of the street. During the Eisenhower era, according to Mr. Stewart's figures, U.S. direct investment abroad has gone up—but U.S. benefits on this investment have gone down. What a pretty kettle of fish.

It turns out, in Mr. Stewart's words, "we have taught the American industrial lesson very well." He might well have said too well, because this is exactly what has happened. We have trained foreign workers, financed foreign companies, provided foreign competitors with the best machinery and know-how. In addition to heaping these advantages upon Europeans, Asians, and Africans, we have handicapped ourselves with restrictive labor practices, wage-induced inflation and the most backward system of tax depreciation followed by any modern industrial nation. Whatever the idealism which has inspired us, "these are the industrial facts of life," the witness told the subcommittee.

It isn't often that labor and management go deeply into the same subject and come up with almost identical conclusions. So many of the upper crust labor leaders have gone highbrow on us that they sometimes argue

that foreign workers are more important than our own. Many industrialists have soothed their souls with love lyrics to mankind while grabbing off profits from the subsidized international trade. Far more culpable than labor and management, the American Congress has permitted itself to be brainwashed by the special pleaders for the level-down philosophy. Worst of all, I suppose, is the State Department. Under the past three Presidents it has misread the American Constitution to mean promoting the general welfare of the world rather than this Nation.

In any event, our policy on overseas investments is of a kind with so many other policies. We waste too much in agriculture, we work too little in industry, we talk too much in diplomacy and think too little in education. Sure we must survive, but if Voltaire were around I'm afraid he might say: "I fail to see the necessity."

Foreign Aid Is Breeding Inflation, Kemper Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable James S. Kemper, U.S. Ambassador to Brazil from 1953 to 1955 and an outstanding insurance executive and business leader of Chicago, recently wrote an excellent article on the inflationary effects of foreign aid.

This article, which appeared in the June 25 Chicago Sun Times, reflects views based on his experience in the diplomatic service and his sound understanding of basic economic principles.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include the statement by Mr. Kemper:

FOREIGN AID IS BREEDING INFLATION, KEMPER SAYS

(By James S. Kemper)

The foreign-aid program as it now is set up adds to the inflationary pressures in the United States; it spends money we don't have to waste, and it is not making good friends for the United States.

As my wise Scotch grandfather often said, "Bad loans never make good friends." This is just as true between nations as between individuals.

Inflation is a deadly threat, and it should be controlled now. It destroys business because it forces a businessman to abandon the sound principles which should govern decisions, in favor of short-term measures designed to preserve as much as possible of his financial strength. Worse, it destroys the savings of our people.

When a man lives a thrifty life and saves his money for his old age and dependents, he is entitled to expect that the dollar he saves will buy approximately an equal value at the time he needs it. To save a dollar that will buy 2 bushels of potatoes at the time it is saved and then find that it will buy only 1 bushel of potatoes at the time it is used, is a cruel confiscation.

Not only does inflation destroy the savings our people have, but it destroys the will and desire to save. Personal savings are the very basis of our private enterprise system and the private enterprise system is the basis of a free society.

I say that foreign aid is spending money we "haven't got." That is obvious because, with taxes at top levels, we have had deficits in most years of this generation and we are facing new deficits under this year's program. Deficits mean that our Government must issue bonds. These are a lien on the present property and future earnings of our people.

You can't put a debt against people without automatically reducing the value of what they have. Since money is the measure of our property, each deficit is a reduction in the value of our money.

If our foreign-aid disbursements had been made with greater care and perspicacity there would have been no necessity to raise the debt limit. The corollary to this would have been a reduction in the taxes already overburdening the American taxpayer.

Some of our foreign aid goes to governments which actually are not friendly and in some instances are under communistic domination. Some of it is used to finance nationalization of business enterprises in friendly countries. Those countries won't thank us in the future for our hand in these projects. As we contribute to their socialization, we are guilty of assisting in their destruction.

According to T. Coleman Andrews, former Internal Revenue Commissioner, in 1957 it took an income of \$4,806 to match in purchasing power a 1939 income of \$2,000. It took an income of \$13,004 to match a 1939 income of \$5,000 and it took an income of \$30,971 to match a 1939 income of \$10,000. So, in less than 20 years we have seen the real value of our incomes cut in half.

The effect of foreign aid in countries that get it may be just as bad and inflationary for them as it is for us.

Foreign aid is justifiable as a temporary measure but no country can maintain its strength by gifts from without. We are undermining the morale of the leaders who otherwise would develop in every country with the capacity for working out their own difficulties and problems.

Much of our foreign aid has gone into the building of factories which compete with American industry. Our living standards and our wages provide markets which exist nowhere else. With the machinery we have given them and their low wages, other countries undersell us in our market, in foreign markets, and American workers lose their jobs.

Hundreds of American plants are closed because of foreign competition our foreign aid programs have financed. In order to meet this competition, many American manufacturers have found it necessary to establish foreign manufacturing subsidiaries. Automatically, this helps the economy of the countries in which the plant is located but results in a loss of employment here and a reduction in taxable income.

European countries are doing very well on their own these days. We have a great future in the Western Hemisphere. We have reliable friends in this Hemisphere. If we have money to spare, we well could use more of it in this area where it will produce results that will help us both in national security and in our business.

Much has been said about aid to underdeveloped countries. We can't possibly change the habits and traditions of a foreign country until the people there are ready for it and want it.

There is plenty of money for investment in a country that will support the instrumentalities of development provided those countries can produce stable governments which will respect property rights and obligations. That respect cannot be created by our gifts, and until it comes from within the people, a foreign country will continue to be underdeveloped no matter what we do.

The American people always have been generous and I hope they continue to be. The United States has much to do to maintain its vitality and to develop its economy in a way that will preserve personal and economic freedom in this country.

If we are able to maintain our leadership and our ability to assist in the protection of the free part of the world, we must first control inflation, reduce government waste and bureaucracy, reduce our debt and our taxes, and solve our domestic problems.

Foreign aid is one of the first places to start. We must reduce our foreign aid expenditures now, and eliminate them within a comparatively short time. Otherwise this expenditure of our savings will hasten the day when our own liberties and our free enterprise system will be threatened, and perhaps ultimately be exchanged for socialism or worse.

Discontinuance of Passenger Train Service Between Tulsa, Okla., and Dallas, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Sherman, Tex., Chamber of Commerce board of directors has passed a resolution opposing the abandonment of passenger train service between Tulsa, Okla., and Dallas, Tex., by the Frisco Lines.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the chamber of commerce at Sherman, Tex., on July 27, 1959.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE SHERMAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, JULY 27, 1959

Whereas the St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co. and the St. Louis-San Francisco and Texas Railway Co. has filed an application with the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Railroad Commission, seeking to discontinue passenger train No. 517, southbound, and No. 518, northbound; and

Whereas the city of Sherman would be irreparably damaged by the discontinuance of such passenger train service; and

Whereas if the discontinuance of such passenger train service is allowed, the city of Sherman and its citizenship and a large area surrounding the city of Sherman would be left without any passenger train service whatsoever either north or south; and

Whereas the above railroads received a considerable amount of freight revenue from the citizens of Sherman; and

Whereas in view of the extensive income received from freight by the railroads from the citizens of Sherman, its industries, and business houses, the railroads should be willing to continue to give passenger service along with and in conjunction with its freight business: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Directors of the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Sherman, Tex., That the Interstate Commerce Commission in Washington and the Texas Railroad Commission in Austin be requested to deny the application of the above-named railroads for permission to discontinue the

operation of trains No. 517 and No. 518 (Black Gold); be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to U.S. Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, U.S. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, and Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN.

DAN H. POOLE, Jr.,
President, Sherman Chamber of Commerce.

DEWAYNE DAVIS,
Manager, Sherman Chamber of Commerce.

These Days, Money Talks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is quite appropriate that during the labor debate now in the House, an earlier editorial by George E. Sokolsky should be remembered.

Therefore, I would like to present for the study of my colleagues the editorial entitled "These Days, Money Talks."

The protection needed now by the American consumer and business enterprise is that labor be placed under anti-trust laws to eliminate its present monopolistic power.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, May 29, 1959]

THESE DAYS, MONEY TALKS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The reason that labor leaders are so haughty is that money talks. They have the money and they have the votes and the politicians are scared of the smallest of them. The hospital strike in New York is a case in point. The union demands recognition, which as a practical matter means enforced union dues, eventually the closed shop and the checkoff. Those who collect money for charity do not collect it to enrich labor leaders and to give them expense accounts. If the nonprofessional worker is underpaid, he should be paid more, but there is no need for shop stewards, labor leaders, and grafters.

Two courts issued injunctions against the union which ignored court orders. It is like James Hoffa's notice to Congress that if it passed legislation that displeased him, he would call a nationwide strike. After the threats had had enough time to accomplish whatever Hoffa desired them to accomplish, he withdrew his threats, denied that he had said them, and in the course of the denial obliquely made the same threats.

In effect, what Hoffa implies is that he is bigger and more powerful than the Congress of the United States. And it may be so. Again it is money that talks. It is votes that talk. So many Members of the of the Congress get their campaign support, above the table or under the table, from labor leaders and labor unions that they vote as they are told to vote just as in the early 20th century, there were U.S. Senators who obeyed J. P. Morgan and John D. Rockefeller, the two leaders of predatory businessmen.

And as these businessmen, in time, lost their heads, became too sure of themselves and encountered an aroused public opinion, so the new kind of labor leader, a selfish, predatory person, who manages a huge treasury and who fights to keep his membership in-

tact and the dues coming in, is losing his head, too. There is only one phrase which correctly characterizes these kinds of labor leaders: They are too fresh. They believe that they can dominate the whole American people. They will, of course, fail, as their prototypes in Wall Street have failed.

The danger is not so much that the labor leaders will succeed in dominating the United States as it is that we shall, in a most critical time in our history, become involved in dangerous strikes and contentions which can affect the course of events by making this a defenseless nation. The hospital strike in New York is dramatic, but a steel strike at the present time would be a tragedy.

Even the labor leaders need to worry about that before a sufficiently wicked inflation could drop the value of the dollar to the verge of worthlessness. Apparently, the labor leader's personal desire to remain in a lucrative office is so great that he takes risks which even peril that job. And in this unseemly and disastrous business, he is only too often supported by politicians whose only gift is the garrulosity of the extrovert. Inflation can bring here, as it has elsewhere in the world, the man on horseback, the politician who promises too much and thrives only by suppressing the rights of the people.

Such labor leaders as George Meany, Walter Reuther, David Dubinsky and other top men, must recognize what money riches has done to their movement. But they are helpless because of the frightening pressures of such men as James Hoffa who can control any union he chooses to control through the instrumentality of the strike. If Hoffa opposes a union, his truckmen will make deliveries, will cross picket lines, will thereby assist the employer in breaking a strike. If Hoffa wishes to refuse to cross a picket line or to conduct a secondary boycott, he can tie up an entire city. He and Harry Bridges can tie up the entire transportation system of this Nation, force every industry to stop work because they can hold up shipments into and out of all plants.

No human being in this country should have that much power and a government which tolerates abuse only paves the way for its own destruction.

Auerbach Will Be Missed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, FBI Agent Richard W. Auerbach has been appointed to take over the Federal Bureau of Investigation office in San Francisco.

After a most successful tour of duty as agent in charge of the Bureau's Chicago office since September 1959, and based upon his outstanding record with the Federal Bureau of Investigation under the able leadership of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Mr. Auerbach is well equipped to face his new duties and responsibilities in San Francisco, one of the most important FBI posts in the country.

I have known Richard Auerbach for over 21 years and I am delighted with his well-earned progress. I ask unani-

mous consent that an editorial from the Chicago-American of August 4, 1959, commenting on the service of Agent Auerbach, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AUERBACH WILL BE MISSED

Richard W. Auerbach, who has been agent in charge for the Federal Bureau of Investigation in Chicago since September 1957, has been ordered to take over the San Francisco office, and Chicagoans will hate to see him go.

He has been an energetic crime fighter, cooperating enthusiastically with State and local law enforcement agencies, and he has carried on a variety of campaigns of his own for improving law enforcement and preventing crime.

One of the most important of these was his campaign among Illinois bankers to cut down the number of raids on banks by robbers. Working with the Illinois Bankers Association and the Illinois Savings and Loan Association, he showed the bankers how to protect themselves, through better money-handling practices and the installation of protective devices, both against armed robberies and embezzlements.

Also he worked tirelessly against juvenile delinquency and the distribution of smut literature.

A top espionage agent in World War II, he did some of his most effective work in Rio de Janeiro, where he ran a brokerage house as a cover while checking up on Nazi and Japanese spies.

In the San Francisco FBI office, Auerbach will have new responsibilities and added authority. We join with the thousands of friends he has made in Chicago in wishing him every success.

Louisiana Champion, From Lafayette, Competing in National Teenage Safe Driving Road-e-o Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am justly proud of the fact that the Louisiana champion in this week's finals of the National Teenage Safe Driving Road-e-o, taking place here in Washington, is from my congressional district. He is 17-year-old Bill Young, son of Mr. and Mrs. Pierre Young, of Lafayette, La.

The winner of the Louisiana title is competing with representatives from the other States in the written and skill phases of this contest sponsored by the Junior Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Accompanying him to the Nation's Capital is Second Vice President Cary Moore, of the Lafayette Junior Chamber of Commerce, son of Mr. Guillian Moore, Sr., of that city. The Louisiana finals of the road-e-o were conducted in Jefferson Parish—county—where approximately 50 young people, winners in the local contests conducted

by the various junior chambers of commerce throughout the State participated.

The written tests this week have been given at the Statler-Hilton Hotel and the skill events staged at the National Guard Armory. First, second, and third place national winners will receive scholarships worth \$2,000, \$1,500, and \$1,000, respectively, during the presentation of awards at a banquet Thursday night.

Among the events arranged for the contestants during their stay here was a visit to the White House where Bill Young was photographed standing next to the President.

The Lafayette Junior Chamber of Commerce, with a membership of around 40 young men active in community affairs, sponsors numerous civic events in addition to the safe driving competition which is open to both boys and girls. The organization, formed several years ago, meets for a luncheon program on the first Wednesday of each month and gathers for a night meeting on the third Wednesday. The officers are headed by President Carroll Baudoin and the others, in addition to Cary Moore, are Alvin O'Fleruity, first vice president; Scotty Brane, treasurer; and Gerry Bush, secretary.

Needed: Overhaul of Federal Milk Order System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the system of Federal milk orders, operating in 76 marketing areas throughout the country, I believe, needs an overhauling.

Over one-third of the milk sold wholesale by the Nation's farmers is priced under the Federal milk order system. However, unfortunately, there is a wide price range—too wide, I feel—for milk under this system. For example, milk prices range from \$5.65 per hundredweight in New England and \$6.63 in southeastern Florida, downward to \$3.38 per hundredweight in Chicago and \$3.34 per hundredweight in Milwaukee.

I am aware, of course, that the pricing system established for each order is established individually to fit the marketing conditions in each area.

The comparative prices, however, reveal that there is, in my judgment, too great a discrepancy between areas. I therefore believe that it is time we took a new look at the overall system of Federal milk orders. The goal would be to make adjustments in price formulas to assure fair treatment of all farmers throughout the country.

The August 1 edition of the Wisconsin Agriculturist contained an editorial entitled "Fluid Milk Pricing Formula Is Outdated."

The editorial constructively points out definite factors to illustrate that the present milk pricing formula definitely needs an overhauling.

I invite the attention of our colleagues on the Agriculture Committee to the editorial. In addition, I am forwarding the comments to the Secretary of Agriculture for his review.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLUID MILK PRICING FORMULA IS OUTDATED

Economic pricing under Federal orders holds the attention of Midwest dairy leaders these days. That, in spite of USDA's recent turnaround on hearings to consider such a pricing formula for Chicago. The request was made by Pure Milk Association.

Under most Midwest Federal order pricing formulas, fluid milk prices—class I and class II milk—are based on manufacturing milk price plus a premium. Dairy men are growing more concerned about this formula. The price of manufacturing milk for several years now has not gone up with the general price level of things they buy.

Many dairy leaders feel that the demand for fluid milk is not very greatly related to the demand for manufactured dairy products. Fluid milk demand is tied more closely to consumer purchasing power. So they would like to see consumer purchasing power taken into account in the pricing formula for bottled milk.

Most of those who would like to see an economic pricing formula in order areas want consumer purchasing power, the general price level and cost of production to be used as a basis for pricing formula.

Boston and New York already have such a pricing formula. It has meant higher prices to farmers for milk going into fluid uses.

There is little question that today's pricing formula is outdated. Whether we like it or not, our order areas, general handling of milk, and support price policies have driven a real cleavage between milk going for fluid consumption and that used for manufactured dairy products.

Demand for fluid milk continues to grow with our increasing population and workers' higher purchasing power. The picture is quite different for milk going to manufactured uses.

Cheese demand may well be establishing somewhat the same pattern. But butter use has shrunk. And dry milk is so interwoven with Government support purchases and siphoning off surplus production that it has developed its own unique patterns.

You can expect to hear a lot about changing pricing formulas in the near future. And for good reasons.

The Long-Range Threat of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WALTER M. MUMMA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, the coined phrase "It's a topsy-turvy world" takes on grave significance when you

stop and think about where ours is going if the American public and elective officials remain aloof to inflation and all its contributing factors.

The Washington Daily News for Monday, August 10, contained an enlightening analysis which is an attempt to show us in an understandable manner the long-range threat of inflation. Dr. Schaefer pulls no punches in discussing all the factors and undoubtedly treads on some toes in doing so.

Mr. Speaker, that newspaper article was an eye opener, and it was my feeling that all the Members would be interested in reading it. The article follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Aug. 10, 1959]

THE LONG-RANGE THREAT OF INFLATION— FREE SOCIETY CAN ONLY STAND ON FIRM, DURABLE FOUNDATION

(By Dr. Alfred Schaefer)

The inflationary consequences of the French Revolution and of the First World War were destructive but short, and could be cured by appropriate drastic measures.

The creeping inflation of our days is more dangerous, because the economic power of the State and the volume of circulating money have increased enormously.

Modern inflation is not only an ethical and social problem—it seems to be embedded in the free economy, like a managerial disease. Like a sick organ in the human body, there is in the economy an organ which shows this cancer: the weakening money.

No solution can be based only on technical measures. The reconciliation of stable money and full employment is an unsolved problem, and full employment with perpetually rising wages is certainly the most risky experiment of our so-called free economy.

REACTION TO THE PUBLIC

The public is unorganized, inadequately informed, generally apathetic, confused by the disputes of economists and advisers. It could elect to public office men recognizing the value of stable money, ready to fight for it—but this is a pious hope. Everybody agrees on the perils of too rapid inflation. But too many believe that inflation is here to stay as part of modern life, that a 2-percent annual loss in the purchasing power of money is not so bad, forgetting that this means 50 percent in one generation and that sooner or later business will have to pay a correspondingly higher rate of interest.

It is true that until now long-term bond financing has gone on, that through custom and inertia "wolf" has been cried so often that when the real "wolf" appears few take any notice. This dangerous acceptance of slow inflation helps to create or intensifies the very consequences it fears.

DANGER SIGNS

Sooner or later the little man will realize these consequences, and then he could have accelerated currency troubles. The signs are increasing—even in the United States—and we are all under warning:

Soaring prices for shares.
Stock options as the only incentive to management.

Buying "growth" instead of "yield."
Interest for South African gold mine stocks.

High interest rates for bonds.
Preference for index-based bonds.
Flight into seemingly more stable money.

Investors, pension funds, trust funds are all investing 30 percent and more of their capital in stocks and other property—often regardless of the price. Soon there could be too little real saving—

No buying strike of the unorganized public against high prices for consumer goods seems possible, not even against the probably politically necessary, but economically scandalous worldwide agricultural price supports through subsidies and stockpiling.

MANAGEMENT REACTION

There is too much lip-service paid to the goal of monetary stability. Management partly accepts slow inflation and adjusts its plans accordingly.

Like the public, management is not much frightened any more about a slump—the welfare governments will help. During the last recession nobody dared to let the slump ride itself out, to accept a really corrective shake-out of the weaklings or a strike of the labor unions—everybody asked for subsidies, relief, Government orders, cheap money, tax reductions, credit injections.

HALFWAY THERE

We are therefore already half-way between a pure market economy and a centrally planned economy, in an economy which depends on the decisions of the state, of large-scale firms, groups, and other economic units.

We are all sinners against the very roots of our capitalistic society. We psychologically expect and accept the annual round of wage increases as our fate, we would consider ourselves as shylocks if we did not grant a little increase in salary or in fringe benefits to everybody every new year. Kindness is a human quality, softness is an economic mistake.

THE GREAT FICTION

Wages are the most important, the crucial problem of the capitalistic world of free enterprise. Wages are linked to retail prices, industrial prices to wages, farm prices to industrial prices, retail prices to farm prices—a rigid vicious circle of prices and earnings.

The compensation of workers in money has increased in the last 10 years at least twice as much as productivity.

Wages resisted even recessions. It should be borne in mind that, generally speaking, wage increases cannot reasonably be based on increases in the productivity of particular industries. Rather, they must be limited, at the most, to the average rise in productivity of the economy as a whole. In estimating the latter, it is well to remember that both agriculture and the service industries, particularly the latter, in the last 10 years have had average productivity growth rates of some one-half to 1 percent only.

Even in an especially progressive industry wages paid should not be geared to changes in productivity of that industry.

Such practices would almost force other industries whose productivity has risen less, to grant similar wage boosts lest they lose workers lured away by the higher incomes earned in the rapidly advancing industry. Escalator clauses in contracts—introduced on a large scale by the biggest industrial company in the world—set the pace for seemingly sacrosanct increases following every possible increase in the index of living costs, regardless of productivity.

Nobody therefore is much interested in fighting inflation, because he will soon catch up with higher prices.

High and prolonged unemployment compensation relieves the pressure on the individual to find another job or on the unions to reduce their excessive demands.

The labor unions are in danger of pricing their members out of the market, especially in the United States (hourly wage rate of steelworkers \$3 versus \$1-1.25 in Switzerland, 80-90 cents in Germany).

THE LEVER

Too much political power is in the hands of union leaders, but partly because management did not dare to resist the excessive wage demands which set in motion the

whole inflationary spiral: From fear of losing out to the competition of other firms, nobody dared to face a real showdown, to accept a prolonged strike.

In the long run no help from outside can reestablish a sound monetary balance. Higher taxes mean compulsory savings and are no remedy, because they will be spent by governments and finally passed on to the consumer in the form of higher prices—but the consumer will not accept a lower standard of living.

Since the war government expenses have everywhere increased through programs for housing, social security, highways, armament, atomic science, etc. Pressure groups push expansion of their own plans.

Everywhere there is a superstate with a superbudget, supertaxation, superwelfare—we cannot increase it without approaching dangerously near the Russian system.

Tax reforms are needed. The fiscal elephantiasis has partly destroyed the efficiency of the interest rate as an essential weapon for securing an equilibrium between money and goods. The interest rate as a factor in cost is less important than the tax burden. It is an absurdity that the tax angle is very often more important than any other consideration.

A serious restriction of money and credit and an increase of rates are immediately criticized—one has only to remember the accusations during the last few years, when the tightening of the money supply was in reality a very appropriate but feeble measure against an exaggerated credit expansion. And in order to make the policy effective, money must be made not only dear, but also short.

DEFLATION: NAUGHTY WORD

It is bad form to use the word "deflation." Since the thirties the fear of unemployment haunts everybody.

But full employment gave the labor unions their exaggerated bargaining power, brought the wage-inflation as a new danger.

The continuous increase in the supply of money and credit, the swelling of the stream of money at a rate faster than that of the stream of goods and services, must be stopped.

Individual savings and insurance, which produce the bulk of much-needed investment capital, must be based on the confidence that the value of money will remain more constant than it has been in the last 15 years. Otherwise inflation will strike at the roots of the economy of the free world, and our grandchildren perhaps could go hat in hand to Moscow.

We must make up our mind: Sound money and full employment and ever-increasing wages cannot go together.

We can count on and must encourage a conservative and courageous policy of the central banks, free of all political pressures. We must accept eventually a period of higher interest rates—dictated by the market—and we must insist on a balanced Government budget. But most of all should we frankly and categorically resist any further automatic wage increases, and abolish any short-term escalator clauses.

Higher productivity then will be able to keep prices down and money sound, provided that management will finally feel the moral responsibility to pass technical progress on to the consumer in the form of lower prices.

ROLE OF UNITED STATES

The United States has an international responsibility in this regard. The dollar has become the measuring stick for others. Between \$14 and \$16 billion of short-term money are kept by Europe in the United States. It can be assumed that most of the European industrial nations will not inflate faster than the United States.

The American balance of payments is passive. The dollar shortage does not exist any

more. Some gold has returned to Europe—more could flow out if it knew where it could safely go. American investors buy European stocks, partly because the buying power of the dollar is higher in Europe than in the United States.

U.S. competition abroad is cramped by high prices and wages. Import restrictions cannot be any longer a remedy in a climate of freer international give-and-take.

Increased wages for steel workers would put a major milestone on the road to further inflation. A general acceptance of the idea that a creeping inflation of 2 to 3 percent is inevitable would accentuate serious potential risks and endanger the dollar as the yardstick for the world's currencies.

The vanishing respect for private property is intimately related to our laxity about the integrity of money. A free society can only stand on firm and durable foundations.

In Memoriam to William S. Jennings, of Texas, Conservationist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the preservation of this country's vital natural resources and wildlife is a fine and honorable dedication for a life. And one of the most outstanding examples of a dedicated conservationist was the late William S. Jennings, of Texas. His death was a deep loss to his State and Nation.

Although only 36, Bill Jennings had built a reputation as a wildlife conservationist. He loved his country and he worked to preserve her freedom as a P-38 fighter pilot in World War II and worked at other times to preserve her invaluable natural resources. His active life in the church also set a fine example.

About the last year of his life, Mr. Jennings showed extraordinary courage as he went about his work in behalf of conservation although doctors had told him he would soon die of leukemia.

The Lone Star State and the Nation will miss William S. Jennings, of Texas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article by Russell Tinsley which was printed in his Outdoor Scene column in the Austin American for Tuesday, February 11, 1958, entitled "Lost Friend."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LOST FRIEND

(By Russell Tinsley)

Conservation lost a true friend when Wildlife Biologist William S. Jennings died last Sunday.

Bill Jennings was dedicated to the preservation and restoration of wildlife in Texas. And he was one of the bravest men I have ever known, too.

About a year ago Bill received a severe jolt, one that would have all but shattered the hopes of a man with less fortitude. Doctors told him he had dread leukemia and had only 2 years to live at the most.

Most people would have given up, then and there. But not Bill Jennings. No one would have guessed of the great burden that Bill carried around inside him unless he knew the story, for Bill never let on that he was dying. He didn't ask for sympathy.

Everyone admired Bill Jennings. Bill was cheerful until the last. He and I had planned a javelina hunt to south Texas later this month. He kept telling me about the new scope sight he received for Christmas, and his plans for next deer season. Bill didn't let his illness interfere with his plans for the future.

Bill Jennings had great courage. "But that's the way he did everything," admitted Howard Dodgen, executive secretary of the Game and Fish Commission.

Leukemia was unquestionably a lick below the belt to Bill, a healthy, husky fellow who served his country faithfully as a P-38 pilot during World War II. Yet he remained at his desk and worked unselfishly until the finish.

"Bill was one of the finest fellows we ever had at the commission," said Dodgen. "Nobody was ever more devoted to his work."

ENJOYED LIFE

The 36-year-old biologist was assistant director of wildlife restoration and, as commission information chief L. A. Wilke put it, "a fellow who enjoyed a good story and who got the most out of life."

Bill joined the game commission in November 1949, after graduating from Texas A. & M. College with his master's degree. Previously, he had attended Arkansas State Teachers College and received his bachelor of science in biology from the University of Texas.

He was raised in Texarkana, Ark. Bill first gained recognition with his work with whitening doves in the Rio Grande Valley. He came to Austin as assistant to Eugene A. Walker in March 1954.

"Bill Jennings was a capable and dedicated research worker and a man of high principle who had the strength of his convictions," explained Walker. "His leadership and efforts toward wildlife conservation will be sorely missed."

Margaret Louise Hill, president of the Travis Audubon Society, said: "Conservation suffered a great setback when Bill Jennings passed away."

Yes, Bill Jennings was not only a dedicated conservationist, but also a man of great moral strength who was a pillar of truth in his church work and a man of unparalleled courage. We'll all miss him.

Caribbean Tensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, among the many articles about the mounting tensions in the Caribbean was one by Thayer Waldo in the August 7, 1959, issue of the *Courier-Journal*, Louisville, Ky., which I include:

TENSIONS IN CARIBBEAN ARE TOO DEEP TO BE EASED BY THE O.A.S. MEETING

(By Thayer Waldo)

MEXICO CITY.—The prospects for any solid, far-reaching settlement at the Inter-American Foreign Ministers' Conference, opening August 12 at Santiago, Chile, are little better than they were for solving the Berlin issue in Geneva.

Foreign-policy executives of the 21 Western Hemisphere republics were summoned to this emergency session by the Organization of American States, in hopes of finding a way to ease present tensions in the Caribbean area.

But differences of outlook and approach among the governments directly involved in that critical situation are so basic and far-reaching that no compromise solution seems possible.

Not since the stormy 1942 gathering at Rio de Janeiro, a month after Pearl Harbor, has any Pan-American conference faced such explosive problems as those the ministers will be called upon to deal with in Santiago.

A RIFT INDICATED

The aftermath of that earlier meeting was a split in the inter-American organization that lasted 3 years, when Argentina refused to sever relations with the Axis Powers.

There are now strong indications that the meeting about to begin may end in a similar rift, on an even larger scale.

Lined up as chief antagonists for this showdown are Dominican Dictator Rafael Leonidas Trujillo against Cuba's Fidel Castro and President Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela.

Trujillo accuses the other two of plotting actively to overthrow his regime. He says he has abundant proof that two abortive invasions of the Dominican Republic during June were mounted in Cuba, with Venezuelan backing.

Castro and Betancourt—both of whom recently cut diplomatic ties with Trujillo—counter by charging that the Dominican strongman is training a force of 20,000 mercenaries for an all-out assault on Cuba, and has offered to finance an armed coup in Venezuela.

MERELY SYMPTOMS

If the whole dispute were limited to such overt claims, the foreign ministers might be able to weigh the evidence and come up with a clear-cut verdict—even with an acceptable peace-making formula.

However, the strident battle cries are merely symptoms of a much deeper and more dangerous conflict. Revolutionary zeal among thousands of exiles from Caribbean and Central American countries was fanned to white heat by Castro's guerrilla-war triumph over the well-equipped forces of Fulgencio Batista.

And there is no question that those elements have since received aid and comfort from Cuba's victorious rebels.

Originally, Castro proclaimed his intention to lead a crusade for elimination of all remaining dictatorships in the Americas. But grave domestic problems—plus stern warnings from abroad—gave him pause.

RAUL IS OUR MAN

No such constraint affected his brother, Raul, commander in chief of Cuba's reorganized armed forces and also officially designated as successor to the premiership, if Fidel should disappear.

The crucial fact here is that Raul Castro has been publicly identified by Soviet experts on Latin America as "our man" and a card-carrying Communist Party member.

Together with other top military commanders in Cuba, Raul helped organize and equip the two expeditions that tried to invade Panama and Nicaragua, respectively.

Neither foray was Communist-led. President Luis Somoza of Nicaragua described those who headed the rebels there as reactionaries. Several were sons of prominent and wealthy Nicaraguan families.

Best explanation for the support given them by Raul Castro and his cohorts is that it was hoped Somoza's national guard would kill some of these young men, thus promoting their infuriated relatives to back a second and larger invasion. One of the captured Nicaraguans told Government interro-

gators: "We came in to try to get ahead of the Reds, who are preparing a revolution."

As for the Panamanian adventure, it appears to have been chiefly an attempt to provoke intervention by U.S. security forces in the Canal Zone.

LONG-RANGE PURPOSE

Behind all this outwardly confused maneuvering, though, lay the long-range purpose of forcing the O.A.S. to call a full-dress conference. When Trujillo announced annihilation of Dominican exile contingents that landed in his country 2 months ago, the die for that was cast.

The vote to hold the meeting was unanimous—only because the two hostile factions had vastly different ideas of what should be discussed.

This cleavage came into sharp focus July 30, with a heated 5-hour wrangle over an agenda in the O.A.S. council. Trujillo and Somoza wanted it limited to recent events and the nonintervention principle.

Venezuela proposed a broad survey of representative democracy and respect for human rights throughout the Americas. This point—loaded with potential dynamite—was eventually included.

Then Cuba sought to inject a resolution dealing with economic underdevelopment as a cause of political unrest. On that, the United States and eight other countries abstained, four voted against it and eight in favor—three short of the absolute majority required to approve.

HOW THEY LINE UP

As the ministers head for Santiago and their ticklish task, here is the picture:

Cuba and Venezuela can count on down-the-line support only from little Honduras. But Trujillo cannot look for even that much assistance.

The rule-by-decree regimes of Somoza and Paraguay's General Alfredo Stroessner have much in common with that of the Dominican dictator—yet they are not about to make public cause with him at the conference table. They have too much to lose and nothing tangible to gain by it.

Sympathy toward the Cuban-Venezuelan position can be expected, in varying degrees, from Mexico, Colombia, Uruguay, Ecuador, and Bolivia. Their attitudes will be determined largely by how far Castro is willing to go in pledging himself to strict nonintervention from now on.

TEN GENERALLY NEUTRAL

The other 10 Latin republics are likely to be generally neutral, at least where the Caribbean quarrel itself is concerned. But if the ministers take up the democracy-and-human-rights issue seriously, representatives of Trujillo, Somoza, and Stroessner will find themselves on the defensive, with everyone else opposed.

That is when the major fireworks are likely to begin. Any demand for proof that these rights are "effectively exercised"—and the wording of the agenda clearly contemplates this—will see the Dominicans raising a cry of "interference in internal affairs."

A formal resolution on the matter is almost certain to bring a walkout by Trujillo's men—with Stroessner's, at least, probably following suit.

On the other hand, a proposal to condemn Red influence in Castro's regime and/or the Caribbean area as a whole could well prompt Cuba and Venezuela to bolt the conference. Both countries insist that their governments are non-Communist, but that they will sign no official anti-Communist declaration.

Finally, if Fidel Castro himself shows up at the conclave and addresses it—as he did in Buenos Aires last April—the effect on Pan-American solidarity cannot be predicted.

Ambassadors of Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial from the Paterson News of Friday, August 7, which cites impressive increases in the ranks of foreign students at U.S. colleges and universities over the past 10 years. From the Institute of International Education comes the report that 47,000 students from 131 countries registered here last year, representing the largest foreign student population in the world. This increasing percentage of foreign students attending our educational institutions has great significance, I think. As the article points out, these scholars, besides acquiring the knowledge needed in improving the economic life and health of their countries, can be invaluable ambassadors of good will between the United States and their homelands. They can take back an understanding of American concepts of freedom and respect for the individual that can be a persuasive force for stability and resistance to Communist inroads in their homelands. And this is so—because they have seen America first.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMBASSADORS OF GOOD WILL

The Institute of International Education reports an increase of nearly 90 percent in the ranks of foreign students at U.S. colleges and universities over the past 10 years. The 47,000 students from 131 countries registered here last year represent the largest foreign-student population in the world.

Even more impressive than the student totals are the trends indicating the countries represented by these young men and women, the subjects they are studying, and the record number of foreign professors visiting U.S. campuses.

In the past 5 years, the number of foreign professors has tripled. For the first time on record, U.S. colleges last year imported more teachers (1,937) than they exported (1,842). This is undoubtedly a reflection in part of the Nation's stress on science education. Almost half of the visiting professors were experts in the physical sciences—double the number in these fields who came here during the previous year.

As the institute notes, the status of science education on our campuses is reflected in the increasing percentage of foreign students attracted by courses in science or applied science. Engineering is the most popular subject, but the humanities is a close second. The popularity of engineering is understandable since many of those who enroll here have high hopes of landing engineering or technical jobs with overseas branches of American firms in their homelands.

The most interesting thing about the institute's survey is the changing origin of our student guests. For the first time last year, more students came here from the Middle East than from Europe. The Far East still sends the greatest number (15,823), with

Latin America second, the Middle East third, and Europe now fourth. And as might be expected, many of the new students from the Far and Middle East came to the United States to study the physical sciences.

These scholars from the Far and Middle East, besides acquiring the knowledge needed in improving the economic life and health of their countries, can be invaluable ambassadors of good will between the United States and their homelands. They can take back an understanding of American concepts of freedom and respect for the individual that can be a persuasive force for stability and resistance to Communist inroads in their homelands. And this is so because they have seen America firsthand.

Fallout Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the crucial problem of fallout protection has become extremely important and deserves urgent and immediate action by all levels of government—Federal, State, and local. In connection with this, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution on civil defense unanimously adopted by the special committee on civil defense at the 51st annual Governors' conference at San Juan, P.R., August 5, 1959:

RESOLUTION ON CIVIL DEFENSE

Peace, with dignity, is the paramount concern of our Nation. But the maintenance of peace requires national strength. An essential element of this strength is the ability of our Nation to survive a nuclear attack.

Unfortunately, today, our people are not prepared to survive the fallout from a nuclear attack on our country. Yet, it is the fallout from nuclear weapons which will threaten every hamlet, city and farm in our Nation. It is fallout which will cause up to three times as many deaths as would result from the bursting of nuclear bombs on targets in our country. Deaths and sickness from fallout could make casualties of half the population of our country.

Protection against fallout, however, can be achieved and achieved by means which are within our reach as individuals and as States.

Without protection against fallout we are vulnerable to nuclear blackmail. But, if our citizens, as individuals, take protective action against the threat of fallout, it will be abundant notice to any potential enemy that we, as a people, are determined to survive and that we will not be forced by nuclear blackmail either to abandon our friends or to forsake our national interests at home or abroad.

As Governors we have a heavy personal and official responsibility for the safety and health of our citizens. So crucial is the problem of fallout to the maintenance of peace and the health of our people that we do hereby resolve that:

1. Each State initiate a vigorous and continuing campaign of education as to the nature of fallout, the extent of the danger, the fact that protection can be achieved, and the crucial importance of affirmative action by individual citizens as a protection

against nuclear blackmail and to increase the prospects for peace.

2. That the responsible Government officials—Federal, State, and local—take immediate steps to assist and encourage the people of this country to prepare themselves successfully to survive radioactive fallout and other aspects of an enemy nuclear attack on the United States, including such matters as adequate warning, shelters, radiation detectors and survival kits; and to that end, that an early meeting of the Governors Conference Committee on Civil Defense be held with the President of the United States, the national military leaders, and other official representatives of the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government for an intensive review of the nature of the nuclear hazard and the cooperative steps which are available to government—Federal, State, and local—for the nuclear protection of our people.

3. That each State initiate a survey of all State owned or operated facilities to determine both their adequacy as fallout shelters and what steps are needed to provide fallout protection for their users, both regular and transient.

4. That each State develop a protected seat of State government which will assure the continuance of State government leadership and function during and after a nuclear attack.

Religious and Racial Discrimination Amendment to Mutual Security Appropriation Bill, H.R. 8385

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, today I testified, together with the Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING], in support of my amendment to the mutual security appropriation bill, H.R. 8385. My amendment deals with the elimination of religious and racial discrimination on the part of any country which enters into mutual security agreements with the United States. As the debate on this matter previously showed, Saudi Arabia, Norway, and Iceland, for example, follow discriminatory practices against some Americans because of their race, religious faith, or color.

This matter was before the Senate when my amendment to the mutual security authorization bill was defeated by a vote of 47 to 43, although I am satisfied that a considerable number of Senators who voted against my amendment did so, as they have told me since, because they were not aware of the importance of the amendment.

I thought I owed it to the Committee on Appropriations—and the Senators from New York agreed with my position procedurally—to offer the amendment in committee for the committee's consideration, so that when it reached the floor later, if it were not adopted by the committee, the argument could not be raised that the amendment had not been offered in committee.

My testimony speaks for itself. I ask unanimous consent that the testimony I offered in the Committee on Appropriations in support of my amendment be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. While I was in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs this morning, and not in the Committee on Appropriations, at the time the able Senator from Oregon spoke, I did attend the latter part of the hearing before the Committee on Appropriations. I took occasion to read the printed comments of the Senator from Oregon. I think they present as excellent and as persuasive a document as I have read with respect to any given issue. I merely desired to have the Senator from Oregon know my reaction.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from California very, very much.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE BEFORE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, AUGUST 12, 1959, ON RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION AMENDMENT TO MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS BILL, H.R. 8385

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before your committee to urge acceptance of an amendment to the mutual security appropriations bill which will put the Congress of the United States on record in opposition to any policy by our Government which acquiesces in discrimination against American citizens on the grounds of their race or religion.

The U.S. Senate is firmly opposed to such discriminatory practices. I am convinced. The question is whether this is the legislative time and place to raise this issue. My answer is that it is always appropriate to raise this issue, and it is especially appropriate when we are discussing a measure to strengthen the United States and the free world.

The adoption of the amendment I now propose will make for a stronger America. It will make clear to the world that we mean it when we say we are a Nation of free men dedicated to the preservation of human rights and the dignity of man.

The language of the amendment I ask you to adopt reads as follows:

"It is the sense of Congress that none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act should be used for furnishing assistance to any nation which as a matter of declared policy or practice, as determined by the President, creates distinctions because of their race or religion among American citizens in the granting of personal or commercial access or any other rights otherwise available to United States citizens generally."

This amendment is modeled on the Lehman resolution which was unanimously adopted by the Senate on July 25, 1956. That resolution reads as follows:

"Whereas the protection of the integrity of United States citizenship and of the proper rights of United States citizens in their pursuit of lawful trade, travel, and other activities abroad is a principle of United States sovereignty; and

"Whereas it is a primary principle of our Nation that there shall be no distinction among United States citizens based on their individual religious affiliations and since any

attempt by foreign nations to create such distinctions among our citizens in the granting of personal or commercial access or any rights otherwise available to United States citizens generally is inconsistent with our principles: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that it regards any such distinctions directed against United States citizens as incompatible with the relations that should exist among friendly nations, and that in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state every reasonable effort should be made to maintain this principle."

The Lehman resolution was adopted because of the widespread revulsion in this country against our Government's toleration of discriminatory practices by certain Near East countries against American Jews. There was particular concern over our agreement with Saudi Arabia which permitted that country to bar American soldiers of Jewish faith from a base which our country maintained at Dhahran.

All of you are familiar with these facts. I am confident that there is universal disapproval of this policy of exclusion and discrimination. Certainly no one in the administration or in the Congress would want to defend this policy on the ground of principle or morality.

It is interesting to note that after the Lehman resolution was adopted unanimously by the Senate in 1956, both the major political parties adopted strong planks on this issue at their national conventions in the summer of that year.

The Democrats said at Chicago:

"We oppose, as contrary to American principles, the practice of any government which discriminates against American citizens on grounds of race or religion. We will not countenance any arrangement or treaty with any government which by its terms or in its practical application would sanction such practices."

And the Republicans said at San Francisco:

"We approve appropriate action to oppose the imposition by foreign governments of discrimination against U.S. citizens, based on their religion or race."

The language of both statements is clear and forthright. It is regrettable that in too many instances those fine statements constitute mere words.

The U.S. agreement with Saudi Arabia, which was negotiated in 1952, was to expire early in 1957. There was every reason to hope, in view of the Senate resolution and the declaration of both the political parties, that the administration would say to the Saudi Arabian Government, firmly and honestly, that this was a reciprocal agreement conferring benefits on both parties; that it obligated each to respect the other, and that we could no longer accept an arrangement which contradicts the fundamental American principle that all Americans are entitled to the equal protection of the law in the United States. We hoped that we would tell Saudi Arabia that the United States could not permit any country to degrade any American into second-class citizenship.

King Saud came to Washington in 1957. He was given a most unusual welcome. President Eisenhower went to the airport to receive him personally. It is true, of course, that he did not receive a red carpet reception in New York City, a fact which displeased him, but which should not have surprised him too much since so many people who live in New York would not be allowed to enter Saudi Arabia on any kind of a carpet.

It is to be regretted that the agreement between the United States and Saudi Arabia in respect to the Dhahran Air Base extended

another 5 years without providing for the termination of these offensive anti-Jewish screening procedures. It has been stated that we made some protest to Saudi Arabia—but the King was in no mood to defer to our concern. As the late Secretary Dulles told the press at a conference on April 23, 1957:

"We brought up the matter . . . during the talks that took place when King Saud was here. I did not find his attitude at that moment very receptive, largely perhaps . . . because of the fact that he felt that he had not been given nondiscriminatory treatment himself in the city of New York."

But, the new agreement went much further than the old. For we now agreed to extend substantial economic and military aid to Saudi Arabia. We agreed to train Saudi Arabian pilots and naval personnel and to expand the port at Dammam.

In following this course of action, we renewed and confirmed an offensive and un-American arrangement. We made possible the practice of discrimination against Americans overseas and, in certain instances, the abridging of the rights of American citizens here in the United States.

This was an abysmal surrender of principle, an abasement unworthy of our country, repugnant to our Constitution, defamatory of our flag. We did this, apparently, because the administration believed that we had to surrender principle to convenience, because it was necessary to yield up the dignity of Americans for consideration of expediency. This degrading course of action was followed because some people thought, apparently, that it was in the best interests of U.S. foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, I am vitally concerned about the security and defense of the United States. But I insist that there is not a single valid consideration which dictated or justified this course of action. It was expediency, nothing more nor less.

Is the base at Dhahran so essential to the defense of the United States that it must be maintained at the expense of precious human rights? Should we discriminate against our own fellow citizens by signing international agreements conceived in bigotry and born of shameful expediency? Should we accept the alibi that the security of the United States makes this base at Dhahran a vitally important one?

I deny this categorically. For the Dhahran base is not a military base.

I have the testimony of the late Secretary of State himself.

The Department of State Bulletin, August 26, 1957, page 348, quotes a remark made by Mr. Dulles during his August 6, 1956 press conference. He was asked about applying inspection procedures to bases in the Middle East. He replied:

"Answer. Well, we have no bases in the Middle East (addendum: excluding North Africa) unless you include Turkey, and that would be covered in this plan, I presume."

"Question. Dhahran?"

"Answer. That is not a military base."

"Question. Mr. Secretary, on another subject, don't you think that—"

"Answer. Excuse me. We have certain rights there but we do not—but that is not operated as a military base."

Mr. Thomas K. Finletter, former Secretary of the Air Force, believes that " . . . the value of the Dhahran base is relatively small and that it can be replaced, but that the value of the principle involved is high and cannot be replaced." He has stated:

"There has been much unfounded talk about the 'vital' necessity of the Dhahran airfield to the interests of the United States. I think I am reasonably aware of the importance of the base structure of our Air Force and I cannot agree with the idea that any one base such as Dhahran is vital. I happen to believe that our base structure

should be strengthened well beyond its present state but there are many places other than Dhahran where a substitute base for Dhahran and the additional bases which are needed could be located. I do not believe that the need for the Dhahran airbase in any way requires us to sacrifice the principles in which the American people believe."

Are we making this intolerable concession to expediency because of oil? Since oil was first discovered in Saudi Arabia, we have been warned periodically that the Arabian American Oil Co. might lose its advantageous position in Saudi Arabia unless our foreign policy conformed with that of King Saud. We heard this in 1948; we were then threatened with the loss of oil if we supported the United Nations resolution calling for the partition of Palestine. It turned out to be an empty threat then. It will always be empty as long as Saudi Arabia has no place to sell its oil except to the West and as long as oil reserves continue their enormous expansion. Saudi Arabia needs oil royalties just as much as Aramco needs oil. And let no one confuse the corporate and constitutional entities that are known as Aramco and the United States. They are not one and the same.

Will we lose Saudi Arabia as an ally? This question is predicated on illusion. I seriously question whether Saudi Arabia would ever consider itself an ally of the United States. This is not the place for an extended review of our policy. But I do want to place on record my view that our Government miscalculated in 1957. At that time, there was a belief in high quarters that King Saud would embrace the Middle East doctrine, which was then under debate, and that he might become the kingpin of our Middle East policy. This was the reason for the elaborate state visit and the lavish favors conferred on Saudi Arabia at that time. But within a few months, Saudi Arabia again insisted on being neutralist. It wanted no part of the Middle East doctrine. During the 1957 Syrian crisis, Saudi Arabia's U.N. delegate lashed at the United States and the West at the United Nations in language so intemperate and shocking that our Government was constrained to ask whether he was really expressing the views of his King. Was he? We have never found out. However, anyone who thinks the United States can ever count on the King of Saudi Arabia as an ally of the United States in the cause of freedom holds a view that I think is very questionable. The King of Saudi Arabia does not believe in democracy. He is no respecter of human rights. He is a tyrannical absolute monarch who still maintains a slave market. Human rights, human dignity, human liberty for the masses of the people are as foreign to his form of totalitarianism as is the case with communism.

Let us be clear on one major point. The United States will never succeed in establishing a strong and respected policy in the Middle East unless it is prepared to demonstrate its strength—and not its weakness. I am not talking about any fleet maneuver or military parade of might—I am talking about strength of conviction and loyalty to principle. I believe—and I know that many experts on the Near East have felt this way—that the peoples of the Arab world—indeed, the peoples of Asia and Africa—will have much more respect and admiration for us if we refuse to be deflected from our fundamental principles. Our loyalty to the guarantees of the Constitution of the United States is our great strength. When we retreat from the principle of equal citizenship for all of our citizens because of pressure from a foreign monarch who threatens to deny us airbase accommodations unless we surrender to expediency, we lose prestige and respect all over the world. The foreign

policy of the United States must be made in Washington, not in any foreign capital. It must be consistent with the equality of citizenship rights of the Constitution of the United States. It should strengthen the human rights goals of the Charter of the United Nations. It must not be trimmed or tortured to fit the prejudices and passions of other governments.

But instead of strength, we have shown weakness. Once a democratic government yields and retreats before the threats of prejudice and expediency in the formulation of international agreements, it becomes less and less able to resist undesirable diplomatic pressure and it subjects itself to further and more intolerable diplomatic impositions. It is no accident that the Arab boycott against American Jews grew in intensity after the renegotiation of the Saudi Arabia base. In early 1958, the leading American Jewish organizations submitted to this body a document in which they pointed out:

"The Arab blockade and boycott of Israel has now been extended by the Arab League to a systematic boycott and blacklisting of any American enterprise that maintains permanent business connections with Israel or with Israeli firms and indeed to a worldwide effort to boycott any business owned by Jews.

"The Arab League maintains a public blacklist of American and other companies that invest in Israel, maintain branches, assembly operations, or distribution outlets there, or that license patents for Israel use.

"American vessels that stop at Israeli ports are denied permission to make calls at Arab ports.

"American planes that land in Israel are forbidden to fly over Arab territories.

"No American is permitted to enter an Arab land from Israel except on official business.

"Americans who are Jews are a special target of the Arab boycott. Saudi Arabia, particularly, refuses to allow the Arabian-American Oil Co. or other concessionaires to employ Jews for work in Saudi Arabia. Most Arab League states refuse visas to Jewish travelers and some refuse to allow Jews to land even in transit. . . .

"The Arab League has been circulating questionnaires to chambers of commerce and individual companies throughout the world inquiring whether specified companies were controlled by Jews or employed Jews. . . .

"The United States has subsidized the export of wheat to (Arab) countries . . . out of tax funds supplied by all our citizens. The Arab League states refuse to ship their American wheat on blacklisted vessels or to buy wheat from American exporters who are Jews or who have dealings with Israel. . . . In effect, therefore, the United States submits to the operation of the Arab boycott and Americans are taxed for a wheat subsidy plan from which they are barred."

The Jewish organizations which submitted this memorandum declared:

"The Arab boycott of Americans is international intimidation; it thrives on appeasement and capitulation. We are confident that Americans deplore the Arab boycott and will want to resist this impairment of the rights and privileges of American citizenship. We are confident, too, that if the U.S. Government would strongly oppose this international blackmail and medieval bigotry, the Arab boycott against Americans inevitably would end.

"In the light of the foregoing, we, the undersigned, declare our repugnance of the Arab boycott and urge all commercial firms to resist it with every legal means at their command. At the same time, we express our firm hope that our own Government will prohibit racial or religious discrimination against American citizens in the administration of any treaties or executive agreements to which it affixes its signature."

Mr. Chairman, I wish to emphasize that my amendment is intended and designed by me to be universal in its application. I have not singled out Saudi Arabia or any other Arab country for singular or exceptional treatment. My amendment would apply to any and all foreign powers that insist on including in any international agreement with the United States discriminations between and among U.S. citizens based upon race, color, or religious faith.

It is true that the Government of Saudi Arabia has been a notorious offender in this matter because of the anti-Semitic policies toward American Jewish citizens which it has insisted must be acceded to by our Government in its international agreement with Saudi Arabia under the Dhahran Airbase. However, there are other instances of discriminatory practices against certain American citizens followed by other governments, and there is the constant danger that if we surrender our ideals in respect to this principle to one nation, other nations in diplomatic negotiations may use it as a bargaining threat.

I am informed that Norway still discriminates against American citizens who may be Jesuit clergymen. My amendment would apply to that situation, as well. I understand that Iceland discriminates against American citizens who may be Negroes. My amendment would cover that situation also.

Further, let me make clear that I do not argue in support of the proposition that we have any right to interfere with the sovereign right of a foreign government to determine for itself its own domestic public policy in regard to its attitude toward the people of any particular race, color, or religious faith. What I do argue is that in exercising our sovereign rights as a democratic government based upon the constitutional guarantee of equality of citizenship, we have the duty to make clear to any foreign sovereign power that we will not enter into a treaty or executive agreement with such a government unless it is willing to grant the same rights and privileges under that agreement to all American citizens irrespective of their race, color, or religious faith.

Mr. Chairman, I submit to you that the time has come to stop this abject accommodation to the hatreds and hostilities of others. I do not suggest that we should try to reform the world. I know, Mr. Chairman, that we are subject to the charge that our hands are not as clean as we should like them to be. Much can be said in criticism of our own failings on the domestic scene. And I do not believe that we can use the mutual security program as an instrument whereby we will persuade other governments to revise domestic practices with respect to their own citizens which seem inequitable to us. But I do insist, Mr. Chairman, that we must always resist any policies or practices by foreign governments which create distinctions between Americans, and which deny some of our citizens rights which are accorded to others. And certainly, we should not place our blessing on such intolerable affronts by subsidizing them with grants and loans provided by American taxpayers—even, ironically, by some who are the victims of these discriminations.

The history of American diplomacy is replete with many examples of a stirring and honorable stand taken by our Government in defense of the rights of the American people regardless of their race or creed. Secretary of State Lewis Cass declared that the object of our foreign policy is "not merely to protect a Catholic in a Protestant country, a Protestant in a Catholic country, a Jew in a Christian country, but an American in all countries." (Quoted in American Diplomacy, by J. B. Moore, p. 135; 1905.)

In 1885, when Austro-Hungary refused to accept an American minister-designate be-

cause his wife was Jewish, Secretary of State Thomas F. Bayard declared:

"Religious liberty is the chief cornerstone of the American system of government, and provisions for its security are imbedded in the written charter and interwoven in the moral fabric of its laws.

"Anything that tends to invade a right so essential and sacred must be carefully guarded against, and I am satisfied that my countrymen, ever mindful of the sufferings and sacrifices necessary to obtain it, will never consent to its impairment for any reason or under any pretext whatsoever.

"It is not believed by the President that a doctrine and practice so destructive of religious liberty and freedom of conscience, so devoid of catholicity, and so opposed to the spirit of the age in which we live, can for a moment be accepted by the great family of civilized nations or be allowed to control their diplomatic intercourse.

"Certainly it is, in my belief, be accepted by the people of the United States nor by any administration which represents their sentiments."

The United States refused at that time to support the Austro-Hungarian position. In his annual message to Congress, December 8, 1885, President Cleveland declared:

"Question has arisen with the Government of Austria-Hungary touching the representation of the United States at Vienna. Having under my constitutional prerogative, appointed an estimable citizen of unimpeachable probity and competence as Minister at that court, the Government of Austro-Hungary invited this Government to take cognizance of certain exceptions, based upon allegations against the personal acceptability of Mr. Kelley, the appointed envoy, asking that in view thereof, the appointment should be withdrawn. The reasons advanced were such as could not be acquiesced in, without violation of my oath of office and the precepts of the Constitution, since they necessarily involved a limitation in favor of a foreign government upon the right of selection by the Executive, and required such an application of a religious test as a qualification for office under the United States as would have resulted in the practical disfranchisement of a large class of our citizens and the abandonment of a vital principle in our Government. The Austro-Hungarian Government finally decided not to receive Mr. Kelley as the envoy of the United States, and that gentleman has since resigned his commission leaving the post vacant. I have made no new nomination, and the interests of this Government in Vienna are now in the care of the secretary of legation, acting as chargé d'affaires ad interim."

In 1880 an American Jew was expelled from Czarist Russia once his Jewish identity became known. This brought a sharp protest from John W. Foster, the American Minister to St. Petersburg and the grandfather of the late Secretary of State Dulles. Mr. Foster had the backing of the Department of State.

In 1908, in his speech of acceptance of the Republican nomination for the Presidency, William H. Taft noted:

In some countries . . . distinctions are made in respect to the treatment of our citizens traveling abroad and having passports of our executive, based on considerations which are repugnant to the principles of our Government and civilization.

He committed his party and administration "to make every endeavor to secure the solution of such distinctions which in our eyes are both needless and opprobrious."

On December 15, 1911, Secretary of State Philander C. Knox notified Russia that the United States had decided to abrogate the treaty between the United States and Russia of 1832 because Russia was refusing to honor American passports duly issued to American citizens on account of race or

religion. This action of our Government was strongly approved by the Republican National Convention in 1912, and in the same year by the Democratic National Convention and the Progressive Party Convention.

I offered my amendment to the Mutual Security Act on July 8 because this is the right place for us to make our stand.

This year, the Mutual Security Act contains a new statement of purpose. We say:

"It is the sense of Congress that peace in the world increasingly depends on wider recognition, both in principle and practice, of the dignity and interdependence of man, and that the survival of free institutions in the United States can best be assured in a worldwide atmosphere of expanded freedom."

If we believe this statement to be true, then I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we should not allow a single American dollar to be used to confirm and subsidize policies which mock that high purpose.

If we believe in the dignity of man and in the survival of free institutions, and in expanding freedom, then let us back up our ideals with action which is consistent with those ideals. Let us take our stand, once and for all, against practices which dishonor men, which deny their equality, and which subvert free institutions. Let us not vote money which perpetuates these practices and which weaken America as the leader of the free world.

The amendment I offered on the floor of the Senate was defeated by a close vote, 47 to 43. I believe that some Members of the Senate may not have been fully informed of the issue involved when the roll was called, because some who voted "no" were among the sponsors or supporters of the original Lehman amendment. Accordingly, I announced my intention of pursuing this matter further. I have been greatly encouraged by the extraordinary decision which was handed down by the Supreme Court of New York State on July 15, when the court overruled a ruling by the New York State Commission against discrimination which had allowed Aramco to question job applicants about their religion, on the ground that Jews would not be allowed to enter Saudi Arabia.

The New York State Commission had granted Aramco an exemption from the operation of New York law after our Department of State had reported to the agency that denial of an exemption might affect American policy in the Middle East.

The New York Supreme Court said:

"If the enforcement of the public policy of New York State would embarrass the State Department in the Near East, then it should be said that the honor of American citizenship—if it remains for New York State to uphold it—will survive Aramco's fall from Arab grace."

In other words, Aramco has now been told that it may not violate New York law at the behest of a foreign government. It now remains for the Congress of the United States to tell our Department of State that it must not underwrite discriminatory practices against American citizens by any foreign government. The New York Supreme Court decision may mark a decisive turning point in this unpleasant controversy. The decision struck a long overdue blow against sacrificing equal rights of citizenship for all Americans in international agreements upon the altar of unconscionable expediency. I ask this committee to take a similar position. I believe that this is the right place to make this request because we are concerned here with a measure which should strengthen not weaken U.S. foreign policy and enable our country to continue in its place of high leadership in the free world. We cannot presume to lead the free world coalition in the defense of freedom if we are parties to its subversion.

Consumers Get Most Benefit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to my remarks in the RECORD of July 7, 8, 9, 20, and August 3, I include the sixth in a series of articles prepared by Mr. Alvin F. Bull, managing editor of Wallaces' Farmer, concerning the farm problem. This article will appear in the August 15, 1959, edition of Wallaces' Farmer:

CONSUMERS GET MOST BENEFIT

(By Al Bull)

Hybrid corn, stilbestrol, nitrogen fertilizer, four-row equipment—we hailed these amazing production boosters for their benefits to the farmer.

It's true that they have helped farm folks. But the consumer of food has benefited even more.

New technology in agriculture has a habit of doing that—helping the consumer more than the farmer in the end. Unfortunately, the consumer seldom recognizes this.

Let's take an imaginary example. Suppose the research workers in USDA find an inexpensive new hormone that enables sows to raise one more pig per litter.

The first folks who adopt it make a good profit from its use. They have more hogs to market with little additional expense.

This gives them a lower cost per pig, and the few extra hogs these early users send to market do not affect prices much. But then neighbors see how well the hormone works. So they try it and produce more pigs, too.

Demand for hogs is inelastic (a 1-percent increase in supply drops prices 2 to 3 percent). So the sizable increase in total supply drops prices enough to decrease producers' total income from hogs.

There's no benefit left for hog producers. But the consumer gets cheaper pork chops. And the hog-corn ratio settles a little lower to allow for the decrease in production costs.

The consumer buying pork chops for less probably doesn't realize that his saving is the result of new technology in agriculture. But he may have heard what a great thing the new hormone has been for farmers.

Often the consumer doesn't even see the saving. It may be soaked up in the processing and marketing channels. Still the consumer benefits. His pork chop price holds steady instead of rising to allow the bigger marketing margin.

This new technology situation is imaginary but typical. The first folks adopting a new cost-cutting practice make money from it. But when the bulk of farmers take it up, the benefit is passed on to the consumer (or processor).

Farmers now grab up new technology rapidly, trying to be one of the leaders who profit from the practice.

This is why the consumer, still spending about 25 percent of his income about 25 percent of his income for food, eats much better than in the past.

Last year, for example, the average consumer spent \$397 for food, 22.2 percent of his disposable income.

Had he purchased the same type and quantity of food as in 1935-39, the bill would have been only \$287—only 16 percent of his income.

The difference lies in extra services, better quality food, and the upgraded diet represented by the 1958 purchases.

New technology has been pouring into agriculture at an explosive rate. The production boom that resulted accounts for much of our farm surplus problem.

Antibiotics, new crop varieties, systemic insecticides and the rest of agriculture's new technology are no accident. We, as a Nation, planned it that way through more than the past 100 years.

It seemed wise planning, too. We had a growing population to feed. Folks that could be spared from food production were needed to make industrial goods for our growing economy.

So the Government endowed land grant colleges and USDA with generous funds for production research.

U.S. tax policies have encouraged commercial research, as well as the manufacture of items which increase farm production. Fertilizer is an example.

Government programs—reclamation, parts of SCS and ASC—still work primarily to expand production.

Farmers responded. Output per man-hour on the farm has more than doubled since 1940, for example. This record outstrips most industries.

Most of the benefit of these efforts went to consumers.

They have more food than they can eat. Never have they faced the threat of starvation which worries most of the world.

They buy their food with a smaller percentage of their incomes than in any other nation.

Many young workers have been raised on the farm but freed from food production to turn out luxury items that give the United States the highest standard of living in the world. One farmworker now produces food for 23 others.

Our farm technological revolution has spurred economic progress for the Nation. But it has not always brought equal benefits to farmers.

In a nutshell, new technology pouring into agriculture has built up the productivity of land, labor, and capital to where we are faced with surpluses.

This does not mean that we should call a halt to production-boosting research. Nor that we should outlaw the use of fertilizer, feed additives, or machinery.

Neither should we even be slow in seeking improved practices in the future. This would be turning our back on progress.

But a backlog of improved production practices in the hands of research folks almost guarantees that surplus problems will be with us for years to come.

This leaves farmers holding the bag. Unless, that is, we find an acceptable way to bring supply into balance with demand.

Cardinal Cushing Is Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very timely editorial which appeared in the Sunday Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., for August 9, 1959:

CARDINAL CUSHING IS RIGHT

Richard Cardinal Cushing is right. Nikita Khrushchev, the Soviet Premier, should not

be allowed to put his foot on U.S. soil. It was edifying to learn that the archbishop of Boston is firmly opposed to the Red chief's visit here.

Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Boston, the majority leader in the National House of Representatives, shares the same thought as the cardinal. He does not believe that Khrushchev should come to the United States either. By Papal decree, the highest honors of the Catholic church have been conferred upon the noted Democratic Congressman and his wife, Mrs. Harriett McCormack, a former opera singer of eminence.

Premier Khrushchev has the dubious reputation of ordering the killing of 2 million people in the Ukraine, and a later "indoor sport" of his was to put thousands of Hungarians to death. He allows one Catholic priest and one Protestant minister in the whole of Russia and carries out the destruction of synagogues, so that the Jews have no place to worship.

It is not known whether Khrushchev is a relative of the late Adolf Hitler, who murdered over 7 million Jews, and thousands upon thousands of Poles, and Czechoslovaks. But he certainly should be kept out of the United States.

Eliminate Legislative Detours on Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Hazleton (Pa.) Plain Speaker of Friday, August 7, 1959:

ELIMINATE LEGISLATIVE DETOURS ON HIGHWAYS

The communities which have been fighting for badly needed superhighways in northeastern Pennsylvania have cleared one roadblock after another in the past few years to get their fair share of the interstate road program.

But the legislative detour which a congressional committee threatens to impose at the very base of the entire program—the Federal financial base—might well turn out to be the straw which will break down all the hard won gains for a modern road system in this distressed area.

Certain Members of this same Congress, which votes multibillion foreign aid bills session after session, would, through what amounts to penny pinching, sabotage the entire road program. Proposals made by the House Ways and Means Committee would delay the construction timetable and cause most of the activity by the participating States to grind to a halt.

It is difficult to believe, but the evidence is at hand, that some Members of the Congress are so nearsighted that they cannot see the enormous scope of the Federal highways program. This is not just another porkbarrel project—but one on which the next era of economic and industrial development of this Nation hinges.

Just as the early canals and railroads enabled the continental concept of this Nation to materialize, so will the vast network of superhighways planned under the Federal Roads Act of 1956 be a network of lifelines for our rapidly expanding economy.

And areas such as Hazleton and its sister communities of northeastern Pennsylvania,

long outcasts and orphans as far as attention from the great white father at Washington is concerned, must have these new highways, and have them soon, if their self-help efforts to salvage their economies are to continue with any success.

Union Immunities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the Landrum-Griffin bill is the minimum protection needed against labor organizations' tremendous monopolistic power.

Actually the teeth that are needed in any labor bill can be provided by placing labor organizations under antitrust law, as my bill H.R. 8003 would do, as outlined on pages 14195-14198 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD August 3.

An editorial appearing in the Wall Street Journal April 11 entitled "Union Immunities," with reference to Dr. Roscoe Pound's book "Legal Immunities of Labor Unions," is certainly pertinent to the current labor debate, out of which will come labor reform, if any.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the above-mentioned article:

UNION IMMUNITIES

On this page today there is a letter from a reader who asks us to elaborate on the subject of organized labor's immunity from laws which affect all other Americans.

Several months ago this newspaper printed a condensation of a booklet entitled "Legal Immunities of Labor Unions," written by Dr. Roscoe Pound, former dean of Harvard Law School, and published by the American Enterprise Association, Inc., of Washington, D. C. In that essay Dr. Pound listed labor's immunities and noted how they endanger the rights of property of both employer and public.

In practice these immunities include: The reluctance of courts to look upon crimes—committed during labor disputes by labor operatives—as crimes, per se; the refusal of unions to become legally responsible organizations by incorporating and so becoming legally tangible entities; and the practice of committing all matters affecting labor organizations to an administrative agency instead of confining the agency's jurisdiction to matters involved in employer-employee relationships.

To illustrate such immunities, consider first the fact that no effective legal action can be secured against unions as such for interference by pickets with travel on streets and highways, destruction by pickets of property and other such common occurrences during strikes. As Dr. Pound writes, "The members of a union are not its agents and the union is not liable for the acts of its members in the course of a labor dispute." Yet, "the employer is held for what his agents and employees do in the course of their employment."

The legal irresponsibility of unions is exemplified by their ability to break contracts by striking for reopening of talks even though a provision in the contract prohibits it. In one case when this happened the company sued for damages. Yet the court held that the best interest of all parties

would be served if the question of damages for the 3 weeks' stoppage was eliminated, "to avoid the regeneration of antagonisms that finally have been dissipated." In other words, the union can break a contract with impunity in order that there will be no hard feelings.

The practice of turning over all kinds of cases affecting organized labor to an administrative agency, the National Labor Relations Board, has further strengthened unionism's power. Whereas other regulatory agencies are supposed to function to protect the public, the NLRB has habitually operated with the apparent aim of protecting organized labor alone.

But more than anything else, organized labor owes its unique position of power to its immunity from antitrust laws which prohibit monopolistic combinations and agreements in restraint of trade. It is just such combinations and agreements which provide big labor with its lethal punch.

Several unions, such as Walter Reuther's United Auto Workers, control the manpower in entire industries. For all practical purposes, one word from Mr. Reuther can close every auto factory in America. No human being outside the labor movement has such power. Even an attacking enemy would be hard put to so thoroughly cripple the Nation. That unions not only have this power but use it at will is exemplified by the industrywide steel strikes in recent years—one of which came at the height of the Korean war.

If organized labor were brought under antitrust laws could it still bargain effectively for the workers? It is obvious that it could. Local unions could still bring tremendous pressure on individual companies, and it could bring this pressure without jeopardizing whole industries and the national security.

As there is no question about the permanence of an articulate labor movement on the national scene, so there can be no doubt that excessive power in the hands of unionism is a threat to the well being of the Nation. The answer to the problem lies in action by Congress to limit that power. For it was Congress in the first place that permitted unions to menace the Nation's welfare by granting them immunity from the Nation's laws.

The Visit of Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I include the following editorial from the Pittston (Pa.) Sunday Dispatch of August 9, 1959:

THE VISIT OF KHRUSHCHEV

Many pros and cons have developed in this region as well as throughout the country on the proposed visit of Nikita Khrushchev, the Soviet Premier, to this country.

Fact is, during the week there were several disturbances in local taprooms when tempers got hot as beer garden clients gave their views on the subject. In one case the city police were called to halt what was changing from words to fists—all because of the discussion on Khrushchev's visit.

Actually, we think it is a good thing—not the barroom fighting—the visit of the Soviet Premier.

When nations are talking, they are not fighting.

We believe it will impress Khrushchev when he sees the United States and realizes that here in the United States people have much to protect, and are willing to do just that when the chips are down.

Many top leaders and other have tagged Khrushchev as "the murderer of Hungary," etc., and as the head of the government that did those things; let's say the title suits him.

However, the point of his visit is not to be exonerated for his past actions, nor to coddle him in fearful fashion. The purpose is to create a friendlier attitude between nations that man end the cold war, ease tensions, and cancel out the fears of a world-destroying world war III.

The exchange of visits—Khrushchev to the United States, Eisenhower to Russia—may be just what is needed to bridge the gap between the two great powers. Certainly the United States doesn't want control over any other nation, and these exchange visits may convince Russia of that and at the same time show Russia the futility of oppression in European countries such as Hungary.

Now it may not work out that way. The Soviets may still continue past practices—but it is worth a gamble. War at any time is hell—but nuclear war would be deadly right in the kitchen of every home.

Exchange visits, talks, handshaking, negotiation, or what have you in the line of diplomacy can be irritating—but irritation is an inconsequential thing compared to what could happen if each country slammed the door on the other.

Blind Can Lead the Blind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. MONTTOYA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article which appeared in the June 28, 1959, issue of the Albuquerque, N. Mex., Journal. This article, in my opinion, clearly demonstrates the tremendous courage which the blind people of our country have shown in the face of overwhelming odds. The blind do not want sympathy; all they ask is an opportunity to prove their worth:

FIVE HUNDRED DELEGATES MEETING IN SANTA FE BELIEVE BLIND CAN LEAD THE BLIND

SANTA FE.—About 500 persons meeting here this weekend believe emphatically that the blind can lead the blind.

They are delegates attending the annual convention of the National Federation of the Blind, an organization they quickly point out is of the blind not just for the blind.

The founder and president is Dr. Jacobus Tenbrook, 47, professor of speech and chairman of the department at the University of California at Berkeley.

Tenbrook has five degrees, mainly in law; has written three books on constitutional law and public welfare, and is married and the father of three active children.

FOUR THOUSAND MEMBERS

He has been blind since childhood, a fact he considers as much a nuisance as his Dutch ancestry.

All officials of the federation, which has chapters in 46 States, are blind. One dele-

gate laughingly said the only requirement for membership is to be blind and want to join.

Sighted persons may join but hold no office. There are about 40,000 members.

The blind have the right and the competence to speak for themselves through their own organizations and no outside group—however well-meaning has the right to presume to speak for them typifies the attitude of the group.

The federation also is interested in breaking down social barriers between the blind and sighted persons, so that the blind will be accepted as normal human beings, no better nor worse than the rest.

OPPOSE SPECIAL SHOPS

Asked what it means to be blind, members may reply with their own questions:

"Have you ever entered a room and felt an awkward hush come over those already there?"

"Was the person with you at dinner ever asked, 'Does he take cream in his coffee?'"

"Were you ever practically lifted on or off a bus?"

"Has anyone ever avoided the word 'see' in your presence?"

Citing the otherwise normalcy of the two-thirds out of 1,000 blind persons in the United States, delegates point out the group includes about 100 practicing lawyers as well as a prison convict—sentenced for check forging.

They object to special shops and "cages" for blind citizens and demand their right to work along with "their sighted fellows in the professions, common callings, skilled trades, and regular occupations."

BLEW HIS TOP

Jack Polston, a stocky, athletic-looking delegate from Costa Mesa, Calif., was blinded in 1955 in an accident while working at his trade as a journeyman electrician.

A roughish, self-reliant fellow, Polston blew his top when an agency worker suggested his wife get a job to help bring in money.

"I was a damned good electrician. I wasn't any different than before, except I just didn't have any eyes," Polston said.

Determined to support his family, he went to the Oakland orientation center for the blind, administered by Allen G. Jenkins.

"If you're looking for sympathy around here, you won't find it any place but in the dictionary," Jenkins, who has been blind since childhood, told Polston.

Polston recalls that during his 17 months in the center, the instructors, all blind, not only taught me how to get around, but an attitude—to accept the blindness and go on from there.

USUAL REPLY

Returning home, Polston convinced his union officials and they convinced contractors that he was still a journeyman electrician.

When contractors called the hiring hall for an electrician, the union expeditor would sometimes reply, "we got a good man here. There's only one thing you should know—he's blind."

Polston said the usual reply as he became better known was, "Hell, I don't care. If he can do the job, send him out."

There is the answer the federation is seeking for all the blind.

The federation, since organized 19 years ago, has set as its primary goals the destruction of the protective caretaker philosophy of agencies for the blind and on the other hand the assertion that—

"1. Blind people are essentially normal people and blindness is not in itself a mental or psychological handicap but only a physical nuisance.

"2. All discriminations against the blind—legal, economic, and social—which flow from the misconception of blindness as more than a physical disability must be abolished in

favor of the complete equality of opportunity for all who are blind."

SEEK PASSAGE

"3. The blind themselves are qualified to lead the way in solving their own problems because of their personal experience with blindness."

It is this final point upon which the federation has become most belligerent, and is now seeking passage of a Federal law to require Federal agencies for the blind to consult with the blind in making decisions.

Federation leaders also claim longtime political and private agencies for the blind have threatened economic reprisal to prevent the organization of self-governing local blind associations.

They testified in Washington, D.C., last March on behalf of the proposal they believe will protect the right of the blind to organize and to be consulted on matters concerning their welfare.

TWO REQUIREMENTS

Popularly known as the Baring-Kennedy bill, the measure was introduced by Senator JOHN KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, and Representative WALTER S. BARING, of Nevada.

The bill would require the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to do two things:

1. To consult and advise with authorized representatives of organizations for the blind in the formulation, administration, and execution of programs for the aid and rehabilitation of the blind.

2. To enforce a prohibition against agencies supported by Federal funds from exerting official influence against the right of the blind to join organizations of the blind.

Witnesses for the bill at the hearing included a chemist, electrician, former member of two legislatures, a public utility commission executive, a schoolteacher, couple of lawyers, and others from every walk of life—all blind.

U.S. Olympic Committee Clarifies Position Relative to Recognition of Red China and Its Participation in Olympic Games

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, today the following letter was received from Mr. Kenneth L. Wilson, president of the U.S. Olympic Committee, in which he definitely clarifies the position of the International Olympic Committee regarding the recognition and admission to the Olympic games of Communist China. Attention is called to the third paragraph in Mr. Wilson's letter of August 10 in which he says:

Contrary to common opinion the action of the International Olympic Committee concerning Nationalist China was not influenced by the People's Republic of China, i.e., Communist China. Prior to the International Olympic Committee action Communist China had voluntarily withdrawn from Olympic competition and has shown no inclination to apply for readmission. Nor does it seem likely that she will be readmitted in the foreseeable future.

In plain words, Red China voluntarily withdrew from Olympic competition and has made no effort to apply for readmis-

sion. In view of the confusion and misunderstanding that has arisen, I urge the reading of Mr. Wilson's letters of July 31 and August 10, which follow:

U.S. OLYMPIC COMMITTEE,
New York, N.Y., August 10, 1959.

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VAN ZANDT: We want you as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives to know the steps the U.S. Olympic Committee has taken to have the International Olympic Committee recognize and admit to the Olympic games the Olympic Committee of Nationalist China under the name "Republic of China Olympic Committee."

We hope this will clear up in your mind any possible misunderstanding that has been generated by inaccurate publicity given this matter.

Contrary to common opinion, the action of the International Olympic Committee concerning Nationalist China was not influenced by the People's Republic of China, i.e., Communist China. Prior to the International Olympic Committee action Communist China had voluntarily withdrawn from Olympic competition and has shown no inclination to apply for readmission. Nor does it seem likely that she will be readmitted in the foreseeable future.

Yours very truly,

KENNETH L. WILSON,
President.

U.S. OLYMPIC COMMITTEE,
New York, N.Y., July 31, 1959.

The U.S. Olympic Committee met in Philadelphia, Pa., July 19-20, 1959, for an emergency session. After considerable discussion, the following statement was issued:

"The U.S. Olympic Committee strongly urges that the International Olympic Committee take immediate action to recognize the Nationalist Chinese under their rightful name—the Republic of China Olympic Committee. The U.S. Olympic Committee feels that immediate recognition of the Republic of China Olympic Committee can be accomplished in view of a statement made July 19 by the International Olympic Committee President Avery Brundage.

"Mr. Brundage said: 'The wording of the resolution adopted at the IOC meeting May 28, 1959, was unfortunate and certainly did not express the intent of the Munich meeting. The IOC action was merely a move to identify properly the athletes living on Taiwan (Formosa). The Formosa Chinese have now applied under the name of their country—the Republic of China Olympic Committee. I will recommend and support the recognition of this committee under this name.'

"The U.S. Olympic Committee is convinced that any delay in reinstating the Nationalist Chinese (Republic of China Olympic Committee) will seriously damage the Olympic movement in the United States.

"The U.S. Olympic Committee itself has no voice or vote in the affairs of the International Olympic Committee, and can only make recommendation to that body, as it is now doing.

"Because the United Nations headquarters are located here, and because the United Nations recognizes the Nationalist Chinese as the Republic of China, the American public view is understandable.

"This is a desperate situation and our hope is that the International Olympic Committee will help to correct it."

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH L. WILSON,
President.

ASA S. BUSINELL,
Secretary.

Labor Statesmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is important that restrictive trade practices and restraint of trade as have grown up under the unions' monopolistic position should be restrained. Legislation placing unions under antitrust law is possible as I have explained during current debate on the labor bill. Price fixing is but one of the economic consequences of labor's monopolistic position. There are many others and labor's monopolistic position culminates in labor leader dictation to our Government.

An editorial entitled "Labor Statesmanship," by George E. Sokolsky, is rather thought provoking on this subject. Labor organizations should be placed under antitrust law. Nothing short of this will solve the problems confronting us.

The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 2, 1959]

LABOR STATESMANSHIP

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The outpricing of American commodities is, in a measure, due to the unstatesmanlike attitude of the labor leaders who stimulate inflation by demanding increases in wages which produce increases in prices.

As a result, the purchasing value of the dollar goes down. In a word, as compared with the dollar in 1940, the purchasing value of the dollar is now 48 cents. Higher wages can mean a lowered value for the dollar. This process can continue until the dollar is worth little or nothing.

Again one may use the automobile industry as an example. The price of the American car in 1957 and 1958 encountered resistance, resulting in sufficient unemployment in Michigan as to be a serious problem and at the same time an increased import of European cars in the United States which became a competitive factor in 1958. Fortunately, it now appears that the trend in both categories is not as severe in 1959. Nevertheless, outside of the United States American cars are outpriced and American automobile companies are increasing their investments in foreign countries.

The Government of the United States encourages private investments abroad wherever possible. This is done for political reasons, but it is unrelated to the unemployment problem in the United States which, if continuous and if the numbers increase, may have very serious social effects.

Some labor leaders when they call strikes avoid asking for direct wage increases, but prefer what is euphemistically called a package deal. This includes various fringe benefits which, by any calculation, amount to increased wages; but the payments are postponed. For instance, maternity benefits for women workers are a form of wages but they are paid out by other means than a weekly check. Similarly, increases in vacations with pay involve the cost of labor by other bookkeeping procedures than hourly wage payments.

All fringe benefits are calculated as costs of operations and go into the price which increases with each round of strikes or threats of strikes. To keep prices down, that is, to keep the cost of production down,

management adopts all sorts of labor-saving devices, reducing the manpower engaged in production.

Unless this manpower can be absorbed in other industries or in service operations, there must be unemployment.

The management of labor unions faces difficult problems. The thoughtful, conservative leadership which is headed by George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, is always badgered by two groups, the ideological socialists, such as Walter Reuther, who usually have a good press, and the racketeers who cause trouble because they have made unionism a private business and operate without consideration for the welfare of the country.

A combination, for instance, of Harry Bridges, who has taken the fifth amendment as to his Communist affiliations, and Jimmy Hoffa, whose union has been expelled from the AFL-CIO for corruption, is a menace to the United States as great as any foreign foe. Harry Bridges recently impudently announced that he, and not the President or Congress, would determine what is the foreign policy of the United States. He said that no matter what the President, the Department of Defense, the State Department or the Congress decided as the policy between the United States and Formosa and the United States and Red China, he, Harry Bridges, private individual, of alien origin, would have to approve that policy so far as it could be implemented by the shipment of arms. In a word, he established a veto power for himself. This is an intolerable situation in any country for any individual. When Bridges and Hoffa combine, these two men could control the transportation operations of the entire Nation and could imperil the national defense.

It Will Help Region

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittston (Pa.) Sunday Dispatch of August 9, 1959:

IT WILL HELP REGION

Reports that the Glen Alden and Hudson Coal Co.'s may take over several pumping stations previously handled by the Lehigh Valley Coal Co. and the Pennsylvania Coal Co. serves as a shot in the arm for the hopes of the coal business in this region.

It will be a big blow against mine abandonment, and probably with some later cooperation from regional mineowners and some help from governmental agencies, the mines of Greater Pittston may become workable again.

There are many persons on the street who express the opinion that we should forget about spending any money on rehabilitating mines in the Pittston region. They cite many things—but one thing they do not cite is the fact that there are thousands of mine workers unemployed. These men worked all their adult lives in the mines and most of them are far past the age of 45. They cannot obtain other employment for two reasons—(1) there is little if any other employment to obtain in this region; (2) few employers will hire men over 45, particularly when it means breaking them in on unfamiliar jobs.

That's why it is important to all as neighbors and as beneficiaries from full employ-

ment to urge rehabilitation of regional mines. It is also the reason why the reports about the Glen Alden and Hudson Coal Co.'s stir confidence in our regional economic progress.

Why the States Don't Want United States To Give Back Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Roscoe Drummond as it appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of August 5, 1959:

WHY THE STATES DON'T WANT UNITED STATES TO GIVE BACK RIGHTS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

SAN JUAN, P.R.—There is no better place and time than here and now, at this 51st annual Governors' conference, to give a report on what has happened to the noble experiment which President Eisenhower launched 2 years ago. He proposed to give back to the States some of the "States rights" which the Federal Government had preempted and to reverse the flow of power from the State capitals to Washington.

Question. What has happened? What have been the accomplishments?

Answer. Nothing has happened. There have been no accomplishments.

I don't mean that there haven't been some speeches, several resolutions, one or two modest proposals. Yes, all of that and some more of the same here this week.

But no Governor has arranged for his State to recover a single function which the Eisenhower administration has offered to give back.

You are familiar with the debate: How the Federal Government is constantly increasing its power and how the States are constantly losing their powers; and can't something be done about it? When the President addressed the Governors' Conference at Williamsburg in 1957, he proposed a commission of Federal officials and State Governors to cite some functions which could be returned to the States and some taxation which could be given up so that any State which so wished could take back both the function and the taxation.

Sounds made to order, doesn't it, for any Governor and any legislature wanting to begin to redress the balance of State-versus-Federal power? The commission suggested several modest starts like the vocational education-grant programs and small-scale natural disasters.

But no State has acted to take back a single function.

This Governors' Conference here in San Juan continues to debate "The States and the Nation," as it does again this week, but the States find more reasons for doing nothing than for doing anything about it.

There are reasons. I don't want to suggest that there aren't. The reasons are these:

1. The Governors of the more prosperous States have so much on their hands that they feel no Federal encroachment and are quite content to leave things as they are.

2. There are other Governors who theoretically would like to see certain functions recovered by the States but who cannot bring themselves to levy the State taxes to finance these functions even when the Federal Government abandons the same taxes.

3. There are also Governors who would rather have the States' rights issue to talk about than to solve it. They know that they can't recover a State right without recovering a State responsibility, and when they complain about the Federal Government performing a service which belongs to the States, they really don't want the service performed at all, either by the States or the Federal Government.

Underlying all of these resistances by the States to recovering functions which are performed by Washington is a weakness of every State government which, until it is corrected, will prevent any important redress of the balance. That weakness is the distorted representation of rural districts in the State legislatures.

The rural districts of every State in the Union have massively disproportionate legislative power and dominate the legislatures to the disadvantage of the underrepresented cities.

The mayors of the cities know they will get nowhere when they appeal to their own States for help, so they inevitably turn to the Federal Government as the only recourse.

A Letter From the White House: No Invitation to Chou En-lai

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following correspondence between myself and the President and a brief statement which I issued to the press today:

AUGUST 4, 1959.

THE PRESIDENT,

The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I agree with you that an exchange of visits between you and Premier Khrushchev may create better understanding between the United States and the Soviet Union and thereby promote the cause of peace. It seems to me that the cause of peace could be promoted for exactly the same reasons if you and Chou En-lai were to exchange visits.

China, like the Soviet Union, is more enemy than friend. China's internal hate campaign against the United States is well known, as are China's aggressions in Korea and against Taiwan. But surely, if better understanding might lead to peace between us and the Soviet Union, we should at least attempt better understanding through visitor exchanges with China, at all levels, to promote the cause of peace in this area.

Of course this involves recognition of China. This can be done without turning "soft." Recognition does not mean forgiveness or approval. William Macomber, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, wrote me July 31, 1959:

"As I have mentioned in previous letters to you the fact that we maintain normal diplomatic relations with a particular country does not imply that we approve or disapprove of its internal policies or practices."

Your hopes and efforts, applauded by almost everyone, to achieve the end of nuclear tests require that we recognize China. No feasible inspection agreement can be concluded without the participation of China, the world's largest and most populous nation.

Considering your great responsibilities and the state of your health, your agreement to

go to Europe and to the Soviet Union may very well rule out a trip by you to China in the near future. With this in mind, and with deep admiration for your selfless decision to make the trips to Europe and the Soviet Union, I offer this alternative suggestion: That you encourage visitor exchange on other levels. I refer particularly to Members of Congress, journalists, national leaders, teachers, and students.

Such visitor exchanges with China might also lead to better understanding which would promote peaceful relations with China just as we are now trying to do with the Soviet Union.

Sincerely,

CHARLES O. PORTER,
Member of Congress.

AUGUST 7, 1959.

The Honorable CHARLES O. PORTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PORTER: Thank you for your letter. I am glad to have your suggestion that I exchange visits with Chou En-lai, as well as your view that we should afford recognition to Red China.

I cannot agree with you that it would be desirable for this country to give diplomatic recognition to Communist China or for me to invite Chou En-lai to visit this country. So long as the balance of advantage lies in maintaining our present policies in the Far East, I believe we should not change them. I believe these policies best serve the cause of peace.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN CHARLES O. PORTER, DEMOCRAT, OF OREGON, AUGUST 12, 1959

I appreciate the President's personal attention to my letter. However, I regret that the only matter of substance was his flat assumption that "the balance of advantage lies in maintaining our present policies in the Far East." On the basis of this reasoning the President apparently believes that "the balance of advantage" has tipped the wrong way with respect to the Soviet Union. That is presumably why he has invited Khrushchev to visit us, but not Chou En-lai. In my opinion the President holds no such views but they would naturally follow from his letter to me.

The President did not comment on my statement that visitor exchanges at all levels with China could promote peace just as the existing and expanding visitor exchange program with the Soviet Union promotes better understanding and peace.

Nor does the President suggest how we can achieve an end to nuclear weapons testing unless China subscribes to the inspection agreement.

While it is virtually unique, as well as an honor and a pleasure, to receive a letter from the President, and while it is gratifying to know he has personally considered this important matter, I would rather have received a more responsive letter from one of his assistants. Disputed issues of this magnitude need responsive and responsible discussion.

Hoffa's Combine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, many people throughout our great land both with-

in and outside the labor movement are alarmed over the monopolistic position of labor unions which are above and beyond antitrust law. This situation needs to be corrected.

Perhaps one of the best current studies showing the need for antitrust law can be found in the article by Roscoe Born which I would like to include for the attention of my colleagues during our labor debate:

HOFFA'S COMBINE—HE QUIETLY, INFORMALLY BUILDS POTENT ALLIANCE OF TRANSPORT UNIONS—TEAMSTERS AND MARITIME UNITS ARE CORE; FLIGHT ENGINEERS FRIENDLY, RAIL UNIONS SHY—WHAT WILL AFL-CIO DO?

(By Roscoe Born)

(Reprinted from the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 22, 1959)

WASHINGTON.—The grand alliance of transportation unions that Teamster President James R. Hoffa proclaimed last year, then appeared to abandon after outcries of alarm, has quietly become an all-but-accomplished fact.

Largely unnoticed, Mr. Hoffa and key collaborators have put together basic pieces of the combine—enough of them to indicate that an unprecedented Teamster-led monopoly is taking shape. The transport combine will have greater power to bargain, to organize and to strike than do its unions operating on their own. Whether or not this power is ever called into full play—as, say, in a national transportation strike—the mere fact of its existence will make the combine formidable for employers and for the public at large.

Here's the status of the assembly operation so far:

Mr. Hoffa's own truckdrivers are now firmly linked with longshoremen and seamen's unions on both coasts. These allies include Joe Curran's AFL-CIO National Maritime Union, with 40,000 members sailing out of Atlantic and gulf ports; Paul Hall's AFL-CIO Seafarers' International Union, with 75,000 members on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, as well as the Great Lakes; Harry Bridges' Independent International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, numbering 70,000 dockworkers and warehousemen on the Pacific coast and in Hawaii; and Capt. William Bradley's independent International Longshoremen's Association, with 52,000 dockhands on the Atlantic coast.

ANOTHER UNION BOXED IN

Another dock union, holding sway on the increasingly important Great Lakes, is boxed in to the point where it may have to join the Hoffa league or be squeezed out of business.

Mr. Hoffa has built a strong tie with one air transport union, the 5,000-man flight engineers, and is flirting with the airline stewardesses union; he also has tasted success in a drive to enlist in the Teamsters the men who work in and around the Nation's biggest airports.

And within 2 years, one top truck union strategist predicts, the growing power of this combine will attract at least some of the stand-offish railroad brotherhoods—despite the rail unions' steadfast denials. "They know there's not a ghost of a chance that we'd go along with them," insists one railroad union official.

What has developed so far may not be a complete conference on transportation unity on the 50-union scale envisioned last year, but it's close enough to convince Mr. Hoffa that success can't elude him.

"We already have the nucleus set up with the Teamsters and the maritime unions," he declares. "Eventually, the others—including rail and air—will see the advantages of this cooperation and they'll want in, too. It may never be formally proclaimed the

way C.T.U. was announced last year, but it will exist and will be just as effective as what we had planned for the C.T.U." Although Mr. Hoffa had first mentioned the idea of an alliance of transportation unions some months earlier—in mid-1957—congressional and AFL-CIO reaction to last July's formal C.T.U. announcement was so violent that he backed off.

HOFFA SCOFFS AT NATIONAL TIEUP

Even now, without the railroad unions, the combined power of the unions already allied is enough to halt the flow of much of the Nation's commerce if they all decided to strike simultaneously. If the combine reaches full flower, this paralytic power would become complete. Mr. Hoffa naturally scoffs at any such possibility: "Talk of a national transportation tieup is nonsense," he snaps. The Teamster chief argues such a step would be self-destructive, figuring Congress would ram through legislation to stop the strike.

As a practical matter, anyway, Mr. Hoffa and his allies expect to achieve their ends without having to resort to such extremes. Local or regional tieups would be more likely. The combine might, say, close down the port of New York or cut off supplies to the island of Puerto Rico to back up demands of one union. Or it might merely move against a single employer group at a time in any one area. "The only way to win a strike," contends the Teamster chief, "is to shut one group down and let potential competitors operate."

As of now, the transport unions' capacity for united strike action is limited; because contracts expire on varying dates, the unions can't all walk out at once without risking costly lawsuits. But most of them can and will refuse, under contract provisions, to cross other transport unions' picket lines. And the wealthy Teamsters can extend financial help to less prosperous striking unions. Furthermore, the transport unions are working toward common contract expiration dates, which would make simultaneous strike action possible.

Such strategy aims basically, of course, to strengthen union hands at the bargaining table. The Teamsters already are mapping joint bargaining strategy with friendly dock unions; each knows in advance what the other will demand from employers that two or more of them deal with. While the transport combine may never adopt a complete uniform slate of contract goals, Mr. Hoffa can at least be expected to work out common demands for fringe benefits, such as pensions, and to stand firm against contract proposals he considers too gentle. And the allies will work to minimize the impact of automation on transport unions, notably in warehouses and on the waterfront.

"Full coordination of bargaining demands is a good sound policy and essential to the well-being of all our members," says Teddy Gleason, general organizer of the International Longshoremen's Association, after a visit to Mr. Bridges' west coast dock union.

More effective organizing is another target of the combine. "We'll work to eliminate jurisdictional problems," asserts Mr. Hoffa. As a clue to what may be in store, it's noteworthy that the Teamsters already are collaborating with the ILA and the National Maritime Union to sign up workers along the Canadian side of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

These varied goals may lead the transport unions to a more formal organization than now is envisioned. A Teamster official says the combine will be interested in legislation, as well as bargaining and organizing. "If we're going into these matters," he adds, "that means we'll have to set up a research department. And if we're going to have that, we'll have to have a per capita tax from each union."

Mr. Hoffa's recent gains have been achieved in relative silence, thus avoiding

the uproar that greeted his proclamation of a permanent conference on transportation unity last July. So violent was the reaction then—both in Congress and in the AFL-CIO—that Mr. Hoffa never held a heralded meeting of an estimated 50 union presidents to perfect his C.T.U.

QUIETLY RESUMED WORKING

Then, while the epidemic of Hoffaphobia died down, the persistent little Teamster leader started working more quietly toward the same goal. Just the other day, when he met in New York with 13 other union chiefs, notably bosses of dock and seamen's unions, there were earnest denials that transportation unity was afoot. But as Mr. Hoffa left the meeting, one of his top aids whispered, "There's your C.T.U.," and Jimmy grinned in agreement.

The current steps toward a transport combine, however quietly and informally taken, seem likely sooner or later to kick up a storm on Capitol Hill, just as last summer's announcement of the original plan did—especially since the plan then and now includes Mr. Bridges, leftwing leader of the west coast longshoremen.

At that time Senator EASTLAND, Mississippi Democrat who heads the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, called such an alliance a threat to national security. Arkansas' Democratic Senator McLELLAN, chairman of the Special Senate Investigating Committee, declared "the welding of Hoffa's powers with those inherent in these other organizations has grave implications for the destiny of our national economy." Chimed in GOP Representative HOFFMAN from Mr. Hoffa's home State of Michigan: "If such a federation calls a strike they could starve us into submission in 6 days."

Also incensed was the AFL-CIO. Only months earlier it had expelled the Teamsters on grounds of corruption. The old AFL had kicked out the International Longshoremen's Association in 1953 as a gangster-dominated union and the old CIO booted Harry Bridges' union in 1950 as Communist dominated.

MEANY'S ORDER

The presence of the Teamsters and the ILA in the group's list of sponsors "could very well be the start for what you might call a birds-of-a-feather federation," Mr. Meany declared. What was worse, to federation officials, was the fact that AFL-CIO unions—including that of Joe Curran, National Maritime Union president and a vice president of the AFL-CIO—were joining up. Mr. Meany and his colleagues promptly ordered all federation affiliates to cancel formal pacts with expelled unions.

Then something happened to brighten Mr. Hoffa's hopes. Last December Mr. Curran, of the NMU, and Mr. Hall, president of the rival Seafarers' International Union, forgot a lengthy feud in order to promote a 4-day worldwide boycott by many transport unions of ships flying "flags of convenience." These are U.S.-owned vessels sailing under flags of Panama, Liberia, Honduras, and Costa Rica to avoid high labor costs and taxes in the United States. Labor officials say the boycott tied up 160 vessels in 19 ports, but was really effective only in the United States where Mr. Hoffa's Teamsters cooperated.

More cooperation grew out of this 4-day effort. The following month, Mr. Hall and Mr. Curran signed a formal peace treaty ending their feud. Both agreed to drop lawsuits, charges of unfair labor practices and other disputes. It was Mr. Hoffa who, his aids claim, helped bring the rivals together.

TEAMSTERS, BRIDGES' UNION JOIN HANDS

Other Hoffa efforts began to bear fruit. On the west coast, the Teamsters and Mr. Bridges' International Longshoremen & Warehousemen's Union, also foes for many years, joined hands. They set up a perma-

nent committee of five members from each union to bring jurisdictional peace and cooperation on common problems.

Mr. Hoffa's chief of staff, Harold J. Gibbons, meanwhile went to London for conferences with officials of the International Transport Workers Federation, an organization maintained by unions in 62 nations. Mr. Gibbons carried assurances that the Teamsters would cooperate again in any new boycott of convenience ships. A week later, Mr. Hall and Mr. Curran went to London, too, to work on the boycott plans. It's expected now that the unions will select two shipping companies as sample target's and apply a permanent boycott.

It was new boycott plans that drew Mr. Hoffa and other transport union chiefs to New York earlier this month. There officials of 14 unions set up a steering committee to cooperate on any problems that confront the participating unions.

"Right now, it's just the boycott," says one union official who attended the meeting. "But it's easy to see what's on their minds. They pop up with stuff about automation and jurisdiction."

Among those at the meeting was Larry Long, president of the International Brotherhood of Longshoremen, a dock union created by the AFL to compete with the expelled International Longshoremen's Association. Though the IBL and the ILA have been enemies from the start, their leaders met on friendly terms, and some maritime union officials think a pact between them is sure to come.

Mr. Long's union dominates Great Lakes docks, but with the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway faces a possible challenge from the ILA. The east coast union has contracts with some employers who expect to move inland along the seaway. They'll bring ILA contracts with them, labor sources note. With Mr. Hoffa backing Captain Bradley's ILA, the inland dock union would be hard pressed to hold ground.

"Long either goes along with the new group, or he gets shut out," a Teamster official forecasts.

While Mr. Hoffa has been working out ties with sea and dock unions, he has been solidifying his relations with the Flight Engineers. When the Engineers engaged Eastern Air Lines in a long strike late last year, they found the Teamsters willing to post collateral for a \$200,000 loan to keep them going. The loan has been repaid now, and the Flight Engineers feel deeply grateful.

"We're not about to break with the Teamsters," confides one Flight Engineer official. "We have no place else to go. The federation isn't too interested in us."

Still unsettled is the Flight Engineer feud with the Air Line Pilots' Association over which union gets jurisdiction over the third crewman in jet aircraft cabins. Engineers believe this fight threatens the existence of their union, and that the federation has refused to act to protect their jurisdiction. If the Flight Engineers should strike again over this issue, they believe pilots may try to keep the airliners flying without engineers.

"We might need the Teamsters again," says an Engineer source, recalling that truck union officials were prepared last December to halt deliveries of fuel and other supplies to Engineer-struck airlines.

AID PACT STILL IN EFFECT

Still in effect, despite AFL-CIO orders, is a mutual assistance pact between the Flight Engineers and the Teamsters; it rather vaguely promises aid by each union to the other in any emergency. An Engineer source says: "The idea of further association with the Teamster officials predict the Engineers may join the transport combine, and one Engineer privately agrees—even if the alliance includes Harry Bridges.

"We couldn't say we're willing to accept the Teamsters but not their friends," he reasons. "We have to buy the whole package."

With the Flight Engineers in the transport league, it wouldn't be necessary to get the pilots' union, Mr. Hoffa's advisers figure. But the Teamsters are definitely eyeing a dissident segment of the pilots' union, the Air Line Stewards' and Stewardesses' Association. At the recent convention of the association in Chicago, the truck union's Mr. Gibbons was a convention-long observer and "he wasn't there just because he likes pretty girls," one labor official notes.

To help entrench his strength in the air transport field, Mr. Hoffa is pushing a drive to sign up workers in and around the airports in 22 big cities. The Teamster chief says air freight is about to blossom into a real competitor of surface shipping, and therefore the Teamsters can't ignore the airlines.

In February, Mr. Hoffa won his first round in this campaign. Pan American World Airways' stock clerks voted nearly 2 to 1 in favor of the Teamsters in an election conducted by the National Mediation Board. Teamsters thus won the right to represent 861 Pan Am employees who handle freight the airline hauls.

This still leaves the rail unions outside the Hoffa sphere, and one railway labor source insists: "Among our chiefs there isn't one that would lean that way at the present time." After reflecting a bit, he adds: "Times do change, but I just can't see our people going into any transportation council."

Nonetheless, Teamsters claim economic necessity will force some railroad unions into the alliance eventually, possibly within 2 years. According to Teamster reasoning, railroads must offer lower rates to compete with other forms of transport, notably St. Lawrence Seaway shipping, and so must try harder to keep labor costs down. That pressure will make railroad workers more interested in a broader base of bargaining strength, Teamsters contend. They point to a recent request by railroads that train unions accept a 15-cent hourly pay cut in new contracts to be negotiated by November 1. The unions were expecting to win 12-percent wage increases.

It's worth noting, too, that the railroad unions' total membership has been declining in recent years. And railroads are gradually diversifying into other forms of transportation, notably trucking and pipeline operations, in which nonrail unions have long since staked out jurisdictional claims. As a possible basis for coalition, the Teamsters already negotiate with many of the same employers that railroad brotherhoods deal with: the Hoffa union represents drivers for the trucking subsidiaries of the Santa Fe, New York Central, and Pennsylvania railroads, to name just a few.

How will George Meany and the AFL-CIO react to the developing transport combine? Some transportation unionists argue it doesn't make any difference what the federation says now. Some unions with Teamster pacts ignored last summer's AFL-CIO edict to cancel them, they say, and the federation hasn't done anything more about it. Joe Curran, whose participation in Mr. Hoffa's CTU prompted the federation order, is still consorting with Teamsters. And now he's been joined by Mr. Hall, who is president of the AFL-CIO Maritime Trades Department, as well as president of his own Seafarers' Union. So far, this fraternization, with banished unions hasn't brought any new blast from Mr. Meany.

On the other hand, Mr. Meany made such a point of outlawing pacts with expelled unions that he can hardly ignore these new developments, some federation officials say.

The issue undoubtedly will come up at the next AFL-CIO executive council meeting in Washington, May 18. At that time, too, the council may consider whether to readmit the expelled ILA. If the longshore union is welcomed back, after trafficking with Mr. Hoffa, it would be taken as a sign that the AFL-CIO no longer objects to such behavior.

Congressman Philbin and the Polish Cause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, last month my good friend, Francis Mieczko of Webster, Mass., gave a courageous and forceful speech on the Polish cause over Radio Station WESO in Southbridge, Mass.

In his eloquent remarks, Mr. Mieczko touched upon my humble efforts over the years in behalf of the gallant Polish people and their fight for freedom and liberation. I am indeed thankful to him.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the text of Mr. Mieczko's address over WESO on June 7, 1959.

The material follows:

CONGRESSMAN PHILBIN AND THE POLISH CAUSE

Ignace Paderewski, the excellent Polish statesman and world renowned pianist, with his political wisdom and with his enchanting music, exerted tremendous influence on President Woodrow Wilson during First World War and also after its conclusion. Under the influence of Paderewski's music, President Woodrow Wilson constantly pondered in his mind the Polish villages and cities, which were drowning in tears and blood under the burden of years of bondage, devastated with sword and fire by their greedy and selfish neighbors: Prussia, Austria, and Russia.

Sensitive of human plight, President Woodrow Wilson, a statesman with a just and noble heart, learned about the country of our forefathers and grandfathers, and, when the time of decision arrived, he gave his friend Paderewski and his countrymen the greatest of all gifts: Poland—free and independent Poland. He guaranteed the freedom and independence of Poland in the Versailles Treaty in the famous 13th paragraph reintroducing Poland into the international arena after well over 100 years of bondage. President Woodrow Wilson became the idol of the Polish people. Faith in historical justice and the deep confidence that all evil someday will find its end, finally triumphed. Every Polish child of school age had a great admiration for the American Nation and everlasting esteem and honor for its great and noble President. President Woodrow Wilson had occasion to visit the capital of Poland, Warsaw. The result of his visit was material help and food from the United States of America so vital to Poland's continued existence in the world of free nations.

After 20 years of fantastic rehabilitation, the young Polish state once again was subjected to humiliation by the same greedy and selfish neighbors, Germany and Russia. In 1939 Poland was again crucified and ferocious ravens tore her flesh swiftly even as her last breath of life was ebbing.

The epic of the tortured Polish nation immensely impressed President Roosevelt. President Roosevelt, in his manifesto calling for mobilization of all powers against Teutonic tyranny and barbarism, declared Poland the inspiration of all nations and asserted that such a nation cannot perish. Unfortunately, after a few years the greatest drama, the greatest tragedy in world history took place. The same President, for reasons, which only history will read, either under the burden of his sickness or under the influence of his ill-advised White House staff, failed to realize the greed and rapacity of Stalin and, disregarding the fact that the Polish soldiers fought valiantly in all sections of the front, allowed Poland to be seized once again by the Red communistic hand of Stalin.

Therefore, we are looking today to the friends devoted to Poland, friends who could achieve an insight into her situation as well as into the situation of other countries in Europe, similarly occupied by Russia, and who could in the right moment follow the example of President Woodrow Wilson.

Our researchers are at constant work. We scrutinize every word spoken in defense of Poland by individual Senators and Congressmen.

With pleasure we state that among the proven and warm friends of Poland we can rely on our Congressman from Massachusetts, PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

Congressman PHILBIN, well known from numerous movements in the Polish cause during World War II, does not stop his work for Poland's welfare and on every possible occasion gives deep understanding of the exceptional situation in which the Polish nation now exists. What is more, he sees clearly the injustices which the Allies have done to their truest and most faithful partner.

During the past few weeks, Congressman PHILBIN asserted himself honorably on two occasions on the floor of Congress for the Polish cause.

By his speech in the House of Representatives he saved from deportation 60 Polish sailors who, 4 years ago, escaped from a Polish ship to Formosa and then found asylum in United States of America. This year all these seamen were notified about pending deportation to Poland because of the present progressive improvement in the general situation, because of the so-called communistic thaw in Poland after October 1956.

Congressman PHILBIN, as an experienced statesman, demonstrated in his speech the communistic government imposed upon Poland, upon the Polish people known for their love of peace. In that speech he pointed out that the individual living conditions in Poland are deteriorating from day to day, contrary to the news spread by false propaganda. Individual rights, which are so jealously guarded here by the Constitution are there brutally and ruthlessly trodden upon. Here the highest law is the Constitution; over there the law of the mailed fist. He recalled among other things: (1) The recent unprecedented raid on Jasna Gora, the monastery of the Pauline Fathers in Czestochowa, (2) the ban to distribute by church auspices the gift packages received from America from the National Catholic Welfare Council, (3) the removal of crucifixes from schools and public buildings, (4) the suppression of rights of speech and press.

As a truly great friend of Poland, Congressman PHILBIN concluded his remarks with a unusually strong appeal to the President of the United States of America and to the Government to abandon threats and proceedings about deportation of the Polish sailors and to continue the principle of offering asylum for the brave and unfortunate people of oppressed nations.

The day May 18 is a great day for all Poles scattered all over the world. It is a

day on which the Polish soldier conquered the seemingly unconquerable German fortress on Monte Cassino in Italy 15 years ago. Congressman PHILBIN kept that in mind, too. On that day he delivered a flaming speech in the House of Representatives. He reminded all Congressmen that, thanks to the sacrifices of the Polish soldier, the final victory over the Germans was accelerated, but Poland herself went from one bondage to another.

Congressman PHILBIN in his daily work helps individual Poles in an apparent and friendly way. A wise philosopher says: "The friend in need is the friend indeed." Congressman PHILBIN has proved to be a true friend, indeed. Moreover, his frequent efforts in the Polish cause encourage us to feel that Congressman PHILBIN, like President Woodrow Wilson, in his nobility and righteousness, has before his eyes the vision of a free and independent Poland.

May the Almighty God bestow upon him health and give him inspiration in his valiant fight for the righteous cause of Poland.

May God grant him wisdom and courage so that he may continue in his efforts to curb these cruel injustices against God and humanity.

National Library Week Activities in New Hampshire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein the summary of the National Library Week activities in New Hampshire, compiled by Dr. William R. Lansberg, executive director:

NATIONAL LIBRARY WEEK IN NEW HAMPSHIRE (By William R. Lansberg, executive director)

New Hampshire, which opened the first free public library in the Nation at Peterborough in April 1833, can well be proud of the many varied activities which marked the State's observance of National Library Week in April 1959.

Statewide planning for National Library Week in New Hampshire was developed by a State committee of over 60 members under the chairmanship of Edward J. Gallagher, editor of the Laconia Evening Citizen. This writer served the committee as executive director. Cochairmen of the important local activities committee were William T. Weitzel, librarian of the Manchester Public Library, and Siri Andrews, librarian of the Concord Public Library; chairman of the statewide special events committee was Raymond T. Holden, North Newport author, poet, critic, and 1958 NLW State committee chairman; Emil W. Allen, Jr., assistant State librarian, served as chairman of the statewide promotion committee.

To encourage local participation in New Hampshire, the State committee planned a contest which we believe will prove to be one of the most unusual NLW devices used in any of the 50 States. A special award of a complete set of the "Encyclopedia Americana" and other prizes were to be presented to the New Hampshire libraries, large or small, which put on the most original observances of National Library Week. As the week of April 12-18 approached, reports indicated that many libraries in the State had become somewhat secretive about their

plans, in order to insure protection for their entry in the most original contest.

We want to say a word about three other activities sponsored by the State committee.

Walt Kelly, creator of "Pogo," contributed a special "Pogo" cartoon to help carry the National Library Week message "Wake Up and Read" to all Americans in every walk of life. Twenty thousand copies of the "Pogo" leaflet were printed and distributed in New Hampshire—in restaurants, supermarkets, and libraries.

The week before National Library Week, Robert S. Monahan, a member of the Hanover delegation in the State house of representatives, offered a joint resolution to the New Hampshire Legislature, which was passed unanimously on a voice vote.

In addition to the joint resolution of the State legislature Governor Powell himself wrote a National Library Week proclamation.

We have already described the planning behind the contest for the most original observances of National Library Week by New Hampshire libraries. Encouraged by the contest, more libraries participated this year than in 1958. We received excellent coverage on New Hampshire activities in the press and on radio and TV.

To select only a few from the great number and variety of New Hampshire programs, special library events included plays by puppets for moppets and a panel discussion on "The Arts" for parents at the Concord Public Library; the Bedford Library showed townspeople its newly redecorated quarters; a hobby show was scheduled at Rumney, featuring afghans, paintings, decorated cakes, jewelry, and lampshades, all tied in with books on these subjects; Pease Air Force Base in Portsmouth, like many other New Hampshire libraries, held open house all week long; the Laconia Library called attention to its outstanding collection of Indian artifacts with exhibits and a talk by Solon Colby, of Meredith. Baker Library at Dartmouth College held a book sale during the week, and displayed two exhibits: "Notable Books of 1958" and "Notable Recent Acquisitions."

One of the most original observances of National Library Week occurred in March at Bow, where the library put on its Library Week show a month early at town meeting time with a special display for voters in the new Community Building. Mrs. Harold W. Howe, the librarian, reported many new customers in the library as a direct result. There was also a benefit to tempers during town meeting: the books gave voters a chance to browse—and cool off—between items in the warrant.

NEW HAMPSHIRE'S MOST ORIGINAL CONTEST

More than 100 New Hampshire libraries put on special programs for National Library Week; 40 of these libraries submitted entries in the contest for the most original observances of National Library Week by New Hampshire libraries. The judges agreed that a wonderful job was done by all, making it most difficult to pick the winners.

Judging the contest was a committee under the chairmanship of Miss Shirley Barker, author, of Derry. Other members included Mrs. Joseph F. Culick, president of the New Hampshire Federation of Women's Clubs; Miss Mary C. MacNeil, vice president of the Business and Professional Women's Clubs of New Hampshire; and William R. Lansberg, director of acquisitions at the Dartmouth College Library and executive director of National Library Week in New Hampshire.

Four prizes were awarded as a highlight of the annual meeting of the New Hampshire Library Trustees Association in Concord on April 30.

The grand prize for the most outstanding program judged from every aspect went to Marlboro. The judges felt that, considering the size of the community (population

1,561) and the resources with which the library had to work, this was a most worthy winner. As we have already mentioned, the grand prize consisted of a complete set of the "Encyclopedia Americana," presented by the publisher.

The prize awarded to the New Hampshire rural library with the most outstanding program during National Library Week was presented to Wilmot (population 380). This prize, which was presented by the State librarian, consisted of three books to be selected by the winning library.

The library having the most outstanding program for children was also a small town—Gilsum (population 568). Their prize, three "Landmark" books, was presented by the judges. The Gilsum entry in the National Library Week contest opened as follows: "The week's challenge to 'Wake Up and Read' did not catch Gilsum trustees napping."

Winner of the contest for the city library having the most outstanding program for National Library Week was Concord. The prize, presented by the New Hampshire Library Association, included the following volumes: "American Panorama" edited by Eric Larrabee; "A Passion for Books," by Lawrence Clark Powell; and the magnificent novel "Islandia," by Austin Tappan Wright, a native of Hanover.

CONGRATULATIONS

On the second day of National Library Week, Monday, April 13, we received the following telegram from national headquarters in New York:

"Second National Library Week has made good start in New York with press, radio, and TV support. Steering committee would appreciate having by return wire your own brief report of your library week. Include comments on press coverage and community activities."

"Thanks and best wishes."

Being an economical New Englander, we replied by night letter as follows:

"New Hampshire observance includes proclamation written by Governor, joint resolution passed by State legislature, contest for most original observances by New Hampshire libraries. More libraries participating, excellent press, radio, and television coverage. Practically complete coverage in State publications of civic, fraternal, religious, and other groups through representation on large State committee. All kinds of library programs being presented, probably topped by speech in French on De Gaulle and the new France by Baron Charles De Pampelonne, French consul general in Boston, at Nashua public library next Thursday evening."

A week later we received this reply:

"Thanks for splendid news in your wire last week concerning Library Week success in New Hampshire. Congratulations on variety and extent of program, the total picture looks bigger and better than ever."

"EMERSON GREENAWAY,

"President, American Library Association."

"WHITNEY NORTH SEYMOUR,

"Chairman, National Book Committee."

About the same time, we received this letter from the national director of NLW:

"DEAR BILL: Well, I take my hat off to you up in New Hampshire. This is darn good work. I am impressed with what the house of representatives did and your use of 'Pogo' material is excellent. All in all, you have done a very sound job indeed. Our sincere congratulations."

Cordially,

"JOHN S. ROBLING,

"Director, National Library Week."

"P.S.—How many 'Pogo' booklets did you print? I had not heard about your contest for the most original observances. This is a new idea indeed. Let us know the results. Perhaps we can use this in our handbook for 1960."

Finally, a month after National Library Week, we received the following note, also from John S. Robling:

"Cheers and congratulations to you for the wonderful material on your most original contest. I hope very much that what you did there this year can become a national pattern, and we intend to use this story in the national report."

Additional Cleveland Views on Khrushchev Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the announcement of Soviet Premier Khrushchev's impending visit to the United States has evoked varied reactions in the city of Cleveland, as indeed has been the case throughout the country. On the one hand the hope is expressed that his visit may lead to a reduction in cold war tensions between our two nations, while the other view suggests that nothing more than Communist propaganda purposes will be served by the invitation.

The wide divergence of opinion relative to Mr. Khrushchev's approaching visit is well reflected in the editorial comment of Cleveland newspapers. So that the officials charged with the responsibility for arranging his itinerary may give consideration to all published viewpoints, I include the Cleveland Plain Dealer editorial of August 4 and the Cleveland Press editorial of August 5 with my remarks:

[From the Cleveland Press, Aug. 5, 1959]

SHOW HIM THE WORKS

The major objective of Americans during the forthcoming visit of Nikita Khrushchev should be that he see as much of the United States as possible. We should not be too finicky about what he sees—as long as it is a great deal of the tremendous variety that adds up to U.S.A.

Those of us who have been traveling about this country recently, on business or vacation, return to our desks tremendously impressed with this land and its people—its wealth and richness, its strength and vitality, its growth and change.

This is reflected in myriad ways—by the great superhighway developments, by the mushrooming of huge suburban shopping areas, by the number of new schools, churches, and other public buildings—not to mention uncountable new factories and residences.

Seeing them will help Khrushchev estimate how quickly he can match and surpass the Americans.

He should get a good picture of the American standard of living and our great desire not to have it destroyed by war or subversion.

And, lest he miscalculate American strength he should have a chance to inspect the nonsecret aspects of our Military Establishment.

Among the places Khrushchev should see if his tour of the country is to be complete, is Cleveland.

Cleveland typifies so much of the strength of America—vast productive capacity, rich cultural resources, and people of countless nationality backgrounds working and living together.

Naturally, to Clevelanders who fled the Iron Curtain countries, or who still have relatives living unhappily beyond the curtain, he will not be a welcome visitor.

He typifies the iron hand which still grips the great nations of central Europe, and the attitude of these folks is understandable.

But they should remember that the most realistic hope for these nations to shed the yoke of Russian domination is an easing of the terrible tensions in the world.

It was the hope of easing these tensions that led President Eisenhower to agree to this exchange of visits.

Thus no one should place obstacles in the way of gaining the greatest possible benefits from Khrushchev's tour.

And the greatest benefits will come only if he sees as much as possible of this vast and busy country.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Aug. 4, 1959]

KHRUSHCHEV TO SEE AMERICA

The highest possible official person-to-person exchange was initiated yesterday when President Dwight D. Eisenhower invited Prime Minister Nikita Khrushchev of the Soviet Union to visit Washington for informal discussions of world issues and to tour the United States next month.

Sometime this fall President Eisenhower will return the call and visit the Soviet Union. At the same time, in announcing Khrushchev's coming, the Chief Executive revealed his plan to call personally on Prime Minister Macmillan of Britain, President de Gaulle of France, and Chancellor Adenauer of West Germany before the Russian arrives.

This exchange could be one of the most momentous historical developments of our time.

Khrushchev has long made known his desire to visit America. Yesterday's formal invitation was accepted with alacrity. The trip has long been under consideration. Before he left on his Russian visit Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON knew the invitation was pending. The whole proposal was started by the President weeks ago. It is a brave and forthright gesture to mollify the stresses and strains in Russo-American relations. There is talk that it might even lead to a formal summit conference despite the failure of Geneva, although at his special press conference the Chief Executive brushed aside a question on that point as premature.

Khrushchev's desire to visit the New World will open up a new world to him in more than the geographic sense. In their televised discussion the Russian chief told Nixon he knew nothing about communism. This was not true. Nixon knows and understands a great deal about the political ideology of the Russians and their followers. But it has long been evident from the statements made by Khrushchev that he really knows nothing about American capitalism. His notions appear to have been taken out of Karl Marx's book, more than a century out of date, and from the mythological propaganda of the Communist Party.

His appetite to see America for himself was whetted by the reports brought back by Mikoyan and Kozlov. Now he will get the opportunity.

For 2 or 3 days Khrushchev will be entertained in Washington. He will have informal talks with the President that in no way will be construed as negotiation. Then for 10 days the Russian visitor will be taken around the country. Frankly we hope that they will be the 10 days that shook Khrushchev. He should, being an intelligent and observant man, be divested of some of his silly preconceptions. He should get a new picture of American living standards and attitudes, of this country's productive power and the virility of the capitalism he so lightly

downgrades. To translate and paraphrase a famous Latin saying, we hope he will come and see and be conquered.

Certainly this exchange means that the Berlin crisis will be shelved, at least for a while. It means that the President, who had met Khrushchev only casually at the summit conference in 1955, will be able better to take the measure of the man and get over some points that it is only in his power to do. If Khrushchev is unimpressed nothing has been lost from the American viewpoint. If he comprehends what he sees a new and possibly constructive turn may be given to East-West relations.

Contentious Concept

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, implicit, but not mentioned in the current labor debate on labor reform legislation, is the struggle that has been long going on within labor unions between labor leaders and the union members themselves.

I believe local unions should have control of their own affairs, not as subordinates to the national union which dictates and activates. My bill, H.R. 8003, places unions under antitrust law provided the protection needed by local unions and union members from their own dictatorial leaders. Naturally this will be strenuously opposed by these national leaders. Nevertheless, I believe union members deserve this protection. Otherwise, they will have little, if any, voice in their own union affairs.

An interesting study by Robert D. Novak entitled "Contentious Concept: AFL-CIO Fights the Idea Government Must Guard Workers From Union Leaders," I found authoritative and explanatory of the situation now existing within labor unions and I submit it for the RECORD for others interested in this controversial matter:

CONTENTIOUS CONCEPT: AFL-CIO FIGHTS THE IDEA GOVERNMENT MUST GUARD WORKERS FROM UNION LEADERS

(By Robert D. Novak)

WASHINGTON.—In its struggle against the Senate-passed Kennedy labor reform bill, organized labor is battling a concept rather than anything tangible which would cripple its power.

It is opposing the concept that the Government must intervene to protect the worker from the union just as the union once intervened to protect the worker from the employer. After gradually picking up momentum over the past 10 years, this concept is now the focal point of labor legislation.

That is why the AFL-CIO has concentrated its heaviest fire against the bill of rights for union members added to the Kennedy bill on the Senate floor. This attempts to safeguard the rights of rank-and-file union members, and, as such, affects the relationship between a union and its members to a far greater extent than existing laws.

No longer is this struggle merely a matter of determining the balance between union power and employer power. It is also now a struggle between the power of union leadership and the power of union membership. And it is just such a theoretical separation of leadership and membership that makes the bill of rights unpalatable to labor leaders.

OLD ALIGNMENT

Furthermore, the fact that the bill of rights was approved by the most liberal Senate since New Deal days shows that the old liberal versus conservative alignment on labor matters is no longer totally valid. Liberals who back labor on everything else oppose it on the matter of guaranteeing rights for union members.

These liberals, and conservatives as well, believe such protection is needed because of the power amassed by labor chiefs in this generation—partly through the aid of friendly Federal legislation. More important, they believe that unions can no longer be called voluntary organizations because of widespread union shop agreements which require union membership of employees. On the other hand, labor leaders fear that this trend might lead to the dreaded creation of a two-party system within unions.

The Kennedy bill's seemingly innocuous bill of rights asserts equal political rights within unions for all members, freedom of speech and assembly, freedom from arbitrary dues and assessments, protection of the union member's rights to sue, and safeguards against improper disciplinary action. A union member could go to court to protect these rights. Violation could bring a jail sentence for the offending union official.

Although organized labor claims that these provisions would hamstring union operations and breed an epidemic of lawsuits, most lawyers believe that the bill of rights would not infringe on union power very much. A watered-down version, substituted for an earlier proposal of Arkansas' Senator McCLELLAN, provides several safety hatches for unions.

The freedom of speech guarantee, for example, is modified by a provision that unions may enforce reasonable rules in conducting union meetings. Furthermore, a proposal that the Secretary of Labor be empowered to go to court to enforce these rights was rejected, leaving the burden to individual union members who probably would hesitate before going to the time and expense of legal action.

Clearly, then, labor is battling most of all symbolic intrusion into what it considers as its private domain. AFL-CIO President George Meany told a House Labor subcommittee: " . . . it is one thing to include such rights and safeguards in a union's constitution . . . and quite another thing to incorporate them into a Federal statute." In other words, the duty to protect workers' rights lies with the union itself.

The Meany statement is strikingly reminiscent of the more flamboyant words of George F. Baer, one of the anthracite operators at the time of the great 1902 coal strike: "The rights and interests of the laboring man will be protected and cared for, not by labor agitators, but by the Christian men to whom God in His infinite wisdom has given the control of the property interests of the country." In other words, the duty to protect the workers' interests lies with the employer, not the union.

BALANCE OF POWER

Mr. Baer's philosophy, widely shared by employers of his day, was all but obliterated by such legislation of the early 1930's as the Norris-LaGuardia Act barring antiunion injunctions and the Wagner Act requiring recognition of unions. It was not until pas-

sage of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947 that a desire for additional laws protecting union members from their officers became apparent.

Basically, Taft-Hartley was an attempt to alter the balance of labor-management power in favor of management; it provided some safeguards for the worker, but this was a byproduct, not the main goal. Even then, however, the House version of the bill contained a bill of rights, later stripped from the measure by the Senate. Democratic Senator KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, now the chief sponsor of labor legislation but then a young House Member, declared that something should be done about "democratizing election procedures and administration" though he opposed the House bill.

The movement for Federal protection of union members as an issue separate from the struggle between labor and management did not shift into high gear until the Senate's McClellan committee began its investigation of union abuses in 1957. In some ways, the flood of mail from rank-and-file unionists complaining about their leaders was more of an eye-opener than the testimony in open session.

Labor leaders call the entire drive a cynical attempt by ultra-conservative employers to destroy unions by acting as protectors of the workers. "This is no more than a try to split workers from the union leaders," contends Democratic Senator McNAMARA, of Michigan, one of labor's staunchest friends in Congress.

Actually, many employers are lukewarm about the bill of rights. They are far more concerned about stricter curbs against picketing and the secondary boycott technique by which a union pressures a neutral employer into ceasing business with a strike-bound employer—issues that fit into the old labor versus management power struggle. Moreover, some industrialists privately oppose the bill of rights concept on the ground that it might weaken union stability and make workers less tractable, leading perhaps to unauthorized strikes.

Backers of the bill of rights, who fear too much public employer support as a kiss of political death, are delighted by this. They have been so anxious to keep management out of this fight that a provision of the bill of rights bars a union member from borrowing money from an interested employer to go to court against the union leadership.

The support of the protection of union members' rights comes in large part from the liberal intelligentsia, once so firmly allied with the labor chieftains but gradually drifting away since the end of World War II.

This disaffection is typified by a 1957 Fund for the Republic pamphlet written by Clark Kerr, chancellor of the University of California and a prominent labor economist. Dr. Kerr declared: "It is said, by some, that only the unions can scrutinize themselves; that it is not the proper business of anybody else . . . the corporations said this once, too, and they were scrutinized. And the unions will be, too."

Archibald Cox, Harvard law professor and Senator KENNEDY's labor braintrust, told Congress last year that Government should insure internal union democracy. "The Government has this duty because labor unions enjoy their present power by virtue of Federal statutes," he declared.

This philosophy has wide adherence among liberal Democratic Senators; the views of Mr. McNAMARA are the exception rather than the rule in the Senate. In the House, the sentiment is much weaker. Congressmen from heavy industrial districts are backing the AFL-CIO stand to the letter. Significantly, most students of Congress believe the Senate has been better attuned to public opinion than the House in recent years.

NEED FOR REGULATION

Even liberal lawmakers who see the need for Federal regulation have a dilemma. They fear any intervention in internal union affairs may weaken labor's power somewhat, though the effect of the current bill of rights would be minimal. Consequently, these liberals worry about the prospect of unwittingly bolstering employer power every time they strengthen safeguards for rank-and-file unionists.

One solution they see to the dilemma would be grants of more economic advantages for unions as compensation for weakening their monolithic internal structure. To some extent, this has been done in the Kennedy bill with the addition of union-desired changes in the Taft-Hartley law, such as one giving strikers the right to vote in union recognition elections even though they have been displaced on the job by non-union workers. But these sweeteners were more in the nature of an attempt to gain labor's support for the bill than any conscious attempt to maintain the current labor-management power balance.

To be sure, the movement to insure internal union democracy has not totally obscured the now-familiar legislative struggle between labor and management. The AFL-CIO opposes the Kennedy bill because of provisions in the latter field, such as mild limitations of picketing, as well as because of the bill of rights.

But no startling changes that would drastically alter the current labor-management balance are now very likely—aside, possibly, from some stiffer curbs eventually in the picketing and secondary boycott fields. The widely voiced plea by employers to place unions under the antitrust laws probably will go unheeded.

The significant legislation in years to come probably will fall in a different field. If no bill of rights is passed by this Congress, the issue will be renewed next year. If it does pass, more stringent regulations will be offered some time in the future. "The unions are simply going to have to accept it. After all, they're public utilities," asserts an Eastern liberal Democratic Senator.

It should be remembered, however, that employers retreated from Mr. Baer's philosophy only after three decades of turmoil and violence. It cannot be expected that labor's retreat from the philosophy expressed to the House subcommittee by Mr. Meany will be any more graceful.

A Formula for Reliability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, John D. Paulers, director of public relations at the Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp., has forwarded me two articles from Missiles and Rockets magazine, which I believe should be called to the attention of my colleagues in Congress and the good people of America:

FIRST THINGS FIRST: A FORMULA FOR RELIABILITY—AN EXPERT DECRIES OUR MISPLACED EMPHASIS ON PERFECTING ASSEMBLIES AND URGES PRIORITY FOR MATERIALS
(By John N. Dick, colonel USAF, retired)

WASHINGTON.—A new word has made its way to the top of the vocabulary of modern weapon systems—the word "reliability."

The concept of reliability as applied to military materiel is not new, of course, but with the coming of everyday missile firing and the approach of manned space travel, the word has assumed new importance. Contributing to awareness of the vital importance of component reliability have been:

Serious and substantial failures of critical aircraft, rocket and missile missions, including some repeated failures of missiles considered to be operational.

Recognition that the failure of one small and perhaps inexpensive part can abort a mission costing millions of dollars.

The tremendously high costs of modern systems and equipment, including both astronomical initial cost and continuing high costs of maintenance.

Recognition of the necessity for reliability goes beyond the military, of course. Intense national interest has developed as a result of some spectacular and highly publicized missile failures, and as a natural byproduct of the international race in space travel. As a result of this interest, accompanied by some concern and doubt as to our scientific and production capabilities, Congress has looked into these areas.

As their awareness of the critical nature of component reliability has grown, military materials suppliers have come to recognize reliability as a functional responsibility of organization.

Although reliability problems have been better defined and some praiseworthy efforts made to solve them, on the whole these efforts have been too sophisticated for complete success. The basic flaw is that the primary effort to insure reliability is applied at the wrong end of the complex weapons system program. Too much engineering time and attention have been devoted to perfecting an assembly of complicated components, and not enough to perfecting individual parts and—even more important—the basic materials themselves.

How effective is it to require 100 percent testing of component parts for reliability without fully appreciating and perfecting the specifications of the basic materials from which they are produced?

Misplaced emphasis: Because of the knowledge, ability, and experience of top-flight aeronautical designers, the emphasis in missile design has been on sophisticated performance of very complex systems; not enough attention has been given to development of materials capable of such performance. A byproduct of this misplaced emphasis is that much research and development effort is expended not in the laboratory but on the shop or factory floor—the least efficient and most expensive place for research and development.

Despite the excellent technical advice and assistance which commercial suppliers can provide the military in areas of metals, ceramics, chemicals, and other materials and services, the systems designer and operator often have the impression that they must work only with whatever materials are in being. Except in the laboratories of some progressive suppliers, the concept of vigorous and thorough basic research and development of new materials, designed for specific and exacting performance requirements, is not well established. The resultant "fire-fighting" system of stamping out weaknesses and "crash programs" directed at troublesome areas boost materials costs and subtract from the overall quality which could be obtained with available funds.

If a broad solution to the problem is to be found, policy thinking about defense will have to be reoriented. Basic research will be required to get a better perspective on the systems of the future.

Present and future: Immediate solutions to the practical problems of reliability will demand more attention (and surely more funds) for:

More thorough study of the materials now in use in systems and components.

Determination of their strengths and weaknesses, their full capabilities and their shortcomings.

Determination of the precise qualities required to make the materials more useful and the systems more reliable.

Determination of which materials are most likely to succeed as hardware and fuel in the space age.

An aggressive research program in those most likely to succeed, flexible enough to change direction and emphasis in the future.

Future solutions will require:

Constant review of weapons and defense systems—those in being, those in design and even those that are just a wild gleam in some designer's eye.

Determination of extreme requirements of environment, involving temperature, stress, erosion, corrosion, radiation, shock, friction, acoustical elements, and expectable life of materials.

Continuous review of all known materials which show promise of resolving any of the problems raised by these environmental factors. Major research effort should be applied in this direction.

A wedding of materials research with fabrication research in order to achieve maximum results in both areas.

Prospecting for new areas of materials research, keeping uppermost in mind the environmental problems and the directors of progress indicated by accomplished research.

By putting first things first, by reorienting our thinking to give a high priority to basic materials research, we should eventually make it possible for the systems designer to specify his materials requirements and fabrication methods, and incorporate these tailor-made materials into his gimmick of tomorrow with a much higher degree of reliability than he can achieve today.

COMPONENTS RELIABILITY: WHAT'S NEEDED?

(By Don Perry)

The velocity of change in the exploding fields of missiles and their related technology is so great that each day's effort brings new concepts, new designs, and new developments.

Still there apparently never seems to be a lack of such choice phrases as: "Let's advance the state-of-the-art," or "we have to beat them to it" and you name the astronomical position, etc.

This is all well and good because this Nation advances when there's a sense of urgency in the prodding. But it occurs that there's still lethargy in one important area: components reliability.

On page 14 of this issue of Missiles and Research, a guest writer makes the point that "too much engineering time and attention has been devoted to perfecting an assembly of complicated components, and not enough to perfecting individual parts and—even more important—the basic materials themselves." He says that a by-product of this misplaced emphasis is that much research and development effort is expended not in the laboratory but on the shop or factory floor—the least efficient and most expensive place for research and development.

To this we would like to add another tragic fact: Too many thousands of components going into missile systems are not designed specifically for the particular missile involved. In far too many instances they're off-the-shelf components usually designed for a variety of applications which too often are either modified or put beyond

their performance parameters to fit into a missile system. Missile failures frequently are the costly result.

Let's cite some statistics pertaining to the Nike-Hercules. The system consists of approximately 1,500,000 individual parts, ranging in weight from the smallest fraction of an ounce to hundreds of pounds. It contains one-quarter of a million feet of wire, 2,000 vacuum tubes, and a host of functional components, such as gyroscopes, servomechanisms, and electronic computers. Approximately 80,000 engineering drawings are required to depict the system on paper. The prime contractor utilizes 3,300 subcontractors and suppliers scattered across the country. The system alone uses—directly or indirectly—practically every raw material used by American industry, and provides work to some extent for nearly every type of industry in the country.

With so many subcontractors and suppliers it is virtually impossible for the prime, military, or major sums, to specify in precise detail the performance parameters for each component. What usually happens is that in known critical systems areas, great reliability attention is paid to some components, while other components that might be subjected to the same vibration, shock, and g-forces go practically unnoticed. The choice phrase, "random" failure, is then offered to the public.

There is the argument that missile systems would be priced out of the pocketbook of the American taxpayer if each component were designed for a specific missile application. Components manufacturers themselves are reluctant to fire up assembly lines and produce for a specific application. "Why should we," many say, "when we can make one item and sell it to many customers?"

But as man prepares for space, Government and industry are becoming more cognizant that he is too valuable a commodity to risk on a 98.2 percent reliability factor. More will be required to satisfy an American public which will become irate and aroused when the first life is lost.

Won't it be a little bit too late then to explain why more emphasis was not placed on this field? This fact should be told now: the reliability standards necessary for man in space will entail far more Government action and fund support than has ever been evidenced in the past decade of missile development.

To say that it will be costly is an understatement. But you don't build a high-speed racing car that wins high-performance races by revamping an existing 65-horsepower engine. In the same way, you don't develop highly reliable spacecraft by using the same parts that are in the home television set.

What do we do about all this? First, it will be up to Government to strengthen its present, mostly inadequate reliability requirements to such a par—as the enviable standards being achieved with fuzing and arming. Next, Government must furnish the financial incentive to components manufacturers to start designing parts from the ground up. We must insure that components are given the most thorough testing in the laboratory—not in the shop or at a firing range—before they are wedded into the subsystems picture.

Then and only then will we see a marked improvement in reliability. Maybe then the scientists can quit sending up missiles with just prayers and hopes. We'll have something we know will work. This is as the science of rocketry should be.

Midsummer Love: Democratic Workers Give AFL-CIO an Assist With Welfare Petitions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by John C. Calpin which appeared in the Philadelphia Bulletin on Sunday, August 2, 1959.

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin, Aug. 2, 1959]

MIDSUMMER LOVE—DEMOCRATIC WORKERS GIVE AFL-CIO AN ASSIST WITH WELFARE PETITIONS

(By John C. Calpin)

Over the years, labor has often lamented that the politicians only love them for their money and voting aid at election time. In the other months, they are not consulted about appointments of consequence and have to go with hat in hand to get minor appointments.

The local Democrats are out to show the AFL and CIO that they love them now, too.

Every one of the 3,000 Democratic committeemen has been supplied with petitions, prepared by political arms of the labor movement, urging Congress to expand unemployment compensation and social security benefits.

They are taking the petitions around as they make their pre-election canvass to spur registration, and getting signatures from the citizenry. They get some benefits, too, so it is not entirely an unselfish move.

GREEN SENDS LETTER

Congressman WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., the Democratic city chairman, sent a letter to each committeeman, suggesting that the party workers talk to every working man and woman about the changes.

The petitions ask that Congress extend unemployment compensation benefits for 39 weeks' duration. Also, they want weekly payments raised to 50 percent of the average weekly wage or two-thirds of the State's average wage, which would approximate \$50 a week.

Social security changes deal with Representative AIME FORAND's House Resolution 4700 which asks for 60 days' hospitalization for those on old-age security pensions and also supply surgical and dental services and nursing care for 120 days minus the 60 days' hospitalization.

Green told his committeemen that the solid Democratic delegation from Philadelphia is fighting hard for the legislation, in alliance with the AFL's Labor League for Political Education and the Political Action Committee of the CIO.

AUGUST 15 DEADLINE

Each petition carries places for 136 names and the Democrats are to try to get as many signed up as possible. Petitions are to be turned in to ward leaders who will give them to Green. August 15 is the deadline set.

Similar action on a smaller scale was tried during the primary election period when petitions calling upon Congress for a minimum wage law of \$1.25 were circulated.

About 71,000 signatures were obtained and sent to Congress, both by labor leaders and the political workers. Petitions are still being circulated.

One of the reasons the Democrats have accepted the petitions for distribution could be a selfish one, although not in a derogatory way.

The petitions have been a door opener and selling point enabling Democrats to get into houses to make their political spiels and to get people to register.

Labor union members are more likely to be amenable to those who can say to them "I have here a petition by the AFL-CIO * * * than to someone asking them for money or aid of some other kind.

The Forand bill on social security pensioners had a hearing last week before the House Ways and Means Committee.

Testimony was presented to show that it will cost about \$1 billion a year, to be paid for by a proposed one-quarter of 1 percent contribution by employee and employer on wages up to \$4,800 a year, and by three-eighths of 1 percent by self-employed. The average cost would be \$1 a month.

Costs of hospital care is figured at \$904,900,000, and surgical bills at \$80 million.

Advocates of the bill say that people over 65 spend twice as many days in hospitals as younger persons and that their medical bills are half again as much as their juniors.

MEDICAL COSTS

Cost of medical aid is mounting faster than any other price in the Consumer Index, it was testified. Medical insurance for the aged is so expensive that it is practically nonexistent or hedged with exceptions.

The bill would spell out that those already on social security pensions and their legal dependents would be covered but that those who have been pensioned as permanently disabled would be excluded.

Surgical bills would be paid but not the ordinary medical bills. Semiprivate accommodations and all hospital services ordinarily provided would be paid for, up to 60 days, in any year.

Unusual Reaction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the President's unusual reaction to normal questions at a recent press conference indicates either lack of understanding of the facts behind the questions or, possibly, a feeling that maybe there is something, after all, to the repeated complaints against executive secrecy.

The President's reaction—telling a reporter to sit down in a parade ground drill sergeant's manner—came after the President was asked to comment on House action limiting mutual security funds if the Congress is refused information about the mutual security program. The absurdity of the administration's anti-information position is set forth clearly in the following editorial which appeared in the Hartford (Conn.) Courant of August 3, 1959.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant, Aug. 3, 1959]

DON'T YOU SIT DOWN, MR. MOLLENHOFF

An unusual incident took place at the last Presidential press conference. President Eisenhower, who has been unusually generous and open with the press, had started to answer a question concerning a House amendment to the foreign-aid bill. The provision would cut off aid funds if the administration persisted in withholding from Congress, and the General Accounting Office, evaluation reports and other documents that showed how the program was doing. "You start your question with an implied fact that is not a fact," said the President, adding with some heat that there was no such thing as administration secrecy policies. When the questioning reporter, Clark R. Mollenhoff of the Des Moines Register and Tribune, rose to say something the President inserted in his remarks a brusque "Please sit down," and went right on to say that his administration withheld information only when the national security and national interest were involved.

The background of this exchange, as of the House's amendment, was the fact that the Comptroller General and congressional committees, having heard that there was waste and inefficiency in the foreign-aid program for Laos, and elsewhere, had been told by the International Cooperation Administration (which runs the program) that it was none of their business.

The President's position on this issue reflects an attitude he has shown before, one that is difficult to interpret as anything but an incomplete understanding of the necessity, in free representative government, for all kinds of information so that the whole tripartite system can function. One reason is that the President has had a number of advisers who themselves do not understand the need for this information, and the principle called freedom of information or the public's right to know.

The President rested his position chiefly on an Attorney General's opinion of 5 years ago defending what is known as executive privilege. It is indeed widely accepted, sometimes even by newspaper people who should know better, that Presidents from George Washington down have always refused information to Congress or the people when they felt like it, because this is the constitutional way. Actually there is no such doctrine in the Constitution, and it is one that has never been tested in court. But Supreme Court decisions approaching this issue indicate that such privilege, if it exists, is limited.

Naturally, there must be protection of the executive department from congressional fishing expeditions into matters that are none of Congress' business. But that is hardly at issue in this foreign-aid provision. What possible infringement of executive authority is there in finding facts about the aid program? What possible justification is there for withholding from the appropriating body information on how the appropriations are used?

Essence of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the foreign visitor to America's shores is cer-

tain to be greatly impressed by the vast material abundance that is encountered on every hand. Wherever one goes in this great country, a picture of health and prosperity emerges. Yet the visitor would be seriously misled if he were to conclude that the essence of America lay in its material wealth. Indeed, many of our most priceless assets lie in the less-tangible areas of cherished values and ideals, located in the hearts and minds of our people.

In its editorial of August 9 entitled "Essence of America," the New York Times appropriately reminds us of the central place that these values occupy in the life of the Nation. As this editorial articulately conveys certain of these basic values, I ask that it be included with my remarks.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 9, 1959]

ESSENCE OF AMERICA

What is the essence of our society, of our civilization? The question arises naturally as we contemplate Premier Khrushchev's scheduled visit here next month and the hopes that have been expressed that this visit might correct the Premier's obviously great misconceptions about our Nation.

Those who express such hopes usually imply that they think the essence of America is its material wealth and the widespread distribution of that wealth among our people. Put most crudely, the argument seems to be that if only Khrushchev can see with his own eyes the throng of automobiles on every factory parking lot, the abundance of goods in our supermarkets and the like, he will immediately realize the error of his ways and radically alter the picture of our Nation in his mind. Hopes based on this kind of reasoning are, we suspect, an illusion and an insult to Premier Khrushchev's intelligence. There is very reason to suppose that he knows even better than the average American the number of automobiles, television sets and perhaps even dishwashers produced here annually. If he prefers to talk about our unemployed and our slums, that is because he is first and foremost a skilled propagandist mindful of his propaganda obligations every time he opens his mouth.

But the essence of America is not its wealth. We were far poorer than we are today in the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries, yet increasing millions flocked here from foreign soil. There was not an automobile or a television set or a refrigerator in our entire land when Emma Lazarus, 76 years ago, captured some of the essence of our Nation in her immortal lines for the Statue of Liberty:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free.

The wretched refuse of your teeming shore."

America is a nation of men and women who yearn "to breathe free." If he could only understand this, Premier Khrushchev would know more about the essence of America than all the physical evidence of our wealth could ever tell him. From pioneer days the American dream has always been of a nation whose members decide their own fates and who are subject to no arbitrary power that stands higher than the law or public opinion. It is no accident that our Constitution provides for a government of checks and balances, that our corporations are hemmed in by antitrust laws, and that a struggle now rages about what limitations should be placed on the leaders of our powerful labor unions.

Frankly, we don't expect Premier Khrushchev to grasp this essence of America while he is here. His mind is too cluttered

up by the Marxist fairy tales about how the capitalist state is the dictatorship of the rich to understand the complex reality that will unfold before his eyes while he is here. But at least let's try our best to give him some inkling of what democracy at work is really like. After all, it's our freedom and democracy that make our way of life better than his, not our automobiles and our television sets.

The President Demands All-or-Nothing Labor Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include the following editorial from the Providence (R.I.) Sunday Journal; dated August 9, 1959:

[From the Providence (R.I.) Sunday Journal, Aug. 9, 1959]

THE PRESIDENT DEMANDS ALL-OR-NOTHING LABOR REFORM

With his vigorous appeal for a strong labor reform bill, President Eisenhower has placed the prestige of his office and of his personality squarely on the side of drastic reform.

He brushed aside any mild reform as useless. He dismissed the various moderate reform proposals as ineffective. Only a far-reaching measure, he insisted, will satisfy the overwhelming national demand for reform, curb the crooks and racketeers, stop the racketeering, corruption and abuses of power, and eliminate what he described as a national disgrace.

Four elements of reform were cited by the President as indispensable. A proper measure, he declared, must outlaw blackmail picketing, ban the secondary boycott, eliminate the "no man's land" between Federal and State jurisdictions, and guarantee free elections within the unions with full disclosure of union finances. "Unless it does these things," the President declared, "it is not a reform bill at all."

There is room to differ with this sweeping pronouncement. Even granting that all the reforms the President has advocated are desirable, the realities of the situation suggest that in demanding so much on an all-or-nothing basis, the President is running the risk that this year, as last, no reform bill at all will be adopted.

The bans he proposes on picketing and on secondary boycotts are extremely complicated and highly controversial. They are not nearly as simple and as black and white as the President made them appear with his examples; and they are bitterly opposed even by the honest and responsible leaders on the labor side. The "no man's land" reform, though eminently desirable, is a side issue with no bearing on the major aim of eliminating racketeering and corruption from the labor movement.

Only with his fourth point—the guarantee of free elections within the unions with full disclosure of union finances—does the President strike to the heart of the matter.

This is where the corruption starts. This is where the racketeers muscle in. This is the source of the trouble from which most of the other troubles arise. It is the loose election practices within the unions which permit the hoodlums to move in and take over. It is loose financial practices which permit the hoodlums, once in control, to extend their corruptive influence.

It is important to bear in mind that the need for this vital reform within the unions is acknowledged on all sides. It is not a matter in serious controversy. Conservatives like Senator GOLDWATER are for it. Responsible labor leaders like Mr. Meany and Mr. Reuther are for it. Senator McCLELLAN and Senator KENNEDY and all of the moderates are for it to a man. If Congress were forced to act for or against this single reform alone, it would be approved in a breeze.

The trouble is that the various bills now under consideration in Congress go various distances beyond this basic reform—and the further they go, the more controversial they become. Of the three bills now before the House, the one the President singled out as a good start toward a real labor reform bill happens to be the one that goes furthest into the area of bitter controversy.

The reactions to the President's appeal were about as expected. The National Association of Manufacturers was thoroughly pleased. Walter Reuther was thoroughly displeased. (The President, he said, had been taken in by labor's foes and given a few catch phrases to support legislation he didn't understand.) Senator KENNEDY took quick exception to the President's remark that the Kennedy bill (which passed the Senate 90 to 1) and similar bills in the House were wholly ineffective.

The President has taken a gamble by throwing all the force of his influence on the conservative side of the debate. We must now wait to see whether this is sufficient to swing the tide and produce a sweeping reform, or whether the action merely adds fuel to the controversy and results in no reform bill at all.

The United States and the Challenge of the Underdeveloped Areas of the World—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the Congress and of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, I realize that much of the future lies in the underdeveloped areas of the world. The Honorable Francis O. Wilcox, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, made an excellent speech on this subject in Detroit, Mich., on May 1, 1959.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including part II of this speech which contains good material for the Congress and the people of the United States:

ANSWERS TO THE CHALLENGE: ASSISTANCE THROUGH INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

We would all agree, of course, that the United Nations' primary responsibility is the maintenance of international peace and security. Active support of the United Nations as an instrument through which we strive to build a more effective system of law and order among nations is a cornerstone of our foreign policy. It is only natural that we should think of the United Nations first of all as a political instrument of peace. If it should be unable to prevent the holocaust of nuclear war, all the efforts peace-loving countries are making in economic development would be completely futile.

However, the efforts of the United Nations and its specialized agencies in the economic

and social fields are laying the foundations for a more lasting peace in the political field. These efforts are carried on with an absence of fanfare. They seldom make the headlines. But, in their persistent efforts to raise the standards of living of peoples throughout the world, they have achieved the greatest degree of international economic and social cooperation the world has ever known.

UNITED NATIONS EXPANDED PROGRAM OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

That is a broad statement. Let me illustrate it by reference to the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance, since technical skills are the bedrock of economic development. This program is carried out by the United Nations, its eight specialized agencies, and the new International Atomic Energy Agency.

Since its initiation in 1950, the expanded program has grown steadily to its present great geographical scope. Ninety-six countries and territories are being assisted in some form this year. To these countries will be sent 2,500 expert technicians, and from them will come 2,200 fellowship students for study abroad. The fields of expert assistance and of study by fellows cover virtually every conceivable skill and technique that can contribute to the economic development of these areas. The striking nature of the international cooperation involved is demonstrated by the fact that the experts in 1958 came from 60 different countries, and that most countries are both givers and recipients of assistance. India, for example, which had the largest country program, also sent out 82 of its nationals to work in areas where their particular aptitudes and skills are important.

Again, the broad nature of the cooperation involved is reflected in the fact that the voluntary contributions of some 80 countries support the expanded program of technical assistance. As the initiator of that program, and consistent with our overall policy, we have taken the leading part in its support. However, its truly multilateral nature may be demonstrated by pointing out that a number of states contribute substantially more per capita than does the United States. These include Denmark, Canada, Norway, Sweden, and the Netherlands. This is a point which is either unknown or else deliberately forgotten by those who complain that we contribute too much to the United Nations.

A NEW VENTURE: UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL FUND

From the wide experience gained in the expanded program, and the knowledge that countries' needs for technical assistance greatly exceeded the resources of that program, has come a new United Nations body, the special fund, which came into existence last January. It is headed by a distinguished American, Mr. Paul Hoffman. The special fund will concentrate on larger projects of technical assistance than the expanded program has been able to do. It will also make possible a larger volume of supplies and equipment for each project—although it is not a capital development fund.

For example, it can finance a technical survey needed for the development of a Far Eastern harbor. The engineering study thus financed could lead to an investment of capital from some other source to develop the harbor's facilities. Or it may finance a general survey to determine a developing country's power needs and potentialities. Or it may undertake to establish a training institute for industrial instructors. There, teachers could be trained who would, in turn, pass of their knowledge and skills in order that industry may be developed at a quicker pace.

Since it was created in part to facilitate the conditions for new capital investments, the special fund is expected to work closely with another United Nations specialized agency, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. It will also work

closely with the other specialized agencies and with other sources, public and private, of potential investment capital. The United States was the initiator of the new special fund, and we look forward confidently to its making a significant contribution to the development of the less advanced economies.

INTERNATIONAL BANK AND MONETARY FUND

If technical skills are the bedrock of economic development, they obviously must be accompanied by a sufficient volume of capital to produce tangible economic progress. The United States has joined with other countries in establishing two multilateral institutions whose tremendous significance for the economic development and monetary stability of countries has been—outside the Sino-Soviet bloc—universally acclaimed. I refer to the International Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

Even the traditional critics of foreign aid and of the United Nations appear to recognize the important contribution made by these agencies. The International Bank has been an increasingly important source of capital, a mobilizer of private funds, and a source of technical aid. Since 1946, the Bank has made 215 loans to 49 countries and territories. These loans total over \$4 billion. While the early loans of the Bank were for postwar reconstruction in Europe, its emphasis has since been on the less developed areas. Asia is the region with the largest amount of Bank loans: \$1,195 million. Latin America has received \$878 million; and Africa's increasing importance is reflected in total loans of \$518 million.

The total authorized capital of the International Bank amounts to \$10 billion—an immense amount but not so immense either when considered in conjunction with the immense capital needs of the underdeveloped areas. These needs are so great that the Bank has recommended an increase in its authorized capital to \$21 billion. Congress has approved this recommendation and the United States is now prepared to join with other members to make this increase possible. Our share of the new total authorization would be slightly over \$6 billion.

But even this is not enough. In a good many cases the Bank has had to turn down applications for loans, not because the development projects involved were without merit, but because repayment of the loans in hard currency would have placed undue strain on the borrowing countries. It follows that if a new institution, affiliated with the Bank, could make loans repayable in softer currencies, projects such as these might well become feasible. Consequently, the United States is actively studying ways in which an International Development Association might operate, and has had informal conversations with other Governments on this subject. It is essential to the success of such an institution that it receive broad financial support from the industrialized countries which are members of the International Bank. We hope that such support will be forthcoming.

Similarly, the United States is taking an imaginative approach to the needs of the International Monetary Fund for additional resources. The Fund has been an effective instrument for promoting international monetary cooperation and sound foreign exchange practices. It has provided timely assistance to member countries faced with temporary balance of payments difficulties including many of the less developed countries like India, Indonesia, Turkey, and Burma. Very recently Congress acted favorably on President Eisenhower's request for an increase in the U.S. quota in the Monetary Fund from \$2,750 million to \$4,125 million.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

You can see that the United States has taken the initiative with great vigor to increase the ability of multilateral agencies to meet the needs of the underdeveloped areas.

This is revealed also in connection with regional development programs and lending agencies. We have just finished negotiating with the countries of Latin America, the charter of an inter-American banking institution. Its purpose will be to provide capital and technical assistance to promote the economic growth of Latin American countries.

Last August, President Eisenhower announced to the United Nations General Assembly that we would be prepared to support a development institution for the Arab States. Among the conditions for our support was that the Arab States agree on the usefulness of such a regional institution and that they be prepared to support it with their own resources. Only time will tell the extent to which the Arab States take advantage of this opportunity.

What I have been discussing with you of our actions to promote the economic growth of the underdeveloped areas through the United Nations and other international organizations is by no means an exhaustive account.

It does not include, for example, the important work which the U.N. specialized agencies are doing in virtually every field of human endeavor—agriculture, health, labor, education, and atomic energy to mention only a few. I hope, however, that I have reminded you of the extent of the multilateral programs through which we pursue our objectives. The records of each United Nations General Assembly, of its Economic and Social Council, and of the governing bodies of the various specialized agencies, all underline the importance which members of the United Nations attribute to the crucial problem of raising the standards of living in the poorer areas of the world.

The actions the United States has taken to initiate the special fund, to further regional development plans and agencies, to increase the capacities of the International Bank and the Monetary Fund, signalize an increased emphasis on the values of the international approach to the problems of economic development.

BILATERAL VERSUS MULTILATERAL AID: WHICH IS BETTER?

I am frequently asked the question, "Why doesn't the United States work more through the United Nations? Why don't we provide more of our foreign aid on a multilateral basis?" I have a particular responsibility in the Department of State for our participation in international organizations. So I suppose there is a natural tendency to expect the reply that we should use multilateral channels exclusively. I have tried to make clear my firm convictions about the usefulness of multilateral instruments of economic development—rather, the necessity of using them to the fullest possible extent. But I would not go so far as to advocate their exclusive use.

Our bilateral programs have the advantage of being very closely related one to another; the programs of economic aid in the form of defense support, for example, are directly related to our programs of military assistance in such countries as Korea and the Republic of China. Also bilateral programs can be gotten underway with more speed where time is of the essence. Moreover, our especially close ties with some countries, such as the Philippines, would seem to constitute sufficient justification for bilateral arrangements.

On the other side of the fence, the use of multilateral aid channels has its own advantages for the United States. Multilateral aid, by definition, means that other countries bear part of the cost and frequently more than half of it. There would seem to be no real reason why the heavy burden of foreign aid should be placed exclusively on the shoulders of the American taxpayer. Furthermore, the United States has no monopoly of skills, nor have we an unlimited

supply of trained men and women ready to go overseas to share their knowledge.

The utilization of the great pool of manpower and training resources offered by the United Nations member countries helps speed the pace of peaceful economic development, our basic objective.

An additional advantage is the readiness of countries to benefit from the advice of international organizations in domestically sensitive fields such as fiscal and monetary policy where advice from a foreign government might be misinterpreted. In these fields, governments often find it easier to accept the counsel of an impartial and highly competent international organization than the advice of other governments, no matter how good or well intentioned the latter may be.

I think this whole question of bilateral and multilateral instruments was well summarized by the Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld, when he spoke on April 7 to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. "I would hope," he said, "that all false dilemmas of multilateral or bilateral solutions, solutions inside or outside the United Nations, can be avoided. Call it what you may, regional solutions in a multilateral framework, multilateral approaches based on regional organs, or something else—these are but different ways of indicating elements which will be mixed in every constructive international approach to today's problems."

In one word, there need be no conflict between bilateral and multilateral aid. Each has proven its value in helping raise the living standards of the underdeveloped areas. Together, they constitute a powerful force in enabling those areas to achieve a momentum of economic progress which will make it possible for them to go forward in self-reliant growth.

WHAT MORE NEEDS TO BE DONE?

There are some critics of our aid programs who contend that we are not doing enough. They insist, in view of the serious threat that confronts the free world, that we should redouble our efforts.

Whatever one's view on this point may be, certainly no one should accuse the United States of pinching pennies. In fact, many of us may not fully appreciate the extent of our foreign aid during the post-war period. Only a few weeks ago I looked up the latest figures. If we were to add to the Marshall plan and the mutual security program the contributions we have made through the Export-Import Bank, the World Bank, the Monetary Fund, and various other types of assistance, our total foreign aid would run to something like \$72 billion since 1945. This figure serves as clear proof of our deep interest in helping to build a stable and a peaceful world.

It is our clear answer to those who feel that we have the option of assisting or not assisting in the economic development of the underdeveloped areas. We do have that option, but it is about as meaningful as the option between life and death.

Economic progress in the underdeveloped areas will not, I fear, assure the maintenance of freedom and democracy in those areas. But I am absolutely convinced that the absence of economic progress—and by that I mean a sufficient rate of economic growth to meet the aspirations of their peoples—will mortally endanger the survival of their freedom and democracy. Let us then choose, as we must, to assist them in full and generous measure along the road of economic progress.

In making this choice it is pertinent to ask whether there are not ways in which we can make our aid more effective. We may also ask whether there are things the underdeveloped areas can do to help speed up their economic progress. I think there is room for improvement on both sides.

Speaking about ourselves, may I say just a word about the "Ugly American." In my judgment, this book, by exaggeration and by focusing attention on isolated examples, has belittled the character and capacity of our representatives abroad.

Now, obviously, most Americans who serve abroad are something less than perfect. No human beings are perfect. Some may not represent this country with the ability and the distinction which you and I would like. Some do not speak foreign languages with any degree of fluency. Some may not adjust very well to the customs and traditions of the people where they are stationed.

The point I wish to make, however, is this: The "Ugly American" has done a gross injustice to thousands of able Americans who have done an outstanding job in foreign lands. Many of them are making real sacrifices for their country. Often they are called upon to work and live in hardship posts where health hazards are constant and where the school facilities for their children are quite inadequate. And in the vast majority of cases they have learned to fit well into a new and strange environment.

Again, this does not mean that we are perfect. Many of our citizens going abroad do, indeed, lack the language skills which could bring them into a closer understanding of other peoples' ways of life and thinking. This is true of tourists as well as some of our official representatives. It is a national deficiency, not that of a segment of our population. We in the Government are working hard and effectively to solve our part of this language problem. But the American people, and particularly our schools and universities, will ultimately have to be responsible for its solution.

Moreover, many of us in this country tend to think that our own customs and mores should be embraced by people in other lands. We find it difficult to understand why in India the cow is treated as a sacred animal even though it is very often a great economic burden. Now, the Indians are aware of this problem and are handling it in their own way. We must be tolerant of other peoples' ways of life, of which this is just one example.

On the side of the underdeveloped areas, much more remains to be done in creating the conditions necessary to encourage a freer flow of private capital. Public agencies—bilateral or multilateral—cannot do the job of providing sufficient external capital by themselves. The underdeveloped areas have a heavy responsibility to encourage the inflow of private investment under terms equitable to them and the investor. I mention this one example because it is crucial to economic growth in the underdeveloped areas.

Finally, let us recall the awful burden of world armament expenditures and the great opportunities for development activities if this burden could be lifted from our shoulders. In the next 10 years, the nations of the world may well spend in excess of \$1,000 billion on armaments. What could we not accomplish if some of these expenditures could be used for more constructive purposes? On our part, we have told the world that when sufficient progress has been made toward internationally supervised disarmament, the U.S. Government stands ready to ask its people to join with others in devoting a portion of the savings from such disarmament to a multilateral development fund. Somehow, the nations of the world must find a way to divert their wealth from arms to economic and social development—their own and that of their less developed neighbors.

The road ahead is not an easy or short one—least of all for the peoples and governments of the underdeveloped areas—but as their courage, determination and willingness to sacrifice are great, so must be our faith in their ultimate triumph. We have no choice but to dedicate ourselves—as they dedicate themselves—to the maintenance of free and

democratic institutions under conditions of economic progress.

As Tom Paine said almost two centuries ago: "Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must, like men, undergo the fatigue of supporting it."

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever

possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee)." His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix, and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]
Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbott, Watkins M., Va.
Abernethy, Thomas G., 6278 29th St.
Miss.
Adair, E. Ross, Ind., 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., N. J.
Albert, Carl, Okla., 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., N. C.
Alford, Dale, Ark.
Alger, Bruce, Tex.
Allen, Leo E., Ill., University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, Minn., 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., Mont., 911 Beverly Dr.,
Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., Ala., 3108 Cathedral
Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., N. Y.
Arends, Leslie C., Ill., 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., Ohio.
Ashmore, Robert T., S. C.
Aspinall, Wayne N., Colo., Arlington Towers,
Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., N. J., 113 S. Lee St.,
Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., Kans.
Ayres, William H., Ohio.
Baker, Howard H., Tenn.
Baldwin, John F., Jr., Calif.
Barden, Graham A., N. C., 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., Nev.
Barr, Joseph W., Ind., Tulip Lane and
Glen Mill Rd.,
Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., Pa.
Barry, Robert R., N. Y., 3019 Norman-
stone Drive
Bass, Perkins, N. H.
Bass, Ross, Tenn.
Bates, William H., Mass.
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., Ohio.
Becker, Frank J., N. Y.
Beckworth, Lindley, Tex.
Belcher, Page, Okla.
Bennett, Charles E., Fla., 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., Mich., 3718 Cardiff Rd.,
Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., Mich.
Berry, E. Y., S. Dak., 118 Schotts
Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., Ohio.
Blatnik, John A., Minn.
Blitch, Iris Faircloth,
(Mrs.), Ga.
Boggs, Hale, La.
Boland, Edward P., Mass.
Bolling, Richard, Mo., 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Ohio.
Bonner, Herbert C., N. C., Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., N. Y.
Bow, Frank T., Ohio, 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, Conn.
Boykin, Frank W., Ala., The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., Ill.
Brademas, John, Ind.
Bray, William G., Ind.
Breeding, J. Floyd, Kans.
Brewster, Daniel B., Md.
Brook, Lawrence, Nebr.
Brooks, Jack, Tex.
Brooks, Overton, La., 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S.,
Mich.
Brown, Charles H., Mo., 3723 N. Oakland
St., Arlington, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., Ohio, Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, Ga., Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., Va.
Buckley, Charles A., N. Y.
Budge, Hamer H., Idaho.
Burdick, Quentin, N. Dak.
Burke, Frank W., Ky.
Burke, James A., Mass.
Burleson, Omar, Tex., 2737 Devonshire
Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., Pa.
Byrne, James A., Pa.
Byrnes, John W., Wis., 1215 25th St. So.,
Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., N. J.

Canfield, Gordon, N. J.
Cannon, Clarence, Mo.
Carnahan, A. S. J., Mo.
Carter, Steven V., Iowa.
Casey, Bob, Tex.
Cederberg, Elford A., Mich.
Celler, Emanuel, N. Y., The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E.,
Mich.
Chelf, Frank, Ky.
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, Colo.
Chiperfield, Robert B., Ill., 1713 House Office
Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt, 2122 Mass. Ave.
(Mrs.), Ill.
Clark, Frank M., Pa., 3735 Gunston Rd.,
Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, Iowa.
Coffin, Frank M., Maine.
Cohelan, Jeffery, Calif., 2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., Ill.
Colmer, William M., Miss.
Conte, Silvio O., Mass.
Cook, Robert E., Ohio.
Cooley, Harold D., N. C., 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., Pa.
Cramer, William C., Fla., 6714 Joallen Dr.,
Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, Nebr., 4920 Yorktown
Bldg., Arlington
Va.
Curtin, Willard S., Pa.
Curtis, Laurence, Mass., 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., Mo.
Daddario, Emilio Q., Conn.
Dague, Paul B., Pa.
Daniels, Dominick V., N. J.
Davis, Clifford, Tenn., 4611 Butter-
worth Pl.
Davis, James C., Ga.
Dawson, William L., Ill.
Delaney, James J., N. Y.
Dent, John H., Pa.
Denton, Winfield K., Ind.
Derounian, Steven B., N. Y.
Derwinski, Edward J., Ill.
Devine, Samuel L., Ohio.
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., Mich.
Dingell, John D., Mich.
Dixon, Henry Aldous, Utah, 1817 N. Quinn St.,
Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, N. Y.
Donohue, Harold D., Mass.
Dooley, Edwin B., N. Y.
Dorn, Francis E., N. Y.
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, S. C.
Dowdy, John, Tex.
Downing, Thomas N., Va.
Doyle, Clyde, Calif., 3877 30th St. N.,
Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., N. Y.
Durham, Carl T., N. C., The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.),
N. J.
Edmondson, Ed, Okla.
Elliott, Carl, Ala.
Everett, Robert A., Tenn.
Evins, Joe L., Tenn., 5044 Klinge St.
Fallon, George H., Md.
Farbstein, Leonard, N. Y.
Fascell, Dante B., Fla.
Feighan, Michael A., Ohio.
Fenton, Ivor D., Pa., 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., N. Y.
Fisher, O. C., Tex., Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., Pa., The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., Wis.
Flynt, John J., Jr., Ga.
Fogarty, John E., R. I., 1133 House Office
Building
Foley, John R., Md.
Forand, Alme J., R. I., 4108 Dresden St.,
Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., Mich., 514 Crown View
Dr., Alexandria,
Va.
Forrester, E. L., Ga.
Fountain, L. H., N. C., The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., Fairfax Hotel
Tenn.
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., 3014 N St.
N. J.
Friedel, Samuel N., Md.
Fulton, James G., Pa.
Gallagher, Cornelius E.,
N. J.
Garmatz, Edward A., Md.

Gary, J. Vaughan, Va.
Gathings, E. C., Ark., 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., Pa.
George, Newell A., Kans.
Gialmo, Robert N., Conn.
Glenn, Milton W., N. J., Arlington Towers,
Arlington, Va.
Goodell, Charles E., N. Y.
Granahan, Kathryn E.
(Mrs.), Pa.
Grant, George M., Ala., 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., Ill.
Green, Edith (Mrs.), Oreg.
Green, William J., Jr., Pa.
Griffin, Robert P., Mich.
Griffiths, Martha W.
(Mrs.), Mich.
Gross, H. R., Iowa.
Gubser, Charles S., Calif.
Hagen, Harlan, Calif.
Haley, James A., Fla.
Hall, David M., N. C.
Halleck, Charles A., Ind., 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, N. Y.
Hardy, Porter, Jr., Va.
Hargis, Denver D., Kans.
Harmon, Randall S., Ind.
Harris, Oren, Ark., 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr F., Va.
Hays, Wayne L., Ohio, 1323 Barger Drive,
Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., N. Y.
Hébert, F. Edward, La., 26 Cockrell St.,
Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, W. Va.
Hemphill, Robert W., S. C.
Henderson, John E., Ohio.
Herlong, A. S., Jr., Fla.
Hess, William E., Ohio.
Hiestand, Edgar W., Calif.
Hoeven, Charles B., Iowa, 100 Maryland
Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., Mich., 100 Maryland
Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., Ill.
Hogan, Earl, Ind., 5211 Flanders
Ave., Garrett Pk.,
Kensington, Md.
Hollifield, Chet, Calif.
Holland, Elmer J., Pa.
Holt, Joe, Calif.
Holtzman, Lester, N. Y.
Horan, Walt, Wash.
Hosmer, Craig, Calif.
Huddleston, George, Jr.,
Ala.
Hull, W. R., Jr., Mo.
Ikard, Frank, Tex.
Irwin, Donald J., Conn., The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., Calif.
Jarman, John, Okla.
Jennings, W. Pat, Va.
Jensen, Ben F., Iowa, 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., Mich.
Johnson, Byron L., Colo.
Johnson, Harold T., Calif.
Johnson, Lester R., Wis.
Johnson, Thomas F., Md.
Jonas, Charles Raper, N. C.
Jones, Paul C., Mo., 1111 Army Navy
Dr., Arlington,
Va.
Jones, Robert E., Ala.
Judd, Walter H., Minn., 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., Mo.
Karth, Joseph E., Minn.
Kasem, George A., Calif.
Kastenmeier, Robert W.,
Wis.
Kearns, Carroll D., Pa., Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.),
W. Va.
Keith, Hastings, Mass.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), N. Y.
Keogh, Eugene J., N. Y., The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., N. Y.
Kilday, Paul J., Tex., 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., Tex., 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., Calif.
King, David S., Utah.
Kirwan, Michael J., Ohio.
Kitchin, A. Paul, N. C.
Kluczynski, John C., Ill.
Knox, Victor A., Mich.
Kowalski, Frank, Conn.
Lafore, John A., Jr., Pa.
Laird, Melvin R., Wis.
Landrum, Phil M., Ga.

Appendix

Majority Leader Johnson's Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, not many daily sessions of the 86th Congress have gone by in the past several months without some reference being made as to the record of the Democratic Congress or the batting average of administration proposals. I have always felt and continue to feel that the record of the 86th Congress is a good record. There have been many accomplishments and there will be more in the next several weeks as this session of the 86th Congress draws to a close.

This record is the result of a cooperative effort put forth by Senate and House to enact sound and worthy legislation which will meet the needs of our country and our international obligations. The one person who has been the most responsible for this record is our majority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

The August 9 issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch carries an interview with Majority Leader JOHNSON as written by Edward Woods. This article gives a fine insight into the leadership qualities of the majority leader and discusses in some detail the accomplishments of this Congress and what he expects to accomplish before we adjourn.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

JOHNSON DEPENDING ON CONGRESS ACTION IN FIVE AREAS TO ADD TO LUSTER OF DEMOCRATIC RECORD—SENATE LEADER'S HOME-STRETCH PROGRAM AIMED AT DEMOLISHING REPUBLICAN ATTEMPT TO FASTEN "WON'T DO" LABEL ON MAJORITY PARTY

(By Edward F. Woods)

WASHINGTON, August 8.—LYNDON B. JOHNSON is depending on favorable congressional action in five major areas in the closing weeks of the first session of the 86th Congress to add luster to what he considers an already brilliant legislative record chalked up by the topheavy Democratic majorities in both houses.

Bills on which the Senate majority leader is pinning his hopes for demolishing charges by Republicans and some Democrats that his is a "won't do" majority relate to labor reform, housing, civil rights, shoring up the inflation-battered highway program, and raising the minimum wage to \$1.25 an hour with coverage extended to millions of additional workers.

There are many more projects JOHNSON would like to see dealt with before Congress,

now looking toward adjournment around Labor Day, packs up for a recess until next January.

Hence, the legislative proposals getting JOHNSON's attention at the moment do not represent his total objective. Rather, he has selected them because he believes they are attainable goals, even with time running out.

For example, a bill to provide Federal funds for school construction and to improve teachers' salaries is one which has his support. But it is so snarled up by divergent opinions as to its scope and the degree of Federal control it might impose on public education that JOHNSON apparently sees little chance of passage at this session. He would prefer to devote his energy and skill to legislation which has a chance of passage.

All of the issues involved in the JOHNSON homestretch program are seedbeds of political controversy, particularly so since 1960 is a presidential election year. Also, JOHNSON is always faced with the threat of Presidential veto, which Mr. Eisenhower has exercised four times this year on major bills favored by the Democratic majority.

Curiously, while JOHNSON is being berated by Republicans with charges that he pushes legislation which he knows Mr. Eisenhower will not sign, thus giving the Democrats a political issue, some members of the Texan's own party complain that he is too moderate in his approach to national problems and leans backward to accommodate himself to the veto threat by fashioning legislation with attractive labels but insufficient substance.

Discussing the record of the first session of Congress thus far, JOHNSON, with an almost aggressive display of pride, told a Post-Dispatch reporter:

"This has been one of the most constructive and productive years in the history of Congress."

Leafing through a long typewritten list of Senate actions, JOHNSON said, "During this 1st session of the 86th Congress we have passed a total of 589 measures, including 192 private bills, and confirmed 37,137 administration nominations."

"Why, we passed a statehood bill for Hawaii that they've been talking about around here for 40 years. We've initiated the entire program on space."

In assessing the Senate actions, an observer would find it difficult to separate entirely those measures advanced by the Eisenhower administration and those initiated by the Democratic leadership.

But it appears that in those areas where there was dual action on the part of the administration and the Democratic-controlled Congress, the Senate, under JOHNSON's guidance, has increased the scope of the programs even though they might later be whittled down somewhat in the House. A coalition of southern Democrats and conservative northern Republicans functions more effectively in the House than in the Senate.

A bill providing Federal loans and grants to help depressed areas rehabilitate themselves is a case in point. The administration requested \$53 million this year for this purpose. The Senate passed the bill after increasing the proposed fund to \$385 million. The House approved it but reduced the amount to \$283 million.

The Senator was reminded that Mr. Eisenhower had been criticizing Congress for what is called backdoor spending, a term applied

to passage of a bill carrying no specific appropriation but authorizing the Treasury to pay the bills out of debt revenue when the funds are needed. It was pointed out that some critics say JOHNSON had been accused of being too much concerned with trying to pass "veto-proof" legislation.

JOHNSON was scornful and visibly irritated. "We've never done any 'backdoor' financing the President didn't approve or request," he said. "As for veto-proofing legislation, we've had vetoes—four of them—and we don't have the votes to override one of them. We are going to do what we think is right, just as we've been doing all along. Who wants to be a billy goat and butt his head against a stone wall?"

Referring to critics in his own party, JOHNSON observed:

"All this talk about vetoproofing comes from people who would like to have an issue. I want progressive legislation even if it can't satisfy everybody."

What did the Senator consider the most important accomplishments of the Senate this year?

"Everything we've done this year is important," he replied. "A depressed areas bill is important in some areas. Extension of the \$63 million-a-year airport construction program is important in others. A labor reform bill is important to everybody. Creating an independent agency to find new uses for coal is certainly important to people in Pennsylvania and other coal-producing States."

JOHNSON ticked off other bills passed by the Senate, some of which are still awaiting House action: Raising the school milk fund to \$78 million, extension of corporate tax rates and certain excise taxes, home rule for the District of Columbia ("people ought to have a right to vote on who runs their government"), plugging a tax loophole to bring the Treasury about \$180 million more revenue from insurance companies, raising the public debt limit, supporting programs to accelerate atomic energy development for peacetime use, liberalizing the Senate cloture rule, and taking many steps to implement foreign relations through the World Bank and Monetary Fund, Inter-American Bank and a \$50 million health for peace program.

"We've carried out this program while at the same time going under the President's budget request this year by hundreds of millions of dollars," JOHNSON said. "Since 1955 we've cut under the President's budget requests in the first session by a total of about \$10 billion."

What some Members of the Congress think is the most potentially explosive issue, labor reform, is out of JOHNSON's hands. JOHNSON was instrumental in getting a corrective bill through the Senate, 88 to 1.

The House goes into battle next week with Republicans and northern Democrats lined up with President Eisenhower behind a bill which organized labor regards as too harsh. The union lobbyists are pressuring liberal and middle-of-the-road Representatives to support a bill which Mr. Eisenhower regards as even less effective than the Senate bill sponsored by Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts.

Hence, the result of the House fight, no matter which way it goes, is likely to have far-reaching political consequences in next year's elections.

Civil rights legislation, now also being considered in the House, is certain to tax the majority leader's skill in accommodating fiercely divergent points of view in his own party. His formula generally follows the line of convincing one side or the other that it is licked and better make the best deal possible.

JOHNSON has a moderate bill in the hopper, which would set up a conciliation service to function in areas of racial difficulties, outlaw flight across State lines to escape prosecution for bombings, require preservation of voting records and extend for 2 years the life of the Civil Rights Commission investigating discrimination.

The plight of the highway program is another item worrying the Democratic majority. It is not politically feasible for Congress to leave here with the highway trust fund in the red and the program bogging down. Having rejected a proposal by the President to meet higher construction costs with a boost in the Federal gasoline tax of 1½ cents, the Congress is going to have to find the necessary additional funds some place. But that, for the time being, is the House Ways and Means Committee's problem.

JOHNSON relies a great deal on grassroots opinion in evaluating the moderate course he follows. Rifling through clippings of the results of one of the major public opinion polls, he seems to find ample satisfaction that his is the right course.

Headlines over the poll results read like this: "Democrats Given Edge on Holding Down Prices"; "Republican Vote Strength Found Below November 4 Level"; "Democrats Show Gains Since Election"; "Poll Develops No Sign of Republican Upturn," and so on.

Senator Hartke, of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there are very few men who have made such an early and favorable impression as a freshman upon, his Senate colleagues than the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE]. It is gratifying to know that his merits are so well recognized in his native State of Indiana.

Senator HARTKE came to Washington backed by the largest margin of votes ever given to any Indiana candidate for a statewide office. The people of Indiana recognized a good man when they saw him.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Fort Wayne Journal Gazette, carried on July 27, entitled "Hartke Justifies Voters' Confidence."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARTKE JUSTIFIES VOTERS' CONFIDENCE

VANCE HARTKE was elected to the U.S. Senate last November by the largest margin of votes ever given to an Indiana candidate for any office.

His election followed an active campaign in which he went to every part of the State to let the people know who he was, what he believed, and what he stood for.

His official majority of 242,001 indicated that the voters liked what they saw and heard.

They gave him a tremendous endorsement. Less than 7 months have passed since he took his oath of office in Washington, yet it can be safely said that during this time he has measured up to great confidence which his fellow Hoosiers reposed in him last November.

He impressed congressional leaders from the very day he arrived in the National Capital.

This was shown by the fact that he received three major committee assignments.

Senator HARTKE was placed on the Finance Committee, one of the most powerful in the Senate. It handles all tax and tariff legislation. Its members carry unusual weight with other Senators.

He was also assigned to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the District of Columbia Committee.

To the duties of these assignments and to his Senate responsibilities in general, Senator HARTKE has brought intelligence, experience, sincerity, commonsense, and great energy.

He has worked long hours in the Senate and in his office and has kept in touch with the folks back home.

He has worked closely and harmoniously with the able leadership of Senator LYNDON JOHNSON and Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, yet he is his own man who follows the dictates of his conscience and his own sound judgment.

Whatever he does, he has a reason for it and is able to state that reason with clarity and conviction.

Senator HARTKE is devoted to the interests of his own State and the welfare of the Nation at large.

He is vigorously opposed to extravagance and waste in Government. He stands for every economy consistent with the progressive growth and the security of America.

At the age of 40, Indiana's junior Senator is launched upon a career of public service which promises to be one of the most useful and brilliant in the entire Nation.

Every citizen of Indiana can take pride in his achievements.

Japanese Congressman's Open Mind on Race Cheers South Under Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, those of us who voted to make Hawaii a State have been vindicated—that is, those of us who voted for it with possible reluctance and conceivable misgivings. I voted to make Hawaii a State. The election to Congress of Representative D. K. INOUE demonstrates to the world that Hawaii is made up of people who reflect the finest traditions of the magic in the word, American. At one of his first press conferences in America, this fine and patriotic soldier of World War II was asked his stand on the most inflammatory questions before this Congress, one, suffrage for the District of Columbia, and the other integration. In answer to both of these questions he was

forthright, firm, and unequivocal. On both of these questions he took the sensible stand which is, in substance, that he is determined not to prejudge any question. Being of a minority race, he understands what it means for the minority to be heard. He understands that the people in the South are a minority group and that their story should be told to the Nation and to the world. This is all we ask.

Mr. Speaker, everybody in Congress knows that the Representative-elect from Hawaii fought with one of the most gallant divisions ever to bear the American flag. In that division, his regiment was known as the Go-for-Broke. His division was known as the Division of the Purple Heart. His gallantry earned him 15 battle stars and cost him his right arm. What else could a man do for his country? Mr. Speaker, my newspaper, the oldest daily in the South, the most outspoken and fairminded paper in the Nation, has seen fit to write about this fine American of Japanese origin under date of August 12. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therewith an article entitled "Japanese Congressman's Open Mind on Race Cheers South Under Fire."

Mr. Speaker, I am glad I voted to make Hawaii a State so that this man might take his place in the Congress of the United States.

The article follows:

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Aug. 12, 1959]

JAPANESE CONGRESSMAN'S OPEN MIND ON RACE CHEERS SOUTH UNDER FIRE

Remarks of the new Congressman from Hawaii, a man of Japanese ancestry, have given fresh encouragement to southerners because they indicate an open mind.

"I believe the people of the South have a story to tell," said Representative-elect D. K. INOUE at a press conference in Washington, "and I would like to listen to their story."

Another remark that was quoted by our Washington correspondent as making "a hit with southern Congressmen" was this statement:

"I don't believe integration in itself is a solution to the problem of civil rights."

Just what significance may be attached to these statements we cannot now predict. Perhaps they are the diplomatic remarks of a man who has not yet even been sworn in as a Member of the House of Representatives and who rightly enters with caution. Surely they cannot be construed as out-and-out embrace of the white southerner's belief in separation of races.

It is ironic that southerners, accustomed to vicious attack from race mixers, find comfort in any reasonable and courteous approach to the race problem.

Representative INOUE (pronounced, we have heard, In-oh-way) is an especially interesting spokesman on the subject of race. He will be the first Japanese to sit in the U.S. Congress. As readers know, the News and Courier opposed admission of Hawaii to statehood both on the grounds of distance from the mainland and the large proportion of oriental population.

When Mr. INOUE was elected to the House and a Chinese Hawaiian to the U.S. Senate, we commented gloomily on introduction of Asian influence to the lawmaking body. These things having been done over our protest, we shall look eagerly if not hopefully

for any positive values that may be forthcoming. Perhaps Mr. INOUE has furnished a ray of light.

Japanese are proud people. They have a keen feeling for racial integrity. They seldom mix in marriage with other races.

They are disciplined people. Not only did the famous Nisei regimental combat team recruited in Hawaii win more combat decorations than any other World War II unit, but also it had the best conduct record and the smallest number of absences without leave.

Japanese students, we have been informed, have the best average scholastic records in Hawaiian schools. Chinese are second, whites third and Hawaiians last. Japanese also have the lowest incidence of crime.

In contemplating the South's Negro problem, Japanese may come closer to sympathy than white northerners grant people of their own color. If that is the case Representative INOUE may turn out to be a valuable ally for southerners struggling to preserve their civilization against attacks in the falsely invoked name of civil rights. His words have set an example that Caucasian lawmakers might closely study. We would not reject a Japanese guide to return of local self-government in this Federal Republic.

Lake Michigan Water Diversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on Lake Michigan water diversion, delivered before a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, on August 7, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAKE MICHIGAN WATER DIVERSION

(Remarks by U.S. Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, before subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works August 7, 1959)

Mr. Chairman, coming before this subcommittee to discuss water diversion is not a new experience for me, because I have seen this issue dragged from Supreme Court to special master, from Joint International Commission to Senate committees and from there to the full Senate in a fashion somewhat reminiscent of the man who, not being satisfied with one judge's determination, sets out on a shopping expedition to find a judge that would agree with him. Neither is the presentation of the facts and issues of this case completely devoid of theatrical makeup and ever-changing window dressing. The title of H.R. 1 reads "An act to require a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois waterway for navigation, and for other purposes." Then on July 13, Senator DOUGLAS—appearing before this subcommittee—not even once referred to navigation problems and all throughout his testimony he insisted that "all we ask is that this matter of Chicago's waste disposal be studied by a competent body." In his testimony on July 27, Norval E. Anderson, engineer of the Sanitary District of Chicago, confirmed that this was the

purpose. If there are any navigation purposes attached to this proposed diversion—authorizing the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct the study would certainly not provide us with the desired information on navigation needs. Moreover, it is now even uncertain whether all this diversion is really intended for pollution abatement. Mr. Milton P. Adams, engineering adviser to the attorney general of Michigan, appearing before this committee, advised it that he had some "reason to believe that Chicago's continuing demands for additional diversion, is due in part at least, to increased public utility needs for more cooling water from the canals rather than for district sanitation." Now, there is nothing in the Supreme Court decision controlling the present diversion at Chicago, nor in any subsequent act of Congress, which would permit a substantial portion of these waters to be used for condensing purposes in connection with private utility steamplant power generation.

I therefore urge that we depart from diversionary and discredited tactics and that we look at the actual facts and issues.

THE FACTS AND FIGURES OF THE CHICAGO DIVERSION

I previously filed with each member of the committee a very short brief, primarily raising the international issue, Canada having objected in no uncertain terms.

Today, I shall follow through with the other issues.

Of course, the basic question is as follows: Is it the responsibility of the Federal Government to clear up a local sewage problem which Chicago's neglect has created?

Is it good national policy or good foreign policy, or good constitutional law, for the Federal Congress to attempt to take the resources, in scope, from some sovereign States, for the benefit of a district of another State?

If any diversion by Chicago is to be permitted, it is our humble opinion that Chicago should be required to return the domestic pumpage, after purification, to Lake Michigan.

We contend that, because of the issue raised by Canada, the bill should be, if it is not tabled, referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

I need not stress what this committee already knows, that the Supreme Court has had jurisdiction, and is retaining jurisdiction of this very issue. As a matter of fact, the master appointed by the Supreme Court has held his first meeting with all concerned this Tuesday, August 4, in Philadelphia.

Now, before we examine the law and equity in this case, let us recapitulate the facts:

First, the bill provides that the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Chicago has the authority to increase by 1,000 cubic feet per second its water take from Lake Michigan—this to be in addition to all domestic pumpage and the 1,500 cubic feet per second already authorized.

The district already has been authorized to take 1,500 cubic feet. It wants to be able, in dry weather, to take a flow of 5,000 cubic feet per second; and in wet weather, taking nothing, just so long as it doesn't exceed the annual average of 2,500 cubic feet per second.

If the bill should become law, it would raise the issue as to whether the Supreme Court's jurisdiction has been done away with, and if so it would do away with the issue before the Court of any return of domestic pumpage in purified form to Lake Michigan.

Let me say that Chicago has already diverted three streams which formerly flowed into the lake; and the lake level is down 7 feet now.

What is that due to? There is a difference of opinion about it. But engineers say that

an additional 1,000 cubic feet would reduce the lake level a fraction of an inch.

When you realize that water has for years been continuously taken, and none given or returned by Chicago, this dangerous lowering of the level clearly shows the necessity for no more diversion.

In Milwaukee, sewage is purified up to 95 percent and Milorganite is created and sold for fertilizer.

I think the facts are conclusive on this: that Chicago doesn't want to spend any extra money, so to speak, to do the job that Milwaukee is doing.

FAILURE OF PROOF

The supporters of this bill have failed to make out a case. The undisputed evidence shows that the city has created the situation; has failed to remedy it by failing to extend its sanitary works.

This admission comes out of the mouth of H. P. Ramey, the Chicago Sanitary District chief engineer, as follows:

"Ramey said the district in recent years has had a good reputation and was credited with treating all sewage to the highest degree possible, or 90 percent removal of solids. Actually, Ramey said, this was not the case.

"Sewage treatment in the plants of the sanitary district has declined from a general average of 93 percent in 1951-52 to 87 percent or less in 1955-56.

"The lapse in sewage treatment has occurred at the west-southwest treatment plant, the plant which was cited in 1955 as one of the 7 modern wonders of civil engineering in the United States."

This went into the RECORD last year and was quoted in the Chicago Tribune, September 4, 1957, and the Chicago Daily News of the same date.

Last year, we showed what a poor job the Chicago plant had been doing for itself. In 1952, its purification was tops. In succeeding years, it has dropped miserably, and that is due to the fact that, while it has taken on an additional acreage in sewage, it has not increased the facilities of its sewage plants.

The purity of the effluent from the sewage plants of Chicago dropped from a peak of 93.6 in 1952, to a low of 85.6 in 1957.

The removal of the sewage solids from the liquid, which at one time, in 1952, was as high as 91.1 percent, had dropped by 1957 to 80.6 percent.

It is well to note that Milwaukee's purification efficiency remains at a high of 96 percent.

As indicated above, the Chicago Sanitary District figures show that between the years 1952 and 1957 the percentage of solids removable decreased from 91.1 to 80.6, or 10.5 percent, clearly indicating the inefficiency of the sanitary district.

The information shown above was brought from Chicago by Mr. Gordon McCallum, Chief of the Division of Water Pollution of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, at the specific insistence of myself.

Let me also read from the Supreme Court's opinion of 1929, which was in the RECORD last year, which language is applicable to the present situation:

"The sanitary district authorities, relying on the argument with reference to the health of its people, have much too long delayed the needed substitution of suitable sewage plants as a means of avoiding the diversion in the future. Therefore, they cannot now complain if an immediately heavy burden is placed upon the district because of their attitude and course. The situation requires the district to devise proper methods for providing sufficient money and to construct and put in operation with all reasonable expedition adequate plants for the disposition of the sewage through other means than the lake diversion."

Again this year your subcommittee had before it the testimony of Michigan Associates Consulting Engineers which most clearly proves, through actual photographs, that the Chicago Sanitary District is failing to do what the Supreme Court required them to do—that is to collect and treat its sewage in such a fashion that it could take care of the sewage disposal requirements of the area by means other than diversion.

The observations of the Michigan consulting engineers are confirmed by a 2-day survey made by the U.S. Public Health Service on October 27 and 28, 1958. Both surveys show (1) that portions of the waterway are grossly polluted; (2) that raw sewage and industrial waste are allowed to be discharged into the waterway without prior treatment; (3) that a large quantity of sewage is found in the canal—indicating either that the district's sewage disposal plants are not operated efficiently or that they are bypassed; and (4) that the district maintains an extensive number of sludge lagoons, which overflow and discharge into the canal without prior treatment.

Although the district brought here a whole battery of experts on July 27, in an attempt to refute these findings—they have certainly failed to negate even one point. At most they have shown that these deplorable practices do not take place every day of the week, but are regulated by the district, so that more favorable pictures could be taken during the off days.

Now, from all of this, it must appear that more water is not the solution, but more and better plants are.

EQUITIES

Let me summarize the equities:

1. Chicago needs more and better sewage plants to handle the growing volume of its sewage.

2. The overloading of the sewage plants, I have already shown.

3. Chicago has no health problem, and any diversion is not related to its health. The Supreme Court special master, in 1941, found that even a low of 54 percent purification level did not endanger health. Senator PROXMIRE demonstrated that fact when he read from the Health Commission's report in Chicago.

4. Neither Chicago nor the Illinois waterways have a navigation problem. There was a temporary problem, but it was solved when the Public Works Committee approved an authorization for water retaining works at Alton, Ill.

5. Chicago is luring industry by low taxes and unmetered high water use, whereas other lake cities are metering the use of water and solving their own sewage problems.

6. The bill originally provided for a 3-year diversion. Now, they want a 1-year diversion which will inch away the levels of the Great Lakes, to the damage of other States rights, transportation, harbor operation, and the operation of utilities on the St. Lawrence.

7. I repeat: The prime purpose of the bill is to save Chicago money in its sewage operations, it having allowed purification to slump, as indicated above.

8. The witnesses for the Army Engineers admit that there is no navigation issue involved, unless what we are talking about is the damage to be caused by additional diversion to the navigation on the lakes.

9. The Great Lakes States all have a legal ownership interest in the waters of the Great Lakes, subject only to the Federal Government's limited jurisdiction over commerce and navigation—this being evidenced by the President's veto messages of 1954 and 1956, in which he said as follows:

"(a) Existing diversions are adequate for navigation on the Illinois Waterways and Mississippi River.

"(b) All methods of control of lake levels and protection of property on the Great Lakes should be considered before arbitrary proceedings with the proposed increased diversion.

"(c) The diversion should not be authorized without reference to negotiations with Canada.

"(d) The legitimate interests of other States affected by the diversion would be adversely affected."

10. A new objection has recently come into being—the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes Waterway is completed and must not be damaged. This bill, I say, would undermine confidence in the future reliability of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

11. Illinois has only 57 miles of lake front, and the other States have about 500 miles. Canada has 3,772 miles of the Great Lakes, and the U.S. frontage is 2,278 miles.

THE GAINS TO CHICAGO AND THE LOSSES TO ALL OTHERS

I should like to stress again that the opposition to the diversion by Chicago is not based merely on Chicago's failure to solve its own domestic problem—it is based on the damages that such diversion would produce to the other States. For as the mayor of Cleveland stated: "To permit Chicago, or any other municipality, to extract large quantities of water from the Great Lakes watershed would constitute a subsidy just as surely as though Chicago was being handed a sum of dollars. To the degree that Chicago is benefited, others down the line will be injured to the same extent." But the evidence produced before this subcommittee has proven more than that—it has proven that Chicago's gain will be more than offset by the resultant losses to all other States.

The statistics provided by the State of New York Power Authority show that the annual loss to the authority in revenues from a 1,000 cubic feet per second diversion, would be over \$1 million a year. The total revenue loss, if such diversion was authorized to continue during the term of the license of the Niagara and St. Lawrence plants would amount to \$51 million.

The statement by the Lake Carriers' Association demonstrates the effect of the diversion on Great Lakes shipping. With the present permitted diversion, plus domestic pumpage of about 2,000 cubic feet per second, the city of Chicago is already depressing the Lake levels about 3 inches below what they would be otherwise. As the study by the Corps of Engineers has determined, a further diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second will further lower the level approximately 1 inch and the level of Lakes Erie and Ontario by somewhat less amount. Such a lowering, it is estimated, would mean a total loss of approximately 1½ million tons of vessel carrying capacity by the combined United States and Canadian fleets of the Great Lakes vessel during a season. This is a loss to transportation companies alone of about \$2½ million. And now that the St. Lawrence Seaway is fully open, larger ocean vessels are trading in the Great Lakes, and these vessels, too, will suffer a loss in carrying capacity, as well as an increase in navigation hazards.

The mayor of Cleveland, further, testified that a 1-inch drop in the lake level would result in a reduction of the potential capacity at the Cleveland plants and that a million dollar's worth of plant supply would be lost.

What else would this diversion do to the interests of the Great Lakes States? What about the damage to the beaches and resorts, the harbors and the docks, now too high above water; what about the lower levels in the St. Lawrence Seaway canals? What about the future of the seaway?

The U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has reported to this com-

mittee that the sanitary district could solve its sewage treatment problem without the diversion by means of chlorination and aeration at a cost of about \$1 million per year. I submit that if further diversion is authorized the losses to the many other interested States and businesses would far exceed the costs of such better and more permanent system by Chicago. Where, therefore, I ask, is the equity and economic soundness of Chicago's case?

Is it really expected that monetary benefits that H.R. 1 would give to Chicago should be paid by the citizens of Wisconsin and Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, and New York?

And, furthermore, the problem is not merely that of the unjust enrichment of the city of Chicago. It is also the problem of the wise utilization of the waters of the Great Lakes, and any water resources expert will challenge the economic soundness of using and committing these good waters for the flushing of sewage.

THE LAW THAT PERTAINS TO THESE WATERS

The Great Lakes are international waters. They are a national asset, and they make up the Great Lakes watershed.

I doubt very much whether Congress has the authority under the Constitution to pass bills that would authorize the transfer of large quantities of water from the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence watershed to the Mississippi watershed, with substantial damage to the Great Lakes, the municipalities on the Great Lakes and the people with property bordering the Great Lakes.

The authority of the Federal Government to divert water from one watershed to another for the exclusive needs of sewage treatment, is certainly very questionable. It is amusing, therefore, to observe the pathetic effort made by the Chicago Sanitary District to stretch inapplicable court cases in order to "prove" that the plenary power of the Federal Government over navigable waters "includes the power of diversion from one waterway to another." To buttress their position the district cites a recent *amicus curiae* by the Solicitor General of the United States (in *Wisconsin et al. v. Illinois et al.*, October term 1958) to the effect that: "The plenary power of Congress over navigable waters empowers it to deny the privilege of obstructing them, or to impose terms on a grant of the privilege." This is certainly a very correct statement of the Government's duty to protect the navigability of streams, but one that totally fails to establish the power of the Government to enrich some States at the cost of others through the authorization of diversion for purposes totally unrelated to navigation.

In the leading case of *U.S. v. Appalachian Power Co.* (311 U.S. 377), the Supreme Court held that: " . . . it cannot be properly said that the constitutional power of the United States over its waters is limited to control for navigation. . . . In truth the authority of the United States is the regulation of commerce on its waters. . . . The authority is as broad as the needs of commerce." Again in *Wisconsin v. Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago* (278 U.S. 367), which is the landmark in the diversion controversy, the Court restated its position that Congress, in the exercise of its Constitutional power to regulate commerce, may adopt any means having some positive relation to the control of navigation and not otherwise inconsistent with the Constitution. A very strong statement was again made in a recent opinion by Justice Douglas to the effect that "It is not for courts, however, to substitute their judgments for congressional decisions on what is or is not necessary for the improvement or protection of navigation. . . . If the interests of navigation are served, it is constitutionally irrelevant that other purposes may also be advanced." (*United States v. Twin City Power Co.* (350 U.S. 222, 224).)

This, I submit, is a very correct and constitutionally sound position. But it is only this far and not further that we can go, and I submit again that H.R. 1 has nothing whatsoever to do with navigation or commerce. Any endeavor, therefore, to defend diversion for sewage flushing purposes, from the Great Lakes Basin to the Mississippi Basin, as coming within the realm of commerce, makes a sham of our law.

I submit, also, that to the extent that the issue involved in this diversion is not one of national commerce but of a conflict between the several States as to waters that are commonly shared—this is an issue for the courts. For as the Supreme Court said in *Wyoming v. Colorado* (259 U.S. 419, 464): " * * * a controversy between two States over the diversion and use of waters of a stream passing from one to the other 'makes a matter for investigation and determination by this Court' in the exercise of its original jurisdiction," and again "the upper State on such a stream does not have such ownership or control of the waters flowing therein as entitled her to divert and use them regardless of any injury or prejudice to the rights of the lower State in the stream."

THE FACTS OF THE CANADIAN DIVERSION

In the brief that was submitted by the district, there are references to waters that have been diverted from the whole system by Canada. My understanding is that in every instance, that was pursuant to agreement between our country and Canada, and these diversions were made before the St. Lawrence development, that is, before these two countries have put into the same \$1 billion.

Now let me refer to the specifics of brief filed by the district and let me set the record straight:

1. There never has been any diversion of water by Canada that was not pursuant to treaty or agreement.

2. Although Canada has had the use of an extra 16,000 cubic feet of water at Niagara for power purposes, the Niagara Treaty of 1950 provides that we and Canada should have the right to take the same amount of water for our powerplants.

3. Canada has contributed water by diverting Long Lac and Ogokie Rivers into the Great Lakes Basin, some 5,000 additional cubic feet per second.

4. Nothing has been said about the fact that every drop of the water taken at Niagara was and is returned to the lake resulting with damage to nobody.

We are perfectly willing that Chicago have additional water if it will return what it takes to the lake in purified condition, the same as Milwaukee does.

There is one point we must not forget, and that is that a large portion of the power generated in the early days in the Canadian powerplants at Niagara was allotted to industries on the U.S. side. Later, recognizing American power needs, the United States refused to allow its industry to be deprived of the power allotted to it under the agreements between the countries, and Canada had to dim-out to conserve power to meet its obligations. One of the principal reasons for negotiating the 1950 treaty was to resolve this conflict.

And let me stress again: The Chicago diversion is a real diversion in the sense that it diverts three rivers and approximately 3,300 cubic feet of water per second from the Great Lakes Basin to the Mississippi Basin. That water that Canada uses and reuses at Niagara is really a detour because it detours the water through its plants and returns it to the river and the lake.

It must be plain from the record in this case that the letter of 1958 by Assistant Secretary Macomber, which was cited by the bill's proponents, doesn't state the fact.

My previous brief in the matter, which I filed with each member of the committee, set forth Canada's position in no uncertain terms. It also clearly indicates that after the visit of Messrs. Douglas and Yates to Canada for the purpose of enlightening the Prime Minister that the Prime Minister was not "enlightened" and that he told the Canadian Parliament that he enjoyed the visit but that they had not established any reason for the Canadian Government to change its position.

If, as contended by the district, that for 40 years under the 1909 treaty, Canada had available some 16,000 cubic feet, that is a matter, not between Illinois and Canada, but between the Government of the United States and Canada.

And finally, after the 1950 treaty, the rights of the two countries were established to be equal.

IS AN ADDITIONAL STUDY NOW NECESSARY?

What is the purpose of this new proposed study?

The bill's title is a misnomer describing it as a study of navigation. The contents of the bill are more honest, saying that the purpose of the bill is to study the effect of diversion on Lake Michigan and on the Illinois Waterway. An amendment that was offered by the Chicago Sanitary District on July 27 would extend this study also to include pollution, the treatment of industrial waste, the flows of water throughout the southern part of Lake Michigan, and sundry other topics.

I submit, however, that any such studies are not needed at this time. The major part of this study has already been made and is contained in Senate Document No. 28, 85th Congress, 1st session, entitled "Effects of an Additional Diversion of Water From Lake Michigan at Chicago." The document sets forth in unquestionable terms that the present authorized diversion is adequate to meet the water requirements for navigation on the Illinois Waterway, and shows that losses would result from an increase in the diversion to navigation, power development, and shore property interests. The effect of such diversion would also be to increase power production at the sanitary district's plant at Lockport on the Illinois Waterway and save the sanitary district the money it would otherwise have to spend to solve its domestic sanitation problems.

Another study at this time would appear to be simply a waste of time and money, and the only possible reason for its institution would be in the fact that such study would offer an excuse for starting more diversion.

It has been said that such study, if authorized, would not interfere with the duties of the master, appointed by the Supreme Court, to look into this complex situation, but would, instead, provide him with additional data. I say this in response: About 30 years have passed since Justice Hughes, the previous master, has studied this problem; why not give the new master the opportunity to decide for himself what possible new information or studies he may require? And since one study was already conducted in 1957 and the new master commenced his own fact gathering this week—there is certainly no need to hasten and conduct a brandnew costly survey for his benefit, and without his collaboration.

CONCLUSION

1. The evidence shows that the Chicago district is to blame for its own predicament in that its sewage disposal plant, which was efficient years ago, has not been kept up-to-date as Chicago has grown.

2. It has diverted three rivers which formerly flowed into Lake Michigan; it has been taking some 3,300 cubic feet per second

from Lake Michigan, and has not returned a drop thereof.

3. The argument that Canada has up to 1950 had 16,000 cubic feet extra water, falls by its own weight:

(a) Because every drop of the water was returned to the river and the lake.

(b) It was pursuant to agreement with the United States.

4. Illinois has some 57 miles of frontage on Lake Michigan, and the other States have 500. Lake Michigan is part of the Lake-St. Lawrence watershed, and none of the other States have agreed to this diversion by the Chicago district.

5. Now that the St. Lawrence Seaway is a reality the port projects must not be jeopardized by this unreasonable demand. Chicago "the wonder city," has spent less per capita for sewage treatment, and has a lower tax rate than other cities. She should not expect to take from the other States. Her job, as the court has suggested, is to clean up her own house.

6. The Chicago district has no basis for relief by Congress since this is not a navigation or commerce problem. Congress has no authority to divert water for the sole purpose of stultifying Chicago's sewage down the Illinois River (*Wisconsin v. Illinois* (278 U.S. 367).)

7. The Chicago district has no basis for relief in law or equity:

(a) A temporary diversion would mean lower lake levels, which would lower harbor and canal depths, decrease safe shipping drafts and reduce tonnage carried. Lake shore property would be impaired, dock pilings would become exposed.

(b) Canada has repeatedly voiced its opposition to a unilateral diversion. Under the 1909 Boundary Waters Treaty, article II "It is understood, however, that neither of the high contracting parties intends by the foregoing provision to surrender any right which it may have to object to any interference with or diversion of waters on the other side of the boundary, the effect of which would be productive of material injury to the navigation interest on its own side of the boundary." As stated by Justice Holmes in *Sanitary District v. U.S.* (266 U.S. 405, 426), it is the duty of the United States to carry out its treaty obligations to Canada, which borders on the Great Lakes, and furthermore, the 1909 treaty "expressly provides against uses 'affecting the level or natural flow of boundary waters' without the authority" of the United States, the Dominion of Canada and the Joint International Commission.

I therefore submit that no diversion should be undertaken by any one of the two Governments without consultation and agreement with the other.

(c) While continuously pleading for an increased diversion from Lake Michigan—in order to meet existing sanitary needs—the Chicago Sanitary District has also followed in recent years a tremendous territorial expansion program which by necessity would make its present plants inadequate. From some 508 square miles in 1954, the district, through annexation grew to more than 920 square miles in 1958, an increase of 81 percent.

It is during this same period that the efficiency of the Chicago sewage treatment fell dramatically. I submit therefore that it is partly because of this expansion program, and the resultant fall in sanitary efficiency, that Chicago wants more water, and is now coming to Congress for aid. But it is presumptuous for Chicago to believe that the expansion program of the sanitary district, however meritorious it may be, should be financed by the other Lake States.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the subcommittee, let me say this in conclusion: Additional diversion of Lake Michigan waters has no justification either in law or

in equity; it is contrary to the interests of the other Lake States and contrary to the tradition of close and friendly relation with our Canadian neighbors; and finally, such diversion for the treatment of sewage is certainly, from a scientific and water resources point of view which must consider not only the needs of today but also the demands of tomorrow, a very uneconomic and unsound utilization of this generous gift of nature—the waters of the Great Lakes.

Tax Loopholes for Sale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, everyone pays lip service, at least, to the principle of equality in taxation, but our Federal tax pattern has developed, through the years, into a patchwork of inequities.

It is understandable, perhaps, that the tremendous and growing pressures of the national tax burden should have spurred the ingenuities of those taxpayers having the resources and incentives to develop mechanisms of individualized relief. Many of these devices have acquired legislative and administrative acceptance because, when viewed singly, they gave forth the color of equity.

Any careful and nonopinionated appraisal of the overall Federal tax structure, however, cannot but produce a recognition of sharp disparities in the treatment of various classes of taxpayers.

This fall, in the relative calm of congressional adjournment, there will be opportunity for a dispassionate examination of our tax laws, and for real progress toward an equitable apportionment of the taxload. The opportunity will come in the hearings announced to begin November 2 before the Committee on Ways and Means.

Our distinguished, discerning, and conscientious chairman, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, of Arkansas, has provided this forum for serious-minded students of tax philosophy to exchange views and seek guideposts toward a rationalized tax system. Mr. MILLS knows that he has offered tax specialists a broad and stern challenge. He knows, too, that this challenge must be taken up in good spirit if ever we are to plug obvious tax loopholes and apportion the tax burden fairly and without favor among our citizens.

The average-salaried citizen would profit little from the retention, for a fee, of a skilled loophole sleuth, but the need for a general tax survey, such as Chairman MILLS contemplates, is nowhere more sharply emphasized than in the promotional material of those in the business of finding escape hatches for those facing heavy tax liability under the basic rates. As an example, Mr. Speaker, I include, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, a circular received from Prentiss-Hall, leading distributor of tax publications:

HOW TO USE TAX-FREE INCOME TO KEEP MORE OF YOUR EARNINGS FOR YOURSELF—A NEW REPORT OF SPECIAL INTEREST TO MEN IN THE HIGHLY TAXED \$15,000 TO \$100,000 BRACKETS

The most effective way for a man with substantial income to keep more cash for himself is to tap today's nine big sources of tax-free income.

This goes far beyond the ordinary concept of savings taxes. For dollars earned on this tax-free basis can be 100 percent yours to keep.

Here is how tax-free boosts your actual income at various income levels:

If your income is—	You keep (without tax-free income)	You keep (with 10 percent of your income tax-free)	You keep (with 20 percent of your income tax-free)	You keep (with 30 percent of your income tax-free)
\$100,000.....	\$46,360	\$53,590	\$60,520	\$67,180
\$50,000.....	\$29,700	\$32,650	\$35,480	\$38,100
\$25,000.....	\$17,770	\$18,770	\$19,720	\$20,570
\$15,000.....	\$11,380	\$11,380	\$12,280	\$12,670

And you needn't stop there. The more tax-free income you get, the more money you keep for yourself.

This method of reducing taxes is so effective that in 1958 more people used it than any other major tax method.

To help you use this method for 1959 we have prepared a special 40-page handbook on the subject. This handbook will come to you at once without cost if you will simply place your advance reservation for the new 1960 Federal tax course which comes out in the fall.

Your complimentary handbook, "How To Get Tax-Free Income—Now," explains the following big close-at-hand sources of tax-free income for executives:

1. It explains an arrangement under which a portion of each year's company profits can be credited to the executives' individual accounts—tax-deductible by the company and tax-free to them.

2. It tells you how to get dividends from certain stocks completely tax-free (these need not be reported as income).

3. It shows you under what circumstances an executive can (under sec. 105(d) of the code) eliminate the tax on certain salary payments.

4. It explains how the company can now provide for your personal insurance costs (including life insurance), vacations, recreation throughout the year, country club memberships, overseas travel—and more, all tax-deductible by the company and tax-free to you.

5. It tells under what circumstances the company can give executives gifts and presents—tax-free to them.

6. It explains how the company can now set up a survivor benefit plan to provide tax-free payments for an executive's wife (and other family members).

7. It tells you how to have other people make improvements on your real estate—which they pay for—and which are tax-free to you.

8. It explains how to build a sizable tax-free investment income, whether you put your cash in real estate, stocks, bonds, or in a group of today's most tax-sheltered businesses.

9. It explains how to sell one's residence without paying a tax—even if you show a whopping profit.

These are just nine of the methods explained in this brandnew 40-page handbook, "How To Get Tax-Free Income—Now." They offer at last a solution to the executive's toughest personal problem: how to find relief from the ever-tightening squeeze of high tax rates and cheapening dollars.

How to get this new 40-page handbook

without cost. Simply return the card attached to the next page. The handbook will come to you at once with our compliments and we will enter your advance reservation for the new 1960 Federal tax course which comes out in the fall.

Just a word about the Federal tax course. Each year it is used by more company executives than any other tax work in America. Here is why the great new 1960 course will be so valuable to you:

1. It will feature more than 500 worked-out examples showing you how to handle virtually every kind of personal and company tax question you'll run into.

2. Every bit of material it contains will be up-to-the-minute on the latest tax setup.

3. It will spotlight more than 175 tax savings.

4. It will give you more than 200 pages on deductions alone.

5. It will comprise more than 1,400 pages of information all expertly tabbed and indexed.

6. It will give you filled-in specimen tax returns to follow for maximum tax savings.

7. It will cost only \$24.50—its tax-deductible expense—and there is nothing to pay until the new 1960 tax course is delivered to you in October.

Just return the enclosed card today. You'll receive without cost the special 40-page handbook "How To Get Tax-Free Income—Now" by return mail and the 1960 Federal tax course when it's released to the business world in October.

Tribute to Dr. Walter Prescott Webb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, Time magazine this week paid tribute to one of this country's most distinguished scholars and past president of the American Historical Association, Dr. Walter Prescott Webb.

Dr. Webb has been for a long time a professor at the University of Texas in Austin, and I am proud and grateful that on many occasions I have had the benefit of Dr. Webb's advice and counsel.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from Time magazine of August 17, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Time magazine, Aug. 17, 1959]

"PLAINS" TALKER

Shambling through downtown streets like a man in plowed ground leathery little Walter Prescott Webb looks every bit his part, a shrewd real estate trader in Austin, Tex. But Walter Webb, raised in the alkali flats of west Texas, schooled in the saddle and for 40 years a professor at the University of Texas, is also his generation's foremost philosopher of the frontier, and the leading historian ("The Great Plains," "The Texas Rangers") of the American West. At 71, he has been made the hero of a sort of plainsman's festival of letters—a collection of his occasional essays ("An Honest Preface," Houghton Mifflin; \$3.75), trimmed with the personal tributes of his Texas friends. Says his old friend and cultural sparring partner, J. Frank Dobie, the famed Western folk-

lorist ("The Mustangs," "The Voice of the Coyote"); "Webb is one historian who never lets the evidence stand in the way of the truth—as he sees it."

HAVE GUN, CAN TRAVEL

In his inaugural address as president of the American Historical Association, included in *An Honest Preface*, Webb admits that "I am one of the few persons who did not have to leave home to get a job. I am an example of institutional inbreeding which frightens all universities except the two that practice it most, Harvard and Oxford."

As historian of the plains, Webb follows in the tradition of the great Frederick Jackson Turner, who first formulated the frontier theory of U.S. history in 1893: "The existence of an area of free land and the advance of American settlement westward explain American development." To write his history of the Texas Rangers, says Webb, "Like Parkman I went to all the places where things had happened," and finally "I stumbled on one of the few original ideas I ever had." The idea, "What I saw was that when Stephen F. Austin brought his colonists to Texas, he brought them to the edge of one environment, the Eastern woodland, and to the border of another environment, the Great Plains. The Texas Rangers were called into existence primarily to defend the settlements against Indians on horseback. While the conflict between the Rangers and the Comanches was at its height, Samuel Colt invented the revolver, the ideal weapon for a man on horseback."

"In that flash of insight," says Webb, "I sensed that something very important happened when the American people emerged from the woodland, and the revolver [was] an adaptation to the needs of the new situation."

THE SOUTHERN CENTURY

As the years stiffen his knee joints, notes Doble, Webb's "intellectual movements" become ever more "flexible and limber." Two years ago in a Harper's magazine piece titled "The American West: Perpetual Mirage," Webb pointed out the "one overwhelming fact which 17 States have been trying to hide for the last century" "The Heart of the West is a desert"—both geographically and culturally.

Historian Webb sees the country's next frontier in the South. "Forget the misfortune and injustice of the past," he told the Texas Council for Social Studies last June. "If I could, I would convince the Southern people that their future is brighter than it has ever been in history. The South is the one region whose resources have been largely undeveloped and unexploited. It is not only possible but it is also probable that this next century will belong to the South."

News Reporter Snared in a Red Intrigue on Nixon Russ Trip

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Nat Finney, Washington correspondent of the Buffalo Evening News, was a key figure in an interesting incident which occurred in Sverdlovsk, Russia, while he was a member of the press corps accompanying Vice President Nixon.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Finney's account of the incident:

NEWS REPORTER SNARED IN A RED INTRIGUE ON NIXON RUSS TRIP

(By Nat Finney)

WASHINGTON, August 8.—I had never expected it to happen to me but while I was in Russia covering Vice President Nixon's recent trip the Communists in cloak-and-dagger fashion tried to make me the fall guy for a bitter attack on the American press. It happened in Sverdlovsk.

The American newspaper-radio group was being briefed on the next day's activities in a second-floor lounge of the Bolshoi Urals Hotel when Paul Nevin of CBS radio and I were called out of the meeting.

Mr. Nevin wasn't present, so I stepped out of the briefing session and was confronted by a pair of formidable-looking, middle-aged Russian women, well enough dressed to prove they belonged to Russia's Communist apparatus.

One of them, English speaking and dressed in a pale blue frock, ordered me to come with them to my room, which was No. 219 at the back of the hotel. I asked why, but was given no explanation.

With the two women I marched to my room, where I sat on the bed and they took the two chairs. The woman in the blue frock announced—it was no introduction—that the other woman, who was wearing a print dress, was the directress of the hotel.

After fixing me with a hard stare, the directress proceeded to read in Russian from a two-page document. I gathered from her tone of voice the document was serious, but knowing little Russian, could form no notion what it was all about.

The directress clutched two Lincoln pennies in her left hand as she read, and at one point slapped them down on a night stand in a gesture that suggested she was proving some point.

The document having been read in Russian, the directress handed it over to the woman in blue, who I had gathered by this time was an interpreter. She read it in fair if somewhat awkward English.

I had been denounced, along with Mr. Nevin, by the residents of house No. 4, allegedly adjacent to the back of the hotel, for twice throwing fruit and American coins out the window to children, and then snapping pictures of the children as they picked up the fruit and coins.

This denunciation had been sent to the Sverdlovsk municipal council, a part of the local Communist apparatus, and the local first secretary of the party had taken cognizance of the denunciation and would protest to Vice President Nixon if I did not immediately hand over the films I was supposed to have made of the children picking up fruit and coins.

I told the women in blue who spoke English that there must be some mistake because not only had I thrown no fruit and coins to children from my window, or taken any snapshots, but I had never opened the window. I explained that I couldn't hand over something I didn't have, and went on to explain, in the hope it might help, why I had never opened the window despite the fact the room was an oven at midday.

"There's no screen on it, and I spent 15 minutes killing the flies already in the room," I said.

I inquired how the Russians who denounced me could be so sure fruit and pennies had been thrown from my window.

The woman in blue gave me a story about how I had first thrown things from the window and taken snapshots at 8 o'clock the night before, and that the parents of the children, living in house No. 4, had caught the youngsters in the very act of picking up fruit and coins and letting themselves be snapped.

The children had pointed out the windows, mine of the second floor and Paul Nevin's on the fourth floor, so there could

be no mistake and I was told I must hand over the film forthwith.

This had gone far enough for me so I barged out the door despite the attempts of the woman in blue to intercept me, and located Herbert Klein, the Vice President's press assistant, and Richard Davies, Mr. Nixon's aid on loan from the State Department. I was telling them the strange story when Mr. Nevin arrived.

The immediate analysis of the accusation and the way it had been made was that the Sverdlovsk and quite possible the Moscow newspapers planned to blast Mr. Nixon's American press entourage. Earlier incidents suggested something of the sort was afoot.

So Mr. Klein, Mr. Davies, Mr. Nevin, and myself immediately called on Assistant Press Ministry Director Popoff, who was traveling with the Nixon entourage, in his room.

He attempted to pass the thing off by saying there is an old Russian proverb that where there is smoke there's fire, and that when the films were developed everything would be cleared up.

Mr. Klein inquired whether there was likely to be a story in the Sverdlovsk newspapers the next morning, but Mr. Popoff shrugged that off with a remark that he had nothing to do with the local newspapers.

When we left Mr. Popoff's office, I went to my room, picked up all the exposed film in my bags and handed it over to Mr. Klein. If the Communists were about to forge a picture they weren't going to have my film in their possession.

Mr. Klein next contacted the Vice President, and after talking with him went back to Mr. Popoff. He told Mr. Popoff that the denunciation of me read by the woman was a total fabrication, and that if it appeared in the Russian press, the Vice President would have to consider mentioning it in his TV-radio speech in Moscow on Saturday night.

There was nothing about the incident in the Sverdlovsk or Moscow newspapers the next day. The Russian secret police, we all knew, continued to burrow for material for a manufactured blast against the American newspapermen, but up to the time we crossed the Polish border, nothing had appeared except Premier Khrushchev's canard against U.S. television.

Why I got tapped for the frameup in Sverdlovsk I don't know, and probably never shall know.

The Interstate Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, there is, as I have pointed out before, a growing concern in the State of Missouri over the failure of the Congress to provide legislation to assure the steady continuance of the interstate highway program. Illustrative of this concern are many editorials which have appeared in Missouri newspapers. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record several of these editorials.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Joplin (Mo.) Globe, May 28, 1959]

THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY DILEMMA

Congress faces a real dilemma in deciding what to do about future financing of the

Federal interstate road program. It comes up to a crisis at the start of the new fiscal year, July 1.

The choice is between full speed ahead in giving the Nation a superhighway system, and a slowdown. The problem, of course, is money.

The Federal Government pays 90 percent of the cost of the Interstate System and 50 percent of major State roads. And the Federal trust fund set up to finance it with gasoline, diesel fuel, and certain other taxes is proving inadequate as the program moves to a level of \$8 billion in expenditures. Most States have used up their allocations, or will this year and want more in order to continue. Missouri is in this category.

There are several alternatives. President Eisenhower wants to up the Federal gasoline and diesel fuel taxes $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents a gallon to $4\frac{1}{2}$ cents to keep the program on a pay-as-you-go basis, as originally planned. Congress is balking at this. Some Congressmen want to dip into the Federal Treasury again, which means more deficit financing and an unbalanced budget. Others advocate issuing Federal road building bonds, which is just another way of deficit financing at more interest cost to the taxpayers. It also opens up a new area of Federal financing, which could go off in all directions in any number of bond funds, a dangerous policy.

Of course, the program could be stretched out several years beyond the present target date of 1972 for completion of the Interstate System, but we are warned this could be costly in lives as population and traffic increase.

Some way to keep the road program on a pay-as-you-go basis, or nearly so, seems desirable. One suggestion is to sound out the people on accepting Federal car stamps, or licenses, in lieu of saddling motor fuel with a larger tax, or otherwise levying the cost against car owners.

Any way you look at it, the problem is extremely troublesome. We need the roads for the sake of the economy and the public safety. But we don't like more taxes.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, July 30, 1959]

CONGRESS PLAYS TO PUBLIC APATHY ON HIGHWAYS

As of now, at least, Congress has detected no great public demand for action on modern highways. Congressmen appear to be more impressed with public resistance to a proposed increase in the Federal gasoline tax. As a result, a majority of the House Ways and Means Committee has voted to make drastic cuts in the Federal program.

Of course the Members of Congress are supposed to be more than sounding boards of the more vocal opinions back home. They are paid for a full-time job. They should have time to get more information on problems and to give them more thought than is possible for the average voter.

But, as a practical matter, many congressmen will invariably take what appears to be the way of least resistance. The public attitude on the highway program is a very important factor. And, the public opinion polls indicate that a majority of people think they would prefer a slow-down of highway construction to any increase in the gasoline tax.

Of course neither the polls nor the mail can tell the timid Congressmen what the public reaction will be after the collapse of the program. The average person reacts according to the impulses of the moment. He can't be expected to look ahead to the consequences of congressional action or inaction. That's the business of the Congressmen.

A general shutdown of the Federal program would affect most of the people in the United States. It would wipe out jobs on

highway projects and in all the industries that supply material or machinery for highways. Directly affected would be the employees of cement plants and steel mills.

A shutdown would stop highway department work all the way from the big city freeways to the rural farm-to-market roads. Without additional money the Federal Government will be unable to make contributions to any State highway projects next year. A reduced program of the type proposed by the Ways and Means Committee would be different from a shutdown only in degree.

The average motorist would receive very little tax saving as compensation for a highway disaster. The proposed gasoline tax increase to keep the program moving is only $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents a gallon. For a motorist who drives 10,000 miles a year and gets 12 miles to the gallon the tax would add only about \$12.50 a year. It is nothing compared with the benefits in rural roads, major highways and city expressways.

True enough, the average motorist doesn't visualize the highways that could be built in the future. For use of an existing turnpike he is ready to pay an average charge of around $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents a mile. A driver who gets 12 miles to the gallon of gas pays a toll equivalent to a tax of 18 cents a gallon. The turnpike saves the motorist far more than the cost. But the man who will pay a high price for something he can use now may be only vaguely interested in the highway he could have for tax money in 1965.

Unfortunately the tax needed to build the highway would have to be a clear-cut fact years ahead of the highway. And timid Congressmen visualize motorists aroused to a frenzy over another $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents. There is no question that this is a period of widespread resistance to new taxes of all kinds.

But we have a higher opinion of the intelligence and ultimate judgment of the voters than seems to be held by most Congressmen. While people might snarl briefly over the most inconsequential tax, we believe they are capable of seeing the purpose. Some sections of modern freeways are being completed and they will give the public a demonstration of what the program means. We can't imagine many people carrying a long grudge against Congressmen who voted to build highways.

We wonder whether some Congressmen aren't more concerned over the opposition of the oil companies, many trucklines and other large special interests that think they would be hurt by a tax increase.

This highway program was launched as the biggest construction job in the history of man. The public resistance to a tax increase doesn't appear to be half as serious as the consequence of failure.

[From the Columbia Missourian, Aug. 3, 1959]

INTERSTATE ROADS

Congress finds itself on the horns of a dilemma when it comes to discussion and action on the interstate highway program.

The House Ways and Means Committee voted to extend the program over a longer period of time to lift the burden of immediate financing. Rather than vote an unpopular increase in the Federal gasoline tax to take care of the costs, the committee reported out a plan to issue highway revenue bonds and extend the termination date of the highway system for 4 years, until 1972.

The Federal Government takes care of 90 percent of the cost of the system while the individual States pay 10 percent.

Typical of probably many other States is Missouri's situation. Ready to let contracts and planning on the Federal money, Missouri has had to postpone bidding, and approximately 3,500 employees will be let out of their jobs during the next 2 months.

So Congress will be faced with these two situations: Slow down the construction, have a rise in unemployment and some inflation with the issuance of bonds, or increase the consumer's tax on gasoline from 3 to 4.5 cents and keep the program going with the employees working. One must remember the highways have to be paid for sometime.

For an election year coming up, Congress is faced with a politically injurious situation. What will be done eventually is anybody's guess.

Congress should allocate what highway money is now coming in to projects such as this rather than putting it into the general fund.

In any case, if a person is sufficiently interested (if he drives an automobile, he should be interested), a letter to one's Congressman or Senator could do much to influence his representative's decision one way or the other.

Nobody is out and out for increases in taxes, but if we are to be intellectually honest, we ought to be willing to pay for something if we want it. It may be, as with so many things in these days of installment buying, that we would prefer buying it now but not starting our payments until next year or trying to defer them indefinitely.

[From the Jefferson City (Mo.) Sunday News and Tribune, Aug. 2, 1959]

ONE WAY TO END HIGHWAY BUILDING PROGRAM DILEMMA

Any way you twist the dial, the blame for the present slowdown of the roadbuilding program in Missouri and other States must be laid squarely at the doors of Congress.

There appears to be only one solution to the problem—a major letter-writing campaign by voters to Congress to get the interstate highway construction program back on schedule.

Caught in the snarl created by Congress' inaction are such primary and urban projects as Jefferson City's Highway 50 east expressway segments and a number of other roadbuilding programs in the capital city area.

Other than the interstate projects such as Route 40 the setbacks will be only temporary.

But in the case of Jefferson City and other areas the delay will cause inconvenience and continued blight. The numerous shells of homes along the Highway 50 east expressway from the West End Fire Station to Vetter's Lane will remain at least until November.

Had the flow of Federal funds not been disrupted, this segment undoubtedly would have been under construction late this month. Bids on the project were to be opened last Thursday.

Rex Whitton, chief engineer of the State Highway Department, says his best guess is that letting of bids on the first segment will be accomplished in October. That would push the start of construction back to November.

Nor will the slowdown have any longtime effect on the second segment—running from Vetter's Lane to the present Route 50 near the Moreau River bridge.

Mr. Whitton had no alternative but to put a stop order on letting of new construction contracts. Federal funds will taper off by the end of September and until this situation stabilizes and the State knows just what funds it will receive, the dilemma will continue to exist.

Missouri's chief engineer, rated among the best in the Nation, believes the State will be able to catch up on its primary and urban roadbuilding schedule by next March.

But the interstate program is another matter.

If Congress doesn't come up with a suitable financing program, Missouri's inter-

state construction schedule will be set back seriously.

The House Ways and Means Committee has voted for a slowdown in the nationwide program. The plan, if adopted by Congress, would slash scheduled allocations to State from \$2½ billion to \$600 million in the 1961 fiscal year starting next July 1. Allocations for ensuing years would be reduced sharply below the present figures.

Part of the present Interstate Highway System financing dilemma is of Congress' own making. It voted a speedup in the program last year because of the recession. Because of this and other factors the fund faces a \$500 million deficit by spring.

Congress thus far has turned a cold shoulder toward a number of recommendations which would permit the interstate construction schedule to be carried out as at present.

The interstate highway program was advanced originally to meet not only existing and future traffic needs but to assure the Nation an adequate network of freeways in the event of war.

Obviously, Congress is not treating the program in this light at present. The House Ways and Means Committee proposal would set back the completion date 4 years at least.

If mid-Missourians and other's don't act, such a situation is likely to develop.

Mid-Missourians would do well to pepper their Congressmen immediately with letters urging a quick and sound solution to the interstate highway financing problem.

Reform Can Be Overdone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention of my colleagues to an editorial which appeared in the Northern Virginia Sun on August 12 which soberly reflects on the proposition that not all unions in this country are corrupt and that reform in the labor-management field can be overdone.

I believe that the publisher of this newspaper, Mr. Clayton Fritchey, is to be congratulated for having the courage to face up to this problem in a fair and objective manner, particularly when the overwhelming majority of the American press has gone overboard in its editorial comment in demands for legislation which clearly goes beyond the scope of antiracketeering reforms in the labor-management field.

I believe that this penetrating editorial puts the entire question of reform legislation in its proper perspective.

The editorial follows:

[From the Northern Virginia Sun, Aug. 12, 1959]

ALL UNIONS AREN'T CORRUPT: REFORM CAN BE OVERDONE

The labor bill that is the subject of the current free-for-all, no-amendments-barred debate in the House, acquires most of its urgency and impetus from the revelations by the Senate Rackets Investigating Committee of labor corruption on the part of a few unions.

For months, the headlines have focused the public's attention on the misuse of union funds by corrupt officials, on rigged union elections, on threats, intimidation, and strong-arm tactics. The normal activities of legitimate unions, not being headline worthy, have not enjoyed the same attention.

Thus, the labor bill comes up for consideration at a time when the general public is down on labor as a whole, even though the abuses have been concentrated in a small minority of unions representing but a fraction of total union membership. The public is likely to forget the steps that legitimate labor has taken to clean house, the most remarkable of which is the expulsion from the AFL-CIO of a full 10 percent of its membership because of corruption in certain unions.

As the House debates the labor bill, the cry is for reform—the elimination of the abuses and corruption disclosed by the McClellan committee. But in the antilabor atmosphere that prevails, there will inevitably be a tendency to try, in the name of reform, to enact provisions which may be aimed more at curbing the power of the legitimate unions than of the corrupt unions.

As a matter of fact, this is largely true of the three principal points of difference between the two opposing labor measures, which have to do with secondary boycotts, picketing in an effort to get management to recognize a union, and the jurisdictional no-man's land between the States and the Federal Government. Changes in the existing law on all three of these subjects have been desired by management long before and quite apart from the rackets investigation and its revelations.

These changes may be wise and needed, but they should not, in all fairness, wear the disguise of reform measures. In order not to confuse them with the true reform provisions of the labor bill on which every one can agree (those having to do with control of union funds and the democratization of union elections) the other provisions really should have been considered as a totally separate bill and debated on their own merits.

But it is too late for that now. All one can hope the House will do will be to realize that the major differences between the two competing bills before it do not deal strictly with reform, or with the corrupt unions alone. They deal with the basic labor-management power balance, and apply to all unions, the clean and the corrupt alike.

It would be tragic if a hopeless tangle over these issues were to result in a scuttling of the true reform provisions on which all might readily agree.

Recognition of Scholastic Attainment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a recent magazine editorial has brought to light an imaginative and sound proposal for encouraging educational achievement at the secondary school level.

For some months now there has been extensive discussion of ways to attain the objective of a higher level of scholastic effort, and I believe that this pro-

posal to give academic achievement the same recognition that athletic achievement now receives will be of interest to all Members of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of August 8, 1959, entitled, "Some Schools Award Letters for Brains as Well as Brawn," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post, Aug. 8, 1959]

SOME SCHOOLS AWARD LETTERS FOR BRAINS AS WELL AS BRAUN

Would it encourage interest in scholarship if students could earn a letter in the classroom as well as on the athletic field? This idea is being considered in the search for ways to stimulate scholastic attainment in the high schools, and a few schools over the country are trying out this idea. One with a long enough experience to justify some conclusions is the Sharon Springs (Kans.) High School. Sharon Springs has given scholarship letters for the last 6 years.

The scholastic letter is identical with those awarded to athletes except that it is inlaid with a small lamp representing the "lamp of learning." It is tougher to earn than those won by a halfback or tackle; a student must make all A's for a semester to win one. The four-letter man must be a rare phenomenon, although Sharon Springs seems to have produced several.

The idea is no longer regarded as an experiment. "We feel that giving the scholarship letter has definitely created more interest in scholarship," says Principal William P. Seigle, of Sharon Springs. The record bears him out. Two of last year's 25 graduating seniors were in the finals of the National Merit Scholarship Contest. In the last five annual State competitions for Kansas class B schools, Sharon Springs finished first four times and second once. Of the 94 students enrolled this year 7 boys and 2 girls earned letters for all A's the first semester. Six of the seven awards to boys went to athletes. There need be no antagonism between brain and muscle.

A more favorable attitude toward scholarship in our secondary schools is certainly needed, and, if this can be achieved by letting the students wear their grades on their sweaters, what's wrong with that?

Cotton Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Times-Picayune of August 11, 1959:

COTTON DILEMMA

U.S. agricultural officials have offered to meet with officials of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange to discuss what, if anything, may be done about the decline in cotton future trading.

Offer of the meeting probably is not overly considerate of the Department since the Government has put cotton exchanges in

this country practically out of business. Not a single futures sale was made on the New Orleans Exchange last Wednesday—the first such experience on record. Congress, it seems to us, should be in on the discussion, since it passed the business-killing legislation.

There is hardly such a thing as a free cotton market in the United States any more. Prices move along a nearly straight line from day to day, held up by the Government support price. With a large carryover at the beginning of the season August 1 and a big crop coming on, prices won't move much above the Government floor. Mills do not need to hedge their purchases (price insurance) since they know the price level will hardly change.

Since the Government takes over most of the cotton, it also holds a virtual monopoly in the export business. To get rid of excess cotton, it sells in foreign markets at about 8 cents a pound below the domestic floor price, thus making cheap cotton available to foreign mills who make cheap cloth for the world markets. Our mills can hardly compete for cloth orders abroad. Losses on the foreign sales of the raw cotton are paid by the taxpayers in general.

Congress has done a job of socialization on the cotton industry. Mr. Khrushchev probably would say the system is too cumbersome, too roundabout and expensive, and has discriminated against several segments of the industry. Having done a poor job, Congress ought to be ready to get back to the law of supply and demand, and a free market. So far, however, nothing indicates that it is ready to start undoing the damage that has been done.

The Time To Save Our Seashores Is Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. President, just over 10 years ago, Miami Beach, Fla., boasted several miles of open shoreline for the enjoyment of the public. Then came a building boom and the construction of a large number of hotels.

Today, about 2 miles of Miami Beach's 7½ miles of ocean front is open to the public. The rest is blocked off for private owners—the hotels and their guests.

Padre Island in Texas could well come to a similar fate if we do not act now. And even if the actual beaches were not fenced off, private development would ruin one of this Nation's few remaining stretches of virgin shoreline.

The people of America need a national seashore area, particularly along this section of our coast. Private development has already started at both ends of this great island. The bill I have introduced to create a national seashore park on Padre Island would not push off this private development, but it would preserve for future generations the major part of this area so rich in recreational opportunities, color, history, and legend.

Anyone who doubts what could happen needs only to visit other parts of America's coastline and see how the beaches have been used.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article by Pat Murphy which was printed in the Houston Chronicle for Sunday, August 2, 1959, entitled "Beaches Shut Off—Dizzy Hotel Boom Haunts South Florida."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BEACHES SHUT OFF—DIZZY HOTEL BOOM HAUNTS SOUTH FLORIDA

(By Pat Murphy)

MIAMI, FLA.—As gold coast south Florida's sun-loving population pours over the million mark, the ghost of a costly postwar blunder has cropped up to do some timely haunting.

This is the big beach giveaway of 1948, the year Miami Beach shook off its World War II khaki tunic and embarked on a helter-skelter hotel-building spree.

From the starry-eyed tourist's view, the staggering results—a glittering concrete cliff of breathtaking resort hotels stacked along the wave-washed shore—are magnificent.

MORE APPALLING

But to taxpayers, the sight is often more appalling than appealing.

With nothing more than building permits, builders threw up an impregnable wall along the beach, virtually barring the public from using it.

Along the 7½ miles of Miami Beach oceanfront, all but 2 miles is taken up by hotels and their private cabana clubs, swimming pools, and overhanging additions.

And the tide of concrete would have kept moving seaward had not a bitter—and sometime fantastic—controversy been touched off by a coterie of angered community leaders.

SWAMP TO PARADISE

To understand the story of Miami Beach's disappearing public beaches, one must go back to the days of Carl Fisher, the intrepid and heady visionary who transformed Miami Beach from a mangrove swamp into a paradise.

In the dizzying boom days of the 1920's, Fisher began promoting lots along the then-scattered beach areas, and offered land to those who—in those days—would dare build a hotel on the wasteland.

For the next 15 years, hotels sprouted with no apparent danger to the public's stake in the beaches. Hotels were needed to attract tourists for the benefit of the area's economy, it was argued.

On the south end of the beach, 10-block Lummus Park was built—a seaside amalgam of sand, surf and beautiful landscaping for public use.

HOTEL MADNESS

But by the end of World War II, after hundreds of thousands of GI's had discovered the beach during training days here and began flocking back, hotel madness hit.

Nowhere along Florida's 1,398 miles of coastline—longest in the Nation—did postwar building hit such a stride.

Mammoth, neon-lit hostelrys sprouted like wild vine, foundations dug deeply into the sand and clinging to the high-tide mark.

The Miami Beach City Council granted permits for the hotels to plant bulkheads just above the high water mark on their own property, ostensibly to prevent erosion of the hotels' property by the surf.

EXTENSIONS IN SEA

Then the council floated a huge bond issue at public expense and built at intervals

along the entire hotel row a series of groynes, long, narrow, pier-like extension of steel and concrete which reached from the shore to as much as 250 feet into the ocean.

Engineeringwise, these appendages were to grab sand and reclaim more beach area. But as the building spree gathered steam, and more bulkheads and groynes sprouted, it was apparent that the public was being cut off from use of the beaches.

One of the first to attack was Beach Councilman Melvin J. Richard, a young lawyer and tough political fighter who contended a land grab was being pulled on John Q. Public by fellow councilmen.

WAR DECLARED

Others joined Richard and war was declared.

Richard reached into Florida antiquity for laws under the Spanish tidal grants of two centuries ago, and contemporary laws. What he found was like a bombshell. State law was being violated, he contended.

Said the law: "Lands between ordinary high and low water marks are the property of the State or of the people of the State. They are held, not for sale, or conversion into other values . . . but for use of all the people of the State."

CARRIED TO COURTS

Richard and others carried the issue to the courts. He found that hotels and palatial residences alike had erected walls, posted no trespassing signs and had built additions to block public use between the high water mark—owned privately—and the water—owned by the public.

During the court fight, three attorneys were even jailed by a circuit judge for attempting to take the matter over his head to the Supreme Court.

The beach's city attorney at the time washed his hands of the matter and said it was a State matter to decide, despite existing law.

REFUSED TO ACT

The south Florida area's State's attorney refused to act, and would not enter the court fight as the public's representative.

Florida Gov. Fuller Warren also turned his back when asked to intervene after an injunction to prevent further absorption of the beach was filed before circuit judge Charles A. Carron in Miami.

By then, in 1950, all but a few patches of the beach had been gobbled up by hotel development, and the other was privately held property with price tags reaching as high as \$2,000 a front foot.

As a public beach, most of Miami Beach was lost, except for the few spots earmarked for public use.

ACCESS BLOCKED

Access to hotel beaches was blocked by groynes, walls or hotels themselves.

One feeble remedy was engineered: Small public beaches—some as small as 50 wide—were built at the ends of public streets between the hotels.

But by the time Judge Carroll issued a ruling that hotels had no right to public portions of the beaches where construction had been carried out, the beaches were lost. No attempt was made to have the costly architecture torn down.

The bitter fight aroused the community and the same mistakes aren't being repeated.

But public swimming areas are at a premium in this area which depends on surf-side attractions for its tourism.

PUBLIC IN A BIND

Guests at dozens of lower-priced hotels off the ocean are left to seek swimming areas far from where they might have found them.

County officials, reeling under public demands and criticism from economic forecasters, are in a bind to provide more bathing

facilities. Involved is the staggering cost of buying private land in undeveloped ocean-front areas to gain access to otherwise publicly owned beaches.

Recently, Miami Beach had to cough up nearly \$500,000 for a 450-foot chunk.

In contrast, other parts of the State planned differently and prevented a takeover of the beach areas.

FOLLOWED LAWS

Just north of Miami Beach is booming Fort Lauderdale, for example, city fathers followed the high and low water laws strictly and outlawed any hotel building anywhere on the beachside of its ocean highway.

Thus, hotels are away from the ocean, and the entire 6-miles strip of Lauderdale beach is publicly maintained and dedicated. The same is true of other east and west coast resorts.

As a civic leader recently grumbled: "Our troubles today can be traced to a failure early in our growth to make profits yield to public rights."

Forewarned Is Forearmed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excellent letter which I received from Mrs. John F. Stevens, Jr., of Brooklyn, N.Y., in which she presents her views concerning relations between the United States and the Republic of Panama. Mrs. Stevens, a member of a distinguished family, is the daughter-in-law of the late John F. Stevens, who was the chief architect of the Panama Canal and a man of exceptional talents and ability in other fields of endeavor:

BROOKLYN, N.Y., August 7, 1959.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I cannot let another day go by without thanking and complimenting you on your fine speech and eloquent plea for an immediate awakening, recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 29, which I personally consider your clearest analysis and strongest appeal to date to the people of this country for recognition of the impending danger and threat proposed by the people of Panama for a so-called occupation of the Canal Zone, to take place November 3 of this year.

There is a saying to the effect that "to be forewarned is to be forearmed." Do the people of this country thing this an idle threat, to be more or less disregarded as impossible and therefore not to be taken seriously? Do they really understand its implications and to what it might lead if not prevented?

November is very close at hand and this is a very serious situation. Surely Congress must recognize the earnest and timely warning in your speech and, as you say, "declare itself upon the question of U.S. sovereignty over the Panama Canal and Canal Zone" at once, before it is too late. You are a valiant warrior and doing a wonderful job, but this battle should not be left longer for you to worry about and fight alone.

With admiration and best wishes,

Sincerely,

HARRIETTE L. STEVENS

Mrs. John F. Stevens, Jr.

Distribution of Obscene Literature Through the Mails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. President, the Post Office Department, through the Postmaster General, has stepped up its never-ending campaign against the distribution of obscene and pornographic literature through the mails.

Not long ago I met with the Postmaster General on this problem, and together we went over the various materials and methods used by peddlers of filth material. We reached the conclusion that enlightenment of the people as to what to do when this material comes to light is the best way we can fight this evil.

I personally began a campaign several weeks ago to help stamp out pornographic material by taking to the radio and television, and by means of statements through the press and in the mails. I am happy to say this campaign is paying off. I have already been able to turn over to the Post Office Department evidence which will help postal officials track down and apprehend the offenders who, for a few dollars, would warp the minds of our children with their filth and propaganda.

In this respect I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate an editorial from the Capital Baptist, a publication of the Baptist Church here in Washington. In this editorial the editor praises the Postmaster General, Mr. Summerfield, and postal officials for their fight against the obscene and pornographic materials mail-order business.

I think this is a great example of how we can reach the people and tell them what to do when they come across pornographic materials in the mails, and thus stamp it out.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Capital Baptist, issue of June 11, 1959, entitled "Your Help Solicited," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR HELP SOLICITED

At the recent meeting of the Southern Baptist Convention a strong resolution was adopted commending Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield and other postal officials for their courageous fight against the mail order business in obscene and pornographic materials.

Last month in a major address Postmaster General Summerfield set forth some of the dangers that confront America's children, and also some of the problems involved in fighting this battle.

This is a problem that Washington Baptists need to be greatly concerned about, and so we would like to share some of the statements that were made in the following paragraphs.

"There is flourishing in this country today a vile racket of huge proportions about which the public is not too well informed.

This racket involves the use of the U.S. mails for the wholesale promotion and conduct of mail order business in obscene and pornographic materials. I say it is huge advisedly. We can estimate at present that the sale of these materials through the mails is running at more than \$500 million a year.

"The especially vicious aspect of this racket is the fact that these purveyors of filth are aiming their attention more and more at the Nation's children—teenage boys and girls, and even younger. With complete arrogance, they are violating the homes of the Nation in defiance of the Federal Government.

"They are dumping pornographic sewage into the hands of hundreds of thousands of our children, through the family mail box—most of it material that has not been ordered—material intended to solicit the sale of utterly obscene pictures, slides, films, and related trash.

"How do these merchants of filth obtain the names and addresses of children? They have any number of ways. One of the most common is to offer, in a legitimate ad in a normal publication, the sale of a product of interest to a boy or girl. This would be stamps, or model airplanes, or doll clothes, and the like. These items are frequently offered at bargain prices. The child, usually with the parent's assistance, sends for and receives the item. Now the smut dealer has the name on his list, and soon the child is receiving lewd solicitations through the mail. These racketeers also buy prepared mailing lists of children's names, of which there are many. They even go to the extent of gathering up high school year books, from which they take names and match them up with addresses in city telephone books. If you were to read some of the solicitation material that these debauched persons send to the children, I believe you would be sickened.

"Consider this, if you will, in the light of a recent report on delinquency by a Senate subcommittee. The report states that one out of every 5 boys in this country, of ages 10 to 17, has a record, charged with breaking the law. Again and again, in the investigations of armed robbery, extortion, embezzlement, and forgery, authorities find that those guilty of these crimes were early collectors of obscene pictures and films. And it is well known that almost all sex criminals and sex murderers prove to have a long record of addiction to pornographic and sadistic material. Your children may never be exposed to this material, but they could be victims of sex criminals who have been exposed to it.

"Congress, as far back as 1865, made it a Federal offense to mail obscene matter. The Post Office has lent its fullest support to all such legislation, but, nevertheless, commercialized pornography has continued to grow. It has expanded tremendously since World War II. It has doubled in just the past 5 years alone.

"Especially, as I have pointed out the effort has been to expand the market through sales to children. There appear to be two basic reasons for this rapidly growing volume: First, the huge profits realized from a relatively small capital investment; and second, the very broad definition of obscenity handed down by certain courts, notably in Los Angeles and New York, where the great bulk of the mail-order business in obscenity and pornography originates.

"These liberal rulings have established, over a period of time, virtual sanctuaries in which dealers of obscenity have operated with impunity and in defiance of justice. We in the Post Office for several years have strongly urged legislation which would permit prosecution not only on the points of mailing of obscene material, but in the communities where it is received—where the real damage is done—and where citizens have an opportunity to express their standards of morality and decency. Such legislation was

passed by the 85th Congress and signed into law by President Eisenhower last year. It is, we believe, among the most important legislation adopted in recent years.

"To make full use of this new legal weapon, however, the Post Office must have the cooperation of parents and decent-minded citizens everywhere. Without such cooperation on a broad and resolute scale, we are under great handicap. As you know, the absolute privacy of the mail is one of our basic American rights. The Post Office Department cannot, and will not, violate this right, even when it has strong evidence that the mail is being used for unlawful purpose. I, for one, believe fully in this right. The Post Office, therefore, can legally identify and take action against violators of the mails only on the complaints of citizens who receive such material.

"Let me repeat that point: We can act only after the recipient of obscene mail has opened that mail, and the material has been forwarded to the local postmaster as evidence. To achieve this cooperation on the largest possible scale, our intensified program for action is fourfold:

"1. To draw maximum public attention to the menace of this racket;

"2. To urge parents to help us apprehend the mailers of filth to their children;

"3. To help mobilize community support behind adequate law enforcement of local ordinances or State laws when these purveyors are apprehended and brought to court;

"4. To rally public opinion behind new and stiffer legislation on obscenity.

"Help us to alert parents across the country. Help us through your organizations, and your publications, and by your individual efforts. Let the parents of America know what to do on any day that obscene mail arrives in their homes. The process is very simple: First, parents should save all materials received, including the envelopes and all enclosures. Second, parents should report the material immediately to their local postmaster and turn the materials over to him, either in person or by mail.

"Finally, all citizens, whether or not their children have been touched with this filth, can help by backing up Members of Congress and local officials in their growing efforts to stamp out this evil."

A Bill To Amend the Internal Revenue Code With Respect to Scholarships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I call attention of the Members of the House to a bill I have introduced today that is designed to remedy a glaring inequity in the treatment of academic scholarships under the present tax structure.

Much has been said recently about our Nation's urgent need for more and better education. It is also generally realized that improved utilization of this country's potential manpower depends to a large extent on scholarships and fellowships. Yet, under our current tax laws, such financial assistance to students is still regarded as income for certain tax purposes, to the detriment of the recipients of scholarships and their families.

The bill I have introduced would eliminate this inequity and smooth the way for students who have demonstrated sufficient promise and application to have been awarded scholarships and fellowships.

Effectiveness of Foreign Aid Program in South Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I recently had the opportunity to read an article by Mr. Albert V. Dix, who is an official of the Dix Newspapers with publications in Wooster, Ravenna, Kent, Belaire, and Defiance, Ohio, giving his views on the effectiveness of our foreign aid program in South Vietnam.

Mr. Dix has visited South Vietnam on four different occasions during the past 5 years, and is well qualified to judge from personal observation whether or not our program has been helpful or utterly useless and wasteful.

Mr. President, in my opinion, the article by Mr. Dix is so enlightening that others should have the opportunity to read it. I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Dix be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee currently has under investigation the administration of foreign aid in South Vietnam.

The probe is the result of charges by a roving newspaper reporter of maladministration, graft, and so forth. The reporter, according, at least, to a televised report of his testimony before the committee, does not even know the correct pronunciation of the name of the president of South Vietnam, Ngo Dinh Diem.

It would be easy for anybody making a quick tour of Vietnam to get an erroneous impression. It would be easy for any newspaper correspondent, frequently frustrated in contacts with high Vietnamese officials, unskilled in and uncomprehending of the importance of good public relations, to become browned off with the place in general and to begin hunting flaws. To realize what our foreign aid, even with all the admitted mistakes we have made in its administration, has accomplished there, it would be necessary to have actually seen conditions there over the past 5 years.

Less than 5 years ago utter chaos reigned in South Vietnam.

Hundreds of thousands of refugees were pouring into already overcrowded Saigon every week from Haiphong in the north.

Terrorists still roamed the countryside and it was only with extreme danger that one ventured outside the city limits of Saigon.

The Hoa Hao and the Cao Dai, two religious sects hostile to the established government in Saigon, still had large, well-equipped armies.

There was no assurance that the Communist armies of Ho Chi Minh would not pour down over the 17th parallel, the demarcation

line set by the Geneva Treaty after the Communists defeated the French.

The French were still in Saigon. They hated the new government, and vice versa. They also hated the Americans who had come in to attempt the seemingly impossible task of establishing in Saigon a government capable of setting up some kind of order.

I first saw Saigon in the spring of 1955. I got there right at the tail end of the Binh Xuyen trouble when an army of Communist-inspired river pirates under Le Van Vien tried abortively to oust the government of President Ngo.

When I arrived the Binh Xuyen still held the building in which the central police station was located and some of their terrorists were still in the city and had the nasty habit of almost nightly tossing hand grenades into the open doors of crowded restaurants, hotels, and even residences.

Refugees filled the streets and sidewalks where every night old people died and babies were born.

Most veteran observers to whom I talked didn't give Vietnam much of a chance. Frankly, I didn't either but hoped I was wrong.

We gave our full backing to Ngo Dinh Diem. He knew nothing of the science of government and less of practical economics. But he had more than his share of courage. He was—and is—personally honest and he hated all that communism and Ho Chi Minh stood for. He had killed some of President Ngo's family. The story is he had them buried alive.

But our investment of confidence in Ngo Dinh Diem paid off.

He smashed the Binh Xuyen, captured, and executed Ba Cut thus breaking up the Hoa Hao as a strong unit, and forced the surrender and dispersal of most of the Cao Dai. Those of the Cao Dai who didn't surrender, along with their "pope," are in exile in Cambodia.

I have been in Vietnam three times since the spring of 1955.

In that relatively brief period, unbelievable progress has been made. All the hundreds of thousands of refugees have been resettled in new little communities where they are self-sufficient on small farms.

The standard of living of the people has been raised, a thing most necessary to prevent them from turning to the Communists for something better.

And a great measure of security throughout the country—except for isolated pockets—has been established.

Many other things have been done there, including establishment of better roads, better communications, better schools and better transportation.

Much remains to be done and it has now reached the stage where much of it can be accomplished and financed by Vietnam itself, with some expert technical advice.

I know of no finer, abler, or more honest gentleman in the foreign aid branch of our foreign service than Leland Barrows, head of the mission in Vietnam. Or for that matter, D. C. Laverne, his erstwhile assistant who has been sent into Laos to clean up a mess there.

Along with me, he will be the first to admit there were mistakes made. But at the outset, it was necessary to do something, even if it was wrong.

And while we are thinking this one over let's indulge in a little personal introspection.

The Republic of South Vietnam was actually born with the crushing of the Binh Xuyen in the spring of 1955. It is actually less than 5 years old. How many mistakes did we in America make in, say the first 100 years of our history.

It is well for the Senate to go into the Vietnam situation. They should familiar-

ize themselves with it, but thoroughly. I think they will agree with me that, in view of the almost hopeless task that appeared at the outset, real miracles have been accomplished.

Donald Comer Writes Daily News Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Donald Comer is one of the most outstanding leaders in the American cotton textile industry. A past president of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, he is chairman of the executive committee of Avondale Mills, whose main offices are in Birmingham, my district, and chairman of the board of directors of Cowikee Mills, also principally an Alabama concern. With all of us who are familiar with the cotton economy, Mr. Comer is very anxious lest the continued excessive importation of oriental textile products, manufactured by use of cheap labor and thus which can be sold at cheap prices, should make continued serious inroads into the well-being of our domestic cotton industry and all those associated with it, either directly or indirectly.

In a recent letter to the Daily News Record, Mr. Comer endorses the petition of the National Cotton Council to the Secretary of Agriculture to take steps to curb these excessive imports. He also names those groups who are in opposition to the petition and raises questions as to why these groups should object to the petition. Believing that this whole problem is one in which the Congress should interest itself and, in fact, one in which a great many of my colleagues do take an interest, I am pleased to include this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under leave heretofore granted.

AUGUST 7, 1959.

DAILY NEWS RECORD,
New York, N.Y.

GENTLEMEN: In your issue of August 5, I notice that there are six groups that are opposing the petition of the National Cotton Council for relief, under section 22 of the AAA, of unfair imports of cotton goods. This petition is signed by all of us who are primarily interested in cotton—the farmer, the warehouseman, the cotton merchants, the cottonseed crusher, the ginner, and the spinner.

I can't think that people who are opposing the National Cotton Council's petition understand what the problem is. Our Government pays the cotton farmer a parity price on the cotton he raises. The American spinner pays this price for some 9 million bales of the crop. The other 5 million bales are to be offered to our foreign competitors at 8 cents a pound less, which is presumed to be about the world price. The Government pays the farmers a parity price for this cotton and sells it at a loss of 8 cents a pound and the taxpayers of America, of which I am one, has to make up this loss. We of the National Cotton Council are asking that the foreign spinner not be able to take his low wages and this low price cotton

and flood our markets with goods manufactured under these unfair conditions.

Your article lists six groups who have written the Secretary of Agriculture opposing our petition. They are—

United States-Japan Trade Council. In their business of exporting they do not seem to think for a minute of the injury to a neighbor.

U.S. Council of the International Chamber of Commerce. This association has refused right along to recognize our danger and seem to be among that group who think that our industry should be expended.

Committee for a national trade policy. I would like to remind them that Secretary Hull, the father of this reciprocal trade program, said his idea was for every nation to swap with the other nations what each had in overabundance that the other nations needed.

National Retail Merchants Association. I know that some of our retail distributors are in the Orient with their buyers seeking what I presume they consider bargains for their customers over here. Of course, right now they are customers and we are not disposed to fuss with a customer, but I would like to remind them that it is our wages that buys all they sell whether it is from across the ocean or whether it is from home and if our plants are shut down whose wages will buy what they have to sell even though it comes from across the water and is cheap.

American Association of University Women. I don't know who speaks for the American Association of University Women. It certainly does not speak for my wife or my daughters, and I can't help but wonder where this decision came from, or why.

American Veterans Committee. I don't understand this group. I am a veteran. Our employees are veterans and I know that whoever spoke for the veterans does not represent us so I can't help but wonder where the authority came from for such a position, or why.

I had hoped that when the Cotton Council which represents all of us had agreed on a procedure that we would get the relief that we are entitled to from the Secretary of Agriculture. I sent you a copy of a recent letter I wrote to Assistant Secretary of Commerce Kearns in which I reminded him that back in 1933 the American mills had to pay a processing tax of 4 cents a pound which put us out of competition and broke some of us and crippled others until the Supreme Court declared the law unconstitutional. I suggested to him that we might have to go to the Supreme Court today to get rid of this 8 cents a pound discrimination which is double the original tax of 4 cents.

Yours truly,

DONALD COMER,
Chairman, Executive Committee,
Avondale Mills, Birmingham, Ala.;
Chairman of the Board, Cowikee
Mills, Eufaula, Ala.

The Army's Thesis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very important and timely editorial entitled "The Army's Thesis," which appeared in the August 12, 1959, issue of the Times and Democrat of Orangeburg, S.C. The editorial supports Gen. Lyman L. Lem-

nitzer's fight to obtain the essentials for a modern army. The Congress, by its actions on the defense appropriations bill this year, has indicated its willingness to provide some of the funds needed to accomplish this end. I hope that with the support of such able editors and publishers as Mr. Edward H. Sims and Mr. J. L. Sims of the Times and Democrat that Secretary Brucker, General Lemnitzer, and all others interested in providing our country with a strong defense posture for all eventualities will be able to convince the Congress to do even better in the next session.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Orangeburg (S.C.) Times and Democrat, Aug. 12, 1959]

THE ARMY'S THESIS

Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, recently sounded a note on military strategy which is highly significant. It concerned the possibility that military operations will have to be conducted—in the future—without resort to nuclear weapons.

As the reader probably knows, our strategy in most areas of the world, especially in Europe, has been that we would use nuclear weapons if trouble arose.

Meanwhile, talks on limiting nuclear weapons and on banning the testing of nuclear weapons have continued, intermittently, between the United States, Russia, and Great Britain. Also, there is the ultimate possibility that a ban on the use of nuclear weapons will be imposed.

This ban does not exist today; nevertheless, Lemnitzer and the U.S. Army believe that we need strong conventional forces, and should not rely too much on mass-destruction weapons, which might never be used. Certainly, they have not been used since World War II, and there have been some brush-fire wars since that time.

It is probably true that we have relied too heavily on mass-destruction weapons in recent years. Our military commanders abroad have stated that they would use these weapons in case of aggression against any of the NATO countries, for example. Yet we come to the case of Germany, and wonder what would happen if the East Germans and West Germans got into a border war.

If this occurred, and the East Germans invaded West Germany, our military commanders would then be faced with the necessity of using nuclear weapons—according to our stated strategy. Just where would we drop nuclear weapons? On East Germany?

In other words, while we cannot hope to match Soviet ground forces in Europe, it is highly questionable whether we would use nuclear weapons in all circumstances involving brush-fire wars, or limited wars.

For that reason, we agree with the Army Chief of Staff that we need a modern Army, as well as a modern Navy and Air Force. The Army, after all, bears the brunt of the burden—as far as the dying is concerned—in all of the wars.

Federal Highway Construction Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my re-

marks in the Record, I wish to insert a telegram I have just received from the Associated General Contractors and highway and heavy local unions of the State of Minnesota who, at a joint meeting, adopted a resolution urging Congress to take immediate action to provide financing for the Federal highway construction program and thus maintain the program at its present level:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
August 12, 1959.

Hon. Roy W. Wier,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Following resolution adopted at joint meeting of Associated General Contractors and highway and heavy local unions in State of Minnesota, signed as below.

"Be it resolved by members of this conference assembled at the Radisson Hotel, Minneapolis, Tuesday, August 11, 1959, That Congress take immediate action to provide financing of the Highway Trust Fund by placing all road user taxes into the Highway Trust Fund in order to maintain the highway construction program at the present level."

It is imperative that Congress, at this session, take action to see that the program is continued.

It would seriously affect the economy of the State of Minnesota and the Nation if this action is not taken.

Abe H. Johnson, vice president, Associated General Contractors Highway Division; business agents and officers of unions as follows: L. J. Gough, Operating Engineers No. 49, St. Paul; Stan Olson, Drivers Local No. 1208, St. Paul; A. P. Eberly, Drivers Local No. 221, Minneapolis; Frank Demeria, Drivers Local No. 346, Duluth; Ernest R. Lee, Carpenters No. 951-1429, Brainerd and Little Falls; Harold Veal, Laborers No. 563, Minneapolis; Victor E. Lapacko, Laborers No. 132, St. Paul; Raymond Landkamer, Drivers Local No. 487, Mankato; Richard Schmidt, Carpenters No. 1464, Mankato; Eugene Topness, State Council of Carpenters; John E. Swedberg, Laborers Local No. 563, Minneapolis; W. H. Meyers, Laborers Local No. 132, Mankato; N. K. Long, Carpenters Local No. 87, St. Paul; Leo Ruberto, Laborers Local No. 132, St. Paul; Fred J. Bauer, Laborers Local No. 132, St. Paul; Orville J. Evenson, Cement Masons No. 557, Minneapolis; John F. Horbach, Cement Masons No. 560, St. Paul; Robert Penning, Cement Masons No. 557, Minneapolis; Herbert F. Kortz, Carpenters No. 1644, Minneapolis; Joe E. Erickson, Carpenters No. 7, Minneapolis; Floyd Coughtry, Carpenters No. 930, St. Cloud; Hollis Larsen, Laborers No. 1316, Winona; Nicholas Gretz, Carpenters and Laborers, Faribault; William Bammert, Building Trades and Cement Finishers, Mankato; Dave Roe, Metalplasterers Building Trades Council; Teddy Webb, Laborers No. 563, Minneapolis; Leonard W. Snell, Carpenters No. 606, Virginia; A. W. Pryor, Laborers Local No. 1097, Virginia; Joe Babolian, Local No. 1180, Fargo-Moorhead; Mike Kelly, Laborers Local No. 580, Grand Forks-Crookston; George Reid, Local No. 1148, Austin; Fred Howie, Local No. 515, Faribault; Clarence C. Johnson, Local No. 563, Minneapolis; Pat Sweeney, Local No. 563, Minneapolis.

Oil Industry Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the oil industry is celebrating its centennial this year. The industry is and has been of incalculable importance to the progress of this country and it plays a major role in our defense program.

On August 9, 1959, the San Angelo (Tex.) Standard-Times published an article describing the significance of west Texas in the history of oil development. I ask unanimous consent that this article entitled, "West Texas Holds Big Role in Oil Centennial," be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the San Angelo (Tex.) Standard-Times, Aug. 9, 1959]

TITUSVILLE GETS SHOW, BUT—WEST TEXAS HOLDS BIG ROLE IN OIL CENTENNIAL

(By Grady Hill)

A sleepy western Pennsylvania town of 9,000 expects to play host to perhaps 50,000 people on August 27 when the oil industry celebrates its centennial.

The big show that day will be at Titusville, Pa., where Col. Edwin L. Drake on August 27, 1859, drilled in the world's first commercial oil well.

But that will be mostly a case of "queen for a day." The world-shaking petroleum "first" wrought by Colonel Drake has moved beyond Pennsylvania and even the boundaries of the United States in the ensuing century.

BIG WEST TEXAS PAYROLL

Today much of the centennial observance could well be centered in west Texas, which over the last three decades has held a major share of the spotlight in American oil development. (The Standard-Times will observe the centennial with an oil section on Sunday, Aug. 23.)

In 35 counties surrounding San Angelo the exploration, production, servicing and maintenance branches of the oil industry (aside from the refining and service station end of the immense enterprise) last year contributed 38.1 percent of that south and west Texas area's nonagricultural payroll.

Approximately \$1 out of every \$3 paid out in salaries and wages (aside from that for farm and ranch help) went to oil and gas workers.

PAYROLL \$167,497,000 IN AREA

The official figures compiled by the Texas Employment Commission district office here put it this way:

"Of the total of \$439,929,332 in calculated total nonagricultural payroll, based on required reports from employers of four or more persons, the oil industry payroll provided \$167,497,000."

The TEC also confirmed that in the actual exploration and drilling field activity current is better than it was this time last year. Over the Permian Basin (which extends into

New Mexico) there were 370 rotary rigs working last week, a higher figure than at the start of the seventh month of 1958.

Oil industry trade associations report that west Texas itself tops all other sections of the State in crude oil production today. In fact, it provided 399 million barrels of crude (and 952 billion cubic feet of natural gas) in 1958. That was 44 percent of Texas' oil output.

WEST TEXAS TOPS CALIFORNIA

The production figure, in fact, puts west Texas well ahead of California, the Nation's second largest oil producing State.

All of the development has occurred since the first west Texas commercial producer was brought in in Mitchell County in 1921 (the big strike which really sent Texas ahead came in 1923 with the Santa Rita gusher opening the Big Lake field in Reagan County just west of San Angelo).

But for the moment the spotlight turns back a century and eastward across the continent to Titusville, Pa. Thousands of west Texans have received invitations to the centennial.

TEXANS TO CENTENNIAL

Many Texans will go up for the affair, following a testimonial pig bearing messages from the Governors of 33 oil and gas States which started a trip through a pipeline last spring from Corsicana, Tex., to Titusville.

A feature will be the drilling of a new Drake test starting Monday on grounds adjacent to Drake Well Park. Drilling is scheduled to continue until August 24 when the new well will be shot. The next day the rig will move to a nearby location to remain in operation throughout the August 23-29 centennial celebration.

The Interstate Road Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, next to the question of the labor union racketeer bills, nothing has captured the concern and worry of the American people as much as the present situation affecting the interstate roadbuilding program. Thousands of people in my district alone are out of work because of the present economic crisis in this industry I was happy to join Mr. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, in his remarks on the floor last Tuesday, and hope that his program will be given early consideration by both the Public Works Committee and the Ways and Means Committee. Because of the high interest in this problem, and because of some of the facts contained in the following press release, I thought that it might be of value to other Members of the House:

WOLF CRITICIZES ADMINISTRATION FOR MISLEADING COST ESTIMATES ON THE HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Congressman LEN WOLF, Democrat of Iowa, said in Washington today, "I cannot believe that a 40 percent miscalculation by the ad-

ministration in the costs of the highway program was a simple, technical error."

WOLF said that the administration told Congress in 1956 that the total cost of the highway program would be \$25 billion. Now we are told that the costs will be over \$36 billion.

In his remarks WOLF proposed a plan which would make possible a continuation of the Interstate Highway System without increasing gas taxes at this time. WOLF pointed out that the present difficulty of the interstate highway program is a temporary one which can be corrected by using more of the revenue gained from autos, auto accessories and tires than are now being used directly for the highway trust fund. He said, "total receipts collected from excise taxes on highway road collected items are \$3.6 billion whereas only \$2.2 billion find their way into the highway fund. Over \$1.4 billion collected from excise taxes could be used to make up the deficit which the administration says will exist in the highway fund. It is sound fiscal policy to use revenues gained from a particular area of the economy to improve that area. I hope that an intelligent re-evaluation of assigning tax moneys will be undertaken by the administration."

WOLF also pointed out that the Bureau of Public Roads is presently making a comprehensive revenue and tax study of our road system which will be completed and enacted into law in 1961 and, consequently, "we should not be hasty in instituting new tax measures without the benefit of this study."

WOLF stated that he was opposed to any tax increase to make up the temporary deficit because "as is well known, it is almost impossible to remove taxes after they have once been levied. Experience teaches us that levying a tax is not a temporary fiscal measure."

"What is needed to solve the present dilemma of the highway program," he said, "is greater tax benefits derived from auto and truck receipts going directly into the highway fund during the next few years, and the enactment of the comprehensive suggestions of the Bureau of Public Roads on highway users tax in 1961."

United States-Soviet Debates on Freedom Versus Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today the country and the world looks forward with mixed expectations to the exchange visits by the President and Premier Khrushchev.

Realistically, we recognize that the visits may, or may not, contribute to a lessening of tensions and to ironing out East-West differences. In all likelihood, the settlement of such differences, if accomplished at all, will be a long-term challenge. While hoping for the best from the exchange visits, I believe we must not expect overnight changes in Communist tactics. Rather, we must look ahead to see what else can be done to resolve problems, reduce tensions, and lessen the possibility of war.

As one way of accomplishing these objectives, I believe that a series of college-level debates between teams representing

the United States and the Soviet Union would be useful. The debates would be on the theme, "Our Free Way of Life Against the Communist Way of Life," and would cover government, economics, religion, and other major topics that represent differences between our systems.

I ask unanimous consent that a proposed program, relating to the debates, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the program was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

The proposed debates envision:

1. Agreement between the United States and Soviet governments for the exchange of college teams to debate the comparative values of freedom versus communism;
2. Selection of a United States debate team (or teams) on a competitive basis;
3. Nongovernmental sponsorship for the program, with guidance by educational leadership; and
4. Selection of specific institutions (perhaps ten) within the United States and the Soviet Union for the debates.

TEARING DOWN THE IRON CURTAIN

The goals would be: (1) to combat the distortions spread about us by the Communist propaganda machine; (2) to give the Soviet people a realistic comparison of the values, objectives, methods, and achievements of the U.S. system and Soviet systems; (3) provide the American people with a clearer concept of Soviet ideas, beliefs, and other factors to better enable us to understand and attempt to resolve East-West differences.

Among the greatest benefit of such an exchange, I believe, would be the opportunity to again expose the Russian people to an un-distorted picture of the American way of life, goals, ideas, and policies of peace.

The exchange of debate teams—as a follow-up to the trip of Vice President Nixon and the Eisenhower-Khrushchev visits—too, would help to tear down the Iron Curtain. If allowed to stand, this curtain will only increase, rather than diminish, tension, fear, and the possibility of war.

REFUTING KHRUSHCHEV'S BRAGGING ABOUT SOCIALISM

Mr. Khrushchev has challenged the United States to a battle of ideas. Let's take on the Communists. I am confident we will be the victors.

The Soviet Premier has often bragged that our own system has outlived its purpose and that our grandchildren would like under socialism (in the Soviet Union, a false front for Communist dictatorship). I believe that our college debate teams can not only effectively refute this oft-repeated falsehood, but also would be able to impress upon the Russians that we—and our children—are dedicated to democratic processes, capitalism and freedom voluntarily—not through coercion of a 4-6 percent minority—such as that by which the Communist Party now dominates Russia.

VICTORY WILL BE BASED ON KNOWLEDGE, NOT IGNORANCE

I am aware, of course, that there will be those who would criticize the idea of Soviet exponents of communism coming to this country. Senator WILEY continued. However, we cannot fight an ideology through ignorance. Although we recognize that the Communists—even the leaders—do not know much of our way of life, we must also candidly admit that we, also, are too little aware of Russia's progress in recent years.

FREEDOM WILL TRIUMPH

To effectively combat this atheistic ideology, we must accept its challenges head on, analyze it, show up its weaknesses, and

provide a comparative set of facts, figures, principles, ideas and ideals by which the Russians—and the world—can make a well-reasoned judgment as to which system—in the long run—will provide the best kind of life for its people.

I am confident that our system and its ideals will triumph.

In view of the devastating effect which nuclear-missile warfare would have on the whole world, it is wiser to take the existing opportunity to debate them on ideological grounds, than ultimately meet them on battlefields.

We must realistically recognize, of course, that the cold war—even through a broader East-West exchange of ideas—is not likely to turn overnight into an era of sweetness and light. For, as yet, Mr. Khrushchev has made no sign that he is ready and willing to supplement his words of peace with real deeds.

Consequently, we must continue to remain alert, vigilant, open to negotiations, but not willing to make unilateral concessions—and keep our powder dry.

Donald Comer Writes Assistant Secretary of Commerce Kearns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Donald Comer is chairman of the executive committee, Avondale Mills, and chairman of the board of directors, Cowikee Mills, and a leader on the American textile manufacturing scene. In a recent letter to Assistant Secretary of Commerce Henry Kearns, he has pointed up graphically the problems now being encountered by farmers, ginners, warehousemen, merchants, cottonseed crushers, spinners, and men engaged in many related trades, because of the continued importation of cheap foreign textile products in excessive amounts. Believing this letter will be of great interest to my colleagues here in Congress, I am pleased to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under leave heretofore granted:

JULY 27, 1959.

MR. HENRY KEARNS,
Assistant Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KEARNS: My principal excuse for writing you again is to call your attention to the fact that the National Cotton Council composed of farmers, ginners, warehousemen, merchants, cottonseed crushers, and spinners have all asked the Secretary of Agriculture for protection against unfair cotton-good imports under the provision of section 22 of the Agriculture Act and to ask the assistance of the Commerce Department in this effort. While writing I would also like to call to your attention that ever since the AAA legislation our Government has been trying to put a sales tax on cotton in order to help pay promised farm subsidies.

At first they let cotton sell at the world market but required American mills to pay 4 cents per pound extra which they called a processing tax. This immediately put our cotton goods in an unfair competitive position with every substitute and every competitive fiber. The mills complained bitterly

and long over their growing hurt. There were some failures—two in Alabama that I know of. One in Ozard and one in Enterprise. These two mills because of inability to pay the accumulated tax were put in bankruptcy by the Federal Government and sold at auction. This situation was only cleared by the Supreme Court declaring the tax unconstitutional. Today the Government has changed their tactics. They have fixed a so-called parity price for cotton which the American mills have been paying. The foreign mills largely refused to pay this price and millions of bales of cotton accumulated in our warehouses.

In those early days the foreign mills had to have about half of their wants supplied by American cotton but because the parity price was considerably higher than the world price the foreign demand for American cotton has shrunk to about one-seventh. This artificial high price for American cotton is not only killing the foreign market but is encouraging the growing of cotton in every other country in the world. The Department recently has been offering our accumulated cotton to the rest of the world about 6½ cents under the parity price. They are proposing now to make this 8 cents beginning August 1, and they are not protecting the American spinner from the return in this country of goods made from this cheaper cotton to say nothing of his cheaper wages.

By some hocus-pocus we are now burdened with 8 cents instead of 4 cents. Instead of taxing me 4 cents they give my competitors a bonus of 8 cents. Since the Supreme Court threw out the 4-cent law it seems to me we should go to them now for our rescue from this second double threat to our life. Could your Department suggest the best way to start such a procedure?

Yours very truly,

DONALD COMER.

Excerpts From Address of Dr. Mordecai W. Johnson, President of Howard University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on February 12 of this year, Dr. Mordecai Johnson, president of Howard University, made the Lincoln's birthday address before the joint convention of the Michigan Legislature.

There is no man living better qualified to speak of Abraham Lincoln than Dr. Mordecai Johnson. The son of slave parents he, like Lincoln, has devoted his life to all the people of this country. He has been teacher, preacher, YMCA worker, and educator. In 1922, when he was only 32 years old, he delivered a commencement address at Harvard University, which is still remembered. Its title was "The Faith of the American Negro."

It gives me pleasure to offer for printing in the Appendix of the Record excerpts from Dr. Johnson's Lincoln's Birthday address of 1959. The whole speech should be included, for it was a magnificent one. Space problems alone have forced me to excerpt from it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Dr. Johnson's speech be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AN ADDRESS ON ABRAHAM LINCOLN BY DR. MORDECAI W. JOHNSON, PRESIDENT OF HOWARD UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON, D.C., BEFORE JOINT CONVENTION OF THE MICHIGAN LEGISLATURE, FEBRUARY 12, 1959

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cramton, distinguished members of the senate and house of the great State of Michigan, I am deeply grateful to you for the privilege which you give me today of joining you in meditative appreciation of our great leader, Abraham Lincoln—the man whose name is the greatest of all names connected with popular government in the history of the world. I have come to you today, bearing in my heart a deep sense of personal indebtedness to this man, for I am a child of slaves. My father was a slave and my mother was born a slave. Both of them were set free by Abraham Lincoln. Along with the deep sense of debt which I bear in my heart toward him is another which is akin to it, namely, the sense of debt which I bear toward you and for your kindred in this State who, under the leadership of Abraham Lincoln, made so very large an investment of devotion and suffering in that cause which made it possible for us to be free. I know that if that humble minority to which I belong could be aware that I am here today they would want me to tell you that they will never forget these things. They will remember the name of Abraham Lincoln and the citizens of these free States as long as they live, and they will cherish these revered memories and hand them down to their children and their children's children until the end of time.

I want to thank the members of this senate and house because your interest in this minority is still vibrantly alive. In recent years you have responded in a wonderful manner to the leadership of the Honorable Louis C. Cramton in the house, by crossing all party lines to establish a Fair Employment Practices Act in this State, which undertakes to provide an open door of economic opportunity for every citizen, regardless of his race, creed, color, or national origin. Several years ago I had the privilege of coming here to attend a banquet which was given in honor of Mr. Cramton, at which time outstanding members of this body and your distinguished Governor heaped honors upon him for his diligent and unwearied devotion to the passage of this Fair Employment Practices Act and for the outstanding character of his devotion to the public good. My heart throbbed with joy at this banquet, for I have known and loved Mr. Cramton for 32 years. He is the best living example of Abraham Lincoln whom I know of in this world.

In undertaking to talk with you about Abraham Lincoln today I must approach him from that angle of his life which interests me most deeply. I am a teacher of young men and women. Among my graduates who give me greatest pride are a few who have become distinguished servants of humanity in the field of the public life. I am always searching for those qualities in men of distinction which have proved effective in the public life, hoping to be able to speak with my students about those qualities in such wise as to cause them to study and to reflect upon them, with the purpose of making these qualities a part of the basic ingredients of their lives. Of all the men in the public life of the world who have deeply impressed me in this respect, Abraham Lincoln is one who grows on my affections year

by year. The qualities of his heart and mind are remarkable, beyond measure, in their fitness and power to sustain and to transform the institutions of the democratic public life. Now if you will remember that this is a schoolteacher and a child of slaves talking with you, having perhaps a bigger message in his heart than he is able fully to articulate, you will try to think with me as I speak. In this way your own intuitions will supplement what I have to say and may turn an otherwise stumbling effort into a matter of power.

THE FIRST PERIOD OF LINCOLN'S LIFE, 1809 TO 1854

The great work of emancipating the slaves and the preservation of the Union, for which Abraham Lincoln will be remembered throughout the ages, was done in the last of the three periods from 1861 to 1865, and the decisive political events preceding this great work were brought to pass in the period from 1854 to 1860. It has been customary to pass over this first period of 45 years in a cursory manner as if it were really of very little importance. It appears that Abraham Lincoln himself rather thought of it in this way. He was a man who spent very little time thinking about the days of his boyhood and early manhood. When people tried to make a great deal of it, he said, "Why, it is a great folly to attempt to make anything out of me or my early life. It can all be condensed into a single sentence, and that sentence you will find in Gray's Elegy—"The short and simple annals of the poor."

But there was a whole lot more to the life of Abraham Lincoln in those first 45 years than he himself took time to mention. For in those 45 years this man developed by his own efforts one of the most powerful groups of qualifications for political leadership ever to be found in history. These are the qualities which made him the power that he was from 1854 to 1861, when he became President of the United States, and which led him in the years 1861 to 1865 to become the emancipator of the slaves and the preserver of the Union.

A VIVID AND POWERFUL ETHICAL DISPOSITION

Now what are these qualities? First of all, Abraham Lincoln developed in those early years a vivid and powerful ethical disposition which he made radically applicable to every human being whom he touched—whatever his race, color, creed, sex or national origin—and he extended it even to animals. He was especially sensitive in the presence of cruelty, either to men or animals, and often found it impossible to pass by an animal in distress.

This was no quality merely given to him. Maybe the greatest part—the instinctive part—was given to him, but he cultivated the rest of it deliberately and thoughtfully. He had the same experience that most of us have when we pass by a man or an animal suffering from cruelty or distress. He got a message from his heart, which told him: "This is your kinsman and he is hurt. Are you going to help him?" Again and again in his life he tried to pass by, but again and again he would come back deliberately, thoughtfully, and help that man or help that animal. He kept this up constantly until it became an habitual disposition of his life, and it never weakened until the day he died. He was never able to look on cruelty complacently. He was never able to look at men and women who suffered from any unjust cause without feeling identified with them. This is where he got his great conviction that slavery was wrong, that the cruelty connected with slavery was wrong, that a cruel thing like this had no business to exist on this earth, and that somehow or other it ought to be done away with. There is no place on record where he never said anything different from that. He said it over and over again, because it was a considered judgment,

arising from the heart, confirmed by the reflections of deliberate intelligence, and nourished as a part of his life.

A THOROUGH ACCEPTANCE OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

In the second place, Abraham Lincoln was a man who had a thorough grasp of the meaning of the Declaration of Independence, and he accepted the radically transitive universal ethics of that Declaration of Independence with all his heart. I do not mean merely that he accepted it intellectually. He accepted it as a part of his very being. Abraham Lincoln had one of the most precious habits that a man can have in this world—the habit of prolonged aloneness in meditation and in thought. Being impressed by the language of the Declaration of Independence for example, he would go off with it by himself, or he would sit alone by the fire when there was no one at home but himself or when other people were sleeping. Then, wrapping his long legs around the chair and putting his arms on the back of the chair, he would read the words alone, asking himself, "Now, just what was it that these men had in mind when they wrote these words? Of all the politically significant words written on paper, these were the most precious to him:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that, whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter it or to abolish it, and to institute a new government."

These words he turned over and over in his mind until the spirit of them possessed him through and through, and until he felt the electric possibilities of them in all the aspects of his being—intellectual, moral, and spiritual. Of these words he said, "I have never had a feeling politically that did not spring from the sentiments embodied in the Declaration of Independence . . . which gave liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but I hope to the world, for all future time. It was that which gave promise that in due time the weight would be lifted from the shoulders of all men."

Whenever you hear him speak about "The Union" this is what he is talking about. He is never talking merely about the physical union of men in the physical territory of the United States. He is talking about that Union "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal"—the most hopeful community of life, the most powerful community of life, the most creative community of life in the world. And when he said that, above all things, he wished to preserve the Union, this is what he meant. He felt that these words of the Declaration of Independence were the electric cord sweeping through the entire Declaration of Independence, the foundation and inspiration of the Constitution of the United States, and that there was no cruelty, no evil, no neglect of human rights or human welfare that could long endure in the presence of their moving and cleansing power.

A MASTERFUL POWER OF COMMUNICATION

In the third place, Abraham Lincoln acquired in early life a masterful power of communication. In all the history of public political speech there is no man in this country who ever had a greater power than Abraham Lincoln. It was an intellectual power, because he was a thoughtful man who gathered his facts and arranged his arguments with great care. He carefully studied grammar. He studied the language of the Bible and pondered it and absorbed it in his system. He studied mathematics, not in order

that he might become a mathematician, but that he might reason precisely, consecutively and with a clear and powerful relatedness. But there was something more than intellectual power in his speaking. There was a moral power and often persuasive moral beauty in what he said. He respected and loved the people to whom he was speaking. He believed in the capacity of the most ordinary man to understand the most profound ethical and political truths, if he needed them for his life. And when he spoke to such men he was not making an oration of words. He was speaking what he deeply believed. He was speaking directly and simply as if the fate of the world were depending upon his being understood. Sometimes when he spoke his rugged, melancholy face would light up like a lamp and throw a glow of persuasive beauty to the very ends of the auditorium. People loved him, believed in him, flocked to him because he bought their allegiance with the gold of sincerity and clarity that came to them from a pure heart.

HABITUALLY SIMPLE AND TRUTHFUL IN INDIVIDUAL RELATIONS

Another of his great qualities—the fourth—was his habituation of himself in his actions to simple and truthful relationships with individual human beings. You can see this nowhere better than in his practice of the law. If a client had a crooked or an unjust case, he would not take it if he knew it beforehand. If he took the case and found out afterwards that the cause was crooked or unjust, he would do everything consistent with the law to get out of it. He was helpless to use his best powers in the presence of the necessity to defend cruelty or crookedness. But if you had an honest case, very often the first thing he would try to do was to see whether he could adjust it without going into court, and especially if the case involved cruelty and injustice, he would put his whole life and soul into that case. He would address himself to the jury in simple, direct and unadorned speech, and when he came to the cruelty involved, his language would sometimes burn with a fire of indignation as if to scorch the very ground on which he stood. And when he had finished, what did he charge you? Just about what it would take to buy the groceries and to take care of the most ordinary expenses of living. He did not take your case for the accumulation of money. He took it for the joy of setting things right, for the privilege of being vehicular toward the establishment of justice.

A SENSE OF HAVING GREAT UNSPENT POWER

Along toward the end of this preparatory period of his life, the fifth quality developed within him, which is remarkable to think about: he developed a sense of having great unspent power and a sense of melancholy distress because that power in him had never had a chance to be used up fully in some great cause. He walked about conscious of that power and with the feeling that some day the occasion would arise when he would use it for everything that he had in him. He respected that occasion and looked toward it, afar off, with melancholy hope, and because he respected that far off occasion, he never would sell his powers cheaply. He would not sell them for money. He was a poor man and the powers he had could have made him a great corporation lawyer and could have gotten him riches quickly, if he had gone to the big city; but he knew that what he had was too precious for money and he would not sell it so. He would not sell it either in order to cheat people out of their votes. In the first election in which he ever sought office, he said simply, "I am humble Abraham Lincoln. I have been solicited by my friends to become a candidate for the legislature. My politics are short and sweet. I am in favor of a national bank. I am in favor of the internal

improvement system and high protective tariff. These are my sentiments. If elected, I shall be thankful; if not it will be the same." And although he went to the State Capitol 3 times and to Congress once, as the elected representative of the people, he quit them both with very great dissatisfaction of heart, because he was occupying political power and moving about among men who accepted political power without having any great cause at stake. For him to be in political office with no great cause to use up his powers, was too cheap an occupation. He did not like it. He did not want it. He stayed at home, nourishing his powers, waiting for a great and worthy day to come.

Now I want to suggest that here in this preparatory period of his life Abraham Lincoln developed five of the greatest possible human qualities. (1) A vivid and powerful ethical disposition, livingly applied to every type of human being, urging him to respect them, to deal truthfully with them and to allow his compassion to go out to them whenever they were cruelly treated or left alone with struggles that they could not endure; (2) A wholehearted devotion to the Declaration of Independence, so that the city of justice which he saw when he read it, lived in his mind's eye like a city built by God. He longed to be of great use to that city, and would rather have died than to have betrayed it; (3) remarkable powers of communication: Simple and direct speech to people whom he loved, unadorned and never mixed with deceit; the marshalling of facts accurately and honorably, the drawing of conclusions with inexorable logic; reverent of truth, and at times throbbing with a passionate devotion to justice which caused his face to radiate with hope and expectancy; (4) a sustained habit of simplicity and truthfulness in his everyday actions affecting ordinary people. When he practiced law in a circuit of 14 different counties, he met and served a multitude of men whose names were without celebrity of any kind. He saluted them with courtesy, served them truthfully and honorably, loved them and enjoyed their trust. They called him "Honest Abe" and knew that he was a man who was utterly reliable, who when he gave his word meant what he said and would do it, whatever it cost him in time or effort or money; (5) a great sense of power residing in him—intellectual power, moral power, spiritual power locked up with an immense energy of devotion—but power waiting for a great and worthy occasion of use, not to be sold cheaply, not to be used for the heaping up of money, nor merely to buy high office. There was only one piece of goods he wanted most eagerly to buy—a great cause that would consume his powers as a great fire consumes wood. That cause came to him in 1854 when the Missouri Compromise was repealed. The whole country was shocked with a sense of crisis that swept like wildfire into every State of the North and it swept into the heart of Abraham Lincoln. He knew that his hour had come. At once he laid aside everything and straightway went where he could place himself at the disposal of a powerful inward necessity to strengthen the people in this crisis, for the life and death struggle between slavery and the Union which he loved.

SECOND PERIOD OF LINCOLN'S LIFE—1854-60

One who reads the history of the second period of Abraham Lincoln's life, from 1854 to 1860 will find him giving an unparalleled devotion to political action. First of all, he made a decisive change in party allegiance. In the history of parties in this country there is nowhere a record of devotion superior to that which this man Lincoln put into the building of the Republican Party between the years 1854 and 1860. In this

undertaking he subordinated entirely his personal ambition to hold political office.

UTMOST USE OF HIS POWERS OF
COMMUNICATION

He put all of his remarkable powers of communication at the disposal of his cause. He sought out and obtained direct confrontation with Douglas, the greatest proponent of slavery, and conducted a series of debates with him, which turned out to be one of the most determinative debates ever carried on in the world. He took the program of the Republican Party and expounded it from every helpful angle that deep moral conviction and logic could conceive; he defended it from every angle that sincerity and logic could command, until by his convictions and his thought he had established it in an impregnable and persuasive position.

COMPASSION FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE SOUTH

Now I come to the third and last period in the life of Abraham Lincoln. In this period I wish to concentrate attention entirely upon a quality which first appeared in the early days of his conflict with the slave system, but which reached its greatest development only in this third period; namely, his compassion toward the people of the South.

In the earliest days of Abraham Lincoln's fight against slavery he learned how to do what is almost impossible: How to fight an evil cause without entertaining malice and enmity toward the men who support that evil cause. He hated slavery but he never hated the slaveowners or the people of the South as a group. When he agreed as he did agree that the Constitution required him to leave slavery alone in the Southern States, he did not agree to this merely for the sake of taking a political position. He agreed to it because he believed in the righteousness of this position and because he intended to be loyal to it. Abraham Lincoln did not feel that the people of the South were different in any fundamental respect from the people of the North. He did not feel that they supported the slave system, because there was some peculiar element in their human makeup which inevitably required them to do this. He knew that the people of the South had not hatched the slave system. The people of the North were just as much responsible for the development of the slave system as the people of the South. Moreover, he knew that there were hundreds of thousands and even millions of white people in the South who held no slaves, and would like to get rid of the slave system, but now that the slave system had come to be the only working economic system in the South, they did not know how to get rid of it. He was not sure that he himself would know how to get rid of the slave system if he were then so situated in the South. Instead of hating the southerners, therefore, his compassion went out to them with a loving heart. He knew that the slave system was injurious to them as well as to the Nation, and he wanted to bring it about some day that they would be in a position to put the slave system aside, and to unite freely in their hearts with their brethren of the North in support of the Union. He wanted to keep them in the Union so that a Union committed by majority leadership to the proposition that all men are created free and equal could be decisively helpful to them in working out a way to overcome the slave system and to establish complete freedom from it in their institutions and in their hearts.

One of the most beautiful things about Abraham Lincoln's thinking during this period of his life was this: that although he was obliged to approve the taking of arms, and to justify and to carry through the killing of men in battle, never did he, under any circumstances, allow the actualities of war to alter his compassion for the people

of the South or to harden him into hating them or into despising them. When, on the one hand, some of his advisers urged him to despise them and to let them go their evil ways into secession, and when, on the other hand, some of his advisers urged him to take advantage of the secession, to break his personal and his party pledges and vindictively to free the slaves in spite of the Constitution to the contrary, his answer was always substantially the same, "I will not do it. They are still members of the Union. It is my purpose that they shall remain so. If we keep faith with them and do our full duty in bringing the expansion of slavery to an end, we can eventually find a way to do away with slavery in their midst, with their consent and cooperation. In all these matters I am the one who is responsible, and I must have some principle of my own to act upon. It is my duty to do this and I will do it."

Not only did he persist in his compassion, he reached out his hand in loving solicitude, endeavoring to persuade them. "Brothers," he said in effect, "you have made a great mistake. You have seceded from the Union, which is precious to us all. You have taken up arms against your country in order to advance a cause which will destroy the Union. You would not have done this but for the evil influence of the system of slavery on your institutions and in your hearts. Come now, give up the slaves. I will have the Government of the United States compensate you with money in full for every slave that you give up." This was the length to which compassion took him and held him until the day when he met the Captain of Eternity in a decisive way.

When the war was over and the victory was won, and when his advisers wanted to know, "Whom shall we seek to hang; upon whom shall we lay the retribution of death?" "Nobody" was the answer of his compassionate heart. "These are our brothers. Tell them the gate is open. Let them come home and let us work together for the rebuilding of the Union."

Do you tell me that the history of the United States says that slavery was abolished and the Union was preserved by the victory of the Civil War? I tell you it is not so. There was one place in America where the slave was always free; there was one place in America where the Union was never broken—there in the heart of Abraham Lincoln. That is why we love him, black and white, North and South. That is why they love him in every nation in the world. That is why they will love him a thousand years from today. For he was liberty. He was Union. He was freedom.

"O, God, what can we ask Thee?
That in every legislature in the land,
In every Governor's chair, and in
The White House itself,
Again and again we may have
One more man like Abraham Lincoln."

War on Corruption Is Job for Labor,
Business, Bar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure today of introducing into the RECORD an article prepared by Mr. Robert F. Kennedy, chief counsel of the

Senate Rackets Committee, which was written for United Press International.

It is extremely interesting to me to observe that while we have been debating labor-management reform legislation here in the House of Representatives for the last 2 days on the basis of abuses within the labor movement itself, Mr. Kennedy points out very forcefully that the abuses have been just as shocking on the part of employers and employer groups.

Under the guise of labor reform, those who have traditionally found the legitimate labor movement an obstacle for their plans to completely exploit the American worker have tried to deny the working men and women of this country the legitimate tools they need to carry out their collective bargaining.

I am pleased to learn that Mr. Kennedy, who undoubtedly is one of the great authorities in this country in the field of labor-management abuses, at the very outset points out that the AFL-CIO has moved vigorously and effectively to deal with this problem within its own ranks.

I trust my colleagues will ponder the full significance of Mr. Kennedy's observations as we move toward a final vote on legislation in this vital field of labor-management relations.

The article, which appeared in the Northern Virginia Sun on August 12, follows:

WAR ON CORRUPTION IS JOB FOR LABOR, BUSINESS, BAR

(By Robert F. Kennedy, chief counsel of the Rackets Committee)

WASHINGTON.—In 2½ years, the Senate Rackets Committee has heard a parade of witnesses who have told stories of theft, extortion, doubledealing—or other forms of man's mistreatment of his fellow man.

A great deal of this kind of testimony has led some people to the conclusion that the fault lies solely with labor. Nothing could be further from the truth. The committee has looked into relatively few unions, and where corruption has been shown, the AFL-CIO has often moved vigorously and effectively to deal with the problem. The expulsion from the AFL-CIO of the Teamsters and Bakery, Confectionery Workers unions are two such examples.

At the same time, the committee has looked into some 50 companies and corporations. No business group has yet to take any action comparable to that of labor against these business enterprises which have been shown to have engaged in unsavory practices.

In addition, we have had a number of lawyers about whom there has been serious derogatory information. Some lawyers have invoked the fifth amendment before the committee. Yet bar associations have yet to take the first action against any of these offending members of the legal profession.

The corruption we have uncovered weaves from labor to management to lawyers to all segments of our society. This is not labor's problem any more than it is management's or the taxpayer's problem. It is a problem that strikes at every one of us; this corruption is a problem for all of us as Americans.

The committee of necessity has had to explore the seamy side in the field of labor-management relations, but a great many people showed great courage and we should not lose sight of their brave fight against tyranny and corruption.

James Luken of Cincinnati is such an example. A leading Teamster official, he pro-

vided a marked contrast to the 100 fellow Teamster leaders who appeared before the committee and invoked the fifth amendment. He testified forthrightly about his fight with James R. Hoffa since he became head of a milk wagon drivers local in Cincinnati, and then head of the joint council there.

He told without dramatics the threats to his life—how a hearse showed up at his house one day to pick up his body; how flowers were sent to his funeral.

He told of his bitter fights with William Presser, the president of the Ohio Conference of Teamsters, whom the committee has labeled corrupt. He related how Hoffa told him: "If you want to get ahead in the Teamsters in Ohio, you take orders from Bill Presser. He's my man." When Presser appeared before the committee he invoked the fifth amendment.

The committee has found that the mark of corrupt leadership is its affinity for close relationship with employers; the frequent sellout of union members. In Ohio, where the contracts are higher than the Hoffa-negotiated Michigan contracts, Luken and his associates have had to fight "side deals" executed by Hoffa with large trucking companies, to the detriment of the members. In New York, where the contracts are far superior to those negotiated in the Midwest, Teamster official Tom Hickey stood his ground against Hoffa in 1954 and won for them wage increases far in excess of what Hoffa had told the large motor carriers they could settle for.

Luken and Hickey are but two examples of the majority of teamster officials throughout the country who are honest and who devote their energies to the improvement of conditions of their fellow workers.

One of the committee's most inspiring witnesses was John McNiff, a 23-year-old lawyer whose New York group took up the cause of thousands of Negro and Puerto Rican workers, working for sweatshop wages and under sweatshop conditions in small manufacturing plants in New York.

He found part of the root of the problem was corruptly led locals of the old UAW-AFL (now the Allied Industrial Workers Union). But he also found that for every crooked labor leader there was a greedy employer, only too eager to do business at the expense of his workers and in the interest of his higher profits. McNiff's fight was made much harder by the attitude of these employers who maintained that the signing of "sweetheart" contracts was just part of routine business practices.

McNiff's forthright fight brought from Arizona Senator BARRY GOLDWATER the comment that his testimony was by far the most outstanding I have listened to in 5 years of labor hearings.

Daniel E. Conway, Joe Kane and others fought against the leadership of James Cross, head of the Bakery and Confectionary Workers, which was expelled from the AFL-CIO because of his corrupt leadership. They went one step further and set up a new bakery union under the wing of organized labor and governed by its ethical standards.

There are numerous other stories: Amos Renker, the rank-and-file Teamster leader in Joplin, Mo., who has fought the autocratic rule of the local's secretary-treasurer Floyd Webb. When seven employees of a trucking company in Joplin protested the way they were treated and sent a petition to Hoffa, he sent it back to Webb. Soon thereafter, one of the protesters was brutally beaten with a ballpeen hammer. The local's complicity in the matter was admitted when it paid a large settlement to the victim—but out of the dues of the local's members. Renker came to Washington despite threats in Joplin to keep his mouth shut.

Mrs. Nancy Dawson, the pretty 32-year-old Detroit overall company owner who fought back when a mob-backed company entered into competition with her. She received numerous threats before her testimony, which at one point forced her to go into hiding for a week. But she came to Washington and told her story.

The rank-and-file members of the operating engineers union in Long Island, who have fought the dictatorial control of the Dekoning machine, father and son, at risk of their livelihoods and their lives.

These people have faced great obstacles, but they have met the test of courage.

U.S. Engineers View Soviet Exhibition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as we recall, the Soviet exhibit in New York closed on August 11.

For the first time since the World's Fair in 1939, the exhibit gave American viewers a chance to see displays of technological and cultural progress of the Soviet Union.

We recognize, of course, that the Soviet exhibit left a wide variety of impressions upon U.S. viewers. Some felt it overemphasized the scientific and technological developments in Russia; others thought that the displays were based on hopes of things to come, rather than existing progress—even though the exhibits did contain some evidence of devices presently in operation; still others were impressed by the fact that, although progress in the Soviet Union is substantially behind the United States in many fields, they have come a long way in recent years.

In this scientific-technological age, the Soviets—not only at the exhibit, but in their international dealings—heavily emphasize the progress that they have made in these particular fields. Consequently, I believe it is particularly enlightening to get an engineer's view of the Soviet exhibition.

The August edition of American Engineer contained a thoughtful article entitled "U.S. Engineers View of the Soviet Exhibition." The article contains U.S. engineers' evaluations of the Soviet exhibition. To give my colleagues the benefit of their authoritative views on the display, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. ENGINEERS VIEW SOVIET EXHIBITION

(In the next 15 years the U.S.S.R. will rise to first place in the world, not only for the overall volume of production but also for per capita output.—The 21st Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.)

For the first time since New York's World Fair in 1939, Americans this summer are getting a chance to view a display of the

technological and cultural progress of the Soviet Union.

Here, spread out on three floors of the New York Coliseum are the achievements—or, in some cases, the would-be achievements—which the 21st Congress of the Communist Party boasted last winter would be the forerunner of accomplishments that would bring the people of the U.S.S.R. the highest living standards in the world.

Accompanied by five members of the New York State Society of Professional Engineers, the American Engineer toured the \$12 million show last month to get a firsthand look at the engineering aspects of the Soviet Exhibition. Taking part in the tour were Herbert F. Roemmele, director of alumni relations and placement officer at Cooper Union; A. G. Kandoian, vice president of International Telephone and Telegraph; E. R. Smoley, consultant in petroleum and chemical engineering; W. J. O'Donnell, chief engineer, Applied Research and Development of Republic Aviation Corp., and William Wocken-fuss, consultant in mechanical engineering.

What the group found was not so much an exhibit of Russia today—although there was ample evidence on this score—but more of what the Soviets hope to have in the future. A future which the Russians see becoming a reality within the next 15 years.

Everything from fur coats and the latest clothing fashions to television sets and electronic gadgets fill the three floors of the colosseum. But the big pride of the Soviet exhibitors appears to be their technological and scientific displays which overflow the second floor. Clustered around a huge chrome-plated exhibit of spunk models are machine tools, models of drilling rigs, steel mills and super airliners plus dozens of electronic gadgets, navigational devices, and chemical displays. Practically every available inch of the floor is crammed with some item, or some planned product of the Russian technology.

The engineering and scientific exhibits are handled artfully, with a self-technique not too far removed from Madison Avenue. English language tapes play constantly, describing the more technical aspects of the exhibits. It is obviously a show geared to the general public rather than an attempt to present the technical engineering achievements to American engineers and scientists.

Here's the way one member of the New York group, E. R. Smoley, summed it up:

"The show really isn't designed to present engineering materials to engineers or scientific materials to scientists, but rather to give the general public a sales talk on what they are doing and what they are trying to do.

"It's really what they are trying to do . . . actually they are showing the future . . . they are talking about what they hope to do by 1965 and their exhibits and models are models of the future as much as anything else."

Another member, W. J. O'Donnell, spotted the same preoccupation with the future in the housing display:

"They present what they have accomplished to date, but they are trying to show where they are going in housing. The models are all models of the future housing around the Moscow area."

Mr. Smoley saw it as a "contest of the future." "They are selling themselves and their way of doing things for the future."

The exhibit, of course, was by no means limited to the Russian's hopes and dreams. There was plenty of tangible evidence of present-day products and achievements scattered throughout the show—automobiles, tools, television sets, radios, space satellites. Mr. Wocken-fuss got this general impression of the show:

"I think the show was almost spectacular from the point of view that 40 years ago they

had hardly anything and now have almost everything in process and some of it in actual production. They have made tremendous strides but I believe they still have a few years to go before they equal the quality of our products."

The technicians and engineers who guided the NYSSPE group through the exhibit were perhaps as interesting as the show itself.

Dean Roemmele was particularly impressed with this aspect.

"I was rather impressed with the fact they did not dodge any questions and tried to go out of their way to tell us important facts. * * * On the whole I thought we were well received.

The Russians appeared especially proud of a display of machine tools, several of which operated by punch cards and tape. However, Mr. Wockenfuss, a consultant in mechanical engineering, described the tools as "standard" products. "Nothing exceptional on any one of them. Relatively crude by our standards."

While the New York group looked on, one of the machine drills, operated by tape, stubbornly refused to function properly. After a couple of adjustments by the embarrassed Soviet technicians, the machine went back to work and obediently etched out the word "peace" on a metal block.

The Soviets devoted a large part of the display to electronic units. Much of this was in the consumer area—television sets and radios. Among the exhibits was an impressive working model of a Russian airport with the latest in navigational devices. Tiny jet models take off and land while radar instruments plot the course of the plane. Spectators could listen in on the tower instructions by means of telephones located around the model.

After viewing the exhibits, Mr. Kandoian, the ITT engineer, said he believed the Russian's state of art in the electronic field was beginning to be comparable to that of the United States. He described the radios and television sets on display as "very good," but not too different from the sets in the United States and Europe.

Mr. Kandoian noted that the cheaper sets had printed wiring, while the more expensive models used hand-soldered wiring. He also said the Russians appeared to be farther behind in providing overall nationwide telecommunications and in the use of microwave techniques.

"The ability to get television throughout the country is apparently limited," Mr. Kandoian commented. "Most of it is concentrated around Moscow and the big cities."

"But they are beginning to bridge the gap in electronics * * * whether or not they will continue to forge ahead is anybody's guess," he said.

Boris Fedjuk, who identified himself as an engineer in the Moscow Television Laboratories, led the group through the electronics display. Speaking flawless English, Mr. Fedjuk was often high in praise of the products he was describing.

Once he flatly stated that the Russian television sets were superior to U.S. models and lamented the fact that the United States and other Western nations were not buying them. Later he was asked how the printed circuits in some of the cheaper sets could be repaired. He replied the sets were "twice as reliable" as the U.S. sets because the Russian Government maintained strict quality control.

Russian advances in space and aviation were depicted in a series of elaborate models. The displays, however, were not overly revealing from an engineering standpoint.

Mr. O'Donnell, from Republic Aviation, had this to say on these exhibits:

"They actually didn't show very much in these models. Of course, we know they

have a good aircraft. In fact they have their TU-114 right out here at Idlewild Airport." (It carried the Russian Minister Frol Kozlov to the exhibit in an 11-hour trip, nonstop from Moscow.)

"We also know they have large rocket engines and this has enabled them to do things earlier (in the space field) than we could since they could use cruder electronics in their space vehicles. You might say they did it by the 'brute force' method."

Mr. O'Donnell, however, described the actual exhibits in these two fields as not much to look at.

Slogans and typical Soviet propaganda statements were tossed in wherever there was an extra foot of space. "In the U.S.S.R. unemployment has been stamped out for all time." "People receive equal pay for equal work." "In the Soviet Union, education is free of charge."

Another read: "More than 90,000 engineers are trained in the U.S.S.R. a year."

Underneath these high-sounding slogans and statutes of heroic workers were some concrete evidence that it wasn't all propaganda. Evidence of a nation that has moved rapidly in 40 years to a place of prominence in the world. And probably more important were the show's numerous hints of Russia's grandiose hopes and plans for its future development.

As Mr. Wockenfuss commented after the tour:

"At the present time I don't worry about their competitiveness, but in 25 years I think we better look out."

And Mr. O'Donnell saw it coming even faster.

"I think in less time than that, because they are moving ahead very rapidly. * * * I think maybe it's a matter of 5 or 10 years."

Space People Stories Unverified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, this is the third and final article on "Flying Saucers" by George Todt in the North Hollywood (Calif.) Valley Times.

Mr. Todt, an able and talented reporter, has done an excellent job and rendered a commendable service in collecting, analyzing, and reporting the main trends of thought and opinion on this subject:

SPACE PEOPLE STORIES UNVERIFIED

The basic difference of approach to the problem of flying saucers by the competing UFOlogist and Contactee groups is, as I explained yesterday, that of the scientific method versus a non-scientific one.

The UFOlogist is one who is continuously searching for the kind of realistic data which can be incorporated into substantial evidence which will stand up under the most searching scrutiny by anyone. He is interested in the truth alone and has no axe to grind of any kind. He stays open-minded until all the returns are in to be counted.

The person described as Contactee, on the other hand, has shown little, if any, concern in the past for the element of demonstrable proof. As a matter of fact, leaders of this controversial group seem to become invariably rather testy—or at least haughty in the extreme—whenever a demand for ade-

quate proof is requested of them. And absolutely none has ever been forthcoming.

The leading Contactees, sometimes called Saucerians, prefer to reply to our requests for proof something like this:

"Well, if you can't take my word for it—you are indeed hopeless."

Just like that, you see.

As you perhaps might have guessed after reading this far, few self-respecting UFOlogists would care to contact members of the various Contactee cults with even a 10-foot pole that had a skyhook attached to the end of it. Not in several weeks of Sundays, and that's for sure. In truth, they are carefully avoided wherever possible.

On the other hand there has been increasing evidence, which is mounting rapidly of late, to show that the mystic Contactees are working overtime to penetrate the ranks of the scientific clan. Apparently they believe that such infiltration would give them stature and, perhaps, some measure of respectability in intellectual circles.

Their devious methods to gain such questionable results are often quite amusing, even ludicrous, at times. One means of deception practiced upon an unsuspecting public, which is rather an ingenious device of sorts, is this one: Guilt by association, in reverse. An example of such shenanigans might be to take the names of the most respectable UFOlogy outfits—such as the National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena (NICAP), Civilian Saucer Intelligence of New York (CSI), or Aerial Phenomena Research Organization (APRO), for example—and "accidentally" place them in the midst of a routine "directory" list of Contactee cults immediately before a big convention of the latter was about to commence.

Then, when the local press ultimately has a field day at the expense of Saucerian elements who have talked in the most grandiose cosmic terms without bothering to offer any scientific evidence to support their amazing and unverifiable claims—the innocent UFOlogists simultaneously get taken along willy-nilly for a very undeserved ride on their parts.

You see, it's "guilt by association"—and the UFOlogists don't like it even a little bit. Which accounts for their understandable chariness in getting mixed up with anything even remotely resembling Saucerians if they can help it.

So anytime we might happen to see any of the UFOlogy Big Three (NICAP, CSI, and APRO) accidentally included among amalgamations of Contactee listings, we may be quite sure that the former were not consulted as to their wishes in the matter.

Actually, the UFOlogists have never taken the stand that personal contact with occupants of flying saucers, or unidentified flying objects, is an impossibility in any sense of the word.

They simply believe that thus far, at least, none of the fantastic claimants of visitations by the space people have proven to be very reliable witnesses in regards to the far-fetched stories they have related to us. Some have been pretty smelly and preposterous—or simply ridiculous, depending upon one's point of view.

To sum it up quickly: There really is a whole of a difference in method and approach by the members of the flying saucer fraternity.

And to be completely factual, it isn't one fraternity—but at least two of 'em.

They are so incompatible in their respective philosophies that they can never hope to become integrated.

This schism will continue on indefinitely into the future, and what's wrong with that, anyway?

Depressed Area Legislation Is Needed Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, to thousands of American citizens, depressed area legislation is just as necessary today as it was a year ago. More so, in fact, for there has been an accumulation of misery in the intervening months. Another year has been added to the period in which so many willing hands have been idle due to reasons beyond their control. Industrial stagnation, which has prevailed particularly in communities where products of mines and plants have been deprived of markets by goods imported from across the seas, simply closes the door to job opportunities. It is destructive of ambition, incentive, and morale. It stunts individual, community, and national development.

But Congress cannot in conscience continue to ignore these conditions. Democratic representatives and Senators are among those of us who have introduced surplus labor legislation and have appealed for its enactment. I suggest that these voices be raised with renewed vigor, for time is running out on another session without accomplishment in this direction. Unless legislation is forthcoming, the leadership in this Congress must accept responsibility for an incongruity in which it rejects its own recommendation of the preceding session.

Mr. Speaker, a year ago Congress passed and sent to the White House the so-called depressed area bill. While that particular version of needed legislation was obviously too unsatisfactory to expect the President to attach his signature, there was nonetheless implicit in the measure an acknowledgement—by both the House and Senate—that legislation to assist surplus labor districts was necessary.

In the ensuing 12 months an encouraging number of unemployed men and women have returned to work, resulting in a highly favorable revision of surplus labor statistics by the Department of Labor. Unfortunately, however, the figures show no significant economic gain in numerous areas which have suffered most and over the longest periods of time. Included in those regions of prolonged and critical business activity are the neglected communities in Pennsylvania receiving no apparent benefits of the Federal Government's multibillion-dollar defense program.

In view of the continued distress in the most gravely-affected communities, Congress has been delinquent in failing to act on an admitted obligation. The new 86th Congress was organized in January, but there was no departure from the leadership that decided on the need for depressed area legislation in 1958. The same party is again in charge of both

houses. I hope that the strategy employed last year—when a totally unacceptable bill was rushed through in the closing days of the session—is not responsible for the current delay. Political philandery is especially deplorable when hunger and want are involved.

Let us have action, Mr. Speaker.

Teenagers Can Be Safe Drivers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an essay entitled "Teenagers Can Be Safe Drivers," which was written by Timothy Kerwin, my constituent, and was awarded first place prize in a recent contest sponsored by the Edison Park Community Council of Chicago, Ill. During these times when our newspapers are filled with stories of teenage crimes, it is indeed heartening to know that there are civic groups, such as the Edison Park Community Council, whose faith in our youth has not faltered and who are willing to give of themselves to promote and encourage our teenagers to accept their place in adult society. Timothy Kerwin exemplifies the spirit of many of our young people who are a credit to their community and their Nation. I hope my colleagues will agree that as long as we have youngsters like Timothy Kerwin our country need not fear for its future.

The essay follows:

TEENAGERS CAN BE SAFE DRIVERS

(By Timothy Kerwin, first-place winner)

Parents and teachers will agree that because of their good reflexes and mechanical knowledge teenagers should be able to excel in the field of driving. I say, "should be," but then why is it that teenagers have many more fatal accidents than adults? The main cause is a lack of the sense of responsibility.

Driving is truly an adult's privilege, and if we teenagers want to take part in the privilege, we must act like adults. The driving of a car is not for a person who has a child's outlook on life; for a slight misjudgment here, or a little too much speed there, could result in instant death, not only for us but also for others. With the privilege of driving goes the great responsibility for the lives and property of those around us.

Teenagers need to be shown that a car is not a toy—it could be a deadly weapon. High-speed driving is not a sign of how mature you are or how well you can handle a car. It really shows how immature you are, and only that the car which you are driving is built well for high speeds.

Teenagers as well as all other drivers should have common courtesy and proper respect for the laws, for these are the laws of survival in driving. All of the traffic laws are made for only one reason and that is—to save our lives—not to slow us down. Only a fool or a child would disobey them.

Showing off by taking corners on two wheels, or going 40 miles per hour down a

side street is merely a sign that you want attention. The quickest way to get it is to run down someone's little child who may be chasing a ball or riding a bicycle down the street.

The teenage drivers who have an adult outlook on life and who realize the great responsibility they are taking upon themselves from the very instant they start the engine of the car they are driving—can and will be safe drivers.

There has been, for some years now, a generally unfavorable attitude of adults toward teenage drivers. The accidents teenagers have had has caused this feeling, which in turn has led to insurance increases. There is also a lot of criticism on teenage driving habits.

Because of the few irresponsible drivers in the teenage group, today's adult feels a sense of resentment toward the teenage driver. As the old saying goes, "One bad apple can spoil the barrel." This one outcast, so to speak, is usually the boy who dominates and overrules his parents. His father and mother sign for his first car and what happens. He goes out every night and gets his buddies to go for a ride. These rides may result in disaster. Who is to blame? The teenager, of course, for the accident, but more so his parents for giving him the ownership of the car.

It is the dream of every boy to one day have, for his own, a car. A car of his own is more than a means of transportation, it gives him prestige. Word gets around that so and so has a car, and immediately he is a very popular young man. Everyone wants to ride with him. He takes a few fellows and a few girls out for a drive some evening, and gets into an accident. The next morning splash all over the front page of the newspapers, "Teenage Hoodlums Wild Midnight Ride, One Killed, Three Injured."

This is the main reason for the feeling of resentment on the part of adults. The one "cool guy" spoils it for the rest of the fellows. The majority of teenagers do feel a sense of responsibility when they are behind the wheel of a car.

If we could straighten out the few irresponsible teenager drivers we might be able to change the unfavorable feeling toward us. If the fellows who drive cars would quit showing off there might be an entirely different feeling toward us all.

We, as teenagers, should not try to show the other fellow who has the better car and who is the better jockey. I sincerely believe that if all teenage drivers, fellows and girls alike, would drive safely, the whole outlook would change and look better for everyone.

The teenager can be a safe driver if he obeys all traffic rules and uses commonsense. Stop trying to be a big deal, and above all remember God's commandment, "Thou shalt not kill."

Receives First Polish Cultural Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of Monday, August 10, 1959, commenting upon the award presented to Dr. Stephen P. Mizwa, president of the Kosciuszko Foundation, New York, by

the American Council of Polish Cultural Clubs at a meeting held recently in Wilkes-Barre:

CULTURAL AWARD

Dr. Stephen P. Mizwa, president of the Kosciuszko Foundation, New York, was signally honored at the dinner, winding up the convention of the American Council of Polish Cultural Clubs at the Sterling on Saturday night when he received the organization's first award to an internationally known figure for the advancement of culture.

Dr. Mizwa was the logical choice for this distinction, for he is the active head and founder of an organization that, in many ways, parallels the American Council of Polish Cultural Clubs. While there is no conflict between the two, it is an added tribute to Dr. Mizwa to be chosen under the circumstances.

To this community, the recognition, extended to Dr. Mizwa, was especially gratifying because he is a frequent visitor and is known to thousands of local residents. When the Kosciuszko Foundation was launched 35 years ago, Dr. Mizwa came to Luzerne County to solicit support because of its large population of Americans of Polish descent. His first call was at the home of Dr. and Mrs. Joseph J. Kocyan, then residents of Plains, now residents of Wilkes-Barre. Dr. Kocyan currently is chairman of the board of the Kosciuszko Foundation and was toastmaster of the A.C.P.C.C. dinner on Saturday night when Dr. Mizwa was cited. Mrs. Kocyan is president of the women's committee for the Polish room of Wilkes College, host to the convention.

A noted educator, Dr. Mizwa has climaxed an outstanding career with his long and dedicated service to the Kosciuszko Foundation in a capacity for which he is eminently fitted by training and temperament. The American Council of Cultural Clubs has set a high standard in its initial choice for this award.

Missouri Novel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to make a brief comment on a book entitled "Ring Around the Moon," a Missouri historical novel—1834-60.

From the very heart of Missouri comes this stern, yet romantic and strange story of rugged men and women—pioneers who found true courage in a living God to meet and cope with overwhelming problems.

These early-day Missourians were individuals, too—white and black folks with heartaches, fears, frustrations, and perplexities that they could not leave behind them as they left their former homes.

This was an age rampant with superstitions—an age of vast illiteracy so far as book learning was concerned.

"Ring Around the Moon" is the story of the strength and weaknesses of Basil Thayer, who with his family came from the East in the first half of the last century.

It deals intimately with the problems of his personal life, as well as with the problem that plagued the sovereign States at that crucial time in our history: The issue of slavery and smoldering racial discord.

According to Negro superstition, a ring around the moon was an omen of evil, forecasting a violent storm and, as well, lengthy tribulation for the black race.

For Basil Thayer, it foretold, perhaps, his fall into the pits of seething passion, bleak despair, and alcoholism, from which only a living God and human compassion and understanding could redeem him.

Set in the fictional mid-Missouri town of Hawthorn, "Ring Around the Moon" is rich with the color and spirit of early Missouri as well as accurate historical background.

Industry Stubbing Its Toe on the Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I wish to insert into the RECORD a column by Laurence Laurent which discusses the now famous equal time provision of the Federal Communications Act, section 315.

Although I am in favor of some revision of section 315, I hope that the broadcasters realize the very great responsibility which is placed upon them as a result of the kind of provisions they seek.

It is clear from the behavior of the television broadcasters that they are doing all in their power to pressure Congress. They have denied access to some of our political leaders on the most flimsy nonlegal grounds, in the hopes that this would point up their side of the story. Even though I may agree that some changes must be made in section 315, I hope that Congress will look very carefully into this question and will not act too hastily.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 13, 1959]

INDUSTRY'S STUBBING ITS TOE ON THE HILL

(By Laurence Laurent)

The television industry, whose spokesmen are highly effective in congressional hearings, manages to fall on its face when dealing with political realities. This falling has been particularly noticeable this summer, with the TV-radio industry trying to persuade the Congress to change the equal political time regulations.

The industry has a good case. There is general agreement that the Federal Communications Commission goofed when it ruled that equal time applied during political campaigns to newscasts. Industry spokesmen have already persuaded the Senate that it should pass amendments to the Communications Act which exempt newscasts.

But when the same legislation came before the House of Representatives, the industry began taking pratfalls.

Members of the House are much more reluctant than Senators to give the radio-TV operator additional freedom. The Representative runs for reelection every 2 years, and thus is constantly concerned about the treatment he gets from news media.

First, there was the incredibly badly managed "Face the Nation" incident with Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota. His friends announced that he would be a candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination, an announcement that could have been a surprise only at, say, Manus in the Admiralty Islands.

CBS canceled Senator HUMPHREY's appearance, on the advice of attorneys. The advice—to many Congressmen—was bad. Senator HUMPHREY, technically, is not a candidate and, technically, section 315 does not apply.

The incident has been interpreted by several members of the powerful House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee as coercive. They feel that CBS was trying to force them to amend the equal time law by the threat of a blackout on all candidates.

One Democratic committee member cited last Sunday's two-network performance by Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, and said: "It may be news to CBS, but everyone else in the country knows that the Vice President hopes to get the Republican presidential nomination in 1960."

He objected to NIXON's network hour, only in the light of the HUMPHREY cancellation.

The current fight over labor reform legislation is causing more bitterness against the networks. First, time was provided for the President to express his views; and this, surely is beneficial to the public. But when Democrats asked for equal time in the name of the Speaker of the House, the request was denied. Instead, the networks provided forum programs. This served only to prove what politicians have long felt: Some equal time is more equal than other equal time.

For the most adept hairsplitter, section 315 does not apply to political issues, only to candidates. The sad part, however, is that the TV-radio industry missed a splendid opportunity to show the Congress how well it is prepared to meet its responsibilities.

Worst of all, the mistakes are being made during the summer when the airwaves are filled with tedious repeats. It is the perfect time for lively, controversial public affairs programs. It is the time when radio and TV can best afford to be generous.

An Exceptional Statement on Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, a bill was introduced by our colleague, ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, of South Carolina, which provided termination of the Catawba Indian Reservation in that State.

During the hearing Mrs. Gladys Thomas gave such an outstanding unrehearsed statement that I have asked permission to insert a portion of her remarks in the RECORD as follows:

These are the reasons we feel this way:

A lot of our people are kicking for tax reasons. They say we will have to pay property tax, which is the only tax that we don't have to pay. I pay tax on my income where

I work. We pay taxes when we buy a car license, and every other kind of tax. For the additional benefits I would get for paying taxes, I would rather pay taxes.

The roads that we have passing our house are fit only for Army vehicles to be tried out on to see if they can take it. That is about what it amounts to. They are washed out in gullies. Then when we ask them to fix the road, they say, "You are not a taxpayer." That doesn't help us.

Not only that, the schools are not adequate for the children. My children don't go down there because I live on the new reservation. They have only two teachers and two classrooms for the children, and they do need more.

I think when you pay for anything you get exactly what you pay for. We feel if you go uptown to a store and buy a dress or a hat and pay a good price for it, you get good merchandise. If you pay a cheap price, you get exactly what you pay for.

We are just like the people on the outside—we want to be sure that we are able to collect the things owed to us as well as they do.

Our children are growing up. They tell them, "You are not taxpayers. You cannot do certain things." We live out in the country and use old country roads. When I went to school we were not even permitted to ride the schoolbus. I had to quit school in the ninth grade because they didn't allow our people on the reservation to hold public jobs which amounted to anything more than cutting sorghum. My father was not able to pay somebody to haul me to take me back and forth to high school every day. He did for a year and a half. I had to get up at 5 o'clock in the morning and go to the Rock Hill Printing & Finishing Co. to work, and come back at 6 or 7 o'clock at night, because at that time people were working 12 hours a day. That is the way we had to get what little education we have. They refused to let us ride the buses because we did not pay taxes. "You are a group of people who are ignorant." We cannot be considered people who can do just anything, because we don't pay taxes.

We feel that we want to be self-supporting people. When you can pay your own way, you feel more self-supporting.

I am not here hunting something for nothing. I feel if we are going to hunt for something for nothing, we will never amount to very much, because you don't get anything that way. You have to work for what you get; and when you feel you are working for what you have, you are a whole lot better off than if somebody hauls off and gives it to you. I know the rest of you know just what we mean.

We have some down there on the reservation for whom it would not work out, but they would be very few families. I would be willing to say 97 percent of our people are a thriving people. At least 98 percent of our people have hospital insurance and do not have to be on charity when they go to the hospital. Very few of them are getting welfare checks. A few are, but not very many.

Never in history have you ever heard tell of a Catawba Indian dying in a county home. We have never turned our people loose to die in the county home. Somebody was always taking care of them.

I feel if they are given a chance to make something of themselves, they can do it. There are some few who holler about doctor's bills. We are no different than anybody else. Why can't we pay our doctor's bills? Plenty of white people in our section are in worse condition. Plenty of colored people are worse. You might say some of them just exist. Some of them are just existing, but others are also living. We pay our own doctor's bills.

Don't you think when a person knows he has a responsibility he is going to try to do better? He is going to try to better himself in order to meet these things. It is just like a young man when he gets married. When he is single he has no responsibilities. He can say, "I can spend my money any way I please, and throw it away if I want to." But let him get married, and he knows he has a wife and family to take care of, and 90 percent of the time he straightens up. You find some who don't.

As we have said, we can pay for our insurance. We can afford to go to the hospitals when we are sick. We may not want or be able to afford a fancy private room, but 98 percent can afford a normal hospital bill, I would say. Not always has the Government paid it.

Mr. HALEY. You think the Indians would be much better off to have their own property, so they could go ahead and make the improvements that they want and have something so when they went into a bank to borrow money they would be in a position to put up some collateral, in order to improve their own situation; is that correct?

Mrs. THOMAS. Our people are just like any other nationality of people. We have some who would not try, but they are very few, not many. The majority will try. I think you would see better homes on the reservation. Some of them do not have a fine education and all that, but they have knowledge and foresight enough to see the benefits. You can do just so much and can't do any more. Most of our people are textile employees. On the average, you just don't have the money to spend \$2,000 or \$3,000 at one time for improvements. If you don't have it, they won't do it. We can go uptown and get credit for lumber for a few hundred dollars, which we have done. Otherwise, you can't do it.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I want to join with you in commending the witnesses, especially Mrs. Thomas, for stating perhaps better than I could, this Monday morning at least, my own particular philosophy of an American citizen. Usually Monday is a dark day for me. This Monday will be a bright day because of the statement which has been made.

If I may repeat what you said, you thought people get about what they pay for. I think that is right. I think you have stated the situation just as it is.

The fact that you folks feel that you would like to get some roads and receive the treatment which is given to citizens who are without any handicap, and you are willing to pay for it, is just a little bit exceptional in this day and age. That paternalistic way of life does not apply to any particular race. It applies to all races.

Mr. BERRY. Certainly the remarks of Mrs. Thomas are the best speech on free enterprise that I have heard in a long time. I want to commend you.

My only question is this: Would you have any objection if I inserted part of your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Mrs. THOMAS. No; I would not.

A New Citizen at 100

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on August 15, 1959, Mrs. Mary Poburka will

celebrate her 100th birthday and will have been a citizen of the United States for 5 days. The realization of this dream of citizenship is largely due to the efforts of Mrs. Anna Strojny, one of my constituents and one of the truly sincere patriots of our Nation. Mrs. Strojny has helped thousands of people to achieve citizenship. When she learned of Mrs. Poburka's desire to become an American citizen before she died, she immediately assumed the task of seeing to it that Mrs. Poburka received the proper instruction in English and American history, and she personally contacted the Immigration Department to expedite Mrs. Poburka's application.

Mrs. Poburka, a resident of this country since 1914, left Poland with her husband in 1913, intending to sail to Brazil, where free land awaited potential settlers. Mr. Poburka, their two sons, and three daughters went to Brazil. Mrs. Poburka and four other daughters came to America.

In the long years that followed, Mrs. Poburka never had the opportunity to learn English. Her family worked, those about her spoke Polish, and the language of her adopted country was alien to her. Now her family is scattered throughout North and South America and she has declared her desire to become a full-fledged participant in our national history.

"They didn't realize until recently how much I wanted to become a citizen," she says.

Now, thanks to the help and assistance of the immigration and naturalization personnel and the technical and moral support of her patriotic friend, Mrs. Poburka is within sight of her long-awaited goal. I want to take the opportunity to wish her a very happy birthday, her first as a fellow American, and to wish her full enjoyment of the privileges guaranteed in her new role.

And I should also like to inject a word of praise for the devotion and sincere dedication to freedom demonstrated by Mrs. Anna Strojny, Americanization teacher. I have never met an individual who more personifies the meaning of "citizen" than this noble woman whom I am fortunate enough to represent in Congress. I stand in awe of her accomplishments and I am sincerely proud that she has chosen to live in the 11th Congressional District.

Mrs. Strojny is indeed a dedicated American. Even though, for several years now, Mrs. Strojny has herself been an invalid, due to a severe attack of arthritis, she has not in any way impeded her efforts to help immigrants become American citizens.

This wonderful woman has helped more than 12,000 immigrants become American citizens through her unselfish efforts and adherence to American ideals. In 1950, she was decorated for her inspiring contributions to foster Americanism. During World War II and to this day, as honorary president of the Mothers of World War II, Mrs. Strojny continues to organize visits to veterans

hospitals in the Chicago area and helps make the lot of our wounded veterans a great deal more pleasant.

Mrs. Strojny indeed exemplifies the very essence of all that makes America a great Nation. I am sure she will share with Mrs. Poburka the pride of citizenship on August 15, and God grant that Mrs. Strojny may continue her splendid service to her country for many years to come.

Wisconsin Completes Its First Watershed Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that Wisconsin has always been a leader in the field of soil and water conservation. And within the State, my home district, the ninth, has led the way in watershed protection work. In fact, my district has more small watershed projects underway than any other congressional district in the State.

One of these projects, the Lost Creek Watershed in Pepin County, was the first such project to be completed in Wisconsin under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954. And even before the Lost Creek Watershed was formally dedicated July 28, the project had proven its worth by adequately controlling the 4.5 inches of rain which fell during a 7-hour period on July 8.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the Record an article which appeared in the Eau Claire Leader, Eau Claire, Wis., at the time of the dedication of the Lost Creek Watershed project:

LAST STORM PROVED VALUE OF LOST CREEK WATERSHED

(By Fred Steffen)

PEPIN.—"It works, too."

These words of eloquent praise were applied Tuesday to the Lost Creek Watershed by the president of the Lost Creek Watershed Association, Dallas Milliren, Rt. 1.

His tribute was paid on his 184-acre dairy farm, all of which lies within the 5,800-acre watershed—the first to be brought to its present state of advancement under Public Law 566 in Wisconsin.

Milliren took advantage of excellent haying weather to get some of his crops in while soil conservationists toured the watershed during the afternoon but he was one of the honored guests at the evening banquet where he and Grant Erickson, Pepin, the association's secretary-treasurer, were recognized as having been prime movers in getting the association going.

Lost Creek got its name because under ordinary circumstances it filtered down into the subsoil and became lost before ever reaching a larger body of water. But when there was a heavy rain it went wild. The watershed was developed to tame it under adverse conditions.

And tame it, it did. The first big test came July 8 this year when there was a protracted rainfall over the area. It was a day

when between 4 or 5 inches fell on the watershed in a short time. It reminded Milliren of a statement he had made when the watershed was completed.

"I've been troubled with floodwaters since 1933 when I moved on this farm. Now I can sleep better because I know the flood problem is under control." How much under control he discovered earlier this month. Three floodwater retaining structures and two grade stabilization structures stood the test and tamed what would have been a disastrous flood.

In the lowlands there are many fine fields of crops which would have been destroyed if the waters had not been held back. More important, tons of soil remain on the hillsides where they belong because 36 of the 42 farmers in the watershed are active soil conservation district cooperators—using modern methods to preserve their farms.

Not far away in Bogus Valley, farmers are working to form a watershed. The July 8 storm brought trouble to them they hope to curb in the future. They can go down to Lake Pepin and look at the Bogus Creek sandbar at the mouth of the creek which built up another 100 feet after the July 8 storm. The contrast is close at hand.

A group of about 40 who took the afternoon tour of the watershed heard its various elements described by Harold Smith, Eau Claire, area conservationist of the Soil Conservation Service.

Following the tour of the watershed in the afternoon a formal dedication banquet was held at the Methodist church with Pepin County District Attorney Earl McMahon acting as master of ceremonies.

Guest of honor was Dr. A. L. Patrick, Washington, D.C., field representative of the Soil Conservation Service in whose area Lost Creek lies. Approaching 70, he will retire soon after 44 years as a scientist, teacher, and administrator in soil conservation affairs. He was recently cited for "sustained invaluable services in planning and administering soil and water conservation activities."

"Wisconsin is a State of firsts in soil and water conservation work," he said. He noted Wisconsin is one of the few States completely covered by soil conservation districts.

He outlined the extensive damage which can be caused by high water and explained how Public Law 566 combats the menace.

The 1936 act was replaced in 1954 by the present Public Law 566, which was broadened by amendments in 1956 and 1958.

Cost of the Lost Creek project, both Federal and local, is about \$190,000 with the Federal Government paying about two-thirds of the cost and about one-third non-Federal.

Dr. Patrick noted the high rate of cooperation within the watershed. "This is a wonderful record," he said, "one which I wish were duplicated in every small watershed project in the country."

"Your efficient State soil conservation committee also deserves a lot of credit for the way they have been helping to forward the small watershed work throughout the State."

Among the agencies which participated in the project were the U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Wisconsin Conservation Department, Wisconsin Soil Conservation Committee, College of Agriculture, extension division, and the Lost Creek Watershed Association.

As he closed his talk, Dr. Patrick said, "As our country grows the various segments of our society become more interdependent. Agriculture cannot stand alone. Neither can a town or a city. They decline or prosper together. What happens to raindrops that fall in the upper reaches of a small watershed affects the man in town as much as it does the farmer."

James P. Wesberry, Jr., a Former House Page Successful in the Business World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have observed during the 13 years I have served as a Member of the House that the House pages have been exceptional and outstanding boys, who have maintained very high standards as to quality of service, devotion to duty, and the maintenance of moral and ethical standards.

During my service here I have watched the careers of many of these boys after they served as pages and pursued their education in colleges and universities, and entered upon their chosen careers in life.

I know of the great interest manifested by Members of the House of Representatives in these excellent young men who have served as pages, and it is for that reason I bring to your attention the accomplishments of one of these fine young men whom it was my pleasure to sponsor as a page 10 years ago. Some of you will recall, I am sure Jimmy Wesberry, of Atlanta, Ga. He applied himself diligently to the performance of his duties as a page, and to his studies in the page school. It has always been one of his characteristics to apply himself diligently to whatever task is at hand. He was president of the student council of the Capitol Page School, and during the latter part of his page service he was overseer, having charge of all Republican pages. He graduated from Emerson Institute here in Washington, and graduated from the Georgia State College of Business Administration in Atlanta, with a bachelor of business administration degree.

He is now a certified public accountant and management counselor, and at the time he received his certificate as a certified public accountant, he probably was the youngest certified public accountant in the Southeast. He was for a time associated with the well-known firms of Mount & Carter and Richardson, Stell & Co., in Atlanta. While with the firm of Mount & Carter, a good portion of his time was devoted to governmental accounting and systems, and in particular the auditing and systems of Fulton County, Ga. He supervised the quadrennial executive audit of the State of Maine covering the two terms of Gov. EDMUND S. MUSKIE. Subsequently he served 4 months as acting controller of Hillcrest Poultry Industries of Lewiston, Me., a group of eight corporations engaged in integrated poultry processing. Within the last few months Mr. Wesberry completed the highly publicized audit of Jackson County, Ga., as a result of which court investigations are now in process.

It was a proud moment in Jimmy's life when just recently he established his own office in the Citizens & Southern

National Bank Building in Atlanta, with a new sign on the door, James P. Westberry, Jr., certified public accountant and management counselor.

I think it can be said that his career is typical of those of the fine, outstanding boys who serve as pages here, acquire worthwhile knowledge of the operation of the Federal Government, and return to their respective homes to take a leading part in the affairs of their respective communities.

I know that all of you join me in extending best wishes to this former page for continued success in his chosen career.

Yes, Indeed, an Unusual Young Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include the following column entitled "An Editor's Notebook" which appeared in the Charlotte Observer of last Sunday, August 9. This column written by John S. Knight is a regular Sunday feature in all of the Knight newspapers:

AN EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK

(By John S. Knight)

YES, INDEED, AN UNUSUAL YOUNG MAN

Once upon a time, a popular but aging President of the United States was fortunate enough to have a young, tireless, and ambitious Vice President willing and able to handle the unpleasant and difficult chores which the President found either trying or distasteful.

The President was a wise man with a rare talent for composing differences between men and persuading them to work together for the common welfare.

Instinctively, however, he disliked the seamy side of politics and refused throughout his administration to indulge in personalities or bitter attacks upon his critics.

The people liked this grandfather image of their President, but the politicians of his faith deplored his unwillingness to be a strong party leader.

So in each campaign year, the young Vice President was sent forth to rally the partisans and exhort the populace while the President contented himself with a few, inoffensive TV appearances in behalf of his party's candidates.

The Vice President, being young and believing an election should be a contest between two parties of differing philosophies, hammered hard at the opposition and pulled no punches.

He made some enemies. A lot of them, in fact.

The upper strata deplored the young man's aggressive tactics. At the ward level they called him an alley fighter.

HE NEVER LOST OBJECTIVE

But the young man took this criticism in stride and applied himself diligently to learning all he could about the workings of government.

He uttered no complaint even when a corps of conspirators within the White House engaged in an abortive attempt to force him from the ticket when the President ran for reelection.

Nor did he sulk over the President's failure to champion his cause.

The Vice President, unanimously renominated, continued to give the President his loyal and unswerving devotion.

Later, when it was determined that the United States had been remiss in the cultivation of a better understanding with our Latin American neighbors, the Vice President was selected to make a good will tour.

This was the signal for the Communists to capitalize upon Latin disenchantment with our policies.

The story of the Vice President's travails on this journey is too well known to bear repeating here. It is enough to say that the President's emissary conducted himself with courage and dignity in the face of great personal peril.

For this, the President graciously commended the Vice President in the most glowing terms.

ANOTHER SURPRISING CHAPTER

The next chapter concerns the growing East-West tensions produced by Premier Khrushchev's ultimatum on West Berlin.

So it was concluded at the highest levels in Government to send the Vice President to Russia, ostensibly to open the U.S. fair in Moscow but really to make sure that Mr. K. would not be left with any misunderstanding of U.S. policy.

Meanwhile, a lip-serving Congress had passed a seemingly innocuous resolution on Captive Nations Week which was signed by the President and given an untimely release as the Vice President flew to Russia.

As our young man arrived, Mr. Khrushchev used this action to taunt and goad him at every opportunity.

But the Vice President gave as good as he got in these verbal exchanges. Even the Vice President's enemies conceded that our boy more than held his own.

When it was announced that the Vice President would return by way of Poland, the cynics and doom-sayers had another journalistic field day.

Some uninformed pundits saw the Poland stopover as a trick to win votes; others dolefully intoned that the Vice President would be lucky to get home without making serious blunders.

So they were wrong again. The Polish people gave the Vice President a rousing welcome in contrast to Khrushchev's recent cool reception in the same country.

The Vice President is back in Washington, has reported to his President and once again has proved he is a man of no mean stature.

SO, THE PLOT THICKENS

But even in view of his superb performances and dedication to duty, this young man must be cut down to size.

So say the Doris Fleasons and other luminaries of the Washington press corps who have never had a hero to worship since the days of F.D.R.

And so say an element of the Vice President's own party who appear enamored of a personable millionaire Governor who goes about distributing inherited wealth and bears an improbable nickname which fits nicely in a one column head.

So the plot thickens. There isn't much political mileage left in a 6-year-old TV speech made by the young man in which he hammed it up with frequent references to his wife's cloth coat and a dog named Checkers.

It was an earnest speech defending a fund which friends had raised to cover the young man's mailing expenses for Christmas cards and political literature when the young man first ran for office.

There was nothing wrong with the fund, except that the young man's backers kept books and it became a matter of public knowledge.

Older and wiser politicians usually pick up a hotel key and find the contributions under the mattress, but the young man and his supporters were naive enough to do things legitimately.

But as we have said, there isn't much campaign fodder in this one.

At 46, a dishonest politician usually has more in the till than a home encumbered by a mortgage.

So how can the Vice President be discredited?

Well, many things have been tried and more are to come.

The Washington wiseacres thought they had something when it was announced that the President's brother was being sent to Russia to keep an eye on the Vice President.

That one laid an egg.

Now the scheme in the millionaire Governor's camp is to not attack the Vice President openly, but to let the public polls show that he isn't too popular.

Nixon doesn't photograph well, he looks like Gromyko, you know.

THERE'S MORE TO COME

The Governor, who is angling for the presidential nomination, said recently in Puerto Rico that his party could win the next year assuming the wisdom of the delegates in picking a candidate who can win.

That's it. Promote the idea that our serious minded young man has done well enough, but that he can't win.

Better a rich and engaging personality with a Pepsodent smile and a cute part in his hair than a man of demonstrated ability who has come up the hard way and bruised a few sensibilities in the process.

This is the slick strategy being perfected behind the scenes with old masters of the political arts figuring out the moves.

But our young man, a realist in all things and a fatalist in politics, will have a strong counter-campaign.

There are letters, for instance, from the millionaire Governor commending the Vice President in the highest terms for his exceptional conduct during the President's two grave illnesses.

There is the record of solid accomplishment and dedication to his labors which the American public will not soon forget.

Yes, once upon a time there was a young Vice President who studied and worked harder than most any other Vice President in history.

Some disliked his careful calculations, resented his shrewdness and durability—forgetting all the while that today's world leaders must be calculating, shrewd and durable.

Others just didn't care for the Vice President, but couldn't explain why. Too young? Too political? Not enough sex appeal?

The end of our story cannot yet be written, nor even predicted.

But we have a hunch that the young man in question will, as usual, confound his critics and strengthen the faith of his friends.

For this is a very unusual young man.

Free Advice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include

a note entitled "Free Advice," from the Wall Street Journal for Thursday, August 6, 1959:

FREE ADVICE

It is very nice of two Democratic Governors—Governor Brown of California and Governor Williams of Michigan—to join former President Harry Truman in giving the Republicans some political advice.

The two Governors, discussing politics, volunteered that they thought Vice President Nixon would be the easiest candidate for the Democrats to lick and that their fellow Governor, Mr. Rockefeller, would be the toughest. This agrees with the sentiment expressed by Mr. Truman and such other leading Democrats as Senator HUMPHREY.

Could be. But when advice is so freely and cheerfully given by those who can hardly wish the Republicans well in the next encounter, we'd suspect some Republicans might be reminded that advice that's free is worth exactly what it costs.

What K. Should See

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I commend to the Congress the observations contained in an editorial which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., on August 7, 1959.

There is considerable discussion today as to what Premier Khrushchev should be shown when he visits the United States next month. Because his time is limited, it is obvious that he can see only a few of the numerous important features of a democracy which should be included in his itinerary.

The editorial follows:

WHAT K. SHOULD SEE

As might have been predicted, a good many Americans are already beginning to make fools of themselves over the forthcoming visit of Soviet Dictator Khrushchev. The problem is how to keep them from making a fool of America.

Dallas offers to give him the big Texas gladhand. A Corn Belt town in Iowa, weighing in with chamber of commerce flourishes, wants to show itself off as a model community of diversified agriculture and industry in the heartland of America. Philadelphia wants him to see the Liberty Bell.

Well, we aren't sure how impressed Mr. Khrushchev would be with the Liberty Bell, though you could count on him for a nasty remark about its crack. But what is beginning to nauseate us slightly is the hoopla atmosphere the Red czar's visit is stirring up.

Before we're through, every tanktown in the country will be trying to crowd in on the act for a bit of self-promotion; every politician will fancy himself another Nixon and try to match wits with the mighty Russian on TV; and countless thousands of well-meaning individuals will think their mission is to convert Khrushchev from the errors of communism to the glories of Americanism. They will imagine that as he stands awed before the Liberty Bell, a great light will dawn.

Well, it won't. If any light dawns on Khrushchev, it will be the red light of warning, not the inner light of conversion. He is coming here to see America—partly because he wants to, partly because our President wants him to. Whatever Khrushchev wants to see will, within broad limits, doubtless be thrown open to him. What else he will be shown will be for the purpose of correcting such misconceptions as he is believed to have about America.

Some eye-opening views he is bound to get just my moving about. He is a shrewd observer and will not miss the surging strength of America, as it exhibits itself in our infinitely complex industrial metropolises and our vast and mechanized agricultural prairies.

There are other signs he could not miss, but should have his nose rubbed in regardless. For example, a rush-hour traffic jam in almost any big American city; if he has any doubts that Americans in all walks of life own cars by the millions, there is nothing like a traffic jam to relieve him of them.

Khrushchev doubts that the \$14,000 home on display at the American fair in Moscow is anything average workingmen could afford. Let him see them by the millions—typical suburbs; typical factories with their acres-upon-acres of adjacent parking lots; typical supermarkets; shopping plazas and our wonderful department stores. Let him "campaign" in the plazas, as our politicians do, asking the parcel-laden shoppers where their husbands work, how much they earn; let him see the goods they buy on a normal day.

Let him see our farms, and ponder how so few can feed so many, with such mountainous surpluses left over. Let him see our factories, the obsolescent as well as the automated, and sense how little of all they produce goes into armaments, and how much of it could if necessary.

Above all, let him talk to as many people as he will talk to—not the fawning celebrity chasers; not the self-serving politicians; not the civic braggarts, but the ordinary, free, proud American people. Let him sense their abhorrence of every kind of tyranny, most especially the kind his slave-system practices throughout its captive empire. Let him see how unafraid they are of Russian threats and bluster.

Federal Interstate Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. QUENTIN BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution which was passed by the Pembina County, N. Dak., Board of County Commissioners on August 6 in regard to the interstate highway program:

HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK,
Representative of U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: It has come to the attention of the Board of County Commissioners of Pembina County, N. Dak., that a certain curtailment of Federal funds available for road construction is being made.

The board passed a resolution on August 6, 1959, which is as follows:

"Whereas it appears that much unemployment will exist due to curtailment of the present interstate road construction program; and

"Whereas lack of Federal funds will curtail State, county, and farm-to-market road program; and

"Whereas as such would have a depressing effect on our whole economy:

"Now, therefore, the board of county commissioners of the said county do hereby urge Congress to provide the necessary funds to maintain the present interstate highway program, primary, secondary, and farm-to-market construction program at their present levels.

"Motion made by Commissioner Copeland of Pembina, seconded by Commissioner Green, of St. Thomas; upon a vote, carried."

We urge that you support such financing so that the highway construction program will be self-sufficient by proper allotment of funds from gasoline taxes and excise taxes from sale of vehicles that use the highways.

Yours very truly,

WM. J. STURLAUGSON,
Pembina County Auditor.

Welcome to Naturalized Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege last Tuesday to say a few words of welcome to 83 newly naturalized American citizens. The naturalization ceremony took place in the U.S. Court-house here in Washington, and the new citizens were sworn in by District Court Judge George L. Hart, Jr. Under permission granted, I include my remarks at this brief but impressive ceremony:

I am glad to have the opportunity to participate in the services relating to the admission of new citizens by way of naturalization. My parents became naturalized citizens, and a great many distinguished and leading citizens of the country are the children of parents who obtained their citizenship in this manner.

I come from the great city of Philadelphia, where the Declaration of Independence was signed and where native-born and naturalized citizens work hand in hand to operate a splendid community and to participate in its economic, religious, social, and civic life. The same is true of this city and all other places participating as political subdivisions of the United States.

A whole new avenue of opportunity is today opening for you. As citizens you can now participate in the operation of American Government even if it only consists in voting for those who seek to be elected. This privilege will be available to the District, I hope, in the very near future. It is now available to all those who live outside of the District. Some may become interested in representing either of our two great political parties on a more active basis as precinct representatives, which is the starting point for many who later become our local and State officials.

At any rate, civic and political opportunities are immediately available to those who seek to participate actively in the affairs of our many communities. Economic and educational opportunities are open almost without limitation. Freedom of motion to live and work in any part of the United States. These opportunities were taken by people, whom I know personally, who only a decade ago were Hungarian refugees and who now

are settled, secure and active in the economic life of the community in which they live.

These ceremonies now held are just about 1 month prior to the observation of Citizenship Day, which was designated by the President of the United States in a Proclamation issued the 25th day of April 1959 as the 17th day of September, in commemoration of the signing of the Constitution and in recognition of those citizens who have come of age and those who have been naturalized during the year.

The President also designated the period beginning September 17 and ending September 23, 1959, as Constitution Week, and he urged the people of the United States to observe that week with appropriate ceremonies and activities in their schools and churches and in other suitable places.

U.S. citizenship is a glorious possession representing the dreams and struggles of men for centuries. Our Constitution, which guarantees priceless freedoms to our citizens, sets forth a concept of liberty that has been an inspiration to freedom-loving people everywhere. Citizenship Day will honor those youths of native birth, just arriving at voting age—of whom there are approximately 2½ million each year—and those from other countries recently naturalized, as they accept the rights and privileges of citizenship, and begin full participation in the civic and political life of their communities, States, and Nation. The observances of Citizenship Day and Constitution Week not only will honor especially these two groups of our citizenry, but will afford an opportunity for all citizens, native-born and naturalized, to rededicate themselves to the ideals and principles upon which this Nation was founded and built.

Red Gains in the Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following informative survey of Communist activities south of the United States by Mr. Edward Tomlinson, experienced Latin-American correspondent, published in the August 10, 1959, issue of the Washington (D.C.) Daily News:

REDS MAKING NEW GAINS IN AMERICAS (By Edward Tomlinson)

A new survey of Communist activities south of the border shows that the Reds are making steady headway in at least a half dozen of the 20 southern Republics.

Communist agitators and propagandists are more active in Cuba, Venezuela, Guatemala, Chile, Argentina, and Uruguay than at any time in the last 5 years.

There can be no question of the Communist resurgence in Cuba since the revolution which overthrew the Batista government last New Year's. There may not yet be any conclusive evidence that they have gained control of the main agencies of Fidel Castro's regime.

RACK REFORM

But they are blatantly supporting the most radical of its measures, such as the agrarian reform program and especially the anti-U.S. attitudes of many of the top officials.

The Chilean Communist Party leader, Elias Laferte, has called for a concentration

of party bigwigs from all the countries to assemble in Santiago, Chile, during the American Foreign Ministers' Conference, beginning August 12, to defend the Cuban revolution. El Siglo, the party newspaper in the Chilean capital, has published a manifesto stating that "we must mobilize to prevent the conference interfering in the affairs of Cuba."

In Venezuela, the party boss, Gustavo Machado, has become one of the most powerful political figures in the country. Latin diplomats in Caracas are reporting to their governments that Dr. Machado not only has the ear of key members of the Venezuelan Congress but that he frequently sees some of the top officials of President Romulo Betancourt's administration.

BEING WATCHED

The return of the Communists to the political arena in Guatemala is also being watched with increasing anxiety by all the Central American governments.

The Reds in Argentina are so powerful in about one-third of the labor unions, and they are working so closely with those that are dominated by die-hard followers of former dictator Juan Domingo Peron, that they have imperiled the government of President Arturo Frondizi.

In Uruguay, one of the most tolerant of all the countries toward Communists and leftists, the Government has for the first time in several years become concerned about the activities of Russian diplomats as well as local communist leaders.

All-American Foreign Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the fact that our Foreign Service is truly all-American and representative of every part of our Nation as well as every strata of society is not generally understood, and I am pleased to include with my remarks today an excellent discussion of this subject by Hon. Loy W. Henderson, a distinguished career officer of the Department of State now serving as Deputy Under Secretary.

Mr. Henderson's letter was a reply to one from me prompted by a discussion in the House July 21 between the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], and others. I believe Mr. Henderson's letter will be of interest to them and to the American people generally.

The letter follows:

DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE,
FOR ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, August 4, 1959.

The Honorable FRANK T. BOW,
House of Representatives.

DEAR Mr. Bow: Thank you for calling my attention, in your letter of July 23, 1959, to the debate which took place in the House of Representatives on July 21, during which it was suggested that the Foreign Service is made up mostly of graduates of the so-called Ivy League colleges. You commented that this did not accord with the impression you have gained from your acquaintance with Foreign Service officers, and you asked to be informed of the distribution of colleges attended by officers in the Foreign Service and

particularly by those in the secretariat of the Department.

I read with the greatest interest the report of this debate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I was impressed by the interest shown in the Foreign Service, and it is my impression that the spirit of the remarks made was friendly. I can assure you that the Department of State shares the point of view so eloquently expressed that the Foreign Service of the United States should be broadly representative. I feel that I must add, however, that it is also essential that the Foreign Service Officer Corps be composed of officers of the highest abilities and qualifications.

The experience of nearly 200 years of participation by the United States in the field of international relations has made it clear that our diplomatic and consular representatives should be men of intelligence, with sound training for public service, who possess a good education obtained from educational institutions or otherwise. The Foreign Service is a profession of a most demanding character. I am confident that you and your colleagues will agree that it would be unthinkable to admit a physician or a lawyer to their respective professions unless their educations met exacting standards. This is also true with respect to the Foreign Service. It is, of course, important to have in the Foreign Service officers whose backgrounds reflect many varied experiences in all sections of our country. Character and intellectual attainment should, however, be controlling considerations in the selection of our officers.

As a result of our inquiries, I am able to confirm your impression that the Foreign Service is not an Ivy League club. Of the 3,427 officers in the Service, our records indicate only 649 received their bachelor degrees from the 8 institutions which, I understand, constitute the Ivy League. The remaining college graduates come from educational institutions spread across the Nation, including 48 State universities.

You inquired about the officers serving in the Secretariat. We select for work in the Secretary's office only officers of unusual capacity. They cannot, therefore, be considered as entirely typical. However, among the 23 Foreign Service officers assigned to that office, only 3 obtained their bachelor degrees from Ivy League schools, 1 is without a degree, and 19 received their degrees from 17 other colleges and universities.

Every one of our 50 States, as well as Puerto Rico and the Canal Zone, is represented by native sons who are Foreign Service officers. The bulk of them do not come from wealthy families. They are men and women who have earned at least a part of their way through college. We have noted from their records that they helped finance their educations by working at occupations such as the following: Filling station attendant, cowhand, janitor, hotel clerk, ice-man, salesman, merchant seaman, supermarket cashier, common laborer, luncheonette counterwoman, department store clerk, waiter, typist, riverboat deckhand, and lumberjack. If you will forgive a personal allusion, I think that I am typical of them. During my high school and college days (I graduated from a midwestern institution) I have worked in rubber factories, steel mills, lumber mills, in shops of various kinds, and in the harvest fields. Like most officers in the Service, I worked during my summer and Christmas vacations in order to help pay for my schooling. Some of our most capable and valuable officers, however, have come from families with means which enabled them to spend their vacations otherwise. Unfortunately, there are still many positions in the Service in which a man with private means willing to spend his own funds for the advantage of the U.S. Government can be more effective than one without an independent income.

Foreign Service officers are drawn on a basis of equality of opportunity from ancestors who came to this country from Asia and Africa as well as from Europe. Our files do not indicate the racial or ethnic origins of our officers. It is our policy not to show race or religion in the personnel records. I know personally, however, that the Negroes in the Foreign Service Officer Corps, for example, are not confined—as has been suggested—to one or two showcase examples.

Another point of misapprehension has arisen, I think, from statistics which the Department of State itself made available to the Congress and the public. They were statistics covering colleges attended by 670 persons appointed to the Foreign Service Officer Corps between January 1, 1946 and September 20, 1952. A newsman quite correctly calculated, from these statistics, that 47 percent of these appointees came from 10 large colleges and universities. Those 10 schools, however, included not only several Ivy League schools but also California, Stanford, Chicago, Wisconsin, Georgetown and George Washington, which are not. Since the period cited above, incidentally, we have made a number of changes designed further to encourage applicants to the Foreign Service from all the parts of the United States. Since mid-1955 the number of centers at which our written examination is given was increased from 16 to 65. The oral examination is being conducted in 23 cities so applicants from every corner of the United States may conveniently and inexpensively take it.

There was also some discussion on the floor of the House of the fact that junior officers frequently find themselves doing work which does not call into play the full range of their background knowledge and scholastic preparation. Instead of engaging at once in activities of a highly responsible nature, young officers in their initial assignments may find themselves handling the office accounts, inventorying the effects of American citizens who have died abroad, preparing trade lists, issuing passports, and engaging in other similar tasks. The pattern of assignment of such responsibilities does not differ between Embassies headed by career or noncareer Ambassadors. We do not consider tasks of the sort I listed above to be menial chores. The young officer engaged in them will one day be better prepared to run an office—as Consul General, Deputy Chief of Mission, or Ambassador—as a result of the experience derived from this work.

It is my understanding that Members of the Congress would like to see a U.S. Foreign Service drawn from main street sources. If by this they mean that they desire a service which truly represents the United States from all walks of life and from every quarter of this country their desire, in my opinion, is already realized.

Sincerely yours,

LOY W. HENDERSON.

Poison in Your Water—No. 154

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Dan-

ville (Ill.) Commercial-News of June 4, 1959, entitled "Blue River Pollution Investigated".

[From the Danville (Ill.) Commercial-News, June 4, 1959]

BLUE RIVER POLLUTION INVESTIGATED

LAFAYETTE, IND.—A study and diagnosis of the internal organs of several cows and calves that died after drinking water of Big Blue River near Freeport is being conducted at Purdue University laboratories.

State board of health also has warned residents of Shelby County near the river not to drink or bathe in the water, according to George Jones, Indiana conservation officer. He is conducting an investigation of the source of the pollution which also has caused the death of hundreds of fish.

Ralph Burkhardt, a farmer, told Jones he estimated his loss at \$3,500 for seven cows and three calves that died after drinking from the river.

Head and Shoulders Standout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its Director, J. Edgar Hoover, have long held the esteem and confidence of the Nation. The vigilance and effectiveness of the Bureau's work in protecting the freedoms of Americans against crime and threats to our national security is well known and has earned the continued admiration of our people.

I should like to call to the attention of the Congress, a tribute to this fine agency which appeared in the August 7 edition of the Buckeye Lake and Thornville News of Perry County, Ohio.

The editorial is as follows:

HEAD AND SHOULDERS STANDOUT

It is not likely that public confidence in the Federal Bureau of Investigation as it is now constituted can ever be shaken. It is important to emphasize some of the reasons which underlie this well-deserved respect and trust.

Under the dedicated direction of J. Edgar Hoover, the FBI since 1924 has become one of the world's outstanding investigating agencies. Excellent administrative control, thrift, good budgetary, and accounting procedures and careful planning have made it a model of successful operation—a head-and-shoulders standout among Government bureaus.

From special agent to clerk in the organization, Mr. Hoover's personnel policies have created the highest morale and esprit de corps. The high quality of the Bureau's operations was highlighted again by its record for fiscal 1958. During that year, 96.8 percent of persons brought to trial in FBI cases were convicted. In this same period, over \$132 million in savings and recoveries to the Government were made, as compared with the total of \$105.5 million in direct appropriations approved by the Congress for this agency. This is something that every taxpayer can well appreciate.

For outstanding service and a job well done, every citizen owes this country's top investigative agency a resounding vote of confidence.

Joint Resolution for World's Fair in New York in 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, Hon. JAMES J. DELANEY, Hon. LESTER HOLTZMAN, and I, EDNA F. KELLY, introduced an appropriate joint resolution for the purpose of having a World's Fair in New York in 1964, at the same time that a companion joint resolution was introduced in the other body. At that time, we gave to the newspapers a release explaining briefly the plan for this event which I hope the Members of the House will read.

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, New York, and Representative EDNA F. KELLY, Democrat, New York, today, Thursday, introduced in the Senate and House of Representatives legislation authorizing the President to invite foreign countries to participate in a World's Fair in New York City in 1964. The purpose of the fair is to commemorate the 300th anniversary of New York City; its theme, "Peace Through Understanding," recalls the theme of the 1939 New York World's Fair, "Building the World of Tomorrow."

Senator JAVITS and Representative KELLY pointed out that an organizing committee for the fair has already been established by Mayor Wagner and that plans are underway for the financing of the exposition by private investment and business and commercial interests in New York City and elsewhere. They stated that the fair's sponsors estimate some 70 million people will attend the fair, a figure far in excess of the 45 million who visited the 1939-40 exposition.

Some 10 million or more of the visitors are expected to come from Canada, Mexico, and other foreign nations, and will, it is estimated, spend between \$1 billion and \$2 billion of the \$6 billion expected to be spent by the fair's visitors. Commenting on this, the sponsors stated: "The 1964 New York World's Fair will serve not only as a showcase of America for all those who will visit it but it will also serve to attract foreigners to our shores to visit the rest of the United States along with the fair. This is an excellent followup to Visit U.S.A. Year, 1960, and will go a long way toward making this country a truly international tourist attraction."

Commenting further on the bill, Mr. JAVITS and Mrs. KELLY said: "In its 300 years of existence New York City has grown from a colonial village to the world's leading metropolitan area and seaport of 7 million people. It has been the gateway for millions of immigrants who came to make the United States their future home. Each year its water and air facilities handle cargo measured in millions of tons and valued at billions of dollars. It is an outstanding center in learning, research and culture."

"The 1964 fair has the enthusiastic endorsement of all segments of New York City's varied and active life. Foreign governments as well as private exhibitors will participate."

The full text of the Javits-Kelly bill follows:

"JOINT RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE PRESIDENT TO INVITE FOREIGN COUNTRIES TO PARTICIPATE IN A WORLD'S FAIR, NEW YORK, 1964

"Whereas there is to be held at New York City during the year 1964 a World's Fair which has for its purpose the commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the establishment of the city of New York; and

"Whereas through the city of New York, since its establishment in 1664, the peoples, sciences, cultures, and products of all nations have passed into this continent and the United States of America, and said city has served as a beacon for freedom and democracy as exemplified in the Statue of Liberty, donated by the peoples of France to the peoples of the United States and whose torch lights the way into the harbor of this great city; and

"Whereas, because of its location and purpose, its scope and aims, said World's Fair is deserving of the support and encouragement of the Government of the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and respectfully requested by proclamation, or in such manner as he may deem proper and appropriate, to invite foreign countries and nations to such proposed World's Fair with a request that they participate therein and to take such steps as may be appropriate to secure such participation."

color of eminent domain for resale to private persons"; "59-102, File charges against Russia."

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

GORDON A. LYONS,
Department Adjutant.

RESOLUTION 59-004, ESTABLISH A SINGLE OATH OF ALLIGIANCE FOR NATURALIZATION OF CITIZENS

Whereas, this department by convention resolutions over a period of years petitioned the Congress of the United States to review the Immigration and Nationality Act, especially that part entitled: "Oath of renunciation and allegiance," and to amend by striking provisions for the alternative oath (c) and other such conditions which prejudice and corrupt our constitutional obligations and privileges, to the end that there shall be but one standard of citizenship based upon sacrificial service in time of national distress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion in regular convention assembled in Hollywood, Calif., June 25-28, 1959, reaffirm its strenuous objection to the existence of a less than 100 percent citizenship as established by this oath, and renew its petition for amendment of the said act; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Representatives of the State of California in the Congress of the United States, the President and Vice President of the United States, and the Secretary of State and the national convention of the American Legion.

RESOLUTIONS 59-012 AND 59-064, NATIONAL CEMETERIES

Whereas interment in a national cemetery is the last homage a grateful Nation can render to our department comrades; and

Whereas the greater Los Angeles area contains the highest concentration of veterans in the United States and has no national cemetery, and the east bay area with a rapidly increasing veteran population has available only the San Bruno National Cemetery which at the present rate will be completely filled within from 5 to 7 years; and

Whereas since the cemetery at Sawtelle is available only to veterans who die in facilities connected therewith and as a result families of most veterans dying in the Los Angeles area are put to expense and inconvenience by reason of the fact that no facilities exist closer than San Diego; and

Whereas there will soon be great need for additional national cemetery area throughout the State of California, and the cost of acquiring land therefor will almost certainly increase with every year's delay: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, in regular convention assembled, in Hollywood, Calif., June 25-28, 1959, urge action for the establishment of national cemeteries, one in the Los Angeles area, and one in the east bay, at the earliest possible time; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Legion, Department of California lend its full moral support to the campaign to secure a national cemetery for the east bay area and the Los Angeles area, and that copies of this resolution be forwarded to our Congressmen and U.S. Senators.

RESOLUTION 59-043, OPPOSING COMPROMISE IN OUR RELATIONS WITH COMMUNIST CHINA

Whereas the Communist government of the mainland of China has repeatedly shown herself incapable of recognizing the principles of human dignity, and civilized action in her relationships with the governments of other nations; and

Whereas by repeated acts of aggression

upon her neighbors and repeated threats to the peace of the world, this Communist dictatorship has disqualified herself to join in full partnership with the free nations of the world; and

Whereas any form of compromise with this Government would strike a powerful propaganda blow for the Communist cause throughout the world and serve to dishearten the many millions of Chinese who look forward to the day of liberation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion, Department of California, in regular convention assembled in Hollywood, Calif., June 25-28, 1959, That this organization emphatically opposes any movements to compromise with this totalitarian government, especially; be it further

Resolved, That we strongly oppose diplomatic recognition of Communist China, in any form, by the Government of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That we equally oppose admission of Communist China into the United Nations or any of its agencies, and we urge the representatives of the United States at that body to use the veto power of our Nation to prevent such admission; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Members of Congress and the Senators of the United States representing the State of California and to the President and Vice President of the United States and to the Secretary of State and the national headquarters of the American Legion.

RESOLUTION 59-054, ADEQUATE FUNDS BE PROVIDED VETERANS EMPLOYMENT SERVICES IN ORDER TO PROPERLY DISCHARGE ITS RESPONSIBILITIES

Whereas throughout the years, the American Legion has emphasized the need for continuing to provide an effective employment and counseling service for veterans and has supported legislation to that effect; and

Whereas to many veterans in California and other States, finding suitable employment is a continuing problem; and

Whereas the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, requires the establishment of facilities for adequate counseling, registering, and placement service for all veterans through the various State employment services; and

Whereas the Secretary of Labor's policies, in accordance with the intent and purpose of Congress, state there shall be an effective job counseling and employment placement service for veterans, and it is the responsibility of the Veterans Employment Service of the U.S. Employment Service to see that the policies of the Secretary of Labor are carried out by the State employment services: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, Department of California, in department convention assembled at Hollywood, Calif., June 25-28, 1959, does hereby reiterate its support of the policies of the Secretary of Labor as they relate to the veterans employment program; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Legion's national organization petition the Congress of the United States that adequate funds be provided the State employment services and that adequate funds be provided for the sole use of the Veterans Employment Service, in order that the Veterans Employment Service may be adequately staffed to properly discharge its responsibilities in accordance with the acts of Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the national convention of the American Legion and to each of the Senators and members of the California delegation in Congress.

Six Official Resolutions Adopted by American Legion, Department of California, in Regular Convention at Hollywood, Calif., June 25-28, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of communication to me dated August 7, 1959, from the department adjutant, American Legion, Department of California, together with copies of the six resolutions enclosed to me by the adjutant, adopted by the American Legion Department of California in regular convention assembled in Hollywood, Calif., June 25-28, 1959:

AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA,
San Francisco, August 7, 1959.

HON. CLYDE DOYLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOYLE: Attached for your attention are the following entitled resolutions which were adopted by the American Legion, Department of California, in regular convention assembled in Hollywood, Calif., June 25-28, 1959: "59-004, Establish a single oath of allegiance for naturalization of citizens"; "59-012 and 59-064, National cemeteries"; "59-043, Opposing compromise in our relations with Communist China"; "59-054, Adequate funds be provided veterans employment services in order to properly discharge its responsibilities"; "59-100, Opposing the seizing of private property by public agencies under the

RESOLUTION 59-100, OPPOSING THE SEIZING OF PRIVATE PROPERTY BY PUBLIC AGENCIES UNDER THE COLOR OF EMINENT DOMAIN FOR RESALE TO PRIVATE PERSONS

Whereas within the past 2 years the homes of many hundreds of our California citizens have been seized under the power of eminent domain and then resold at a loss to the taxpayer to private interests at their great financial gain; and

Whereas allowing the power of eminent domain to be used for the purpose of taking property from one private person for the use of other private persons for private purposes is contrary to the basic right of full ownership of private property; and

Whereas both historically and actually the right to remain secure in ownership of one's home is the basic right underlying all other freedoms of our American Republic, and a threat to this right is a threat to all rights of Americans; and

Whereas such activities have been carried out under color of certain State and Federal legislation and certain State court decisions which can be altered only by appropriate legislation in our State and National Legislatures: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, Department of California, opposes in principle the seizing of private property by public agencies under the color of eminent domain for resale to private persons; and be it further

Resolved, That this convention urge that such misuse of the power of eminent domain be curtailed by appropriate legislation in the State legislature and by appropriate amendments to existing laws by the Congress of the United States.

RESOLUTION 59-102, FILE CHARGES AGAINST RUSSIA

"Whereas the Department of California of the American Legion at their annual convention held at Sacramento in 1958 approved the following resolution:

"Whereas near the close of World War II a war weary world, being assured that a permanent peace could be obtained only by an association of nations, accepted the proposition of Alger Hiss and his associates to join in the formation of the United Nations; and

"Whereas certain provisions were made which seemed to guarantee that aggressor nations would be restrained and punished for any violation of the Charter of the United Nations; and

"Whereas U.S.S.R. has repeatedly violated the provisions of this charter and since its inception has been the root of all threats for the peace of the world; and

"Whereas no correction of this end has been possible with U.S.S.R. sitting in the council of judgment; and

"Whereas their extravagant use of the veto, their inciting of the Korean debacle, costing the lives of more than 40,000 American boys, their interference in the affairs of Greece, Indochina, and the atrocious mass murders in Hungary, and finally the treacherous action in the breach of international law which resulted in the murder of the Hungarian leader Nagy; and

"Whereas time has worked against us. We have given 12 years' trial to put this plan to preserve world peace during which time we have had war and threats of war continuously while we progressively lose ground to Russia. In the period since World War II nearly one-half of the people of the civilized world have become captives of the godless dictatorship of Moscow. The time for action is now; delay may be fatal: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, Department of California, in convention assembled this 27th day of June, 1958, hereby demand the representatives of the United

States in the United Nations to immediately file charges in the Security Council against Russia with a view of their expulsion from the United Nations; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress withhold all funds for the U.N. and its agencies until such time as Russia has been removed as a member of the United Nations; and be it further

Resolved, That, failing in this, Congress proceed in instituting the withdrawal of the United States from membership in the United Nations; and

"Whereas 1 full year has passed since the adoption of this resolution during which time the millions of people in Tibet and Iraq have become captives of their communist aggressors; and more of our airplanes have been deliberately shot down in international areas while Soviet leaders flagrantly ignore our protests: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion, Department of California, in convention assembled this 26th day of June, 1959, That we urge, with all the power of our command that the Congress of the United States proceed with our withdrawal from the United Nations and to withhold the payment of any funds to the United Nations or any of its associated agencies; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the national headquarters and to every California Congressman and Senator."

Address of Middlesex County Sheriff Howard Fitzpatrick at New Hampshire Democratic Outing in Milford, N.H.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, recently Sheriff Howard Fitzpatrick, of Middlesex County, which embraces the congressional district I am privileged to represent, delivered a very fine address to a statewide New Hampshire Democratic gathering in Milford, N.H.

Sheriff Fitzpatrick pointed out that if Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, is given the Democratic nomination for the Presidency next year, the Democratic Party can look with confidence to victory in 1960. I certainly subscribe to Sheriff Fitzpatrick's clear remarks and feel certain that if the distinguished and able junior Senator from Massachusetts is our Democratic standard bearer our party will once again occupy the White House.

I recommend Sheriff Fitzpatrick's speech as thoughtful reading to the Democratic membership of the Congress:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished Democrats, ladies, and gentlemen, first I bring to you the greetings of the Democrats of the great State of Massachusetts to the Democrats of our neighboring State of New Hampshire.

We in Massachusetts are looking forward to 1960 when New Hampshire will elect a Democratic Governor. And, we are sure that the 1960 State election in New Hampshire will see many more Democrats elected to office on every level of government.

The interpretation of political news from all sections of the Nation shows that the Democratic Party is in the throes of a political revival such has not been witnessed

since Franklin D. Roosevelt ousted Herbert Hoover from the White House in 1932. He won the election over Hoover by a margin of 472 to 59 in the electoral college.

A look at the political facts since 1952, when the GOP self-termed crusade with a parade of Madison Avenue political hucksters selling the Republicans to the Nation, elected a Republican President, clearly shows that the people realize that they were sold a bill of goods that did not match with performance.

Two years after the people elected a Republican President in 1954, they repudiated the Republican Party and voted the Democrats a majority in Congress.

In 1956 for the second time they refused the Republicans a majority in Congress.

In 1958 they swept the Democrats into control of the House and Senate by one of the biggest single gains in history.

And, in 1958, the people increased the number of Democratic Governors from 29 to 35.

The people did this because they are convinced that the Democratic Party is the "can do" party and the Republican Party is the "can't do, stand pat, hold still" party.

Although the Democratic gains since 1952 have been great, we must remember they have all been on the local and State levels. We have not won a nationwide election for more than 10 years.

And, we must realize that there is a tremendous difference between winning State and district elections and winning a national election.

The forces which are lining up to continue Republican rule beyond 1960 are mighty and powerful forces indeed. There are the all powerful, entrenched interests who oppose change simply because it is change, who oppose new ideas simply because they are new. And there has been a new partner, the vast and powerful Federal payroll accumulated for the past 6 years determined to preserve and perpetuate Republican rule in the White House.

Add to those forces the Republican press and the so-called news magazines which blanket our Nation daily and weekly with propaganda for the Republican Party and their candidates and you'll agree with me that we must nominate for our Presidential candidate a party member that has the confidence of the people, a party member that is known by the people, and a party member that can attract the great independent vote to endorse his candidacy in the 1960 election.

We have the man with all those qualifications. He is our own Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Senator KENNEDY is the front runner in every poll for President because he is easily the ablest and the most qualified man in public life today, and meets every test required to make a great President.

This fact is supported not only by his massive popularity, but is further substantiated by the results of a poll made by the Washington Star of Democratic leaders on May 17. This poll showed Senator KENNEDY leading the large field of potential 1960 candidates for President.

It is becoming increasingly clear that the Democratic Party, if we are to hold our gains and make greater gains in 1960, must nominate for President a party member that has already won the popular support of the majority of the people throughout the Nation. We cannot nominate for President one that would have to seek the popular support that Senator KENNEDY has already attained and expect to win.

The time between the national convention in July and the election in November is far too short for any Democrat to win the popular approval of the people that Senator KENNEDY has gained during the past 4 years.

We have visible evidence in the Republican press of how and of the methods that will be employed to create an image of Nixon

as the "crusader for peace," when actually he has literally taken over Christian Herter's post of Secretary of State without the benefit of Senate confirmation.

Can you imagine how the GOP press would respond if a Democratic Vice President took over the Secretary of State's duties? He would be the subject of great criticism on page one of every newspaper in the Nation. But, Nixon as a candidate for the GOP Presidential nomination, as far as the Republican press is concerned, can do no wrong. He must be pictured as "the great crusader for peace." Election time is around the corner and the GOP press will devote considerable white space to favorably present Nixon and Governor Rockefeller, of New York, the other Republican candidate for President, in an effort to turn the trend away from the Democrats to the Republicans.

This will not and cannot be achieved if we follow the dictates of the people and nominate for President, Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Never in our history have we Democrats been under a heavier responsibility to come to the assistance of our country, to infuse new energy and increase intellectual vitality into the life of our Nation.

We must win the election in 1960.

We will win if we nominate for President, Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The key to victory for the Democratic Party in 1960 is the selection of Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY as our nominee for President.

Every political poll is a testament of faith of the people of the Nation in the leadership and achievements of our great Senator, JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Here is a man who fired the imagination and the admiration of the people of the Nation in the highest tradition of the Democratic Party and he will lead our party victory in 1960 of the Democratic Party.

With Senator KENNEDY as our standard bearer, we can look with confidence to victory in 1960.

John Peter Zenger and Freedom of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, for many years the people of the United States, not knowing the background for the constitutional protections that they enjoy, have taken their liberties for granted, even including such vital ones as freedom of the press now embodied in the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

In the struggle preceding adoption of this constitutional principle, the arrest, trial, and acquittal in 1735 of John Peter Zenger, a New York colonial printer, was a precedent-making victory for a free press, which today is not generally known.

An interesting summary of this crucial case by Mr. Al Stewart in the August 4, 1959, issue of the Richmond (Va.) Times Dispatch merits reading by all students of constitutional history.

The indicated news story follows:

JOHN PETER ZENGER'S ACQUITTAL 224 YEARS AGO WAS VICTORY FOR FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

(By Al Stewart)

August 4 has a special meaning in a Nation where democracy is the prevailing form of

government. It was on August 4, 1735, that a jury's acquittal of a New York colonial printer established a principle fundamental in American democracy today and one firmly embodied in the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution—freedom of the press.

The defendant in the celebrated trial was John Peter Zenger, German-born printer of the New York Weekly-Journal during the fourth decade of the 18th century. The charge brought against Zenger was "printing and publishing a certain false, malicious, seditious * * * libel," and the individual who filed the charge was Gov. William Cosby, appointed by the English Crown to execute laws enacted by the British Parliament for the welfare of New York colonists. As chief executive of New York, Cosby had considerable political power and often used this power to curb the actions of individuals and groups who disagreed with his own political opinions or acts.

Zenger, a member of the Popular Party, the party opposed to Cosby's Court Party, was such a man. The Court Party dictated the editorial policy of William Bradford's New York Gazette, and the Gazette's sympathy for Governor Cosby and his maneuvers aroused the ire of James Alexander and several other vocal opponents of the Cosby administration.

As a result, the Weekly-Journal was formed, with Alexander its first editor and Zenger its printer. When Cosby's efforts to indict those responsible for writing the editorials unfavorable to his administration proved futile, Zenger was arrested on order of the Governor's Council (legislative body), charged with seditious libel, and jailed to await trial.

The printer's 9 months' imprisonment only served to intensify public opposition to Cosby and encourage more letters critical of the Governor and his policies to the Weekly-Journal editor.

Andrew Hamilton, eminent Philadelphia attorney who defended Zenger, entered a plea of "not guilty" to the libel charge. Admitting that his client had printed the issues of the Weekly-Journal in question, Hamilton argued that the statements critical of Cosby were not libelous unless they were proven false, and this Hamilton was unwilling to concede. He appealed to the jurors to return a verdict of "not guilty" if they found the statements appearing in the Weekly-Journal to be true.

In his charge to the 12 jurors, the presiding jurist, James DeLancey, known throughout the colony as an ardent supporter of Governor Cosby, ignored the tradition of judicial impartiality and urged the jury to find Zenger guilty.

"No government can be safe," DeLancey contended, which permits libel to go unpunished.

Despite the protracted arguments which resulted in extending the trial over an 8-day period, the jurors returned to the courtroom after deliberating less than 30 minutes. In an atmosphere charged with tenseness and expectancy, Judge DeLancey queried the jury foreman: "Members of the jury, have you reached a verdict?"

The answer came back distinctly and without hesitation, "We have, Your Honor. Not guilty." The loud applause which greeted the verdict reflected the importance of Zenger's acquittal to liberty-loving colonists in New York as well as in Virginia and other American Colonies.

The Zenger trial would probably have been forgotten in a few years except for its significance in three areas—legal, political, and journalistic.

Legally, the jury's acquittal of Zenger reversed the accepted common-law rule of the 1730's that truth could not be offered as a defense in criminal libel cases and established the principle that the jury is judge of both law and fact in prosecutions for libel.

Today, the truth of published charges is accepted as a defense in prosecutions for criminal libel in all 50 States.

Politically, the printer's acquittal gave birth to the idea that laws framed for English citizens could not be applied to the American colonists without their consent. This idea imbued the colonists with a new spirit of independence and tended to unify them in their struggle against oppressive measures imposed by authorities across the sea. Gouverneur Morris' estimate of the trial's political significance was an apt one: "The trial of Zenger was * * * the morning star of the liberty which subsequently revolutionized America."

Another result of the trial was that it supported the rise of public opinion as a determinant of public policy in the United States. By 1760, 25 years after the trial, popular sentiment was a potent force in shaping Colonial policy on public issues.

Viewed from a journalistic standpoint, the trial was the first major victory for a free press and established a precedent which could be and was cited in subsequent conflicts involving freedom of the press, a concept Alexander Hamilton defined in 1804 as "publishing the truth from good motives and for justifiable ends."

An important tenet established by the trial is that in democratic nations newspapers must be free to comment upon and criticize acts of governing officials. The trial pointed up the intimate tie between political freedom and freedom of the press half a century before Thomas Jefferson wrote his Virginia friend Edward Carrington: "Were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter."

The current of ideas set in motion by the Zenger trial continued throughout the 19th century and the first half of the 20th and has become an integral part of present-day journalism. Although the threat of libel action still hangs over the heads of journalists today, it is not the same libel of which Zenger was acquitted in 1735.

In 1953, New York City paid tribute to the colonial printer by opening the John Peter Zenger memorial room in the Sub-Treasury Building, which stands on the site of the city hall in which Zenger was imprisoned and tried almost 225 years ago.

Included in the room are a variety of scenes and relics depicting Zenger's life and career as a printer. The existence of the memorial room is mute testimony to the lasting importance of Zenger's trial to the fourth estate as well as to all individuals who value personal freedom.

A Possible Cause of Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include a worthwhile message on a probable cause of cancer.

This dread disease which has plagued mankind for centuries and which attacks a number of our citizens, is still an enigma. Its cause is unknown; its cure uncertain.

Tremendous sums of money are spent annually by the Government and by the American Cancer Society and other or-

ganizations on medical research to try to discover a nostrum. So far there has been progress but no definite solution.

Mr. Gilbert has lived a long life free of this dread disease and he now offers his ideas as to the probable cause of cancer. His reasoning, inductive though it be, may prove of value to host of people living in dread of this enemy of mankind:

NEW YORK, August 10, 1959.

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY,
Old House Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: My attention is drawn to the May 19 speech of the Honorable LESTER HILL, Senator from Alabama, on the "Health for Peace Bill," appearing in a reprint of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (not printed at Government expense) sent to us by one of your constituents.

In his speech in support of the bill, the learned Senator refers to the bill as "A measure designed to join the skills and resources of the health scientists of this Nation with the research talent and capabilities of scientists in other countries," and as "a concerted attack upon the unsolved problems of disease and disability which confront all peoples of the world."

Again in the latter part of his speech the Senator refers to the bill as setting forth in simple terms:

"Our belief that disease is a universal threat to the family of man and that we must unite our medical research efforts to wipe out this threat."

Among the diseases, cancer is ranked as the second leading cause of death. On April 12 the New York Times called attention to "an international attack on cancer is being urged in a report that will soon be issued by a Senate Government Operations Subcommittee headed by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY."

The report is titled "Cancer: A Worldwide Menace," and the report states: "Against a universal killer mankind must offer a universal defender—scientific cooperation."

Being now in my middle years, I have seen a considerable stretch of life. I have seen many of my friends and acquaintances and men in public life, in the full vigor of their activities stricken by cancer—cancer of the prostate, or of the intestines, or of the stomach, and the recurrence of the attack, after an operation, in a relatively short period of time, which ended their careers.

In contrast, after a life of business activity, I am entirely free of the dread disease, and the question naturally arises, Why the difference?

In the cases which I have observed, those subsequently stricken with cancer, had been men who ate full and plenty of good food, with desserts; they went through their evening meal from cocktails to coffee and liqueurs; they ate when they were tired, stimulated by their drinks; they had what they thought were light breakfasts; they had substantial lunches; they thought they were eating to maintain their strength, but, unconsciously, they were overburdening their stomachs.

In my case, at an early age, because of a weak heart, I was placed by a physician on a very limited diet but entirely sufficient, eliminating desserts entirely and for periods of time taking only two meals a day and occasionally abstaining from food for an entire day. This course I have followed more or less closely for many years.

Now, of course, only as a layman but as one having had the opportunity to observe over a period of fully 35 years, I can draw a layman's conclusion, and it is, that overindulgence in food (the majority of people not realizing the overindulgence), plus the stimulation of a jaded appetite and a tired physique by cocktails, is a root cause of cancer.

This is the very simple but severe truth, that has been forced upon me.

Our tendency is to overindulge in food. We enjoy eating; we entertain our friends with elaborate meals, without realizing that we are overburdening our bodies. Continuously keeping the stomach full, never getting it thoroughly cleaned out; never giving it a real period of rest, continuously creates fermentation and putrefaction, poisoning the system. Any slight cessation of the stimulation of fermentation and putrefaction gives a false sense of hunger, and we eat again, creating more corruption.

Thus, day after day, year after year, with plenty of "good nourishing food," so termed, giving the stomach far more than it can or was intended to take care of; eating to satisfy appetite not to satisfy real hunger; for years creating fermentation and putrefaction, thereby loading the system with poisonous acid toxins—the result is that, in the course of years but nevertheless inexorably, the poisons develop cancer.

In contrast to such indulgence, I have had to live, as I have stated, a very restricted life with my food. In contrast to dying in the prime of life, I am now enjoying the years of relaxation and out-of-doors activities.

I cannot give a scientific explanation but the contrast between the fullness of eating and the simpler diet, above referred to, affords, to my layman's mind, the explanation. However, a scientific explanation seems to be suggested by the reference to the Sloan-Kettering Institute's annual report, appearing in the New York Times of May 28, last, where the following quotation from the report appears:

"We hope that some day we can correlate individual steroid patterns and the development of physical or mental disease. The concept that the body's steroid metabolism might give a forewarning of coming events is an exciting new horizon in preventative medicine."

I do not mean to say that the Sloan-Kettering Laboratory is thinking or working with the thought which I have tried to express, in view, but I do mean to say that it is searching for truth, and its continuous explorations may bring it to the result of my observation, scientifically explained.

Now, while our scientists are struggling to learn a cure for cancer, or a scientific explanation of how to avoid the disease, if we could only impose upon ourselves self-discipline; if we could learn to avoid perking up, day after day, evening after evening, a tired system, stimulating a jaded appetite with the many forms of drink and stimulants now in popular use, and avoid heavy eating, particularly of animal foods and rich desserts; that is, if we could learn to practice self-control and moderation, I am sure, from my observation, that we could avoid the dread disease of cancer.

The good book teaches us, "To him that overcometh will I give a great reward."

I have followed the urge to address you in the hope that someone, somewhere, may be benefitted by my observations.

With best wishes for your continued good work in the Congress.

Yours sincerely,

FREDERIC N. GILBERT.

Earns Applause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, comments on the Vice President's recent tour

of the U.S.S.R. have been favorable, particularly in my own Second District of Washington State. Many newspapers have published editorials congratulating the Vice President and pointing to the hope that the visit of Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev will help the world's two largest nations to understand each other better.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD three editorials. All were published August 6, 1959. These editorials, Mr. Speaker, are typical of those editorials which have appeared in both the daily and weekly newspapers of my district.

The editorial, "Dick Earned Applause," appeared in the Bellingham (Wash.) Herald:

DICK EARNED APPLAUSE

Vice President RICHARD NIXON has demonstrated by his appearance behind the Iron Curtain that he possesses the qualifications to lead this Nation.

Mr. Nixon not only proved that he can be counted on to meet Premier Nikita Khrushchev on almost any terms but that he has a way of winning cheers from those taught that leaders of this Nation were only "capitalistic warmongers."

It was to be expected that his reception in Poland—a captive nation—would be greater than in Russia. The applause from the crowds that gathered to greet the Vice President was much greater than anticipated.

Mr. Nixon went to Russia to better the understanding between the two leading world powers. He was at first met with accusations from Khrushchev but rather than become quiet and passive he rose to the occasion and showed that he could not be intimidated—even while in the lion's den.

And since many authorities on Russia have said that the Kremlin rulers respect forcefulness and power, Nixon soon overcame the first attempts planned to embarrass him. From then on relations between the two men—while continually on a give and take basis—were more cordial.

It is too early to tell whether much was accomplished by the visit but this much can be said. Some of the air was cleared and undoubtedly the two men understand just where they stand. Nikita has said that Nixon probably will be the next U.S. President. Whether this is true will depend upon the will of the American voters. But Nixon knows from firsthand experience whether Khrushchev will listen to reason. This fact may go a long way toward the promotion of a better international understanding.

Mr. Speaker, the Ferndale, Wash., Record printed the following editorial:

LET'S HAVE HIM OVER

We heartily endorse President Eisenhower's plan to invite Premier Khrushchev to America, and to return the compliment and visit Russia. Vice President Nixon's talk may have done much more good than will be known for years. An interchange of visits might change the Premier's thinking as to America and its weaknesses.

Nixon's visit was a smart piece of strategy. Not that we should get weak and relent in our dealings with Russia, but peace could be possible after we tried all angles with Russia.

Democratic Congressmen should realize that they were elected in a big majority to represent the people, not just a group of labor leaders. Fair laws should be passed to control in the same manner as the Wagner and Taft-Hartley laws are aimed at employers.

And, finally, Mr. Speaker, here is an editorial which was published in the Lynden, Wash., Tribune:

FOR BETTER UNDERSTANDING

Vice President RICHARD NIXON's visit to Russia has provided a welcome change in the headlines, giving hope for possible better international understanding.

Rather than fire insults at long-range, the leaders of both Russia and the United States can gain much by visiting each other's countries. The announcement that Khrushchev will visit the United States and that President Eisenhower will tour Russia should be greeted with enthusiasm.

People of both nations must be made aware that each possess the means to completely destroy the other in nightmarish warfare more terrible than the world has ever known.

Exchange of visits by the top leaders of the two countries should help to bring about better understanding and a determination to maintain world peace.

The Labor Reform Tangle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Joseph Alsop entitled "The Labor Reform Tangle," which appeared in the Washington, D.C., Post and Times Herald:

THE LABOR REFORM TANGLE

(By Joseph Alsop)

The labor reform fight has produced the worst legislative tangle, the most flagrant lobbying, and the greatest output of heat without light in the recent history of the House of Representatives. Yet it is worth trying to thread one's way through the tangle.

Three different bills are involved, to begin with. Least severe is the bill sponsored by Representative JOHN F. SHELLEY, Democrat, of California. It mainly calls for disclosure of union financial transactions. It has been called the "milk and water" bill. But it is actually roughly comparable to the quite significant labor reform bill passed in New York State by Gov. Nelson Rockefeller.

Second, there is the bill sponsored by Representative CARL ELLIOTT, Democrat, of Alabama, which was favorably reported by a majority of the House Committee on Education and Labor. Besides strong requirements for disclosure, the Elliott bill regulates secondary boycotts and other dubious labor practices. It is roughly comparable to the bill that passed the Senate.

Third, there is the bill sponsored by Representatives ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, Republican, of Michigan, and PHIL M. LANDRUM, Democrat, of Georgia. The Griffin-Landrum bill goes much further than the Elliott bill in its restrictions on secondary boycotts, picketing, and so on. In view of its origin, this might better be called the bill of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers. It has also won President Eisenhower's public endorsement.

Among the labor leaders, James R. Hoffa of the Teamsters and old John L. Lewis of the United Mine Workers are opposed to all labor reform legislation, no matter what. Even the Shelley bill would handicap Hoffa. Hoffa's lobbyist John Scanz, has flatly said that labor (meaning Hoffa) "cannot live with" the middle-of-the-road Elliott bill.

The Shelley bill is supported by labor leaders who have acknowledged the need for reform, like George Meany of the AFL-CIO. It is in fact their bill, not Hoffa's, and they are its only backers. Meany and the others like him are actively opposing the Elliott bill, saying it is antilabor. As for the Griffin-Landrum bill, it arouses the same labor emotions as the right-to-work issue—which did not conspicuously aid the Republicans in the last congressional elections.

Despite labor's opposition to it, the middle-of-the-road Elliott bill has the support of Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn, all the House's moderate Democrats, and the 10 to 15 Republican Members who care about the labor vote in their districts. This group in the center is being badly squeezed, however, between the union-controlled leftwing Democrats and rightwing Members.

The real leader of the fight for the Griffin-Landrum bill is the new House Republican leader, Representative CHARLES HALLECK, of Indiana. In discussing labor legislation, Representative HALLECK has said, reportedly, that he "wants a killer, or no bill at all." This is also the approach of the employers' associations. These have been putting on the heat for the Griffin-Landrum bill in a style that can only be compared to the style of Hoffa.

To complete the tangle, the burning issue of civil rights is indirectly but importantly involved. The conservative southern Democratic faction headed by the immensely powerful chairman of the House Rules Committee, Representative HOWARD SMITH, of Virginia, would like to pass stringent labor legislation. Yet many of these southerners would be amenable to Speaker RAYBURN's persuasions, if SMITH and HALLECK did not have an understanding on the civil rights issue.

The existence of the understanding will of course be denied by HALLECK, with many a self-righteous roar. But the fact is well known all the same. HALLECK has undertaken, in effect, to help SMITH block action on civil rights, if SMITH helps him with the labor bill and other measures of special interest to the Republicans.

As these words are written, no one can tell whether HALLECK's Republicans plus SMITH's southern Democrats can substitute the Griffin-Landrum bill for the middle-of-the-road Elliott bill. "The House has never been so buffeted by industry pressures, labor pressures, and White House pressures (for the White House lobbying squad has also been hard at work). The Shelley bill has no chance, but otherwise the outcome of the House voting is quite unpredictable.

One can predict, however, that if HALLECK passes his "killer" bill in the House, no law will reach the statute books. For the Senate conferees will never accept the "killer," whereas they would accept with cheers the bill that Hoffa's own lobbyist says Hoffa cannot live with.

financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the proponents of the Landrum-Griffin bill who profess to be so dedicated in their determination to bring democracy and fairplay to union-management matters, did not let a little of both rub off on themselves when it came to allotting the time in this important debate. The debate has been characterized by a steady dribble of speeches on behalf of the Landrum-Griffin bill while the proponents of the committee bill or the Shelley bill seem to have trouble getting a word in edgewise. It does not argue well for democratic procedures in this body when one sees nonmembers of the Committee on Labor and Education being allowed to orate their antilabor views almost to their heart's content while members of the committee—including members of the subcommittee which conducted the hearings on this important bill—are being limited to a mere 5 minutes in the well of the House. Such a situation is inevitable, however, when those in charge of the debate saw to it that the time was divided in a way that gave two-thirds of the time to those who cared to speak on behalf of the Landrum-Griffin substitute while a mere one-sixth of the time was given to an explanation and discussion of the committee bill and a like amount to the Shelley substitute.

One can only hope that whatever labor-management reform law is finally enacted that it will bring more true democracy to the union halls of America than has so far been allowed to be manifested in this important debate in this Hall of Congress. Under the prevailing circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I can do little more than to take advantage of the House rules which permit me to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that I may get on record on the side of reason and in the interest of having enacted into law the effective labor-management reform legislation which the country needs and the people of America rightly demand.

Mr. Chairman, the way to this legislation is the committee bill. This is not to suggest that the committee bill is the best possible bill, but I am convinced that it is the best bill possible. In fact, it may be the only bill which stands any chance of being enacted into law. All three bills are really not at great odds when it comes to dealing with the matter of racketeering and controlling the other abuses brought out by the McClellan committee. This end could be accomplished effectively by the Shelley bill and it is to the credit of the AFL-CIO that they have endorsed this legislative proposal to help rid the labor movement of the undesirable element which in recent years in a few—but still too many—places has been able to creep in and corrupt honest unionism. Cer-

Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8342) to provide for reporting and disclosure of certain

tainly the crooks and racketeers could be effectively controlled by the provisions of the committee bill. The best proof of this is the fact that 70 to 80 percent of the Landrum-Griffin bill is copied word for word from the committee measure, and whatever is wrong with the Landrum-Griffin bill—and there are many things wrong with it—it cannot be said that it, too, would not get to the basic problems of racketeering and gangsterism in labor-management matters.

Unfortunately, the real need, the true purpose for labor-management reform legislation, to correct the abuses exposed by the McClellan committee, have been all but tossed aside during the course of the last week. It is no longer a question of getting the crooks and racketeers who operate in labor and management affairs. The struggle we are now witnessing arises from the efforts of those on the one hand who, for political or other selfish reasons, do not want any labor-management reform bill passed in this Congress and those, on the other hand, who would use the need for labor reform as a vehicle to carry into law their own antiunion prejudice.

I want a labor-management reform law. I want it to be effective. I want it in this Congress. In my judgment, the fatal weakness of the Shelley bill is not that it will not do the job of controlling abuses in unions but that it stands no chance of being enacted. Realistically, it cannot pass this House. If it did, it would face substantial re-writing in conference and even so, in the end—if last week's TV appearance gave us any indication of the President's knowledge and convictions on the subject—it would probably be vetoed. But on the other hand, the Landrum-Griffin bill has many defects but certainly one of the best arguments for voting against it is that its passage by this body gravely threatens the possibility of enacting any labor reform legislation in this Congress. Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY has explained why this is so when he said last week:

This Congress must pass a labor-management reform bill. We cannot go home without enacting a responsible, effective measure that will strike hard at racketeers without penalizing honest union members—a bill that will carry out all the recommendations of the McClellan committee.

The Griffin-Landrum bill now offered as a substitute for the Elliott bill is not such a measure—and its adoption would endanger final passage of any reform legislation by complicating the chances for a conciliation of the Senate and House version.

The Griffin-Landrum bill seeks to undo the conscientious efforts of the House committee members by substituting a punitive measure—restricting the rights of all honest union members—for a responsible measure aimed at the Hoffas, the Dios, and the Shermans, based on the McClellan committee's reports and compatible with the strong, workable bill which passed the Senate 90 to 1.

The hodgepodge substitute bill, on the other hand, goes far beyond the recommendations of the McClellan committee—threatening to restrict the antiracketeering efforts of honest unions, to bog down small unions and the bill's administration in a welter of redtape, and to weaken labor's legitimate

rights at the bargaining table. Far more than that, it strengthens the grip of racketeers. I am hopeful that it will be promptly rejected by all those truly interested in passing a strong antiracketeering bill during this session of Congress.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts is not alone in understanding why the Landrum-Griffin bill seriously jeopardizes the chances of passing any labor-management reform legislation. For example, his brother, Robert Kennedy, chief counsel for the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, stated quite frankly his concern in this regard earlier this week when he said:

I am concerned that the Landrum-Griffin bill, on the other hand, going beyond the scope of the McClellan committee's findings to affect the economic balance at the bargaining table by honest and legitimate unions and employers, might cause such controversy in conference with the Senate that there would be no bill. This would be tragic—and make many months of effort on the McClellan committee go for naught—for, if legislation is not passed this year when the McClellan committee is coming to an end, it will never pass.

For this reason I am strongly in favor of the Elliott bill; and I am convinced that its passage by the House will lead to the House-Senate conference producing a bill which will do the job this committee is recommending.

There has been so much oratory and so much propaganda about what the committee bill doesn't do that it might be well to state specifically just what it does do. This is what the committee bill will do.

Shakedown picketing is punished with a \$10,000 fine and a 20-year prison sentence.

Embezzlement of union funds is punished even more severely.

Union officers are made personally and legally responsible for their use of funds and must be bonded.

All unions of any appreciable size must make full financial reports.

Union officers must be elected periodically by secret ballot.

The so-called hot cargo contracts, which have formed the basis of much of Jimmy Hoffa's power, are specifically outlawed.

Organizational picketing is strictly regulated.

An expanded NLRB will handle the so-called no man's land.

This is what the committee will do. And this is what a bill should do to correct the abuses brought out by the many months of testimony before the McClellan committee. The committee bill is, in the words of Speaker RAYBURN, "aimed at reforming without ruining, at curing without crippling." But the most important thing that can be said on its behalf is that it is a bill which can become law; a bill which will give to the American people the labor reform legislation to which they are entitled. It will do this without jeopardizing the legitimate rights of unions and union members. It is, as I said before, not a perfect bill. It is not the best possible bill, but it is the best bill possible.

Dr. Maurice N. Eisendrath, Clergyman of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on June 18, 1959, it was my happy privilege to attend a most distinguished gathering of American citizens. The occasion was the national churchman awards dinner during the Washington Pilgrimage of the Religious Heritage of America.

We were pleased to witness the bestowal of several well deserved awards. That of Layman of the Year went to our very able, learned, and genial former colleague, the Honorable Brooks Hays, of Arkansas.

The award of the Clergyman of the Year went to my good friend, the president of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Dr. Maurice N. Eisendrath, a learned and revered rabbi, a truly inspired and inspiring religious leader.

In accepting the award, Dr. Eisendrath made a most stirring address. I am pleased to direct our colleagues' attention to the following excerpts from his talk, as follows:

With all of our talk of religious revival, I believe religion is in mortal danger in our time. The grave danger is that religion will be irrelevant to the profoundest developments of our age—irrelevant to the deep historical and scientific revolutions which now shake our world to its depths. If we seek to find retreat and sanctuary in our cool, modern churches and synagogues from the tempestuous social and political storms which rage outside; if we religionists become entrapped in the blandness, the status-seeking, and the snobishness characteristic of the worst of our society and turn our backs on the hard prophetic tasks which cry out to be done in our communities and the world, then religion will be irrelevant—and bankrupt—and all of us, Christian and Jew alike, will have failed our holy mandate.

However, religion can and must, as a living faith, help to shape society in the image of God's Kingdom. This is the shining testimony of the Bible, of the prophets, of Jesus, and the saints and sages of all religions. In our own times, such disparate personalities as Martin Luther King, Mahatma Gandhi, and Albert Schweitzer have demonstrated anew the revolutionary, awe-inspiring power of religious faith transmuted into action.

Peace is the overarching and testing challenge to all religions today. The word of God must rise above political ideologies, above national patriotisms, and divisions of mankind, and speak to all the children of God. The rituals and dogmas and divisions of religion have kept us from joining, regardless of our differing theologies, in the holy task of building a peaceful world. I think it is a healthy development that Protestants are seeking greater ecumenical solidarity with their fellow Protestants; that Jews are seeking to strengthen relationships with their brethren throughout the world; that the Pope has now sought to establish a greater measure of unity in Christendom. But, at the risk of appearing presumptuous, I submit that it is infinitely more urgent for the leaders of all religions to join hands now to express the conscience of mankind in the

preeminent task: to save mankind from the scourge of nuclear suicide.

I take it that it is a part of the religious obligation to shatter complacency, to think boldly and clearly, to create new initiatives, and to go beyond the immediacies of politicians and the vested interests of generals and to apply the eternal truths of our religious heritage to the thorny realities of the world in which we live. It is a part of our task, it seems to me, to illumine the hard long-range problems that are, invariably swept under the rug because most people find them too difficult and painful to consider.

One such problem, which we ignore at our peril, is the phenomenon identified as the "population explosion." Who will jolt the world community into awareness if not aroused religious leaders? One hundred and thirty-five years ago we reached a population of one billion. Since then, population has soared like a rocket and with much greater potential significance than missiles. The second billion was reached 30 years ago. The third will arrive in about 1963. The fourth, according to the U.N. will be reached in 1980; the fifth, 1990; the sixth, 2000. We will triple the world population in 40 years.

The reasons are obvious. Medical missions, and sanitation, and public health have been brought by the West to the underdeveloped countries of the world, bringing high birth rates and reduced death rates. That the white races will shrink in this rising tide of color is obvious and not alarming. But the real challenge is that this population explosion is becoming a grim threat to the free society. For underdeveloped nations, under puny levels of economic assistance, will not be able to sustain their mushrooming populations under a free society; they may be driven, by sheer economic necessity, to move in the direction of dictatorship by taking the shortcut route of the Communist Chinese because they will not be able to afford the luxury of democratic freedom. Free governments will not be able to inflict upon people living on the raw edge of subsistence the kind of taxes necessary for an upward moving economy. Can democracy survive as an island in a stormy sea of totalitarianism?

It is time for us to bestir ourselves and throw out the habits of thought which a kaleidoscopic world has made dangerous anachronisms. We must insist that the Atlantic community, which has 16 percent of the world's population and consumes 70 percent of the world's wealth, must heed the religious commandment to share their bread with their brothers—not out of philanthropy, but out of humanity. Not for charity, but for survival.

We must, therefore—
Effectuate a summit meeting of the world's great religionists as a necessary step to dramatize the need for bringing about world peace. Such a meeting should include religious leaders from behind the Iron Curtain.

Use this World Refugee Year to spring open the locked doors and gates of this country and all the powerful and favored nations to reasonable numbers of immigrants;

Launch a campaign to double the present level of economic developmental assistance available to underdeveloped nations. It is now between \$3 and \$4 billion. It must be doubled and channeled increasingly through the United Nations. Our present level is not a sacrificial answer to the cries of our brethren. We must not again be guilty of too little and too late. Churches and synagogues must raise funds themselves to supplement the governmental and U.N. aid;

Launch a crash program for the razing of all racial barriers. The emerging world is not white, and the white man cannot stop the dawn. We must get over the colossal egocentrism which blinds us from the real-

ities of mankind's aspirations, the racial revolution sweeping the world, and the terrible price we pay for racial pride and arrogance.

Thinking over these terrible dangers—and yet these great opportunities—ought to be the agenda of religious leadership, together. We need our own summit conference soon. For what is God requiring of us today? Not to die, but to live, to live in order to declare the Word and to do the will and the work of the Lord: to be His servants in order to—

"Make the right to go forth unto the nations
To break not the bruised reed
Nor the dimly burning wick to quench
To make the right to go forth according to
the truth

To fall not nor be crushed
"I'll have set the right in the earth
To be a light to the nations,
To open the blind eyes,
To bring forth the prisoner from the dun-
geon
And them that sit in darkness from the
prison house."

University of Santa Clara

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the oldest institution of higher learning in the State of California is in my congressional district—the University of Santa Clara. Though I am not fortunate enough to be an alumnus of this distinguished university, I look upon it as my own in the sense that it is one of the most powerful influences in the most progressive of districts—my own 10th District.

I am sure my colleagues would be interested in a résumé of the history of one of the Nation's finest schools. For this reason I submit, under leave to extend my remarks, certain portions of a publication entitled "Santa Clara, the Mission University."

SANTA CLARA, THE MISSION UNIVERSITY

Under eastern skies, a young Virginia planter turned soldier mulled the responsibilities of wintering his troops at Valley Forge, Pa.

Under western skies, a small band of dedicated Catholic priests of the Franciscan Order, sent by the Venerable Padre Junipero Serra, established the Mission Santa Clara de Asis, wellspring of the University of Santa Clara.

The year was 1777.

In these closing years of the 18th century, the Franciscan padres taught their way of life to the primitive Indians who inhabited the valley surrounding the mission. Besides instructing them in Christianity, the padres taught their curious neighbors the building trades, and shared with them their knowledge of such skills as animal husbandry, agriculture, and irrigation.

Three generations later, in 1851, the mission was transferred to the authority of the Jesuit fathers, known primarily throughout the world as a teaching and missionary order. Rev. John Nobili, S.J., was the Jesuit sent to Santa Clara with a purse of \$150 and instructions to begin a college on the mission grounds. Thus the mission became the center and the site of California's first college—now the University of Santa Clara.

At Santa Clara, fine teaching is a tradition, and seems to be linked to heredity. From the first years, the campus was a center for great teachers. Men such as John J. Montgomery, a physics professor in the late 19th century, is remembered today as the "Father of Aviation." He was the first to fly a heavier-than-air machine (at Otay Mesa, Calif., in 1883), antedating the Wright brothers by 20 years, and 8 years before Lillenthal.

Rev. Jerome S. Ricard, S.J., called "Padre of the Rains," developed his famous hypothesis of weather prognostications while he taught at the university in the early 1900's. His theory, based on sunspot variations, and his studies, contributed greatly to the science of meteorology.

Rev. Richard H. Bell, S.J., an outstanding physicist and early experimenter in wireless telegraphy, exchanged the first wireless messages on the Pacific coast with his collaborator, Professor Montgomery (at Villa Maria, 9 miles from the campus). Much of Father Bell's work was done on the campus during the years following the turn of the century.

Many other men, alumni as well as faculty, contributed in great and small ways during the university's first century, helping to build the proud heritage which is Santa Clara.

The end product of the efforts of these men, alumni as well as faculty, has produced an outstanding college of law, a graduate division offering graduate study in the humanities, business administration, and engineering and a teacher training program, a college of arts and sciences, a college of business administration, and a college of engineering.

In each of these colleges one finds faculty members of outstanding quality.

Santa Clara's emphasis on "personalized education" has remained unchanged since early days. The faculty is balanced between Jesuit fathers and lay teachers. Since its founding, the university conscientiously has maintained a low student-faculty ratio which today in the upper division averages 1 faculty member for every 12 students.

The Jesuit Order of the Roman Catholic Church is a teaching order requiring 13 years of study before ordination. This means that each Jesuit has earned one or more master's degrees, and in many cases a doctorate degree, before he is assigned a teaching post.

One of the best known Jesuits at Santa Clara today is Rev. Bernard R. Hubbard, S.J., "the Glacier Priest," famed Alaskan explorer and missionary.

Regarded as a leading authority on Alaska, Father Hubbard has the world's largest collection of film on the 49th State. In his laboratories on the campus, he catalogs his films, editing some for educational television.

There are hundreds of excellent colleges and universities across this Nation. But it is my honest opinion that there are none finer or better than the University of Santa Clara.

The Case of America's Vanishing Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the economic effects of low-priced foreign

imports in the United States are becoming so apparent today that few domestic industries are immune. In southeastern Ohio, which I have the honor to represent, our industries have suffered a long and disastrous train of circumstances which have resulted from our Nation's import policy. Jobs, and the thriving factories in which they existed, have vanished as foreign-made products have displaced U.S. goods in our marketplaces. Our potteries, coal mines, mosaic tile plants, and stainless steel cutlery factories have long suffered from the economic competition. To this list we may add hundreds of other industries including some of those which are basic to our economic survival.

This issue has been argued here on many occasions but, each time, there has been a refusal to recognize the assault on our economy which our present laws are encouraging. The problem is admittedly a difficult one, yet there is little evidence that we are facing it realistically, let alone formulating any policy to deal with it.

I wish to call to the attention of the House of Representatives an article discussing this issue which appeared in the July 1959 edition of *Mill and Factory* magazine outlining some of the thinking being given to the problem of import competition within many industries themselves. The article is as follows:

THE CASE OF AMERICA'S VANISHING MARKETS

It's time we all took a long, hard look at Italian silk suits, Japanese cameras, French sport cars, and German handtools. Let's stop kidding ourselves—these aren't bargains. They are deadly poison, and all of us are committing economic suicide when we buy them.

In case you think this is an unbrotherly statement, prompted by patriotic selfishness—you're right. We think the United States is the most desirable country in the world, and we want to hang onto the economy that helps to make it that way.

But unless we start thinking soberly, all that we treasure will be stripped from us and we'll be at the bottom of the heap, taking aid from the very countries whose economies we've rebuilt from wartime rubble.

THE REAL WAR

Put aside your fears of Communist A- and H-bombs, your anxiety about losing a hot war. We are already losing a war that most of us don't even sense—the economic cold war for world markets. Russia, West Germany, Japan, and even Red China are beating us to the punch, in garnering export dollars. And these countries are threatening to strip us of our domestic markets, as well.

Let's look at a few facts. After World War II, the United States was the unique possessor of an intact economy. The rest of the world powers had been just about knocked out by direct war damage, and we were accorded the privilege of rebuilding their economic machines. During this period we enjoyed a competition-free crack at world markets. Everyone wanted American automobiles, typewriters, air conditioners, toasters, and machine tools. But the honeymoon is now over. The industries of England, West Germany, Belgium, Japan, Italy, and France are new again. These countries must find markets for the increasing flow of products pouring from their factories. If they are to raise their living standards, they must sell their goods not only to their own people, but to the very Americans who have rebuilt their economies.

Consider the advance of world production in the past decade, and then project this growth through the next 10 years. Backward countries are emerging from the woods; agrarian economies are leaning more heavily upon the machine. Today a skilled Chinese mechanic is as good as any that Germany, Britain, or the United States can turn out. And we need only look through a high-powered telescope to see how good the Russian mechanics are.

WAGE SUPERIORITY

If the skilled workers of other countries were just even with ours, there would be less problem. But they have a very real edge—lower wages. The thing which helps to lift our living standard, that makes the United States a desirable place to live, is the world's highest pay scale. And this is our Achilles heel, for it adds costs to American goods and puts them out of the running in world markets.

Look at a few examples. The inventor of a new wrench asked for bids from 30 American manufacturers. Their quotations ranged from \$2.18 to \$2.87 for an 8-inch wrench. Under our setup of manufacturer to jobber to wholesaler to retailer to consumer, such prices were prohibitive. This inventor then got bids from West Germany, Japan, and Formosa. Prices for identical wrenches laid down in New York or San Francisco, duty paid, averaged \$0.67 to \$0.70. Samples of workmanship showed wrenches equal to America's finest. The production order was awarded to Japan for 4,000 gross of each of four sizes—and U.S. industry lost another bout because of wage differentials.

Japan and West Germany both quoted prices on a large order for machinery to go to South America. American manufacturers lost this order because their prices, based on American labor costs, were prohibitive.

Sales price on Pennsylvania and West Virginia coal is \$24.50 per ton, delivered in Japan. The British can deliver Red China coal to them at \$10 per ton. Who will get the business? Should the Japanese pay us a \$14.50 per ton bonus to keep our living standard so far above theirs?

It is known that American machine tools needing reconditioning are shipped to Hong Kong and to Red Chinese machine shops for rebuilding and resale. A large used machinery dealer in San Francisco was recently asked to bid on some well-known lathes, milling machines, grinders, and presses which had to be guaranteed equal to new condition for a given period. A second dealer in Seattle was asked to quote on the identical equipment without rebuilding. His price was \$30,000 lower than that of the rebuilt machines from San Francisco. Hong Kong traders wanted the tools for resale to Java and Manila. They imported the used tools without reconditioning, then rebuilt them in a Red Chinese plant. British and Chinese engineers later passed the tools as 100-percent perfect. The Chinese traders then sold the tools at 20 percent under American export prices for the same equipment—realizing a net profit of more than \$50,000. American labor costs lost this business for our export firms.

HOW ABOUT WORKMANSHIP?

There was a time when we could take a more tolerant view of foreign competition. With a couple of notable exceptions, other countries hadn't our know-how, skill, and precision equipment to match us in quality. Many foreign products could be recognized by their shoddy workmanship, and the segment of our market which they served was relatively small.

But things have changed. West Germany is turning out high-quality machine tools at bargain prices. We have a tough job matching the quality of Japanese optics. Italian typewriters and business machines

are making tremendous impressions in our commercial activities. And all of us know about the workmanship of many low-cost foreign cars.

In all of these instances, quality of product is equal to or better than our own. As in the case of the wrench inventor mentioned above, you can put goods from both sides of the water together without quality distinctions. We have ourselves to thank for this foreign product excellence, of course. After billions of dollars and lives spent to destroy, we have poured almost equal effort into rebuilding the same production lines. This time, however, we've done a thorough job. Not only have we provided them with the machines to produce superior goods, but we have literally allowed foreign manufacturers to pick our brains of the latest ideas emerging from our research labs.

CASE OF HAND BITING

As an instance of learning a lesson to perfection, consider the Japanese success in sewing machines. Before World War II the bulk of the sewing machines sold in Japan were made by Singer. This firm set up its sewing schools, instructed Japanese women in Western-style stitching, and was almost solely responsible for the establishment of Japanese needle trade industry.

The war changed all this, for when the Japanese began to emerge from the shambles of their wrecked economy, the kindly U.S. military occupation forces looked around for something the Japanese could make. They set them up in the sewing machine business, guaranteeing it would succeed by barring all imported appliances. At the occupation's end, the new Japanese Government also cracked down on imports.

Meanwhile, back in the United States, we had rolled out the carpet to visiting economic missions, including the Japanese. These latter inspected Singer sewing machine facilities, taking generous numbers of detailed photographs of manufacturing processes, design, and the like. Armed with the latest facts, the Japanese went home, changed some dies and other production equipment—and began to turn out exact copies of Singer's latest sewing machines. They exported these machines to the United States, where they were warmly received. So ardent was the greeting by one large mail-order house that the only other U.S. producer of sewing machines, whose contract was canceled in favor of the Japanese import, was forced out of business.

In 1957 Japanese sewing machines comprised 50 percent of the total units sold in the United States. In 1958 Japan exported over 1 million units, the bulk of them coming to the United States. Singer Manufacturing Co., our last domestic producer, has its back to the wall in a major modernization effort at its Elizabethport, N.J., plant. The firm will abandon 50 percent of its present space there. The balance of the area is packed with cybernetic marvels—electronic handling, latest machine tools, electrostatic painting, to name a few. With this setup, Singer hopes to offset some of Japan's terrific wage advantage. Average monthly rate in Japan is \$30, for a 44-hour week. It's going to take a lot of pushbuttons to balance that with our \$390 per month for a 40-hour week.

TROUBLE AHEAD FOR MINING

The U.S. mining industry has had its share of troubles with foreign ores of all types. It now appears to be on the verge of a battle for survival with Russia in this area. These are some of the reasons we think so:

1. Mining costs in Russia are based on an average of less than \$1 per ton.

2. Vast deposits of uranium on the western slopes of the White Sea make Russia a leader in the production of this vital material. Belomorsk is said to be destined to become uranium capital of the world.

3. Iron deposits in the Krivoi-Rog district near the Don are estimated at 500 million tons. Another 500 million tons lies in the Urals, and surveys of the Kerch Peninsula add another billion tons. Total estimates from such surveys are around 56 billion tons of iron ore. If this figure is only half right, just remember that we are now finding it profitable to extract our iron from taconite. We are increasingly dependent upon foreign sources for better ores.

4. Chlatury manganese deposits in the Georgian Republic weigh in at 300 million tons. Another 300 million tons have been found at Nikopol, with more at Krivoi-Rog, Mariupol, and on the Crimean Peninsula.

5. Russian graphite deposits are estimated at 2 billion metric tons, with an ash content of only 8 percent. They can treat this graphite at a maximum cost of \$1.50 per ton. U.S. labor costs can't match this.

6. Other important Russian mineral reserves include 8 million tons of bauxite; 35 million tons of 15-percent thorium; 185 million tons of 20-percent copper in the Urals alone; and a Ural plant that produces more than 10,000 tons of nickel yearly.

In the face of these native supplies, plus a state-controlled labor rate, it will be impossible for the United States to compete in world markets. And, with our increasing dependence on outside sources of bauxite, iron, copper, manganese, tin, chromium, and vanadium, we'll probably be contributing to Soviet domination in ore production—whether we like it or not.

WHAT CAN WE DO?

We'll agree that the picture looks pretty black. We certainly can't go back and plan our industrial development differently. And it would be defeatist to sit back with folded hands and wait for the end. Action to offset our disadvantages is the only course possible. Some measures we should consider might include:

1. Ultimate mechanization of all possible production. If labor costs are out of control, then eliminate as much labor as possible.

2. Increased protective tariffs. Of course, the Congress would not consider this because of worldwide feedback. The United States has poured a lot of money into rebuilding shattered economies. Closing our doors to the marketing of products from those economies would be just the sort of ammunition Russia could use to advantage.

3. Failing revision of tariff laws, a movement to buy American. The person who buys a wrench made in West Germany is as guilty as the Flat owner of wrecking our economy.

4. Establish branch factories in foreign lands. By using cheaper labor, U.S. firms can produce quality items at lower cost. Such products, then, might compete with other foreign goods in U.S. markets.

5. Firm up our patent laws. We can out-design and out-invent any competing country, but we must have protection for the ideas we develop. More stringent enforcement of patent regulations, and worldwide prosecution of violators should be one of our goals.

6. Pour money into research and development. Assured of protection for new products, we should bend every effort to improve what we've already made—as well as come out with products that are completely different, and better.

7. Educate union leaders and members to the economic facts of life. High wages are greatly to be desired, but they don't come out of thin air. Unless wage rises are based on increased productivity, they are self-defeating by their inflationary influences.

Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8342) to provide for reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, this speech was never made. I was precluded from speaking by the "gag rule." But I want the record to show how I felt on these issues.

Mr. Chairman, I saw many excellent speeches and have witnessed some great comment on this labor debate but I want to pay particular tribute to the great and gentle lady from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN]. She has demonstrated tremendous courage and a remarkable intellect and has clarified many points.

I too want to get the crooks out of labor, but only the crooks. I do not want to be party to wrecking the philosophy of collective bargaining which has brought the highest standard of living in the world to America. The committee bill in my opinion does the right job and I shall give my support to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, throughout this entire debate much has been made of the racketeering labor union leader who makes deals for private purposes and private gain. We have heard the labor union movement criticized and we have heard that union leaders are putting tremendous pressures on the Congress to vote a soft labor bill.

I, for one, am fed up with the picture that has been presented to the Congress and to the American people that the business interests in this country are in no way involved in the racketeering and crookery of certain labor union leaders. For every crooked labor leader who makes a deal there is a crooked businessman with whom the deal was made.

I would like to give you some examples of this fact and I hope that when we vote on this matter and when we tell the story of labor racketeering to the people between now and the next election we will include the sordid story of the corporations, great and small, that made deals with crooks in the labor movement to destroy the legitimate rights and economic benefits coming to working people. These businessmen, whom I will describe, were more interested in profits than moral scruples. Consequently, it ill behooves many of these corporations to adopt an angelic or holier-than-thou

attitude to this problem before the American public. So, as Al Smith used to say "Let's look at the record."

The International Longshoremen's Association, formerly headed by the racketeer Joe Ryan, was a creature of management to secure low-wage contracts and to destroy other legitimate objectives of working people on the waterfront. As A. H. Raskin, the New York Times reporter, has pointed out—by the way, I shall have something to say about the New York Times later:

The sordid story of employer collaboration in the degradation of the International Longshoremen's Association is * * * a quarter-century in the making and it wound up in the transformation of what had been a union into an amalgamation of gangs so powerful that the insurance companies and the police joined with the shipping lines and the stevedores in acknowledging and confirming their supremacy. The ILA was a Frankenstein monster of the employers' own fabrication. They subverted the union over the years; they kept its president, Joseph P. Ryan, in automobiles and expensive clothes, right down to the pajamas he wore to bed at night; they subsidized the hoodlums Ryan recruited from Sing Sing to hold the rank and file in subjection. At no time even when its investments in "harmonious labor relations" ceased to pay any dividends, did the shipping industry undertake any discernible role of leadership in the campaign to dislodge the ILA from its dominant position on the piers. On the contrary, the employers took sanctuary in the pious defense that the law required them to be neutral in union affairs.

For every labor thug on the waterfront, Mr. Chairman, there is a business thug on Wall Street and Park Avenue. In volume 4 of the "History of Labor in the United States," by Professors Perlman and Taft, there is an extensive discussion of employer crookery in the building trades. It is clear, from the analysis of these experts, that where racketeering exists, it is also the employer that is the benefactor.

Charges of widespread graft in the building industry have frequently been made. Evidence that the business agent has often extorted money payments through threats of strikes has been produced. Nevertheless, the business agent has been neither the sole nor the chief beneficiary of the system which made graft possible. Favored employers also benefited. Contractors and suppliers of material have used the grafting business agent to gain monopolies, to harass competitors, or to escape penalty when unable to complete the work on the date specified. Furthermore, the graft came out of the pockets of the builder, and ultimately the consumer, and as long as wages and job conditions were improving, the building tradesmen, far from feeling depressed by the leader, viewed him as an efficient fighter for their interests.

We have heard bandied about these Halls the names of Beck and Hoffa and how they are the crooks that are hated by business which recognizes them for what they are. Well, let us look at the record again.

Business Week—in January 1948—said about Dave Beck that his methods "have endeared Beck to an ever-widening circle

of local businessmen on the Pacific coast. To them he is the businessman's labor leader." That same year, *Time* magazine also added to this story. They said:

The great majority of employers (in the Northwest) think he is wonderful and applaud like happy seals when he speaks to the chamber of commerce.

And what about this businessman's friend who announced his support for President Eisenhower on the steps of the White House in 1956? Well, Beck, before he retired as Teamster president made a loan out of union funds of \$1.5 million to the Fruehauf Trailer Co. and then received in exchange a personal loan of \$200,000 from that company. This corporation knew their friend, Beck, of course, knew the business psychology. As he was fond of saying, "I run my union like a business. We deal in one commodity—labor."

What about some of our other high-class billion-dollar corporations?

The Senate Rackets Committee charged in 1958 that the A. & P. food chain had entered into a 5 year collusive agreement with Max Block, head of the two meatcutters' unions to freeze out two other unions. According to Charles Douds former regional director of the National Labor Relations Board in New York, the company forced its grocery clerks to join Block's union while two other unions were in the process of organizing them. The company recognized Block's union and according to the charges of the Senate Rackets Committee probably made itself millions of dollars as a consequence of this sweetheart arrangement. While A. & P. competitors were working 40 hours a week, A. & P. employees labored 45 hours a week for about the same pay. This was reckoned to be about a \$400 saving per year per employee on the part of A. & P.

These are things that the mass media does not publicize. Consequently the American people are not aware of this kind of crookery on the part of big business. On the subject of the press, even the august *New York Times* is not without dirty hands. The *New York Times* paid off, through a strawman, certain union crooks over \$43,000 in order to get their paper delivered. They did this rather than expose those crooks. And there is only one reason why they did this, they were more interested in profits than public service. It should also be noted that this was deducted as a business expense. It is good to report, however, that the *New York Times* has stated

that it would never enter into such crooked dealings again. As Senator MUNDT told Amory Bradford, vice president of the *New York Times*:

I think it should be said too, that as long as people do pick up the tab to finance extortion like this, it tends to make that extortion profitable. Once the corporate community decides it is not going to be blackmailed, and is not going to get involved in paying the fee that these racketeers prescribe, it will be very helpful in correcting the situation.

Other newspapers such as the *New York Journal-American*, a Hearst newspaper, also paid this tribute to the labor gangsters.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this incomplete rundown of certain employer violations is enough to get the point across. Let us not overlook the businessman who participates willingly in the sweetheart contract, in the backdoor under-the-table deal which benefits him economically. Let us remember that for every labor crook there is a business crook who countenances and encourages such behavior.

Mr. Chairman, I am for the strongest possible labor-management antiracketeering bill but I know that until businessmen also clean house and realize that they too are involved in immorality and illegality when they play ball with the labor racketeer and when they employ crooks to do their bidding for the purpose of having a higher annual profit report, we cannot solve this problem by just the simple act of writing a new law. The Justice Department better get busy now and enforce existing laws, too.

We must get the crooks, all of them, in industry, in banks, in the Government, in the legal profession, in the medical profession, in labor unions, or wherever they exist.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House

Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Complacent Americans Facing Threats to Their Way of Life From Communism, Own Apathy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. William J. Edwards, of Saginaw, Mich., who is president and general manager of Lake Huron Broadcasting Corp. This article appeared in the Saginaw News on August 2, 1959. Mr. Edwards recently led a group of Saginaw businessmen on a European tour which took them behind the Iron Curtain. I thought the Members of this body would be interested in the observations he made while on this trip.

The article follows:

COMPLACENT AMERICANS FACING THREATS TO THEIR WAY OF LIFE FROM COMMUNISM, OWN APATHY

A visit to Moscow, the inner sanctum of world communism, can be a disturbing experience. You observe a different way of life. You gain impressions, some anticipated and others totally unexpected, and you are aware that your are making impressions on others as you move about. When you are alone, you ponder the things you've seen. You wonder how it all happened, and you find yourself thinking about the future of the world. Then, you are impatiently anxious to get home to shout aloud to everyone who will listen: "Be for America! Stand up for your church! Take time to realize that freedom and justice cannot be divided, but can be removed!"

I expected to find a grim, subjugated people in Russia. Instead I discovered the inhabitants of Leningrad and Moscow to be innately patriotic and extremely proud of their country and its accomplishments. Despite the lowest standard of living of all the countries I visited, the people seemed to be thriving on promises of what the next 7-year plan will provide. A deeper look made it clear, however, that living conditions have markedly improved in the recent postwar years, and housing is being constructed at an almost frantic pace.

The English-speaking students with whom I talked were generally friendly and intensely curious about America. At times, their suspicions of things American were too obvious to hide. Most of them believed that conditions in Russia were far superior to our living standard. A few confided that Americans have more material possessions than Russians, but they were quick to add that soon the Soviet Union will far surpass us in consumer goods as well as everything else.

Because of the language barrier, most of our contacts were with students. With a change of clothes, they might have appeared to be Americans, but there were differences. These young men with such inquiring minds

were atheists. They look upon religion as superstition, and they haven't heard about Jesus Christ. Bethlehem and Calvary are meaningless words to them, but they can tell you much about Lenin and the revolution.

Frankly, I did not believe that religion could be ruthlessly stamped out. I bolstered my argument with the knowledge that primitive man, from the dawn of recorded history, had to turn to a higher power. Whether it was the sun, the moon, a waterfall, or the mountaintop, he nevertheless worshiped a greater being. I have no such illusions now.

Religion can be obliterated. It has been wiped out in Russia, largely speaking, even though a few churches remain, for what I believe to be propaganda reasons. The church is being erased in Czechoslovakia and in East Germany by relentless Communist pressure. How can it be done, you ask. The answer is crystal clear. The constant din of propaganda develops opinions. The truth can become false, and wrong can become right. When personal liberty ceases to exist, man becomes a pliable creature. Then substitution becomes the order of the day. Into the void, left by the departure of religion, comes the state, and the newly molded being dutifully strives to be worthy of his place in the new religious order.

To the students, Americans are pleasant, money-grabbing decadent people. They firmly believe that our star is setting as a great power, because the superior system of communism cannot be denied, and the world will soon be Communist. They inquire about our social problems, the apathy of the people, and our public debt. They wonder why we do not throw out this "outdated" American system and embrace "the social order that is destined for the world." War, they say, is out of the question. They believe the United States would not dare launch a war, and they tell you that communism does not need a war to accomplish its aims of world domination.

I tried to dismiss these impressions. These were minds blinded by governmental control and thwarted by guileful propaganda. But, some of the statements they made, and some of the expressions made by officials we met, caused me to be concerned.

I believe we Americans do face a major threat to our way of life. Russia is making enormous economic progress, and, our position as a leader in world trade is under constant attack. I think our Government needs to establish a Department of Foreign Trade with a Cabinet-level secretary to meet this attack. I believe that continuing inflation can lead to socialism and socialism can lead to communism. In short, I believe we can lose our American heritage through public apathy. The astounding progress of the Soviet Union was not built on "a something for nothing" policy. If any people have known personal sacrifice, the Russians have, and there's nothing old-fashioned about patriotism in that strange land.

I think we've got to be far more concerned about the importance of religion in our daily lives. We've got to be concerned about our fellow man, and not ourselves alone. We must keep alive our Christian ideals and American traditions by active support and constant vigilance. I remember the sad statement of a gentle professor. He was the only man who talked with me freely behind the Curtain. "Unfortunately,"

he said, "our people were not too interested in the church. It wasn't so important to go, and we didn't attend very often. Now, it's gone, and it's too late. All the children are atheists." It couldn't happen in America, I said. We are a church-affiliated nation. And, as we talked on, I realized that it could happen. Slightly over 50 percent of us belong to a church, and approximately 33 percent of the members attend worship services regularly. That means that about 15 percent of all Americans worship God regularly. Could that small number save the church against the engulfing tide of atheism?

If our system of freedom is to be preserved, surely we as individual citizens must be more concerned about the status of this country and how the affairs of this beloved Nation are conducted. It seems to me that we must awaken and recognize that our increasing public debt, inflation, the activities of pressure groups and Government spending are matters of personal interest to us. Propaganda has changed the American image in much of the world. But deep inside us all we know that our way is the only way. If we believe that, it will take more than a nod of agreement to keep it.

A few days ago, while relating some of my impressions of the Soviet Union, a friend handed me a card. Written on it was an excerpt from an inspiring address entitled "The Price of Freedom Is Courage," given by H. W. Prentiss, the president of Armstrong Cork Co. He said:

"The history of all great nations in the experiment of self-government ultimately generates release of initiative and enterprise made possible by self-government, ultimately generates disintegrating forces from within; for again and again, after freedom brings opportunity and some degree of plenty, the competent become selfish, luxury loving, and complacent; the incompetent and the unfortunate become envious and covetous. And all three groups turn aside from the hard road of freedom to worship the golden calf of economic security. The historical cycle seems to be from bondage to spiritual faith, from spiritual faith to courage, from courage to freedom, from freedom to abundance to selfishness, from selfishness to apathy, from apathy to dependency, and from dependency back to bondage again."

Perhaps we are at the apathy stage at this moment. If we are, a revitalized interest in America by all of us can change the course of events.

Caution, "Pol" at Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce an editorial from one of New York's major newspapers. Newsday, published daily on Long Island, enjoys a vast circulation in my district; hardly a reactionary publication. In fact its past record shows that it leans to a liberal, progressive stand. Here is proof

of the clear-thinking liberal on the labor problem. Here is the progressive in defense of real reform within the labor movement—for the Griffin-Landrum bill. The article follows:

CAUTION, "POL" AT WORK

Speaker SAM RAYBURN, who finds himself juggling a handful of hot potatoes, would like to counsel sweet reasonableness in the regulation of unions. Persuasive politician ("pol" for short) though he is, we doubt his radio broadcast Monday will convince many Americans that there is anything wrong with outlawing crookedness and blackmail among the powerful minority of dishonest labor organizations. RAYBURN opposes as too restrictive the bipartisan Landrum-Griffin bill, now pending before Congress and powerfully supported by President Eisenhower. He favors the far too mild Elliott bill.

On this one, we're with the President. The Landrum-Griffin bill, out of the assortment before Congress, is the only one with teeth in it—teeth, by the way, that will not bite any honest union. It outlaws the iniquitous secondary boycott, holds union officials to a strict accounting of funds; in fact, does nothing any honest union should oppose.

We had, in this country during the 1880's-1890's, the robber barons of business, who cynically manipulated politicians and stole the country blind of natural resources while sweating the workers. The unions developed in reaction to this trend. But now some of them have become just as cynical, just as thieving, and just as powerful. The balance between capital and labor must be maintained. If industry can be regulated, so can unions.

Our advice, again, is to write or wire your Congressman and/or U.S. Senator and urge that the Landrum-Griffin bill be passed.

Why Not Let the Light Shine on Laos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BURKE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, in the continuing efforts of the Congress to safeguard the right of the people to know how their money is being spent, the adamant refusal of the President to allow an accounting to be had of foreign aid funds is a shocking abuse of Executive privilege. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include two excellent editorials on that subject:

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal, Aug. 8, 1959]

SUCH INCONSISTENCY CALLS FOR A TEST IN THE COURTS

President Eisenhower's demonstrated passion for secrecy in the conduct of Government business is now heading for a challenge in the Senate. We believe that body should meet the challenge head on and insure a court test of the President's belief that any plea of Executive privilege and not the justifiable one of national security is sufficient to keep the people from knowing how the people's business is being conducted.

The issue has arisen repeatedly. What brings it to a head now is press disclosures of supposed mismanagement of the foreign-aid program in Vietnam and Laos. Congress asked for the facts. The International Cooperation Administration on Thursday again refused to divulge them, again was

backed up by the White House plea of Executive privilege.

What makes this all the more astonishing is that President Eisenhower said only last year that "a strong society of free men must be kept fully informed—liberty can flourish only in the climate of truth." How he can reconcile such eloquence with the contention that Congress should not be allowed access to information on how its appropriations for foreign aid—or anything else—are being handled is beyond us.

AN INCREDIBLE STIPULATION

Its incomprehensibility is intensified by what happened when the President last week signed the new foreign-aid authorization bill. This measure contained three amendments which, in sum, would require the ICA to furnish Congress or the General Accounting Office information they request in connection with the aid program, with the specific exception of whatever the executive department saw fit to label as "secret" because of national security considerations.

The President signed the bill with the almost incredible stipulation that he would not be bound by the anticorruption amendments because he regarded them as unconstitutional—a point, beyond all question, that it is up to the Supreme Court to determine.

The authorization bill is one thing, the actual appropriations bill another. The House this week, in the appropriations bill, strengthened the original anticorruption requirement with a proviso that none of the nonmilitary funds being appropriated may be used if a request for information from Congress or the GAO is ignored by the foreign aid agency for more than 20 days.

The President hopes that the Senate will eliminate all of these anticorruption provisions. We believe it should follow the lead of the House, and that both bodies of the Congress should enact additional legislation, such as empowering the GAO to take court action against noncomplying officials, to insure that this whole question of the use of executive privilege to withhold nonsecurity information will get a definitive review in the courts.

DISMAL TRUTH SUPPRESSED

A House Government Operations Subcommittee, after investigation, found our foreign aid program in Laos "studded with waste, mismanagement, and, in some instances, corruption." It sought the Government's own accounting and the full story behind this dismal picture. The information is essential to the writing of sensible legislation—not only in this instance, of course, but in many another. But the Government refuses to disclose the facts, pleading executive privilege.

The public surely must agree with Subcommittee Chairman PORTER HARDY, Jr., of Virginia, that "concealment of deficiencies can hardly be construed as being in the public interest . . . this denial of information also enables the executive branch to avoid public criticism and censure."

[From the Louisville Times, Aug. 10, 1959]

WHY NOT LET THE LIGHT SHINE ON LAOS?

President Eisenhower has grown increasingly touchy over what he considers efforts to encroach on the "constitutional duty and power of the Executive." On most such occasions we have felt he was right—as, for example, his consistent opposition to the campaign of former Senator John Bricker to limit the President's treaty making powers by constitutional amendment.

We feel the President is on less solid ground, however, when he approves withholding information about foreign aid from the Congress he expects to appropriate for foreign aid.

The case in point concerns the administration of U.S. aid in the kingdom of Laos. This southeast Asian nation of 2 million, smaller than Illinois plus Indiana, emerged independent in 1954 after the Indochina war.

It has been under constant pressure from Communist China and North Vietnam, which border it for 600 miles.

The State Department has taken the position that aid to Laos has been a striking success, the proof being that it has not succumbed to communism. Since 1953, however, there have been continuous rumblings, first touched off by the General Accounting Office, that foreign aid to Laos has been a colossal scandal.

AN ARMY OF 25,000

Since 1955 U.S. aid has amounted to a quarter billion dollars. Part of it was used to build up a 25,000-man army. A House Government Operations Subcommittee has contended that "significant military opinion" favored a 12,000- to 15,000-man force, but that the late Secretary of State Dulles insisted on the 25,000 figure despite contrary recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Reports of bribery by a U.S. construction company operating in Laos have been heard by the subcommittee, together with reports of personnel shuffled to avoid public disclosure of what was going on.

The subcommittee's chairman, Representative PORTER HARDY, Jr., a Virginia Democrat, does not like to see tax money wasted. During the last Truman administration he raked the Defense Department over the coals for what he considered outrageous waste in purchase of materiel. It is not, with him, a matter of party; simply one of waste.

He has tried without success to elicit from the International Cooperation Administration an accounting of aid administration in Laos. Partly on this account Congress wrote provisions into the foreign aid authorization bill this year aimed at forcing the administration to comply with congressional requests for information.

President Eisenhower signed the bill, at the same time sharply criticizing the anticorruption provision. On the same day, July 24, Representative HARDY renewed his request for information on aid to Laos and Vietnam. This week he received from James W. Riddleberger, director of ICA, a letter to the effect that release of the information would not be in the public interest.

CONGRESS SHOULD KNOW

We can fully appreciate that the public interest is overriding on secrecy concerning the Central Intelligence Agency and perhaps some phases of missilecraft. The only possible interpretation of secrecy on aid to Laos is to assume that it has been so mismanaged that disclosure would tend to discredit the whole foreign aid program.

From our viewpoint, the fierce effort to conceal what has happened in Laos is a greater indictment than simple confession could possibly be. We have felt and still feel that U.S. foreign aid has been of inestimable value in containing Communist imperialism. If it was a mess in Laos, that nation is still free, and should not be used anyway as an example to damn the whole program.

At the same time, Congress appropriates the money of U.S. taxpayers to be used for foreign aid, and has a right to know for what the money is spent.

Panama Canal Control Plotted by Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I

include the following well-prepared and well-written article by Mr. Donald R. Larrabee, which appeared in the Sunday Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass., on July 19, 1959, on the vitally important subject of the relations between the United States and the Republic of Panama and specifically concerning the Panama Canal. Mr. Larrabee is to be congratulated for his fine article:

PANAMA CANAL CONTROL PLOTTED BY REDS
(By Donald R. Larrabee)

WASHINGTON, July 18.—Seething unrest in the Caribbean, promoted if not provoked by international communism, poses a major threat to U.S. control of the strategically and commercially vital Panama Canal.

"The Caribbean is today a powderkeg," Panama's Ambassador to the United States, Ricardo Arias, told the New Bedford Standard-Times.

"A prime objective of the internationally organized Communist movement is wresting control of the Panama Canal from the United States," said Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, Pennsylvania.

CRISIS GROWING

The Caribbean crisis has been growing rapidly since Fidel Castro overthrew the Batista regime in Cuba January 1. Since then there have been threats and unsuccessful invasion attempts against the Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, and Panama. Haiti is threatened by a squeeze play between Cuba and the Dominican Republic. And rumors persist of counterinvasions aimed at Cuba.

In an exclusive interview, the Panamanian Ambassador made no attempt to minimize the potential seriousness of the Communist movement in America's backyard. Insofar as Panama is concerned, he said, there was nothing funny about the attempted invasion by 600 well-armed Cubans in April, even though it was dismissed in some quarters as a comic venture.

Panama's President Ernesto de la Guardia, Jr., has said militant Communist Reds led the attack and their ambition, he declared, is to take over the Panama Canal.

Congressman Flood, who has been preaching the "Panama danger zone" theme since the Suez Canal crisis in 1956, says there is overwhelming evidence to support these statements.

But what disturbs the Pennsylvania Congressman, a seven-term House veteran and long-time student of Latin American affairs, even more is the way certain Panamanian politicians and extreme nationalists—wittingly or unwittingly—are playing into the hands of the Communists by their demands for sovereignty in the 10-mile-wide Canal Zone.

International communism, Flood says, opened its agitation campaign aimed at wresting control of the zone from the United States following the Suez crisis in 1956.

NOT SATISFIED

It is a historical fact that Panama has never been completely satisfied with the basic treaty of 1903 under which the United States was granted permanent use, occupation, and control of the Canal Zone.

Panama got its independence, in the process, but it has claimed unfair treatment ever since, and according to Flood, these claims have led to a progressive deterioration and piecemeal liquidation of U.S. rights in the zone.

The frictions are not new—but Panama's assertion of its rights has become progressively more blatant since Suez. The last straw, according to Congressman Flood, was the passage of a law by the Panamanian National Assembly last December to extend the Republic's territorial waters from the internationally recognized 3-mile limit to a 12-mile limit.

The effect of this action was to proclaim sovereignty over a stretch of ocean that enables Panama to control access to the canal. Panama hasn't yet asserted its alleged control by any overt step, but what move could fit better into the pattern of communism than to see a gradual undermining of U.S. control and eventual maritime separation of the two coasts of the United States now linked by the great waterway?

LONE VOICE

Congressman Flood has been almost a lone voice in Congress in warning about the dangers of the sovereignty law. His speeches on the House floor since January 9 have roused the Panamanian National Assembly to the point where he was denounced as that country's public enemy No. 1.

The State Department, if not his colleagues in Congress, shared his alarm over the enactment, sent a note to the Government of Panama expressing the hope that the action would be reconsidered. The National Assembly lost no time in rejecting this request.

The validity of the law has not been conceded by the United States, Britain, or France. But Soviet Russia was quick to endorse it. Congressman Flood's fears have not been justified, as yet. He indicates satisfaction that the government of President de la Guardia is not likely to enforce its sovereignty to the waters in question.

"But," adds Flood, "we don't know what we will get tomorrow."

AIMS DISCLOSED

Perhaps the Congressman's fears are more understandable in the light of some of the debate preceding adoption of the law. Here spilled over the innermost long-range aims of certain political leaders. One candidate for President in the elections to be held next May, Deputy Aquilino Boyd, demanded that Panama receive half of the gross revenues of the canal. Boyd asserted that the canal is now surrounded by 9 miles of exclusively Panamanian waters in which Panama can exercise definite acts of sovereignty.

From remarks made during that debate, there seems little doubt that the new law could be used to require the display of the Panamanian flag on vessels entering these waters. Panama could exercise vigilance over shipping to maintain internal security, could regulate fishing activities, try persons for offenses committed on board ships in Panamanian waters, require foreign war vessels to comply with her navigation rules, enforce customs, fiscal, and sanitation regulations.

PERPETUAL USE

Says Congressman Flood, "Should candidate Boyd's insistence on 50 percent of the gross annual canal revenues for Panama (which would approximate \$43 million as compared to \$3,800,000 for present net revenues) ever prevail, the resulting deficit of approximately \$40 million would have to be borne by the over-burdened American taxpayer or world shipping, with possible liquidation of the entire canal enterprise."

Flood predicts the cry "The Canal Is Ours" will be a popular campaign theme next May. Radical leaders, he says, "seem willing for their own political advantage to bring their country to the brink of disaster."

COULD BE ISSUE

Ambassador Arias, interviewed at the Embassy for nearly 2 hours, said emphatically that his Government does not want to take control of the canal from the United States. He conceded, however, that this could become a hot issue in the election campaign. Arias, incidentally, may himself be a candidate for president.

"There is," he said, "no seed that will flourish so fast as one which has to do with nationalism. There is a feeling in Panama now that something must be done to

straighten out our position with the United States. Panama feels it does not get all the benefits it should be getting from the canal."

The Ambassador readily acknowledges that the United States possesses the "use, occupation, and control" of the Canal Zone, but this is by no means the same as having domain or sovereignty. The official Government position is that Panama still enjoys its sovereign rights; she has merely granted to the United States the exercise of certain of these rights for canal purposes.

If the Ambassador was asked, the Government of Panama is not trying to exert control over the canal, what then is the purpose of the law extending her sovereignty over coastal waters to 12 miles? And what about the charge that the agitation over the canal was inspired by the Suez crisis?

PROBLEMS EXISTED

"When Suez started," he replied, "Panama didn't stir up the canal issue. The newspapers began getting interested and started making their own interpretations. The Suez incident put the Panama Canal in the spotlight, but our problems with the United States existed long before Mr. Nasser was born."

As for the 12-mile law, the Ambassador said his government acted because it didn't want to be caught with the status quo when its representatives sit down with those of other maritime nations at international conferences to consider the width of territorial seas.

But, beyond this, the Ambassador said Congressman Flood should take a closer look at the law passed by the National Assembly. An examination, he said, will show that it must be implemented by the Executive in accordance with the Constitution and pursuant to any agreements arrived at in international conferences.

Congressman Flood has a deeper concern, however. He says the "attempted surrounding" of the canal is not only a violation of international law but a clear transgression of existing treaties. The United States, he admits, has over a long period of time failed to meet its treaty obligations in the management of the waterway. These obligations, obviously, are still further challenged by the sovereignty law.

A reading of history shows, indeed, that over the last 50 years, Americans have periodically made concessions and agreed to revisions in our treaty relations in hopes of reducing friction over the Panama Canal. Somehow or other, these decisions to surrender basic treaty rights have only given birth to more agitation for a greater Panamanian role in canal affairs.

The central issue in the current canal situation—that of titular sovereignty—is not a new development. It is bound up in treaties going back to 1901. The frictions appear to have their genesis in these documents.

The United States took on the job of building the canal after the French had tried and failed. President Theodore Roosevelt in 1902 favored a route through Panama, although there was substantial U.S. sentiment for a canal through Nicaragua. A year before, the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty between Britain and the United States gave up British rights to build and control an Isthmian Canal across Central America and recognized the exclusive right of the United States to do so.

In assuming this responsibility, the United States adopted the main points of the convention of Constantinople of 1863 relative to free navigation for vessels of all flags through the Suez Canal.

The next important step was the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 between Panama and the United States which, for the purposes of brevity, was the document which guaranteed the independence of the new Republic of Panama from Colombia which

governed it as a province. A treaty had already been in the works with Colombia but it was rejected by that Government and, in the events that swiftly followed, Panamanian revolutionaries accepted a treaty much more favorable to the United States than the proposed Colombian treaty.

On Panama's part, the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty granted to the United States the perpetual use, occupation, and control of the Canal Zone for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal as if the United States were the sovereign of the territory.

Panamanian leaders, including the current Ambassador to Washington, claim today—56 years later—that this language clearly does not give the United States sovereign rights in all matters, only those directly related to operation of the canal.

Ambassador Arias says the 1903 treaty was poorly written and signed somewhat hurriedly for the Panamanians by a French engineer, Philippe Bunau-Varilla, who had been deeply involved in the defunct French canal project. Panama, he says, didn't get the kind of deal that had been suggested in the treaty with Colombia which, foremostly, gave that nation sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

Within months after the treaty signing, Panama began protesting the absolute sovereignty status of the United States. Congressman Flood says this is nonsense. The treaty, he maintains, clearly authorized perpetual control of the Canal Zone by the United States for the primary objectives of constructing the Panama Canal and for its permanent maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection.

LAND GRANTED

Ambassador Arias insists Panama merely granted land to the United States for certain specific canal purposes. He cites the words "as if it were the sovereign" and concludes that they mean the United States really is not the sovereign. In no part of the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty, the Ambassador claims, is it ever stated that Panama cedes to the United States either domination over or sovereignty of the Canal Zone.

The same basic question has been argued for 55 years. But, without being resolved, the notion that Panama had been cheated seems to be at the base of the numerous minor crises that have arisen in connection with the canal ever since.

In order to reduce friction, President Franklin D. Roosevelt gave up certain treaty rights in Panama outside the Canal Zone and, in another effort to improve our relations, a revised treaty in 1955 attempted to straighten out certain economic problems relating to trade and wages and working conditions of Panamanians employed in the Canal Zone.

Still, as of today, Ambassador Arias says his country does not feel it is receiving all the benefits it should be getting from the canal. The 1936 treaty supposedly had satisfied certain salary classification problems between American and Panamanian employees. The 1955 treaty, the Ambassador says, was aimed at establishing a principle of "equal pay for equal work," but differing United States and "local" rates still are in force.

At the present time, President de la Guardia and President Eisenhower are exchanging notes on the subject. Panama claims its citizens working for the Canal Company are not getting wages and working conditions equal to American employees. An issue such as this is a source of much hard feeling, the Ambassador says.

Another point of friction has to do with treaty provisions affecting items imported into the Canal Zone. The treaty says, according to the Ambassador, that imported items must be procured from the United

States or from Panama "unless it is not feasible to do so." This latter loophole has opened the way for widespread duty-free entry of a wide variety of goods into the zone which Panama feels it should supply and from which it could derive great economic benefit.

The Ambassador says the United States has set a high goal, in terms of living standards, in the Canal Zone. He would, he said, much prefer to see a correction of the employees' salary problem than a boost in the annual direct payment of \$1,900,000 the United States makes to Panama.

WILL BE SOLVED

"I believe," the Ambassador said, "that the wage scale and import problems will be solved eventually. The United States must accept them, because we are right. The United States cannot afford to discriminate. The trouble is, the Panamanian people won't appreciate it when it finally comes because they will think it was forced on the United States and wasn't born of genuine generosity or any real understanding."

Ambassador Arias is especially irritated by a resolution introduced by Congressman Flood which has as its purpose the reaffirmation of the "complete and exclusive sovereignty" of the United States over the Canal Zone and the canal. He said the agitations of extreme nationalists for a greater voice in the Canal Zone won't be solved "by dishing out information or by offering a resolution * * * it offers no solution."

The Congressman, on the other hand, says he is the best friend that Panama has in North America and is looking out for their best interests in a situation where international communism is ready to exploit every difference with the United States.

"My concern is that the Communists are going to take advantage of this situation," Flood told this reporter. "There is no doubt whatsoever that the canal is a rallying point for any nationalists. Even those who are not Communists will take whatever lies at hand for purposes of revolution. The Communists go wherever the fighting is to insure turmoil and disorder."

"I know of the fantastic population potential in Latin America. It is an extremely important facet of the problem, it is intermarried with the economic problem which is chaotic."

"What I am afraid of," continued Flood, "is that our State Department, in its concern for Asia, Africa, and Western Europe, is going to win those battles and lose the war in our own backyard. Our best minds and men are at Geneva and who the devil cares about the Amazon when there is the Rhine at issue."

One of the preventive measures currently being proposed to deal with the Caribbean crisis is the formation of an inter-American volunteer police force under the Organization of American States. The purpose of such a group would be to deter or counter any use of force against any Latin American country.

HAZARDS CITED

Congressman Flood calls the proposal "unrealistic" and says it is charged with "serious diplomatic hazards."

Ambassador Arias comments: "There might be something to it, although I think it would be wise to give the matter more thought. The OAS has been efficient and able to handle some situations. But, things could reach a point that the moral force of OAS might not be enough."

Internationalization of the Panama Canal under the Organization of American States or the United Nations has also been seriously suggested. Former President Truman, for one, said as recently as last November that the canal ought to be internationally controlled "and there wouldn't be any trouble" over it. When he first suggested the internationalization of the Panama Canal and other

waterways in world commerce at the Potsdam Conference in 1945, it was flatly rejected by Joseph Stalin.

Today, Congressman Flood points out, communism strictly favors this. Ambassador Arias, recalling the Truman incident, would have no part of the idea. And, he says he thinks the immense majority of the Panamanian people would oppose it.

Testimony of Dr. Willford I. King, New York University, Presented to the Senate Subcommittee on Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony of Dr. Willford I. King, economics professor emeritus, New York University, which was presented to the Senate Subcommittee on Education on April 8, 1959, and which concerned proposed legislation providing for Federal aid to education. I felt that Dr. King's observations regarding the needs of our educational system and his comments concerning the desirability of extending Federal aid to education would be of interest to the Members of this body:

TESTIMONY OF WILLFORD I. KING, PH. D., L.L.D., ECONOMICS PROFESSOR EMERITUS, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, PRESENTED TO THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION ON APRIL 8, 1959

SCHOOL EXPERIENCE OF WILLFORD I. KING

1886-87: Attended country school in western Iowa.

1888-95: Attended country school in western Nebraska.

1897-99: Student at Wallace's Preparatory School in Lincoln, Nebr.

1900-05: Student at the University of Nebraska.

1904-05: Laboratory instructor at the University of Nebraska.

1905-09: High school teacher. Taught in four schools in Nebraska, Iowa, and North Dakota.

1909-13: Graduate student in economics at the University of Wisconsin.

1910-17: Economics instructor and, later, assistant professor at the University of Wisconsin.

1926-45: Professor in charge of statistics in the school of commerce and the graduate school of business administration at New York University.

1945-47: Professor of economics, New York University.

1955 to date: Member of the board of directors, American Education Association.

COMMENTS ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION PROVIDING FOR FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Having spent the major part of my adult life in teaching, is it surprising that I am strongly in favor of sound measures intended to improve the quality of education in the United States? It is my view that every child and youth should have the chance to obtain education to the extent necessary to enable him or her to make good use of the talents with which he or she is endowed.

As doubtless every member of this committee is well aware, nearly all advocates of sound education who have, in recent years,

looked into the situation prevailing in this connection in the United States, have been shocked by the great deterioration in the quality of education which has been instilled into our youth by our existing school system. For example, in some areas, it has been found that a large proportion of high school graduates are lacking in the ability to read, spell, or write even reasonably good English, or to solve very elementary problems in arithmetic. The situation in this respect is, in fact, so bad that some colleges have actually installed, for their beginning students, remedial reading courses. When, in the first decade of the present century, I was teaching science in various high schools in the Middle West, I never heard of any such situation existing. Most of the pupils entering the ninth grade could read, write, and spell fairly well, and were familiar with the basic principles of arithmetic. None of the graduates of any of the four high schools with which I was connected were lacking in any of these respects. No one so lacking would have been considered for graduation.

Present proposed Federal legislation is designed to help finance the building of additional schoolrooms so as to lessen overcrowding, and to increase the pay of schoolteachers in order to help make positions in this field as financially rewarding as are jobs in other lines available to potential teachers. Will legislation along this line help to remedy the sad situation now existing in the educational field? Are overcrowding in the schools and poor pay for teachers the prime factors responsible for the deterioration in the quality of education which has occurred? I believe that your committee will need to consider each of these points carefully. May I have the privilege of pointing out a few of the facts in connection with each?

What is the basic reason giving rise to the shortage of schoolroom space? Let us first take up the case of the elementary schools.

As most of you will probably remember, in years not so long past, the typical elementary school teacher handled a class of 40 pupils without undue difficulty. Now, it is assumed that class sizes should be kept down to 20. Evidently, this change calls for doubling the number of classrooms. What has brought about this demand for reducing the sizes of classes?

The answer is that adoption of the system of promotion on the basis of age, rather than accomplishment—virtually abolition of the grade system—has necessitated the change. Formerly, all the pupils in a teacher's class were roughly equal in their educational understanding, and could be handled on that basis. Now each grade teacher tends to have in her class a hodgepodge of pupils, a large proportion of whom have not mastered the work in previous grades. Many of them, having found that study is not necessary to obtain advancement, take no interest in their work. The result is that the teacher finds more difficulty in trying to educate 20 pupils than she did formerly in actually educating 40 pupils. Furthermore, at present, those not interested in their school work, and having plenty of energy, get into mischief. Here we have the prime source of the great growth in juvenile delinquency which has occurred in recent years.

In the high schools, overcrowding is accounted for primarily by the fact that restrictions on entrance have been lowered to conform with the idea of universal promotion. The important fact that different individuals have different capacities has been overlooked or forgotten. Instead of recognizing the fundamental truth that a large proportion of children are entirely unfitted for academic work, that they could serve the social weal far better by engaging, at an early date, in some trade, than by wasting their time on studies in which they are not in-

terested, and that being a good carpenter or plumber or automobile repairman or store clerk, is more honorable and more useful than being a third-rate member of some supposedly more learned profession, it has become the fashion to hold that everyone should go through high school and college.

My first personal experience with this new way of looking at things occurred when, after my formal retirement from New York University where I had been teaching statistics to high-quality students, I was called upon, during World War II, to teach some classes in elementary economics. When I was on the University of Wisconsin faculty, I had taught many such classes, and felt that I was quite familiar with things in that line. I had always found the students much interested in this field.

What a change I now discovered. Most of those registering in my elementary economics courses at New York University showed not the slightest interest in learning economics. They were going to college for the sake of prestige, and all they wanted was 4 points credit—not training in economics. Unfortunately, from their point of view, a very large proportion did not receive the 4 points credit.

Clearly, from the standpoint of the social weal, the proper thing to do is to weed out of our high schools all those pupils not suited for the work, and to give those that so desire brief training in trade schools. Were this done, there would be no lack of space in high schools to accommodate the pupils.

The next point to be considered is whether underpay is a primary cause of the present shortage of trained teachers. In my opinion, while it undoubtedly has some influence, other forces are still more potent in bringing about the teacher shortage. What are some of these?

Perhaps the preponderant force is the fact that stripping the teacher of the power to punish, and universal promotion, by breaking down discipline and generating misbehavior and juvenile delinquency, has, as a teacher of our acquaintance puts it, "made teaching a nightmare." She said that she formerly thoroughly enjoyed teaching her classes in the New York City school, but now she is waiting most impatiently for the date of her retirement. One of the reporters for the New York World-Telegram recently publicized well the troubles of teachers in some of New York City's difficult schools when he took a temporary job in one as a teacher, and wrote up his experiences in the newspaper mentioned.

A second highly important cause of teacher scarcity has been the evergrowing requirements that prospective teachers must graduate from schools of education in order to secure certificates to teach. Obviously, taking such courses calls for the expenditure of very considerable sums of money. Furthermore, the best evidence seems to indicate that courses in pedagogy and educational psychology rarely aid their students materially in learning how to teach classes well. I still remember my experience in such courses when I was a student at the University of Nebraska more than a half a century ago. Even then, I was required to take a course in educational psychology in order to be permitted to teach in a high school. My chum and I commonly referred to the time spent in that class as our rest hour, for there was so little content that the professor was compelled to put in nearly all the time in repetition. It was the only course in the university that we felt not eminently worthwhile. I never discovered that it helped me one iota in teaching.

Hearsay evidence leads me to believe that most courses in schools of education now are even worse than the one that I took so many years ago, for not only do they

fail to give their students sound training in education, they furthermore fill their minds with the pernicious doctrines of progressive education, the system which sponsors promotion regardless of attainments, and which, in general, inculcates the imbibing of smatterings of knowledge concerning many fields, and mastery of none—the very doctrines which have been largely responsible for bringing about the great deterioration which has occurred in our public school system.

Obviously, potential teachers have only a limited amount of time to devote to college training. The more they waste on these courses in pedagogy and educational psychology, the less time they have to devote to the subject matter which they should master before engaging in teaching in secondary schools. Here we have a primary reason why all investigations show that a large proportion of our present high school teachers are very ill-prepared in science and mathematics, and that the same is true in the case of potential teachers in these fields. Will granting Federal money to the States for promotion of education have any tendency to remedy this state of affairs?

Does it not seem probable that, if the schools in the various parts of the United States that are short on teachers were to reestablish discipline and then make it a practice to employ suitable applicants who could pass, with good grades, examinations in the fields which they were expected to teach, there would be little trouble in securing good teachers for most of the vacancies. With one exception, none of the teachers under whom I studied in the country schools had ever been to college. Yet I received fine instruction from them. As a matter of fact, in addition to training in the fundamentals of the three R's, I was thoroughly drilled in geography, history, grammar, and arithmetic. In the case of the latter, I solved all of the problems in Ray's "Higher Arithmetic" except two, which neither my father, who was rather expert in that field, nor the county superintendent, could solve. I learned enough about physiology and civil government to pass the requirements in these subjects for entering the university, and mastered bookkeeping sufficiently to enable me to teach the subject in high school without further preparation—and Harry Lee, the teacher who instructed me in these things, had had only a year's training in an academy. Obviously, spending years in schools of education is a foolish prerequisite for teachers in elementary schools.

Is it true that, in the present prosperous year of 1959, many school districts are so short on funds that they cannot afford to erect such buildings as they need in order to educate their youth? I have just taken the trouble to compare, for the United States as a whole, per capita real incomes in 1890 and 1959. I find that, in terms of dollars of 1947-49 purchasing power, as measured by the consumer price index, per capita real income has risen from \$581 to \$1,670. In other words, it is now two and eighty-seven one-hundredths times as large as it was when I attended country school. If we allow for the fact that various grades of government now extract from the pockets of the taxpayers something like 30 percent of those citizens' revenues, it still is true that they have remaining double as much real income as they had in that earlier period, a time in which they found it feasible to give excellent instruction to all of the children in elementary subjects. Some of the finest teaching in that field that I have ever known about was given by Miss Lora Sirless in an abandoned log cabin in Scott's Bluff County, Nebr. The people there did not know that palatial surroundings were essential to the teaching of the 3 R's. Providing adequate

classroom space and facilities for teaching would today burden few communities unduly.

Is it not true that, at present, a major fraction of the cost of school buildings represents making them suitable not only for educational ends, but also for entertainment purposes? If and when the Federal Government pays part or all of the cost of these elaborate structures, can it be truthfully said that the money appropriated has really been used primarily for aid to education? Is it not, instead, merely an aid to schooling—a very different thing?

Another important point to be considered is the burden of school construction and higher teacher pay upon the taxpayers of the country. If part of the financing is done by the Federal Government, is it not obvious that the burden must still be met entirely by the taxpayers of the Nation, unless Congress engages in the utterly unsound practice of inflating the circulating medium, and thereby levying a hidden tax upon all holders of such things as bank deposits, mortgages, and bonds, or recipients of pensions, annuities, and social security payments? And is it not generally true that, if the voters in a given school district decide by ballot to erect a new school building in their immediate area, they will be much more careful to guard against waste and undue frills in connection with the construction, than will be the case if they think most of the burden is to be borne by Uncle Sam?

Finally, if Congress decides to vote money for subsidizing education throughout the Nation, just what new taxes do you plan to impose in order to assure that there will be no Federal deficit financing, and, hence, no deterioration in the value of the dollar? I believe that you should give this matter your very careful consideration before appropriating money for aid to education.

I greatly appreciate your consideration in giving me time to thus present my views.

Report of Publisher of Ebony, Jet, and Tan Magazines on Visit to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I have the privilege to include an account of the prominent Negro publisher who traveled to Russia in the Vice President's press party. Mr. Johnson is founder and president of the largest Negro publishing firm in the world. His company publishes Ebony, Jet, and Tan magazines which have a monthly circulation of an estimated 1½ million copies:

Any Negro who feels that communism is the solution to the race problem in the United States will be sadly disappointed if he takes a trip to Soviet Russia.

This is the opinion of John H. Johnson, publisher of Jet and Ebony magazines, who, with his wife, Eunice, was a member of the press group which accompanied Vice President Nixon on his recent trip to Russia and Poland. There are relatively few Negroes in the Soviet Union, and Mr. Johnson agrees with the

Russian claim that it does not have a race problem. However, he is quick to point out that most of the privileges which we take for granted, such as freedom of speech and press and the right to own property, are not enjoyed by the Russian people.

The American Negro who wants better housing, more productive employment, and more individual opportunities will find that they are not available to him in Russia because they are not available to the majority of the Russian people.

Mr. Johnson does feel, however, that even though the Communist philosophy is not a good one for Negro or white Americans, there is no reason why the United States and Russia should not be friendly and peaceful. He believes that the Nixon trip contributed much to the development of friendly relations between the two countries and that further cultural and educational exchanges should be continued.

America: Looking to the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Adm. L. H. Frost, Director of Naval Intelligence:

Gentlemen, from one point of view, we here tonight represent a variety of special talents and abilities—right within our naval activities alone. But I am more interested in thinking of those things that hold us together and serve our common purpose. We live in an age where specialization is natural and necessary, but it tends to create walls around many groups and threatens what is commonly called the whole man.

That is why tonight I am going to talk briefly about some issues which transcend our individual naval and private pursuits—and point rather toward the objectives we have in common—to what there is at stake for us in the year 1959 and many years ahead.

In short, my central theme is the United States—not in the impersonal terms of a world power—but in terms of you and me, our heritage, the crisis of civilization, our goals—and, unfortunately, the temptation of all of us to push these things over to or beyond our side vision.

Let's start out by taking a brief look at our historical attitudes toward the world around us and our future. As you know, we were fortunately isolated from the major troubles of the world during a good part of our history. This was not just geographic coincidence. We wanted it that way. It was so essential to our national objective and purpose that we set forth our views in the Monroe Doctrine—a virtual ultimatum to all world powers that the Western Hemisphere was not to be a preserve for tyrants or potentates.

This was not only a great historic decision to take under the circumstances. It was one of those rare and inspired decisions whose strength rested not only on military power—but rather on those intangibles of the spirit

that mark any man, or group, or organization who know clearly what they want and have the courage to pursue it.

We often forget that in the late 18th and the early 19th centuries we were considered the curse of world stability. Kingdoms and powers considered us anathema. Our Declaration of Independence alone contained ideals that—in the eyes of rulers everywhere—threatened to upset the status quo and release the bonds of men. But genuine as it was—our revolution had its own distinct nature. It did not reject the past—it sought to fulfill it. It had no interest in violence. There was on legacy of sustained hatred. In fact, George Washington in his farewell address counseled against indiscriminate emotional involvement with other nations. You may remember that the American public in that decade was strongly pro-French and quite anti-British—and the British and French were at each other's throats.

What was the driving force behind all this? Simply this, if I may borrow a historian's words: That the United States is the only nation in history where men chose a genuine ideal and then built a State around it.

All during the 19th century we had a new continent to explore and settle. All of our energies were directed to that end and to keeping the Union intact. Toward the end of the century the Monroe Doctrine was extended, we had our brief war with Spain, and then took a plunge into imperialism. We weren't at all happy with imperialism and soon started to disengage from that venture.

Although we had emerged as a sea power by the turn of the 20th century, we retained essentially the desire to work out our own destiny free of the power struggles on the Eurasian continent. But by the time World War I commenced there was enough conviction in the country that our interests would somehow be involved that we protested violently against that very idea.

As you know—and this was to be repeated in 24 years—we entered with our hearts more than our heads, saw as our objective solely military victory, and assumed that the post-war period would find a new world of enlightened leaders. Woodrow Wilson's disappointment with our allies set the tone after World War I. Nevertheless, well-meaning but idealistic and unrealistic treaties piled up.

Again we were ill prepared psychologically to participate in the Second World War. When we had to, finally, we set our goal as unconditional surrender. As a people we didn't think very much about problems that would exist in the world after victory. In fact, we took refuge in another dream—just as in the First World War—and trusted that the United Nations would take care of everything. We weren't very realistic—we still yearned to mind our own business—and hoped that foreign troubles would go away. But it was too late—history had caught up with us. Technology had, in effect, made the world shrink. Oceans were no longer broad sheltering expanses.

What happened after World War II was simply this: Leadership of the free world was thrust upon us as a nation. We reluctantly accepted it. Finally, we realized how necessary it was and began to grow with it. We recognized at last that "no man is an island"—that when the bell tolled for Poland, for Czechoslovakia, and for Hungary, it was also tolling for us and for all free men.

I have briefly touched on some of the highlights of our history to set the stage for my next remarks—the nature of the threat against us today and our problems in facing that threat. Suffice it to say that all Americans have a nostalgia for the good old days. We keep hoping for normalcy. But I am

afraid that what we are facing today is the normalcy that will be with us for a long time to come. There's no use in fighting the 20th century. We are right in the middle of it. Destiny may even make it the American century.

Several years ago President Eisenhower stated in a public address that we are living not in an instant of peril but in an age of peril. This was part of his counsel that we face up courageously to our problems—and neither look away from them nor become hysterical over them. As you will see, this is extremely important in the matter of the Communist threat.

I fully realize that all of you know what the Communist story is—particularly that of the Soviet Union. But even in Washington where such matters are of daily concern, I find that all of us have to keep taking stock of our approaches to the problem. If you become greatly absorbed in any one aspect of it, you are apt to be surprised or misestimate another aspect. By the same token, if you stress only the dramatic aspects of the Communist threat, you miss the key to the entire problem.

Let me illustrate. The Soviet threat is most often discussed in public in terms of military hardware. The most dramatic side to this is a surprise nuclear attack on the United States. Now, I have no intention of saying that this is unimportant. Proper defense against such a contingency is vital. But a stalemate has been reached on the score of strategic nuclear warfare. It may be mainly psychological—but nevertheless it is real. The Soviets know full well what would lie in store for them and they are unlikely to risk all they have gained by an ill-advised risk.

Where, then, does the real threat to us lie? The real threat lies across the whole spectrum of human activity—politics, economics, sociology, culture, and the military. In all these fields and with apparently highly practical coordination, the Soviets make war against the entire fabric of Western society. This has been aptly termed "protracted conflict"—a conflict that is carried out everywhere and all the time. This is the real, everyday conflict that the non-Communist world finds hard to assess as an ultimately decisive threat. For the Communists it is a campaign of attrition or erosion of the foundation of the free world.

Now this is far from a military equation. The military factor is there but it is only part of it. When Western nations become aware of a potential or manifest enemy, they traditionally seek to assess his military strength, his military capabilities, and if possible his intentions. This was adequate in its day and time but it isn't enough in the case of the Soviet Union—for while you fasten your attention on only one expected military attack, he may win a dozen equivalent campaigns without having moved a battalion, a submarine or an aircraft. It is this new kind of warfare that peoples of the West have misunderstood for the most part. Why?

Perhaps we can find the answer if we try a little analogy. When the average American looks about him he perceives physical objects but he clothes them with his own ideas and traditions and experience. He is an optimist at heart. He likes to reach solutions as quickly as possible. He doesn't mind compromising if the other fellow is ready to give in a bit too. He finds the past a bedrock of value and is willing to build on it through experimentation. He is not given to sustained hatred. He's reasonably willing to help other nations out if they are in trouble. But he's not generally interested in changing the world. In short, his philosophy is one of live and let live.

You get an entirely different picture if you look at the world through Communist eyes. I am not talking of some 200 million

people in the Soviet Union but of several million Communist Party members and a small inner core of leaders who are committed to world domination from Moscow. They run what we call a closed society. Every aspect of activity is controlled from the top. Lenin summed it up in 1900 when he stated that "we want the whole of their lives." Moreover, he laid out specific plans for reshaping those lives as a token of the future shaping of all lives on this planet.

As the Communist looks around the free world he is not affected by tradition, by respect for institutions of the past or by any spiritual kinship with the past. For him there is a philosophy that explains all of life in one package. There is no picking or choosing—everything in the package is interrelated. Thus he has an explanation for nature, for man, for society, and for history.

His philosophy tells him that societies all around the world are evolving toward communism—each at its own pace. The leaders of those societies will try to slow the process and will even get desperate and violent about it. But it is hopeless. By the same token, the Communist can, by judging situations correctly, give history an assist every now and then by fostering a revolutionary situation. It is his duty to do this. His sole norm of conduct is to advance the spread of communism. Yet, if he acts rashly and tries to speed things up at the wrong time, he is guilty of jeopardizing the revolution. You have a real paradox here—a constant urgency to weaken the West and at the same time an infinite, watchful patience. Undergirding this is an unshakable conviction that communism is to be the final flowering of history, and that every other system is destined to pass away.

I am not going to set forth here the numerous beliefs and guides to action by which the Communist lives. My main purpose is to remind you that through Communist eyes Western civilization is a waning force but still standing in the path of Communist progress. This isn't just an opinion—it is the consistent core of Communist belief going back over 100 years. It is what Khrushchev means when he jovially says: "We will bury you."

Now what happens when we try to judge Communist conduct through Western eyes? In the first place, you will find people who urge that we must negotiate with the Soviets to bring a lasting peace to the world. There is no intrinsic evil in negotiating—the trouble lies in what you buy. For various reasons, an attempt to negotiate may be necessary. Indeed, on certain special issues a negotiated settlement could be to our good. But the important point is that the Soviets cannot negotiate for world peace and stability. For them peace and stability mean their freedom to expand Communist power and influence without hindrance. For them there is no question of what they want or why they want it. Those are settled matters for the Communists. Their sole problem is how to get it. This reduces itself to an operational problem, judging each day which situations are ripe for exploitation, where to recede for the moment, and where to apply pressure.

They are not standard aggressive dictators occupied only with a plan to gain the world by military conquest. They are rather professional revolutionists who keep military strength as a ready tool. This military strength is every bit a psychological tool as it is a means of actual aggression. That is why I stated earlier that the threat lies across the entire spectrum of human activity in protracted conflict—in politics, psychology, economics, force, culture, and religion—every day and everywhere.

We can separate this threat into three broad categories.

The first is the one that is with us every day—cold war. It is the one least worried

about and yet is the one that could ultimately be decisive by the aggregate weight of many seemingly small victories and advantages. This is the area of the so-called cold war where the Soviet objective is erosion of the strength of the free world.

Here you find instances like Iraq, the attempt to infiltrate Syria and Egypt, the slow penetration of Afghanistan, the pressures on Berlin, and threatening notes to our allies. All around the clock broadcasts cover the world threatening, flattening, cajoling. Millions of well-printed books and pamphlets are placed in strategic spots wherever the Soviets detect any basic discontent. It is a tireless campaign designed to sow discontent or apathy and to stoke the fire for the day when some internal trouble sudden blazes up.

This is the area in which we Americans by ingrained habit and disposition do not have a sure touch. We find it rather incredible that any group could work with such zeal and single mindedness for so many decades. We, in the West, like to think in terms of the white of peace and the black of war. When the white of peace is disrupted, the black of war takes over. But to the men in the Kremlin there is a wide field of gray between the white and the black. If they can keep the free world in that zone of gray they will have their most fertile opportunities to exploit the world and yet not risk unduly the hazards of total war.

With the free world constantly badgered during periods of neither peace nor war, the men in the Kremlin hope to keep us off balance with no sure idea of the direction we should pursue or the action we should take. They rely on their belief that the United States will not see cause enough in any one situation to undertake decisive retaliation. Moreover, they alternate between apparent reasonableness and a menacing attitude and we are constantly tempted to give them the benefit of the doubt.

This then is the so-called cold air which is waged by the Soviet Union day in and day out. If you try to measure its progress by still photographs you may derive some measure of comfort in isolated instances. But it can only be measured, as it were, in motion-picture sequence. In that way you see the stark truth of Soviet expansion over 42 years. The same dreary story will continue to unfold unless we realize that we are in a long-drawn-out contest that we can lose by default little by little over the years.

Another category of the Soviet threat is found in the area of limited war or localized aggression. This subject is often discussed these days but there is an element of confusion about it. When you talk of general war, you usually have no trouble in matching up the opponents by name and numbers. The issue appears clear cut.

Limited wars are not so easily defined. But there is a common theme running through them. The Communist bloc is—or considers itself—an interested party. Soviet troops—as in Korea—may be two stages away. Nevertheless Soviet strength is the prime mover of the situation. In the Taiwan Strait area, the Soviets are one stage away—yet Communist China is ultimately dependent on the Soviet Union. In some cases, as in Lebanon, you have an incipient limited war. Without our help, the balance could easily have swung to the ultimate Soviet advantage.

The rising discussion of limited war is no fad. There is an inherent logic to it—springing from the nature of the power balance today. In the first place, limited aggression is closely related to the cold war. It is, in fact, the occasional flaring up of the cold war. By nature, limited aggression is the preferred Soviet method of edging out at its periphery. In the Soviet mind, limited aggression and limited risk are two sides of the same coin. Just as the cold war is designed to erode, so is limited aggression

designed to bite off manageable and digestible pieces.

As the United States and U.S.S.R. consolidate the strategic nuclear stalemate, the Soviet assessment of risk in a local situation may very well alter appreciably. When the alternative to both sides will mean nuclear destruction, the alternative may turn out to be not very real in cases of local aggression.

Added to this, is the fact that a strategic nuclear stalemate does not leave the Soviet drive for power spinning its wheels. Just as there is traction for the Soviets in the nonmilitary means of cold war, the Soviets will find traction in limited aggressions.

There will be only one way to deter limited aggression—and that will be by having an adequate limited war capability. Otherwise we may be faced with using massive retaliation over a situation that will—judged by itself—perhaps not appear that important.

Up to this point I have covered the cold war—or protracted conflict—and limited aggression. These are the termite programs of the Soviets. The Soviets intend them to pay off over the years. In the end, the Western structure would be eroded and weakened fatally. The collapse would come from within—if the Soviets have their way—and not because of a bolt of lightning.

We now come to the third category of the Soviet threat—general war. This is the most dramatic, naturally. I repeat that I am not underestimating the threat of a surprise attack by the Soviet Union. My point is that we can deter the Soviets in this field and are in a continuing position to do so. What disturbs me most is that in the public mind there has been an imbalance in recognizing the total threat from Communist power. Too many people have felt that if the Soviets are deterred from a nuclear attack on us, then the situation is well in hand. Moreover, those who do ponder only the nature of nuclear war, are apt to become apathetic or despondent over the future. This is where the imbalance in the assessment gives root to the very attitudes the Soviets seek to foster.

Gentlemen, there is no doubt that in the fast pace of our daily life we leave ourselves wide open to strong stimulations. Whether it be news of crime or war or politics or a scientific breakthrough, we receive it through all news media played to the hilt. All of us are so engrossed in our own daily problems that we are more apt than not to accept the eye catching and the dramatic at face value. Whether we realize it or not, we are constantly bombarded by the sensational side of a story. This can easily lead to cycles of elation and depression and finally to a feeling of indifference. Some say: "It's all too much for me," and others say: "Leave it to Washington—that's their job."

I can understand this kind of frustration but it is disturbing because it is not part of the American heritage I discussed earlier. The very nature of the democracy we cherish carries within it a sense of individual responsibility and a jealous sense of having one's say in the Nation's progress and welfare. That is now a necessity as well as a privilege for all of us. It is all the more vital because we are actually in a crisis of civilization. This type of crisis always involves the very fabric of society.

And now I would like to summarize the import of my remarks tonight. In the first place, I have tried to set right the imbalance of general views that have gradually grown up in Western society as a whole on the Soviet Union. There is an almost irresistible tendency for us to judge an enemy solely in military terms. Probably for this

reason we feel safe if our defenses are strong or feel that our defenses are weak if the enemy continues to expand his power.

The trouble here is that modern history has known no enemy of the Soviet type. He is imbued with what amounts to a fanatical sense of religion—and he goes in heavily for military strength. He does not engage in war for its own sake and, in fact, does not look upon military conquest as necessarily the way to reach his objectives. Nevertheless, there are times and places for the use of military force in aggression—whenever the risk is consistent with the preservation of the Communist world base.

By belief—and this belief can find adherents anywhere—he prefers to soften up nations, expand his influence gradually and to secure each gain for good.

Now what are our priorities in warding off this type of aggression? Well for one, we as a nation should think first of rediscovering our own national ideals and objectives and then get at the task of warding off an enemy. Our sights must always be set well beyond the goal of merely countering communism. After all, the American Revolution of 1776 is the only genuine revolution of the modern age. Communism merely depersonalizes man and reverts him to a fatalism and slavery that is centuries old.

The ranking priority after renewing faith in our own heritage and our own destiny and looking steadily to the future, is, of course, the maintenance of strong national defense across the board—both the capability to deter an enemy resort to all-out war and the capability to deter limited aggressions. In the face of a well armed foe, the Soviet Union is likely to tread with caution even in the cold war.

But, there remains another priority—the one most difficult to handle—and yet, as history shows, the decisive one in so many cases. This is the case of a nation realizing that the greatness of its past is no guarantee of a great future. Voices throughout the country are at last warning that freedom must be reearned by each generation. To reearn freedom is not unpleasant but it does call for sober reflection and some sacrifice.

It would be an ironic tragedy if a nation like the United States—the state built around a great ideal—were ultimately to change for the worse or fall because its people lost their sense of purpose, their sure touch, and their natural optimism.

This is the area I would like to leave you thinking of—the fabric of our society and the necessity to keep it strong. For the protracted warfare of the Soviet Union is directed squarely at that fabric—to weaken it by apathy, to rend it by internal suspicions and quarrels, and to dissolve it by pessimism and fatalism.

As naval officers and as citizens in your own communities you can be the leaven to stir up reflections on our heritage and to keep in mind that we are fighting on many fronts—all of grave importance. Every American has a personal responsibility for his civilization. As naval officers, all of us have been trained in the tradition of accountability and can be counted on to set the example of seeing the multiple threat to the United States in all its aspects. This is not a time for Americans to succumb to hysteria or apathy—to hotheadedness or gullibility—or, to borrow an expression, a time to jump on the horse and ride off in all four directions. You have the training, the background and the maturity to set the tone in your daily lives and contacts for a true appreciation of what our Nation stands for and just what is threatening to undermine it.

The Labor Bill

SPEECH

OF

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8342) to provide for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I join wholeheartedly with what I believe to be the overwhelming desire and determination of the people of the United States and the Members of this House to correct and end racketeering and abuses in the labor-management field.

I have been ready and I am ready now to vote for a strong, effective bill to drive the racketeers, chiselers, and hoodlums out of the dark dens they have established in the labor movement over the protests and against the active opposition of the overwhelming number of legitimate and honest leaders and members of organized labor. I am equally determined to put a stop to the equally despicable activities of conniving, bribing, and extorting racketeers in the management field, as are the overwhelming number of legitimate and honest businessmen.

In the debate this week we have not had an opportunity to vote for a bill representing what I believe to be the general public interest in labor reform, rather than the expression of views of the two sides in a labor-management controversy unrelated to labor reform.

Perhaps many Members of the House feel the Shelley bill leaned toward the interests of labor. If so, I sincerely believe it to be honest, responsible labor—not gangsters. Certainly, many of us feel the Landrum-Griffin bill thoroughly confuses labor reform with fundamental alterations in basic management-labor relations. It would punish labor as a whole for the acts of a few individuals. It seeks to disarm labor at the collective bargaining table. Under the guise of "reform" it would destroy balances of collective bargaining achieved by honest labor and management over many years which have resulted in the greatest opportunities, the greatest advances and the greatest prosperity for both business and labor that the world has ever known. I cannot believe that most of management wants this. I believe they recognize the advantage to business of a well-paid, happy, and free labor force under high standards of living which provide the markets for their goods and services.

Many of us are convinced the Landrum-Griffin bill is an administrative monstrosity, unenforceable, confusing, and

inconsistent with the great body of labor law. There is grave question that it would result in the ending of abuses the people of this country seek, even if its wording would appear to accomplish this.

The Landrum-Griffin bill was not presented in committee. It was not submitted for study nor forged in the crucible of debate. It had no opportunity to be cleaned up and made workable by legal minds. It was sprung on this House without an unbiased or disinterested report. It was the unrevealed hole card of one interest group. It is my sincere conviction that its excesses would hinder rather than assist true labor reform.

Had I the opportunity, I would vote for a true labor reform bill—one, incidentally, not backed by either labor or management, but which I believe would serve the best interests of all the people of this country. I will still vote for such a bill when I have the chance.

The Landrum-Griffin bill will now go to conference along with the bill passed by the other House. I can only express my deep and sincere hope that reasonable minds and responsible attitudes will prevail and that out of conference there may emerge a sound, workable, fair bill which will bring real reform in the labor-management field and which will win the overwhelming support of this House and the people of the country and will not destroy the ability of labor to achieve its legitimate objectives. Such a bill would reflect highest credit upon the Congress and would win the commendation of the people of this country for a job well done.

The Labor Bill

SPEECH

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8342) to provide for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, throughout the House deliberation on labor reform legislation, I have consistently supported the bill reported out by the House committee, and I have consistently voted against all efforts to amend that bill by replacing it either with the Shelley substitute, supported by AFL-CIO leaders, or with the Landrum-Griffin bill supported by President Eisenhower. I did this because I believed and still believe that the committee bill represented a fair and reasonable middle-of-the-road approach to the labor-management reform problem. It was a bill which, in the words of Speaker RAYBURN

would "reform without punishing" and "cure without crushing." It was a bill which Mr. Robert Kennedy, Counsel of the Senate committee investigating labor racketeering, declared would "carry out all of the recommendations of the McClelland committee," and would set the Hoffas out of the labor movement. I opposed all efforts to amend this bill because I was fearful, and still am fearful, that any drastic changes from the committee bill might lead to a stalemate in the conference between the House and Senate that would result in no labor legislation being adopted at all, which I would regard as a great tragedy.

In spite of these considerations, the House yesterday voted to substitute the Landrum-Griffin bill for the committee bill. In today's final voting, therefore, I am voting against the motion to recommit and in favor of final passage of the bill.

My votes today, however, are being cast with the express understanding that my vote does not constitute approval of many of the provisions of the House bill, but that I believe it is imperative in the interests of getting effective labor control legislation that a labor reform bill be sent to conference between the House and Senate. I am hopeful that as a result of this conference a fairer bill can be worked out which will root out the Hoffas and the racketeers in the labor movement without penalizing legitimate union organizations. I also voted to send the bill to conference with the understanding that I will definitely reserve my final vote until I have a chance to see whether the conference committee agrees to a better and fairer bill, more nearly in line with either the bill which was reported out by the House committee or the Kennedy bill which passed the Senate earlier this year.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the request of a group of prominent constituents of mine, I insert in the RECORD a telegram which I received from them this morning:

FAIRPORT, TEX., August 13, 1959.

The undersigned, after studying the various labor bills now pending before Congress, feel that the most effective and most needed labor legislation protecting the rights of management, labor, and the country as a whole is contained in H.R. 8400 called the Landrum-Griffin bill. We urge your wholehearted support and vote for this measure in a form which will not substantially change the tenor and meaning of the bill as it is now written on the following points:

1. Gives jurisdiction in labor relations cases now existing in the "no man's land."
2. Closes major secondary boycott loopholes,

3. Clamps down on picketing for union recognition,

4. Bar denial of a union member's rights by a labor boss.

We further request that this message be read by you into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

John W. Hazard, W. C. McLendon,

O. L. Bass, Sr., L. C. Morrison,

T. W. Davis, J. G. Dickson, D. V.

Collins, T. C. Selman, Francis

Swann, Ralph David, W. V. Curry,

Horace L. Owings, D. C. Donald-

son, Mrs. Mark Powell, J. E. Dingle,

W. T. Galloway, Vernon Richards,

Mark Powell.

Garrison Diversion: A Matter of Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon the House will act on the conference report on H.R. 7509, the public works appropriation bill for 1960. In that bill is contained an appropriation of \$425,000 for investigations and planning for the Garrison Diversion project in North Dakota. This figure is \$125,000 less than the amount asked by the President and voted by the Senate for this project. On this subject, I include a copy of a resolution I received this morning from the North Dakota American Legion. The resolution relates to the justice of our request and provides an excellent summary of the various factors involved:

RESOLUTION 9 PASSED AT 41ST ANNUAL CONVENTION, THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF NORTH DAKOTA, BISMARCK, N. DAK., JUNE 22-23, 1959

Whereas the original program for the development of the water and land resources of the Missouri River Basin, as set forth in the Flood Control Act of 1944 and related documents, authorized diversion of water from the Missouri River for irrigation and other beneficial uses in North Dakota; and

Whereas those portions of the basin program which will serve such beneficial uses as flood control, production of hydroelectric power and navigation, among others, which are of value mainly to other downriver States of the basin, and now well along the road to completion; and

Whereas successive studies have incontrovertibly proved that the Missouri River carries adequate water to serve all purposes set forth in the Flood Control Act of 1944, including irrigation, so that no part of the basin and no part of its economy need fear that fulfillment of the total plan, including irrigation, will deprive it of an adequate and fair share of the river's flow; and

Whereas North Dakota has sacrificed some 450,000 acres of land for Oahe and Garrison Dam Reservoirs, and was given to understand that the irrigation portion of the project in North Dakota would be compensation for this sacrifice; and

Whereas already the development of the Garrison diversion portion of the basin project has been delayed several years beyond the originally contemplated starting date; and

Whereas economical and orderly development demands that there be no more delay and that a start of construction on Garri-

son diversion be launched at the earliest possible date, certainly no later than fiscal year 1963, in keeping with the original program as set forth in the aforesaid Flood Control Act of 1944, and in keeping with the understood bargain with the State of North Dakota and its people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Department of North Dakota of the American Legion hereby urges that the Congress of the United States take such action as is necessary to speed investigations preliminary to actual construction and also as is necessary to actually begin construction no later than fiscal year 1963; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the chairman of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees of the U.S. Congress, to members of the North Dakota congressional delegation, to the secretary of the North Dakota Water Conservation Commission, to Gov. John E. Davis, of North Dakota, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the national legislative chairman of the American Legion, and to such other parties as may be deemed advisable.

New York 156th Guardsmen Receive Eisenhower Trophy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, presentation ceremonies of the Eisenhower Trophy for calendar year 1958 were held on August 5 at Camp Drum, N.Y., to Headquarters and Headquarters Battery, First Howitzer Battalion, 156th Artillery. The cup was accepted for the battalion by Capt. Edward J. Schrowang, commanding officer of Headquarters Battery, and Lt. Col. Frank W. Harkin, the battalion commander.

The Eisenhower Trophy is awarded annually to the outstanding company-size unit of the New York Army National Guard. The trophy is awarded on the basis of strength, attendance at armory drills and field training, performance of armory drill training and annual field training, and proficiency with individual weapons. In winning this trophy, the 156th unit was adjudged the best among 254 company-size units in the New York Army National Guard. The members of the 156th unit are residents of Ulster and Dutchess Counties in my congressional district and I am justifiably proud of their outstanding performance.

I am happy to congratulate Lieutenant Colonel Harkin, the battalion commander, and the individual members of this unit for their superior accomplishment in winning this coveted award.

In commenting further upon the history of the 156th, the Poughkeepsie New Yorker relates:

TOPS AGAIN

"Without stinting praise for the battery commanders, or for Lt. Col. Frank W. Harkin, battalion commander, or the other imaginative and effective commissioned and non-commissioned officers of the battalion, much credit must go to the individual artillery-

men—and the esprit de corps which inspires them.

The 156th Field Artillery has a long and distinguished history—dating back to 1653 and including service in every major war.

"The neatness and bearing of the average guardsman, even when he's in green fatigue uniform, is an outward sign that he's proud to wear the red, white, and blue regimental crest of the 156th.

"In an age when young men are often loosely lumped with beatniks and juvenile delinquents, it's heartening to see that the citizen-soldiers of the 156th are worthy counterparts of the minutemen who left plow and shop to fight and die on the green at Lexington, or at Bunker Hill, where a parent unit of the 156th saw action.

Veterans With Less Than 90 Days' Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. Robert J. Boyd, of Staten Island, N.Y., in which he expresses some interesting views and comments upon the subject of those who served in the Armed Forces of this country for less than 90 days:

STATEN ISLAND, N.Y., August 2, 1959.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Representative, State of Pennsylvania,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have received a copy of your remarks in Congress in regards to a letter written by one George Dreisbach in reference to veterans with less than 90 days' service during a period of hostilities. I, being the son of one such veteran, now deceased, but whose widow is striving to get along on what little social security she has obtained through working after the passing of said veteran, wish to thank you for bringing it to the attention of Congress. This group of under 90 days veterans indeed is in need of a spokesman as whenever my mother has made any move to receive the benefits given to other veterans' widows she has been turned down for the following reasons: Veterans death was not due to service, veteran had under 90 days' service or was not discharged for service-connected disability.

Just as a matter of information I would like to state my late father's record so you can judge for yourself as to the justice of the 90 days' stipulation in the case of Spanish American War Veterans wherein the war didn't even last the 90 days required:

1. Enlisted, 1st Battalion, Naval Force of Pennsylvania (Reserve), February 15, 1898. Honorably discharged to U.S. Navy, June 16, 1898. Total, 160 days.

2. Enlisted, U.S. Navy, Philadelphia, Pa. Served U.S.S. *St. Louis*, U.S.S. *Richmond*, and U.S.S. *Arctic*, June 17, 1898. Honorably discharged, U.S. Navy, League Island, Pa., August 24, 1898. Total, 68 days.

3. Enlisted, New York Naval Militia (Reserve), August 21, 1902. Placed on retired list as Lieutenant commander, February 28, 1934. Total, 31½ years.

The above veteran because of the short duration of the war with Spain still only served 68 days active duty. I have heard that Congress at one time in case of this kind that the time served was reduced to 70 days,

but cannot obtain any official statement on this. Even 70 days still would leave 2 days short, but I think the Reserve cruises should be taken into consideration as they are done in present Reserve programs.

Sincerely, I hope your time in office will be a long and rewarding one and that you will be ever mindful of the minority regardless of their need. Thanking you for your attention and whatever help you can obtain for this forgotten group.

ROBERT J. BOYD.

A High-School Girl's Views on True Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to present today the prize-winning composition of a young lady from my district—Miss Gloria Sickal, a student of the Clare, Mich., high school, in the 10th District which I represent.

Miss Sickal's work took top honors in the State of Michigan in a nationwide contest entitled "My True Security," sponsored by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce and one of the large life insurance companies. In recognition of her achievement, Miss Sickal was brought to Washington recently to participate in the national awards banquet.

She very appropriately points out that "only when we know the truth and are free from fear can we find within ourselves true God-given security and freedom."

I am pleased to present for the RECORD the composition which was selected as the best submitted from the State of Michigan:

THEREIN LIETH SECURITY

Throughout our busy world we see people searching for security. To some security is stocks and bonds or a large bank account; to others, property, a job, or a college education. Some put a premium on social standing, fame, or fortune, while others worship family customs and traditions. Yet all of these things, in spite of their individual importance, when acquired, still leave us scurrying about searching once more for security. This makes us wonder just what is security.

Security does not come with the acquisition of material things, but security comes from within. It is not something we can buy and pay for, but rather an intangible quality of confident assurance. Security is a sense of being needed and of needing others; a feeling that every day we live has an ultimate purpose. Security cannot be found by following the crowd to be accepted, but must be found within ourselves. There is in each one of us an inborn desire to be loved and cared for, but there must also be a desire to love and care for others.

The story is told of an unattractive little 8-year-old girl in a Pennsylvania orphanage whose annoying mannerisms caused her to be shunned by all the other children. Even the teachers disliked her and wished that she might be transferred elsewhere. In fact, they were seeking diligently for a legitimate excuse to be rid of her. One afternoon it

appeared that their opportunity had arrived. This girl's roommate reported that a clandestine correspondence was apparently being conducted with someone outside the grounds. "Just a little while ago she took a note out and hid it in a tree," was the report. With some satisfaction, the head of the orphanage and her assistant commanded, "Take us to that tree. Show us where she left the note." Surely enough, there was the note in one of the branches. Opening it quickly, the women were somewhat embarrassed to read, "To whoever find this: I love you."

A little girl, hungry for love, hungry for security, was only seeking out someone who might be equally lonely. In this way the little girl had actually found security in the hope that someone was receiving her love. What are we giving to others, not only to our families and close acquaintances, but also to our country? Are we this eager to give of ourselves for our country, or are we taking our freedoms for granted? We must remember that "we have no rights without responsibilities."

Some governments of the world today subordinate the individual and emphasize the state. But in America the state is individuals, and without them there would be no country, no government, no democracy. In America there is no set pattern and mold into which each must fit, but we have freedom to choose. Let us not distort this freedom to the point that we choose nothing; nor let us assume that the right to choose guarantees the right choices. The right choices come only from clean hands and a pure heart and a continual searching desire for the truth. In the Bible we find these guiding words: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free," and again, "Perfect love casteth out fear." Only when we know the truth and are free from fear can we find within ourselves true God-given security and freedom.

The Labor Bill

SPEECH
OF

HON. DAVID S. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8342) to provide for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, the House of Representatives has spoken its will on the matter of labor reform. I am one who supported the committee bill. Nevertheless, my strong desire to see that good labor legislation be enacted, overrides all other considerations at this time. The real tragedy would be for this session of Congress to adjourn without any labor legislation on the books at all.

There has been some fear that the conference committee might not be able to reconcile its differences, because of some of the extreme provisions of the Landrum-Griffin bill. At this time, I urge the conference committee, whose membership has now been announced, to

do all in its power to carry out the mandate of the American people, in producing a satisfactory labor bill. I call upon the Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY of the other body to use his great influence to see that there be no stalemate, as has been feared. A stalemate would be a disservice to the Nation.

I realize that there are some serious problems to be ironed out. There are differences to be reconciled, and inequities to be removed. Nevertheless, if all participants in the conference committee approach their task with the firm resolution to come up with a labor bill, I know that they will succeed, and that they will not allow the intense partisanship which has manifested itself up to now, to destroy the results of the great effort which has gone into this bill. I express the hope that the Nation will give this bill a fair chance to succeed, to the end that this might mark the prelude to a new era of improved labor-management relations.

In Person

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention of my colleagues to a penetrating editorial which appeared on August 14 in the Chicago Daily Tribune. This editorial is one of the most sensible appraisals that I have seen regarding the pending visit of Premier Nikita Khrushchev to this country. I hope that the delegates to the United Nations, particularly our own American delegation, will seriously consider the suggestions made in this editorial and effectively carry them out.

The editorial follows:

IN PERSON

Premier Nikita Khrushchev of the Soviet Union will improve his visit to the United States by speaking before the United Nations General Assembly in New York. He has graciously accepted the invitation of the headquarters Secretariat and is expected to make his appearance September 21 or 22, 6 or 7 days after he arrives here and after the Assembly convenes.

For those who have come in late, it may be mentioned that U.N. exists to maintain peace on earth and good will toward men. It may seem anomalous that Mr. Khrushchev should be the guest of an organization which entertains these goals, but in the current age of wonderful nonsense (as Westbrook Pegler dubbed a preceding era) such things are as normal as everyday doings in the monkey house.

Indeed, Khrushchev's date with U.N. may provide that organization with an unwanted opportunity to do something relevant. After 2 or 3 days devoted to organization matters, each of the 81 member nations gets an opportunity to sound off, and a number of them will have had an opportunity to be heard before the Communist boss takes his turn at bat.

The leadoff oration is customarily delivered by the spokesman for Brazil, and the

United States is also heard on the first day. Either a Brazilian friend or the American speaker might rehearse the stated purposes of U.N. Among these are to save the world from the scourge of war, to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights and the rights of nations large and small, and to promote respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law.

Having laid this groundwork, a catechism should be prepared for submission to Khrushchev with the object of ascertaining how and in what manner his activities and the activities of the Soviet Union and international communism are contributing to any of them.

The question, referring to articles 33, 34, and 39 of the U.N. Charter, might seek to disclose whether a wide variety of Khrushchev's threats and demands may not, in fact, have endangered the maintenance of international peace and security, given rise to disputes, or led to international friction.

Specifically, there is the Khrushchev demand that the status of West Berlin be altered, that it be stripped of the protection of Western military forces, and that it then be left like a plum to be plucked by Russia's East German Communist satellite. Not only have these demands provoked international friction and given rise to a threat of peace, but they represent a unilateral Soviet repudiation of international undertakings carrying the force of a treaty, this being in violation of the U.N. Charter.

Some of Khrushchev's other statements should also be examined to determine whether they contribute to peaceful prospects or whether they threaten the maintenance of peace. Such remarks, for example, as these:

"We shall bury you."

"Your grandchildren will live under socialism."

Khrushchev has also talked very expansively about Soviet rocket power. He has dropped the hint that whereas the United States could loft an earth satellite the size of an orange, Russia could launch one weighing tons. He has at various times informed the Turks, the British, and the Germans that he could wipe them out as he chose.

Here is an opportunity for U.N. at last to get down to business, and seriously seek to discover whether Khrushchev and what he represents have any interest in peace or ever intend to make any contribution to it. But if U.N. merely allows the Soviet boss to appear in the masquerade of a peace lover preaching the customary line of coexistence, it will have signed its own admission of what almost everyone ought to know—that it is devoid of meaning, a mere collection of hollow men without even sawdust stuffing.

Rank-and-File Petition in Support of Landrum-Griffin Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include a petition which arrived this morning signed by 25 rank-and-file members of Office Workers Local No. 12, at the Twin Cities Arsenal in Minneapolis, Minn., urging passage of the Landrum-Griffin bill. Without the letters of encouragement that have come

to all of us from members of organized labor, the Landrum-Griffin bill might never have passed this House, and I call attention to the following petition as an illustration of the sound and fair attitude toward labor reform which has been taken by so many card-carrying union members. We can be justly proud of the rank-and-file union members in our society today.

The petition follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., August 12, 1959.

HON. ANCHER NELSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN NELSEN: Your support in the enactment and passage of the proposed Landrum-Griffin labor bill presently pending in Congress is urgently requested herewith.

It is our opinion that President Eisenhower outlined the labor union situation thoroughly in his recent broadcast and we agree that certain union officials, although in the minority, constitute a threat to the liberty and security of the American way of life, and must be regulated.

We vehemently protest the misuse of union funds for political purposes as well as the failure of most unions to publish their financial status.

We further protest and deplore the propaganda of union official lobbyists that the Shelley bill, H.R. 8490, has the support of all union members of these United States. It does not. This bill is sponsored by and will further support the union official hierarchy and is solely beneficial to their minority interests and we urge your vigorous dissent when this measure is brought up in Congress for consideration.

We, the undersigned, members of OLEU No. 12, local office workers, A.F. of L., and TCA employees, therefore, respectfully request your immediate action in this matter of curbing the excesses of high labor union officials and respectfully demand that you use the full authority of your office to pass adequate legislation to remedy this critical situation prior to the adjournment of this Congress.

We are watching your interest in this matter and await your action and reply.

Harold O. Holmberg, steward and board member at large; R. S. Freeman, J. N. Freeburg, Marion L. Strommen, Sylvia Zajac, Marjorie Luethi, J. A. Grady, Catherine C. Drake, T. A. Johnson, Mabel E. Erickson, Helen Vickmark, G. N. Wieland, Lorraine E. Sterans, A. M. Towle, Thelma B. Woodward, Alice Kelsen, John M. Gully, G. H. Neddersen, Adeline Heywood, June Peters, Caroline Hedeon, Dagmar Dingley, Ella Niemeyer, Helena Kennedy, Hazel Braun.

The Labor Bill

SPEECH
OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8342) to provide for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, recently a friend of mine who is an admirer of the late Senator Taft told me that he believed that Senator Taft would have opposed certain sections of the Landrum-Griffin bill. After an extended visit on this matter I asked him to put this in writing so that I could put his thoughts in the RECORD. The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman, it is indeed a sad day in the history of Republican statesmanship when we can witness a Republican administration using abuse as an excuse for placing new and totally unwarranted restrictions on peaceful and lawful union activities in aid of labor disputes. This type of punitive action, contained in section 705 of the Griffin-Landrum substitute, is far removed from the distinguished statesmanship of that noble leader of republicanism, the late Senator Robert A. Taft. As we all know, Mr. Chairman, Senator Taft was the father of the very provisions on boycotts and picketing which the Griffin-Landrum substitute would so drastically and severely amend today.

Ten years ago, in 1949, after 2 years of study on the effects of the Taft-Hartley Act, Senator Taft had this to say when he presented a host of amendments to the act which actually passed the other body that year. He stated as follows, and I quote:

"We have always contemplated amendments to the act. We had set up a special joint committee to deal on their merits with criticisms of the act. We analyzed the criticisms of the act and I think we were the only Senators who ever undertook to deal with these criticisms in detail and on their merits. We attempted by amendments to meet every legitimate criticism."

"In general we went back to the bill as passed by Senate (in 1947) as distinguished from the bill finally agreed to in conference and we eliminated a number of the provisions agreed to in conference. . . . We retain in our substitute the essential principles of the Taft-Hartley Act, which we feel necessary in order to maintain equality in labor management relations."

In other words, instead of making the law more harsh and more disruptive of trade union activities, Senator Taft, with that tremendous objectivity of his, recognized the faults and weaknesses of his first attempts at lawmaking in the labor relations field. He was willing to admit his mistakes and try again to provide a more balanced, a more just and fair piece of legislation.

At that time Senator Taft offered amendments covering some 26 separate subjects. Chief among these subjects were new protections for peaceful picketing and new protections for union activities which were unfairly restricted by the secondary boycott provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

When it came to picketing Senator Taft was quick to protest the right of all peaceful picketing. His only object was to prevent mass picketing and violence on the picket line and other forms of real coercion. Senator Taft made this abundantly clear in floor debate. Among many other things, he stated, when the antipicketing provisions of the Taft Act were being considered on the Senate floor:

It will not be directed against the use of propaganda or the use of persuasion or against the use of any of the other peaceful methods of organizing employees.

And again he stated on this same subject:

It would not prevent anyone conducting peaceful picketing or employing persuasion. All it would do would be to outlaw such restraint and coercion as would prevent people from going to work.

And in 1949, Senator Taft recognized that the word "restraint" might be too broad. Accordingly one of his most important amendments was to eliminate this word "restrain" from the antipicketing provisions of section 8(b)(1)(A) of the act.

Now comes the Griffin-Landrum substitute and what does it do? Under section 705 it would eliminate all peaceful picketing and all peaceful persuasion and all propaganda or informational picketing unless a substantial number of employees, have been already organized—that is, enough to petition for an NLRB election and then only if, afterwards an election is petitioned for and won by the union. Otherwise all picketing at all other times is prohibited.

To make the Griffin-Landrum proposal more punishing, the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board must go at once to court to get an injunction against any peaceful but unlawful picketing.

In other words, here we are heading in exactly the opposite direction from the labor relations statesmanship of Senator Taft.

Then let us look at the subject of secondary boycotts. Senator Taft said again and again he was only seeking to ban the true secondary boycott that harms truly neutral employers with whom there is no labor dispute whatever. In 1949 he repeated this position. And he even offered an amendment to eliminate any restrictions on boycotting the substitute manufacturer of struck goods farmed out during a strike. But most important of all, he recognized the rank injustice of the mandatory court injunction against all secondary boycotts in every case, even before the National Labor Relations Board has determined whether the boycott provisions have been violated. He asked for and persuaded the Senate to repeal this mandatory injunction provision.

Then later when amendments to the Taft Act were being discussed in 1953, shortly before his death, he favored exempting all job site construction activities from the secondary boycott provisions of the Taft Act because these were not secondary boycotts in the true sense.

But the Griffin-Landrum bill, far from following this objective leader of our party, contains amendments to the boycott provisions which go in exactly the opposite direction from Senator Taft. In the name of correcting corruption these new provisions would reach out in every direction even to the picket line at the lawful strike scene to make sure that every outsider will go through this picket line and to outlaw it whenever it may persuade any outsider to respect the strike.

Mr. Chairman, this is indeed the opposite of correcting labor corruption. This is the opposite of statesmanship. This is the use of law to protect special interest and to repress lawful trade union

interests. For this reason I cannot in good conscience follow my leadership. I cannot support and I must oppose the Griffin-Landrum substitute.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a copy of my newsletter released today:

KEENOTES BY REPRESENTATIVE ELIZABETH KEE

The present session of Congress is rapidly drawing to a close. The goal for adjournment fixed by the leadership is September 5, but it is likely that we will have to remain here until the middle of September to dispose of a large list of remaining bills.

One thing which is aiding the push for adjournment is the forthcoming visit of Premier Khrushchev, of Russia. If Congress is in session when he arrives, it will be difficult not to invite him to address a joint session. Yet many Members feel that an appearance before Congress might be a big mistake and, therefore, they hope we can adjourn before he arrives.

This has been a busy session and Congress has acted on many important issues, some of them highly controversial. But I am afraid that we will leave Washington without acting on several bills which should have immediate attention.

Legislation to aid distressed areas has passed the Senate but is languishing before the House Rules Committee. If the bill ever comes to the floor, I am confident it will be passed. But the present outlook is not too favorable. Failure to pass the bill will mean that we will have to delay another year a cooperative program to rehabilitate areas with persistent and heavy unemployment.

Congress must not adjourn without passing legislation to continue the interstate highway building program. At present, there is much disagreement on proposals for raising new money to finance the program this year but I am sure that with the roadbuilding programs of all the States adversely affected, some satisfactory solution will be reached.

Also, it is imperative that Congress pass new housing legislation. In a surprise move the Senate this week decided to try to override the President's veto of a bill passed earlier this year. The move failed, as everyone expected it would. Now the question is whether Congress and the President can agree on a housing bill in the short time remaining in this session.

Congress also has a duty to do something this session about the farm problem. It is obvious at this point that a general farm bill which would make a start on reducing the tremendous surpluses now on hand will not be passed. I regret to see Congress evade this serious issue. It is costing more than \$1 million a day just to store commodities now on hand and big crops this year will add quite a bit to this cost.

At least Congress should pass legislation to strengthen the research program of the Department of Agriculture so that new uses can be found for our farm commodities. I am firmly convinced that this is the only long-range answer to the farm problem. I am sure our scientists can develop new in-

dustrial uses that will require large amounts of wheat, corn, cotton, and other commodities. I have a bill now pending which would provide a good start toward this goal. There is still time to act if Congress will face up to this difficult task.

Although time may be running out, there are many important legislative matters yet to be disposed of. This means that the remaining days will be extremely busy ones for Members of Congress.

Hazleton, Pa., Newspapers Awarded National Citation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following news story from the Hazleton Plain Speaker of Wednesday, August 12, 1959, which reports that the Hazleton newspapers—the Plain Speaker and the Standard-Sentinel—have been awarded a national citation from the Associated Press Managing Editors Association for "outstanding news and photo coverage in 1959" for their performances following the tragic fire at the Hotel Gary in Hazleton in early March of this year. I extend my congratulations to the staffs of both newspapers for this award.

The above-mentioned article follows:

ASSOCIATED PRESS NATIONAL CITATION AWARDED HAZLETON NEWSPAPERS FOR COVERAGE OF HOTEL GARY FIRE—CITATION ONE OF FIVE PRESENTED TO PENNSYLVANIA NEWSPAPERS IN AP SALUTE

The Plain Speaker-Standard Sentinel, hours ahead of competition in keeping Associated Press newspapers throughout the world abreast of developments in the Hotel Gary fire March 5, have been awarded a national citation from the AP Managing Editors Association for outstanding news and photo coverage in 1959, it was announced today.

The citation, presented at the APME convention at Seattle, Wash., is one of five presented to Pennsylvania newspapers.

The award to Hazleton's two daily newspapers is in recognition of a news beat scored by the staffs of both morning and evening papers as they covered the fire which claimed seven lives.

SPECIAL STANDARD EDITION

The morning Standard-Sentinel, summoning all off-duty reporters and photographers, hit the streets with a special edition shortly after the fire began raging in the downtown hotel.

Plain Speaker editors and newsmen were roused from bed to assist in coverage of the tragedy which brought inquiries to the local newsroom from all parts of the United States and Canada.

Before dawn, graphic photographs taken by Standard-Sentinel photographers were transmitted to AP member newspapers over the Plain Speaker-Standard Sentinel wirephoto transmitter, and eyewitness accounts were telephoned to metropolitan newspapers throughout the country. A dramatic Standard-Sentinel photo of a woman leaping from a burning ledge received worldwide play.

The fast, complete photo-news coverage continued through the day as local staffers

donned raincoats and boots and accompanied firemen through the gutted hotel.

Plain Speaker-Standard Sentinel reporters maintained a constant vigil at the city's two hospitals, getting firsthand reports on the tragedy from survivors.

PROVIDED FOLLOWUP

Full coverage didn't end the day of the fire. Followup stories were continued for weeks as Plain Speaker-Standard Sentinel reporters queried State and local sources for stories pertinent to the tragedy.

The national AP wirephoto network continued carrying pictures taken by Plain Speaker-Standard Sentinel photographers, including one combination that showed a Plain Speaker staffer taking a picture of the gutted hotel from the scoop of a shovel high above the street.

The citation presented to the local newspaper reads:

"The Associated Press Managing Editors Association awards this citation for outstanding participation in the Associated Press news and newsphoto reports to the Hazleton Plain Speaker and Standard-Sentinel for extraordinary, fast and complete news and picture coverage of the fire which destroyed the Gary Hotel in downtown Hazleton on March 5, with a loss of seven lives. The staffs of the Standard-Sentinel and the Plain Speaker provided news and pictures running hours ahead of any competition. Wirephotos were sent direct from the Hazleton transmitter."

The citation is signed by Michael J. Ogden, of the Providence Journal-Bulletin who is APME president, and John D. Paulson, chairman of the citations committee of the APME who is affiliated with the Fargo Forum.

Accompanying the citation was a letter from Alan J. Gould, executive editor of the AP in New York City, to Copublisher Frank Walser, in which Gould added his personal commendation to the AP award.

"Membership cooperation such as yours contributes to a superior service by the Associated Press, AP staffers everywhere salute you and your staff," Gould wrote.

The four other Pennsylvania newspapers which received similar citations: Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Pottsville Republican, Scranton Times and the Allentown Sunday Call-Chronicle.

The Exile of Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, the United States, foremost trading nation in the world, finds itself today in the unfortunate, and certainly unusual, position of a debtor in international accounts. Our exports in 1959 are not expected to exceed \$16 billion, while imports may reach \$15 billion, an all-time record high. Meanwhile, Government aid programs and investment of U.S. private capital abroad have run up a hefty deficit in our international balance of payments.

Our Nation's gold holdings reflect our current disadvantage in world commerce. Our gold reserves, backbone of the American monetary system, which in turn supports currencies in many parts of the world, have slipped below \$20 billion for the first time in 20 years. So far

in 1959 the United States has lost more than \$950 million in gold, and when this is added to the nearly \$2.3 billion lost in 1958, it represents the greatest exodus of gold that any country has ever experienced in a comparable period.

Many Americans are expressing alarm at this state of affairs. Many of my colleagues have urged a prompt reappraisal of our Nation's problems and responsibilities in international commerce. A large number of American industries, including some of our largest industries, have warned that due to a combination of factors, notably inflation, our own low tariffs and new trade obstacles abroad, their ability to compete effectively in world markets is deteriorating.

The press, too, has turned increasing attention to this problem. One of the leading business columnists, E. F. Tompkins, of the New York Journal-American, well known for his perceptive analysis of the American business scene over a period of many years, recently examined the serious nature of what he calls "the migration of industries." I commend Mr. Tompkins' article to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the New York Journal-American, Aug. 11, 1959]

BAD ECONOMIES: THE EXILE OF INDUSTRIES
(By E. F. Tompkins)

A new interstate problem is arising—the migration of industries.

Of course, every State wants new industries, for new industry pays large taxes and provides stable employment. But should one State raid another State?

On one side, industries operating in one State are given inducements to locate in some other State. In this respect, Tennessee has a special advantage. As headquarters of the TVA, a subsidized Federal project, Tennessee offers as bait low-cost hydroelectric power which other States cannot supply. By advertising its unshared asset, Tennessee has captured some migrant plants, drawing protests from West Virginia and elsewhere.

On the other side, some States pursue policies that drive industry away. Ruthless taxation is such a policy, exemplified by New York, both city and State, labor government—government subservient to labor bossism—is another; as an instance, Michigan will do.

Not yet widely recognized is the further fact that an expatriation of industry, and hence of employment, is becoming a serious national problem.

There is a growing tendency for American industries to establish branch factories abroad so as to take advantage of foreign low wages. Their purpose is to retain or acquire foreign business by making American-type goods which can compete in world markets.

The joker is that the same goods may be sold in the American market at lower prices than the same kind of goods manufactured here. Thus the establishment of American branches in foreign countries amounts to an exportation of both American capital and American employment.

Two factors lie behind the exportation of industry.

One factor obviously is the high American wage level, which sustains our standards of living. These standards are desirable in our domestic life. Nonetheless, American prices based upon American wages are noncompetitive in the world market, and are becoming so in the home market—due to the second factor.

The second factor is the progressive demotion of our protective tariffs under the free-trade program instituted by the New Deal in 1934.

Our industrial system, our wage scales, and our standards of living grew up under protective—but not prohibitive—tariffs during a period of 146 years. Since 1934, through reciprocal trade agreements—which have been hardly reciprocal at all—the tariff system has been virtually wrecked; and the process continues.

Today we have, for almost the first time, an unfavorable mercantile balance—imports exceeding exports, and a loss of gold. We also have groups of industries demanding redress, including such vital industries as textiles, steel, electrical goods, and base metals.

For both local and national reasons, it appears that industry and labor, as well as Federal and State government, had better get together on the problems of migrant industry.

Impact of Import Competition on the Nation's Economy

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the magazine Mill and Factory has conducted a survey among nearly 150 American industrial companies, large and small, to determine the impact of import competition on the Nation's economy.

Results of the survey come as a distinct setback to those who share the notion that unlimited foreign commerce advances our economic well-being.

For example, three quarters of the companies polled expect to lose greater share of the domestic market to foreign products, and nearly two-thirds of these companies anticipate rising unemployment as a direct consequence of this market invasion.

Nearly a third of the respondents said they purchase foreign-made goods and materials for their own use. When asked why, only 15 percent said such products and materials were not available at home; but almost two-thirds noted that foreign prices are lower.

The survey asked if present U.S. tariff laws should be modified. Nearly 75 percent of the companies said tariffs should be increased; another 35 percent said our tariff schedule should be extended to cover more products. A scant 12 percent thought tariffs should be reduced, and 7 percent indicated tariffs should be eliminated completely.

The survey sought to pin down the current major trends in foreign competition. In this connection, 72 percent of the respondents said import competition is increasing. More significant, over half of the companies expressed belief that expanded import competition will lead to the total destruction of certain vulnerable U.S. industries.

The magazine also presented a report by its Washington editor, Mr. A. N.

Weckler, who toured Western Europe's industrial centers. I believe my colleagues would be interested in highlights of Mr. Weckler's dispatch, as follows:

Goaded by the industrial progress in West Germany and Great Britain, where wages and prices have been held in check, the other countries of Western Europe are aiming at similar goals.

West German wage levels show little change over the last 18 months. The average gross hourly earnings are a shade higher, but manufacturers report that these increases were more than offset by increases in productivity.

Price levels in Germany have remained practically unchanged since the fourth quarter of 1958. The unwavering line in prices holds true for basic materials, capital equipment, construction, and consumer goods.

Italian industrial leaders report that wage levels in their country are likely to go up further this year. But here as in Germany and Britain, they anticipate productivity improvement. Prices in Italy have remained steady, and this picture is not expected to change.

European manufacturers view the years ahead as highly competitive, with their industry competing not only with the output of other European nations, but with the United States to an increasing degree. Now, there is a seller's market in much of Europe, especially in consumer goods. A middle class is developing and this creates a large demand for housing, autos, and durables of all kinds.

Common market in Europe, with Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg, gradually eliminating all tariffs will mean that the producers in each of these countries will have to be competitive in both wages and productivity.

U.S. producers will be at a sharp disadvantage in the European markets. The average hourly wage levels in the major industrial countries of Europe are between 20 and 25 percent of the rate for the same work in the United States. Fringe benefits in Europe are on about the same fractional order.

Our Progress in Puerto Rico

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in the July issue of the AFL-CIO American Federationist, there appeared an article entitled "Our Progress in Puerto Rico," by Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín. The article described the vast advances in the economical growth of the Commonwealth since 1940 and the correlative improvement in working conditions.

Puerto Rico has truly achieved an admirable rate of development. This has derived primarily from its own dynamic energies and the boundless determination of its people and their leaders. Puerto Ricans can justly be proud of their accomplishments.

It is with the intention of increasing understanding here on the mainland of the progress and spirit of our island Commonwealth, that I include the article by Governor Muñoz-Marín in the

Appendix so that it may be brought before this great forum of the American people through the RECORD of this Congress:

OUR PROGRESS IN PUERTO RICO

(By Luis Muñoz-Marín, Governor of Puerto Rico)

Just 3 years ago Puerto Rico celebrated a momentous occasion. For the first time in its history, industrial production surpassed agricultural production and we had arrived at a most important milestone on our long road to a better life for our people.

We have been passing other progress markers steadily in the past 3 years, and if the modest prosperity we are seeking is not exactly just around the corner, it is at least on the horizon. We hope and expect that by 1975 the standard of living will be as high in Puerto Rico as it was in the United States in 1950.

Puerto Rico today is vastly different from the Puerto Rico of 1940 because the people of Puerto Rico realized that they had to solve their own problems and because they had those qualities necessary to solve them.

To be able to appreciate the changes today, it is necessary to know something of conditions as recently as 1940. Puerto Rico was then a stricken land or, as a U.S. Senate commission concluded after a factfinding visit, "a hopeless case."

Beset with overpopulation, bereft of natural resources, besieged by hunger, illnesses of the body and a grave malady of the spirit, we seemed destined to a poverty-stricken existence derived out of one important crop—sugar. The cane season supplied 6 months of employment a year for the bulk of our workers but left them and their families idle and hungry the other 6 months. The annual per capita income was only \$121, among the lowest in the world.

In the next few years, using the one natural resource we had plenty of—the hope and resourcefulness of our people—we began to climb out of that mire of hopelessness and poverty. Operation Bootstrap was born, a product of the mating of imagination with will.

Bootstrap had, and still has, one basic doctrine. That is, to be nondiscriminatory, to be hospitable to all ideas and to have a heart. We are not capitalistic nor are we socialistic—we are merely realistic, willing to try anything so long as it does not compromise our freedom and dignity.

One of our most important decisions, arrived at through trial and error, was to use Government funds as a catalyst to stimulate private investment in Puerto Rico.

We built factories to prove that they could be run at a profit and then sold them to private enterprise. We erected plants and invited companies to lease, rent or buy them. We put up hotels and engaged private operators to run them.

And, finally, we developed a tax program which exempts qualifying companies from commonwealth taxes for a period of 10 years.

Incidentally, qualifying for our tax program is not an easy matter. We have set up stringent requirements, prime among them being that we shall never accept a "runaway" plant.

We grant no inducement to any firm that is to close a factory anywhere in the States in order to open it in Puerto Rico. We are not luring runaway capital. We only want, and need, our proportionate share—and it is relatively infinitesimal—of the new capital that is generated each year in the United States so that we can provide the jobs, the decently paid jobs, our people need.

We contribute appreciably for our size to the economy of the United States. Our purchases from the United States have increased over fourfold in the past 15 years. We are now buying more the \$600 million worth of U.S. goods every year.

Today we have 565 Operation Bootstrap

plants in operation. Our per capita income has risen to \$470, less than one-half that of Mississippi, the lowest of the States, but a great improvement nevertheless. Perhaps the greatest single proof of Puerto Rico's progress is that the average span of life has increased from 46 years in 1940 to 68 years today. We also have one of the highest literacy rates in the world.

Politically, Puerto Rico is a commonwealth, freely associated with the United States. This is a result of a compact between the people of Puerto Rico and the Congress of the United States approved in 1952.

Under this compact the people of Puerto Rico wrote their own constitution. It contains a bill of rights which not only incorporates the traditional American guarantees to the individual but also reflects recent advances with respect to social and economic matters, carefully adapted to the social and economic realities of Puerto Rico.

Prominent in our constitution are the rights of workers "to organize and to bargain collectively with their employers through representatives of their own free choosing" and "to strike, to picket, and to engage in other legal concerted activities."

The constitution of Puerto Rico also guarantees the right to choose one's occupation freely, to receive equal pay for equal work, to reasonable minimum wages, to protection against industrial risks to health and safety, and to an 8-hour workday with at least time and a half compensation for overtime.

Beyond these basic guarantees, we have developed a program of labor legislation that contributes more expansively to the climate of healthy labor union practices.

These constitutional provisions are supported by legislation on minimum wages, employment security, workmen's compensation with full coverage including agricultural workers, industrial safety, group insurance for small farmers and vocational rehabilitation of injured workers.

In January, after 2 years of collection to build the fund, we began our first unemployment insurance payments. We now also have a bureau of unemployment insurance for sugar workers, which provides compensation during the off-season.

Workers' education in Puerto Rico is provided freely through seminars and conferences organized by the department of labor and the Labor Relations Institute of the University of Puerto Rico. We teach the principles of democratic unionism, labor-management relations and every phase of labor legislation.

Our department of labor is giving full and honest accounting service and advice to any union that requests such service by a majority vote. Most of the unions affiliated with the AFL-CIO are requesting such services.

Our labor legislation, to a great extent, parallels our legislation granting 10-year tax exemption to new industries. To understand this parallel, it must be realized that the company with an operating loss is exempt from income taxes anyway. Therefore tax exemption does not mean anything if there are no profits. By the same token, our labor legislation will be meaningless if there are no jobs to protect, improve, and multiply.

With its right to strike fully protected, labor has the power to nullify the meaning of tax exemption for any employer. Similarly, with the freedom to cease operations and leave, management can drain good labor laws of all significance to the workers.

During our arduous struggle to lift our people out of poverty, both of these self-defeating extremes have, save for a few exceptions, been avoided.

We have continued to create jobs. Our economic development program has changed Puerto Rico from a one-crop economy to a predominantly industrial economy. Industrialization has brought 41,000 new jobs, and real wages in manufacturing rose by 57 percent between 1953 and 1958. About the same

number of jobs has been created indirectly through the operation of the economic development program.

Average hourly wages in Puerto Rico are not only higher than in other countries in Latin America and all of the Near and Far East, but they are also higher than in most of Europe. In the 30 months following January 1956, hourly earnings in manufacturing rose over 40 percent in Puerto Rico while in the United States they rose only 7 percent.

With these gratifying accomplishments under our belts, we realize that we have made a good beginning. But that is all we have made. There is yet very much to be done.

Many of our people still live in substandard housing. There is still much unemployment. We still have an average of 80,000 totally unemployed people—13 percent of our entire work force.

Despite our progress we have only started to make inroads against unemployment. In the transitional period industrialization makes better jobs, better income, and a better standard of living before it provides full employment.

By 1975 we expect there will be enough jobs and sufficient pay to keep our people at home. Until that time, as U.S. citizens and with traditional American get-up-and-go, some of them will continue to move to places that offer a better chance of making a living for their families.

Some of them, I am afraid, will suffer from the prejudices, rackets, and exploitations that have afflicted every wave of migration to the United States. Because of their democratic background and inherent sense of liberalism, they will look to unions to safeguard their rights, and as long as unions do not let them down, they will make loyal and dependable members and, eventually, valuable leaders of the labor movement.

Puerto Rican workers today depend too much on the Commonwealth and Federal minimum wage laws. The ideal minimum for employees and management alike, to my way of thinking, is a minimum of government participation in the fixing of wages; but this is possible only where the workers are properly represented and able to negotiate for themselves.

That is the potential for unionism in Puerto Rico, and our laws and our disposition leave the door open for it to pursue its opportunity.

As I told the recent meeting of the AFL-CIO executive council in San Juan, there is a kind of union, undeserving of the name, that the people of Puerto Rico will not welcome. For the dealer in fraudulent contracts, the gangster, and the racketeer growing rich on labor's funds, there is no room in this Commonwealth. Our people do not tolerate dishonesty in government and they will not tolerate crooks in the guise of labor leaders.

The proud record of the AFL-CIO proves without doubt that the true spokesmen of American labor equally abominate these people and their practices and are willing to fight and sacrifice to wipe them out, as they must. Our government stands ready to give honest unionism our full support in that struggle.

Steel Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, for many years it has been fashionable to label

those who attack the Federal Government's tariff giveaway policies as spokesmen for marginal, inefficient industries or for selfish industries whose workers were poorly paid or for stagnant industries which resisted the trend to diversification.

Recent developments, however, have proven beyond question that those who fought against free-trade philosophy were far closer to the facts of economic life than their opponents. For in spite of systematic tariff whittling, in spite of our dogged devotion to multilateral trade councils, this Nation's trade posture has slumped to a point where the current outlook is for a \$5 billion balance-of-payments deficit in 1959.

Equally significant is the fact that injury traced to abnormal foreign competition is no longer confined to our smaller industries. Would anyone call our automobile industry small? Is the steel industry small? Or the lumber and wood products industry? Is the textile industry small?

The steel industry provides one of the most dramatic instance of market penetration by imports. The United States, world's greatest steel producer, now buys more steel abroad than it sells, although the industry's capacity would have far exceeded production even without a strike this year.

These and other aspects of the steel import problem were explored by the magazine *Business Week* in its edition of August 1, 1959. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this timely article as recommended reading for my colleagues:

STRIKE GIVES FOREIGN STEELMAKERS A WEDGE TO WIDEN U.S. MARKETS—STEEL IMPORTS HAVE BEEN SEARCHING, ESPECIALLY INTO HOUSTON, BUT SELLERS MAY NOT BE ABLE TO HOLD ALL GAINS

While the steel industry sweats out its nationwide strike, both the companies and the steelworkers are casting many an anxious glance over their shoulders. They are watching to see if foreign steel suppliers will seize the opportunity to nail down a piece of the huge U.S. market for themselves. In the past couple of years, the industry has learned that overseas competition is not given to missing any bets.

SPARE CAPACITY

The U.S. steel mills—all but a handful of them now shut down—have plant capable of turning out 147.6-million ingot tons of steel a year. Even if the United Steelworkers had not gone on strike, no one in the steel industry expected all that capacity would be used this year; they figured there would be 30 million tons to spare.

Yet, in the first 5 months of this year, steel from foreign mills came into the United States at an average rate of 300,000 tons a month—or 3.6 million tons a year. (You can figure that 300,000 tons of steel products equal 400,000 ingot tons of mill production.) The imports themselves are only a small percentage of the steel used in the United States. But, say men in the industry, what justifies their worrying about steel imports is that foreign steel is coming into the country at all—despite the substantial gap between U.S. production and capacity.

RECENT SURGE

Imports have leapt lately: from 118,000 tons in May last year to 384,700 tons in May this year. Meantime, the United States has lost its longheld position as a net exporter of steel: in May it imported twice as much

as it shipped abroad. This, the steelmen say, makes apprehension even more justified.

There's no disputing the fact that steel imports are up sharply; their rise came right along with U.S. industry's scramble to build up steel inventories as a hedge against the strike. But outsiders who know the steel industry say it's still too early to tell the true impact of foreign steel on the U.S. market. The spring of 1960, when industry should be well along on rebuilding depleted steel inventories, will be the earliest time for a clear reading on how much of their inroads foreign steelmakers will be able to retain. It will have to sell then in a well-supplied market.

BUSIER PORTS

Steel imports have been climbing fast. It's not possible to tell how much more is entering the country now than in May (the last month for which there are official figures). But it's plain from a survey made this week by *Business Week* reporters in the Nation's ports and industrial centers that imports in June and July surpassed those in May.

On the west coast, the amount of foreign steel unloaded at the ports of Los Angeles, Long Beach, and San Diego doubled in the 6 weeks from June 1 to the start of the steel strike; the week before last the three ports combined were handling foreign steel at a monthly rate of 35,000 tons. West German producers shipped most of the west coast's foreign steel until a few months ago. Now more and more is coming from Japanese mills. In Boston it's estimated steel imports so far this year are double those of last year. Toledo, which handled virtually no foreign steel until the Seaway opened, has unloaded 7,000 tons so far this year. Traffic up the Mississippi is growing heavier: In the first half of 1958, some 4,000 tons left New Orleans for upriver cities, so far this year 15,000 tons of foreign steel have been shipped upriver.

BEST CUSTOMERS

Probably the hottest place in the country for foreign steel sales is Houston. There, at least four agents of foreign steel companies have set up offices, and at least another dozen brokers are handling sales of other foreign mills. In the first 5 months of this year 300,000 tons of foreign steel (mostly reinforcement bars and oil country goods) came into the port of Houston compared with U.S. produced tonnage of 461,000 tons. In the same time last year, foreign steel ran to 83,800 tons and domestic to 359,000 tons. It's estimated that steel users in the Houston area buy 20 percent of all steel imported into the U.S.

The biggest man in this business in Houston is Andre Crispin, a 35-year-old Belgian, who holds the post of Belgian consul in Houston as well as running his import business. Some Southwest steel producers say that no matter what prices they charged, Crispin and the mills he represents would undercut them. Crispin, though, insists he's not trying to run anybody out of business. "There's simply not enough European steel available for export for it to become a primary source of supply in this or any other area of the country," he says. Nevertheless, he estimates that even after paying duties he is undercutting domestic prices by 2 percent to 5 percent.

WHO SELLS WHAT?

The American Iron & Steel Institute's import records show that the bulk of steel imports (79 percent in May) comes from Europe and that more than a third of European steel shipped to the United States comes from the mills of Belgium and Luxembourg. Steel producers in those two countries live almost wholly from exports. Their U.S. salesmen and agents are probably the most aggressive in the business. But in the competition to get a share in the U.S. market for imported steel, the West Germans and

the French are selling harder; from April to May this year the West Germans boosted their steel exports to the United States from 57,800 to 84,000 tons, and the French from 59,000 to 74,500 tons.

Until this year, the bulk of the business done by foreign steel producers in the United States was in concrete reinforcement bars, pipe and tubing, rods, and wire nails. Some 52 percent of the barbed wire used in the United States last year came from foreign mills. The foreign mills' business in the United States is still heavily in those lines. But in the last few months they've boosted sharply their business in the generally more lucrative lines of plates, sheets, and strip steel.

UPWARD PRICES

Despite the hard selling that's going on, prices quoted for foreign steel have been bounding upward since the strike began. In almost every industrial center, *Business Week's* reporters found that foreign steel brokers and agents are offering prices now that are little different from those normally charged by domestic producers. Before the strike, the difference between U.S. and foreign mill products was, on the average, \$40 to \$50 a ton. Now it seems to be \$10 a ton at best.

While prices have climbed, orders have gone down. There may be no firm connection between the two, though. It's much more likely that orders have slipped from their peaks in May and June because of the time lag between order and delivery of a shipment of foreign steel. This lag is rarely less than 6 to 8 weeks and for some products runs 3 months.

This dip in orders—several steel import agents say their bookings are 20 percent less this month than last—might give heart to some of the domestic producers who are apprehensive about foreign steel's inroads. But the domestic producers point out that in the last 6 months foreign steel mills have learned a lot about doing business in the United States and that their next step probably will be to set up stocks in warehouses here. (Apart from foreign specialty steelmakers, few do this at present.) So far, there's little indication from *Business Week's* survey that this is happening.

It's a Great Day for P. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we have been so busy here in Congress, pondering the great problems which confront our own Nation and the world in general, that too often we overlook some of the truly great events which occur in our own backyard.

I should like to take the opportunity today to call my colleagues' attention to an editorial which appeared in the *Chicago Sun-Times* on August 14. It is significant to me that this great *Chicago* newspaper would also pause in its reflections on world events to pay tribute to one of the most beloved citizens of *Chicago*, P. J. Cullerton.

Mr. Cullerton has just been honored by the Irish Fellowship Club, of *Chicago* when he was elected this organization's president last Wednesday. I wish to

commend the Irish Fellowship Club for its excellent selection. This honor bestowed upon Mr. Cullerton is particularly significant to those of us in public service because it proves that the citizens of this country know how to reward dedicated service to a community.

Mr. Cullerton indeed exemplifies the very essence of public service. Through all the years that he has held public office, he has served as a shining example of all that reflects the highest of standards in serving the people.

Since we Irish of all nationalities must stick together, I am indeed proud to be able to include the Chicago Sun-Times' editorial in today's *Record*.

The editorial follows:

IT'S A GREAT DAY FOR P. J.

Breathes there a Chicago Irishman with soul so dead, who never to himself has said, in this, my own, my native land I want to be No. 1 Irishman in the No. 1 Irish city in all the world—the city that put St. Patrick's Day on the calendar—Chicago?

And so Parky Cullerton has made it. Glory be, the Cullertons and the O'Donnells of Tipperary can now be singing that it's not a long way to Chicago when Bridget O'Donnell's grandson is the king of the Irish in that wonderful place where a Daley is mayor and a Ryan runs the county.

A county assessor is important, but anyone who knows anything about Chicago knows Assessor P. J. Cullerton didn't "arrive" as a VIP until Wednesday when he was elected president of the Irish Fellowship Club of Chicago.

The club has summoned many important men to bang its March 17 gavel and to introduce important men as speakers—and not all of the chairmen and not all of the speakers have been Democrats, as Parky is.

Parky has two important tasks to tackle. First, he should get the club listed in the phone book. Next he must get agreement on a speaker for next St. Patrick's Day. Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, and Vice President NIXON have spoken in the past and the Chicago Norske Club should have first call on Governor Rockefeller.

The problems of the leader of Chicago's Irish are not trivial, believe us, and Parky has our sympathy as well as best wishes.

Panamanian Politicians Exploit Anti-U.S. Surge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, for some months there have been almost daily news dispatches of ominous character from Panama or other parts of the Caribbean littoral and islands.

The latest news story from Panama by Mr. Ralph K. Skinner, well-informed special correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, in the July 30, 1959, issue of that paper, describes the current status in the deteriorating situation on the Isthmus.

As such, it merits reading by every Member of the Congress, especially those

on committees dealing with Panama Canal questions.

The indicated new story follows:

PANAMA POLITICIANS EXPLOIT ANTI-U.S. SURGE
(By Ralph K. Skinner)

PANAMA, PANAMA.—Anti-Americanism is burgeoning here. It comes out in such indirect, as well as direct ways.

In a recent broadcast, former Foreign Minister Aquilino Boyd called on the Panamanian public to "invade" the Canal Zone on November 3, Panama's Independence Day.

His colleague, former Deputy Foreign Minister Ernesto Castillero furnished newsmen with more details of the plan. It was that Panamanians should "enter the Panamanian territory known as the Canal Zone" and occupy it symbolically and effectively. While Dr. Castillero said this should be done without violence, he offered no guarantees.

With such proposals coming from educated men, recently associated as top officials with the Panama Government, it is not difficult to understand the growing anti-American attitude of the underprivileged, unemployed, badly oriented masses of Panama's people.

Feeling keenly their economic inferiority, the people of Panama see the Canal Zone as an island of prosperity in an ocean of distress. Under such circumstances, envy is not remarkable. The economic tragedy of Panama is attributed to the United States.

INCIDENT HINTED

Their emotions aroused, and feeling sorry for themselves, the people of Panama are ready to believe virtually anything their press and radio tell them. Almost without exception, they are fed a diet of anti-American propaganda.

There is strong evidence here that ultra-nationalist forces in Panama believe the next move is to provoke an international incident with the United States in the Canal Zone. It is their stated intent to bring Panama's case before an international group, even as the Suez Canal crisis eventually was brought before the United Nations. Such an incident may come even sooner than the threatened November 3 invasion of the Canal Zone.

President de la Guardia, Jr., says Panama-U.S. relations are deteriorating and that he regrets it sincerely. But he attributes the deterioration solely to the United States.

The President says the two principal causes of friction are inequality of wages in the Canal Zone and failure of the United States to purchase more in Panama.

Panama alleges that Panamanian citizens employed in the Canal Zone by the U.S. Government do not receive the same wages as U.S. citizens. This is termed discrimination and violation of the 1955 Treaty.

EXPLOITATION CHARGED

Washington replies that the treaty is being complied with to the letter. It is stated that negotiators of the treaty, both Panamanian and American, knew that wages for employees in categories plentifully available locally would be based on prevailing wages in Panama. Actually Canal Zone wages for such jobs average from 30 percent to 200 percent higher than in Panama. Panama asserts that its citizens should receive wages based on U.S. scales.

A leading Panama capitalist said the United States is taking advantage of the low wages in this capital city caused by 30,000 unemployed adults out of a total city population of 200,000. Traditionally wages are low in Panama because the family political oligarchy has refused to pass minimum-wage legislation, thus protection vested interests here.

The U.S. Government-owned stores in the Canal Zone usually purchase supplies from Panama and the United States. Purchases of some items are made from other countries.

Panama says this violates the treaty, that everything humanly possible of being obtained in Panama should be purchased here, regardless of price.

As an example, the best rice grown in Panama does not meet minimum U.S. standards in the Canal Zone. Therefore rice is purchased elsewhere. This has been going on for several years, but Panamanian producers have not improved the quality of their rice.

The situation in beef is similar; choice quality is not available at any price in Panama. Rather than meet competition, Panamanian monopolists clamor for the Canal Zone to be made a captive market for inferior products, informed sources say.

When Panama's demands were not met by local U.S. officials, President de la Guardia wrote a personal letter on this matter to President Eisenhower and had it delivered to him in Washington.

It was several weeks before Mr. Eisenhower answered. This disturbed Panamanians who expected an immediate reply. The reply stated that the matter would be investigated and a report furnished.

Later, the acting American chargé d'affaires delivered to the Foreign Minister of Panama an aide memoire (an unsigned statement used in diplomatic circles) on the matter.

After deliberation, the Foreign Minister refused to accept the aide memoire, alleging that another personal letter from President Eisenhower should be forthcoming as this was on a President-to-President basis.

The Panama press was encouraged to consider the delivery of the aide memoire as a slap at Panama's dignity. One of the most influential men in this capital, who controls many avenues of propaganda, said the slight to the President was an insult to every citizen of Panama.

Newspapers blazed with the alleged affront, which offended the dignity of Panama. Wire services reported the Panamanian reaction widely.

Washington reconsidered and, belatedly, there came a personal note from Mr. Eisenhower to President de la Guardia. Panama claimed a moral victory; Washington had been shown it could not trifle with Panama, the newspapers crowed.

If the United States erred in not understanding Latin-American dignity, Panama may have erred in overplaying the incident, raising anti-American sentiment to a new high pitch.

Bernard Abrams, Elected National Commander, Jewish War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, my constituent, Mr. Bernard Abrams, of 60 Glenwood Avenue, Jersey City, N.J., has just been elected national commander of the Jewish War Veterans. I would like to call this fact to the attention of my colleagues and to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article about him which appeared in the Jersey Journal, of Jersey City, N.J. The article follows:

NEW JEWISH WAR VETERANS COMMANDER
MADE DECISION AT SEA
(By John Hoffman)

Bernard Abrams, of Jersey City, whose vigorous campaign led to his election as national commander of the Jewish War Vet-

erans is a man who doesn't believe in half measures.

Though a lawyer he was assigned as a medic in the Army in World War II and served 14 months in the European theater.

On the *Queen Elizabeth* returning from Europe in September 1945, he remembers, then that he decided to join the Jewish War Veterans.

"I thought I'd give it a try and if it turned out to be everything I hoped, I'll stay with it and give it my best," Abrams remembers himself thinking.

Abrams joined the newly formed Lieutenant Grover Post in Jersey City and found that the JWV was all that he expected it to be.

He rose from post, to county, State, and finally the national levels in the organization, giving his best all the while.

His associates describe him as a fighter. The symbol with which he carried the JWV convention was a tiger which Abrams says describes the ways he goes after things.

Though not bombastic, Abrams doesn't think too much modesty about oneself is the greatest of virtues, especially about what one thinks.

There's no doubt about what he believes in as the delegates to the JWV convention learned.

Abrams platformed a strong and unrelenting civil rights program, and a dissent to the policy of Saudi Arabia which keeps American Jewish servicemen from being stationed in that country.

In the coming visit of the top Soviet, Nikita Khrushchev, Abrams is characteristically adamant.

"We cannot trust them, we must never let our guard down."

Abrams, who has been a resident of Jersey City since he was 2, graduated from Lincoln High School and was one of the top men in his class at John Marshall Law School. His law office is on Jackson Avenue.

Abrams, 45, is married to the former Clara Wolfson, of Bayonne. They have a 15-month-old son, Alan.

It is the first time I have been able to return to a college campus since 1940. It has been a rewarding experience.

I have been interested in talking to nearly all National Science Foundation participants on the B.Y.U. campus this summer. Besides the physics institute previously mentioned, the college is also carrying on institutes in general science and radiation-biology.

All told, on this campus alone, there are in excess of 100 teachers in attendance. Over 90 percent of these teachers have indicated that they would not have been able to attend on their own. If the same situation holds true at the other 299 colleges holding institutes, you can imagine the ultimate effect of the program on science and mathematics teaching.

I also examined to some extent the manner in which these NSF institutes are being administered. I find conditions very healthy.

The National Science Foundation is presently assigning institutional responsibility to the Dean or head of the appropriate science or mathematics department, and the schools of education are used in a consultant basis only. This is most wise, as it insures teachers of true content courses. Comments would indicate that this feeling in our ranks is practically universal.

We received approval this spring of our application under Public Law 864 for \$4,400 of science equipment, and we are thankful for the opportunity to attend institutes such as the ones observed here at Brigham Young University, that we may be of more service.

We heartily approve of the educational program presently being carried on under the direction of the National Science Foundation.

Sincerely,

RICHARD B. KNOTTS,
Superintendent.

Red China and the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in extension of my remarks, I enclose my newsletter of May 27, 1959, which discusses the admission of Red China into the United Nations, as follows:

Should the United States recognize Red China and support her admission to the United Nations? Certainly not for the present, in my opinion. The question was discussed in a recent speech by Hon. Walter S. Robertson, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs. He described the situations as follows:

The Chinese Communists conquered the mainland of China in 1949, and the Government of the Republic of China withdrew to Taiwan (Formosa). The Chinese Communists were at first mistakenly thought by some to be merely agrarian reformers, but proved to be ardent Communists. "The Peiping (Communist) regime was imposed by force with the volition of only an infinitesimal fraction of the Chinese people. . . . It has kept itself in power by blood purges and the liquidation of some 18 million mainland Chinese in 9 years."

The Far East is a critical area in the global struggle between East and West. American policy there is to encourage the newly independent, lesser developed countries to make progress in the ways of freedom, without

falling within the orbit of the Communist bloc, and to build up our Far Eastern allies and friends. It opposes the further spread of Chinese Communist influence, and supports the non-Communist Government of Nationalist China.

Our recognition of Red China would on the contrary strengthen Red China by greatly enhancing her international prestige, and would weaken Nationalist China. "It would, as a practical matter, mean the liquidation of the Republic of China." From this would flow the following results:

(1) The strategic position of the free world would be weakened by the loss of Nationalist China's 600,000 troops in Taiwan, with resultant Communist military threat to Japan, the Philippines, and southeast Asia.

(2) Other Asian nations would feel that they could no longer rely on the protection of the United States against the Communist threat, and would have no alternative but to come to terms with the Red Chinese colossus. There would be a rapid expansion of communism throughout Asia, and America's moral position would suffer irreparable damage.

(3) It would blot out any rallying point in the world for non-Communist Chinese, and deliver Taiwan's 10 million people to the slavery of the mainland.

Of the 13 countries of the Far East, only 3 have recognized Red China. It has long been our policy in granting recognition to consider whether such action would be in the best interests of the United States, and whether the country seeking recognition had shown a willingness to live up to her international obligations.

Recognition of Red China would not be in the best interests of the United States for reasons given above, and Red China has not shown a willingness to live up to her international obligations.

When the Red Chinese gained control of the mainland of China in December 1949, they repudiated the international obligations of China, and confiscated, without compensation, properties of other nationals valued in the hundreds of millions of dollars. Communist China has flagrantly violated her armistice agreements both in Korea and Indochina, and her agreements for the release of American prisoners.

The admission of Red China to the United Nations is governed by the terms of its Charter. After due consideration, those terms were framed to provide not for universal membership, but for membership of "peace-loving nations willing to assume and live up to the obligations of the Charter."

The record shows that Communist China is not a peace-loving nation, but is an outlaw regime. It invaded Tibet. It took part in the aggression against South Korea. It is still threatening war in the Taiwan Strait.

Space Secrecy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, recently the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] addressed this House on the subject of executive branch secrecy in the field of space research and space programming. It was his conclusion that if this House cut the appropriations of the National Aeronautics

Letter: Educational Program of National Science Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include a very interesting letter from Mr. Richard B. Knott, superintendent of Consolidated School District No. 30 at Warrenton, Oreg., in which he expresses his reaction to an educational program of the National Science Foundation. I hope that all Members will take the time to read the letter as it is an excellent grassroots report on the work of the Foundation:

SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 30, CONSOLIDATED,
Warrenton, Oreg., July 30, 1959.
Hon. WALTER NORBLAD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WALT: It has been my privilege this summer to attend Brigham Young University on a National Science Foundation stipend. The physics institute that I attended was well conceived and well executed.

and Space Administration, the responsibility should lie with the executive branch because the House could not be expected to grant automatically requests for funds for agencies which were not keeping the appropriate committees of the Congress fully informed of their activities and plans. He used as proof of this hampering secrecy the recent report of the Senate Subcommittee on Government Organization for Space Activities, Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Let me say that the continuing battle which Congress fights to keep itself fully informed of what the executive branch is doing is an important one, and that the gentleman from California has made a great contribution by his efforts in this field. But at the same time, I wish to make clear that the House Committee on Science and Astronautics has insisted on being kept fully informed of the activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and that agency has been fully and frankly cooperative in its efforts to comply with the wishes of this committee.

The extensive records and material presented to this committee in the authorization hearings before this committee, and all other contacts we have had on virtually a daily basis with the NASA reflect credit on Dr. Glennan, the Administrator, Dr. Dryden, the Deputy Administrator, and Mr. Gleason, the Assistant Administrator for Congressional Relations, together with their staff. I am safe in stating that when the Committee on Science and Astronautics recommended to the House the authorization program it did, that these recommendations were on the basis of complete and thorough study. The action taken by the House on the appropriations whatever the reasons, represented the judgment of the Members by majority vote, but were not a reflection of any lack of study or gaps in information on the part of the committee of which I am chairman.

Now I also want to say that the report of the Senate subcommittee to which I have referred is an important study which deserves close attention for the thoughtful conclusions which it presents. It would be my view that the Senate report is correct in directing attention to the needs for Congress to have greater knowledge of how the detailed programs of the NASA and the Department of Defense relating to space are coordinated in the President's National Aeronautics and Space Council. Despite the similarity of name, the Space Council is separate and distinct from the Space Administration. This committee has not received a clear report of what the Council has been doing.

Because I have been well satisfied with the cooperation received from NASA, I would be greatly surprised to discover that there has been any serious gap in information supplied to this committee. If there are any such gaps known to the Members of this House, I should appreciate having them called to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, and we shall move swiftly to fill them.

Report From Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the following will be of interest to my colleagues. It appeared in the most recent issue of the weekly News Focus, volume II-32, edited and published by Charles L. Bartlett, who is also the Washington reporter of the Chattanooga Times:

REPORT FROM MOSCOW

(The following is excerpted from a report by a U.S. labor economist, Vladimir D. Chayrid, on his observations at the U.S. exhibition in Moscow. Mr. Chayrid, who was born in Russia, was assigned to the exhibition by the Labor Department to answer questions about the worker's life in America.)

I wish there were 20 American labor economists here familiar with American economic life. All of them could be busy answering thousands of questions of how the American people, and especially the average American worker, live. For the average Russian the hunger for knowledge, for facts about Americans, must be far greater than his hunger for food.

The questions most frequently asked deal with unemployment, wages, hours of work, living conditions, social security, unemployment insurance, and many others in this general area.

The attacks on the American way of life have been quite frequent and severe since the beginning of the exhibition. For the last few days, however, these have ceased for some reason or other. (The report was written just prior to the announcement of Khrushchev's visit to the United States.) To all of us, however, these attacks are one of the real indications of the success of our exhibition.

Do the Russian people believe what we tell them about America? After being here for several weeks and discussing with them our way of life, both at the exhibition and at other places, I am sure that the overwhelming majority believe what we tell them and what the exhibits show them.

At the Labor Department exhibit in the dome when some controversial matter develops between myself and some Russian professional propagandist, the crowd invariably will side with me rather than with him. These professional agitators invariably show up as soon as a sizable group of people begin to listen to my presentation.

For example the other day at the Labor exhibit I was explaining to a group of some 50 Russians the American social security programs. The group was vitally interested. Immediately a professional agitator broke in and told the crowd that this social security program did not apply to Negroes or foreign-born persons, that opportunities for these people in America were very poor.

This was an excellent opportunity for me to tell the crowd about myself—how I came from Russia some 30 years ago and how I was able to obtain an education in the United States and also a responsible job in the Labor Department. The agitator kept breaking in that I had already answered his question, but the crowd kept saying I should tell about myself and other groups like myself in the United States.

Frequently the agitator becomes embarrassed and disappears. It may be of interest to know that as soon as the Russian visitors

learn that I was born in Russia of modest parentage they are extremely sympathetic and I could stay and talk there, as I often do, for as long as 4 hours at a stretch. It is often physically impossible to break away from the crowd.

When I leave the stand, many continue to follow me asking questions that they might have been uneasy to ask in the presence of the professional agitators. Many thank me most profusely for answering their questions while others apologize for their professional agitators. It is literally impossible to stop and answer a single question of 1 Russian without attracting a crowd of 50 or more Russians within a few seconds. Such is the hunger for knowledge about the United States.

Conservation Reserve Program Booms Production of Game Birds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that at least one of the agricultural programs of relatively recent establishment is gaining support and producing good results. I refer to the soil bank conservation reserve program. While there is room for more progress, the following article from the Milwaukee Journal of Sunday, August 9, 1959, by conservation writer Russ Lynch, shows the beneficial results of the conservation reserve program in Wisconsin:

SOIL BANK'S RESERVE LAND PROGRAM BOOMS PRODUCTION OF GAME BIRDS

(By R. G. Lynch)

Pheasant populations are up in almost every State. And it is no coincidence that cropland has been going wild on farms in the soil bank's conservation reserve at the same time that the birds have been increasing in the last 2 or 3 years.

Wisconsin this year has a sizable conservation reserve acreage for the first time (the 1959 signup tripled the total for preceding years). So Wisconsin game managers and sportsmen have reason to wonder what effect nearly 500,000 acres of "wild" grass, scattered over 9,000 farms, will have on upland game in the next 5 or 6 years.

The answer depends in part on the extent to which they can induce the landowners to delay weed control until after nesting time, to plant food patches and shrub cover, and in ruffed grouse country, to seed clover along with grass.

HELPS PHEASANTS

J. R. Smith, State superintendent of game, said last week that the most important impact of CR land would be to help restore the pheasant population in the southeastern counties, where last winter's heavy snow killed off perhaps a quarter of the breeding population. He also expects the rabbit population to benefit.

Pheasants are down in the area southeast of a line roughly drawn from Manitowoc to Dodgeville. This includes intensively farmed country where more grass cover could be important, particularly if it was undisturbed during nesting.

Rock County, a top agricultural area, will have more than 12,500 acres of grass, distributed over 203 farms, that cannot be grazed or harvested for 5 years. In this

county, 158 whole farms have been retired from production.

Jefferson County will have some 10,600 acres in CR grass on 231 farms; Walworth County, 5,100 acres on 94 farms. Other pheasant producing counties have comparable CR signups.

QUAIL COUNTRY, TOO

Some sample counties in the quail country include Grant, 13,800 acres on 284 farms; Crawford, 9,100 acres on 127 farms; Richland, 3,200 acres on 73 farms.

So far efforts to enlist CR farmers in a wildlife program have been spotty and not very successful. When county meetings were held last fall to discuss CR regulations, the conservation department and local clubs were invited to participate. Despite bad weather, 3,211 persons attended the 71 meetings. Some game managers proved to be salesman but more were not. A few clubs offered help for farmers who would apply wildlife practices.

But all the signups game managers and sportsmen's clubs obtained in the 71 counties totaled only 907 acres, including 200 or 300 food patches, mostly of one-half to 5 acres. Half as many more were carried over from preceding years.

Nick Calabrese, who is program specialist in charge of the soil bank, said, "I'm sure the local clubs can get a lot more cooperation from the farmers if they make a real effort, particularly if they offer some help."

UP TO SPORTSMEN

Smith, the State game chief, intimated that it would be chiefly up to the clubs, saying that conservation department personnel already had more programs than they could handle effectively. "But we have put in some time on the soil bank," he said, "and will find men to work on it."

A landowner who did not want to be named told the writer that he had put in a food patch and wildlife shrubs and from his experience judged that not much would be done by farmers without some help.

"It's a lot of bother and work," he said. "I think it will take something like the tree planting program. That didn't make much headway with farmers until it was organized and planting machines were available locally. If the Department or the clubs would set up a definite program, and help, for food patch and shrub planting, they'd maybe get some results."

MANY HELP SHARPTAILS

Smith said that CR land was not so important for quail or ruffed grouse, although clover seeding along with grass could benefit the grouse.

"There'll be a gain in nesting areas and edge," he said, "but the loss of grazed woodland will more than offset it. Woodland grazing increases ruffed grouse habitat as much as 10 to 1."

"But the CR may help sharptails, particularly along the Lake Superior shore in the clay country. Acre for acre that land is more productive of sharptails than the sand country, but the increase of farming has driven the birds out. Now they may come back."

A Matter of Dollars and Cents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CARLTON LOSER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting an article

from the Nashville Tennessean, written by an excellent reporter and editorial writer, Mr. Gene Graham, who is beginning a series of interpretative articles designed to explain subject of local and national interest.

This article deals with a lawsuit in the U.S. District Court for Middle Tennessee, at Nashville. Three Federal judges, all Tennesseans, will conduct the trial and rule upon the matter of reapportionment in Tennessee which was not decided by the State general assembly.

The article follows:

A MATTER OF DOLLARS AND CENTS—TEN AND ONE-HALF MILLION DOLLARS IS SIPHONED FROM DAVIDSON TAXPAYERS EVERY YEAR—THREE JUDGES MAY HOLD THE ANSWER

(By Gene Graham)

A lawsuit of historic and national significance will begin in Nashville shortly.

It is one which is destined to keep the eyes of a nation riveted firmly upon a solemn, mahogany-paneled courtroom on the eighth floor of the Federal building here.

For at issue in this milestone American legal clash are problems complex and common among all the Nation's States—even the two new ones which moved from territorial to statehood status this year.

Basically, the issue is one of equity. It is commonly known by the somewhat cumbersome name of legislative reapportionment.

Vast population upheavals growing out of the postwar years in America are behind it, although the trend really began to a less noticeable degree before World War II.

EXPLODING URBAN CENTERS

That population has expanded—and it has shifted as the desert sands, forming huge human drifts upon the archaic governmental structure of America's exploding urban centers.

With the mechanization of farms and the rapid industrial expansion of two and a half decades now, humans in massive numbers have left a rural society to become dwellers of large metropolitan centers, once-small cities which now move toward the metropolitan status, and once-rural towns which can no longer be so classified.

But they have left their State governments behind.

All over America—not just in Tennessee—they have left the same number of legislators representing the same territorial limits, limits within which, unfortunately, the people no longer live in such proportions as they did when States were being hewn of a wilderness.

OLD SAM CRIED "TYRANNY"

By the same token, the same number of legislators represent the narrow territorial confines of modern metropolises which once were not. In truth, it is a condition similar, if not identical, to the one which caused old Sam Adams to cry out "Taxation without representation is tyranny" upon colonial streets, sparking the tinder of revolution.

The world is calmer today. This issue is thus joined in the hushed forum of American jurisprudence. The trial, as announced Thursday, will be conducted by three distinguished Federal judges, all Tennesseans.

They are Federal Sixth Circuit Judge John D. Martin, Sr., Memphis, who only last week stepped down as presiding judge of, though remaining upon, the Cincinnati-based appellate court; District Judge Marion S. Boyd, Memphis; District Judge William E. Miller, Nashville, whose rejection of a State motion to dismiss the lawsuit earlier in the week set the stage for the legal test.

"We look forward to this lawsuit with the notion that Tennessee is upon the threshold of a great and long-overdue governmental reform of pioneering proportions and

national implications," said Z. T. Osborn Jr., Nashville attorney and one of three who will represent the parties suing the State for fair play.

NO COMMENT

George McCanless, State attorney general, declined comment yesterday. McCanless, in his official capacity, will defend the State, which has insisted reapportionment is a matter for the legislature alone to decide, just as the Tennessee Supreme Court previously held.

The suit will be adjudicated, of course, on the grounds of equity and that alone. But behind the issue of equitable representation is one of tax dollars and cents, just as it was taxes which prompted Adams' outburst against Great Britain two centuries ago.

Using Davidson County as an example, here is that story:

Perhaps few people realize today the degree to which the State has become a tax-collecting agency for local governments. Not counting its receipts last year from Federal sources, the State collected—in State taxes—\$270,914,354. It redistributed to counties, cities and local school districts more than half of that amount, \$140,442,548.

Part of this was what is called local-share taxes, e.g., gasoline, income, alcohol, beer, etc. A much larger portion, not strictly State-share in nature, is doled out for education in the form of State grants-in-aid.

And due to the balance of legislative power being firmly entrenched with rural counties, those shares—the plaintiffs complain—are grossly out of kilter.

In Davidson's case, just how much is this true—or is it?

Davidson County, according to the studies of the nonpolitical and statewide Tennessee Taxpayers Association, paid \$38,178,924 in taxes last year. That represented 14.1 percent of the total—or 14.1 cents of every State tax dollar collected.

Of this, the State returned to Davidson (including the cities of Nashville, Belle Meade, Berryhill, and Oak Hill) \$9,882,834—or 2.6 of those 14.1 cents. Retained by the State was 11.5 cents.

Since 48 percent of the State income was not redistributed, this means 5.5 of Davidson's 14.1 cents was used by the State as Davidson's strictly percentage share of financing such statewide functions as welfare, roads, etc. That leaves 6 of Davidson's pennies to be accounted for.

WHO TRADES WHERE?

The TTA also estimates, based upon its studies, that 15 percent of Davidson's 14.1 cents was paid by outlying counties, by trade area shoppers who converge upon their natural trading center, which obviously desires that trade. This accounts for 2.1 cents, leaving 3.9 cents as the nearest figurative amount which Davidson County invests in State government without direct return.

Reduced to pennies, this sounds small. But when considered in the light of total State collections—\$270.9 millions—it amounts to \$10,565,100 a year.

Davidson's local governments, forced this year to make vast increases in its tax rates, look upon that money with a view to what just a portion of it could do in meeting the community's great problems—sewers, expanding schools, parks, slum eradication.

Some argue the TTA's estimate that outlying counties pay 15 percent of Davidson's contribution to State taxes is too low. No exact figures can be given, but the TTA counters with the argument that the biggest chunk of the sales tax, for example, comes from the sale of food, which almost invariably is purchased at home. And it can be shown, too, that the 1-cent share rebated to cities from the 7-cent gasoline tax does not approach the amount actually collected in Tennessee's cities and growing towns.

The most pertinent question, then, would seem to be whether Davidson and the metropolitan centers should, in keeping with the so-called equalization theory, subsidize the admittedly poor counties of the State to the extent of \$10 million a year.

"We recognize this obligation," urban leaders say, "but \$10 million a year is too much to ask when our own tax burdens, our own community needs are so great."

Whether such arguments can be sustained is a moot matter before a legislature which has resisted all efforts, since 1901, to give the city folks a louder voice in State affairs, tax distribution being but one of them.

So the issue was removed from the legislative branch and dropped before the Federal judiciary to resolve. And that's where the matter lies—while a nation watches—today.

HOW THEY STACK UP

Here is how the four largest Tennessee metropolitan counties fare in sharing State taxes collected within their boundaries. Roughly half of the taxes collected from them are redistributed by the State in either grants-in-aid or local-share taxes.

Hamilton County pays \$22,540,074; gets back \$7,220,792; or 32 percent.

Knox County pays \$22,594,257; gets back \$7,053,052; or 31.2 percent.

Shelby County pays \$57,569,304; gets back \$16,823,099; or 29.2 percent.

Davidson County pays \$38,178,924; gets back \$9,882,834; or 25.9 percent.

The four counties pay approximately \$140.8 million—or roughly 50 percent—of the State's \$270.9 million in taxes.

The Labor Bill Battle in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, now that the House debate is over and the Landrum-Griffin substitute bill overwhelmingly approved, on reflection I feel sure that all the problems have not been solved. Somehow I feel we are only treating the outward evidences of trouble and not the inner or basic difficulty that will continue to plague the labor movement, the consumer and free enterprise. This basic problem is the fact that labor organizations are still above and beyond the law because they are not subject to the same ground rules as are business enterprises; namely, antitrust law.

So I was quite interested to read the article by Mr. Arthur Krock in the New York Times of August 14, 1959 on the final day of debate on labor reform legislation. I believe his conclusion supports the views I expressed during debate on pages 14196-14198 of the RECORD of August 11 in presenting my bill, H.R. 8003, as a possible amendment to the labor reform bill.

Surely other Members of Congress share this concern over the need for antitrust legislation.

The article is as follows:

THE LABOR BILL BATTLE IN CONGRESS

(By Arthur Krock)

A balanced analysis of the truth and consequences of the struggle over labor union

reform legislation, now coming to a climax in Congress, may have to await the competence in research and the perspective of some future Edward Gibbon. But the stakes of the battle are plain in contemporary view. The most powerful, and in some respects the only, monopoly in the United States is fighting to preserve its control of the national industrial machine.

The monopoly was founded in the first years of President F. D. Roosevelt's New Deal by pro-labor laws of Congress and by even more pro-labor interpretations of these laws by administrators and judges appointed with that expectation. The results included a political alliance between union labor leaders and the candidates of the Democratic Party in which one interest promoted the interest of the other—an alliance to which liberal Republicans on the northeastern seaboard sought and were granted a sort of second-class membership.

The moral and spiritual animations of this pro-labor movement were generated by a prior monopoly which the Republican Party had fostered and protected. This was a combination of financial and industrial management power which operated politically through campaign contributions to submissive political candidates and through influence over the President's choice of administrators and judges. But the subsequent transfer to organized labor of power over the economy and industrial liberty of the United States, which was initiated by President Roosevelt and nailed home by President Truman, has been followed by the usual abuses of monopoly. These have included corruption and some excesses the robber barons of American industry never ventured.

Now for the first time since the pendulum of monopoly hit the reverse top of its arc a President of the United States is trying to unstuck it for a moderate downswing. The legislation President Eisenhower favors represents a very moderate backswing because it does nothing to cover labor unions under the antitrust laws that effectively restrain a management monopoly. And this legal immunity is the principal of several which are basic sources of the power of union leaders, both corrupt and otherwise. Yet the bill the President is supporting—proposed by a Democrat and a Republican in the House of Representatives—is the pending legislative draft that would provide effective restraints on the legalized social coercions of the economy by labor unions that also are important sources of their monopoly. These coercive activities are the secondary boycott and picketing, often deserving the administration's tag of "blackmail," which the labor chiefs prefer to call organizational.

The House committee bill, a milder corrective measure of union corruption and union coercive practices than the easy-going Senate measure, was officially opposed by the merger AFL-CIO, which endorsed a third draft with even less corrective effects. Though a large number of the Members of Congress have publicly qualmed under union threats of reprisal at the polls, this third measure had no chance of approval, and that was as well known at Meany-Reuther headquarters as it was in the private rooms of the Democratic and Republican leaders of Congress. But whether or not designed as strategy to make support of the House committee bill appear as bold independence of the AFL-CIO, its draft was so employed by legislators who knew that the union leaders would have been glad to settle for the House committee bill and would have regarded as another political triumph the rejection of the measure endorsed by the President.

One of the possibilities attributed to this latter bill is that its restraints on the secondary boycott and organizational picketing will hamper honest unions in their legitimate concerns.

But it could readily be safeguarded against by conference change in which the fundamental restraint of secondary boycotting could still be preserved. In all likelihood this safeguard would appear in the event of the final passage of a bill which will correct the basic abuses of the labor monopoly.

But, undisturbed by this administration, this Congress and the next one, will be union power to dominate collective bargaining, paralyze nationwide industries if this domination is resisted, elude the laws and ordinances against violence and coercion and suspend vital public services, including the sources of public information.

A Tribute to Mr. Herbert C. Hoover on His 85th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include an open letter to former President Herbert C. Hoover which appeared in the St. Joseph, Mo., News-Press extending congratulations, and was written by the editor, Arthur V. Burrows:

TIMELY OBSERVATIONS

Mr. HERBERT C. HOOVER,
Waldorf-Astoria Towers,
New York City.

DEAR Mr. HOOVER: The News-Press congratulates you on this, your 85th birthday. The News-Press feels it has a right to send you these congratulations as an open letter, not alone because of the personal esteem in which you are held by the editor of this newspaper, but because of the proud record this newspaper holds as regards your personal self.

The News-Press was keenly alert to the world tension in that fateful summer 45 years ago. It was June 28, 1914, a Bosnian Serb, Gabriel Princep, assassinated Archduke Francis Ferdinand, heir to the Austrian throne. You, Mr. Hoover, were in England when that tragedy occurred in Sarajevo, Bosnia. Sarajevo caused World War I.

It was the News-Press privilege to commend editorially the generosity of you, Mr. Hoover, nearing 40 years of age, who so gladly financed stranded Americans in London. You made it possible for them to get home, starting in late July, when chancellories feared the negotiations to prevent a world war would be futile. They were futile, Mr. Hoover, as you so well remember. Germany declared war against Russia August 1 and against France August 3.

You read your London Times and saw, Mr. Hoover, as did we in our paper, that Britain asked Germany to guarantee the neutrality of Belgium by midnight of August 4. Germany refused and Britain declared war on Germany August 4. You were still in London when German troops entered Leige. Our News-Press called that the rape of Belgium. We were probably the first newspaper of the whole Middle West to so severely castigate the German Emperor, the mad Kaiser. For that and following editorial conduct of our newspaper, Albert, King of the Belgians, conferred the Medaille du Roi Albert on Louis T. Golding, our editor and publisher.

Mr. Hoover, that editor and publisher still lives. He was 94 on May 9 last, so he is your own contemporary and no two men ever saw more eye to eye in those far away years

when it seemed God let the very light of the heavens go out one by one.

This newspaper time and again commended you for your great work in feeding Belgium. No man in all world history, single-handed, had ever to that time, or has since, so endeared himself by a single act to so many millions of people. It was inevitable, Mr. Hoover, that you were Chairman of the American Commission for the Relief of Belgium from 1914 to 1919. It was inevitable your friend, Mr. Woodrow Wilson, name you his U.S. Food Administrator, where you served so well from June 1917 to July 1919.

Your course as Secretary of Commerce under two Republican Presidents was hailed by the St. Joseph News-Press, not once but many times. It was the privilege of the News-Press to support you for President in victory in 1928 and in defeat in 1932. It was our joy to commend Mr. Harry S. Truman when he recalled you to public service after the cruel, willful conduct of Mr. Truman's predecessor.

The News-Press and sister paper, the St. Joseph Gazette, acclaimed you to the world for both the first Hoover Commission and the second Hoover Commission. The good of the Hoover Commissions will live long after you are gone to God.

Your step is slower, your face is more lined, your head more bowed, sir, but you bear that same mark of individual initiative, proud Americanism you had when you were in two Presidents' Cabinets, when you yourself were President. Or when you broke bread in St. Joseph, Mo., in that home of Mr. and Mrs. John Wyeth at 2916 Frederick early in 1933. Yes, even to just this summer when you so hospitably received our friends, Mr. and Mrs. James E. Josendale, of this city, in your home in Waldorf Towers.

The tangible proof of your goodness, your accomplishments, Mr. Hoover, sir, are for all to see: The honorary degrees from 81 institutions here and abroad, the 296 medals and other awards from here and abroad, the honorary citizenship of 24 European cities, 56 honorary memberships in scientific and technical societies. Mr. Hoover, you are the living exemplar of individualist America at her best, from that humble home in Iowa where you were orphaned to the plaudits of the world. It is a rare privilege to know you, sir. God bless you. God keep you for His very own.

Economic Advantages Motivate Support for Labor Bill

SPEECH
OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8342) to provide for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations and for other purposes.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, the labor bills before the House have disturbed many legislators and voters and the speeches in favor of and against the bills have created a great confusion in the minds of a great majority. I believe that we must have labor legislation.

Last year I supported and voted for the Kennedy-Ives labor reform bill which passed the Senate and was defeated in the House by eight votes. The Kennedy-Ives bill regulated the internal union affairs without undue meddling in the administration of unions and without weakening the collective bargaining powers. The Kennedy-Ives bill was defeated by a combination of Republican Members and southern Representatives.

This year there are three bills before the House. The combination which defeated the Kennedy-Ives bill last year has once again combined and supports the Landrum-Griffin bill. I oppose the Landrum bill, which, in my opinion, is "buckshot" legislation, injuring the guilty and innocent alike. I favor the Shelley bill and shall support this bill.

The labor situation as we all know it is not all black nor all white. There is a great need for reform and for improvement, but no necessity to destroy labor. The support for the blunderbuss Landrum-Griffin bill comes mainly from Republicans and southern Democrats. Why? Why do these bills go beyond the reform of unions and seek to adopt methods which punish labor? It appears to me that selfish economic and political reasons motivate the support for this bill more than a desire to chase out the crooks from the House of Labor.

The Elliott bill, H.R. 8342, known as the committee bill, and the Shelley bill, H.R. 8490, introduced by Representative JACK SHELLEY, of California, and 14 other Members, have provisions to get rid of the crooks in labor, but the Shelley bill contains no provisions which bust unions or destroy their legitimate gains obtained through sacrifice. What does the Shelley bill do and is it effective? The Shelley bill requires financial reports by unions covering 90 percent of the labor force in unions and gives the Secretary of Labor discretion to compel the remaining small unions to file reports if the Secretary thinks it is necessary or that there is a violation of law or any corruption within the union. False filing under the Shelley bill carries severe criminal penalties. Embezzlers of union funds are subject to Federal prosecution and embezzlers, Communists, and convicts are denied the right to hold union office for a period of 5 years. Employees whose rights are denied can sue in Federal courts after they exhaust their remedies within the union. Employees' rights to vote and participate in union activities are protected. The subversive, the neurotic, and the troublemaker are subject to union discipline by reasonable regulations. The Shelley bill provides further that union financial officers must be bonded and they are required to account for their stewardship. No conflict of interest must appear in their conduct and officers are required to report any conflict of interest. No loans in excess of \$2,500 can be made and loans above \$250 must be reported. The crooks are controlled, the employees are protected, and the ban on secondary boycotting, as provided for in the Taft-Hartley law, is continued. The Shelley bill is not an antilabor bill. It is a fair and effective bill, and under its provisions crooks are

controlled, employees are given a bill of rights, and dishonesty is punished. Why not the opposition to the Shelley bill, and why then the support for the Landrum-Griffin bill?

During the amendment stage of the bill, the combination of Republicans and southern Democrats ganged up together to deny the Secretary of Labor and the Attorney General to bring an action to restrain any union officer who was about to violate the provisions of title I of the bill and left the remedy to the union member without the support of the Secretary or the Attorney General. This amendment was overwhelmingly supported by the combination and became part of the Landrum bill.

Let us analyze the motives for the Landrum-Griffin bill. This measure was sponsored by Congressman LANDRUM, a Representative from Georgia, and Congressman GRIFFIN, a Republican Representative from Michigan. The Republicans who helped defeat the Kennedy-Ives bill last year are not seeking a solution, but want a political issue. Their votes in my opinion are politically inspired without regard for the economic effect on the industrial East, North, and West. Congressman LANDRUM, the Representative from Georgia, comes from a State which is antiunion. Georgia is 1 of the 19 States in the Union which has adopted "right-to-work" laws, recognized by many as "right-to-wreck unions" laws. Organizational or recognition picking is one of labor's traditional practices to unionize a plant and to raise workers' wages. Bar all organizational picketing and recognition picketing by statute and you authorize and empower employers to exploit and to pay indecent wages and require longer hours. Where picketing is for the purpose of blackmail, then such picketing should be made a crime and prohibited. The Landrum bill, however, outlaws all types of picketing except where a plant is on strike.

The Shelley bill outlaws blackmail picketing, but provides that where picketing is carried out for the purpose of unionizing and obtaining decent wages and decent working conditions, such activities should not be condemned or curtailed. When picketing is carried on by a rival union when a legitimate union represents a plant or a business, an employer should have the right to go before a labor board for relief. Many workers throughout the United States are still not covered by a Federal minimum wage law, and these groups who are not permitted to organize by picketing will be compelled to work at slave wages. Inasmuch as Georgia has no minimum wage law, these unprotected workers are at the mercy of predatory employers. The advantages of cheap labor are recognized by industry and it flees locations where there are strong unions so they can pay cheap wages and make exorbitant profits at the expense of labor. It is a well-known fact that industry has fled from the industrial East and North to find haven in States like Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and other localities, which provide right-to-work laws and do not provide any minimum wage protection and labor legislation.

The following are some of the Southern States which have right-to-work laws: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Mississippi, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. Their Representatives supported almost unanimously the Landrum-Griffin bill.

What is the situation in Georgia with respect to its labor conditions? Georgia, in my opinion, is an antiunion State. While it has compensation laws on its books, it pays a miserable maximum of \$30 per week to an injured worker as compared to \$45 per week in other States. Georgia provides no minimum wage law for employees not covered by the Federal minimum wage law and the amount an employer pays may be insufficient to provide the bare necessities of life. In Georgia, where unions seek to help themselves by picketing, statutes prohibit mass picketing. Georgia and other Southern States have a competitive edge against northern industrial States. Their edge lies in the unfair advantage these States enjoy in the form of non-union shops, lack of compulsory insurance, and lack of minimum wages.

For example, the States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas do not have any compulsory law for workmen's compensation. An injured worker is left to the whim and bounty of his employer and is not protected by statute when he is injured. When it comes to the question of wages, many of the Southern States who by their support of the Landrum bill are seeking to steal away and lure Northern industry into their area have no minimum wage laws. The Southern States which have no minimum wage law are Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas. Arkansas has a minimum wage law, but the minimum is pathetically low and amounts to a minimum of 16 cents per hour; hardly sufficient to keep body and soul together. These States do not have minimum wages in the retail trades, the hotels and restaurants, and in the laundry and drycleaning establishments. They afford no protection to the workers, and if the workers are denied the right to organization which the Landrum bill takes away from them, then certainly they are at the mercy of the ruthless employers and they are permitted to starve with the sanction of the State.

This is the story behind the support of the Landrum bill. It is an economic drive by a section of our country to continue their practices of indecent wages and to attract business from fleeing industry. The Republicans for political gains have betrayed the industrial sections of our country and have joined with the southern Representatives to pass the Landrum bill over prostrate labor. The philosophy of the Landrum bill is found in the attitudes of Georgia statutes and the statutes in the Southern States. Thus, the Landrum bill is motivated incidentally by a desire to eliminate the crooks, and in my opinion, primarily for selfish economic reasons, to continue nonunion shops, and thereby to maintain for Georgia and other Southern States their competitive edge of cheap labor,

thus being able to steal industry from those industrial States which have high standards of working conditions for the working man and high wages.

The Landrum bill bans the "hot cargo" provisions while the Shelley bill does not. The ban on hot cargo is another device to maintain nonunion conditions in Southern States. A hot cargo provision in a contract means that an employer and a union agree that an employee or a truckdriver shall not be compelled to handle his employer's goods which come from or go to a struck plant. It guarantees an employee the right not to be a strikebreaker or cross a picket line. A ban on hot cargo provisions means that nonunion shops which endanger a union worker's standard of living may continue on its merry way and union employees are compelled not only to handle their goods, but cross their picket lines if necessary. Why should a truckdriver be required to handle goods for a nonunion company or a struck company which pays slave wages and compels workers to work under onerous conditions? The Landrum bill with its ban on hot cargo and its provisions make the hot-cargo stipulation an unfair labor practice, forces truckers to cross picket lines of secondary employers who pay indecent wages and provide substandard conditions to the workman. Must this truckdriver cross a picket line with goods when he knows and recognizes that crossing a picket line will help an employer whose plant is struck and who seeks to undermine his own standard of living and lure away business from industrial States? The Landrum bill requires that action on his part and this is the vice and meanness of the Landrum bill. It is in substance a fight by anti-worker States to maintain their competitive advantage by destroying the effective tools which labor has to maintain its gains in this jungle of business rivalry. The Landrum bill aligns Government on the side of employers and denies labor unions the right and the opportunity to protect themselves against predatory practices by ruthless employers.

I support the sentiments of knowledgeable and responsible leaders who are not antilabor or anti-industry, but are anticrooks, and who seek a true labor reform bill. What we seek is to guarantee the worker his right to vote, choose and participate in union affairs, to guard union funds from dissipation through loans or larceny, to punish union leaders who steal or who default in their position of trust, to disqualify Communists and convicts from holding office for a stated period of time, to protect employees in their right to refuse to cross picket lines while prohibiting concerted activities by employees to force any person to cease doing business with another person, to prohibit blackmail picketing while preserving the right to picket for legitimate union aims. What we seek in substance is support of a bill which will accomplish these objectives. I believe that the bill which best accomplishes these objectives is the Shelley bill which I support. I favor the defeat of the Landrum-Griffin bill which would press down upon the back of labor a yoke of tyranny.

A Salute to Herbert Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, no man in American public life has served so unselfishly and has earned and deserves the respect and high regard of the people of the United States and in fact the people of the free world for the great services he has rendered to suffering human being whenever he has been called upon to help.

Herbert Hoover has lived to see the day when those that scorned and ridiculed him have had to eat their words. He stands today as one of the great humanitarians and great statesmen of the generation.

I submit herewith the following article by George Sokolsky which is a tribute to Herbert Hoover:

HOOVER AT 85

(By George E. Sokolsky)

There have been plenty of changes in this world since 1874 when on August 10 Herbert Hoover was born in an Iowa village called West Branch. His parents were Quakers; his father a blacksmith, his mother a seamstress. The parents died young and Herbert was sent to live with relatives, finally settling down in Oregon. This, then, is a proletarian beginning for a man who has been described during most of his career as the stereotype of American capitalism.

AT STANFORD

No State aided him. No government supported him. He was what we today like to call underprivileged, but he was a strong farm boy, sturdy, and willing to work, with a sharp mind and a capacity to make his way.

He managed to get enough education to go to what was then called Leland Stanford University, and he worked on all sorts of projects, many of his own devising, so that he could pay for his needs.

Typically, he ran a newspaper route and a laundry route, and he worked summers for the Geological Survey of the United States.

Thus, Herbert Hoover became a mining engineer. He married a geologist, Lou Henry, and together they set off to work in all parts of the world. His success in his own field and in business was immediate and continuous.

Herbert Hoover got into politics by accident rather than by design.

He was the leading American permanently domiciled in London at the outbreak of World War I and was, therefore, invited by Ambassador Walter Hines Page to assist the large number of American refugees who were stuck in England because of the beginning of the war and who had no means to take care of themselves.

BELGIAN RELIEF

He handled this job so ably that he was invited to undertake Belgian relief. He, who had been a mining engineer, found himself a social worker all of a sudden.

And here the simplicities of Quaker upbringing intervened.

Herbert Hoover could tolerate no conflict to interest.

When he was working for himself and his family, he did well and amassed a fortune. Now that he faced public service, he felt it essential to divest himself of conflicting assets.

From that day in 1914 when he undertook to serve the people and governments, he avoided private involvements of any kind. Fortunately, he could afford to work without compensation and that he has done ever since.

Hoover was an unpopular President, although he received an enormous vote.

The times required him to compromise his judgments and when once or twice he did compromise, particularly with the late Senator Borah, it turned out that he erred.

DEFEATED MAN

A man who has a philosophy of life, must guide himself according to those principles.

I can recall the days in 1933-34 when Herbert Hoover was sitting often alone in his rooms in the Waldorf-Astoria, avoided by those whom he helped on the road of life.

He was a defeated man and the smart boys run from a defeated man.

In contrast today, a quarter of a century later, Herbert Hoover is one of the most beloved men in the Nation, above partisanship, above rancor. He continues to work steadily, writing a series of books which will clarify the record of many otherwise uncovered situations.

Herbert Hoover stays young by working and by his constant interest in affairs. At 85, he refuses to give up to doctors, nurses and the impedimenta of age.

He can still argue a point refreshingly, his head full of details and his philosophic viewpoint clear and always guiding constructively.

SENSE OF HUMOR

His sense of humor never falls him.

Never one to be vengeful, in his old age he knows no rancor.

How he manages to clear the slate of all the little incidents which hurt a man's feelings, I do not understand.

There must be something in early Quaker teaching that does that or perhaps he has grown so big in spirit that the pin-pricks of politics become like the sting of a gnat.

One of the developments of his years is his friendship with Harry Truman: The two ex-Presidents really like each other.

It will be interesting to see Herbert Hoover at the Republican convention in Chicago in 1960, standing before his party, delivering his address. His truth goes marching on.

An Idea for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, when I was at the World Affairs Institute in North Carolina recently I met Mr. and Mrs. Dabney White of Greensboro, N.C. They, like so many people, are much concerned about preserving peace in the world. They, unlike many people, have worked out an idea which they think would help lead to peace. They want the East and West to compete in the area of research.

Under unanimous consent previously granted I am including hereafter their plan for peace. It is entitled "A 10-Year Plan for Preventing World War III":

A 10-YEAR PLAN FOR PREVENTING WORLD WAR III

(By Charlotte and Dabney White)

If the Russian and American people permit themselves to be caught in the death-

trap of world war III because of the bait fate has placed in Berlin, then they have no more right to claim intelligence than a doomed rat caught in a cheese-baited rat-trap.

Taking a firm stand in Berlin is not enough. We once took a firm stand with Japan and got Pearl Harbor. Nor is it enough merely to take satisfaction in our own achievements and virtues and to condemn the evils and shortcomings of others. Events demand we propose some way out of today's dilemma that can bring benefit not only to ourselves but to all the world.

Russia and China, today, proud of their great strides in catching up with the West, compete with us for allies, raw materials, and markets. In so doing they force us all to play a dangerous cold war game. It is a very old game, a game that in the past brought on nearly all the wars that have been fought. If continued this cold war game can quite easily explode into world war III. The starting incident may occur in Berlin. It may occur almost anywhere. The world today is a tinderbox and war is very near.

But war will not solve today's basic problem. World Wars I and II and the Korean war did not solve it, nor will another blood-letting. To solve that basic problem we need to find some new game that can be substituted for the present cold war game * * * some new game that can be played with more profit and less danger.

Before the dawn of history, man discovered a new idea of world-changing importance; the very simple idea that we can plant seeds and grow crops. Because of that discovery great civilizations became possible, other invention-discoveries became practical and world population increased from less than 10 million to more than 2,500 million. If that great idea were to be forgotten and remain unknown for just 3 years nearly all of those 2,500 million would be dead at the end of that time. The idea is that important.

However, in recent times, man has discovered an even greater idea, the idea that "by planting enough money and manpower in research we can find the answer to almost any problem." This is an idea that can do for man today even more than the first idea did for man in the past. It is an idea whose importance is fully realized by no one, and of such vastness as to stagger the imagination.

This mighty, godlike force of research, which can so easily be used to create a paradise on earth, it today being employed chiefly to discover deadlier and deadlier weapons for the Russians to use against us and for us to use against them. This is a sinful, shameful thing. Too long have we used research chiefly to discover new ways of killing. It is a force, far too wondrous to be used chiefly for such purpose.

It is man's chief key, given him by God, for unlocking all the shining wonders of the world and universe that man is heir to. As such it should be made into a great and ever expanding international enterprise devoted to bringing new knowledge to benefit all men everywhere.

International research on a grand scale, each year discovering vast stores of new knowledge and new ways to increase wealth; organized upon a highly competitive basis to keep all research workers doing their best, yet with the competition wholly within the organization and entirely divorced from national ambitions * * * can give us a new game to substitute for the dangerous cold war game now being played between East and West.

It can give us a new game played by competing research teams, a game highly publicized, strenuous and dramatic, turning world interest more and more toward man's ever enlarging conquest of the unknown and

diminishing interest in profiting at a neighbor's expense.

Properly organized and adequately financed, research into all the fields of human thought and action and including not only research proper, but also invention and development, should grow and grow and grow until one day it becomes the greatest industry in the world, greater than farming or manufacturing, greater even than all other industries put together, providing a new field where men compete under just laws and without fear of war or enslavement. Such work under law can pioneer a pattern for control by law of all world affairs.

The plan is a profitable plan. It will bring us material wealth, a vast new wealth of knowledge and new understanding, dynamic peace and soaring progress.

It is suggested herewith that we wrest the initiative in the present cold war from the Soviets, by proposing that we at once set up an International Agency for Research into all fields, and that we finance that Agency by levying on each nation 10 percent of the amount that nation is now spending on its military, and that this percentage be doubled each year until the whole world is spending on cooperative research at least 10 times what it is spending on war preparations.

It is suggested that we propose that a world truce be declared for the next 10 years to give a decade of peace for getting the research program underway and that any nation using armed force as an instrument of national policy be declared an outlaw and an enemy of the rest of the world and dealt with appropriately.

The above are bold proposals. Perhaps in their very boldness they offer more real chance of averting war and achieving dynamic peace than can be offered by any more traditional and less bold proposal.

If our Nation makes these proposals to the Soviets, and the Soviets turn them down, we will still have won a great ideological victory.

However, the Soviets may not turn them down. They may find in them a meeting ground for East and West and for the devising of a saner, freer, and wiser world order.

If so, we may in a few short years create more real progress for the good of all men and all the future, than will otherwise be created in the next 10,000 centuries.

The Fabulous Fiscal Fiasco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the Democratic Digest, August 1959 issue:

THE FABULOUS FISCAL FIASCO

The Republican Party, loudly trumpeting farewell to the second Eisenhower recession, is trying to brush under the rug the consequences, past, present, and threatened, of its own fiscal irresponsibility. The Democratic Party, thunders the GOP, is the party of budget busters, of inflationists, of financial hooligans. The din created by the Elephant has reached such a pitch and volume as to persuade the unwary that the fellow might have something there. The Digest therefore desires to submit some sobering truths about the Eisenhower administration and its banker-minded fiscal policies.

(The last five paragraphs of this article list certain indisputable facts which the Elephant is having great difficulty hiding under that rug.)

President Eisenhower, a fiscal innocent who was putty in the hands of his first Secretary of the Treasury, Industrial Titan George M. Humphrey, and who is equally malleable for the greatest Secretary of the Treasury since Humphrey, namely, Robert B. Anderson, appears to be as trustful today as ever.

If he found it galling that the results of the Humphrey-Anderson advice forced him to ask Congress in June to raise the ceiling on the public debt, and ask it also to abolish the historic 4½ percent limit on Government bond interest, he took solace in the cry of "Inflation, inflation"—a magic word used by all Republican fiscal wizards to explain why they have got the Government's financial affairs into such a stew.

The Cabinet of millionaires, inheriting from the Democrats a high prosperity without inflation, had scarcely taken the oath before Secretary Humphrey, with a let-George-do-it nod from Ike, started raising interest rates. The Treasury upped the rate on Government bonds far above the requirements of the market—from the previous Democratic rate of 3½ percent to a charitable 3¼. (Charitable to the banks and corporations, that is.) The effect on interest rates in general was electric—and a vicious circle began to rotate, generating inflation as it turned. "Why I can remember," Humphrey mused fondly, "when 7 percent interest was normal. We thought nothing of it." (Today the banks' "prime rate," the interest charged gilt-edge commercial borrowers, has climbed to 4½ percent—and the price of money is scaled up rapidly for the less favored.)

Humphrey also sponsored a \$7 billion tax cut, of which three-quarters was given unfairly and foolishly to corporations and higher income individuals. Foolishly, because this policy caused investment in productive capacity to outrun consumption, with unhappy results. Columnist Joseph Alsop wrote last month: "There would be no budget-balancing problem today, as there would be much less inflationary pressure too," if Humphrey had not put over this "profligate" tax cut.

Humphrey presided over the first Eisenhower recession (1953-54), and converted the recovery of 1955 into the stagnation of 1956-57. The second recession was leering around the corner as he bowed out and returned to his countinghouses in the summer of 1957.

The Republicans choose to blot the recessions from memory, and to assure us that all is now rosy. They blithely advise Congress that the fiscal policies under which the recessions occurred should be not only ratified but intensified. To be sure, the vast Eisenhower deficits have cooled off the GOP's infatuation with tax cutting, but the ardor for tight money is unabated. The balanced budget is given precedence by a veto-branishing President over (1) adequate defenses against an opponent of unexampled might; over (2) the encouragement of a swifter growth by the economy, and over (3) the urgent needs of a multiplying population in such fields as education, housing, urban blight, and conservation of natural resources. (Creeping socialism.) Fiscal management under Eisenhower continues to follow classic Republican theory—as imaginative as Calvin Coolidge, as dynamic as Herbert Hoover, as progressive as the trickle-down philosophy of McKinley's day.

The Democratic Party is just as devoted to a balanced budget as the Republicans profess to be—despite their mammoth deficit of

fiscal 1959. Speaker SAM RAYBURN pointed out July 2, in a sharp rebuke to GOP propagandists, that the Democratic Congress had already cut \$353 million off the Eisenhower budget requests, and he predicted the cuts would reach \$500 million to \$1 billion. But those savings, basically, are no more than a prudent overseeing of the routine house-keeping of the Government. Let us look beyond such details to the big picture.

In the House of Representatives a few weeks ago Representative CHESTER BOWLES, Democrat of Connecticut, noted that "our annual output of goods and services remains more than twice that of the Soviet Union." But he quoted Allen W. Dulles, head of the Central Intelligence Agency, as warning that a much greater rate of growth is enabling the U.S.S.R. to close the gap rapidly. He cited this somber statement by Dulles:

"If it is true that our industrial growth (between now and the end of the new Soviet 7-year plan) will be only 2 percent a year, the United States will be virtually committing economic suicide."

The truth is, the average growth rate of our economy in the first 6 Eisenhower years was only 1.3 percent annually.

TIGHT MONEY STOPS GROWTH

Growth is faster this year, but already the administration (abetted by the Federal Reserve Board) is applying the brakes of tight money. Economists of the top rank¹ reported in July that the "repressive policies now in effect might well lead to an average annual growth rate" for 1958-64—the approximate term of the Soviet 7-year plan—of less than half of the 5 percent annual rate which "we need and can readily achieve."

In 1953-58, these economists said, "we fell more than \$150 billion short of full production, and suffered about 10 million man-years of unnecessary unemployment. In addition, Federal, State, and local governments collected about \$30 to \$35 billion less in revenues than a full rate of economic growth would have generated at existing tax rates."

The economists commented: "The erroneous methods used to fight inflation have contributed greatly to this poor economic performance. Especially, the tight money policy and successive retrenchments in the Federal Budget have been powerful factors in the deficient rate of economic growth."

They continued: "Now in 1959, we are moving upward again as we did in 1955. And once again, we are misreading the signs and applying the wrong policies. The Federal Reserve Board is not reactivating with a vengeance the tight money policy, which has proved to be economically repressive and socially regressive, and a very frail weapon against inflation. In accord with the misguided FRB policies, the administration is asking for the removal of ceilings on interest rates. Budgetary retrenchment is again being given precedence over the neglected priorities of our national and international needs."

"Few, if any, of the fundamental maladjustments which contributed to the erratic and low growth rates of recent years have been corrected. Some of them are now being further aggravated—for example, the further forced decline of farm income, and the immense drive against wage adjustments."

But the President seems content. The oracles of the White House stoop, Messrs. HALLECK and DIRKSEN, are radiant. The Republican National Committee's mimeographs

¹"Inflation, Cause and Cure," a study directed by Leon H. Keyserling for the Conference on Economic Progress, Washington, D.C.

brim with happy tributes to prosperity. The money lenders are happy, too—

The Federal Reserve Board reports that profits (after taxes) of its member banks rose 25 percent in 1958. Since the last Truman year, bank profits (again, after taxes) have increased by 75 percent.

George Champion, president of New York's biggest bank, the Chase Manhattan, says a "prime rate" of interest even higher than the 4½ percent established last May is possible. (He awaits it with open arms.) Henry Clay Alexander, chairman of the Morgan Guaranty Trust, "looks for a continuing rise in the cost of money." (His welcome mat is out.)

Government programs to help home building have felt the hot breath of tight money. Congress a few weeks ago had to raise from 4½ percent to 5½ percent the interest allowable on housing loans guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration. Similarly, the Federal Housing Administration is said to be pondering a raise to 5½ percent in the interest permitted on FHA-guaranteed loans. (Even at the existing rate, a typical FHA mortgage negotiated today would cost \$5,700 in interest, against \$4,500 in 1952.)

But the GOP, although it has given us more inflation than we ever had before except as a result of war, still insists that high-priced money is the best weapon against inflation. Is it working that way? Perhaps it has deterred some people from buying homes. But look at this—

In May alone, consumers increased their outstanding installment debt by \$443 million (seasonally adjusted), the Federal Reserve Board reported in July. That was the biggest jump since September 1955. We may be sure that there was a hidden tax on much of that, buying—for higher interest is in effect a tax, imposed by the Government's tight money policies, and payable to lenders rather than to the Government. But the point is, tight money did not dampen the buying urge—hence did not work against inflation.

Actually, higher interest rates are of themselves inflationary, since they increase costs without increasing production. "Few things have contributed as much to inflation as rising interest rates," Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, said recently.

A budget deficit is supposed to be inflationary. Yet Mr. Eisenhower, who loves to denounce inflation, told Congress in June, as casually as if he were asking it to pass the butter, that higher rates necessitated his requesting \$500 million more to pay the interest on the public debt than he had asked in his budget message only 5 months earlier.

One penny and part of a second penny out of every tax dime now go to the unproductive cost of carrying the Federal debt. The effect of tight money and inflation are reflected also in the debt burdens of the States and cities, of school districts and of public utilities, of home and automobile buyers—indeed, in one way or another, of every American.

And the Republican Party, failure going to its head, is proud of it!

On June 30 last, the fiscal year ended with the biggest peacetime Federal deficit in history—around \$12.5 billion.

Total 6-year Eisenhower deficit—\$19.4 billion versus record of first 6 Truman years—\$3.7 billion surplus.

Public debt: When Truman departed, \$267 billion. On June 30 last, \$284 billion.

Cost of interest on public debt: In Truman's last full fiscal year, \$5.8 billion. Requested by Eisenhower for fiscal 1960, \$8.6 billion (up half a billion from his January estimate). The total Federal budget in 1959 for all purposes was \$7.9 billion.

**Public Opinion Has Shaped the Record
of Accomplishments of This Session of
the 86th Congress**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, we are close enough to adjournment to be able to evaluate the record of this 1st session of the 86th Congress.

In this connection, recently the question was directed to me in a press interview as to whether the record of accomplishment was good or bad.

My reply was, "Not bad."

Then I was asked whether the credit for this record should be given to the Democrats or the Republicans.

"The credit should go to the public" was my answer, because, as I said, it was public opinion, most of all, that wrote the record of this Congress and kept it from being bad. I also attributed great credit to President Eisenhower for his leadership and the fact that by his press conferences and otherwise he stimulated discussions in the press and the expression of public opinion.

The question was raised following this remark as to whether the 86th has been a budget-busting Congress, and with proper and due recognition of the efforts of the House Appropriations Committee, I said we could have a balanced budget in fiscal 1960, especially if the present high rate of prosperity continues so that the Federal revenue from taxes will exceed \$80 billion.

Also, I expressed the belief that, thanks to public opinion favoring the President's "hold the line" on Federal spending programs, the threat of inflation has diminished. I responded also by stating my opinion that the best bulwark against inflation is public ownership of U.S. Savings Bonds.

Mr. Speaker, recently on the NBC radio and television program "Meet the Press" the distinguished former President of the United States, the Honorable Herbert Hoover, expressed the opinion that our country is in more imminent danger from internal causes than from the cold war.

He cited inflation, unbalanced budgets, and overspending by Congress as being some of the domestic dangers.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with Mr. Hoover that those are dangers, and that is why I have constantly resisted pressures to increase Federal spending. Moreover, as I have just inferred, I believe the net result of the efforts of those of us in Congress who have opposed new programs calling for excessive expenditures have been successful overall in this Congress.

Herbert Hoover was on the eve of his 85th birthday at the time of that TV interview. His appraisal of the domestic situation is worth noting. He mentioned the dangers from within, but he was not pessimistic; and we can all take a lesson

of courage and faith out of his experience and words of wisdom.

He was asked:

Have these things weakened us so much that we can't stand out strong against Russia?

To which he replied:

No, I wouldn't want anybody to think for a moment that the American people are not capable of solving any crisis. As a matter of fact, this Nation is now in its 183d year, and it has lasted longer than any representative Government. It has gone through seven wars, has gone through three great depressions.

Mr. Hoover mentioned that we have had some bad administrations in Washington, and we have had evil days on account of wars which produced a series of crises. But he concluded as follows:

And yet, after all that, we still have of the original heritage of the American people a very large part of what the forefathers established. We still have a freedom of religion, freedom of press, freedom of assembly, freedom of enterprise within the limits of some socialistic tack; freedom of speech within the limits of very mild laws on the subject. Generally we possess today the same vitality that gave us the initiative and the ability to solve these crises that we have had in the past.

Mr. Speaker, like Mr. Hoover I have faith in the American people. Perhaps sometimes I feel Congress is not acting wisely. However, as this session of Congress indicates, generally the thinking of the public prevails and I believe the judgment of the people, where they are given the facts, is sound. Yes, I give credit for the accomplishments and record of this Congress and this session to the force of public opinion. As to partisan credit or criticism, I think Republican and Democratic Members of Congress alike can be counted on to debate that issue after adjournment. Instead, I conclude these remarks with the personal comment that service in this House this session, as it always is, has been a privilege and challenge. Individually and collectively we are honored beyond measure to be Members of the greatest legislative body in the world. For that honor I am grateful and only hope my service has merited and justified the judgment of the fine friends and people who sent me here.

Labor Reform Legislation

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, to eliminate any misunderstanding of my position, which may have resulted from my votes on the labor reform legislation passed by the House of Representatives, I think an explanation is in order.

I would like to begin by saying that I am well aware that labor reform legislation is necessary to prevent the continuation of the racketeering and corruption brought to light by the McClellan

committee hearings. However, it must be borne in mind that this condition exists in only a minority of the unions; the vast majority of unions, their leaders and members are, like most people, fine, upstanding, law-abiding citizens.

The House Committee on Education and Labor held extensive hearings on all pending labor reform bills and considered them for approximately 4 months. The bill finally reported by the committee, H.R. 8342, was the result of comprehensive consideration and was designed to do away with the evil practices of corruption, boycotting, hot-cargo handling, and blackmail picketing. It was also designed to protect the union members from being victimized by unscrupulous leaders and the general public from unscrupulous racketeers.

The Landrum-Griffin bill was introduced after the committee reported its bill and did not have the benefit of committee hearings and consideration. Although these bills were widely discussed and debated, I sincerely doubt that they were given sufficient consideration to secure a comprehensive understanding of their impact. Personally, I believe this is a punitive measure.

Passage of the Landrum bill was, I believe, a result of appeal to emotions, rather than logic and commonsense. These were my reasons for voting against this measure when it was offered as a substitute for the committee bill.

When the Landrum bill came up for final passage, I voted in favor of it, knowing that some labor reform legislation was needed and should be enacted. This bill will now go to conference to iron out the differences between the Senate- and House-passed versions. I hope a reasonable and sensible solution to the problem will be achieved which will result in a bill that is fair and just to the unions, union members, and the welfare of the Nation. Such a bill should not penalize the vast majority of unions and union members who are not guilty of illegal and reprehensible practices and, at the same time, should curb the evils pointed out by the Senate Rackets Committee.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Greenville: Industry and Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a willingness to tackle and solve local problems at the local level is always commendable.

Citizens of Greenville, Tex., with courage and foresight, faced the problem of assuring an adequate supply of water for domestic and industrial use.

Through their elected city officials, citizens of Greenville successfully attacked the problem.

The story of this achievement is related in an editorial entitled "Greenville: Industry and Water," that appeared August 9, 1959, in the Greenville Herald-Banner. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

GREENVILLE: INDUSTRY AND WATER

Economic and marketing experts have joined the industrial forecasters in proclaiming that water supply and availability are great factors and will become even greater factors in industrial development during the next few years.

In the race for industry, Greenville need not take a back seat to any community when water flows into the picture.

Thanks to the foresight of Greenville city councils who have served in the past and the men now serving, this community will be able to boast of a supply of upward of 30 million gallons daily and can point now to storage of almost 2 billion gallons in reservoirs today. That's beacoup water.

Greenville is to build soon an intake structure at Lake Tawakoni (formerly known as Iron Bridge Reservoir). It has an agreement whereby we have first call on up to 21 millions of gallons daily once the gaping hole that will be the reservoir takes on water. While the cost to build a line from the reservoir site to Greenville will run between \$1½ and \$2 million, the future industrial development it promises makes the amount somewhat significant.

Industry is already looking at Greenville and the eye they turn toward this community becomes increasingly favorable. Some will be users of tremendous amounts of water. Others are looking for water, location, highway and rail facilities. Greenville has all of these and additional assets not on the list of many communities.

But competition for major industries and industry of any substantial size and payroll is intense. That means that community attitude and desire again rears two heads and Greenville has the right attitude and an intense desire to grow.

While the city administration is currently engaged in a money saving and an efficiency program at some levels, only an idiot would begin to harbor the illusion that Greenville can meet the needs of expansion demanded by the future with a pinchpenny budget and a pennywise, pound-foolish attitude. Progress does cost money, and we can only say it is to the credit of Greenville to save money being spent foolishly or without return and direct it into channels that will return dividends. Growth dividends to include new industry, more families and payrolls. More good, solid citizens and improved facilities and services.

The United Nations and a Bold Suggestion for the Use of Surplus Food Commodities for Economic and Social Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, much has been written of late concerning an international food for peace plan and I would like to call the attention of Congress to a bold yet practical suggestion advanced on this subject by Mr. Glen Leet, program director for the Save the Children Federation, with offices in Norwalk, Conn., and New York City.

Recently, Mr. Leet testified in behalf of a suggestion that the United Nations should assume a role of great importance with respect to the use of commodities in ways which will hold many millions of people at a minimum standard of living and some marginal level of productivity.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to introduce into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following excerpts from Mr. Leet's testimony in support of his suggestion:

Through the U.N. there can be accomplished the international discussion of the problems, principles, and methods which are involved. There can be multilateral discussions and hearings in which all nations will have an opportunity to study and discuss the plans brought forward by individual countries. The outcome to a contributing country is that they would have assurance that the plans to which they contributed were those based on a thoroughgoing study, that there would be plans that have survived in an international discussion and plans in which any objections from other countries could have already been taken into consideration. The U.N. is in a unique position to exercise a role of value both to the surplus-producing countries and to those

which can utilize such surpluses in their development programs. It can—

(a) Provide a forum for the formulation of internationally accepted and generally applicable policies;

(b) Provide a center for receiving applications;

(c) Refer applications to appropriate U.N. agencies for technical appraisal;

(d) Hold hearings enabling interested governments to express themselves on specific proposals;

(e) Transmit to the executing governments internationally approved courses of action, with respect both to commodities and to the use of local currencies derived therefrom, and with indications of available relevant U.N. technical services for economic and social development.

The provision of such international facilities is a very great service to any nation concerned with the constructive use of surplus commodities. Actions taken by such a process, by either donor or recipient countries, will be much less subject to suspicion and distrust. They would remove much of the criticism directed against the contributing country when such arrangements are made on a bilateral basis.

The U.N. should not become involved in the complexities of receiving, storing, and transporting, or in any way physically handling or paying for the handling of such surpluses. Surplus-producing countries already have facilities for this which should not be duplicated.

MAJOR RESPONSIBILITIES

The creation of any new agencies is undesirable. The existing facilities should be used. Within the U.N. framework the major responsibilities should be with those instrumentalities of the U.N. which are primarily concerned with economic and social development. The major concerns are hunger and the need of the underdeveloped areas to eliminate the causes of underprivilege through development.

The major responsibility should not be delegated to FAO because its chief concern is not with economic and social development. The problem will not be solved if the central focus is on agricultural commodities. It can be effectively solved only if surpluses are considered as but one of the resources to be utilized in a comprehensive approach to development.

The use of commodities for development is sound only as a supplement to general development programs reinforced with adequate technical services. Therefore, surpluses cannot be considered as a substitute for member country contributions to the U.N. Special Fund, the expanded program of technical assistance or to the specialized agencies.

It is desirable that local currencies resulting from the sale of such commodities should be made available for economic and social development purposes and for technical assistance services provided by the U.N., the U.N. Special Fund, or the U.N. specialized agencies. Such local currencies should be available to the U.N. in addition to and not as a substitute for normal commitments.

An unprecedented opportunity presents itself at this time for utilization of U.N. facilities in a way which can greatly magnify the effectiveness of the U.N. and the U.N. Special Fund.

Parallel Between Highway Bridges at Mackinac Strait and Columbia River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a great discussion prevails in the Pacific Northwest over whether or not to construct a \$27 million bridge across the mouth of the mighty Columbia River between Astoria, Oreg., and Megler, Wash.

My own State of Oregon has taken the lead in authorizing bonds to help finance this huge structure on U.S. 101, the Pacific coast highway, but thus far our sister State of Washington has been reluctant to do likewise.

As a member of the Roads and Highways Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate, I have tried to do my best to encourage construction of the great structure because I believe it would do wonders for our seacoast economy in the region. Proof now is demonstrated of this belief, in the economic gains brought to Michigan's Upper Peninsula by the \$99,800,000 bridge recently opened across Mackinac Strait.

An illuminating article in the New York Times for August 16, 1959, has described how the Mackinac Bridge attracted 1,390,390 automobiles during its first partial year of operation as contrasted with only 938,282 cars in the last year that ferry boats served the area. Furthermore, the Mackinac Bridge Authority is encountering no difficulty in meeting interest charges and all the necessary operating costs.

Because of the parallel with the proposed Astoria bridge across the mouth of the great Columbia River, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record, the New York Times article entitled "Mackinac Bridge Spurs Economy."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MACKINAC BRIDGE SPURS ECONOMY—TRAFFIC RUNNING 11 PERCENT BEHIND 1958, BUT BUSINESS ON PENINSULA IS BOOMING

ST. IGNACE, MICH., August 15.—In its first 25 months Michigan's Mackinac Bridge has operated in the black, pumped new life into the economy of the upper peninsula and established itself as the State's No. 1 tourist attraction.

Despite an almost universal feeling in Michigan's northland that the 5-mile-long steel span over the Mackinac Strait has brought a new era of tourism, it must be noted that bridge traffic this summer is running about 11 percent behind that of a year ago.

But the traffic is about 50 percent greater than that carried by State ferries that formerly provided the only access to the upper peninsula from lower Michigan.

This means that several hundred thousands more tourists are pouring into the small upper peninsula communities amid the green forests, hundreds of lakes and trout streams and areas connected by generally good highways.

ROOMS HARD TO GET

Responding to this relatively sudden influx, businessmen have built numerous new motels, restaurants, gift shops, and tourist attractions. But in this northern terminus of the bridge, motel rooms are still hard to get and visitors often have to stand in line while waiting for a table in restaurants.

"I can fill my 40 units by 11 a.m. every day," said one St. Ignace motel operator, who refuses to hold reservations for late afternoon arrivals.

At Ste. Paul Marie, a chamber of commerce official commented, "Oh, brother, if you wait until 6 p.m. to get a motel room, you're in trouble."

W. Stewart Woodfill, chairman of the Mackinac Island State Park Commission and owner of the Grand Hotel, a showplace on the island, estimates that the number of persons visiting the island has increased about 35 percent since the bridge was opened.

MANY TOURISTS DRIVE

Steamboats for that scenic spot leave from Mackinaw City, at the southern terminus of the bridge, or from this city at the northern terminus. But many tourists drive northward across the bridge—with an auto toll of \$3.25—and take a trip to the island from St. Ignace before going elsewhere on the upper peninsula. A ferry line is operating this year also, providing a tremendously increased capacity for island travelers.

In July the Mackinac Bridge Authority grossed nearly a million dollars in tolls and showed signs of catching up with last year's traffic, according to Prentiss M. Brown, chairman of the authority.

The traffic total in July was 273,558 vehicles and revenues were \$987,336. By comparison, traffic in July, 1958, the first month after the bridge's dedication, was 307,838 vehicles and revenues were \$1,082,885. The bridge was opened in November 1957, but was not dedicated formally until the following June.

In 1958, the first full calendar year of the bridge's operation, traffic totaled 1,390,390 cars and brought in revenue of \$5,132,958. This compared with traffic of 938,283 and revenues of \$3,664,047 for 1957, including 10 months of ferry operation and 2 months of bridge traffic and revenue.

Engineering studies prior to the bridge's construction estimated that traffic during the first year would reach about 1,850,000. Although this forecast proved too optimistic, the authority is having no trouble meeting its interest charges and operating costs.

Interest on the bonds for the \$99,800,000 bridge amounts to \$4,242,000 annually. This includes \$79,800,000 in 4 percent bonds and \$20 million in 5¼ percent bonds. Operational costs are budgeted at \$600,000 but \$417,000 of this total is paid by the Michigan State Highway Department.

OUTLOOK IS GOOD

Last year the authority spent \$588,000 in operating the bridge and thus had to pay \$171,000 above what the highway department provided.

Interest charges and operating expenses of the authority totaled \$4,413,000, nearly \$720,000 less than incoming revenue.

Lawrence A. Rubin, executive secretary of the bridge authority, is optimistic about the

future. He thinks the original traffic bulge resulting from curiosity is decreasing and normal tourist traffic is increasing.

"I can't see anything ahead that would jeopardize our financial position," he said. "Our traffic should grow as new recreational facilities and tourist attractions are developed."

Lyndon Johnson Reviews Sound Spending Policies of Democratic Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the face of unwarranted charges of wasteful spending by the Democratic Congresses which have served during the present administration, the Senate majority leader has helped give the American people the true facts about fiscal responsibility.

Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON has forcefully outlined that during the last 5 fiscal years Congress has reduced the President's budget requests by more than \$10 billion. It is estimated that the House and Senate will add substantial savings to that figure for fiscal year 1960.

Senator JOHNSON has also reminded the American people that the Democratic Congress has not approved one single dollar's spending by any backdoor procedure that the President himself did not request or approve.

Commending the Senate majority leader for setting the record straight, the Beaumont (Tex.) Enterprise has reviewed Senator JOHNSON's statements for the past few years regarding the national budget. Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit this editorial of August 11, 1959, in today's Record so that every Member of the House and Senate may have an opportunity to review this constructive record compiled by our Democratic leadership:

CONGRESS AND THE SPENDING RECORD

Senate Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON is increasingly resentful of having the Democrats labeled the party of spending, a common practice of the Republicans these days.

It must also make him unhappy to have the same accusing finger pointed at him as an individual. He is convinced that, in both instances, some of the GOP backers of President Eisenhower's budget-balancing campaign are engaging in talk that cannot be justified at all.

Furthermore, the Texan is jealous of the good name of Congress, a commendable attitude, and it irks him no end to have the executive branch laying so much blame for the country's financial difficulties at the door of the National Legislature.

Senator JOHNSON said months ago that more than \$10 billion were whittled by Congress from budget recommendations in the last 5 fiscal years. And he has cited both figures and personal remarks that give convincing support.

Here are some CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reports of budget statements made by the Texas lawmaker back in 1957:

March 8: After indicating that a survey made in Texas favored a reduction in the budget, Senator JOHNSON said his efforts would be directed toward that end.

May 1: Senator JOHNSON pointed out the inconsistency in statements made by members of the executive branch; some responsible Cabinet officers recommending that the budget be cut, but when cuts were made in the House, asking the Senate to restore them. He further said he was going to vote his convictions and not vote for any grant that could not be fully justified.

May 8: In commenting on the budget Senator JOHNSON said, "We cannot cut the budget without cutting spending, and we cannot adopt one course in January and another course in May."

July 11: Senator JOHNSON, in discussing the battle of the budget, provided figures which indicate reductions approaching \$4 billion—or 6.4 percent—from the President's budget that was submitted to us in January.

Following are some CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reports of budget statements by the Senate majority leader in 1959:

January 20: Senator JOHNSON, in referring to the President's budget message, stated: "This is not a balanced budget. It is a propaganda budget. . . . This budget would spend substantially more than current income. . . . Both prudence and candor require that this budget be given a most searching study by the Congress."

February 5: Senator JOHNSON said: "I am going to work as diligently as I can, as leader of the majority, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, to get the budget in balance."

February 9: Senator JOHNSON stated: "I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks a summary of the President's budget estimates and the appropriations of the Congress . . . showing that the Congress has reduced the budget estimate in each one of the last 6 years. The total appropriation was \$22.6 billion less than the Congress was asked to appropriate."

February 9: Senator JOHNSON said: "I do not think that either party should be labeled as the party of the savers or the party of the spenders, but the record does show that the Congress as an institution has been much more saving in its appropriations than the Executive has been in its requests for appropriations."

February 16: Senator JOHNSON stated he felt that a distorted picture was being presented of one branch wanting to hold the line on spending—and the other branch wanting to spend. He pointed out the President has asked for increases in budget estimates—such as 26 percent for foreign aid, 80 percent for OCDM, and many others.

May 28: Senator JOHNSON, following final action on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill for 1960, stated: "The Committee on Appropriations has made many reductions, in fact the committee has taken such action each year since the President assumed office. The President of the United States, good, kindly, economical man that he is, has never submitted to Congress a budget which Congress has not reduced."

June 9: Senator JOHNSON assured Senator Bush that, "It is not a new-found desire of the majority leader to stay within the budget. The majority leader stated last fall that he hoped we could stay within the budget. . . . I have stated on the floor of the Senate and in public meetings all over the country that I hoped this Congress would appropriate less money than the President asked the Congress to appropriate."

June 16: Senator JOHNSON inserted in the Record his newsletter, dated February 10, 1959, in which he had recounted over a \$10 billion budget cut by Congress during the last 5 fiscal years. The newsletter promised that: "The Senate this year will take the same hard look at the budget recommendations."

July 9: Senator JOHNSON, during a discussion of the housing veto, stated: "Let me say a word about the appropriations bills. . . . In some cases, as I stated last fall when I met with the President, I believe the Congress will actually vote appropriations less than those the President recommended. That prediction has been borne out by the appropriation bills passed thus far."

The majority leader is still convinced that this session of Congress will appropriate less money than requested by the President, since it has been done in the past without jeopardizing national security and without illogical spite work.

Domestic Surplus Property Donations for Education, Health, and Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recent press release of Secretary Flemming of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which indicates that personal property in the amount of \$126,822,683. Acquisition cost, was made available to the States for purposes of education, health, and civil defense during the period April 1 through June 30, 1959. During the same period real property in the amount of \$3,211,895 was donated for these purposes.

This is the largest quarterly program we have had and indicates better organization at all levels and the continued declaration of surplus property by the military agencies. It is to be noted that the State of New York had the highest total of \$16,065,988 for the quarter and this, with the overall increase in volume, bespeaks the added impetus given to the program by my colleagues on the Special Subcommittee on Donable Property, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY], and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN].

Mr. Speaker, though the domestic donable surplus property program is large, with allocations of \$261 million for the entire fiscal year 1959, it should be larger. Our eligible institutions need much more property which is being sold at small return to the taxpayer.

Unfortunately, we have not yet developed a program to utilize excess overseas property for purposes of education and health. It is expected that the volume of this excess property will amount to \$1.4 billion acquisition cost in the current fiscal year.

The release of Secretary Flemming follows:

Surplus property for which the Federal Government paid \$130,034,578 was made available to the States for educational, public health, and civil defense purposes during April, May, and June 1959, by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Real property accounted for \$3,211,895 and personal property for \$126,822,683.

Secretary Arthur S. Flemming announced the totals in making his quarterly report to Congress on the Department's surplus property program.

Property no longer needed by the Federal Government is distributed, under the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to educational and public health agencies and civil defense organizations of State and local governments, and to eligible nonprofit health and educational institutions exempt from Federal taxes. Regional offices of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and various State agencies channel the surplus property to the institutions.

Property transferred to the States includes such items as school and hospital building sites; buildings suitable for college dormitory or faculty housing; motor vehicles; hospital, school, and office furniture; hand and machine tools; motion picture projectors; laboratory equipment; and school and office supplies.

The following is a State-by-State list of real and personal property distributed, April-June 1959. State surplus property agencies can furnish details on the operation of the program within their States.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Personal property made available for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations and real property disposed of to public health and educational institutions, Apr. 1 through June 30, 1959 (acquisition cost)

[In accordance with sec. 203(o), Public Law 152, 81st Cong., as amended]

States	Personal property	Real property	Total
Total.....	\$126,822,683	\$3,211,895	\$130,034,578
Alabama.....	4,617,794	30,555	4,648,350
Alaska.....	564,070	69,300	633,370
Arizona.....	687,302	18,904	706,206
Arkansas.....	884,359	11,825	896,184
California.....	9,779,736	225,351	10,005,087
Colorado.....	583,729	71,894	655,623
Connecticut.....	1,305,847	24,777	1,330,624
Delaware.....	724,427	—	724,427
Florida.....	6,765,814	24,090	6,789,904
Georgia.....	2,492,642	—	2,492,642
Idaho.....	684,112	—	684,112
Illinois.....	5,842,006	35,700	5,877,706
Indiana.....	2,835,189	1,625	2,836,814
Iowa.....	2,137,380	3,310	2,140,690
Kansas.....	1,431,046	97,625	1,528,671
Kentucky.....	1,725,509	—	1,725,509
Louisiana.....	1,391,063	27,000	1,418,063
Maine.....	803,949	—	803,949
Maryland.....	2,409,444	89,564	2,499,008
Massachusetts.....	5,164,538	—	5,164,538
Michigan.....	3,436,632	—	3,436,632
Minnesota.....	2,870,641	—	2,870,641
Mississippi.....	2,382,011	116,090	2,498,101
Missouri.....	1,908,116	89,238	1,997,354
Montana.....	316,027	4,557	320,584
Nebraska.....	706,137	29,660	735,797
Nevada.....	208,118	—	208,118
New Hampshire.....	544,318	—	544,318
New Jersey.....	2,398,317	3,000	2,401,317
New Mexico.....	1,096,801	237,155	1,333,956
New York.....	16,023,454	42,534	16,065,988
North Carolina.....	3,524,609	5,967	3,530,576
North Dakota.....	150,527	—	150,527
Ohio.....	4,450,696	6,600	4,457,296
Oklahoma.....	2,574,952	516,143	3,091,095
Oregon.....	1,128,967	10,000	1,138,967
Pennsylvania.....	7,507,606	—	7,507,606
Rhode Island.....	603,897	—	603,897
South Carolina.....	1,919,650	—	1,919,650
South Dakota.....	264,779	3,600	268,379
Tennessee.....	3,116,843	36,137	3,153,000
Texas.....	4,227,562	884,503	5,112,065

Personal property made available for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations and real property disposed of to public health and educational institutions, Apr. 1 through June 30, 1959 (acquisition cost)—Continued

[In accordance with sec. 203(o), Public Law 152, 81st Cong., as amended]

States	Personal property	Real property	Total
Utah	\$1,427,488		\$1,427,488
Vermont	209,587	\$33,786	333,343
Virginia	3,041,476	96,349	3,137,825
Washington	2,212,494	19,086	2,231,580
West Virginia	1,344,802		1,344,802
Wisconsin	2,415,031		2,415,031
Wyoming	294,642		294,642
District of Columbia	510,858		510,858
Hawaii	300,276	345,970	646,246
Puerto Rico	665,393		665,393

Traffic Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, traffic safety is a matter of national interest and national concern.

With increased interest in this problem has come growing recognition of a new facet of highway travel. This is called turnpike driving.

The Abilene Reporter-News, in an editorial carried August 10, 1959, discussed this matter. I ask unanimous consent, in the interest of promoting safer driving, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TURNPIKE DRIVING

As the new network of superhighways spreads (despite temporary slowdowns such as now threatens) all of us motorists around the country will need to change some driving habits, the safety experts tell us. We'll need to learn how to be turnpike drivers.

Here in the Abilene area we have more than the average number of miles of new roads already in use. As soon as the redtape is untangled, Highway Engineer Jake Roberts and his fellow workers will have our town astraddle big Interstate 20.

Enough of Interstate 20 has been in use long enough for us to realize that you can't build a highway which will be accident-proof. Not as long as you let automobiles driven by human beings use it. You can divide the traffic lanes, control the access, make it wide and straight as you please, and still you'll have wrecks.

There's more to being a good turnpike driver than just fighting off monotony. For one thing, the superroad automatically steps up the average speed of the cars on it—legally, as in some cases; illegally in many others.

The students of safety point out that one of the commonest mistakes in driving on the turnpikes is in the technique of passing another car. In city traffic or in traffic on an old-style highway a driver usually has

little choice but to pass from close behind another vehicle. You dart around when you can.

That tactic can be dangerous, even fatal, on a turnpike. At high speed, a motorist has no business being close on another's heels. Turnpikes are designed for lane traffic. If you swing out sharply from behind a car to pass it from a close position, you run the risk of suddenly blocking the path of a fast car coming up in the left-hand lane.

The main thing to remember in driving on a turnpike is that the average speed is faster and the smallest error can, therefore, be magnified almost instantly into a tremendous crash.

Alabama Department, American Legion, Supports Roberts Bill, H.R. 6671

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, on April 27 I introduced H.R. 6671, to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the child of an insured individual, after attaining age 18, may receive child's insurance benefits until he attains age 22 if he is a student attending school.

This to me is sensible legislation which would greatly aid a number of young people and their families all over the country, and which would contribute to educational achievement.

I was delighted to learn that the Department of Alabama of the American Legion has adopted at its annual convention a resolution strongly approving this bill, and urging congressional approval.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this resolution:

RESOLUTION 5

Whereas there is pending before Congress a measure, H.R. 6671, to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the child of an insured individual, after attaining the age of 18, may receive a child's insurance benefits until they attain the age of 22 if he is a student attending full-time school and making satisfactory grades; and

Whereas the youth of this Nation are the very backbone and most precious resource that God has given our country; and

Whereas the Legislature and Alabama Senate has passed a similar resolution: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Alabama Department of the American Legion in its annual convention in Birmingham, Ala., meeting July 19 through 21, 1959, send letters over the signature of the department commander to our Congressmen and Senators in Washington, D.C., to endeavor to their fullest extent that H.R. 6671 be passed and that a copy of this resolution be mailed to each of the Congressmen and Senators and the Honorable Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate, the Honorable RICHARD NIXON.

This resolution was presented by Post No. 105, Goodwater, Ala., and adopted by the resolutions committee.

Statement by U.S. National Student Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, during the debate upon the bill introduced by Senator CLARK and myself, to repeal section 1001(f) of the National Defense Education Act, the question was asked whether the students themselves objected to the oath and affidavit requirements of this act. Since that debate, the U.S. National Student Association, which represents over 1,300,000 students, has adopted a resolution opposing the oath and affidavit requirements. The resolution expresses the hope that the Senate will see fit to reconsider the action by which it referred the bill to committee.

In order that the attitude of the representatives of American students should be called to the attention of this body, I ask unanimous consent that the statement made by the association be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION STATEMENT CONCERNING SECTION 1001(f), NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

The U.S. National Student Association, a confederation of over 390 student bodies and representing over 1,300,000 students, continually has supported efforts to strike from the National Defense Education Act section 1001(f) which requires students entering into the terms of the act to pledge an oath of allegiance and to file an affidavit disclaiming any membership in an allegedly subversive group or belief in allegedly subversive principles. The Senate's recent action in referring consideration of the desirability or necessity of section 1001(f) back to committee, rendering further Senate consideration of the section highly unlikely during the present session of Congress, is considered by USNSA as irresponsible and lacking in the fortitude expected of the U.S. Senate.

By its action, the Senate effectively rejected three viable, realistic alternatives to section 1001(f)—the proposals of Senators KENNEDY, MUNDT, and JAVITS; in doing so, it clearly dictated against the desires of students, student groups, educators, and educational groups, who have for months clearly indicated their distaste for and opposition to the section in question. The referral back to committee clearly ignores the fact that complete committee hearings have already been held and that these hearings indicated strong public support for the amendment of section 1001(f). The committee itself, in fact, voted 12 to 3 to recommend passage of Senator KENNEDY's proposal which would have stricken the section from the act. The Senate's decision, at best, indicates only the unwillingness of the Senate to face a fundamental question directly related to the freedom of the individual.

Because section 1001(f) apparently is meant to remain in the National Defense Education Act, it is safe to assume that a significant number of students, otherwise eligible under the terms of the act, will be dis-

criminated against, not because they are subversive, but because they are opposed in principle to the Federal Government requiring or restricting certain actions or beliefs vis-a-vis a disclaimer affidavit. Such a measure enacted on the part of the Government seems to the USNSA to be an example of employing totalitarian methods to oppose totalitarianism. Democracy, thus weakened, is a poor opponent of totalitarianism itself or of the processes of subversion.

USNSA's 12th National Student Congress, which meets at the University of Illinois during the last 2 weeks of August, will be asked to consider and bring its full weight against the Senate's action. USNSA hopes that the Senate will see fit to reconsider its action, to face the controversial section 1001(f) directly, and to revise it in the light of the fundamental principles of freedom and democracy.

Religious Education and Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DALE ALFORD

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following outstanding address by the Reverend John L. Murphy:

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AND DEMOCRACY

(Address delivered on the program "This Nation Under God," over WMAL radio station, Washington, D.C., Sunday, July 19, 1959, by Rev. John L. Murphy, S.T.D., department of religious education, associate editor, the American Ecclesiastical Review, the Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.)

A number of years ago, the U.S. Supreme Court issued a judgment concerning the released time program. This proposal would permit children in public schools to take religious instruction elsewhere during school hours. Among other things, the decree contained this thought-provoking statement:

"We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being. . . . When the state encourages religious instruction or cooperates with religious authorities by adjusting the schedule of public events to sectarian needs, it follows the best of our traditions. For it then respects the religious nature of our people and accommodates the public service to their spiritual needs."

"To hold that it may not, would be to find in the Constitution a requirement that the Government show a callous indifference to religious groups. That would be preferring those who believe in no religion over those who do believe. . . . We cannot read into the Bill of Rights such a philosophy of hostility to religion." (*Zorach v. Clauson*, Apr. 28, 1952.)

This statement of the Court was greeted as a welcome relief by those who have been terrified by the inroads of Godlessness into our national way of life. For many years, those who have been openly opposed to God and religion have been waging a battle against the foundations of faith, and they have, to a large extent, won the day.

America still faces the unsolved problem of the moral training of its young. On all sides we hear complaints that the younger generation is an unmanageable generation—it wallows in crime and delinquency, it has no ideals, no moral code, no standards. There

is, granted, a good amount of exaggeration in these complaints, but they are not entirely untrue. Quite the contrary, they ought to be expected. As people become less and less interested in religious and moral standards, it only stands to reason that they will eventually give up that more acceptable manner of living that is supported by those standards. When the religious creed is cast aside, the moral code soon follows; when a man no longer believes in God, he eventually begins to act as if there were no God. And no other force has ever been able to replace the rejected Deity: not fear of punishment, dread of public opinion, nor even love of country. When the true God has been cast aside, no faint image can take His place.

There have been some solutions proposed toward alleviating these problems. Released time instruction has been one; the denominational school is another. It is interesting to consider the purpose of the religious school in American democracy. The question, we must note, is not, as some would phrase it, a question of "Catholic schools" and "public schools." While Catholic education looms larger than others in this regard, it does not stand alone. Other religious groups foster their own denominational schools, and—what is most important in the democratic way of life—they do so because of the same basic principles as the Catholic populace. They do so because they have within them, the deep, personal conviction that education and religion cannot be treated in separate spheres.

The problem is a far deeper one than many people might suspect. It is not simply a matter of "doing things in a certain way." Quite the contrary, we are faced here with a question concerning the basic interpretation of our American way of life. Beneath the outer layer of legal disputes or emotional disagreements, or even at times, of bigotry, we can put our finger on a gigantic struggle that is going on between two completely different ways of thinking.

Fundamentally, as far as the basic principles are concerned, the struggle is between religion and irreligion; a way of faith versus secularism; God versus no-god. It is an attack upon the beliefs of all those who believe in God, and see Him as an important element in the democratic way of life.

Traditionally, America has been a religious-minded people. This belief is something which pertains to the law of the land, reaching back to those scripture-like phrases of the Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Creation and Creator are words of deep implication. They give evidence of a grasp of reality among our forefathers that penetrated to the very depths of their being, and became so much a part of them, that it overflowed into their labor of organizing a new nation upon this earth.

The denominational school, actually, exists as a living request that these religious ideals may not be cast aside. It is an alarming thing for the believer to realize that there are men and women in highly influential positions who believe that religion is not important, and that democracy can do very nicely without God.

He realizes, of course, that there are many people who chose to place God and religion in the same class with old wives' tales and savage superstitions. According to our democratic principles, they are entitled to such opinions. But the believer asks only that such an unwanted conclusion be not forced upon others who happen to disagree with it. The man of faith is thoroughly convinced that to separate religious tenets and American democracy is to be guilty of an

error in fact. The American way of life took root in the heart of a Christian people; it was formulated in terms that reflect those Christian principles. It was not a case of a Christian people who just happened, as it were, to fashion the American form of democracy. The connection between their faith and their form of life is far more intimate; the two are intertwined.

This is why the believer fears this denial of religion, not only for the sake of religion, but for the sake of democracy as well. Can we hope that our democratic way of life will continue unhampered, if we throw aside this element of religious belief that was originally so basic a part of its groundwork? That is the precise question.

Those American Christians who support a denominational school do not do so because they feel that the public school system is bad. It is not, by any means. But what they do fear, is the conspiracy of silence that has been built up around the public school system—a conspiracy of silence concerning God. Some will speak of it as a religious neutrality, but it is far more. As some would interpret our laws, the public school system would not only be indifferent to the differences between various religious groups; it would be indifferent to God Himself.

In many respects, this can be seen in the pattern of many a modern university as it exists in some circles. The sacred name of God has almost become a dirty word. He must not be mentioned. There is really a double standard involved in this procedure. A teacher in a modern State-run university (or even high-school) may include anything whatsoever in his view of life; and under the shield of "academic freedom" he may teach it—provided, however, that what he sees does not include God. He may, it is true, teach the true worth of man and the democratic way of life, as far as he is able to without mentioning God. But he must work within this limitation.

On the other hand, he may also teach athelms, communism and free love, and find defenders for his stand. Should anyone object, he will cry out "academic freedom," and claim that he is being persecuted and unjustly deprived of his rights. But should the professor in the adjoining classroom see as an essential part of reality, the existence of God and the need of religion, he is forbidden to say so. The banner of academic freedom is run down, and that of separation of church and state unfurls in its place—spelling out, in reality, separation of state from God.

There are those, therefore, who would not ask that our schools be turned into pulpits; but they do ask if God might not be given an equal chance on the campus and in the classroom, if God might not have the right to be mentioned and defended along with free love and communism.

As it can happen in practice, an agnostic may complain if a teacher in a public school mentions God; he has embarrassed his child. But is there not an equal right for the believer? If a teacher ridicules God and religion (either in an open manner or indirectly), can the devout Christian or Jewish parent not complain? Indeed American education will be in a sad state if one teacher may proclaim in the classroom that God is a myth and religion a fraud, and do so under the banner of "academic freedom," while if a teacher openly indicates that God does exist and is important, he will be stopped by these defenders of freedom, who will cry out that he has broken the law of separation of church and state.

These are the problems of the present age, the concerns of mothers and fathers, of teachers and ministers of religion, of all those who must look to the coming generation and its needs. As Dr. Edward McCrady, then president of the University of the South at Sewanee, Tenn.—an Episcopalian institu-

tion—remarked in 1955: "I ask no more for religion than I do for geography in the educational process; but I also ask for no less." This is the mind of many another in this field. In these days when such matters as personal hygiene and table manners are taught in schools, without the children ever hearing religion seriously considered there, they almost invariably will get the impression that religion, as Dr. McCrady expressed it, "isn't important enough for the Government to bother to pay anyone to discuss it."

In such a situation, there is at least a tacit assumption that religion and God are unimportant or unreal. It is this that disturbs the man of faith. For him, religion is not simply a part of life, a hobby, as it were. It is an all-consuming truth. It is his answer to the problems of the age, to the question of low moral standards, of delinquency, of failure to respect authority. Religion is important to man, and it is important to American democracy. It was so from the beginning and has continued to be important for many centuries.

Precisely because his faith is this all-consuming truth, the believer realizes that it must come to influence the whole man and pervade his entire view of human life. And as such, it has an essential role to play in the educational system of a God-given democracy.

Milwaukee Mayor Zeidler Answers Chicago Pollution Charge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the reply of the mayor of Milwaukee, Frank Zeidler, to Chicago's pollution charges.

Their being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In response to charges by Chicago officials that Chicago should have the right to divert water from Lake Michigan because Milwaukee has a beach pollution problem—a nonsequitur argument, I have the following observations to make:

Milwaukee is not alone with a lake pollution problem. Chicago probably has its own lake pollution problem. I have seen a very dirty flotsam and jetsam off Navy pier after a heavy rain and had no difficulty in identifying materials in the grayish, cloudy water. The Chicago River pollutes the lake also at times.

As for the suggestion by the sanitary district officials that the sanitary district engineers visit the Milwaukee area, as far as I am concerned, they are welcome any time to come to the city hall to discuss with me their and our problems. I feel sure sewerage commission officials would welcome them also.

However, I would expect, in return, an opportunity to visit their plants and to have our experts tell them how to treat their sludge, how to meter their water, and how to stop much of their industrial pollution so that at least they reach our level of purification, which they do not now do. Perhaps the exchange of visits might be mutually helpful. In the interim Chicago officials should agree with us that they will not seek additional water diversion.

The Sanitary District of Chicago persists in its efforts to divert more water from Lake Michigan, thus aggravating the pollution problem of every other Great Lakes city which must return its effluent to the Lakes after purification.

It should be pointed out that the sanitary district (by its demand for diversion, is proposing to flush still greater quantities of untreated or partially treated sewerage down the Illinois River, thus avoiding a nuisance for itself by creating one for the helpless neighbors down the river. They are making the downstream situation continually worse.

Milwaukee, it must be emphasized, has achieved the highest degree of purification possible under existing technology, and we recognize a water pollution problem exists; however, this is no justification for any community on the lakes demanding that it can therefore lower lake levels. Milwaukee will solve its problem without lowering lake levels and it is reasonable to expect Chicago to try to do the same.

Alabama Legislature Commends Congress on Farm Acreage Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of Alabama has gone on record as wholeheartedly endorsing the action of this House in passing H.R. 7740, the cotton acreage allotment bill.

Having strongly supported this legislation, I am pleased to call to the attention of the Members this resolution:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 29

By Messrs. Gilchrist, Solomon, Branyon, Harvey, Johnson (J. T. Tom), Oakley, Adams (Tallapoosa), Gilmer, Lee and Nichols.

Whereas House Resolution 7740, a Federal measure of vital concern to southern cotton farmers, has now been passed by the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas the provisions of House Resolution 7740 were recommended and endorsed by the Alabama Legislative Cotton Study Committee and many farmers, ginners, processors, and others, and is considered by them the most important piece of legislation introduced to remedy the grossly inequitable system of transferring cotton allotment acreage away from the South, the traditional cotton-growing area, to the new cotton-growing areas of the far west; and

Whereas the Members of Alabama's congressional delegation have worked diligently, unceasingly, and tirelessly to secure the passage of this measure by the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of Alabama, the Senate and House of Representatives jointly concurring, That we hereby express our grateful appreciation to the individuals composing Alabama's congressional delegation for their herculean and tenacious efforts, and congratulate them heartily on their momentous contribution to the welfare of the cotton farmers of the South.

Resolved further, That we extend special thanks to the press of Alabama, to the publishers of the Progressive Farmer, and to the many farmers, ginners, processors, and others who promoted and supported this important Federal legislation.

Resolved also, That duly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the Members of Alabama's congressional delegation, and that copies be released forthwith to the press.

Adopted by the house of representatives August 7, 1959.

Concurred in and adopted by the senate August 11, 1959.

Approved by the Governor August 12, 1959.

Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the importance of soil conservation is widely recognized.

The Gilmer (Tex.) Mirror on August 6, 1959, carried a story relating the work of a soil conservationist, John Tolbert, who is now engaged with other scientists in a statewide project mapping the soils of Texas.

Because of the significance of this work in conserving our natural resources, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HE'S MAPPING WIDE AREA—SCIENTIST STATIONED HERE SAMPLES SOIL

A soil scientist is now stationed in Gilmer and is serving Upshur County and six surrounding counties.

The soil scientist, John Tolbert, 23, came here from the Northeast Texas area headquarters office in Mount Pleasant. He is currently working on a statewide project to block-mapped Texas soils and to convert the process of survey to the standard soil survey map.

A more detailed survey than the soil conservation method, the standard soil survey gives each type soil a name and detailed description, Tolbert explained. It's a soil inventory.

Of some 14 counties in the northeast Texas area, Gregg and Upshur are the only counties that have not been converted to the standard soil survey, Tolbert said. However, he added, these two counties are expected to be converted sometime during the fall. Only six counties in the State have been completely converted.

A soil scientist's study of soil begins with the use of aerial photographs.

Then with samples of earth from selected spots he then determines the type of soil by measuring the texture and permeability, slope of the ground, and the amount of erosion, Tolbert explained.

A soil scientist works in cooperation with the work unit in each district, which in Upshur County is the Sabine River-Cypress Creek Soil Conservation District personnel. With information provided by soil scientists, the work units make recommendations to landowners for the best type of grass or legume for a particular type soil. Or if the land would grow trees better, that is suggested, Tolbert added.

This service, he said, is available for any farmer who is interested in and seeks help in improving his farm either by building ponds, sowing cover crops, or planting trees.

Of further aid to the farmer and rancher will be published reports containing detailed descriptions and characteristics of each type soil in the area with a complete coverage of the area in block maps.

Also containing lists of adaptable crops, recommended fertilizers, and expected yields, these reports will be available at the same time that the area adopts the standard soil survey. Tolbert commented.

There are two other soil scientists in the northeast Texas area—one at Clarksville serving the northern section, and another at Mount Pleasant serving the central counties. Besides Upshur, Tolbert's southern area includes Marion, Gregg, Smith, Wood, Rains, and part of Van Zandt Counties.

Prior to Tolbert's coming here, Upshur County was always served by soil scientists stationed in neighboring towns. Bill Walters, who is now area soil scientist in Gainesville, served this area from Tyler until January of this year.

Tolbert began work with the Mount Pleasant office in 1957 immediately after graduation from Texas Tech with a major in agronomy, a study of crops and soils and their relationship one to another. He is originally from Sherman and attended Tarleton State College in Stephenville for 2 years.

Tolbert assumed duties in the Gilmer office in early May. He and his wife moved here July 25 and are living in the Ira Gunn garage apartment on the Pritchett Highway.

our present-day progress and our contributions to the future.

The implication in Mr. JENSEN's statement that the people of the TVA area are accepting and living with a Communist institution in our midst impugns both the patriotism and the intelligence of our people, not only of Tennessee, but also of the other States served by the TVA and even their Representatives in the Congress. Therefore, in answer I denounce the implications of the statement placed in the RECORD by the gentleman from Iowa on August 10, last.

The people of our country, through their Congress, established the TVA some 25 years ago. Recently the Congress has voted by decisive majorities to continue this great institution in the service of our Nation.

Two years ago the Senate voted 61 to 20 to continue the TVA by providing a means for self-financing its power operations.

This year the Senate voted again in favor of TVA by a vote of 73 to 17. During this session the House voted for the TVA on two occasions by margins of 245 to 170 and 242 to 167.

A few days ago the President signed into law the new self-financing bill approved by the Congress. Thus, the people of this Nation have repeatedly endorsed the TVA over the years and, on recent occasions, in spite of Mr. JENSEN's opposition.

This victory was won in spite of the opposition of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]—and in fact his prediction that the bill would never become law. It is the law of the land today.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every one of those who voted in favor of the TVA bill and the President as well, in approving the measure, will resent strongly the implication that his vote and participation indicates any acceptance of any Communist ideas, as Mr. JENSEN would imply.

Mr. Speaker, I have my own reservations about Mr. Khrushchev's visit to our country. Personally, I do not think Mr. Khrushchev should have been invited to the United States. I see no reason why we should roll out the red carpet to those who have denounced our way of life and have dedicated themselves to the overthrow of democracy and our way of life. However, Mr. Khrushchev has been invited to become a guest of our country and should the President and the State Department include a visit to Tennessee in his itinerary, I will say to my colleague from Iowa that our people will proudly show the TVA to him—the world's greatest example of water resource development—where floods have been harnessed, navigation and commerce promoted and where great hydroelectric power dams produce low cost electricity for sale to the people and for the defense of our country. The TVA is one of the greatest showcases in America of democracy in action. Thousands of interested visitors annually come to visit and see this great system of rivers harnessed for the benefit of all the people of our Nation.

The TVA is not all that the people of Tennessee can show Mr. Khrushchev. We could proudly show him the great atomic energy plant where the atom was harnessed and where atomic energy was developed and the atomic bomb produced—the bomb that ended the war and saved the lives of millions of our own soldiers and those of our allies.

We could show him our great industries, farms and factories.

We could proudly show him our great educational institutions—the University of Tennessee, Vanderbilt University and a score of other great public and private colleges.

We could show him our great religious institutions—for ours is a State where religious freedom abounds to the fullest.

In Tennessee we could show him the homes and shrines of three great Presidents of the United States—Andrew Jackson, Andrew Johnson, and James K. Polk.

We could show him the mountains and hills and valleys from which the Volunteers marched forth to King's Mountain with Sevier to New Orleans with the immortal Andrew Jackson, and from which the sons of Tennessee have marched to every war for which our country has fought for freedom—freedom for ourselves and others.

In short, if Mr. Khrushchev comes to Tennessee we could show him at every turn a State where freedom is as natural and necessary to the lives of our people as the very air they breathe. We could show him a land of God fearing people, and churches and homes where Christianity abounds and communism is abhorred.

Thus, the implication in Mr. JENSEN's statement that if he visited the TVA area Mr. Khrushchev would find a little communistic island in our country is one which I highly resent, not only as an individual, but as the representative of the people of Tennessee.

I should point out that a few years ago a group of Soviet Russian agricultural experts, headed by the Soviet Minister of Agriculture, Vladimir Matskevich, visited the State of Iowa to inspect the great farms of that State—Mr. JENSEN's State. I recall that these officials, guests of our Nation, were accorded every proper courtesy while visiting in Iowa; and knowing the natural courtesy and hospitality of the fine people of Iowa, I am sure that these Soviet visitors were made to feel at home as much as possible under the circumstances.

Reports in the press at the time stated how much the visitors from Soviet Russia were impressed with the farms of Iowa. It would be ridiculous for anyone to imply that this common interest in farming evidenced any common interest on the part of the people from Iowa for collectivized farming or any other communistic ideas; but no more ridiculous than the aspersion about TVA which Mr. JENSEN makes in his statement.

The controversy about the TVA is old and has been bitter at times. I would be the first to defend any member's right to express himself fully and completely

Another Tirade Against TVA Answered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the strong feeling of our colleague from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] on the TVA. I am sure we all respect his right to hold and express his opinions on this and any other subject. But, Mr. Speaker, in his most recent expression under the heading "Khrushchev Would Feel at Home at TVA" appearing in the Appendix of the RECORD August 10 last, the gentleman from Iowa makes certain implications which as a Representative of the people of Tennessee, I cannot overlook and leave unanswered.

The people of Tennessee yield to no one in their devotion to the fundamental principles of our country and in their abhorrence of communism.

The people of Tennessee are patriots to the core. In fact, Tennessee has won the nickname of the "Volunteer State" because her sons have volunteered in such great numbers in all our wars to preserve our Nation and the principles for which it stands. Mr. Speaker, the people of Tennessee are notable for their rugged individualism and their devotion to liberty, freedom, democracy, and our great American way of life.

Tennessee is the Nation's most enchanting State. With TVA and our industries and agriculture we are building a sound economy and a high standard of living.

We are proud of our history, our traditions of the past—and we are proud of

on this subject—whether he is for the TVA or against the TVA. Mr. JENSEN is a known extremist on this subject and we have respected his right to be extreme. But, Mr. Speaker, I submit that there are limits to intemperance on this or any other matter; and in this instance, the gentleman from Iowa, in my opinion, is exceeding those limits. In so doing he has not only impugned the good people of my State and the South, and the Members of this body, but has also done a disservice to the people of his own great State of Iowa—whose Governor recently publicly stated that the views of Mr. JENSEN did not represent the views of the people and citizens of Iowa. Tirades and extremism and attacks on our American institutions must be answered and stopped in the interest of preserving America.

Increasing Our Cultural Relations With Eastern Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the visit of Vice President Nixon to the Soviet Union and Poland and the announcement of the exchange of visits between Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Eisenhower have created a new international climate in which anxiety and expectation are mingled. On balance I am convinced that the exchange of visits between the heads of state of the two chief adversaries in the world struggle will be a good thing. I believe Mr. Nixon's visit to Poland has strengthened the ties between that country and our own. Recently I have proposed as an amendment to the Mutual Security Act the building of a children's hospital in Kraków with counterpart funds credited to Poland.

In our preoccupation with the increased tempo of interchange with Poland and the U.S.S.R., we may be in danger of overlooking the other countries of Eastern Europe such as Czechoslovakia and Hungary. On August 5, an editor in the Washington Post and Times Herald said that "this newspaper hopes that the [Nixon] visit to Warsaw will be the beginning of an American policy of paying more attention to the countries of Eastern Europe."

Mr. President, I think the time has come for use to explore the possibility of increased cultural and intellectual contacts with all eastern European countries. The opportunities for this are not, of course, so great as those in Poland, but I believe that an approach can and should be made.

A few days ago a proposal for strengthening American-Hungarian cultural relations came to my attention. It was written by Dr. Bernadotte E.

Schmitt, professor emeritus of modern history of the University of Chicago. I think this modest proposal, which recommends donations of books from the United States to Hungarian libraries, the exchange of publications and eventually the exchange of scholarships between the two countries, is worthy of most serious consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Dr. Schmitt's proposal and the editorial from the August 5 Washington Post and Times Herald printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proposal and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSAL FOR STRENGTHENING AMERICAN-HUNGARIAN CULTURAL RELATIONS

(By Bernadotte E. Schmitt)

In the last several years it became apparent that there is a deep feeling of need for a development of organized cultural relations on broader scale between the United States and Hungary. The encouraging success of the present American program in Poland suggests a similar approach in Hungary. Although the present Hungarian Government follows a different course from that of the Polish Government in relation to official contacts between the two countries, this does not preclude the possibility of a cultural approach with official Hungarian cooperation.

I submit the following proposal for the serious consideration of the U.S. Government.

I. BOOK DONATIONS

I propose that a selected group of Hungarian libraries should receive, as a gift of the United States, a well-balanced selection of American books and serial publications ranging in number from 500 to 2,000.

I would suggest that the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and the National Széchenyi Library, both in Budapest, receive the largest contingent, perhaps 2,000 books each. The 14 university libraries should be given 1,200 to 1,500 titles and some 40 other important libraries, including the National Medical Library, the National Technical Library, the National Agricultural Library, and the National Pedagogical Library (established in 1958) should receive 500 selected titles.

The selection of these materials could be done by a small committee of scholars who know both American resources and Hungarian needs.

The following scholars have expressed their willingness to serve on such a committee if they are requested to do so:

Dr. Elemer Bako, Hungarian reference librarian, Library of Congress.

Prof. William Columbus Davis, department of history, George Washington University.

Dr. William Harlen Gilbert, Jr., anthropologist, legislative reference service, Library of Congress.

Prof. Wood Gray, department of history, George Washington University.

Mr. Edmund C. Rowan, director, Hungarian refugee scientist project, National Academy of Science.

This book donation proposal was prompted by increasing evidence of interest in American culture, literature, history, and the American way of life in general, on the part of Hungarian scholars, librarians, etc. The Hungarian events in 1956 produced considerable educational reform in the country. English language and literature are being taught again in Hungarian universities which unfortunately do not have the necessary books for teaching and research purposes, much less the financial means to purchase valuable and well-balanced collections.

II. EXCHANGE OF PUBLICATIONS

Exchange of current publications and retrospective materials between American and Hungarian institutions (academies, universities, research institutions, funds, societies, etc.) should be encouraged and channeled along the lines indicated in the book donation program.

The library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and several other libraries have already expressed their eagerness to develop such contacts, especially with American university libraries.

This type of voluntary and institutional contacts would be extremely fruitful in further strengthening of cultural ties, common research interests, personal and other bonds as envisioned by the "People to People" program. There is a general trend in Hungary to evaluate traditional historical ties between the United States and that country, and in a growing number of cases in an appreciative form. Cultural exchange contacts as described above would encourage and broaden this sort of trend in publishing and research activities in Hungary.

III. EXCHANGE SCHOLARSHIPS

Exchange scholarships of the same character and volume as provided under the foreign leadership program between this country and Finland could be extended for Hungarian scholars, and if possible, for graduate students and young researchers. (If we can accept Russian scholars and representatives of different fields of knowledge, art and interests in this country without endangering our internal and international security, we should express at least the same degree of recognition to representatives of the cultural life of a country which just recently proved how far its intellectual circles are from being taken in by Communist ideas.)

This part of the program could be developed through the National Academy of Science and other proper channels in this country which have a staff for administering such programs.

IV. WELFARE AND CULTURAL ACTIVITIES

The possibility of a more comprehensive program of cultural exchange should be considered. In this area opportunities may soon present themselves for welfare programs and exchanges in the performing arts.

Perhaps American agricultural products could be sold to the Hungarian Government for local currency. This would provide at least a considerable part of the budget for financing modest programs of exchange and may open the door to further cultural and welfare activities.

MR. NIXON IN POLAND

In many ways it is too bad that Vice President Nixon's visit to Warsaw has been overshadowed by the news of the Eisenhower-Khrushchev meetings. The tumultuous welcome Mr. Nixon received in Poland could not have been staged; it demonstrated the great reservoir of genuine good will for Americans among the Polish people. Mr. Nixon's task has been an extremely delicate one: to replenish this reservoir without complicating the problems of Poland's precarious independence. In essence his job has been to convey American support but to avoid ostentation that could provoke a new Soviet squeeze on the limited freedoms under Polish communism.

That Mr. Nixon was the first high Western official to talk with Communist Party Leader Gomulka is in itself something of a feat. The Vice President did well to show special concern for Polish fears of a new war. Perhaps in private conversation he was able further to allay any apprehensions that the United States is promoting German

expansionism, and to encourage some sort of Polish understanding with West Germany. A quiet agreement between Warsaw and Bonn could do a great deal to relieve fears and help the solution of other problems.

This newspaper hopes that the visit to Warsaw will be the beginning to an American policy of paying more attention to the countries of Eastern Europe. Of all the Soviet-bloc countries Poland is by all odds the freest—Yugoslavia is no longer part of the Soviet bloc—and there are some extraordinary reasons for the position of the Warsaw regime. But the cause of more independence and freedom elsewhere would best be served in present circumstances, not by urging an overthrow of communism and return to the old social system, but by indicating that the United States thinks these countries important and does not believe that Moscow invariably speaks for them. To ignore them is merely to strengthen Mr. Khrushchev's hold.

Public Works Appropriations Bill of 1960 Rejects "No New Starts" Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, we have passed and sent to the President the public works appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1960. In view of the continuing interest of Members of the House and others in the results of our action, I believe it is appropriate to point out further that in enacting this bill the Appropriations Committees of both Houses, and the Congress itself, did not accept the "no new starts" policy which was expressed in the budget presented by the Budget Bureau and the President. The action of the Congress in approving this bill evidences a rejection of the "no new starts" policy and a firm approval of a reasonable program of continuing construction of worthwhile and needed projects and studies of other future projects by both the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of Interior.

It will be recalled that in submitting the public works budget the President and the Budget Bureau favored a policy of continuing the construction of projects already begun but of not undertaking any new starts or even the planning of new projects. The Appropriations Committee of this body disagreed with this policy and expressed itself in favor of carrying on the program of water resource development in an orderly and uninterrupted manner. The Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations approved and recommended funds for 37 new construction starts and for the planning of 11 other projects. The House approved this recommendation in passing the bill.

The Senate added 30 additional starts and 33 new planning studies of other projects. The conferees compromised on 52 new starts and 30 planning studies.

This decision by the conferees was accepted by both bodies in the passage of the public works appropriation bill for 1960.

It should be noted that the additional new starts and studies involve an added cost of less than \$25 million over the budget as submitted to the Congress. So that, although the funds appropriated are close to the recommendation of the President, the policy underlying the use of the funds is quite different.

Apparently it is the philosophy of the Budget Bureau and the administration that the principal function of the public works program is to provide employment in poor times and that in good times we should stop or delay the development of the Nation's water resources.

In passing this appropriation bill, the Congress has refused to take such a narrow and limited view, and has, instead, looked upon our water resource development program as a positive program to develop the capabilities of our Nation for the continued growth and prosperity of the entire country. These programs are more than expenditures—they are investments in America. Our Nation must have a well-planned and continuing program of both construction and planning; in the long run this is more economical, practical, and represents sound policy.

Granting that in times of economic stress we can also use this program as an economic stimulant, it would nevertheless be foolish to restrict the surveying and planning of any new projects. Only with intelligent and deliberate planning can we make sure that we have on the shelf, as it were, well-thought-out projects that the Nation will need if an economic emergency should develop.

Therefore, in repudiating the no-new-starts policy, the Congress in my view acted wisely and with a forward-looking perspective, to provide for an orderly development of our resources at this time in step with the growth of our Nation.

Campaign of Postmaster General To Eliminate Obscene Material From the Mails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Postmaster General, the Honorable Arthur Summerfield, is conducting an intensive campaign for the elimination of smutty material from the mails. This campaign is of interest to every citizen concerned about the distribution of this material as it affects our youth.

Those of us who are familiar with the type of pornographic material that is sent through the mail share the views of the Postmaster General and urge him to intensify his campaign against this type of material. Our decent citizens are requesting it.

The Postmaster General has authority to open and inspect second-class, third-class, and fourth-class mail, but is prevented from opening and inspecting first-class mail.

There are indications that much of this material is being distributed through first-class mail.

I am hopeful that the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee and the Congress will take another look at the handling of this type of mail; and I also hope that we may be able to write additional legislation, if necessary, to eliminate it.

In a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor there appeared an excellent article entitled "The 'Smut Campaign' Via the Mails," written by Josephine Ripley. I ask unanimous consent that the article be made a part of these remarks and be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE "SMUT CAMPAIGN" VIA THE MAILS

(By Josephine Ripley)

There has been public debate in recent weeks over whether Postmaster General Summerfield is riding a broomstick, or whether he is merely wielding it in the manner for which it was designed.

As the Postmaster General sees it, nothing but a "clean sweep" will rid the mails of an unprecedented flood of "obscene and pornographic materials."

The distribution of this material is a \$500 million racket, he has warned. He is particularly alarmed because the racket is directed primarily at young people. From what the Post Office Department already knows of the operation, and from material confiscated, there is reason to believe some 1 million young people will be approached in this way during the coming year.

While the Postmaster General has been provided with a broom for keeping the mails clean, in the form of laws which make him responsible for preventing their misuse, he may use that broom only under certain conditions.

Some feel that the Post Office Department does not have sufficient authority to deal with the problem; others feel that the jurisdiction should rest wholly with the courts.

For while the Post Office Department is charged with keeping the mails free of obscene and indecent material, there is no clear-cut definition of these terms. The determination must lie with the individual responsible for making the ruling.

This first determination is made within the Department, by its lawyers, then by the examiners, and finally, after it has passed through various processes and hearings, by the "judicial officer."

At this point, if the publisher is still on the negative end of the decision, he may appeal to the courts. Congress passed its first antiobscenity law in 1873. Since then there have been various changes and amendments. Today it is a Federal crime to use the mails in interstate commerce to sell or distribute anything that is obscene, lewd, lascivious, filthy, or indecent.

This material, in general, takes the form of pictures, films, cartoons, or questionable magazines. It is generally transmitted by second-, third-, or fourth-class mail.

The Post Office Department has authority to inspect such classes of mail if there is reason to suspect it contains matter of this kind. It may also check mail of this type if

it suspects the content ineligible for the class in which it is dispatched.

But the Department has no authority, without obtaining a search warrant, to open first-class mail, even though it knows that letter-class mail is being used for transmitting obscene material.

In fact, the Department has evidence that the peddlers of indecent material to teenagers are actually distributing their wares by letter mail. The Postmaster General does not ask for censorship authority, but he is appealing to parents and teenagers themselves to report the receipt of such material to the postal authorities.

Although the Post Office Department has been much in the news in recent weeks over its ban on the D. H. Lawrence book (later reversed by a Federal court judge), it is rarely that the Department takes action on a novel.

In the first place, the Post Office Department does not have the personnel to review books. Moreover, books are not, generally speaking, transported by mail, at least in bulk. There are other and cheaper modes of transportation.

The Department had plenty of warning, however, in the case of the Lawrence novel. In fact, it was the publisher who sounded the warning—in loud tones.

Thus the Postmaster General was forced to either ban the book or, in effect, approve it. In any case, the publisher could hardly fail to gain from the publicity. And obviously did.

But what the Postmaster General would prefer to publicize is what he calls the "smut campaign" being conducted by means of the mails on a wholesale scale, and in a far more sinister way.

He is deeply disturbed about this, particularly since it is being aimed "more and more at the Nation's children—teenage boys and girls."

This Is What the People Want

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of August 16, 1959. It is the best analysis of the vote on the Landrum-Griffin bill in the House of Representatives that I have seen, to date.

The House of Representatives is nearest to the people and more likely to reflect their true thinking. The people are not often fooled, having many worries and responsibilities of their own that have nothing to do with government and politics. But, when they are truly aroused they speak with a mighty voice and this voice the House of Representatives heard and responded to.

Let us not forget that there are still 144 million of our population who do not belong to any labor union and their rights must be considered and protected.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Aug. 16, 1959]

THIS IS WHAT THE PEOPLE WANT

The wave of public opinion which carried the Landrum-Griffin labor bill high and wide through the House last week is still at full crest. This is the central fact confronting a House-Senate conference which will shortly determine whether the country is to be granted genuine labor reform in 1959.

The victory won in the House on Thursday, and repeated overwhelmingly on Friday, means that the Nation as a whole will no longer tolerate the claims of certain shabby labor leaders and their unscrupulous cohorts to be above morality and the law. It was an extraordinary display of the popular will, led by the President and reflected by the Representatives. There is now no longer any doubt about the issues or the means of resolving them.

But the bill is not yet law. In April, the Senate passed a reform measure of its own under the sponsorship of Senator KENNEDY, and the two must be reconciled by conferees of both Houses. The Kennedy bill is much the weaker piece of legislation, compromised from the start by an attempt to avoid the disapproval of the unions. Although it took color at the last moment from the impassioned efforts of Senator McCLELLAN, it is a poor substitute for the Landrum-Griffin bill.

So there is still one more battle to fight. It has been suggested that the conference accept the House bill without further ado, but we dare not hope it will be as easy as that. The chief points of debate are likely to be the curbs the House has imposed on secondary boycotting and blackmail picketing, curbs which are anathema to Jimmy Hoffa but which would put a stop to some of the most blatant Teamster brigandage. The Kennedy bill is largely innocent of such restrictions. Where the bills do agree is the necessity for unions to disclose their financial affairs and the protection of union democracy.

These curbs on practice are the controversial provisions. The House conferees will support them in the spirit of their victory there. The Senators are expected to balk, but just how strongly and for how long? Senator KENNEDY, who will set the keynote for his colleagues, says that compromise will be difficult, but that it must be achieved. Otherwise, as he knows, there will be no labor legislation whatever this session. Is there a hint here that the Senator's antennae are also registering the shockwaves of public opinion?

Let us hope so. For this is Congress' great opportunity to set in order the house that labor cannot set in order for itself. And this reform is what the country demands.

Unemployment in State of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on several previous occasions this year, I have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD information to the effect that, while the national employment picture is brightening, the picture in my own State of West Virginia is not wholly one of rosy improvement.

As a further illustration of this unpleasant reality, there appeared on the front page of last Wednesday's Charleston Gazette two adjoining stories—one of them proclaiming that American employment in July was the highest in history, and the other pointing out that unemployment claims in West Virginia are rising.

In order that the Members of Congress may be reminded that our country still has depressed areas, and that the need

for an area redevelopment program to deal with technological unemployment is still with us, I ask unanimous consent that the two items from the newspaper be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston Gazette, Aug. 12, 1959]

U.S. JOB TOTAL HITS PEAK IN JULY

WASHINGTON.—More Americans had jobs in July than in any previous month. There were 67,594,000 employed.

The Government's monthly job survey showed 252,000 more employed than in June, which also was a record. There are 2,415,000 more jobs than a year ago.

Unemployment declined by 238,000 from June to 3,744,000 in July. This is a decline of 1,550,000 from July 1958.

Seymour Wolfbein, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor for Manpower, said in releasing the new data Tuesday that they showed a further and continuing improvement in the overall employment picture.

The seasonally adjusted ratio of workers idle, but seeking jobs, to the rest of the work force rose in July to 5.1 percent from 4.9 in June. The long-term unemployed—those idle 15 weeks or longer—dropped by 110,000 in July to 820,000. This is less than half the figure a year ago.

One sidelight to the new report is that unemployment among Negro workers is 11 percent, or more than double the 4.5 idle rate among white workers.

The July employment increase came despite a more than seasonal decline in farm employment attributed to bad crop weather in many areas—primarily in the South.

Farm employment declined by 406,000 to 6,825,000. But nonfarm employment reached a record 60,769,000, up 658,000 from June.

Many of the youngsters who flooded the labor market in June seeking temporary jobs during their summer vacation, found work in July. Unemployment in the 14-to-24-year age category dropped 364,000 over the month.

The factory workweek declined slightly to an average 40.4 hours. This is still more than an hour longer than a year ago and represents the longest July workweek since 1955.

UNEMPLOYMENT RISES IN STATE BY 5,006 CLAIMS

Unemployment in West Virginia is on the upswing with a total of 21,662 claims being filed under the State's unemployment compensation program, the Employment Security Department reported Tuesday.

The figure compares with 19,311 claims filed last week, compared with 3,431 for the report shows that 5,006 initial claims were filed last week, compared with 3,431 for the previous week. Continued claims equaled 16,656 for the week ended last Saturday, against 15,880 the week before.

A total of \$538,095 was paid in unemployment compensation last week, leaving the cash balance at \$37,756,997.

James L. E. Jappe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Sunday, August 16, Mr. James L. E. Jappe of Cleveland, Ohio, died at

his summer home on Sheep Island in Rideau Lake, Ontario. He was 68 years old and one of the best known personalities in the State, as well as one of its most influential. Jimmy was an attorney, publicist, politician, and lobbyist extraordinaire. Among the many posts he filled in his lifetime were secretary to the Republican National Convention committees in Cleveland in 1924 and 1936, assistant secretary of the Republican National Committee, legislative representative in Columbus for the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, the Cleveland and Ohio State Bar Associations, and many other State and local organizations. He was the friend and confidante of many Members of this Congress, and I cannot put into words the tremendous help and inspiration he has been to me. It is impossible to estimate the great personal loss his passing means to literally hundreds of people, and I know that every Member of this body who knew him will agree with the sentiments expressed in an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer which follows: [From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Aug. 17, 1959]

JAMES L. E. JAPPE

Jimmy Jappe probably had more friends than any other man in our town. The first tenet of the creed he lived by was to help other people; he enjoyed doing it, and the people he did favors for became his lasting friends.

Jappe was also a natural born promoter, and whether he was promoting a Russian ballet at the old Euclid Avenue Opera House or a project to fill the Cleveland Stadium with the biggest baseball crowd ever assembled up to that time, he devoted his full energies to the task.

As a politician, Jappe operated behind the scenes. He helped manage national conventions of the Republican Party in Cleveland, Chicago, and Philadelphia. He was a friend of Presidents, Cabinet members, Senators, Congressmen, Governors, State legislators, councilmen and precinct committeemen, the latter category being the only political office which he ever held or to which he ever aspired.

Jappe had an intimate knowledge of Ohio politics and Ohio politicians, both Republican and Democratic. He was an effective and highly ethical lobbyist in Columbus and he was a close adviser of many a neophyte legislator who went on to achieve higher office and honors.

As a lobbyist, however, Jappe did not confine his efforts to matters in which his clients were interested. He helped to secure the enactment of many measures which he believed to be in the public interest. One of these was a project to recodify the Ohio laws. He originated it, secured legislative approval of it and became one of the members of the commission which carried it out.

His death is a loss to the city, the State, and the Nation.

Amendment of Transportation Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a letter, in the nature of a resolution, addressed to Mr. W. P. Kennedy, president, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio, from the North Dakota legislative board, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen relating to their support of the so-called Case amendment to the Transportation Act.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH DAKOTA LEGISLATIVE BOARD,
BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN,
Fargo, N. Dak., July 22, 1959.

Mr. W. P. KENNEDY,
President, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen,
Cleveland, Ohio.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: Whereas the 1958 Transportation Act has resulted in the practical removal from the jurisdiction of the North Dakota State Public Service Commission of the authority to determine the need for railroad transportation within the State of North Dakota; and

Whereas it is the opinion of this committee that the application of said act has deprived the citizens of this State of much-needed transportation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this committee go on record as being in support of the Case amendment to said Transportation Act as one means of alleviating the impact of said act on the citizens and their requirements for railroad transportation of this State, and that this committee urge upon the two U.S. Senators and two U.S. Congressmen of the State of North Dakota that they support the Case amendment to said act.

Fraternally yours,

S. F. KALUZA, Secretary.

B. J. DELMORE, Chairman.

A. F. FORD,

State Legislative Representative.

Dancey in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the 22d article of a series by Editor Charles L. Dancey appearing in the August 10 issue of the Peoria Journal Star:

FINDS BAKU HAS ORIENTAL FLAVOR

(By Charles L. Dancey)

BAKU.—Only 3 hours in the Big Russian jet from Stalingrad to Baku, following the Caspian seacoast much of the way. Baku sticks out into the sea on a peninsula, and is cool and comfortable. No screens and no flies.

(Stalingrad was hot. About like Peoria this time of year. The only screens I've seen in the Soviet Union—and some flies.)

The camera is nix in Baku between the oil fields and the great harbor that backgrounds the whole city. Also, here were the most police I have seen anywhere, and they have always been plentiful. There is an average of three uniformed cops in every downtown city block.

There were approximately 50 MIG fighter planes on the big paved airstrip where we landed, besides commercial aircraft.

We drove to town through a forest of oil derricks and past miles of low homes built of soft limestone blocks. It looks like a Mexican countryside both in these dwellings and the parched ground.

The people are dark, with aquiline features—Arabic in appearance. The buildings of prominence, the furniture, the dress, everything seems to have an oriental flavor.

Here again, as on the boat, (indeed wherever I get away from a strictly tourist eating isolation) the Soviet "bottlemaker" seems to be the most popular appetizer at all meals. That is, everyone seems to launch his meal with 150 or 200 grams of vodka and a bottle or two of beer. This includes breakfast. I would guess that 150 grams would make about four shots. The book says 150 grams is 5 ounces and not infrequently they reorder when the food comes.

I also buzzed through the old city here—a veritable Casbah, with streets narrower than our snugest downtown alleys winding every which way.

Here I managed to meet only two local citizens unofficially, both Azerbaijanese. They repeated over and over to be sure I understood that while they spoke Russian to me that they were not "Roosee" but Azerbaijan.

I wished I could take one of these young men home, I would get rich. He is strikingly handsome, and also rugged and virile. A Gilbert Roland type only better looking, and a very mobile and expressive face with startling light green eyes flashing out of his dark face and very dark brows.

Here I attended the ballet—best entertainment I have seen. The setting was fabulous, the costuming splendid, and the dancing, of course, superb. The ballet was one enacting an old legend of Azerbaijan concerning a king who fell in love with a maiden who turned out to be the daughter of one of his many wives.

I was told that I would back-track here, flying to Tbilisi in the heart of the Caucasus Mountains, the capital city of Georgia, and the home city of Josef Djughashvili (alias Stalin). Also, that I would fly in a special plane carrying only me and a West German jazz band.

So, on to Tbilisi.

Rev. Ford Lewis, of First Unitarian Church, Portland, Oreg., Supports Mercy Fleet Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the proposal for a Great White Fleet of hospital ships, which would take the wonders of modern healing to the backward nations of the world, where there prevails a shockingly high infant mortality rate and where millions are afflicted with congenital blindness and other tragic diseases.

Life magazine has advanced the suggestion that we take some of our hospital ships out of mothballs and send them across the seven seas with guardian angels of mercy aboard—namely, doctors and nurses and various medical technicians.

A most eloquent sermon in behalf of this proposal was preached at the First Unitarian Church of Portland, Oreg., in my home community, on August 2, 1959, by Dr. Ford Lewis, associate pastor of the First Unitarian Church. Dr. Lewis has emphasized in his message that few

legislative proposals would so circulate and translate into action the noble message of the New Testament.

I ask unanimous consent that the address in support of the Great White Fleet proposal by Dr. Ford Lewis, entitled "From Mothballs to Mercy Missions," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for the information of those of my colleagues who likewise are supporting this humanitarian idea.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM MOTHBALLS TO MERCY MISSIONS
(By Dr. Ford Lewis)

I

Perhaps no dream of the human race has been more persistent and widely cherished than the dream of universal peace. In spite of the fact that no generation since human history began has been without its quota of war, men continue to hope and believe that peace is possible. In spite of the fact that the nations of the world are now in a position to destroy more lives, more homes, more cities, and more civilization in one day than have been destroyed in the entire span of recorded history, we are bold enough to believe in peace as a practical ideal, and to work for it.

Only today our Vice President, who has been on an extended visit to Russia in the interests of peace, has left that land and started home. Representatives of the four most powerful nations in the world have been for several months engaged in discussions in Geneva, attempting to resolve the critical issues of the occupation of Berlin and German unification as well as pave the way for a summit conference to deal with all questions of war and peace.

The dream simply will not die—that the time will come when nations "shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks: nations shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." Not all the Bible, of course, points to peace. The early and more primitive parts of the Old Testament begin with a tribal war god leading his chosen people to bloody triumphs over their enemies. Over the centuries during which the Scriptures were compiled, the social vision broadened. The community of man was widened and made more inclusive. The idea of the brotherhood of man reached a high eminence in the writings of the Old Testament prophets and was recapitulated in the thought of Jesus and the New Testament apostles. Beginning with a god whose highest social vision was a tribal victory, the Bible ends with a God whose worshippers pray for a worldwide kingdom of righteousness and peace.

It was the persistent quest for peaceful coexistence that led during the medieval period in Europe to an arrangement called peace of God. Fighting was prohibited in churches and around all shrines and holy places. Noncombatant populations were protected. Persons who violated these prohibitions were anathematized. They were placed under an ecclesiastical curse involving excommunication from the church and damnation.

The truce of God was similarly enforced to assure peaceful weekends. It prohibited all fighting between Thursday evening and Monday morning. We may think this quaint and naive. Furthermore, when we reflect that one of the objectives of the church in enforcing these rules was to achieve a peaceful Europe in order to organize the Crusades, we may be inclined to discount the whole thing. Nevertheless, the search for peace will go on in our time with or without our cooperation, just as it has in the past.

II

In the 14th century, Dante proposed a world empire for the purpose of ending war. During the same century, Pierre Dubois put forth the idea of a permanent arbitration tribunal. History has vindicated the wisdom of this suggestion, but he was 500 years ahead of his time. In the early 17th century, Henry IV of France proposed a world confederation in the interests of peace. Toward the end of the 17th century, William Penn detailed a plan to establish an international federation between independent nations for the prevention of war. Meanwhile, Hugo Grotius laid the foundation for international law in his book, "The Law of War and Peace," written during the 30-Year War, one of the most destructive holocausts man has ever inflicted upon himself.

All the countries of the world have made their contribution to the effort for peace. Utilitarians and rationalists in England, encyclopedists and physiocrats in France, and idealists in Germany have all worked toward this end. A half-dozen or so international peace congresses were organized in Europe during the 19th century. The history of the League of Nations, the Washington Disarmament Conference of 1921, the London Conference of 1930, the various peace pacts and pledges are well known. Altogether too well known, also, is the fact that in spite of these conscientious efforts to maintain peace, we are still trying to recover from our most recent and worst world war.

We should not be surprised, I suppose, that many persons are disillusioned. They think that a peaceful world society is a false and impossible goal. I have heard some religious fundamentalists quote the Bible to prove that wars will never cease. These people lack faith. They lack faith in themselves and the ideal of a peaceful world. There is no better evidence than this that they lack faith in God, the very God whom they purport to quote literally in support of the inevitability of war. If a man denies the possibility of achieving the highest human dream, he denies either the power or the love of God, or both. His thinking has not evolved with the Bible. He is left in the neolithic backwash of primitive tribalism in which God chooses among the nations and takes sides and supervises the slaughter of one nation by another. But the god they worship was outmoded 2,500 years ago when the Hebrew prophets elevated Yahweh above the nationalistic policies of the tribe and revealed God as a moral judge, a god of peace and justice and of all mankind.

Our question is not the academic one of whether peace is theoretically possible, but what can we do to make it probable? What can we do to advance the cause of peace? Can we do anything as "people to people"—to use the words of President Eisenhower? One specific proposal has been made which I think has great merit. Parenthetically, let it be said that specific proposals are the only kind that can be effective. Everyone is for peace in general. Everyone is against sin, but this is not enough. It was not enough when the "rich young ruler," as he is referred to compositely in the Gospels, came to Jesus to get an opinion on what he must do to share the good life to come. When Jesus proposed a specific course of action, "his countenance fell, and he went away sorrowful."

Again, when the inquiring lawyer asked "Who is my neighbor?" he was given a direct answer which involved certain concrete, if to him unpleasant, realities. He was told that his neighbor was a Samaritan, a good Samaritan, a member of a community with which the Jews had no dealings. We are left with the question of whether the lawyer's good will, which up to this point had been generalized, went to pieces on this particular ethic, or whether it survived the test of a concrete expression of neighborliness.

In any case, the lesson for us is that we must find real ways of putting our ideals

into action. William Blake says: "He who would do good to another, must do it in minute particulars. General good is the plea of the scoundrel, hypocrite, and flatterer."

III

The proposal which seems to me to have such merit was discussed in the July 27, 1959, issue of LIFE. Here, Commander Manson of the U.S. Navy suggests that this country reactivate part of its mothball fleet for the purpose of waging an aggressive peace program. In 1907 President Theodore Roosevelt sent 16 battleships fully armed and freshly painted white, around the world to impress the nations with U.S. naval power. This Great White Fleet was gone 2 years. It succeeded in its mission, but it did not succeed in preventing the next war.

The new Great White Fleet suggested by Commander Manson, consisting of fully equipped hospital ships, cargo vessels loaded with food and clothing, transport vessels converted into floating technical schools, and other auxiliary vessels, would be completely unarmed. Its function would be to bring relief to disaster victims, to carry emergency supplies and medical facilities into famine-stricken areas, and in general to bring the arts of healing into underdeveloped regions wherever emergency needs exist.

Resolutions have been introduced, both in the Senate and the House of Representatives, asking the President to take the necessary steps to put the new White Fleet into operation.

There can be no question of our ability to do this. We have the ships, we have the doctors, the money, and the commodities. The cost of putting the first six-unit fleet into operation and maintaining it for 18 months has been estimated at \$30 million. This is but a small fraction of the amount we now spend for any one of a dozen luxuries. Certainly it represents only an infinitesimal amount when compared with the annual expenditure for the Nation's military armaments.

We now have over \$6 billion worth of dairy products, cotton, and various staples and items of food piled up in our surplus commodity warehouses. The President already has the authority under existing law to divert shiploads of these commodities to areas where emergency relief is needed regardless of the friendliness of the governments involved. Here, in the idea of the new White Fleet, is a magnificent opportunity to implement the American dream which was also the dream of the ancient prophets—of turning our swords into plowshares. What an immense appeal this program would have in the eyes of the uncommitted peoples around the world.

I discussed this proposal with the consul of one of the four great powers stationed in Portland. He commented that from an educational standpoint nothing could be better. He was most enthusiastic, describing the proposal as "a sound thing" and "a good plan." Other consuls with whom I discussed this matter were similarly enthusiastic. No one thought that the plan offered any hope of alleviating the age-old problems of poverty and disease. The hope was expressed that such a program could arouse people in the underdeveloped areas of the world from their apathy and hopelessness and encourage them to take steps to do something about their own condition.

As Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER has pointed out in his newsletter, Washington Calling, healing can be a more effective form of foreign aid than guns or dams or bulldozers. He cited a story told by Congressman WALTER JUDT, of Minnesota, a former medical missionary in China, of the Chinese mother who came to him with a child who had tetanus, as a result of using an unsanitary poultice on the umbilical cord. Dr. JUDT saw that he could do nothing for the child and told the mother so. She collapsed into tears. "But you are young," said Dr.

John, "you can have other children." Thereupon the Chinese mother told him this was the seventh child she had lost from the same cause. A few cents' worth of clean gauze and antiseptic salve might have saved each of these children.

What is involved here is a modern application of the truth Jesus had in mind when he said, "I was hungry, and ye gave me to eat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me to drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me in; naked, and ye clothed me; I was sick, and ye visited me."

Certainly the world needs our help. Just as certainly, we need to give that help. Selfishness impoverishes those who practice it. Undisciplined self-indulgence degrades us as individuals and as a people. Even if there were an impenetrable curtain drawn around us so that the rest of the world could not witness our prosperity, we would be poorer in not sharing. In holding on to our valuable commodities, we are not just guarding these commodities from being used by other people. We are at the same time excluding ourselves from the valuable and necessary fellowship of the rest of the world. The world cannot indefinitely survive with the preponderant majority in poverty and the fortunate few enjoying prosperity. I am not suggesting that we divide all our goods among the rest of the world, but I am suggesting that in sharing our knowledge and techniques in the spirit of brotherly concern, our own real resources, which are spiritual resources, will not only be undiminished but will in fact be increased in that sharing. The lesson of the widow's mite points to the truth that he who gives sacrificially benefits in proportion to the sacrifice. What we have to give is certainly more than a widow's mite. Our obligation to share in proportion as God has blessed us is correspondingly great.

IV

There is a puzzling passage in the New Testament in which Jesus is admonishing his disciples to be perfect even as God is perfect. This has always been a mysterious admonition to me because perfection is an impossible goal. A recent translation by Dr. Torrey renders this, "Be ye therefore all-including even as your Heavenly Father includes all." This is more intelligible than the traditional translation when we apply it to the area of international good will.

One final observation remains to be made. If such a project as this is undertaken, it matters a great deal how it is done. Personnel must be chosen with a view toward obtaining people with the greatest intelligence, sensitivity, and tact. People who come bearing gifts are often looked upon with suspicion. It is imperative in the administration of any such program as this that our assistance will have no strings attached and that our motives shall be the purest.

President Theodore Roosevelt, who organized the first Great White Fleet, was fond of quoting a west African proverb, "Speak softly, and carry a big stick, you will go far." The idea behind the new White Fleet is to speak softly and carry no stick at all. It is to be devoutly hoped and expected that we will go even further.

Mary McLeod Bethune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, nearly 100 years have passed since President Abraham Lincoln signed the great

Emancipation Proclamation into law. In commemoration of this "century of freedom," the National Council of Negro Women has voted unanimously to undertake in 1963 the project of memorializing their founder, the late Mary McLeod Bethune.

I have today introduced a House joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant authority to the National Council of Negro Women to erect in the District of Columbia a memorial honoring Mary McLeod Bethune, the design and location of the memorial to be approved by the Secretary, the Commission of Fine Arts, and the National Capital Planning Commission.

Among the Negro people who have truly shared the American dream of freedom none stands higher than the late Mary McLeod Bethune. Rightly called the "first woman of her race," her life work stands as a testimonial to selfless dedication in behalf of her people.

Born of slave parents in South Carolina on July 10, 1875, Mary McLeod Bethune was educated in South Carolina, North Carolina, and Illinois. Consumed with a desire to help others, she set about finding a place to teach with only \$1.50 in her pocket. Through prayer, determination and unbounded faith, she was enabled to open a small school with only five girls as students. Today this little school has grown into the thriving institution of Bethune-Cookman College, in Daytona Beach, Fla.

During her 38 years as a college president, Mary McLeod Bethune participated in numerous constructive efforts of her time. Among the governmental positions she occupied were as a member of the National Commission for Child Welfare, Director of the Office of Negro Affairs, and the National Youth Administration under Presidents Coolidge and Hoover, special advisor to President Franklin D. Roosevelt on minority affairs, and special assistant to the Secretary of War for selecting candidates to the first WAC Officers Candidate School. During her useful and active life she was the recipient of eight honorary degrees from leading American colleges and universities.

Mary McLeod Bethune was affiliated with numerous literary and religious societies and served as an active officer for dozens of professional and civic associations. Next to building Bethune-Cookman College into a million-dollar coeducational institution, her greatest interest was founding the National Council of Negro Women. She considered the vast potential of organizing into one unit the woman power of 800,000 Negro women, already organized into more than 20 national groups. Her dream was accomplished in 1935 and she became the council's first president, a position she held for 14 years, at which time she became president emerita. Untimely though her passing on May 18, 1955, her memory is enriched by her works and her rare spirit.

It is the hope of the council that the statue of Mrs. Bethune can be erected in Lincoln Park on East Capitol Street where the dramatic figure of President Lincoln and the Negro slave, known as the emancipation group, was erected by

the Western Sanitary Commission of St. Louis. Dedicated on April 14, 1876, the 11th anniversary of the assassination of President Lincoln, this memorial was built with funds contributed solely by emancipated citizens.

Mr. Speaker, this is a moment of great significance in the history of mankind's progress toward social justice. Adoption of this resolution will demonstrate that America is keeping faith with its destiny, and will provide renewed inspiration to free peoples throughout the world.

Should National Education Defense Grants Be Made Available to Subversives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a few weeks ago the U.S. Senate devoted 2 full days of its crowded and delayed calendar to discussing the general proposition, "Should national education defense grants be available to subversives? And, if not, what legislative language should Congress employ to prevent such a perversion of public funds?"

This issue was precipitated by a bill proposed by Senator KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, which would have deleted from the National Defense Education Act the public-protecting language on this issue which the Senate committee recommended and which the Congress adopted at the time of the passage of the act. That protective language required the taking of a loyalty and non-Communist oath before applicants for grants were accepted. Some question had arisen among certain groups in the country about the advisability and the efficacy of such oaths and whether the laws of perjury would operate against offenders. I shared some of these misgivings and as a consequence, Senators will recall I sought to substitute for the Kennedy repealer, language which was admittedly effective—it would have substituted on the oath mechanism a severe fine and a penitentiary penalty against any subversive who sought and secured grants from the National Education Defense Fund by concealing his relationships with Communists or any other totalitarian agents. Ultimately the Senate decided by a narrow margin of one in a rollcall vote to adopt a watered-down substitute for my proposal. Rather than accept the weakened substitute, however, the Senate then voted to return the entire issue to the committee and thus rejected the Kennedy resolution. That is where the controversy rests today.

In that connection the following column from the August 3 issue of the Dallas Morning News, a great constructive Texas newspaper, makes both interesting and informative reading. For that reason, I am asking that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record together

with the statement which I have just made.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DO WE ENDOW TREASON?

(By Lynn Landrum)

Egghead opposition to loyalty oaths to be required of applicants for money offered under the National Defense Education Act does not appear to be reasonable, but it is all the more stubborn for its unreasonableness. When a foreign-born person applies for citizenship, he is required to take the oath of allegiance. When the citizen takes an office, he is required to take an oath of loyalty and fidelity. When a citizen becomes a soldier, he is required to take an oath of loyalty and obedience. When a man in the ranks is promoted to the status of an officer, he again faces the requirement that he take an oath. In what way, then, is it degrading, unjust or uncalled for to require an oath of a lad who asks defense money to help him get an education?

Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, has brought the issue to sharp focus in an amendment to the National Defense Education Act. Senator MUNDT says, in effect, if it is objected that the student is singled out from all other students with a demand for an oath, then let us skip the oath and provide as follows: Any individual who applies for cash or loan under the terms of the act—and who has within 5 years of his application been a member of a subversive organization—is subject to fine or imprisonment or both. That gets it down to brass tacks.

Subversion is conspiracy to commit sedition—treason, so to speak, in time of peace—or actual treason in time of war. Membership in the seditious or treasonable organization becomes the overt act and the Mundt amendment would impose the penalty for application for defense money by one so guilty of membership within the 5-year period concerned.

Do the eggheads demand that traitors shall be educated with defense money? Do they demand that colleges and universities shall take defense money in this way at the very time when they are harboring the active enemies of the United States of America?

Academic freedom, as advanced by these extremist eggheads, becomes more and more a demand for exemption from all the burdens and all the obligations of citizenship. Freedom to plot for the end of freedom is nonsense of the most dangerous sort. And the professed disciples of a freedom so divested of all loyalty and of all love of country are sometimes more dangerous than the actual plotters of treason who meet in dark rooms and mouth moth-eaten dialectical excerpts from Lenin, Marx, and the current Soviet line.

The notion that academicians are somehow or other exempt from the responsibilities of citizenship ignores the line of difference between freedom and anarchy. Science is thinking in search of law. Without law there is no beauty, no wisdom, no justice, no freedom after all.

A Boost for Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to call attention to the

third annual National Conservation Sports Tournament to be held near Davenport, Iowa, August 21, 22, and 23.

This event is sponsored each year by the Davenport Chapter of the Izaak Walton League of America in conjunction with the Buffalo Bill Council of the Boy Scouts of America.

Over 500 Explorer Scouts from all over the United States will participate in the 3-day event again this year. The purpose of the tournament is to promote among the Nation's youth the need for the wise use of our soil, woods, water, and wildlife. The sponsor's hope to influence the minds of the participants so that they will realize that only through the wise use of our natural resources can we continue to prosper.

The events of the tournament help develop physical fitness, keen competitive ability, character, sportsmanship, and a basic understanding of the constant need for conservation of resources.

A winner and runner-up will be selected in each of seven competitive events including marksmanship, archery, mo-skeet, bait casting, fly casting, swimming, and nature trail.

Although my duties here will not permit me to attend this event this year, I have had the pleasure in the past of seeing these young Americans take part in this program which is wholesome and beneficial to all. I trust that other communities will see fit to pattern similar events after this one so that this experience can be made available to more young people all across the Nation.

Architecture of New Buildings on Capitol Hill

Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Douglas Haskell, entitled "Saying Nothing, Going Nowhere," relating to the New Senate Office Building, which appeared in the Architectural Forum for August 1959. The article expresses some of the feelings which many of us have about the New Senate Office Building. We regard it as excessively expensive and as lacking in good taste and in architectural proportions.

I think that as plans are being drawn for the third House Office Building, under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol, this article by Mr. Haskell should receive very careful attention.

Mr. Haskell has been associated with the Architectural Record and the Architectural Forum for many years, and has been editor of the latter publication since 1955. He has lectured at various universities and schools throughout the country. He was referred to by the late Frank Lloyd Wright as "The critic with a conscience." This article indicates he not only has a conscience, but a very caustic pen as well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Architectural Forum, August 1959]

SAYING NOTHING, GOING NOWHERE

(By Douglas Haskell)

The controversial New Senate Office Building has faults worse than high cost and low drinking fountains: it fails to dramatize to the people how their Government works.

Understandably the angry going-over that the New Senate Office Building in Washington received from the Senators was related to practical shortcomings. It is far easier to work up a sense of frustrated outrage in the face of scandalous high cost coupled with discomfort, underperformance, and inconvenience, than it is to deal with that queasy feeling in the pit of the stomach when a building as a whole vaguely fails to come across, despite high pretensions, and gives no clear account of itself to either the mind or the emotions. The kind of thing the Senators felt they could cope with, or at least denounce, was a \$2 million subway not yet leading anywhere and requiring \$4 million more to finish, squawk boxes that really squawked, unworking mail chutes, air conditioning that leaked privileged conversations out of Senate offices, cafeteria equipment that challenged the user not to break his head, and things like that. The equipped building, without subways, cost \$22 million, meaning that for the second time in its career the Senate had created one of the world's most expensive office buildings. (The older, 1906, Senate Office Building was labeled the most expensive in its day.) The consequence of such a building economy is that Washington is forever spending loads of money but is forever short of space.

It would be unfair to ask the Senate to deal with architectural issues, for, unlike their forefathers, Senators today only rarely come prepared with any architectural education whatsoever. Yet the problem that this building gives architecturally to Senators and to every educated American is a serious one, for what it pictures is a state of architectural illness attended by extreme mental confusion, threatening to become chronic in Washington. Everyone who sees it must be aware of a certain tired, meager, rundown impression that the building gives compared to its predecessor, the first Senate Office Building. The new one is vaguely a classical building and vaguely a modern one, but really neither: whether it was built primarily for functional purposes or for monumental ones is left amiably uncertain. The rich appearance of the older Senate Office Building across the street is missing, and the rather joyful variety of forms over there has yielded to monotonous repetition of a vertical ribbon window treatment—much like any modern jail—with here and there a classical feature tacked on. There is one consoling feature: some crisp carving. This is quite obviously an architecture on the way down. Like the costly subway, it has no terminal, but unlike the subway it is not even pointed in a hopeful direction.

Paradoxically, a still greater monotony could have been a help, if the desire was to produce a clearly marked and understandable "office building." Thus, in a purely business-like modern structure, such as the projected Federal Office Building to be erected west of the Interior Building, the drawings show that large office blocks are to be given identical windows, and the monotony of these will be so complete as to transfer all attention from the individual unit to the pattern as a whole—a clear one. The office blocks are to be lifted above a clearly marked base where the lobbies are to be found, and the larger, higher ceilinged ground-floor rooms will no

doubt be available for ceremonial or large-group purposes.

In the new Senate Office Building, on the other hand, where the classical "treatment" has been pasted on—presumably as a formality and to "match" adjacent buildings—nothing "reads." So far as official designations are concerned, the floors on which senatorial offices are found are no doubt named as a ground floor, a first floor, and so on, up to a sixth. As to exterior architectural treatment, however, the first two floors are a "basement" with basement windows and the top two floors are an "attic" with attic windows, and Senators with offices on any of these four floors are living either in the basement or in the attic.

Upon entering, the visitor does find that in fact offices and hearing rooms are intermingled at just about every level. If then he discovers his particular State represented in the architectural "basement," he is left guessing whether that was a slur on the honor of the State, or punishment for a Senator, or a sign that the Senate in its house-keeping just did not care what it did, or whether anyone ever told the Senators that classical architecture, like any other serious architecture, is an art that calls signals. In a modern building with neither "basement" nor "attic" such questions could not arise.

Quite obviously the mixing of two completely incongruous systems, classical and modern, resulted in a building that does not give its signals clearly and that amounts to a picture building. The most thunderous architectural miscue relates to the building's one outstanding feature and ample architectural gesture: that special "portico" at the middle of the block on First Street, which by all the rules, customs, and reasoning of classical architecture ought to be the main entrance to the building. It is not. Ever since Rome the main entrance of any proper governmental or monumental building has been treated as a chief and central celebration. The reason is simple. The first thing anybody has to know after locating a building is where to go in, and the first duty of a Government building is to see that entrants are ceremoniously received. In this instance, having spotted that one big projecting "portico," central to the main facade, capped with a pediment, supported on great box piers, and facing on a ceremonial terrace, the visitor heads straight over there—and finds himself shunted away by a blank marble panel. There is neither a stair from the sidewalk to the terrace nor a door into the building, and apparently the whole costly business has been erected for the sole joy of the bird watchers and the window washers. The real entrance is found around the corner, barely marked at all, and there the visitor heads in, foregoing any remarks about "empty Senate gestures" and "the real business being done through the side door," because manifestly the Senators were innocent and counted on competent architects to guide them.

What difference does it make whether an architecture calls its signals straight or not? Simply this: that when stones are eloquent they proclaim the glory of a government forever. But before eloquence can attend either a work of architecture or a speech, the ideas within must be first coherent and then imaginative.

To begin with, there is here no imaginative realization, inside or out, of what kind of a building, and how very important a building, the architects were dealing with. This was no mere "office building"—that is sure. Now, interestingly enough, the building plan which virtually imposed itself on the architects had implicit within itself a wonderful expression of the drama of government-at-work. All but one of the 15 hearing rooms for the Senate's committees

are two stories high and are flanked on either side by a Senator's suite and by a staff suite, and these have a height of only a single story. Since the two-story hearing rooms, scattered through the building, occur on six of the floors, and each of these hearing rooms pushes up through the floor above, the result is a quite wonderful interlock of one- and two-story elements, almost a Chinese puzzle. Such a plan was an opportunity virtually handmade for the devices of a dramatic contemporary architecture. There is an alternation of rooms large and small, rooms extending upward or downward in relation to any particular corridor, rows of smaller workrooms flanking the larger, more elaborate hearing rooms. All this apparatus of a mighty Senate at work had in it potentially a visual drama (both in the interior of the building and reflected on the exterior), more exciting than any scientific laboratory or industrial plant.

Even traditional architecture in its lustier days found excitement in such dramas of space interplay, for example in churches. But such an art of architectural communication seems to be lost today to all architects who have not gone through the modern revolution. The art of space in a space age belongs, like leadership in rockets, only to those who have followed their imaginations and allowed their art to develop.

This technical opportunity to give Washington a fascinating building of interpenetrating shapes and spaces was only the beginning of what was missed. With it was also missed a symbolizing opportunity. Think what the very presence of such an array of rooms large and small would tell an archaeologist a thousand years hence about the nature and meaning of the U.S. Senate. As students of government well know, the very heart of the American legislative process lies in the committee system. These committees are where the Senators meet constituents face to face in the heat of action. Here is the arena where advocates and opponents of bills fight out their sanguinary battles. Here is the laboratory where the legislators aided by hardworking staff prepare and pursue their relentless fact-finding investigations. If the throngs of Americans visiting the Capitol find the House and Senate Chambers often virtually empty, that is because the real work is being done elsewhere in committee rooms. Yet the building where these arenas are concentrated, this veritable center of the government's performing arts, was treated by Architects Eggers and Higgins as a mere office building in an illiterate classical shell.

In a democracy, government must interpret itself to the people over and over again, and differently as times change. American government has done so. In Jefferson's day the classicism which he imported into a young New World was a romantic interpretation: ancient Greece and Rome were supposed to have been ever so much purer and nobler than the baroque monarchies of Europe as an example to follow.

There were several other very different kinds of classicism in American government building after that, among them imperialist classic, as in the Supreme Court, and penitentiary classic in the new wing of the State Department—but independently of all of them came the second revolution which turned America into an industrial society. It lived by doing exacting work. The egalitarianism of American democracy is less of a marvel now than the capacity of free people in voluntary association to carry through complicated jobs. This triumph is just what a government building such as the new Senate Office Building was fitted to celebrate.

The chance is gone now. But what of the future? The reason why government architecture is going to pieces faster, the closer it lies to the Hill, is that the buildings there

are in the hands of a tight little club of architects who all wear the old classical school tie and are epigoni. They operate under a fast-talking little Architect of the Capitol who knows how to pack expensive things into buildings, but is not a registered architect at all. As long as architecture on the Hill continues to be handled without the competition of new men and ideas it will continue to deteriorate, saying nothing, going nowhere.

Birth of a Great City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today is Chicago's 156th birthday. On behalf of the entire Illinois delegation, as the dean of that delegation, I take great pleasure in inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today an article which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times, briefly describing the humble beginnings of Chicago, which today, 156 years later, stands as a symbol of almost indescribable progress in America.

The story of Chicago's growth is indeed a tribute to what people can do if they are free to carry out their wishes. I can only assure you that under the dedicated leadership of our present mayor, Richard J. Daley, and the bold planning which he has drawn up for my native city, we are firm and resolute in our conviction that the next 156 years will bring even greater glory to Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Sun-Times article follows:

HUMBLE START IN 1803—BIRTH OF A GREAT CITY

On the sun-drenched afternoon of August 17, 1803, a weary company of the 1st Regular Infantry pitched camp at the mouth of the Chicago River. The commander, Capt. John Whistler, had orders to build and occupy a stockade, and it was to be named Fort Dearborn.

Thus, 156 years ago this Monday the bustling city of Chicago had its humble beginning.

It was a bleak scene that greeted Captain Whistler and his men.

Close by the terrain consisted of low, sandy hills dotted with scrub pine and pools of stagnant water. Westward lay windswept prairie; north could be seen thick woods. Land to the south gave way to seemingly endless swamps.

The only signs of life were four crude log cabins, occupied by French-Canadian traders—the forerunners of Chicago's merchant princes.

LOGS DRAGGED BY HAND

Lacking oxen or horses at first, the soldiers had to drag by hand, heavy logs to build the fort. Construction was slow, but by December Fort Dearborn began to function as a link in the chain of garrisons protecting settlers in the Lake Michigan region.

How was it possible that a small fort and a cluster of traders' huts could grow into the Nation's second largest metropolis?

A word provides the answer—location. Fort Dearborn lay on 6 square miles of land that Gen. Anthony Wayne persuaded the Indians to give to the U.S. Government in 1795.

The general's choice of property was shrewd. The site lay at the intersection of important Indian trails long used by French and British traders. Later these trails became hard roads and eventually U.S. Highways 30, 12, 41, and 66.

PORTAGE EVEN MORE VITAL

Of greater importance than the trails was the Chicago Portage. This was a strip of land $1\frac{1}{4}$ miles wide connecting the Chicago and Des Plaines Rivers, and thus linking the Great Lakes region with the Mississippi and Illinois Rivers. Control of the portage meant control of the government, travel and trade of the vast untapped inland empire that stretched to the Rockies.

Despite its favored position, the settlement around Fort Dearborn did not immediately flourish. Savage Indian tribes still roamed the plains, making overland travel difficult.

In 1812 Indians attacked 97 settlers and soldiers 2 miles south of Fort Dearborn and killed or captured the entire party. They burned the fort to the ground. Later it was rebuilt and occupied until its final abandonment in 1837.

With the opening of the Erie Canal in 1825, Chicago's fortunes finally began to improve. The canal, connecting the Hudson River with Lake Erie, provided a direct, easy and inexpensive all-water route from New York to the Fort Dearborn region.

In 1832 the Blackhawk war ended, driving the tribes west of the Mississippi and opening up the way for easier settlement.

INCORPORATED WITH 350

By 1833 Chicago's population increased from 50 to 350, and it was formally incorporated as a town. Four years later, with 4,170 permanent residents, it became a city.

Continued extension of the waterways around Chicago helped its growth.

The opening in 1848 of the Illinois-Michigan Canal, which connected the Chicago and Des Plaines Rivers, eliminated the old portage route.

Real estate prices soared. By 1860 land near State and Madison sold for \$300 a front foot; by 1865 the price was \$500. A year later the cost had jumped to \$2,000.

But in 1871 Chicago suffered a frightful disaster. Fire broke out on the West Side. Fanned by high winds, the flames swept across the dry wooden buildings, traveling 2 miles in little more than 6 hours. Before it was brought under control 27 hours later, the fire had destroyed 17,450 buildings and property worth \$197 million, made almost 100,000 persons homeless and taken 250 lives.

Millions of dollars in aid poured in from all over the world. Chicago began to rebuild—this time in stone and steel. Within a year the business district was erected, and the rest of the city took shape shortly afterward.

Public confidence in Chicago's business stability was not set back by the fire. Just 2 years later in the financial panic of 1873, Chicago banks alone among financial institutions in the Nation's large cities continued to pay out current funds.

In 1890 Chicago's population topped the million mark. From this point on, the city has grown steadily until it now contains within its boundaries more than 4 million inhabitants.

The original 6 square miles obtained by General Wayne has mushroomed to 211.

Chicago's Loop is a scant 6 blocks from where Fort Dearborn once stood. This area alone now does an average retail business of \$1.5 billion each year.

With the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, Chicago stands on the verge of another great expansion, much more than fulfilling the dreams of those who sent Captain Whistler and his men to build a fort at the portage 156 years ago.

Resignation of Dr. John Tyler Caldwell as President of University of Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, it was with deep regret that I learned last week of the resignation of Dr. John Tyler Caldwell as president of the University of Arkansas to become chancellor of North Carolina State University at Raleigh. I congratulate the State of North Carolina for its good judgment and discrimination in selecting Dr. Caldwell for this important position.

Dr. Caldwell became president of the University of Arkansas in 1952, and has been an outstanding success as the chief administrator of that great institution. He is a man of boundless energy and enthusiasm, and has devoted all his great talent to the cause of higher education during these hectic years. He and his fine family will be a great addition to the State of North Carolina.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD articles from the Northwest Arkansas Times and the Arkansas Gazette concerning Dr. Caldwell's resignation. Also a statement by Mr. L. C. Carter, the chairman of board of trustees of the University of Arkansas.

There being no objection, the articles and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Northeast Arkansas Times]

NO EASY JOB

The announcement yesterday that Dr. John Tyler Caldwell is leaving the university presidency to become chancellor of North Carolina State comes as no great surprise. Stories recently have indicated that Dr. Caldwell was being considered as the favorite for the eastern school post, and he made no effort to deny he was interested.

But even with some indication that such a change was probable, the word that he has accepted the offer and asked the board of trustees of the university to release him in Arkansas comes as something of a shock. Dr. Caldwell has made a record of which he, the university, and the State can be proud.

As L. C. Carter, president of the board of trustees, pointed out in a statement, "The people of Arkansas owe much to Dr. Caldwell for his vision and courageous leadership during an important period in the development of higher education in Arkansas. He has directed the university's successful transition from the emergency GI bill days to the present high level of operation. During his presidency the regular enrollment on the Fayetteville campus has increased from fewer than 4,000 to nearly 6,000 students."

During the years he has served as president there has been much building on the campus, and also in Little Rock. The John Barnhill Field House, the Brough Commons, the Roberta Fulbright Hall (to house 400 women students this coming school term), the Carlson Terrace apartments (which are being doubled in size) have gone up during his tenure in office. The great Medical Center in Little Rock has become a reality along with the Medical Center residence hall.

"He has imparted a spirit of enthusiasm, warmth, and high moral principle to the entire institution," correctly reminded Mr. Carter.

Now it will be the job of the university trustees to seek out a worthy successor. The task comes at a difficult time, with classes due to begin next month. There must be much searching, intensive screening of candidates, and a most careful selection of a new president. It is a job that calls for diligence and patience, and the public will do well to consider this is not something which can be accomplished within a period of a few days, maybe not in a few weeks.

To Dr. Caldwell will go good wishes in his new undertaking, which he says he looks forward to "with keen anticipation." And to the members of the board to whose lot it falls to name the next president, our fullest expectation that they will choose most wisely a person who will head the thriving and fast-growing school that means so very much to the State of Arkansas.

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS PRESIDENT CALDWELL GETS NORTH CAROLINA POST

University of Arkansas President John Tyler Caldwell has been named chancellor of North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering at Raleigh, it was announced yesterday.

Dr. Caldwell was elected by trustees of the Consolidated University of North Carolina with only one dissenting vote—that from Trustee Edwin S. Pou of Raleigh, who had said he would like a 30-day delay in the selection so more time could be given to finding a qualified North Carolinian for the office. Pou later withdrew his vote to make the action unanimous.

At North Carolina State, Dr. Caldwell will receive \$17,000 a year—\$2,000 less than his salary at the University of Arkansas.

The post of chancellor is the highest at each of the colleges of the Consolidated University.

President William C. Friday of the Consolidated University, who recommended Dr. Caldwell's appointment, described him as a man of "proven ability as an educator and an administrator. He has great courage and is a strong and vigorous person who is committed to the standards of quality and excellence in higher education."

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS TO BEGIN SEARCH

The University of Arkansas Board will meet at 2 p.m. today at the Medical Center at Little Rock to start the search for a successor to Dr. Caldwell, who will leave Fayetteville August 31.

Dr. Caldwell, 47, has been president of the University of Arkansas since July 1, 1952. Before moving to Fayetteville, he spent 5 years as president of Alabama College for Women at Montevallo.

"The North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering is an important institution," Dr. Caldwell said yesterday, "and I look forward to the chancellorship of it with keen anticipation. On the other hand, I have invested a great deal of labor and love in the University of Arkansas and leave it and the State with regret and with memories I shall cherish."

"It has been a great honor indeed to serve the people of Arkansas as president of their university."

DEEP REGRET

L. C. Carter of Stuttgart, chairman of the University of Arkansas board said, "The board of trustees has not met since learning the news, but I know I speak for each member when I express deep regret that President John Tyler Caldwell has resigned. The people of Arkansas owe much to Dr. Caldwell for his vision and courageous leadership during an important period in the development of higher education in Arkansas. He has directed the university's successful tran-

sition from the emergency GI bill days to the present record high level of operation. During his presidency, the regular enrollment on the Fayetteville campus has increased from less than 4,000 to nearly 6,000. Physically, the university has grown at a spectacular rate.

"During President Caldwell's administration, we have seen the completion of the medical center, John Barnhill Fieldhouse, Brough Commons, Roberta Fulbright Hall, the Carlson Terrace Apartments, the Jeff Banks Student Union, and the medical center residence hall. During this time, the Animal Science Building has been partially completed and numerous other projects advanced. Important new structures are well into the planning stage. Since 1952, the annual budget of the university has been increased substantially.

"SPIRIT OF ENTHUSIASM"

"President Caldwell's greatest contribution to the University of Arkansas and thus to the State isn't measurable. He has imparted a spirit of enthusiasm, warmth and high moral principle to the entire institution.

"We wish for Dr. Caldwell and his family happiness and success in North Carolina."

There was no indication yesterday of a possible successor for Dr. Caldwell.

At its meeting today the Board is expected to name a selection committee to consider possible successors.

ACTING PRESIDENT NEEDED

Also expected to be considered at today's meeting is the naming of an acting president. Normally, this job would go to the provost of the University, but Dr. Lewis H. Rohrbach, vice president and provost, resigned recently, and no successor has been named.

In the absence of a provost, the Board will likely appoint one of the deans on the Fayetteville campus to be acting president. These include Deans G. D. Nichols of the College of Arts and Sciences, Henry H. Kronenberg of the College of Education, George F. Brannigan of the College of Engineering, Paul W. Milam of the College of Business Administration, Ralph Barnhart of the College of Law, and V. W. Adkisson of the Graduate School.

North Carolina State College has about 6,000 students. As chancellor, Dr. Caldwell will succeed Dr. Carey H. Bostian, who resigned to return to teaching.

Dr. Caldwell, the 15th man to be president or acting president of the University of Arkansas, was born at Yazoo City, Miss.

In 1954, the Arkansas Junior Chamber of Commerce honored Dr. Caldwell as the man who had done most for the State during the year.

STATEMENT BY L. C. CARTER, CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF TRUSTEES, UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS

The board of trustees has not met since learning the news, but I know I speak for each member when I express deep regret that President John Tyler Caldwell has resigned. The people of Arkansas owe much to Dr. Caldwell for his vision and courageous leadership during an important period in the development of higher education in Arkansas. He has directed the university's successful transition from the emergency GI bill days to the present record high level of operation. During his presidency, the regular enrollment on the Fayetteville campus has been increased from less than 4,000 to nearly 6,000. Physically, the university has grown at a spectacular rate.

During President Caldwell's administration, we have seen the completion of the Medical Center, John Barnhill Fieldhouse, Brough Commons, Roberta Fulbright Hall, the Carlson Terrace Apartments, the Jeff Banks Student Union and the Medical Center residence hall. During this time, the Animal Science Building has been partially

completed and numerous other projects advanced. Important new structures are well into the planning stage. Since 1952, the annual budget of the university has been increased substantially.

President Caldwell's greatest contribution to the University of Arkansas and thus to the State isn't measurable. He has imparted a spirit of enthusiasm, warmth and high moral principle to the entire institution.

We wish for Dr. Caldwell and his family happiness and success in North Carolina.

Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959

SPEECH

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8342) to provide for reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I suppose it is only natural that in discussing this legislation, we are primarily discussing the shortcomings of the labor movement. We all know those shortcomings exist, and we are trying to enact a bill that will correct them.

But in the course of this effort, I am afraid that some of my distinguished colleagues are brushing aside too quickly the evidence placed before us by the leaders of the labor movement—not those who have been exposed as crooked, unethical or dictatorial, but those whose conduct has been above reproach.

Ordinarily, I agree, it is wise to discount the arguments of special pleaders, or special interests, in writing legislation that affects them. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is no ordinary case.

Older Members of this House will remember the history of previous regulatory bills. They will remember how, when we established the Securities and Exchange Commission to regulate the stock market, we did so over the bitter opposition of the rulers of Wall Street. They will remember how the public utility moguls fought against any interference with their monopolistic practices. In an earlier day, it was the railroads who resisted. And so it has been over the years.

It was the same story, for that matter, when we were in the course of amending the Wagner Act. The labor leaders of that time, the heads of the then rival AFL and CIO—though they were men of integrity—had few proposals to offer that would be regulatory as to labor. We had to proceed almost completely without their advice.

Today we have a different picture. From the very beginning, the leaders of organized labor have cooperated in the

field of reform. They have made constructive suggestions. Indeed, they have insisted, time after time, that legislation was essential.

This is the first time, to my knowledge, that any group, any interest, in our society has voluntarily cooperated in a movement for the supervision and regulation of its internal affairs by government.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, when these men of labor come to us and say, "This clause would hurt a legitimate union activity," or, "That clause would impose an insupportable burden on us," I think we should take them seriously. They are experts; and they have proved their good faith.

I do not think this is an issue that can be justly solved by legislation which pleases nobody. I admit it is tempting to say, in effect, H.R. 8400 is damned by labor as too tough, and H.R. 8490 is damned by management as too weak; neither side likes H.R. 8342, so that must be the answer.

I hope we resist the temptation. I say that to take this course would be a shabby reward for the honest union leaders who have given us their help.

We would not expect an innocent man to welcome conviction for manslaughter because his disowned brother has been charged with murder. And in this case, Mr. Speaker, the innocent man actually helped to build the case against the guilty one.

Compromise is essential in the art of government; but let us not compromise with justice.

I support the Shelly bill, and would support the committee bill properly amended if we get a chance to vote on that. As one who voted for the Kennedy-Ives bill in the 85th Congress I favor legislation that will help get the crooks, without harassing and impeding the forward progress of legitimate and decent labor unions.

The action we take here should be aimed at the crooks, not at the decent, law-abiding unions and their decent, honest, and law-abiding members.

There are unwarranted restraints on legitimate union activity in the Landrum-Griffin bill that prevent me from accepting it. The Shelly and the committee bills amended are the more fair and effective ways to meet this problem.

Let Us Pray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPP

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. SCHOEPP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the column written by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate, entitled "Let Us Pray," published in the Washington, D.C., Sunday Star, on Sunday, August 16, 1959.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET US PRAY

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate)

"There are more things wrought by prayer than this world knows of," declares Tennyson. It is an ominous symptom of the free world's creeping moral numbness that when the Congress of the United States says to all the American people "Let us pray," so many raise the question, "Is this an appropriate time to pray?" But are times for prayer to be determined by political calendars or thermometers? Yes, some reply, "but this particular prayer at this time might upset the international appletart." It is poor timing, say timid souls who themselves are quite free and comfortable—thank you!—to let the jittery world know that prayers are being offered in the United States of America for the victims of the most colossal crime of the 20th century.

There are those who declare that perhaps it is not quite polite to call attention to nauseating things in welcoming malefactors who would like to be regarded by a forgetful world as half-fellows-well-met.

The Soviet juggernaut has invaded and seized the sovereignty of untold millions who are being denied the right of self-determination for which a host of American boys died in the Europe now enslaved. The Soviet hammer has smashed the national life of independent nations and its sickle has cut down the most cherished blooms in their garden of living.

What a sickening roll it is. Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, when solemn promises were broken as the cruel grip of aliens strangled their freedom. Hungary, with its brave attempt to break the hateful fetters, is kept in the police state prison, as is Rumania, only by Soviet tanks and bayonets. From captured East Germany and North Korea thousands flee constantly to the freedom of West Germany and of South Korea.

The crude and rude boss of the Kremlin recently went like a conqueror to Poland, where the one uniting emotion is hatred of the Russians. The foreign tyrant twitted that deeply religious people about their naive faith. He ridiculed their church leaders as he gloried in his gospel of dirt-without-destiny.

Of course, by putting on civilized shows in Moscow it is ardently hoped that the free world will accept the status quo as its attention is diverted from the terrible things that are being perpetrated in the captive countries—things which if not stopped will soon make it impossible ever to retrieve the national existence, as the very roots are being destroyed.

The free world needs to be told in season and out of season, of the crimes of genocide, of deportation, of torture and liquidation of those who refuse to conform. The smiles being broadcast these days are on the deceitful faces of those who even now are carrying out these almost unbelievably sadistic policies. Could Shakespeare have characterized the Soviet perfidy more accurately than is suggested by his line—"Like the smiling flower, and like the serpent under it"?

Mangled Tibet is the latest addition to the roll of captive nations caught in the tentacles of the Red octopus. Are the sounds of the ballet in Moscow to drown out the piteous pleas for liberation from ancient peoples whose very national life is being stamped into the bloody ground?

No wonder the American proposition for a Week of Prayer has evidently struck the Soviet anatomy in a very sensitive spot.

Of course the repetition in the congressional resolution of what has been said by

America again and again brings protests from sycophant Quislings. But the bowed people, behind the curtain, under the taskmaster's whip stir with new hope. Through the resolution a voice which perhaps had seemed to be stifled resounds loud and strong—"Let my people go." The patriotic exiles from all these shackled nations now on our free soil are making the welkin ring with their grateful cheers. They know it is never the wrong time to pray for the right things.

And so we thank the God who hath made and preserved us a nation, that from the halls of our Congress there comes to the enslaved the assurance: "We shall continue to think in terms of your freedom, and not your thralldom. We are looking for your day of liberation, and not for any acceptance of legitimacy to be stamped on your bondage. And so, not only this year—but every year, and every day of every year—we call upon our free Nation to remember you in your captivity, with the poignant resolution of a Hebrew exile of old who, with his people under the rod of the oppressor, swore 'If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning and my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth.'"

And so when Congress says "Let us remember—lest we forget" it is but reechoing the stirring words of Woodrow Wilson: "The right is more precious than peace. We shall fight for the rights of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own government, for the rights and liberties of small nations, until at last the world is free."

When Congress says, Let us pray for the captive people, it is but broadcasting the call of James Russell Lowell:

"Is true freedom but to break
Fetters for our own dear sake,
And with leathern hearts, forget
That we owe mankind a debt?
No. True freedom is to share
All the chains our brothers wear,
And, with heart and hand, to be
Earnest to make others free."

Dancey in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the 23d and 24th articles of a series by Editor Charles L. Dancey appearing in the August 11 and 12 issues of the Peoria Journal Star, respectively:

[From the Peoria Journal Star,
Aug. 11, 1959]

WEST GERMAN JAZZMEN NOT HIP TO
RED TOUR

(By Charles L. Dancey)

TBILISI.—When I reached the airport at Baku, a big West German (who turned out to be the jazz singer with the band) spotted me at once and asked me if I were an American.

When I said I was, he grinned and said, "One look and I knew it had to be."

I said that was particularly funny to me, because the Russians had repeatedly mistaken me for a German.

He said that "to a Russian" there probably was a similarity between an American and a West German. On the plane, the jazz band

and I were the sum total of passengers, and almost all of them spoke English in varying degrees.

All said their tour in Russia was interesting, but all were eager to get home.

They smiled "you-know-what-I-mean" smiles and said: "It's a different world." They weren't impressed. They had been touring 6 weeks.

In Tbilisi I was met by a charming guide, a college student in English, a native Georgian, whose name is Loli (Persian for "Ruby").

We skipped lightly over the two stadiums, usual big housing projects, and huge new parks building, and dropped the car on a mountaintop overlooking the whole city. Then we rode a cable car down in 3 minutes—swoosh.

We walked most of the afternoon, visiting an ancient castle where Stalin was once a prisoner in the dungeon, saw the crumbling fortress on the mountain built by Persian invaders 1,000 years or more in the past, and walked through the "old city," which dates back to 300 B.C.

Here again were the cramped, stacked Arabic or Mexican-type houses, in narrow, dark winding streets, with a good many crummy looking characters.

Loli would say, "Those people are not Georgian, they are Kurds." Or something else.

She is very proud, very intelligent, very well educated in Georgian history, and speaks English excellently and without Gregory Ratoff accent. Her Georgian accent is very soft.

At the end of one of the winding streets stood a building with blue tile front, and later I returned alone through the old city to this place and had a sulfur water bath in a huge square sunken marble pool fed by an artesian well in a great vaulted marble room with Oriental designs in tile on the floor and two great marble "couches." The water comes from the ground already hot from natural hot springs.

This is the ancient bathhouse of the ancient kings of Georgia.

The Georgians are the proudest and most likable people I have met in the Soviet Union. They are the "Iberians" of ancient Greek writings. Colchis, where the Golden Fleece was found, was a Georgian land. They created their own strange phonetic alphabet at least 500 B.C., a close rival of the budding Roman civilization.

Caesar's rival, Pompey, once marched into their mountain homeland near Tbilisi, but they withstood the Romans and often became their allies later. They are also one of the earliest Christian nations, having converted in A.D. 300.

Their whole history is one of constant war with the non-Christian hordes around them—the Moorish conquest failed to subdue them, and their nation and religion survived Genghis Khan, Tamerlane, and the constant attacks of Turks and Persians.

Their religious art, dating to A.D. 800, is hundreds of years before that of Renaissance Italy, and especially in the craftsmanship of their goldsmiths and silversmiths was farther advanced than Italian work of the 13th century.

It is hard to believe that from such a place and such a people came a Josef Stalin.

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Aug. 12, 1959]

TALK WITH NUN RATTLES GUIDE

(By Charles L. Dancey)

TBILISI.—Today we traveled to a little city that is the old capital of Georgia, and when they say "old" they mean old.

The capital was moved from this place to Tbilisi in A.D. 500.

Here is a tremendous cathedral with services underway. We stopped. The singing was very beautiful, and it seemed amazing to

hear such lovely singing from a handful of nondescript worshippers.

When the priest stepped out in his resplendent robes through two little swinging doors to the altar, he was a very young and handsome man with a full beard and long, flowing, curly, black hair—looking like a figure right out of the Bible.

Loli, my guide, was amazed.

"He is so young," she exclaimed. "How is it possible? Only the old people believe. And he can never marry. He is buried."

A nun came to me and asked if I were a believer but I did not understand her Georgian and Loli translated. I said "Yes," and she asked, "Why don't you kiss the cross, then?"

I said that I was a Christian but my church did not happen to include this same ceremony.

The woman replied in English, "Protestant." I nodded. "It does not matter," she said. "It is all one Christ and one God." (This in Georgian translated by Loli.) The nun spoke more.

Again, Loli was visibly shaken.

"This woman is very well educated," she said. "She knows all about Martin Luther."

A rapid-fire exchange between the two of them, and Loli turned again: "She is an engineer—with two degrees. How can it be—so educated and a believer?"

Loli could not get over these two experiences for some time. They did not fit the flat, absolute preachments of her propaganda-flavored education.

Like everyone else in Russia, she also told me that pipes are not smoked. "They are very bad for health," she said. "I know of no man that smokes them any more, except of course my grandfather."

"And how old is your grandfather?" I asked.

Loli looked at me for a moment, and then she began to laugh and laugh. With tears in her eyes she finally replied: "He is now a full century."

Inside this great cathedral are the burial crypts of old Georgian kings, some of the marble slabs shattered by the hooves of Turkish cavalry horses. In the massive walls are 200 hidden secret rooms entered through a tiny door 80 feet up over a gaint arch—where the women, children, and treasures were hidden during raids. Around the church is a battlement wall.

En route back we stopped at another state farm—100 salaried full-time workers living in 16 small apartment buildings plus a big administration building with offices and such to take care of the farm of 800 hectares—2,000 acres.

This whole area is somewhere in the borderland of what is believed to be the ancient homeland of the entire Aryan race that spread over Northern Europe, and although they are an island among darker-skinned Arabic-type Caucasians, many of the Georgians are like Loli—very fair skinned and light haired.

Two side incidences took place here of special interest that I will tell about separately instead of in chronology.

Remarkable Tree Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, it has been only in recent years that the "Tree

Farm" has become a well-known part of the American lexicon. Up in the beautiful Idaho Panhandle, near the blue waters of Hayden Lake, O. K. Smith started farming his trees back in 1925, pioneering a tree conservation program. Today, experts from across the Nation visit Hayden Lake to see his remarkable accomplishments.

The August 1959 issue of the Northwest Ruralite published an interesting article on Mr. Smith. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKABLE TREE FARMER

Little by little over the past 40 years, O. K. Smith, a craggy, youthful man in spite of his "retirement age," has acquired more than a section of woodland and brushy pasture in a picturesque vale near Hayden Lake, Idaho, and has turned it into one of the continent's most productive tree farms.

"Trees are our principal business," he says, "but we like critters, too."

Foresters come from all parts of the country to see how Mr. Smith has done it. Here's what a group of them found out about his place not so long ago: 560 acres of woodland and pasture; 50 acres of cropland.

Tree thinning operations were started in 1925 (this makes him one of the earliest tree farmers in the Northwest).

Products for home use: house, shed lumber, 15 cords of fuel per year, corral posts and poles (don't be fooled by that cordwood, Mrs. Smith has both a wood and electric range).

Grazing: Six to eighty head of cattle. (Mr. Smith says the number depends on how much time he and his sons can find free from their tree operations).

Products sold: Eight truckloads of poles; 130 thousand feet of saw logs at landing; 400 sawed ties; 1,600 cords of fuel wood; 15 cars of pulpwood.

And, as one nationally known forester has said, "All this was produced by foresight and hard work."

The secret of the tree conservation program appears to be in consistent thinning and pruning. Government agencies pay small conservation bounties to tree farmers now for pruning, but when Mr. Smith started his program, it was done not for the bounty but because it produced more salable wood.

There's a fine pine tree in the Smith front yard which Mr. Smith measures every June. It has grown 17 inches in circumference during the past 8 years. "There's about 1,000 usable board feet in that tree right now," he says. A visitor gets the feeling he can give you the same information about every tree on the place.

He took 130,000 feet of lumber off a 10-acre tract 1 year. Most of his merchantable timber is fir, tamarack, and pine.

"I came west in 1898, and I started this kind of farming because I'd seen wheat selling for 38 cents a bushel," is his comment. "We've acquired our acreage, piece by piece, and we now sell some timber every year. Currently, we've been taking it easy. We move maybe 12,000 feet per year, but we could take 40,000 to 50,000 feet without hurting anything."

Mr. Smith leaves the logging to his sons now and spends a lot of time on planning and on handicraft hobbies. He handcarves fans out of white pine in minute delicate filigree patterns. Has a showcase full of his carvings at home. He has a fine brown bearskin robe, tanned and draped over his

sofa in the parlor. "Caught the bear a couple of miles from here," he says, "don't see many like it."

The Smith home is all-electric and, of course, its power supply comes from a co-op: the Kootenai Rural Electric Association at Coeur d'Alene, Idaho.

Presidential Inability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, 1959, I introduced H.R. 871 to provide a method for determining Presidential inability.

In this connection, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following report on Senate Joint Resolution 40, by the Association of the Bar of the City of New York:

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL LEGISLATION ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 40, A PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION RELATING TO CASES WHERE THE PRESIDENT IS UNABLE TO DISCHARGE THE POWERS AND DUTIES OF HIS OFFICE

INTRODUCTION

There presently exists a defect in the Constitution of the United States relating to the situation where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. This inability may come about because of serious illness, as it has in the past, or some other emergency. In the present day and age, the serious consequences of such an occurrence cannot be stressed too strongly. In the opinion of the committee, action should be taken to clarify the Constitution and to enact legislation dealing with the problem, prior to the advent of some future presidential inability. This report discusses the problem and recommends certain constitutional and legislative action relating thereto.

BACKGROUND

Clause 5 of section 1 of article II of the Constitution reads as follows:

"In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President, and the Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly, until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected."

Several times in U.S. history, when the President has been seriously incapacitated, the question of whether the "office" of President, or the "powers and duties of the said office" "devolve on the Vice President" has been forcibly raised. Does a determination of inability affect the Office, or the powers and duties of the office, and does the Vice President, if he assumes the powers and duties of the office, do so on a temporary basis, or on a permanent basis thus displacing or ousting the President?

The problem arises because of the precedent which has been established by seven Vice Presidents upon the death of the President then in office. The Vice President assumed not only the powers and duties of the Office of President but also the Office itself.

In view of the language of the clause, the question has been raised whether the same result will not occur upon the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of the Office, namely, that the Vice President will then assume the Office of the President, and the President will be ousted.

Although the records of the debates of the Founding Fathers demonstrate that this was not the intention of the Founding Fathers, nevertheless the precedents established by the seven Vice Presidents upon the death of the President then in office, the language of the clause, and the reluctance of Vice Presidents Arthur and Marshall to act when Presidents Garfield and Wilson were incapacitated because of the fear that by such assumption of the powers and duties of the Presidency, they would be ousting the President, has led to a constitutional ambiguity which should be clarified.

Historians believe that our Government has suffered in the past as a result of this ambiguity and that the matter should be clarified for the future. Certainly the original understanding of the framers of the Constitution that only the powers and duties of the President passed to the Vice President upon the inability of the President, could be set forth in the Constitution, and it would seem that the present congressional session affords an excellent opportunity to clarify this constitutional defect.

This committee has studied the question and concluded that a constitutional amendment should be enacted by the Congress and submitted to the States amending clause 5 of section 1 of article II. Such constitutional amendment should eliminate the ambiguity and provide, in general terms, for the establishment of a system of determining inability by the Congress. The committee further believes that upon the adoption of such amendment Congress should enact legislation (1) providing a method to determine inability; and (2) establishing a procedure whereby the President, if and when he recovers from his inability, may resume the powers and duties of the Office of President. Throughout the period of inability, however, the President should retain the Office of President, and the Vice President should serve only as Acting President.

The committee believes that the solution to the problem may be found in Senate Joint Resolution 40, and a proposal of the Committee on Federal Constitution of the New York State Bar Association.

THE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE PRESENT PRESIDENT AND THE PRESENT VICE PRESIDENT

President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon on March 3, 1958, published the following memorandum of their understanding of the constitutional role of the Vice President as Acting President during the inability of the President:

"The President and the Vice President have agreed that the following procedures are in accord with the purposes and provisions of article 2, section 1, of the Constitution, dealing with Presidential inability. They believe that these procedures, which are intended to apply to themselves only, are in no sense outside or contrary to the Constitution but are consistent with its present provisions and implement its clear intent.

"1. In the event of inability the President would—if possible—so inform the Vice President, and the Vice President would serve as Acting President, exercising the powers and duties of the Office until the inability had ended.

"2. In the event of an inability which would prevent the President from communicating with the Vice President, the Vice President, after such consultation as seems to him appropriate under the circumstances, would decide upon the devolution of the powers and duties of the Office

and would serve as Acting President until the inability had ended.

"3. The President, in either event, would determine when the inability had ended and at that time would resume the full exercise of the powers and duties of the Office."

Presumably in the event of inability of the present President this memorandum would be construed as establishing a procedure by which the powers and duties of the Office of President would be assumed by the Vice President until the inability had ended. The determination as to the ending of the inability would be at the sole discretion of the President. The memorandum notes that the procedures "are intended to apply to themselves only" and thus would not appear to be binding upon future incumbents of the Office of President and Vice President.

Accordingly, in the opinion of the committee, a constitutional amendment and implementing legislation to govern cases for the future are necessary.

Senate Joint Resolution 40

Annexed hereto as appendix 1 is Senate Joint Resolution 40, as reported this spring to the Senate Judiciary Committee by its Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, a proposed amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which is the same resolution introduced in Congress as Senate Joint Resolution 161 in 1958.

The essentials of the proposed amendment are that it:

1. Clarifies the established view that upon the removal of the President from office, death, or resignation, the Vice President actually becomes President; and
2. Provides for the case where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of the Office of President, but makes clear that the Vice President assumes only the powers and duties of the Office, and not the Office itself.

This committee favors enactment of an amendment to accomplish these two purposes.

In the case of inability, Senate Joint Resolution 40 provides that the President may make a written declaration to that effect; provides a method by which the Vice President, subject to the majority approval of the Cabinet, may make such a declaration; and then provides a system for restoring the powers and duties of the Office of the President to the President upon the termination of his inability. This restoration would occur under a procedure providing the maximum safeguards to insure that the President can resume the discharge of the powers and duties of his Office upon the termination of his inability.

This committee believes that the establishment of the procedure for determining inability and the system of restoration would be best left to enactment by Congress, subject to the veto power of the President contained in clause 2 of section 7 of article I of the Constitution. This committee believes that constitutional amendments should not be overly detailed, and future contingencies in the operation of the implementation of the constitutional mandate, not presently foreseeable, left to the good judgment of Congress and the President, i.e., a majority of both Houses and Presidential approval, or a two-thirds vote of both Houses overriding a Presidential veto.

A detailed analysis of the six sections of Senate Joint Resolution 40 follows:

Section 1 deals with the case of the removal of the President from office, death, or resignation. It provides that the Vice President shall become President for the expiration of the then current term. This confirms the practice which has, in fact, been the situation since Vice President Tyler in 1841 eliminated the word "Acting" from the first paper submitted to him for signature

after the death of William Henry Harrison from the words "Acting President" below his signature. Since then, six other men elected as Vice Presidents of the United States: Messrs. Fillmore, Johnson, Arthur, Theodore Roosevelt, Coolidge, and Truman, likewise assumed, upon the death of the President in office, the actual Office of the Presidency and not just the powers and duties of the Office. The committee favors enactment of section 1 as part of a constitutional amendment.

Section 2 provides that the Vice President shall discharge the powers and duties of the Office of President as Acting President, if the President himself declares in writing that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his Office, but makes it clear that only the powers and duties of the Office shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President. Insofar as this provision makes clear that only the powers and duties of the Office shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President, this committee believes it should be included as part of a constitutional amendment, and this committee's proposal does so. Insofar as it deals with a determination of inability by the President, a matter of procedure, this committee believes it should be included in the implementing legislation of the Congress, and not frozen into the Constitution.

Section 3 provides for the situation where the President does not declare his inability. The Vice President, if satisfied that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his Office, shall, upon the written approval of the majority of the heads of the executive departments in office, assume the discharge of the powers and duties of the Office of President as Acting President. Once again, it makes certain that the Office of the Presidency does not devolve upon the Vice President, but only the powers and duties of the Office. Furthermore, it vests in the executive branch of the Government, in the Vice President and the members of the Cabinet, presumably the men closest to the President and upon whom he would rely to the greatest degree, the power to determine and to confirm the President's inability to discharge the powers and duties of the Office of President. Upon such determination and approval, the Vice President assumes the discharge of the powers and duties of the Office of President as Acting President. This committee believes that this section, which deals with procedure, should also be included in implementing legislation of the Congress, and not frozen into the Constitution.

Section 4 provides for the resumption of the powers and duties of the Office of the Presidency by the President, when the President's inability is terminated. This the President may do by a simple public announcement in writing that his inability has terminated, and 7 days thereafter, "or at such earlier time after such announcement as he and the Vice President may determine," he shall resume the discharge of the powers and duties of his Office. If there should be a dispute as to the termination of the President's inability, the Vice President, again with the written approval of a majority of the heads of the executive departments in office at the time of the President's announcement, may transmit to the Congress the Vice President's written declaration that in his opinion the President's inability has not terminated. If this should occur, the Congress shall thereupon consider the issue and, if it is not in session, it shall assemble in special session on the call of the Vice President. Upon a concurrent resolution, adopted by the Congress with the approval of two-thirds of the Members present in each House, to the effect that the inability of the President has not terminated, the Vice President shall assume the discharge of the powers

and duties of the Office of the President as Acting President until:

1. He proclaims the President's inability has ended;
2. The Congress itself by concurrent resolution adopted by a majority of the Members present in each House determines that the President's inability has ended; or
3. The President's term ends.

In other words, a two-thirds vote of the Members of each House present is necessary to confirm the Vice President's declaration, with the majority approval of the Cabinet, that the President's inability has not terminated. A simple majority of the vote of the Members present in each House to the effect that the President's inability has ended, would thereafter restore the powers and duties of the Office of President to the President. Again, the President would retain the office of President and only the powers and duties of the Office would devolve upon the Vice President as Acting President.

It should be noted that clause 3 of section 7 of article I of the Constitution reads as follows:

"Every order, resolution, or vote to which the concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the same shall take effect, shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be reapproved by two-thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to the rules and limitations prescribed in the case of a bill."

However, the view of the Senate Parliamentarian seems to be that concurrent resolutions, at least insofar as the Senate is concerned, are not used for legislative purposes, and accordingly are not required to be presented to the President. In "Senate Procedure: Precedents and Practices," by Charles L. Watkins and Floyd M. Riddick, Government Printing Office, 1958, at pages 167-168, there appears the following:

"Concurrent resolutions are not required to be presented to the President of the United States unless they contain matter which is properly to be regarded as legislative in character and effect (footnote, Feb. 20, 1896, 54th Cong., 1st sess., Journal, p. 145; Jan. 26, 1897, 54th Cong., 1st sess., Journal, p. 78; see Nov. 24, 1903, 58th Cong., 1st sess., Record, p. 438) and under the practice of the Senate, they are not used for legislative purposes, and are not sent to the President for approval (footnote, Nov. 7, 1919, 66th Cong., 1st sess., Record, pp. 8074-8075)."

This committee assumes that under the procedure to be followed, the concurrent resolutions provided for in Senate Joint Resolution 40 would not require the approval or disapproval of the President, Vice President, or Acting President since the congressional action contemplated would seem to be more in the nature of fact determination than legislative in character and effect. If this were not so, confusion could arise as to whether the Vice President as Acting President could disapprove the necessary concurrent resolutions adopted by the Congress, in his capacity as Acting President. This could result in a situation where a two-thirds vote of the Senate and House of Representatives would be necessary under all circumstances to restore the powers and duties of the Office of President to the President from the Vice President serving as Acting President—a result that is certainly not contemplated and directly contrary to the intent of Senate Joint Resolution 40. The committee takes no position, however, on the general view of the Senate Parliamentarian that, under the practice of the Senate, concurrent resolutions are not used for legislative purposes, and accordingly are not required to be presented to the President.

As with respect to section 3, this committee believes this section, which deals with pro-

cedure, should be included in implementing legislation of the Congress, and not frozen into the Constitution.

The first sentence of section 5 provides, in the language of the present clause of the Constitution, that the Congress may provide for the case of the removal by death, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President. This language should be retained in the constitutional amendment. The Presidential Succession Act¹ provides for the situation, and spells out who shall exercise the powers and duties of the Office of President and that such person shall act as President. The Presidential Succession Act throughout makes it clear that such person as as President, using the words "act as President" and "acting as President."

The second sentence of section 5 provides for the situation where there is no Vice President. Under such circumstances, the powers and duties conferred by the amendment on the Vice President "shall devolve upon the officer eligible to act as President next in line of succession to the office of President, as provided by law." Under this committee's recommendation, the amendment will not confer any powers and duties upon the Vice President, and this sentence should accordingly appear in the implementing legislation and not the amendment.

Section 6 provides that the proposed amendment shall be inoperative unless ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within 7 years from the date of its submission. Section 6 should obviously be a part of the constitutional amendment.

The committee notes that Senate Joint Resolution 40 is silent as to present clause 5 of article II of the Constitution, but assumes that the present clause 5 would be repealed.

PROPOSAL OF THE COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL CONSTITUTION OF THE NEW YORK BAR ASSOCIATION, DATED DECEMBER 13, 1958

The committee on Federal Constitution of the New York State Bar Association, in its report of December 31, 1958, recommended an amendment to read as follows:

"In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death or resignation, the said office shall devolve on the Vice President. In case of the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the said powers and duties shall devolve on the Vice President, until the inability be removed. The Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then be President, or in case of inability, act as President, and such officer shall be or act as President accordingly, until a President shall be elected or, in case of inability, until the inability shall be earlier removed. The commencement and termination of any inability shall be determined by such method as Congress shall by law provide."

The committee on Federal Constitution stated:

"It is felt by this committee that a constitutional amendment is necessary, and that the amendment should provide in substance:

"(a) That the commencement and termination of any inability should be determined by such method as Congress shall by law provide; and

"(b) In case of the inability of the President, that the Vice President should succeed only to the powers and duties of the Office and not to the Office itself."

It endorsed as second best to its proposed constitutional amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 161 (1958) (Introduced in 1959 as S.J. Res. 40). The reason Senate Joint Resolution 161 was second best is stated by that committee as follows:

"Senate Joint Resolution 161 specifies the method and machinery for determining the commencement and termination of disability. This precludes leaving to Congress the details which might have to be changed in the future because the method selected proved to be unsatisfactory. Senate Joint Resolution 161 appears to us to be preferable, however, to other methods that have been suggested."

The executive committee of the New York State Bar Association on January 29, 1959, adopted the following resolutions:

"Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the executive committee of the New York State Bar Association hereby recommends that the present provisions of the Constitution of the United States dealing with the death, resignation, removal or inability of the President (art. II, sec. 1, clause 5 [sic]) be amended so that (1) the commencement and termination of any inability shall be determined by such method as Congress shall by law provide; and (2) the Vice President, in case of the inability of the President, shall succeed only to the powers and duties of the office and not to the office itself;

"Further resolved, That said report of this association's committee on Federal Constitution is hereby approved and adopted, including the text of the proposed constitutional amendment therein set forth, and including the determination of said committee that Senate Joint Resolution 161 introduced in the Senate March 4, 1958, by Senator KEFAUVER and bipartisan sponsors (proposing a constitutional amendment which lays down a detailed method and machinery for determining the commencement and termination of disability) is favored as second best to said committee's proposal and as preferable to other methods that have been suggested."

In both the proposed constitutional amendment of the Committee on Federal Constitution of the New York State Bar Association and Senate Joint Resolution 40, it is made clear that the powers and duties of the Office of President devolve upon the Vice President in the event of the inability of the President, and not the Office itself, i.e., the Vice President does not assume the Office of President but solely the powers and duties thereof. This committee endorses a constitutional amendment making this clear.

The proposal of the committee on Federal Constitution thereafter delegates to the Congress the responsibility for enacting legislation dealing with the determination of the commencement and termination of inability. In this respect:

(1) This committee concurs with this recommendation allowing Congress to deal by law with the determination of the commencement and termination of inability. Such initial legislation would have to have the approval of the President, or be enacted by a two-thirds vote of each House. Repeal or modification would also be subject to the same safeguards. Thus, the possibility of considerations other than the President's "inability" entering into the determinations would be greatly reduced, if not entirely eliminated.

(2) This committee believes that such implementing legislation should be as set forth in sections 2, 3, 4, and the second sentence of 5, of Senate Joint Resolution 40.

As noted above, this committee is of the view that, in the case of the removal, death, resignation or inability, both of the President and Vice President, the official designated by legislation should succeed only to the powers and duties of the President, acting as President, and not become President. This is the situation under the language of the present clause 5 of section 1, of article II of the Constitution, and is retained in Senate Joint Resolution 40. The proposal of the Com-

¹ 13 United States Code Annotated, sec. 19 (June 25, 1958, ch. 644, sec. 1,625, Stat. 672).

mittee on Federal Constitution would change this to make such official the President in the case of removal, death, or resignation, but in the case of inability make such official only "act as President."

It does not seem to this committee that the precedent which has been established by the Vice Presidents on the death of the President alone, should be extended over to the cases of the removal, death, or resignation of both the President and Vice President. The President is elected as such; the Vice President is elected as such, one of his duties being to act as President, and indeed succeed to the office upon the death of the President. No other officials are elected, as the President and Vice President are, with these purposes in mind.

THE NEED FOR ACTION IN THIS FIELD

In the assembling of a bibliography of the literature concerning the question of Presidential inability, the committee was impressed by the fact that the literature ebbs and flows with the status of the health of the incumbent in the White House. Thus in 1881, at the time when President Garfield lay critically stricken, a number of articles dealing with the presidential inability question and prospective solutions appeared. In 1919 and 1920, during the illness of President Wilson, once again the question came to the forefront of the minds of the American people. Most recently, during the illnesses of President Eisenhower, the subject was revived and numerous proposals advanced, extensive hearings conducted by both Houses of Congress, and articles written.

The Republic cannot afford, in the present age of global and national problems of great complexity and vital importance, to allow the constitutional problem of possible Presidential inability to remain in its present unsatisfactory state. It would seem that the present is the time for objective analysis and appraisal of the situation, and for setting in motion the necessary machinery for the enactment of a constitutional amendment and implementing legislation resolving the question in the best manner possible.

CONCLUSION

The committee is of the opinion that a constitutional amendment embodying section 1 of Senate Joint Resolution 40, and providing for the determination of the commencement and termination of any inability as the Congress shall by law provide, affords the best means for dealing with this vital question, to the extent that a constitutional amendment is necessary. The committee believes that sections 2, 3, and 4, and the second sentence of section 5 of Senate Joint Resolution 40 should be included in implementing legislation by the Congress, after the adoption of the proposed constitutional amendment.

The committee has set out as appendix 2, the proposed constitutional amendment of the Committee on Federal Constitution of the New York State Bar Association; as appendix 3, the results of this committee's recommendations insofar as a constitutional amendment is concerned; and as appendix 4, the results of this committee's recommendations insofar as implementing legislation is concerned.

Respectfully submitted.

Richard W. Hogue, Jr., Chairman; M. Bernard Aldinoff; Newell G. Alford, Jr.; Alan J. B. Aronson; Stuart K. Barnes; Alfred Berman; Richard E. Erway; Alan R. Finberg; Marvin E. Frankel; Edwin L. Gasperini; Cecella H. Goetz; Claude E. Hamilton, Jr.; Mark F. Hughes; Joseph S. Iseman; Peter L. Keane; David M. Levitan; Herbert Prashker; William J. Rennett; William I. Riegelman; Hayden N. Smith; L. Harrison Theyer II; Herbert A. Wolff, Jr.

APPENDIX 1

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 40

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE—

"SECTION 1. In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President for the unexpired portion of the then current term.

"SEC. 2. If the President shall declare in writing that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

"SEC. 3. If the President does not so declare, the Vice President, if satisfied that such inability exists, shall, upon the written approval of a majority of the heads of the executive departments in office, assume the discharge of the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

"SEC. 4. Whenever the President makes public announcement in writing that his inability has terminated, he shall resume the discharge of the powers and duties of his office on the seventh day after making such announcement, or at such earlier time after such announcement as he and the Vice President may determine. But if the Vice President, with the written approval of a majority of the heads of executive departments in office at the time of such announcement, transmits to the Congress his written declaration that in his opinion the President's inability has not terminated, the Congress shall thereupon consider the issue. If the Congress is not then in session, it shall assemble in special session on the call of the Vice President. If the Congress determines by concurrent resolution, adopted with the approval of two-thirds of the Members present in each House, that the inability of the President has not terminated, thereupon, notwithstanding any further announcement by the President, the Vice President shall discharge such powers and duties as Acting President until the occurrence of the earliest of the following events: (1) The Acting President proclaims that the President's inability has ended, (2) the Congress determines by concurrent resolution, adopted with the approval of a majority of the Members present in each House, that the President's inability has ended, or (3) the President's term ends.

"SEC. 5. The Congress may by law provide for the case of the removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected. If at any time there is no Vice President, the powers and duties conferred by this article upon the Vice President shall devolve upon the officer eligible to act as President next in line of succession to the office of President, as provided by law.

"SEC. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission."

APPENDIX 2

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL CONSTITUTION OF THE NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death or resignation, the said office shall devolve on the Vice President. In case of the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his said office, the said powers and duties shall devolve on the Vice President, until the inability be removed. The Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then be President, or in case of inability, act as President, and such officer shall be or act as President accordingly, until a President shall be elected or, in case of inability, until the inability shall be earlier removed. The commencement and termination of any inability shall be determined by such method as Congress shall by law provide.

APPENDIX 3

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO CARRY OUT RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL LEGISLATION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"Article —

"SECTION 1. Clause 6 of section 1 of article II of the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President for the unexpired portion of the then current term.

"SEC. 3. In case of the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his said office, the said powers and duties shall devolve on the Vice President, until the inability be removed. The commencement and termination of any inability shall be determined by such method as the Congress shall by law provide.

"SEC. 4. The Congress may by law provide for the case of the removal, death, resignation or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.

"SEC. 5. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission."

APPENDIX 4

IMPLEMENTING LEGISLATION TO CARRY OUT RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL LEGISLATION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

A bill to provide a method for determining the commencement and termination of Presidential inability, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the

determination of the commencement and termination of inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President shall be made as provided in this Act:

SECTION 1. If the President shall declare in writing that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

Sec. 2. The Vice President, if satisfied that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, shall, upon the written approval of a majority of the heads of the executive departments in office, assume the discharge of the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

Sec. 3. Whenever the President makes public announcement in writing that his inability has terminated, he shall resume the discharge of the powers and duties of his office on the seventh day after making such announcement, or at such earlier time after such announcement as he and the Vice President may determine. But if the Vice President, with the written approval of a majority of the heads of executive departments in office at the time of such announcement, transmits to the Congress his written declaration that in his opinion the President's inability has not terminated, the Congress shall thereupon consider the issue. If the Congress is not then in session, it shall assemble in special session on the call of the Vice President. If the Congress determines by concurrent resolution, adopted with the approval of two-thirds of the Members present in each House, that the inability of the President has not terminated, thereupon notwithstanding any further announcement by the President, the Vice President shall discharge such powers and duties as Acting President until the occurrence of the earliest of the following events: (1) the Acting President proclaims that the President's inability has ended; (2) the Congress determines by concurrent resolution, adopted with the approval of a majority of the Members present in each House, that the President's inability has ended; or (3) the President's term ends.

Sec. 4. If at any time there is no Vice President, the powers and duties conferred by this Act upon the Vice President shall devolve upon the officer eligible to act as President next in line of succession to the office of President, as provided by law.

**Magazine Publisher Who Toured Russia
With Vice President Nixon Says Communism Not Answer to Race Problem**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, any Negro who feels that communism is the solution to the race problem in the United States will be sadly disappointed if he takes a trip to Soviet Russia.

This is the opinion of John H. Johnson, publisher of *Jet* and *Ebony* magazines, who, with his wife Eunice, was a member of the press group which accompanied Vice President Nixon on his recent trip to Russia and Poland. There are relatively few Negroes in the Soviet Union, and Mr. Johnson agrees with the Russian claim that it does not have a race problem. However, he is quick to point

out that most of the privileges which we take for granted, such as freedom of speech and the press, and the right to own property, are not enjoyed by the Russian people.

The American Negro who wants better housing, more productive employment, and more individual opportunities will find that they are not available to him in Russia because they are not available to the majority of the Russian people.

Says Mr. Johnson. He does feel, however, that even though the Communist philosophy is not a good one for Negro, or white Americans, there is no reason why the United States and Russia should not be friendly and peaceful.

Mr. Johnson believes that the Nixon trip contributed much to the development of friendly relations between the two countries and that further cultural and educational exchanges should be continued.

Need To Safeguard Our Hawk Population From Extinction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, many Americans mistakenly favor or encourage the slaughter of all hawks, without realizing that these majestic birds often help to control the rodent population which could be a peril and threat to the Nation's food supply.

In the June 1958 issue of the *Reader's Digest* appeared a most illuminating article by Peter Farb about protecting our hawks from decimation and extinction. The article was published originally in *Audubon* magazine, official organ of the National Audubon Society, for May-June of 1958.

Because we of the U.S. Senate adopt appropriations for the Fish and Wildlife Service, and thus pass on policy in this area of ornithology, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Farb's article from the *Reader's Digest*, entitled "The Truth About Hawks," be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE TRUTH ABOUT HAWKS

(By Peter Farb)

Of all the creatures with whom we share the globe, none is more maligned or senselessly slaughtered than the hawk. There are 32 species of American hawks, but most people simply classify all of them as "big" chicken hawks and "little" chicken hawks, and are quite willing to believe that they are bloodthirsty creatures that kill for sport.

The truth is that hawks kill only when hungry, never for sport. They can be trained to the affectionate obedience of a dog, and are as mischievous in the air as otters are around a pond. "It is hawks' near-human qualities of love, anger and playfulness that have made them the favorite birds of most ornithologists," says Dr. Frederick C. Lincoln, famous birdman of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

An exhaustive study by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, based on analysis of the stomach content of 2,690 hawks and owls, revealed that few hawks preyed on chickens or speedy game birds. Most hawks, it has been found, wage a ceaseless war on rodents and destructive birds, and on insects whose fertility, if unchecked, could overwhelm our production of foodstuffs. Recently Prof. Harrison B. Tordoff, of the University of Michigan, estimated that a single hawk saves farmers \$110 a year in rodent damage.

Ranging in size from miniatures no bigger than robins to majestic giants that will attack a gazelle, hawks have been endowed with skills and adaptations that make them undisputed lords of the ether. To search out their quarry, for example, they are equipped with eyes that have been called "perhaps the most highly developed organs of vision in the world." A naturalist once reported having seen a falcon, flying high over a mountain ridge, suddenly close its wings and make a long, unwavering dive for a small bird, which it snatched in its knuckled talons. When the falcon first spotted its prey the two birds were at least 1½ miles apart. If we human beings had comparable visual acuity, we could read newspaper headlines a quarter of a mile away.

Much of the hawk's amazing sight comes from the size of the eyeballs, which are often as large as ours and extend far into the skull. In addition, the retina (the tissues in the back of the eye on which the picture image is thrown) is nearly twice as thick as a human's, and is packed with millions of minute visual cells. To shut out the glare of the sky, the eyes are coated with droplets of yellow oil that act much like a camera filter.

Last summer I saw a little sparrow hawk hurtle down from a height of 100 feet and neatly pluck a grasshopper off a leaf. Astonishing as the feat was, more extraordinary still was the physical transformation that had taken place inside the bird's eye during the dive. While the hawk was circling for prey, its eye lens was working like a telescope; by the time it had plummeted to the grasshopper, the lens shape had altered to that of a microscope.

Sandwiched between the two giant eyeballs, the hawk's brain is necessarily small. Regardless, hawks perform prodigious feats. It is almost unbelievable, for example, that a bird could recall the ravages caused by storms from 1 year to the next. Yet the osprey, when about to migrate south, often buttresses its nest with fresh sticks to withstand the winter blizzards. Furthermore, when these fish hawks rise above the water with a catch, they always turn the fish so that its head is pointing forward, to lessen air resistance.

And consider this example of avian generalship. A Cooper's hawk was seen on the edge of a woodlot, peering hungrily at a flock of starlings sunning themselves on a barn roof. To fly directly at the starlings would have sent them scurrying for cover. Instead the Cooper's hawk circled back through the woodlot so it could approach from the rear. Then it flew inches above the ground, using every available tree trunk and dip in the terrain to mask its flight. When it reached the barn it rose vertically up the shadowed side and took its prey by complete surprise.

Hawks exhibit just about every technique to be seen in the world of flight. Watch the master flier of them all, the peregrine falcon, also called the duck hawk. Many times I have seen one, high above me, turn its nose downward, give a mighty flap for thrust, then close its wings and plummet toward the earth like a hurled stone—sometimes attaining the incredible speed of 250 miles an hour. Suddenly there is an exploding puff of feathers as the falcon strikes a bird with its large clawed fist. The prey is usually killed out-

right. But then comes the most amazing maneuver of all: The falcon darts under the falling bird, flips over on its back and catches the prey neatly in its talons. Here is one of the great displays of controlled power in nature.

A completely different method of flight is found in the big soaring hawks we often see wheeling in lazy circles. These birds are living gliders, among the most buoyant aloft. Nearly every one of their skeletal bones is hollow and filled with air sacs that supplement the lungs and decrease weight. Too, the wings and tail are extremely broad, providing a large lifting area in relation to weight. And at the wing tips the feathers have evolved into what are really many separate little wings, resembling a hand with the fingers spread out. These "slots," as they're called, give the hawk instant control over changes in air currents. As the soars slowly patrol their territories, they coast on deflected air currents and on columns of rising warm air known as thermals, gliding from one to the next. That a hawk can pick up tremendous momentum riding the thermals was shown when an osprey was once clocked at 80 miles an hour in a mere 4-mile-an-hour wind—and not a wing-tip was twitching.

The ability to hover sometimes results in unique methods of hunting. The little sparrow hawk, for example, coaxes mice out of their burrows by hovering a few inches above the ground and squealing loudly. When the rodent pops its head out to see what the commotion is about, exit one mouse.

When not hunting, hawks often tease other birds. Dr. Alexander Wetmore of the Smithsonian Institution has seen them driving blackbirds, herons, and avocets before them, herding them like sheep, yet never attacking. A favorite game is to force a heron, no mean flier itself, lower, and lower until the heron has no choice but to plop down in the middle of a lake and, defeated, swim to the shelter of shore.

But it is in their mating flights that some hawks put on their greatest exhibitions of aerial acrobatics. One spring in South Carolina I saw an ecstatic male marsh hawk plunge wildly downward from a height of 100 feet, flip a somersault at the bottom, bound up again like a ball, and top his rise with another somersault. Then, his mate shrieking approval, he started all over again, tossing in a few barrel rolls for good measure.

Hawks are notable for being among the most devoted of feathered parents, and are believed to mate for life. Many return to the same nests year after year. (One osprey nest was in continual use by successive generations for 125 years, and one of Britain's falcon eyries is known to go back to Elizabethan times.) Although, unlike most other birds, the female is larger than the male, the male does most of the hunting. Occasionally, however, the female joins him, and one naturalist reports having seen a pair of peregrines team up against a nighthawk and fly off with the victim, tossing him back and forth like a football.

Many thousands of hawks have been senselessly shot every year—even near Hawk Mountain Sanctuary in Pennsylvania, which some 20 years ago was set up as the first sanctuary to protect migrating hawks during their autumn passages. Here is the major eastern flyaway for hawks, a narrow 60-mile-long funnel in the mountains where the birds bunch together and boll over the peaks by the thousands. But within a 30-mile radius of the sanctuary, and despite nearly a quarter-century in education as to the practical value of hawks, there are estimated to be more than 100 shooting stands. With Maurice Broun, curator of the sanctuary, I have hiked these "bloody ridges" and seen the woods littered with dead and maimed birds. Broun estimates that upward of 1,500 hawks a day have been shot here during migration.

But hawk protection is gaining. Eight States (California, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Michigan, Rhode Island) and Ontario, Canada, have model protective legislation. Pennsylvania recently strengthened its hunting laws, and 24 State conservation departments are distributing National Audubon Society leaflets which identify the various types of hawks and describe their food habits.

But laws alone cannot save the hawks. First, an alerted citizenry must be ready to plead the facts. In Lambertville, N.J., some facts were dramatically demonstrated by Paul Fluck, a physician and nature enthusiast. In a pen harboring chickens he placed a wounded red-tailed hawk. Farmers, who had frequently shot at this species of hawk, wagged their heads knowingly. But for 3 months, while the hawk's wing was healing, it lived almost affectionately with the chickens, and not a chick was lost. Gone, however, were the rats and mice which formerly fattened on the chickens' feed.

Interest Rates on Government Securities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Mr. Marriner Eccles, for many years Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, recently made a statement on the problem of interest rates on Government securities. Mr. Eccles is one of the most experienced and, I believe, wisest men in this field, and I think his statement is well worth the attention of the Senate and the country.

I ask unanimous consent at this point in my remarks to have his statement printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There seems to be a general lack of understanding of the economic factors which determine the interest rate. It is thought by many, including some influential congressional leaders, that the Federal Reserve can control interest rates while at the same time maintaining stable money, which is its primary objective.

The Federal Reserve can influence the growth in the supply of money as well as restrict it. To permit an expansion greater than the growth in the national product, under present conditions, would have the effect of diminishing the purchasing power of the dollar. This is inflation, and if allowed to continue will lead to ever-increasing interest rates.

Under boom conditions—when the supply of money is held in check to prevent inflation—the demand for credit exceeds the supply, and interest rates are bid up. Such is the present situation. You cannot have low interest rates in a booming economy without bringing about a dangerous inflationary situation. Only an economy in a state of declining activity produces an excess in the supply of money and credit and, hence, lower interest rates.

Of course, the Government can control interest rates temporarily, as during the war when it controlled everything else—wages, prices, etc.—but when such controls are

taken off, and the excess supply of money released, inflation is inevitable.

A large part of the postwar price inflation was a result of the Federal Reserve purchasing billions of dollars of Government securities at fixed prices in order to prevent an increase in interest rates. This was during the period when the Government had a balanced cash budget.

The Treasury and White House, over the strong protest of the Federal Reserve, required this action be taken. In doing this, an excess amount of bank reserves was created which brought about an inflationary expansion of commercial bank credit and of the money supply.

The present administration and the Federal Reserve are trying to avoid making this mistake by curbing the growth of bank credit and allowing the interest rate to rise.

Under present conditions the aggregate savings by individuals and business are inadequate to meet private investment demands and at the same time finance the large public deficit of the States and Federal Government. Hence we find interest rates going up—even though there is a growth in the money supply equal to the growth in the national product, at stable prices.

There is no effective substitute for larger savings combined with curbs in public spending as a means of preventing inflation and increasing interest rates.

It is a fallacious idea to think that the bankers control this situation and are greatly benefited by high interest rates. On the contrary, this condition causes the banks to pay increasing interest rates for savings deposits and time funds—and depreciates the value of mortgages and bonds held in large amounts by the banking system. At present, this offsets any benefits arising from increased interest rates.

The real beneficiaries of the higher interest rates will be the millions of people who put their money in savings accounts in banks and building and loan companies, or those who purchase bonds and mortgages at the present high interest rates. In short—the savers.

The need is for the Congress to deal with the causes of the higher interest rate, rather than to oppose an increase. The Government cannot expect to keep interest rates from rising as long as it has to finance a large budgetary deficit in times of prosperity. The effect of this deficit under present conditions is inflationary and tends to discourage savings on the part of the public and to increase the need for credit.

A statement I made last March before the joint congressional Committee on the Economic Report bears repeating. It is this:

"I want to say again, that to achieve our objectives will always be a source of great political and economical controversy because everyone wants a greater share of the economic pie than it contains. Government and other public bodies want more money to spend—the leaders of organized labor want more pay and fringe benefits for less hours of work—business presses for further profits, and increasing ranks of oldsters call for higher pensions. However, everyone expects these benefits in dollars of stable purchasing power. Unfortunately, all the economy has to divide are the goods and services it is able to produce, and not the amount of money it could create, which is, of course, limitless.

"In our society, this situation is creating a dilemma for the Members of Congress whose constituents want easy money, lower prices, higher wages, greater profits and fewer taxes. Only a combination of the Government, Congress, and the Federal Reserve can successfully deal with these diverse forces. To do this adequately it would be necessary for them to agree on the problems and have the courage to act, regardless of political conditions."

Indian Vocational Training Gains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, almost exactly 3 years ago, on August 3, 1956, legislation passed by the Congress to provide a vocational training program for adult Indians was signed by the President and became Public Law 959 of the 84th Congress. Although this law needs to be liberalized and although substantial additional funds need to be appropriated, the program of vocational training for adult Indians is now a reality and already is proving its tremendous worth not only to our Indian people but also to the Nation as a whole.

Money spent on vocational training to qualify people to hold jobs is just about the best investment the Government can make, and this is what is being done under this program.

I am very proud of the fact that the real pioneer among educational institutions participating in training Indians in job skills under this program is located in the Second Congressional District of Oklahoma and is the Okmulgee School of Technical Training of Oklahoma State University. Mr. L. K. Covelle, director of this fine school at Okmulgee, Okla., not only followed closely the legislation authorizing the establishment of this program, but also was in close and constant contact with the Bureau of Indian Affairs relative to participating in this program long before funds to actually implement the program had been appropriated.

The Tulsa Daily World of Friday January 3, 1958, carried a picture with the following captions:

Another first. Being first in the Nation is becoming routine to Oklahoma State Tech, Okmulgee, with the school enrolling the first Indian to be accepted under the new adult Indian education bill recently passed by Congress. Congressman Ed Edmondson, center, one of the bill's consistent boosters, and Jack P. Jayne, right, area relocation specialist of the Department of Interior, Muskogee, look over the application of Perry McCombs, Eufaula, the first Indian to pass examinations. Director L. K. Covelle (left) registers his approval of the school being selected and one of four throughout the United States for the training program.

It is my understanding that at present more than 400 courses at more than 160 institutions have been approved by the Bureau of Indian Affairs under this program, but Okmulgee Tech is continuing its outstanding and pioneering leadership in this field.

Mr. Speaker, Okmulgee Tech is now nearing the end of its summer semester, and among its 130 graduates will be five students who will complete their training under the provisions of the program which was established as a result of the law we passed 3 years ago this month.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to salute Okmulgee Tech, its director, Mr. L. K.

Covelle, and every member of Okmulgee Tech's staff, for their fine leadership in this program which has such great worth to our Indian people and to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the Record at this point a news story which appeared on page 1 of Okmulgee Daily Times of August 13, 1959:

TECH'S FIRST TO STUDY UNDER INDIAN BILL

Among the 130 graduates at Oklahoma State Tech at the end of the summer semester are five students studying under the adult Indian education bill, Public Law 959.

These are the first students to complete training programs under the law which was established late in 1957, with the first funds allocated early in 1958.

Oklahoma Tech is one of the four schools throughout the United States which was approved for training the Indian youths who were to be educated under the law.

Screening by the Indian Bureau takes place before the student is allowed to enter school, and at Oklahoma Tech only about eight students of the total enrolled under the bill have dropped out of school for any reason.

About 8.5 percent of the total Tech enrollment is students under the Indian bill. However, the largest percentage of enrollment is made up of nonveteran students who enter Tech as soon as they graduate from high school.

The first student accepted at Oklahoma Tech enrolled in January of 1958.

Graduates include Wade Bucktrot, Bristow, completing a 24-month course in auto body metal and painting; Arney Foster, Cromwell and Alice Bear, Okmulgee, completing 16-month courses in secretarial training and Alexandria Cobb, Cushing, and Monica Shoptese, Fairfax, completing 12-month courses in stenography.

Bucktrot, rated as an above average student by his instructors, has had job offers from several different companies, but is still trying to decide which job he wants. Although graduates are allowed to leave Tech 30 days early if they have a job and have completed all their required work, Indian students remain until the last official day of classes.

Each of the four girl graduates have been taking a series of tests prior to accepting employment. Job offers have been made to each of the graduates and they are waiting only for the end of the classes to make a final selection.

Bring World's Fair in Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently there has been a substantial interest in progress toward the development of plans for the observance of the world's fair in Washington, D.C., during the period of 1964, or shortly thereafter.

A world's fair in the Nation's Capital—the hub of the free world—I believe would, in itself, be a tremendously significant event. In addition, it would focus the world spotlight on the advantages of our system—not only to friendly nations, but also to uncommitted countries and to the Communist bloc.

All in all, the fair would provide a unique opportunity to present our way of life to millions of people.

The Washington Board of Trade, local civic officials, and an outstanding committee of industrial leaders from all parts of the Nation, are moving forward in a careful, constructive and realistic manner, toward development of plans for such a project.

Coordinated with the world's fair, I believe, a Hall of States—such as has long been discussed—to display an all-American panorama—would serve as a show place to display contributions of individual States to our national progress.

The hall would provide our 50 States with an opportunity to display individual, unique exhibits, patterned upon resources and human ingenuity which have marked their own progress.

I am aware, of course, that there are competing proposals from other places in the country. Based on available facts, however, it appears that no city has gone so far in the development of careful plans as has Washington, D.C.; the Capital offers a unique climate in which visitors could observe not only the fair itself, but also our Nation's Capital—a living example of free government, together with the shrines, museums, art galleries, and other edifices illustrating political, educational, religious, cultural, and other developments which have contributed to the creation of the great Nation.

Over the weekend, the Washington Star and the Washington Post and Times Herald carried articles commenting on the significance of Washington, D.C., as a site for the world's fair.

I ask unanimous consent to have the articles printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Star]

HOLD THE FAIR HERE

If a world's fair is to be held in the United States in 1964, it ought to be held in Washington—for more reasons than one. The most persuasive point in favor of our city, of course, is that it is the Nation's Capital, and one of the world's most beautiful capitals, at that. But consideration also should be given to the fact that sponsors of the proposed local exposition have done a vast amount of preliminary planning and negotiating and there have been given the impression that their bid for the fair has an excellent chance of being approved.

It is a distinct jolt, therefore, to learn that Senator JAVITS and Representative KELLY, both of New York, have just introduced resolutions to designate New York City as the site of the 1964 fair. Under the identical measures, President Eisenhower would be authorized to invite foreign nations to participate in the New York show, which would commemorate the 300th anniversary of the city's founding. As District Commissioner McLaughlin has pointed out, a group of civic leaders here and a firm of consultants in New York have been working quietly for more than a year on plans for bringing the fair to Washington. These men have been encouraged by the reception their proposal has met in high quarters, including the State Department and the International Bureau of Expositions in Paris.

Mr. McLaughlin stated the case for Washington effectively, we think, when he declared that this city is generally recognized as the capital of the free world as well as of America and that the 1964 fair should be a truly national exposition, representing the country as a whole, and not a local or regional affairs, primarily promoting the interests of any given community.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald]

UNITED STATES TO START TALKS AIMED AT SECURING 1964 WORLD'S FAIR—MEMBERSHIP IN PARIS BUREAU NEEDED; OFFICIALS FAVOR WASHINGTON'S OFFER

(By Phil Casey)

The United States soon will begin negotiations that could clear the way for a world's fair in Washington in 1964. Though the Government would not attempt to dictate what city is awarded the exposition, State Department officials are known to look favorably on Washington's bid as the most businesslike and promising.

Discussions are under way on the executive side. Next steps will be State Department discussions with congressional leaders and negotiations with the International Exposition Bureau to provide for U.S. membership under regulations that the Government can accept.

The bureau, a 23-nation body with headquarters in Paris, was set up in 1928 to determine when and where world's fairs are held. Its aim is to prevent ruinous competition among international expositions, and promote international cooperation in them by the member nations.

BUREAU APPROVAL NEEDED

Washington interests seeking the fair for this area want bureau approval in order to insure international participation and offer better prospects of success, financial, and otherwise.

But the bureau's present regulations make it impossible for the United States to join a State Department spokesman said. The bureau dictates the length and number of international expositions a country may hold in a given period, as well as the places the fairs shall be held.

This may work well enough among nations whose governments sponsor the fairs, but it isn't applicable to the United States, the spokesman said where the Government keeps hands off and leaves the fairs to private interests, the States, and municipalities.

Washington would seem to have the inside track among several other cities, including New York and Los Angeles because of the State Department's favorable view and the report by District Commissioner Robert E. McLaughlin that there is encouraging response from very high levels in the Commerce Department and in Congress.

Yesterday, Senators THEODORE F. GREEN, Democrat, of Rhode Island and ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, came out in support of the Washington bid.

GREEN said, "Washington, as Capital of the strongest nation in the free world, is a logical and ideal location for an international exposition which can truly represent the entire country. Such an exposition in Washington would help to symbolize the tremendously important role which this country is playing in world affairs."

WILEY, saying that Washington officials and private interests are proceeding in a "careful, constructive, and sound fashion," added:

"I feel that the site of Washington, D.C., offers unique advantages for such a fair. . . . My deep interest in the foreign policy of our country convinces me that the exposition could make an important contribution to international understanding, as well as to international trade."

CAPITAL FEATURES CITED

Noting competing proposals from other cities, he said, "It would appear to me . . . that no city has gone as far nor as carefully in the development of its concepts as has Washington. And I believe that no other city is in a better position to offer the inspirational feature which the Capital offers with its great shrines of freedom, as a location for such an international assembly."

Blood on the White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very enlightening and truthful editorial written by Mr. William Loeb, publisher of the Haverhill Journal, Haverhill, Mass., appearing in the issue for August 11, 1959:

BLOOD ON THE WHITE HOUSE

(By William Loeb)

Nikita Khrushchev and his associates in the Kremlin have been responsible for the murder, death and torture of more human beings than any other group of tyrants in the history of the world. Well-intentioned citizens who think that a visit by this monster to the United States will improve international relations do not understand either Khrushchev or the situation.

Khrushchev doesn't need to come to the United States to understand us. Khrushchev knows all about our material success and how much greater it is than that of Russia.

But Khrushchev, like all barbarian killers from the beginning of history, knows that what is important is not the material wealth of a nation. It is what is the state of its armed forces.

Since the dawn of man's existence on this earth, cruel barbarians, with nothing on their backs but with strong swords in their hands, have conquered the well-developed nations and then plundered them at their leisure.

What Khrushchev knows better than the citizens of this country is the strong thrust of Soviet rockets, versus the weak performance of our missile armament.

Khrushchev wants to come to the United States for two reasons, both of them to his advantage.

Pictures of Khrushchev being wine and dined by Eisenhower and other U.S. leaders will be shown all over the world to indicate to the captive nations that there is no hope for them because we have made friends with their slave masters.

The second purpose of Khrushchev's visit is to sell the people of this Nation on the fake idea that, after all, he is only a fat, humorous, easygoing old gentleman and that he and his gangster cronies actually are all very nice and very friendly people who have just been misunderstood and want to be our friends.

This is all done for the purpose of having the United States cut back on its missile and defense program.

Then, little by little, after the United States has been weakened, while Russia grows stronger, will come the final Russian spring at our throats.

It will be too late to do anything then.

This newspaper believes in friendship with all nations. It believes the Russian people would like to be friends with the people of the United States. We certainly know that people in this country want to be friends with the Russian people.

But we are not dealing with the Russian people. We are dealing with the most ruthless collection of power-mad dictators the world has ever seen. They are now slave masters of a third of the world. They will never feel safe as long as the rest of the world remains free.

Cardinal Cushing, Governor Powell, Senator Bridges, and former Secretary of War Hurley and others have come out against Khrushchev's visit. We hope they will be joined by many, many more Americans before Khrushchev's arrival.

Of course, nations always have to deal with the heads of other governments at arm's length across conference tables, but you do not have to invite killers to the White House.

The spectacle of an American President crawling before Khrushchev is certainly one that must make George Washington, John Adams, and Patrick Henry roll in their graves.

President Eisenhower apparently cannot even obtain an answer from Khrushchev as to what happened to the American airmen shot down by the Russians earlier this year.

The stench of the tyrants in our land is not a smell to which most Americans will take easily. Perhaps, if enough still dare to speak out, the Khrushchev visit will be canceled.

Meteorological Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of this House to a resolution passed at the Governors' conference recently commending this body for its action in approving an appropriation to study the feasibility of a National Institute for Atmospheric Research.

This appropriation is contained in the funds authorized the National Science Foundation for the coming year. While the Independent Offices Appropriations bill remains a source of dispute between this and the other body, the conference committee has agreed, and this House has agreed to the necessary item.

I am convinced, as I have said before, that this is an important accomplishment for science in this session and I am pleased to note that the Governors' conference has expressed itself in this way.

METEOROLOGICAL RESEARCH

Whereas the Congress of the United States has approved the proposals of the National Science Foundation to augment and exploit the national capability for research in meteorology, including the establishment of a National Institute for Atmospheric Research: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the 51st annual meeting of the Governors' conference commend the action of the Congress of the United States in supporting the National Science Foundation program to accelerate meteorological research to meet national scientific, economic, and military needs for knowledge of the atmosphere and weather phenomena.

Patent Office Pushes Grassroots Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have before me an article entitled "Patent Office Pushes Grassroots Plan" published in the Sunday issue, August 16, 1959, of the Star by William A. Millen, Star staff writer.

What particularly interested me in this article is that fact that the writer makes special reference to North Dakota and Minnesota as having organized inventors congresses and other States are interested in stimulating inventions, officials said.

Mr. President, this is another indication where the great State of North Dakota shows the way to the rest of the Nation. I know well of the activities of the North Dakota Inventors Congress and the work that they have been doing on a national level by attending conferences and conventions and explaining their program. Hon. Harold Kelly of Devils Lake, N. Dak., is president of North Dakota Inventors Congress and he and his group are doing an outstanding job.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PATENT OFFICE PUSHES GRASSROOTS PLAN

(By William A. Millen)

A triple program, to keep the United States ahead in new inventions and scientific knowledge is being pushed by Commissioner of Patents Robert C. Watson.

This comprises:

1. Encouraging the grassroots movement that has recently started to stimulate inventions. Inventors' organizations have been set up in some of the States and these are interested not only in new inventions, but in aiding the inventor to find a practical market for his product.

2. The production of a new informative pamphlet to aid and guide those seeking patent protection. This publication, which can be secured from the Government Printing Office and is titled "Patents and Inventions—An Information Aid for Inventors," gives the A B C's of applying for a patent, preparing an application and prosecuting patent claims.

3. Periodic displays in the Commerce Department lobby of the practical results of the work of inventors and of the patent office. Business cooperates in this and shows its handwork in the form of machines, devices and other products, results of inventive genius.

IMPORTANCE STRESSED

Commissioner Watson said yesterday:

"In the light of world conditions, it is extremely important to convey the story of the American patent system and the functions and operations of the Patent Office to every person in the United States who has the capacity to invent."

Mr. Watson, a native Washingtonian, became Commissioner of Patents in 1953. He is the son of a patent lawyer, the late James A. Watson.

Are the American people as inventive as ever? The answer is "yes," Patent Office officials say.

The Patent Office is now issuing an average of 1,000 patents weekly. Every Tuesday at noon the inventors get the news. More than 350 new applications for patents are received every workday.

Recently, there has been increased activity in the chemical and electrical fields, in which inventors seek new patents. Synthetics and electronics, since World War II, have become increasingly popular. The mechanical field is holding its own.

Isaac Fleischmann is Director of the Office of Information Services of the Patent Office, which is in the Department of Commerce. He aids in arranging the business displays in the lobby of that building. These present a case history of the patent system by the inventor and by the business firms.

The Patent Office's Official Gazette contains brief descriptions and drawings of patents granted. This goes to the patent profession, directors of research in corporations, private business and libraries.

INTEREST IS PRESSED

North Dakota and Minnesota have organized inventors' congresses and other States are interested in stimulating inventions, officials said. Seattle, Wash., is organizing an effort by business, the chamber of commerce and others to assist inventors in evaluating their inventions and providing contacts. This shows a healthy grassroots movement, officials said.

About 1,000 patent examiners, who are electrical, chemical, or mechanical engineers, make the Patent Office system run.

A Patent Office spokesman said anybody is a potential inventor. "Everyone has a dream of making something new. Everyone has a bit of innate inventiveness in him—a desire to improve," he said.

The Late Mike Benedum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, one of the grandest men it has ever been my pleasure to know was a distinguished West Virginian, the late Michael L. Benedum, who died on July 30 in Pittsburgh.

Mr. Benedum was a world famous oil wildcatter. He extracted fabulous wealth from the ground. But, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Benedum devoted a large part of his great wealth to helping others.

Mr. Benedum was born in the little West Virginia town of Bridgeport. There his heart remained throughout a busy and successful life. Close associates estimate that he spent between \$3 and \$4 million on his hometown. Among his many gifts were a civic center and recreational area with swimming pool, roller and ice skating rinks, badminton and volleyball courts, and a children's playground.

He did not confine his philanthropy to his hometown. On the contrary, he has given generously to churches, schools and hospitals throughout West Virginia and in other States. Close associates estimate he helped 42 colleges through

scholarship funds or direct grants. He has helped financially over 600 students.

One of Mr. Benedum's last acts was to offer \$62,500 for an addition to the Webster County, W. Va., hospital, providing county residents raise a like amount.

On the occasion of Mr. Benedum's 90th birthday on July 16, I wrote to him congratulating him on his long and useful life. In answer, Mr. Benedum sent to me a portion of his last will which eloquently outlines his philosophy of life. This impressive will expresses so beautifully the motives which prompted the many generous and unselfish acts of this grand old man that I insert the copy Mr. Benedum sent me in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FROM THE LAST WILL AND TESTIMONY OF LATE MICHAEL BENEDUM

The disposition of a not inconsiderable estate is never an easy assignment. It has been a thorny and laborious problem for me because, recognizing my frailty and inadequacy, I have not been able to lose sight of the awesome responsibility involved.

If I could have looked upon my material goods as personal property, belonging to me alone, my task would have been immeasurably lighter. But I have never regarded my possessions in that light. Providence gives no fee simple title to such possessions. As I have seen it, all of the elements of the earth belong to the Creator of all things, and He has, as a part of the divine purpose, distributed them unevenly among His children, holding each relatively accountable for their wise use and disposition.

I have always felt that I have been only a trustee for such material wealth as Providence has placed in my hands. This trusteeship has weighed heavily upon me. In carrying out this final responsibility of my stewardship, I have sought to utilize such wisdom and understanding of equity as the Creator has given me. No one with any regard for his responsibility to his God and his fellow man should do less. No one can do more.

I will not attempt to deny that in certain provisions of this last will and testament, I have been swayed to some extent by the tender sentiment that I have for the land of my birth and by my affection for those who are nearer and dearer to me than life itself. While I may seem to have been generous to these loved ones who are the blood of my blood, I know from experience that I am in reality merely passing a responsibility to them.

The book is not closed. The responsibility is merely lessened and divided. It is none the less fearful. I hope that these loved ones of mine will bear with me in this last word of counsel, as I again remind them of the obligation that goes with their material heritage. I have unlimited confidence that they will be faithful to this trust.

As I have seen it, life is but a proving ground where Providence tests the character and mettle of those He places upon the earth. The whole course of mortal existence is a series of problems, sorrows, and difficulties. If that existence be rightly conducted, it becomes a progress toward the fulfillment of human destiny. We must pass through the darkness to reach the light.

Throughout my adult life, day by day and year by year, I have been instilled with the conviction that wealth cannot be measured in terms of money, stocks, bonds, broad acres, or by ownership of mine and mill. These cannot bear testimony to the staple of real excellence of man or woman. Those who use a material yardstick to appraise their wealth and foolishly imagine themselves to be rich are objects of pity. In their

ignorance and misanthropic isolation, they suffer from shrinkage of the soul.

All of us aspire to a higher and better life beyond this, but I feel that the individual who seeks to climb the ladder alone will never find the way to paradise. Only those who sustain the faltering ones on the rungs above and extend a helping hand to the less fortunate on the rungs below, can approach the end with the strength of sublime faith and confidence.

At the end of life each of us must face the great teacher that we call death. Stern, cold, and irresistible, it walks the earth in dread mystery and lays its hands upon all. The wealth of empires cannot stay its approach. As I near my rendezvous with this common leveler of mankind, which takes prince and pauper alike to the democracy of the grave, I do so with resignation to the will of God and with faith in His eternal justice.

Life has been sweet to me—sweet in the loved ones that have been mine, sweet in the friends who have surrounded me, and rewarding in the opportunities that have come my way. I could not leave this earth with any degree of happiness or satisfaction if I felt that I had not tried to bring some of these joys to those less fortunate than I have been.

We know not where seed my sprout. In the poorest and most unregarded child who seems to be abandoned to ignorance and evil, there may slumber virtue, intellect and genius. It is our duty to sow and to nurture, leaving it to others to harvest the fruits of our efforts.

While I am conscious that my love for the land that gave me birth has been an influence in guiding the disposition of my estate, there are other practical reasons why I have favored my native State of West Virginia. It is not that I am unmindful or unappreciative of my adopted home of Pennsylvania, but rather that I have sought to appraise and balance the needs of each and the available potential for supplying those needs.

I cannot close my eyes to the realistic consideration that Pittsburgh and Pennsylvania abound in riches, having a citizenship in which men of great wealth are more common than rare. West Virginia is in a less fortunate position. There can be no question but that its needs are much greater than those of my adopted home. Consequently, in making specific provisions for West Virginia institutions, I have done so in good conscience, with a sense of equity and with recognition of a responsibility to distribute my estate in a way that will bring the greatest good to the greatest number. This decision was not made lightly or impetuously.

Conscious that in this codicil to my last will and testament, I am figuratively speaking from the grave, and that the great book of my account with the Creator has been closed beyond change or amendment, I submit my soul to His tender mercy, and my memory to the generosity and compassion of my fellow man.

Edward W. Hatchett: Canal Zone Ambassador of Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for many months the people of the United States have been reading frequent accounts in the press about dete-

rioration in the relations between the United States and the Republic of Panama. Thus, it was with singular interest that I read in the August 5, 1959, issue of the Panama Star & Herald, the well known isthmian newspaper, an account of recent high honor extended by the Republic of Panama to Edward W. Hatchett, a prominent Canal Zone teacher and civil leader.

Former residents of the isthmus who have watched the influence of Mr. Hatchett grow over the years in both the Canal Zone and the Republic through loyal former students recognize in him an effective ambassador of good will.

Because of the value of such sustained efforts on both sides of the Canal Zone-Panama boundary for the betterment of both areas, I quote the indicated news story as part of these remarks:

ZONE TEACHER IS AWARDED REPUBLIC OF PANAMA DECORATION—FORMER PUPIL, NOW CABINET MINISTER, WILL PRESENT AWARD TO E. W. HATCHETT

Edward W. Hatchett, well-known Canal Zone teacher, has been awarded the Order of Vasco Nufiez de Balboa by the Panama Government, it was announced yesterday.

The presentation of the decoration will take place Thursday at noon in the Panama Foreign Office. It will be made by Roberto Lopez Fabrega, Minister of Public Works of Panama, who is one of scores of Panamanians who were taught by Hatchett at Balboa High School.

Hatchett's citation sets forth his long years of teaching on the isthmus and his close association with many Panamanians whom he taught.

A graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis, Hatchett took his master's degree at Duke University. He taught for several years in a high school at Durham, N.C., and came to the Canal Zone in 1931 as a teacher of mathematics at Balboa High School. In 1957, he was made an instructor in the Canal Zone Junior College.

Hatchett is also well known in labor circles. He was secretary of the Canal Zone Central Labor Union for many years and has been president of that organization since December 1955. He was appointed a member of the Canal Zone Board of Appeals in June 1959.

Character

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, every year, at the Military Academy at West Point, in my congressional district, the Association of Graduates gives three prizes to cadets for the best character sketches of graduates.

This year the first prize was awarded to Cadet G. S. Livingston, 1960, for his essay on the character and heroic achievements of Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright.

This essay is of great interest to all and is one more testimonial to the high ideals, patriotism and achievements of the graduates and undergraduates of the Military Academy:

CHARACTER

(By Cadet Gordon Livingston, second class, Company K-2)

In the annals of professional soldiery there has traditionally existed a single characteristic desire or goal which represents the ultimate aim of each of the members of that profession and the basic reason for their existence. This is victory in battle. Success on the field of combat has, throughout history, remained the criterion which has established the stature of military leaders and the standard by which they are judged. To this general rule there are few notable exceptions. One of these is Gen. Jonathan Mayhew Wainwright—a victor in defeat.

A soldier of the old Army, Wainwright, after his graduation from West Point in 1906, began his career as a cavalry officer in the West of his boyhood. In the trials of his later years he often thought back to his days as a troop commander chasing bandits on border patrol—considering this the greatest freedom he had ever enjoyed. In a day when the Army sought versatility from its officers—men who could act as businessmen, diplomats or showmen, "Skinny" Wainwright was simply a soldier. His claim to distinction was a competence in his chosen profession with an ability to inspire men to the limit of human endurance and beyond.

After a succession of combat staff jobs in World War I, he went through a series of peacetime assignments and schools until September 1940, when he was promoted to major general and sent to Manila to take command of the Philippine Division and keep his rendezvous with the "defeat" which would immortalize his name. On December 7, 1941, he was the senior field commander in the Pacific under Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Together they prepared to face the overwhelming advance of about 250,000 Japanese troops with a meager force of 19,000 U.S. Regulars and about 70,000 assorted Filipino personnel. On MacArthur's removal to Australia, Wainwright assumed command of all forces in the Philippines and continued the fight that comprises one of the great pages in American military history. Paying the price of his country's unpreparedness, he was faced with the prospect of fighting a slow, retrograde action along the Bataan peninsula to buy the necessary time for MacArthur to get help from the United States and start the counteroffensive which would relieve Wainwright's beleaguered troops. This relief was not to come. One of the officers in his command spoke of the general's conduct in this extremity: "Near the end Wainwright was suffering from beriberi. Undernourishment had affected him so badly that he could barely use his right leg. Despite this, dragging himself along and leaning on a cane, he walked along the roads all the time, inspecting the final defenses. He was the only general I have ever seen actually cheered by his men on the field of battle." For 5 long months they fought their desperate delaying action until at last what remained of the general's command retreated to the offshore island of Corregidor from whence they gave the world, more particularly the rudely awakened and remorseful United States, a picture of human fortitude and tenacity with few parallels in modern warfare and reminiscent of the Spartans at Thermopylae and the Texans at the Alamo. One correspondent on the scene wrote only half in jest:

"We're the battling bastards of Bataan

No momma, no poppa, no Uncle Sam,
No aunts, no uncles, no nephews, no nieces,
And nobody gives a damn."

Subjected to a merciless artillery and air bombardment (which at one point placed one 500-pound 240 millimeter shell on the

2-square-mile island every 5 seconds for 5 continuous hours), decimated by disease and malnutrition, the gallant defenders held out for 27 days of hell until the Japs had landed and pushed to within a hundred yards of the Malinta tunnel where Wainwright and the pitiful remnants of his army had at last been forced. Only then, in an effort to spare the sick and wounded men under his command, did the weary general surrender, after a last message to President Roosevelt:

"With broken heart and head bowed in sadness but not in shame I report to Your Excellency that today I must arrange terms for the surrender of the fortified islands of Manila Bay. . . . There is a limit of human endurance and that limit has long since been past. Without prospect of relief I feel it is my duty to my country and to my gallant troops to end this useless effusion of blood and human sacrifice.

"If you agree, Mr. President, please say to the Nation that my troops and I have accomplished all that is humanly possible and that we have upheld the best traditions of the United States and its Army."

On May 6, 1942, the white flag of defeat flew over the battered island and the ordeal of 39 months of brutal captivity had begun for the men who had already drunk so deeply of the cup of suffering, many of whom would never again see the homeland for which they had so heroically fought. During this trying and seemingly interminable time Wainwright was again forced to call on all his reserves of courage and perseverance, this time in a different fight—the fight for life. During his imprisonment he lost some 50 pounds and at the time of the Jap surrender carried only 120 pounds on his 6-foot, 2-inch frame. Constantly maltreated by his captors and suffering from dysentery and assorted other ailments, he yet lived to "witness the greater misfortune of my enemy" on September 2, 1945. And so the message written in the blood of her sons had not been lost upon America, and from the ruins of Corregidor had sprung the resolve which found its culmination on the deck of the U.S.S. *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay 3 long years later.

If this was a triumph of victory, it was also a triumph of defeat, more especially the defeat of a man whose ideals of military devotion sustained and inspired his Nation in its darkest hour. The medals (CMH, DSM, DSC, and many others) awarded him by a grateful people are incidental to the real magnificence of his own victory—a soldier's victory, which all the white flags, surrender articles, or personal indignities could not dim.

He returned to receive the adulation of the American public which he so richly merited and so modestly accepted. At last, permanently weakened from the long ordeal he had borne with such fortitude, his frail body died on September 2, 1953, 8 years to the day after the Japanese surrender. He was laid to rest in the tradition of the Cavalry he loved, with an orderly leading a riderless horse behind the coffin, boots reversed in the stirrups. And now perhaps at least he could take his place in the old cavalryman's paradise of which he had often sung:

"Half-way down the trail to hell,
In a shady meadow green,
Are the souls of all dead troopers
Camped near a good old-time canteen,
And this eternal resting place
Is known as Fiddlers Green."

The motto on the West Point shield today shines with a little more luster from the sacrifice of her loyal son. In the words of one of his classmates, "He did his duty with honor for his country." One can ask no more from any man and can perhaps only add, with grateful heart, "Be thou at peace."

A Letter to Bankers and Insurance Executives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by the Honorable STYLES BRIDGES, entitled "A Letter to Bankers and Insurance Executives—Why the Nation Needs Your Activity in Politics," published in *Human Events*, on August 19, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From *Human Events*, Aug. 19, 1959]

A LETTER TO BANKERS AND INSURANCE EXECUTIVES—WHY THE NATION NEEDS YOUR ACTIVITY IN POLITICS

(By the Honorable STYLES BRIDGES)

In recent months various corporations have announced their intention of becoming active in politics. Programs have been established to encourage employees to register and work for the party of their choice. Political activity once frowned upon by many corporations as too controversial is now being accepted as one of the civic responsibilities of Americans.

Intelligence has recently been received from the great metropolitan centers of the United States that insurance and banking institutions are also becoming concerned with the importance of political activity on the part of their employees.

It seems clear that the votes of the great numbers of blue and white collar workers offer the only hope of balancing the various political pressure groups including the extremes of the labor movement.

It is encouraging, therefore, that bankers and insurance men have determined to discard the ancient antipathy toward politics which has characterized these professions and are launching a program to protect the public interest. This is a very laudable activity and in the words of Shakespeare:

"Tis a consummation devoutly to be wished."

While the grand master plan for political activity is being designed, however, politics continues as usual in Washington, D.C. It is for this reason that I am writing to you.

It happens that the most vital problems which face our Nation at this time concern matters which lie within your domain of special competence. Never before has your guidance and sound advice been so desperately needed by our legislators.

The problems of inflation, deficit financing, interest rates, the role of the Federal Reserve System and the question of gold supply, et al., are complex and confusing to the average Senator and Congressman.

Crackpot plans and panaceas are being daily advocated by those who little realize that most of their suggestions have in the past caused economic collapse of civilizations. All too often those who are uninhibited by the facts grab the spotlight and get the publicity.

May I respectfully submit to the banking and insurance fraternity, therefore, a list of items now pending before the councils of our Government, which need immediate, aggressive and enthusiastic attention by men like yourselves who are experts in the field:

1. The President and the Treasury Department have requested permission of the Congress to remove the fixed interest rates on Government borrowings.

Demagogues have attempted to make this request appear as an insidious conspiracy against the "little man" and for the benefit of the Wall Street bankers' vested interests.

It is clear to you that if we are to have a free economy, we must maintain a free money market. Government bonds must be sold on the basis of their safety and their yield and must compete for the purchaser's dollar with other investments available. Accordingly, interest rates in a free society can never be fixed by anyone except the prospective buyer.

It would be very helpful if bankers and insurance executives would testify to this fundamental economic truth before the various committees of Congress concerned with the problem.

It would be a great public service if bankers and insurance men all over the country communicated with their local, State and Federal representatives and dispelled the smokescreen of socialistic propaganda on this subject.

This question of interest rates is immediate and pending business before the Congress.

How many of your colleagues have made their feelings known? How many of your correspondent banks have been actively recruited in this struggle?

Certainly Congressmen WILBUR MILLS and RICHARD SIMPSON, of the House Ways and Means Committee, and Senators HARRY BYRD and JOHN WILLIAMS, of the Senate Finance Committee, would appreciate a statement of your views.

There is still time to be effective, but there is no time to be leisurely.

Every sizable community in the United States has some type of banking and insurance facility. In addition to providing a repository for the funds of the people and financing local projects, do you agree that your profession has some responsibility for the economic education of your customers?

If so, haven't we reached the time when local bankers and insurance brokers should be organized on a national basis in order to carry the message of the importance of fiscal solvency throughout their communities?

Is it not desirable for local bankers and insurance men to utilize every opportunity before the service clubs, fraternal organizations and civic meetings to emphasize the present dangers of irresponsible and socialistic monetary and fiscal policies?

Is it not necessary for informed people like you to tell the parents of your community what is being done to the legacy of their children?

In modernization programs of banking and insurance institutions, in which the business machines play such a large part, have you allowed finance to become so impersonal that the customer has ceased to be a man and is merely a number?

The traditional and honored role of economic counselor and adviser to the local community must not be lost by bankers in the whirling of electronic machines.

2. It has been said that, "Those who know better should say so."

Officials of financial and insurance institutions do not normally write letters to the editor; but who else is to challenge the fallacious schemes which are proposed daily in both editorial and news columns by persons who are generally unqualified and ill equipped to speak on monetary and fiscal matters?

A recent editorial in the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times, for example, advocated the hackneyed, repudiated theory of escalation

clauses for Government bonds. This would provide that Government bonds at maturity would be redeemed for face value plus a sum equal to the amount of inflation which had occurred since the date of issuance.

To those who have difficulty with thinking this proposal might have some appeal: Should it go unchallenged in the public press; or should the bankers and insurance executives of Florida, independently and collectively, register their professional opinion concerning such an absurd proposition?

It is difficult to select at random a metropolitan newspaper without finding some items of false economics to which the bankers and insurance men of America should address themselves.

3. At the present time an assault is being aimed at the Federal Reserve System in an attempt to use this agency as an instrument to promote cheap money and easy credit.

The scheme is patently preposterous, but how will the people of America ever know unless professionals like yourselves inform them?

4. There is presently an organized campaign to promote a little inflation.

Left-wing economists and socialistic politicians are trying to convince the public that creeping inflation is inevitable, necessary, and desirable.

Yet, with blatant intellectual dishonesty, they add that this inflation will be controlled at a level of from 2 to 4 percent a year.

Obviously, if inflation is inevitable, once it starts spiraling it cannot be controlled at any annual percentage level. The ultimate reckoning of creeping inflation has always been collapse and chaos.

Only the bankers and insurance men of America are in a position to inform the people as to hazards of the weird economic propositions with which we are being bombarded daily.

May I emphasize that in no way do I advocate your activities be characterized as partisan politics. Your professional colleagues throughout the Nation belong to both great political parties.

In the House of Representatives and the Senate of the U.S. Congress, there are many Members from both political parties who realize the importance of the matters which we are here discussing. Unfortunately, they are not in the majority. However, they have steadfastly opposed irresponsible fiscal proposals. These individuals need all the support and assistance which you can give them.

National solvency and sound fiscal policies transcend partisan politics. They are not legitimate matters of debate. They are matters of fact. They have been established by the entire history of man's social and economic organization.

Eventually our survival may depend upon the action we take in respect to these problems.

Other nations of the world such as Japan, Argentina, Germany, Great Britain, France and, in fact, the entire European Economic Community have awakened to the necessity for putting their fiscal houses in order.

As members of the banking and insurance professions you now have the strategic opportunity to be of inestimable service to the Nation and to the world.

Please assert yourself now and speak out with vigor and authority before it is too late.

(STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, is the ranking Republican Member of the U.S. Senate, ranking Republican member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee. His most recent article to appear in Human Events was "The American Heritage," June 3, 1959.)

Progress on White House Conference on Children and Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the designing of a more effective program to provide ever greater opportunities for our youth is a major challenge confronting the Nation.

As we recall, President Eisenhower directed that a Sixth White House Conference on Children and Youth be held in March 1960. This golden anniversary conference, scheduled to be held here in Washington from March 27 to April 2, 1960, has been called the greatest single undertaking of our time in behalf of our young people. Bringing together some 7,000 delegates from all over the Nation, it will provide a springboard for a concerted attack on virtually every question that affects the well-being of the next generation and hope for a more rewarding tomorrow. It has as its stated purpose the promotion of opportunities for children and youth in order for them to realize their full potential for a creative life in freedom and dignity.

We remember that this forward-looking program had its beginning back in 1908, when Theodore Dreiser and James West called on President Theodore Roosevelt to discuss the plight of orphaned children. So impressed was the President that on Christmas Day he personally addressed 200 invitations requesting people from all over the country to attend a White House Conference in January, of 1909.

Recognizing the importance of a sound program to improve the outlook for the Nation's youth—its most valuable resource—it is gratifying to note that progress is going forward on the conference, designed to deal with the major problems and challenges in this field.

I am particularly happy, also, to note that not only the State governments, but also a substantial number of organizations throughout the United States are participating in the conference.

Recently, I was pleased to have forwarded to me a copy of the Conference Reporter, outlining the latest steps of progress. Well realizing that this task of brightening the outlook for the Nation's youth is a challenge of deep concern to all of us, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from this publication printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ADOPTS PROGRAM STRUCTURE AND DELEGATE QUOTAS FORMAT STRESSES FLEXIBILITY

The overall program structure adopted by the executive committee for the 1960 conference expresses two important aims: (1) To achieve interdisciplinary treatment of

conference theme and material; (2) to make it possible for people to meet and discuss, and to reach findings or conclusions in small, intimate groups.

Action of the executive committee at its May 7-8 meeting in Washington made official the following specific features of the program format:

A plenary session will open the conference on the evening of Sunday, March 27.

Each morning thereafter, 5 concurrent theme assemblies will open the day's sessions, each assembly accommodating from 1,000 to 1,500 delegates. The theme assemblies will permit development of major aspects of the conference theme, the issues and challenges.

Specific aspects of conference content will be introduced daily at 20 concurrent forums for 350 delegates each. The forums will include panel presentations and floor discussions dealing with facts, findings, and issues. They will be the flexible unit of the conference structure, providing for a two-way flow of thinking from theme assembly to work group and return.

The work group will afford the delegates their best opportunity for continuous participation—deliberation, discussion, and debate. There will be more than 200 work groups meeting each day. A maximum of 30 delegates will be preregistered for each of these work groups on an interdisciplinary basis and members will continue to meet in the same work group throughout 5 days.

In work groups delegates will reach findings and arrive at conclusions. When 10 work groups meet together as a forum, they will reconcile conflicts, sharpen distinctions, and reach majority and minority viewpoints.

The program committee headed by Dr. Philip S. Barba of Philadelphia was responsible for formulating details of the program structure.

NATIONWIDE QUOTAS ANNOUNCED

The executive committee has approved plans for quotas which will govern distribution of 7,000 invitations to the White House conference, March 27-April 2, 1960, in Washington, D.C.

State committees have been allotted a total of 2,900 delegates. National organizations will share 1,700 invitations. In addition, 600 invitations will be assigned to public officials, including members of the Cabinet, Congress, the Supreme Court, and Governors. International guests will receive 500 invitations. The balance will be allocated to Federal Government representatives, members of the working press, the President's National Committee and its subcommittees.

The plan for State participation, approved by the executive committee at its May 7-8 meeting in Washington, is as follows:

"States will each be allocated a minimum quota of 20, and the remainder of the quota of 2,900 for State committees will be allocated on the basis of the population of each State as a percentage of the population of the United States."

(See p. 7 for a chart of State quotas.)

This plan was based on a recommendation of the National Council of State Committees, headed by Dr. Donald S. Howard, of Los Angeles, a member of the President's National Committee.

The national organization allotment of 1,700 invitations will be distributed as follows:

Each organization in the Council of National Organizations on Children and Youth will receive a minimum of two invitations. In addition, 300 will be reserved for youth representatives from 16 through 21, and another 200 for young adults from 21 through 30. The remainder of the 1,700 organization invitations will be distributed on a formula

that takes into consideration organization size and relation to conference theme.

State youth quotas

In a recent memorandum to the chairman of every State committee, Dr. Howard explains the policy regarding youth delegates from the States as follows:

"Because of the importance attached to participation of youth in the forthcoming conference, State committees have been asked to assure attendance of at least 400 young persons (aged 16 through 20)." This would represent 14 percent of each State committee quota.

"Although it is suggested that 'youths' be interpreted as young persons aged 16 through 20, it is recognized that a State committee may want to nominate particularly outstanding young persons even if under 16 years of age. Similarly, a State committee may also want to include in its youth quota a person of 21 or more who may actually be serving as a leader of young people, such as the president of a student body at a college or university."

Criteria for delegates

The President's National Committee has urged that participants in the conference be "broadly representative of the citizens of the United States."

To achieve this end, State committees are urged to take into account a balance among and between:

- (1) Youth and adults (as described above).
- (2) Lay and professional persons.
- (3) Men and women.
- (4) Persons from rural and urban areas.
- (5) Representation from various racial or other minority groups.
- (6) Representation of business or industry and organized labor.

ACTION: STATE BY STATE

Alaska: Dr. R. Roland Armstrong, chairman, reports five committee members appointed in State. Governor being asked to appoint cochairman for Juneau. Each State agency asked to name resource person to provide guidelines for Alaska study.

California: 300 town meetings to be held throughout State as a result of Governor's call for citizen participation. Each town meeting asked to submit findings and recommendations to Governor by October 8.

Fact book for committee being prepared by 11 State departments.

San Francisco mayor calling meeting of youth from all junior and senior high schools, to follow meeting of Governor's White House Conference on Children and Youth in September.

Colorado: County commissioners designated ex officio members of county committees.

District of Columbia: Causes of family irresponsibility being analyzed by special subcommittee consisting of judge, educator, doctor, social worker, lawyer, youth representatives, and laymen.

Florida: Committee working for 100 percent participation of every State voluntary organization as follows: a copy of Topic Guide goes to liaison person of each State organization, suggesting that organization conduct study in area of special interest, utilizing local chapters and branches. Reports of such studies to be included in State Committee's final report.

Same procedure being followed with departments of State government and State and regional offices of Federal Government.

Hawaii: Values and ideals receiving spotlight, with philosophers, psychologists, sociologists, educators, and laymen taking part in preliminary study.

Illinois: Countywide surveys seeking to determine effect of cultural, social, and economic changes on growth and development of children.

Solid background facts provided to every county committee through "working papers"

prepared by leading authorities within framework of factfinding committees.

Item from Illinois "working papers": "It is more important, in many respects, for the people of a community to be informed about the facts locally, than to have made a study of national trends."

Indiana: Richard Emery, chairman, reports that State legislature has voted financial support to Indiana Council for Children and Youth and its program. * * * Conference held May 13 in Indianapolis.

Eighteen regional workshops and hearings to be held throughout State.

Iowa: Youth employment reported as a priority concern. * * * Vocational guidance and training programs being studied. * * * New services to migratory youth developed through State Youth Employment Service to be described in State report.

Louisiana: Louisiana Social Welfare Association cooperating fully with State committee. Each of association's 10 regions to sponsor workshop focusing on areas of study established by State factfinding committees. Local members of all statewide organizations to be included in these workshops.

Key persons for conference interpretation work appointed in five main regions of State. All newspaper, television and radio material channeled through these representatives, with effective results reported.

Maryland: "Little" White House conference to be held before mid-September at University of Maryland.

Massachusetts: Committee (Dr. Martha M. Eliot, chairman) held its first meeting June 12 in Boston with Governor delivering personal greetings.

Michigan: Detroit Free Press ran series of seven major feature articles, tying in local problems of children and youth with themes and topics of national White House Conference.

Minnesota: Every mayor in State has received questionnaire asking local communities for information about services to children and youth. Results of survey will make up part of Minnesota's conference report.

Missouri: Colleges playing important role: Directors of departments of sociology, psychology, philosophy, home economics, etc., formed into special committee. White House Conference topics will receive focus in discussions, papers, theses throughout next year's classroom study.

New Jersey: Outline for county committees developed by State committee offers practical suggestions for those working through county units.

Ohio: Will hold State conference on children and youth November 19 on Ohio State University campus in Columbus, open to general public.

Oklahoma: Five State colleges in different parts of State to be scenes for regional meetings, cosponsored by State committees and colleges.

Representatives from all high schools, both public and private, will attend youth conference in fall to report on activities and make recommendations to State committee.

Directors of community council throughout State serving as cochairmen of committee on change.

Oregon: Special committee formed to establish criteria for selection of State's 38 delegates to conference.

Puerto Rico: Individual members of Puerto Rico's committee will make personal visits to local committees for consultation.

South Carolina: All statewide studies completed and brought to State committee by May 1; one of first States to finish this phase of conference preparation.

South Dakota: Special subcommittee making basic study of State's migrants, with respect to problems of children and youth.

Mr. Don Rasmussen, chairman, cited in McCall's for outstanding achievement in field of education.

Texas: All junior and senior high schools throughout State will be surveyed through questionnaires prepared by the State's youth participation committee. Results will play part in Governor's meeting and in State report.

Six hundred twenty-five Texas newspapers carried questionnaire for State interpretation committee, seeking response from all regarding areas of concern. Replies will go to Governor's office.

Texas anticipates that 1 million citizens of State will be involved in preparation for White House Conference.

Utah: 700 letters sent to organizations, youth groups, individuals, inviting them to participate in conference planning.

State department of education has loaned its director of health, physical education, and recreation to serve as executive secretary for Utah White House Conference planning.

Wyoming: The Governor has scheduled State white house conference to be held in Cheyenne latter part of August.

MATERIAL COMING FROM NATIONWIDE SOURCES

Reports and papers on a wide variety of professional and lay activities are reaching Conference headquarters from many sources. The following suggests the type of material already received or forthcoming:

1. A first report on findings of "Project Talent" is expected in time for the Conference. This project was planned and is directed by Dr. John C. Flanagan, professor of psychology, University of Pittsburgh, and President, American Institute for Research, Pittsburgh, Pa. Objectives: a profile of the abilities, skills, and interests of half a million American youngsters in grades 9 through 12, and—over a period of 20 years—a record of how they use their abilities, develop their skills and pursue their interests.

2. The Child Welfare League of America will soon publish a book-length report on its monumental study of adoption and foster-home placement. Findings from this major study will be available to the White House Conference.

3. The National Council of Girl Scouts and the National Council of Boy Scouts have recently completed comprehensive studies of youngsters in the age range served by Scout programs, and of youth leaders.

4. Through their education division, the Seventh Day Adventists are conducting in this country an experiment already run off with success in Japan. It is a method for making work experience an integral part of education from the elementary level. The objective is to teach values and ideals through personal experience of the satisfactions that come with doing a job and doing it well.

5. The World Federation for Mental Health is organizing the First World Mental Health Year (1960) and Dr. Frank Fremont-Smith, cochairman of the International Committee, reports that preliminary reports on studies relating to children and youth will be available to the White House Conference.

6. "Delinquent Behavior," a recently published report of the National Education Association's juvenile delinquency project, will provide background for the study of problems in this field.

7. The National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers has contributed studies of experiments in delinquency prevention.

8. The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith has sent in reports of field studies in prejudice and desegregation.

9. From the American Jewish Committee have come "Prejudice and Your Child" and "The Fears Men Live By."

10. The American Heart Association has contributed an interim report of a pilot project in vocational counseling for children with heart disease.

11. A study of major problems affecting the education of the mentally retarded has come from the American Association on Mental Deficiency.

12. "Child Protective Services in the United States" gives a nationwide survey prepared by the American Humane Association.

13. The American Social Hygiene Association's researches on adolescent sexual behavior, now under way, will be available before the Conference.

14. A survey of educational systems by the National Congress of PTA's will also be available.

NEW WHC LEAFLET OFF THE PRESS

A first printing of the new pocket-size White House Conference information piece came off the press the end of May. Copies already have been distributed to State Committees, national organizations and others.

The leaflet describes the themes and purposes of the Golden Anniversary Conference, explains its history, how it is organized and who will attend. It gives points for participation and lists the names of members of the President's National Committee.

A second printing has been scheduled.

FINANCE DIRECTOR APPOINTED

Ephraim R. Gomberg, Executive Director for the Golden Anniversary White House Conference on Children and Youth, has announced the appointment of Dr. Eugene Hotelling as Finance Director.

In making the appointment, Mr. Gomberg said, "The Finance Committee has specifically recommended the creation of this position in view of the very substantial proportion of Conference cost that must be met through private rather than Government sources."

Dr. Hotelling brings a wide background of experience in the field of business administration and fund raising to the White House Conference staff. For the past 2 years, he was affiliated with the Cancer Institute at Miami, Fla., and the United Fund of Dade County.

STUDIES TO PROVIDE HOMEWORK FOR DELEGATES

Before attending conference sessions in Washington next March, each delegate will have a chance to brief himself thoroughly on background data and points of view relevant to the conference program.

This homework will reach the delegate in the form of working papers, reports and volumes being prepared on recommendations of the Committee on Studies, headed by Dr. Eli Ginzberg, professor of economics at Columbia University's Graduate School of Business.

Each conference delegate will receive, when he registers, a working paper prepared for use of the work group in which he is enrolled. There will be about 50 working papers, each relevant to the topic of four or five work groups. Each paper will deal with specific, concrete and factual data, designed to serve as resource material for work group discussions. Specialists in a variety of fields will write these papers.

As further background material, the data-gathering now in process by State committees will be compiled and edited in a single, digest volume. It will give a nationwide picture of conditions affecting children and youth today.

Similarly, the work of national organizations, as reflected in the materials they are forwarding to conference headquarters, will be put into a summary report volume. This will record and evaluate what lay and professional organizations have done during the past 10 years in all fields relevant to the conference.

For further homework, the Studies Committee has planned a prospectus of research recommendations for the coming decade, which will be prepared as part of the general summary of the conference.

Dr. Ginzberg and his committee will take responsibility for compiling three additional volumes of background papers—essentially philosophical in nature—to be written by authorities in various fields. These volumes will deal with "Perspectives," "Trends" and "Issues," and will round out the delegate's study in approaching the conference.

September 1 has been set as the target date for receiving all studies source material, so as to provide adequate time for editing and printing the mass of data prior to the opening of the conference.

STATES LIST THEIR PRIORITY CONCERNS

As the State committees go about the task of preparing for the 1960 White House conference, they have been reporting the problems relating to children and youth that concern them most.

Lists of such priority concerns have come from 24 States: Alaska, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming, and from Puerto Rico and American Samoa.

The concern most frequently mentioned is the treatment, rehabilitation, and education of handicapped children, be they physically handicapped, emotionally disturbed, mentally ill or retarded. Seventeen States and Puerto Rico have listed this as a priority concern.

Juvenile delinquency ranks almost as high among major problems. Fifteen States and Puerto Rico have mentioned their concern with delinquency prevention and with the need for improving legislation and law enforcement, court procedures, social services, and correctional institutions. Four States have also listed specifically the growing number of unwed teenage mothers and the rising venereal disease rate among teenagers as aspects of delinquency.

Next in frequency of mention is the need to expand employment opportunities for middle-adolescents and to improve guidance services and vocational training, especially for school dropouts.

Education is the fourth high-priority concern among the States reporting. Eleven States and Puerto Rico are interested in better schools for all mental levels. Five more States want particularly to provide a greater challenge to gifted children.

In 10 States the expansion and improvement of welfare services has a high priority. For many States this means especially more day-care facilities for the children of working mothers, more homemaking services and family-counseling services to maintain and strengthen family life, improved adoption and foster-placement procedures.

Other State priority concerns include the strengthening of religious and spiritual life, greater recreation facilities, the special needs of migrant children and minority-group children, community and school health services, and school libraries.

COUNCIL OF NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH ANNOUNCES ROSTER OF MEMBERS

Any national organization having a major interest, emphasis, or concern in children and youth and wishing to participate in the Golden Anniversary White House Conference on Children and Youth is urged to communicate with the Council of National Organizations on Children and Youth, Mr. Robert E. Bondy, chairman, room 300, 345 East 46th Street, New York 17.

Organizations are reminded that September 1 is the target date for completing the roster of council membership.

Those that have joined but have not yet designated an official representative are urged to do so immediately.

With this issue the Conference Reporter begins an alphabetical listing of the national organizations which have qualified for membership in the council and have designated their official representative:

AFL-CIO Community Service Activities.
Allergy Foundation of America.
American Academy for Cerebral Palsy.
American Academy of Pediatrics.
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation.
American Association of Instructors of the Blind.
American Association for Jewish Education.
American Association on Mental Deficiency.
American Association of University Women.
American Baptist Convention, Board of Education and Publication.
American Baptist Home Mission Society.
American Camping Association.
American College of Chest Physicians.
American College Health Association.
American College of Osteopathic Surgeons.
American Correctional Association.
American Dental Association.
American Dietetic Association.
American Educational Research Association (NEA).
American Educational Theatre Association.
American Farm Bureau Federation.
American Foundation for the Blind.
American Friends Service Committee.
American Hearing Society.
American Heart Association.
American Home Economics Association.
American Humane Association.
American Institute of Family Relations.
American Jewish Committee.
American Jewish Congress.
American Legion National Child Welfare Division.
American Library Association.
American National Red Cross.
American Nurses' Association.

With Fingers Crossed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include a very timely editorial which appeared in the *Chelsea Record*, Chelsea, Mass., on August 11, 1959:

WITH FINGERS CROSSED

The national head of the American Legion didn't think Khrushchev should be invited to visit the United States. Other prominent men also expressed disapproval.

At no time in history was such an exchange of amenities conducted under such wretched circumstances. The project is greeted by all informed Americans with fingers crossed. They do not propose to overlook the fact that the Kremlin boss is guilty of gross international crimes and that he continually promises his followers that the United States shall be eventually brought under the Communist yoke.

Very likely the Kremlin bosses also have their fingers crossed but in a different mood—that of sardonic satisfaction over what they hope to convert into a diplomatic coup. They probably depend upon a good-natured handshaking exhibition to soften up American opinion.

Landrum-Griffin Bill Would Punish Many for Guilt of Few

SPEECH
OF

HON. DENVER D. HARGIS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. HARGIS. Mr. Speaker, I voted "no" on the Landrum-Griffin bill, which a majority of my House colleagues saw fit to approve as a substitute for the committee's labor reform bill. It is my personal conviction that this bill caters to industry and big business, and is strictly unfair to the rank-and-file laboring man. I promised my constituents I would vote for a bill designed to correct the abuses found in a few of the labor unions, but not for a bill which would inflict unjust punishment on those fine citizens of our working class who are trying to make an honest living by the sweat of their brow. I kept that promise.

A long and hard-fought battle, stretching over many years, gave organized labor the right to arbitrate and negotiate for a higher standard of living. Are we prepared to live with our consciences if we now turn around and take these rights away from them?

I feel certain that all of my distinguished colleagues who voted "no" on the Landrum-Griffin bill share my own sincere desire to rid organized labor of racketeering and corruption—and feel just as strongly about it as any of the Members who cast their vote in favor of this bill. But I refuse to believe that this can be accomplished only by stripping union members of their legitimate rights—rights earned and enforced through peaceful and democratic methods practiced in all free nations.

I want no part in setting a precedent for harsh, restrictive Government interference in the private and internal affairs of labor unions. There will never be a time when honest and just union functions should be endangered and curtailed by unjust Government action. We should not punish organized labor for all time to come because a few men have violated the faith of the labor union members, as well as the entire American population. If we operated on this basis, we would be equally justified in effecting governmental action to control the private and internal affairs of business and industry, where the misdeeds of a very few men also have resulted in widespread notoriety.

Another reason for my opposition to the Landrum-Griffin bill is my firm belief that its passage by the House may well destroy all chances of enacting any labor reform legislation during this session of Congress. The Senate, by an overwhelming majority, already has approved a far less restrictive bill. If they reverse this decision, even under almost unbearable pressure from outside sources, the Members of this distinguished body will leave themselves wide open to charges of hypocrisy. Our Nation may have to wait another year for labor reform, and the gangsters and hoodlums will laugh up

their sleeves, free to continue their corrupt practices.

I do not feel that the backers of the Landrum-Griffin bill can honestly state that their only goal was to rid the unions of racketeering. Too many sections of the bill show total disregard for the hard-earned rights and privileges of the plain, honest, everyday, rank-and-file workmen who make up the backbone of the labor movement, and have done their earnest best to give organized labor the highly respected status it enjoys today—at least with thinking people everywhere who pay more attention to the good record of the many than they do to the bad record and bad reputation of a corrupt and arrogant few.

I want to emphasize to my many friends in business and industry that I would be just as adamant about refusing to vote for, or condone, any legislation aimed at undue interference in the lawful operations of business and industry.

It seems that too many people have forgotten that each of the three—labor, business, and industry—need each other to exist, and legislation aimed at destroying one can end by injuring all three.

I do not want labor legislation calculated to help put the economy of the Nation on a level where a few get rich, and the others get poorer. We cannot move back into the 19th century, politically or economically, any more than we could do it scientifically. This is legislation that deals with the bread and butter of millions of Americans, and it most certainly should be designed for 20th century living.

I ask the people of my home district in Kansas to judge me solely on this basis—that I consider legislation on its merits, and I do not vote in response to pressure from either side—but only on my personal conviction that the way I am voting is in the best interest of this great Nation. I firmly believe that if the Landrum-Griffin bill becomes law, we have betrayed organized labor to satisfy vested interests—and it will be something we will live to regret.

I certainly hope that House-Senate conferees will be able to present us with a just and equitable bill that will put an end to corrupt labor practices without doing massive harm to the entire labor movement.

Poland Is Thorn to Soviets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am today inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD what I consider to be one of the best analyses of the situation in central Europe, particularly regarding Poland, that I have seen in a long time by any American correspondent. This article appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times on

August 17 and was written by one of the Nation's outstanding foreign correspondents, Miss Marguerite Higgins.

I call attention to this article because it points out so graphically what I have said here on this floor on many occasions: that America's real secret weapon in containing the Soviet Union's plans for spreading international communism; and preventing world war III is our ability to keep the captive nations of Europe at least spiritually on our side, even though today, against their will, they are forced to be ruled by Communist regimes.

Miss Higgins makes it clear that the only reason the Soviet Union has not touched off world war III is because Khrushchev and the Kremlin leaders know that they cannot count on the people of these captive nations for any substantial support, even though the puppet Communist governments in these nations may profess their loyalty to Moscow.

It is my sincere belief that Miss Higgins' penetrating analysis of the situation in Poland makes even more appropriate the resolution which I introduced last week in this House, calling for the Congress of the United States to reaffirm its belief that the captive nations must be given full freedom through peaceful means before there can be any lasting peace in Europe.

In view of this article, I renew my plea to this Congress that we adopt the resolution which would call upon President Eisenhower to make it clear to Nikita Khrushchev when he comes to this country that the West must continue to view all Soviet foreign policy moves with suspicion so long as the Kremlin insists on keeping these captive nations of Europe behind the Iron Curtain against their will.

While Miss Higgins describes primarily the situation in Poland, I am confident that the people of Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria would undoubtedly display the same spirit in the cause of freedom as the Poles if they had the opportunity.

Miss Higgins' article follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Aug. 17, 1959]

POLAND IS THORN TO SOVIETS

(By Marguerite Higgins)

WARSAW, POLAND.—A Scandinavian diplomat who witnessed the outpouring of pro-American emotion during Vice President Nixon's stay in Poland had these comments:

"This demonstration was the final proof to me of something I have long suspected. It is this: If a war broke out tomorrow between the Soviet Union and America, the Russians would have no other course but to immediately put all of Poland under Red army occupation. Despite their Communist leaders, the feelings of the Polish people would make this country a liability, not a help, in any Soviet conflict with your country."

AN EXCLAMATION POINT

And in the opinion of an impressive number of neutralist observers in this part of the world, what is true of Poland is also true, though to a lesser degree, of large sections of Communist-dominated Eastern Europe.

The bold, almost disconcerting floods of pro-Western sentiments that greeted Nixon in Warsaw were but the exclamation point to the conclusions on this score that have been building for some time.

The Hungarian revolt, the explosions in East Germany and Poland itself have helped to form these opinions.

CURTAIN FILIGREE

Also, the Iron Curtain has become gradually an iron filigree letting in some light, some tourists, and permitting a few frank opinions to flow back and forth. So it is possible to see how astonishingly little all the years of Communist brainwashing accomplished in these areas which were attached to the Soviet empire after World War II.

This does not mean—and this is a vital point—that a Communist leader such as Poland's Wladislaw Gomulka is not sincere in his pledge to Moscow to keep his country a loyal part of the Russian military pact. Gomulka's pledge is sincere and is possible of fulfillment in times of cold war or even when international tension boils to its occasional moments of great crisis.

"GOMULKA, A REALIST"

But as another neutralist observer put it: "Gomulka is far too much of a hard-headed realist not to understand that if the issues were halfway clear, a country like Poland in any conflict between the Russians and Americans would turn itself into a fast guerrilla movement snapping at the heels—and if possible—at the vitals of the Soviet Army."

"RECALLS SHOWDOWN OF 1956"

"And the Russians know it, too. That's why you Americans are so foolish to let Khrushchev bluff you with his talk of rockets and sputniks. Do you know what deters the Russians from starting a so-called local war over Berlin or indeed over anything else in this part of the world? It certainly is not just American atomic bombs. It's the very real risk that the Russians, in the event of military showdown, might see Eastern Europe turn against them."

Short of wars, however, the historically difficult relations between the U.S.S.R. and such countries as Poland are likely to stay on the even keel that became the order of the day after the momentous showdown of 3 years ago between Soviet Prime Minister Nikita S. Khrushchev and Gomulka.

It was in October 1956 that Khrushchev sent Soviet tanks rolling in the direction of Warsaw in an effort to assert Moscow's will and the continued rule over Poland of Soviet Marshal Konstantin K. Rokossovsky. But in this case Gomulka's will proved stronger than Khrushchev's. The Soviet bluff was called when the Poles told them to call off their tanks or find themselves at war with the Polish people.

MODEL OF INCONSPICUOUSNESS

Since then the Soviet Army in Poland has been a model of inconspicuousness. To a foreigner and even to the Poles themselves it is hard to remember that the Russians are stationed in considerable force in strategic points. For the Red army soldiers stay strictly to themselves.

In Warsaw, for instance, not a single Red army officer or enlisted man is any longer to be seen on the streets. The time when Moscow set the pace for all things Polish from agriculture to architecture also has ended.

Connecticut National Guard Unit Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, each year the outstanding company-size unit

in the Connecticut National Guard is selected to receive a special award known as the Eisenhower trophy. It is a singular mark of reward for the effort shown by members of the unit during the year toward proficiency and training in military subjects. I request unanimous consent to include a clipping from the Hartford Times on the 1959 Connecticut award:

Maj. Gen. Frederick G. Reincke, state adjutant general, Monday presented headquarters and the headquarters detachment of the National Guard with the Eisenhower trophy, given annually to the best unit in the State.

Receiving the award was Capt. William E. Meagher of Salem Street, Hartford, commander of the Hartford unit. It was given at a dress review attended by three other units also undergoing 2 weeks summer training here.

The units were headquarters battery, 1st Missile Battalion, 192d Artillery Regiment; headquarters battery, 1st Missile Battalion, 242d Artillery Regiment; and the Connecticut Military Academy.

The award, given by the National Guard Bureau, is based on training, Federal inspection, attendance, weapons qualification and overall performance.

MATS Mission, Support Our Fighting Forces—ATA Mission, Destroy MATS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House of Representatives the pressure activities of the Air Transport Association regarding the modernization of the Military Air Transport Service. In particular I refer to the latest paper they have circulated to selected persons in Congress opposing \$30 million for the modernization of MATS contained in the Senate supplemental appropriations bill.

In the original budget for the Department of the Air Force there was a request for \$53 million to be used for the modernization of our Military Air Transport fleet. Largely because of the efforts of the Air Transport Association this request was denied by this body and then the Senate. However, it was agreed in the Senate that such item would be included in the supplemental appropriations bill. Senate amendment No. 34 to the supplemental appropriations does contain an item for the modernization of MATS in the amount of \$30 million. The amendment was introduced by Senator CANNON, of Nevada.

The Secretary of the Air Force, the Honorable Mr. Douglas, strongly supported Senator CANNON's amendment in a letter to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations dated July 22, 1959.

The Air Transport Association in its latest effort has again attempted to becloud the strategic airlift requirement of Air Force by stating that the aircraft to be obtained would be used in the "regular

MATS mission which the Air Force views as an airline type of scheduled operation all over the world." Nothing could be further from the truth. The Air Force has repeatedly stated the need for modern transports capable of carrying cargo to critical areas in time to meet the requirements of our strategic and tactical jet forces.

I am amazed and disgusted that an association of the caliber of the Air Transport Association would so lower itself in such an obvious attempt to flaunt the best judgment of our military planners and congressional action resulting from classified information.

The Air Transport Association must realize that the development of modern cargo jet aircraft and suitable turbofan propulsion is of vital military necessity. At the same time they are urging ever and ever increasing participation of our airlines in Department of Defense business they must know that our Nation's airlines are not equipped to carry the multiplicity of cargoes required by our military departments at speeds required in modern warfare.

The funds which the Air Transport Association are fighting are of vital necessity to the Department of the Air Force and in turn such jet cargo development will serve to advance the capabilities of our civilian airlines. When the supplemental appropriations bill is considered I strongly urge that each Member of this House support the \$30 million appropriation for the development and modernization of our military transport fleet.

In closing I ask unanimous consent that the article "MATS and the Mission" from the August 1959 issue of the Armed Forces Management magazine be incorporated in the RECORD at this point. I regard this article as an excellent summation of the Military Air Transport Service, its abilities, and its problems.

MATS AND THE MISSION

(By Bill Borklund)

(Although the importance of its mission is the key to its entire operation, the Military Air Transport Service has been caught this year in a never before equaled barrage of diversionary charges—most, if not all, of them secondary and misleading. Until the underbrush is cleared away, MATS, and the Air Force, are going to have a hard time reaching, with much desired commercial airline help, a much needed program for use of all U.S. support air power in the time of war.

Bombed, badgered and besieged as were few military outfits this year, the Military Air Transport Service enters the final round, this month, of a summer-long congressional hassle over how much money it should be spending on commercial airlift, how much of its military job it should do itself.

At the same time, undaunted by the battering it has taken, MATS is reentering the Washington, D.C., arena with two far-reaching proposals of its own. One: A \$53 million supplemental appropriation request for 10 jet powered aircraft (which Capitol Hill whacked out of the original Defense money request) to start the long-overdue MATS modernization program. Two: a proposal that Defense start airlifting all personnel overseas (present levels—37 percent of Army, 50 percent of Navy, 94 percent of Air Force), double the amount of overseas shipping by air of high value hardware.

Either idea will be enough to start the whole argument again, an argument that

centers around what MATS does and why. Strangely enough, all the mountains of obfuscating manuscript produced this year have done little to clarify the MATS mission, key to the whole argument. The result: means are discussed as ends, the result is called the cause and headline-hunting critics have led a big chunk of Congress (and most of the American public) down a bramble-strewn path of misinformation.

Among the baubles: MATS is the world's largest airline. It isn't even close. Soviet Russia's Aeroflot is No. 1 among the real leaders. In addition, only about 30,000 of MATS' 120,000 Navy, Air Force, and civilian personnel and half its 1,198 assigned aircraft handle the strategic air transport mission. The rest take care of MATS' less-publicized services—Air Weather, Air Photographic and Charting, Air Rescue, Airways and Air Communications, and Aeromedical Evacuation.

MATS runs a plushy airline. The three VC-137A jet passenger planes which prompted this blast are indeed plushy, were built for the Air Force to fly the President, Congress, and high level U.S. dignitaries around the world, are actually off-the-shelf Boeing 707's with standard executive interiors. Assigned to MATS for administrative purposes only, the aircraft are actually under control of the Joint Chiefs of Staff organization. Nearly all other MATS passengers travel the austere equivalent of commercial tourist class.

MATS is competing with commercial airlines for passengers. Total passengers carried by MATS last year amounted to less than 1 percent of the 49 million annual passenger load carried by U.S. airlines alone.

MATS, like any other military organization, has a wartime mission, assigned by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The mission: be ready to move troops, missiles, and other heavy weapons and supplies in any war emergency to support other Air Force components, the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. JCS estimates wartime airlift requirements specifies those that are critical, i.e., must be handled by military aircraft and crews, pegs the rest essential, i.e., can be done by either MATS or civil carriers.

Given a half-day to reach predesignated spots around the globe to cover the "critical" tasks (primarily resupplying Strategic Air Command bombers returning from their first bombing run), MATS keeps an alert force in on-the-flight-line readiness, runs the rest of its airlift through practical training exercises. It is, in essence, a SAC-like supply operation with one exception. SAC must take pictures rather than drop its bombs. MATS can haul and process in peacetime training the same supplies it will actually carry if the big war should start.

To handle the bulk of the "essential" role, it has organized a Civil Reserve Air Fleet. Primary CRAF duty, at the moment: hauling passengers. CRAF list of planes varies depending on predicted requirements, is currently (fiscal year 1960) made up of 242 aircraft under assignment from 27 different civil carriers—primarily DC-4's, for cargo, DC-7's for passengers. There is a slight hooker: For MATS to use any of the CRAF planes, under current agreements with the airlines, it must take them all. Result: MATS must take care of most limited war situations pretty much on its own.

To MATS its "realistic training" program is an absolute necessity if it is to have any chance at all of meeting its wartime obligation. Said one colonel, "Letting pilots fly the aircraft is the very tiniest part of this whole training effort. We've got to train the traffic people, the maintenance men, cargo handlers, the whole crew."

"We have to know what we can move where and how efficiently. (Biggest problem right now is the terminal operation.) You can't mothball an operation like this,

any more than you can SAC, then push a button and have it spring into operation in the wink of an eye—which is how fast we'd have to get going on D-day."

Requesting 6 hours originally, MATS is allowed a 5-hour per day per aircraft utilization rate for training, has reasons for believing this isn't enough. Studies by Rand Corp., and such men as Dr. Paul Cherington of Harvard Business School indicate MATS could not boost this training rate to that required if a hot war started, far less than the 10 hours demanded by JCS, and MATS could maintain this rate for at best 30 days. Their own Korean war experience tends to corroborate this finding. Asked for a 10-hour per aircraft per day operating rate MATS, in the initial and crucial stages of the war, was able to boost its 2.8-hour prewar level to only slightly over 4 hours.

Thus, they are being asked to do what some of the best brains in the country say can't be done. In spite of this, MATS maintains it has the capability the JCS says it should, but, added one officer (in reference to off-quoted ex-Army Chief of Staff Maxwell Taylor's demand for more troop airlift), "We don't have the capability to move everything everyone wants us to move."

MATS supply backlog, one mark of efficiency, in any given airport is running less than 3-day maximum currently acceptable to MATS headquarters. They're thinking of revising that goal to 1 day. And, in response to the Capitol Hill charges that MATS is running scheduled flights overseas along the same routes as commercial carriers, one officers snorted, "A schedule is nothing more than a program any good manager uses to see if he can do what he says he wants to do. As for the routes, although we don't use the same bases, there's usually only one efficient economical way to cross an ocean. We use the same route as the airlines for the same reason."

Beyond its realistic readiness training and the supplemental CRAF program, MATS, in its role as single manager for military air transport, buys a large chunk of commercial airlift. Among the reasons: military air transport demands are higher than the by-product—airlift—of MATS training program can handle; MATS wants only to be able to do its assigned war mission, wants a strong civil air fleet ready to back it up after the first few days or weeks of an all-out war.

Of the \$200 million paid by Defense to civil carriers for contract, charter and common carriage airlift in fiscal year 1959, MATS signed the tab for over half (\$105 million). Of that quantity, \$70.8 million was Congress-appropriated money spent backing up MATS own peacetime operation. The rest it spent as procurement officer for Logair, Quicktrans and the Air Force Ballistic Missile Division.

Even if the requirement for airlift does not increase (and it's likely to), MATS will soon be spending more of Defense's airlift dollar as it phases in Northeastern North America intertheater airlift overseas, eventually will be responsible for the whole \$200 million. All procurements are advertised, all carriers are eligible to bid. Commented one procurement officer, "We don't care, initially, what capability they have."

When the contract is let, however, MATS keeps two things in mind:

1. Placing as much business as possible on a fixed, long-term basis (to get better pricing, make contract administration easier for both the carrier and MATS).

2. The report of MATS Capability Survey Committee which visits carriers' facilities, verifies that they can produce as they say they will. We want to make awards only to responsible and capable carriers. To a good many commanders buying airlift, performance is a lot more important than cost.

But, if MATS has as good a case as any other military organization for existing, that

\$70.8 million, and growing, prize has been too much for the commercial airlines to view with clearcut business acumen. Strangest twist, to MATS officers, in the whole Capitol Hill cacophony is that the very people in Washington who should be helping MATS sell increased use of airlift are, instead, pounding MATS with every brickbat they own.

Like a recalcitrant bulldog, the commercial airlines, through their powerful association lobbyists, are leaning hard on Congress to get them a bigger share of the large MATS business—in spite of MATS boss Lt. Gen. William H. Tunner's statement that "there just is no more business—unless MATS flies its aircraft empty."

And if MATS flies empty? Ignoring for the moment its crippling effect on MATS preparedness, the cost of Defense airlift to the U.S. taxpayer would skyrocket to nearly \$1 billion—something the Pentagon thinks he would take a rather dim view of. Even though MATS used 80 percent of its passenger, 74.8 percent of its cargo capacity during the last fiscal year, commercial airlines still hauled 40 percent of MATS' passengers, 10 percent of its cargo.

This is a far cry from MATS commercial augmentation in 1955 when it spent only \$4.5 million on civil airlines to haul 1.5 percent of its passengers, 6.6 percent of its cargo and mail. In the past 5 years, MATS has reduced its airlift by 107 planes, cut its personnel strength some 2,400 persons. Yet, charges of MATS' persistent expansion, to the detriment of commercial airlines, persist.

False charges are not MATS' only headache. Attracted by the mushrooming market, MATS' bidders list has jumped from 41 carriers in 1957 to 86 this year, is expected to reach 122 in 1960. Most of the additions are briefcase operators with one or two obsolescent aircraft, at most, purchased solely to get MATS business.

Operating under a part 45 certification (called one of the great rackets in the aviation industry by Oklahoma's Senator Mike Monroney) and not subject to Civil Aeronautics Board control, these "tissue paper" firms come under the benevolent protection of a Small Business Administration umbrella—and most of the unreliable outfits spotted by the contract survey committee are in this category.

Said one procurement officer, "These small business set-asides are encouraging the use of old aircraft, discouraging the forward looking companies—and, on top of all that, we figure we pay about a 10-percent premium to give them business."

These quick-hit-and-die operators have prompted an intramural fight among the carriers. But, as reflected in a Congress trying to keep everybody happy, the fight has become something far more ominous. Said South Carolina's Senator Thurmond, "Excessive (governmental) concern with commercial aviation has caused us to progressively nibble away at the Military Air Transport Service."

MATS' request for 10 C-jets (estimated cost: \$53 million) hit a blank wall first time around—for precisely the same reason MATS has been in trouble all summer; national defense mission keeps being obscured by politics and considerations of false economy.

To MATS the argument for C-jets seems pretty clear cut. Says Tunner, "We need both a racehorse and a workhorse." They are getting the workhorse, the C-133. For the other: "It doesn't make much sense to us to try to support a 600-knot-an-hour bomber with a 190-knot transport. We're trying to support a rocket (SAC) with a kiddie car."

Adds Tunner, "The transport plane now in the inventory, being piston driven would be many hours distant from the friendly base with needed materiel and personnel at the time the SAC bomber arrived. It is

precisely the difference in speed between a jet-propelled plane and a piston-driven plane. The SAC plane would therefore be threatened with immobilization after one strike at a target."

And there's the advantage of economy. Ten C-jets will do the same job as 42 of the C-124's which comprise the bulk of today's strategic transport fleet, are nearly obsolete and costly to maintain.

MATS has already heard, in the wings, the yells of the civil airlines. "What they tell us basically," said one MATS officer, "is they want us to do a good job—but not too good." Tunner insists that MATS is not fighting the commercial airlines: "We need them. We are counting on a strong airline industry to backstop us in time of war." But if MATS is not in a fight, it is showing a lot of unexplainable bruises.

What rankles MATS men most, and some of the most knowledgeable men in the airlift business today are in Tunner's organization is that the MATS record is about 180 degrees opposite from the picture painted of it by commercial interests; is, in fact, far better than the so-far performance in war situations of private carriers demanding they be given more of the job to do.

Among the quotable:

On claims industry could do the job cheaper: "Assuming the same operational training level, if we split the cargo-passenger business equally with the civil carriers, Defense airlift bill would jump another \$300 million. If we flew empty, the taxpayers would shell out \$750 million more."

Could do it better?: "Ten times during July, August, and September last year MATS went looking for commercial airlift augmentation, couldn't find it. During the Lebanon and Far East crisis, all bids in some offerings were so high they all had to be rejected. We had to haul the supplies and people ourselves working overtime. It was the tourist season, if you'll recall. During 1 week last November when they were on strike, all but four TWA scheduled flights were handled by MATS. We do not consider this the proper way to maintain military readiness."

MATS' "competitive" setup is preventing civil carriers from developing a cargo capability: "They want us to give them the money to build the aircraft, then guarantee them a profit on the business. The airlines built an incomparably efficient passenger service under a free enterprise system. Passenger business in this country is a drop in the bucket, compared to the commercial cargo they could haul. Why don't they go out and develop it instead of going to Washington looking for a Defense Department dole?"

What about Congress?: "If they buy this civil carrier idea to pare down MATS even more, they'll be behind the biggest eight ball they've ever seen. We already have letters indicating every transport outfit in the country, steamship lines, railroads, busses, will jump on the bandwagon—and you couldn't blame them."

MATS FOUR ENGINE STRATEGIC TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT

C-97.....	48
C-118.....	126
C-121.....	71
C-124 (troop carrier).....	143
C-124.....	310
C-133.....	23
Total.....	578

Ruinous Grain and Livestock Buildup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MERWIN COAD

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to point out to my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the August 1, 1959, issue of the Wallaces Farmer and Iowa Homestead newspaper. Current reports show that our feed grain and livestock supply is far ahead of the demand for these commodities, and all indications point to the fact that by this fall this imbalance will become greater than ever before. For example, Iowa hogs which last year sold for over \$20 a hundredweight are now priced under \$14 a hundredweight, and the normal, heavy runs to market which usually drive the price down have not yet started. I believe that we should all become vitally concerned about this Nation's agricultural problems and steadfastly work for good, sound farm legislation which will correct the injustices done to the American farmer.

The editorial follows:

RUINOUS GRAIN AND LIVESTOCK BUILDUP

The farm surplus crisis is getting worse. Our unwieldy and still mounting grain stocks are just 1 to 3 years ahead of unwieldy supplies of eggs, hogs, and beef cattle.

We're headed for real trouble unless some remedial action is taken soon.

The July crop report confirmed our expectations of a huge corn crop. Total feed grain production this year will be 2.5 million tons higher than last year—enough to produce an added 5 million hogs.

Cattle numbers increased 3½ million last year, are expected to go up another 4 to 5 million head by January 1, 1960. This will give us about 102 million head, a record number, and an increase well beyond that of our human population.

Wallaces Farmer has been trying to point out the lurking danger in our productive might for some time. But some economists and agricultural leaders are still minimizing the problem, saying things will soon work themselves out.

We were glad to see Iowa Farm Bureau leaders give public acknowledgment of our looming crisis. In an open letter to Secretary Benson, the board of directors of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation spelled out their momentous concern about the following:

"The present imbalance between the supply of food and fiber and the effective demand.

"The immediate future prospects for farm income, particularly for the livestock producer.

"The current effort to cast farmers as pampered and greedy wards of the Government."

The farm bureau letter stated that agriculture's bargaining position must be strengthened if we are to compete successfully with industries' protective tariff and labor's monopoly exemptions.

The group asked for: the reduction or elimination of Government reclamation and other programs which actually increase agricultural production;

A land retirement program large enough to balance current production with demand; the use of surplus farm commodities in a practical program to benefit our allies; a sizable transfer of USDA funds to speed research on new industrial uses of farm products.

This concern for our plight by Iowa Farm Bureau is a far cry from the stand usually taken by the American Farm Bureau Federation. We hope the Iowa group will have some influence in changing the farm policy approach taken by the national organization.

Walter Hornaday Writes About the General Accounting Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the General Accounting Office has done and is doing a wonderful job in cooperation with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, of which I am chairman. They have been of great assistance to me as well as to my Committee staff in various phases of investigative work we have undertaken for the purpose of legislating certain of the veteran fields. I have from time to time conveyed my thanks and appreciation for their efforts to the Comptroller General as well as to individuals in his employ.

However, it has taken a veteran newspaper reporter, Mr. Walter Hornaday, of the Dallas Morning News, to bring their story to life, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include Mr. Hornaday's story which appeared in the August 9 issue of the Dallas Morning News:

FOUND: A FEDERAL AGENCY WHOSE OBSESSION IS THRIFT

(By Walter C. Hornaday)

WASHINGTON.—While almost everyone in Washington connected with the Federal Government is spending money hand over fist, a little-known Federal agency is working tooth and toenail to save all it can.

The average citizen has never heard of the General Accounting Office, and if he has he usually has little or no knowledge about what it does.

But to Federal bureaucrats who tend to become careless in handing out the taxpayers' money, the GAO is a power to be reckoned with.

Briefly, the GAO is the watchdog of Congress. Its job is to see that the money that Congress appropriates is spent for the intended purposes and handled honestly and wisely.

Heading the GAO is the Comptroller General. His term is set for 15 years, so he will be less likely to yield to political pressure, and he can't be reappointed. The Presi-

dent appoints him, subject to Senate confirmation, but the Comptroller General's agency is a legislative one, not an executive.

Joseph Campbell, the present Comptroller General, describes the GAO this way:

"A nonpolitical, nonpartisan agency . . . created by the Congress to act in its behalf in examining the manner in which Government agencies discharge their financial responsibilities with regard to public funds appropriated or otherwise made available to them by the Congress and to make recommendations looking to greater economy and efficiency in public expenditures."

The sum of \$67,649,522 was actually collected by the GAO during the 12 months ended June 30, 1958, in refunds for overcharges and other improper costs. It's estimated that about as much more was saved the Government by warnings, payment stoppages and the mere fact that Federal officials knew the GAO was looking over their shoulders.

Since its establishment in 1921, the GAO probably has been responsible for savings of at least half a billion dollars.

The far-flung activities of the GAO have sometimes become a pain in the neck to agencies where carelessness, even outright wrongdoing have been uncovered. Some officials feel that it is prying into matters it has no business being concerned with.

The late President Roosevelt became so irritated with the GAO that he left the post of Comptroller General vacant for 3 years by failing to appoint anyone to succeed the first GAO head, John R. McCarl, of Indiana. It was common talk then that Roosevelt hoped the agency would be abolished.

Lindsay Warren, a Congressman from North Carolina, agreed to take the job only after Roosevelt promised not to try to do away with the GAO.

Comptroller General Campbell and the 5,000 "watchdogs" in the GAO don't wait for money to be lost on Government contracts or through improper methods. Every department and agency is under constant auditing and investigation.

Reports are made throughout the year to Congress, its committees, and to agencies involved. Investigators are regularly assigned to committees of the House and Senate to aid them in their duties.

The Defense Department is the GAO's biggest headache. The sheer size of military spending (Congress recently appropriated almost \$40 billion for the next 12 months) is partly responsible for more wasteful methods being found there than in other agencies.

But GAO officials have learned that many military people are inherently careless about money. The Defense Department also is riddled with contracting officers who are not fitted for the job because of lack of training, in the opinion of some GAO investigators.

A recent report on 12 prime contracts negotiated by the Navy noted that prices \$12-200,000 in excess of actual costs had been accepted. The GAO was able to get back much of these excessive costs.

The GAO and Congress had clashed head-on with President Eisenhower over refusal of the International Cooperation Administration, which handles foreign aid, to furnish requested information.

Congress tacked on a provision to the foreign aid appropriations bill requiring the ICA to supply all information wanted by Congress, and to cut off funds if the data is not furnished. The bill is now before the Senate appropriations group.

The White House has given notice that it won't permit the mutual aid agency to comply, on the basis such a law would be unconstitutional and invade the Executive's power to withhold such matters as evalua-

tion reports, which House and Senate committees and the GAO want to see.

Incidentally, the White House and the Budget Bureau are subject to GAO audits, all except the special fund of the President.

Congress' watchdog agency itself is not immune from congressional probing. The GAO maintains offices all over the world where Federal money is spent.

Regional offices for field operations also are located in 19 American cities, including Dallas.

Strong Support for No Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, with reference to my bill, H.R. 7692, to remove Federal controls from agriculture in an attempt to end the current madness in the field of farming, I include a letter to the editor of the New York Times by the distinguished economist, Prof. Sumner H. Slichter, published in the New York Times of August 14, and an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of August 17, 1959, quoting President Charles B. Shuman of the American Farm Bureau of Federation:

TO CURTAIL FARM SURPLUSES—ENDING SUBSIDIES WITH ECONOMIES USED TO CUT TAXES PROPOSED

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Five of the most overproduced commodities in the United States are wheat, cotton, corn, rice, and tobacco. And yet we persist in paying large subsidies to keep up the overproduction of these goods.

The Government takes the surpluses off the hands of the producers and stores them at enormous expense—at the cost of about a billion dollars a year. So large are the accumulated surpluses that the problem of finding physical facilities in which to store them has become acute. And yet the payment of the huge subsidies to induce still more production of the overproduced commodities still goes on.

What should be done? It is obvious that the United States is losing an important opportunity to raise its standard of consumption. The amount of labor and capital now devoted to finance the production of surpluses could be devoted to increasing the supplies of goods that are scarce and that people would consume in larger quantities if the goods were produced and were available for consumption. How can this diversion of resources from producing unwanted wheat, corn, cotton, rice, and tobacco be brought about?

A simple way to accomplish the shift would be for the Government simply to stop paying subsidies and to use the money thus saved to cut taxes. Consumers would then decide how the released production power would be used because tax cuts would enable them to step up promptly the buying of a vast variety of goods.

GRADUAL ELIMINATION

The additional demand by consumers would pull workers and capital out of the wheat, cotton growing, corn, rice and tobacco industries into more productive uses. In order to mitigate the problems of transition it would probably be desirable to eliminate the subsidies by gradual steps over a

period of about 4 years. In order to provide new sources of demand to pull resources out of the excessively expanded industries, the tax cuts should be timed to coincide or slightly precede the subsidy cuts.

But though tax cuts could provide alternative demand for that now supplied by subsidies, the Government would not need to use all of the savings from the termination of subsidies in this way. The country has enormous public needs. It needs more schools, low-cost housing, better roads, flood control, pollution control, more hospitals, more recreation areas with roads to them, its cities need much replanning and rebuilding.

Hence, the Government would be wise to divide the savings from terminating subsidies into two parts—one part going to individuals in the form of tax reductions, the other part going to the public in the many forms of public works that the country badly needs but cannot now afford.

SUMNER H. SLICHTER.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 17, 1959]

VIEW FROM THE FARM

"Today's burdensome surpluses with their fantastic storage costs are symptoms of a sick farm program which has infected the business of agriculture with the disease of Federal aid and control."

Now, people reading those words might conclude they came from some city slicker so ignorant of the farm he thinks prize-winning calves always come in pairs a couple of inches above some shapely ankles.

Not so. Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, was the speaker. The Farm Bureau Federation represents 1.6 million farm families throughout the country, but does not, of course, claim to speak for all of them. It can speak for a considerable majority of its members, however, for frequent polls the federation holds invariably show opposition to the support programs.

The farmers would be vastly better off, Mr. Shuman told an audience recently in New York, if the Government would permit them to use the free marketplace to supply consumer needs. Government subsidy programs based on parity serve neither the interests of the consumer or the farmer, he added.

Nor of anybody else, for that matter. Consumers and farmers pay taxes (somebody once figured out that there are 51 taxes hidden in one loaf of bread) and the taxes they've paid for the monstrous farm program might be enlightening to some who don't realize the figures. Since 1954, and including 11 months of fiscal 1959, the farm program has realized losses of \$5.8 billion. In addition to paying farmers for things they grew and for things they didn't grow, the Government also spent some pretty impressive sums of money the farmers didn't get a dollar of.

For example, the Commodity Credit Corporation reports for the 11 months ending last May 31 that carrying charges alone on crops amounted to \$495 million, interest amounted to \$145 million and general overhead—that euphemism for a bureaucracy that has moved in on the farmer faster than a corn borer through the lower 40—has cost the taxpayer \$39.3 million in the same period.

Well, if a wasteful program such as this isn't even liked by farmers it's supposed to benefit, what in the world keeps it going?

Mr. Shuman had an answer for that one, too. "Though farmers often have asked that these programs be changed, the Congress has not yet taken effective action."

And that, so far as letting the public know who is really to blame for the follies of the farm program, ought to help separate the sheep from the goats.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following is my newsletter of August 15, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT BY CONGRESSMAN BRUCE ALGER, FIFTH DISTRICT, TEXAS

The labor bill passed, unbelievably the strongest of the three bills considered, and by a lopsided resounding vote, 303 to 125. A victory for Senator McCLELLAN and his committee (through its disclosures), for the President, for the minority Republican House leadership, and for the coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats. By their own statements against the bill, it was a defeat for the House Democrat leadership, the AFL-CIO, the Teamsters, and the dedicated House liberals. But, most of all, it was a victory for the people, both in and out of unions, who by letters and wires demanded labor reform and an end to the abuses and excesses of the power of labor leaders.

The bills considered and their sponsors: (1) The Teamsters sponsored the weakest bill, the Shelley bill (defeated 245 to 132). (2) The Democrat House leadership (and AFL-CIO indirectly) sponsored the committee bill. (3) The administration, most business interests, the minority House (Republican) leadership, and southern Democrats sponsored the bipartisan Landrum-Griffin substitute bill, passed with 156 Democrats and 147 Republicans for, 122 Democrats and 3 Republicans against. Oddly enough and yet understandably, the excesses of labor and of proponents of labor's legislative demands brought on their own downfall or correction. These excesses include (1) unwillingness to concede that effective labor reform legislation was needed; (2) intemperate and inaccurate criticism of the substitute bill; (3) accusations of management's lobbying (galleries full of labor representatives and most lobbying by labor as usual); (4) sponsorship of committee bill that would actually weaken present labor law (example: exempt from boycott provisions 88 percent of truckers now covered); (5) those against the committee bill were accused by Democrat leadership of being "labor-haters" and partisan.

The debate raged around the differences of the three bills (see last week's newsletter). On study I found arguments for the substitute bill outweighed the arguments for the Committee bill (after Shelley bill was eliminated). Arguments for committee bill include: (1) It's stronger than Shelley bill; (2) It goes as far as possible without hurting labor movement; (3) The substitute bill is "punitive" and goes too far. Rebuttal by proponents of the substitute bill (see last week): (1) Only the substitute bill covers the main areas of abuse: (a) Workers' bill of rights (b) union finances (c) No man's land labor disputes jurisdiction (d) Blackmail picketing (e) Secondary boycotts and hot cargo; (2) the substitute bill is not punitive and will eliminate from labor movement only the undesirable.

The debate was the most stimulating of the year—the air almost crackled with excitement, intemperate statements were hodge-podged with studious presentations, tempers flared, laughter greeted many exchanges. Debate highlights, humor or oddities include: (1) Threats by labor proponents that dire political consequences would befall those voting against organized labor's wishes, that

this would be the "Congressional Retirement Act of 1959"; (2) The disclosures of brutality, violence, and coercion by John L. Lewis, Hoffa, and Reuther; (3) The intemperate charges of partisanship by House Democrat leadership, even as Republicans and Democrats smoothly joined (the "coalition") to put through the Landrum-Griffin bipartisan substitute; (4) The union-member Congressman who pleaded for labor reform to protect working people which he claimed only by the substitute bill could provide; (5) The attempt by labor's spokesmen to sabotage the substitute bill by tagging it NAM (National Association of Manufacturers) or Chamber of Commerce-sponsored; (6) The liberals' amendment to include no discrimination in union membership because of race, color, creed or sex, contrary to AFL-CIO desire to select membership by their own rules,—and many others. Volumes will be written describing this 4-day debate and its legislative outcome, a landslide of popular opinion for correction of labor's indiscretions.

My own belief is that even here we are attempting to doctor the surface sores rather than cure the basic illness. The boycotts, financial embezzlements, violence, and other abuses are the sores; the basic illness stems from the monopolistic power of unions which further result in dictatorial power of the national union leaders. The shutdown nationally of the steel industry (Hoffa's power to tie up transport nationally), prevention of piggy-back trucking, price-fixing, limiting of new businesses entering trades, limitation of new products' use such as prefabricated window, door, and building units or plastic pipe, all these and more are situations that cannot be cured short of antitrust law. Why shouldn't labor be treated as equal to business which is under antitrust law? I presented this viewpoint in suggesting my bill H.R. 8003, which would: (1) Return control of local unions to local union members and their elected officers; (2) end monopolistic practice of industry-wide bargaining by professional labor bosses at national and international level; (3) unions no longer could fix prices, restrict uses of new processes and products. Enforcement would be injunctive relief in Federal court (not criminal prosecution). I predict that, though the bill just passed was the best before us, the abuses, excesses and dangers of organized labor's power will not be curbed until and unless labor organizations are placed under antitrust law. Only then will union members, the consumer, and management-labor relations be really protected. Because I believe this, I predict that the national labor leaders will never rest until I am removed from office, no matter how greatly my bill would benefit union members. As always, it is up to the people. The victory of the labor bill resulted from aroused public opinion communicated to Congressmen.

¹ Senator McCLELLAN's endorsement of the substitute bill.

Kindness to a Stricken Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMER H. BUDGE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, recently a news story, originating in Idaho Falls, Idaho, told the tragic tale of a stricken

family. The following editorial from the Deseret News—Salt Lake Telegram, published at Salt Lake City, Utah, on August 7, 1959, discloses a previously unpublished chapter of that story. It teaches a fine Christian lesson, for which all of us are indebted to the organizations, business firms, and individuals who participated:

KINDNESS TO A STRICKEN FAMILY

The brutality of two world wars and the coarsening effect of the aftermath have taken their toll of the gentler virtues. So have the new oppressions and tyrannies of our day. Even in our country which has suffered comparatively little from the direct effects of war and has never been trampled under the heel of tyrants, there are tensions and stridencies which tend to make people less likely to be kind than harsh.

"So shines a good deed in a naughty world," wrote the "bard of Avon" centuries ago and his sage observation might well apply to our time and our people.

It might well apply to the Idaho Falls Junior Chamber of Commerce, the radio and television station of that fine community, Kansas City, Mo., civic clubs, the Lederle Laboratories of New York City and all others who are helping the Kenneth Nelson family, of Kansas City, stricken with botulism (food poisoning) while visiting with Mrs. Nelson's parents on a farm near Idaho Falls.

"Service to humanity is the best work in life and is a part of the junior chamber of commerce creed," said Laddy Dale, head of the "Nelson family survival fund." Because "service to others is the best work of life," the campaign is catching on in numerous western communities and may even become nationwide.

With Mrs. Nelson in an iron lung, Mr. Nelson, their daughter Wanda, 15, and Mrs. Nelson's father, Aaron Cruwell, 74, all dead, and Mrs. Cruwell and three Nelson children recovering or under observation, the sympathy of many persons and communities has been aroused. It is magnificent to see how this sympathy is being transformed into action in behalf of this stricken family.

Lederle Laboratories did a most generous and kindly deed when it canceled out a \$7,825 bill for the antitoxin and also paid the air freight costs as the drug was flown in from various parts of the country. The Idaho Falls JC's, the Kansas City civic clubs and others are gathering funds since the cost of treatment for botulism is very great.

There is an old proverb which says, "Kindness is a language the deaf can hear and the dumb can understand." Certainly, everybody understands when trouble hits our friends and neighbors. It is then that we see and understand how our lives flow into the lives of others, especially those who are struck by tragedy.

Dangers Involved in the Use of Coal

Tar Colors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I am bringing to the attention of the Congress a letter which I have just received, similar to others which have come to me, one of which I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 27, page A6478, discuss-

ing the dangers involved in the use of coal-tar colors, food, drug, and cosmetic yellow Nos. 3 and 4, as coloring agents for butter, cheese, and oleo. I think that from a health standpoint this proposal should receive the most thorough consideration.

It is significant, Mr. Speaker, that most of the civilized countries have outlawed the use of these coloring agents in food products. If we continue to use these agents in our foods we obviously stand to lose our overseas markets. For example, Canada has just announced that it will not buy any more butter which has been colored with food, drug, and cosmetic yellow Nos. 3 and 4.

The letter follows:

IOWA CREAMERIES ASSOCIATION,
Ames, Iowa, August 15, 1959.

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLF: We understand there is a bill before Congress, H.R. 6852, which calls for extending the time for certification of food, drug, and cosmetic regulations on the use of Nos. 3 and 4 colors in butter.

If the Federal Food and Drug question the use of yellow Nos. 3 and 4 colors, it is our opinion that there should be no extension for the use of these colors in butter.

Very truly yours,

IOWA CREAMERIES ASSOCIATION,
J. S. QUIST, Executive Secretary.

Fishing Under Cover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald of August 14, 1959, entitled "Fishing Under Cover":

FISHING UNDER COVER

Sometimes a congressional committee can justify a closed hearing for the protection of a witness who may be asked embarrassing questions about activities that have not yet been fully examined. In these cases the closed hearing is really a part of the information gathering process preliminary to a full-scale public investigation. But where can any excuse be found for closed hearings to protect the committee members who are doing the questioning? That appears to be the only excuse for the McClellan committee's strange star-chamber probe into the affairs of the United Auto Workers Union.

Senator McCLELLAN tried to explain the committee's unusual procedure by saying that it was having a preliminary look at evidence which its Republican members wished to present in order to determine whether a full-scale inquiry would be advisable. But this supposed deference to witnesses called in a fishing expedition soon evaporated when it appeared that the chief witness, Richard Gosser, preferred to testify in open session, and Walter Reuther, UAW president, protested vigorously against the closed-door technique. In these circumstances it seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that the secrecy was ordered solely

for the benefit of the Republican members who were pressing the charges, and that is a wholly unwarranted excuse for withholding from the public and the press what is indubitably the public business.

Robert C. Hill, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the August 9 issue of the Dallas Morning News carried an article on our mutual friend Robert C. Hill, U.S. Ambassador to Mexico.

That portion of his official title "extraordinary" is certainly befitting Mr. Hill, as the following article will testify: AMBASSADOR POINTS UP MEXICO'S TOUR LURES

(By Joe Goulden)

Robert C. Hill, the U.S. No. 1 "tourist" in Mexico wishes his fellow countrymen would give him some help.

Since being appointed Ambassador in 1957, Hill has spent just about as much time meeting Mexico in person in farflung villages as he has in the more formal Embassy in Mexico City.

He has visited most of Mexico's 31 states and territories. He has met the sidewalk hucksters in Tijuana; he has visited the tiny Isla de Mujeres off the coast of Yucatan.

And the big surprise, in Hill's estimation, is that more Americans haven't done the same.

In Dallas recently with the blue-ribbon group of Mexican businessmen, Hill summed up his reasons in an interview.

"Look at it this way," he said. "Why spend thousands of dollars going to Europe when such a beautiful nation is right in our own backyard?"

"The scenery is just as beautiful. The cultures are just as old. The history is close to that of Texas and the Southwest.

"And most of all, the Mexican people want a chance to be friends with and know more about the United States."

A second (and more serious) reason: "Right now the United States is literally fighting a cold war with Communists in some Latin American countries.

"But the more Latin Americans get to know Americans, the less chance the Reds will have. So you might say that tourism is another road to survival."

Ambassador Hill, a hulking man who used to play football at Dartmouth, isn't the type of tourist who wanders gawkeyed with guidebook in one hand and camera in the other.

In fact, judging from descriptions given by aids, at times he must approach being a tourist attraction himself.

His guiding philosophy while making trips is that meeting people and making friends are two different things. Hill would rather make friends.

At a fiesta (he's been to dozens) Hill will don a serape and hat, pick up a guitar, and lustily sing "Cielito Lindo," his favorite Mexican song.

University of Mexico City students had him as a guest at a football game once. Someone asked how Americans kicked footballs.

Hill sent several 50-yard spirals down the field while the crowd stood and cheered.

Nor is Hill a striped-pants diplomat. He believes in finding out things first hand, doesn't balk at getting his feet wet if necessary.

While ambassador to El Salvador back in 1954, Hill, his wife and two children drove the family car over the Pan-American Highway from San Salvador to Washington, D.C.

"I wanted to find out more about the highway, which I consider one of the most important cooperative effects in this hemisphere," he said.

Freedom of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, Hugh Gallagher, of San Francisco, is known in maritime circles throughout the world for his interest in that segment of the economy. He serves as a special representative to the president of the Matson Navigation Co., and is chairman of the mayor's committee for shipping, shipbuilding, and ship repair.

Hugh looks the part of the stern, business executive but hidden behind this protective shield is the heart of an Irish poet. He is the poet laureate of Pacific coast shipping and here, reproduced from the San Francisco Chronicle, is one of his poems entitled "Freedom of the Press":

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

(By Hugh Gallagher)

'Twas my custom to drop in to Eddie's place, in those days when the Nation was dry,

As Eddie had news of the waterfront and Eddie had mighty good rye.

Many's the story, and sometimes a scoop, came from that famous place

Of ships and people and goings on—and that man's unforgettable face.

It had the look of a beaten man with nothing ahead but hope,

But not the scum of the waterfront or the leavings of drink or dope.

He generally sat where he could look on a beautifully modeled ship—

I'd covered her comings and watched her sail on many a busy trip.

From time to time he'd come and go—quiet—and so alone

Like one without "the tie that binds," or friends to call his own.

Cold and drenched by a storm one night, he came through an alley door.

My memory stirred—the modeled ship—these two—somewhere before.

I motioned to Eddie to pour some drinks and moved a chair to his side

Mumbling some words about the storm—not wishing to hurt his pride.

He didn't look up nor did he speak as his glass was filled with rye,

Then he raised it up to the modeled ship and looked me straight in the eye.

It wasn't a weakling's face I saw, but a man's—once strong and fine,

With a thousand years of pain and hurt etched into every line.

His eyes met mine with a steady look, without shame or fear or doubt,

And I knew the sweep of the seven seas, as my brain reeled round-about.

He nodded his head toward the modeled ship—then spoke in a tired voice.
 "A storm was the end of the world for me—but a man must take his choice.
 Remember the case of the *Rio Del Mar* and the night she ran aground,
 And the hero master who gave his life—whose body was never found?
 I was the chief mate on watch that night and I got the brunt of the blame,
 The world collapsed around my being and headlines ruined my name.
 Maybe I should have told the truth and taken my chance with the law,
 But who would believe what happened that night, or the things no others saw.
 I've had my share of storms at sea—but I never knew such a night.
 I tried to see through the blinding snow but couldn't make out the light.
 The order logged was to call the Master when Point Arno was abeam,
 So I stowed the engines and asked the chief to keep a good head of steam.
 I knocked on his door, then opened it wide, and there he lay on his bunk,
 A stink you could cut—a drooling mouth—filthy and rotten drunk.
 I shook, I cuffed him and twisted his ear—and tumbled him out on the floor,
 Then bodily carried him stumbling, in through the wheelhouse door.
 I tried to get through his sodden brain that we hadn't made out the light.
 But he stood there mumbling stupidly, like a man half crazed with fright.
 Above the noise of the storm outside I could hear the breakers roar,
 And a sailor's instinct seemed to warn we were much too close to shore.
 Then he did a thing no man would do, lest reason within had fled—
 He seized the engineroom telegraph, and rang full speed ahead.
 My heart most stopped at what he'd done, then gripped with rage and fear,
 I grabbed the fool at the telegraph and tried to pull him clear.
 But he was a powerful well-built man and he wrestled me to the deck
 And I felt his angry fingers feel for a hold about my neck.
 We fought like two wild animals all over the wheel house floor,
 'Til the rolling ship took a heave to port, and tumbled us through the door.
 Cursing and clawing like maniacs—drenched by the heavy seas,
 He gripped my throat with his heavy hands and forced me to my knees.
 A cresting wave came over the rail, and I pried his big hands free.
 Then she rolled to port, and with all my strength, I flung him into the sea.
 I crawled half choked to the telegraph and rang full speed astern.
 Calling down in the speaking tube for every last blooming turn.
 For minutes the vessel quivered and shook, as she fought to come to a stop,
 And I clung to the telegraph fighting for breath, sick and ready to drop.
 She seemed to check, then she lifted up, then down with a grinding shock,
 But the engines backed and she freed herself from a shelving point of rock.
 I kept her turning full speed astern until sure we were in the clear.
 Then—a moment of horror at what I'd done—I shook with a chilling fear.
 A moist moon broke through the tumbling clouds and I made out a light from afar.
 I knew where we were so I set a course for my precious *Rio Del Mar*.
 She was down by the head and filling fast, but the bulkheads held real tight,
 So we eased her along, and she made her way, steering as best she might.
 We came into port with all hands safe—the ship and the cargo intact.

Then I was alone with a secret dread, and the ghost of my guilty act.
 The headlines screamed of a captain brave, who perished to save his ship,
 And a careless mate who was all at fault was damned by a flippant quip.
 "Asleep on watch," I recall it well, it seared and it cut till it bled,
 My years at sea were at an end—all hope within was dead.
 I was in charge of the watch, they held—I was the man to blame.
 No one could help, and the grisly truth wouldn't serve to clear my name.
 Friends passed my by—no more to sea—my wakeful nights were hell
 And dreary days when I faced the world, with that secret I dare not tell.
 So now I drift from job to job, doomed with the living damned,
 The careless mate—asleep on watch—the ship he dreamed to command.
 So thanks, my friend, for this welcome talk and the warming glass of rye.
 Somehow I'll feel that I have one friend, when others pass me by."
 Then he touched my hand as he turned to go out in the storm and the cold,
 My insides gripped and I felt all sick—suddenly tired and old.
 I looked away for I wouldn't dare to let his eyes meet mine.
 I hadn't the guts to let him know—that I had written that line.

Representative Oren Harris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include a recent editorial from the Washington Evening Star concerning the recent amendment to the stadium law for the District of Columbia. The editorial commends our colleague and my good friend, OREN HARRIS, for his work on this measure. Having been formerly associated with Mr. HARRIS on the District of Columbia Committee, I can testify to the great effort and amount of work exerted by Mr. HARRIS in this regard. We here in the Congress as well as the people of the District of Columbia owe him a debt of gratitude for his untiring efforts and deep interest in District affairs.

The editorial is as follows:

STADIUM AMENDMENT

Thanks largely to the earnest and intelligent efforts of Representative HARRIS, of Arkansas, the House has passed an amendment to the stadium law which deserves quick passage, also, by the Senate. The amendment, by specifying the amount which may be spent for such collateral projects as parking, access, and other important stadium facilities, sets at rest reports that too much money would be allocated to such accessories.

Earlier, Interior Department officials indicated the facilities might cost as much as \$5.6 million, an estimate which rightfully brought charges that the designs were "grandiose" and "utopian." Actually, it turned out that the work involved a number of improvements in nearby federally owned areas which were not directly related to the

stadium. In order to rule out any such inclusions, Mr. HARRIS' amendment limited expenditures for parking lots, approach roads, and utility facilities to \$2.6 million—a realistic figure arrived at recently in conferences between Interior, congressional, and civic participants in the project.

The bill also clears up any further question about the legislative authority of Interior to construct the facilities—a matter which had been queried by the General Accounting Office. It is imperative that this new legislation be approved this year so that the design and financing of the 50,000-seat stadium can proceed. We hope the Senate District committee sends it to the Senate floor promptly and that swift approval follows.

Poison in Your Water—No. 155

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Portland (Oreg.) Journal of May 24, 1959, entitled "Dirty River: Big Swallow Dangerous":

DIRTY RIVER: BIG SWALLOW DANGEROUS
 (By Watford Reed)

Pollution is turning Portland Harbor and the lower Columbia River into something approaching an open sewer.

A big swallow of water from Portland Harbor or the Columbia downstream from Hayden Island contains enough germs to make a person deathly sick. If enough persons should drink it, an epidemic could be started overnight. So far, luck has prevented conditions from being ripe for that, but luck may run out.

The U.S. Public Health Service has found that one big swallow of water from the Columbia at the lower end of Hayden Island in late summer contains 23,300 coliform bacteria—the type that live in the intestines of humans and warm-blooded animals.

In Portland Harbor, the germ count in the summer ranges from very low in some places to 70,000 in others, with an average as high as 24,000.

So polluted is the Columbia at one point—near the lower end of Hayden Island—that the Public Health Service is concerned about repeated exposure of spray to motorboat occupants and water skiers. It could reach a point where it would be dangerous.

The Columbia and Portland Harbor are 97 times as polluted as accepted standards for swimming. Those standards call for an average of fewer than 240 coliform bacteria per 100 milliliters—the equivalent of a big swallow—in water used for swimming, 1,000 for boating and fishing, and 200 in water for domestic use after conventional treatment.

The U.S. Public Health Service declares flatly:

"The bacterial contamination of the lower Columbia River constitutes a health hazard to those who use the water for domestic water supply, for swimming and water skiing, and for activities that involve boating, such as pleasure boating, fishing, hunting, trapping, navigation, and log transportation."

The Service has found that even in months of high water on the Columbia, bacterial pollution is twice as great as standards for boating and fishing.

And 89 percent of the bacterial pollution in the lower Columbia comes from Portland.

In Portland itself, 80 outfalls still pour untreated sewage into the Willamette.

This is true in spite of a \$19 million sewage-disposal project which put 90 percent of Portland sewage through a treatment plant.

Columbia water is almost completely pure before it reaches heavily populated areas. The Public Health Service reports only 51 coliform organisms per 100 milliliters downstream from Bonneville Dam.

No other big city in the United States has such a tremendous river of almost pure water only 40 miles away. But sewage discharges upstream from the Portland-Vancouver area raise the coliform count to 1,200, too much for swimming, boating or fishing, by the time the water reaches the metropolitan area.

Besides menacing health, pollution has threatened to wipe out one phase of the Northwest's rich fishery which yielded commercial fishermen in Oregon alone more than \$30 million a year for 1948 through 1953. The river also contributes heavily to the State's \$150 million a year tourist industry.

Sewage and industrial pollution have combined to threaten the fall run of salmon in the Willamette with extinction. In 1954, only 370 fall chinooks were counted over Willamette Falls at Oregon City. In 1955 there were 75 and in 1956 only 21. In 1957, the pathetic number increased to 53. Figures are not available for 1958.

The fish commission believes that sport fishing is only a tiny factor in the destruction of fall chinooks.

Pollution makes Portland Harbor a virtual death chamber for migrating fish in low water periods.

Twice in 1957, dissolved oxygen in the Willamette River neared the vanishing point, and that summer salmon fingerlings died as far upstream as a moorage near the Sellwood Bridge.

Last year oxygen content of the Willamette was reported higher because industry—mainly paper mills—had begun abating pollution.

But the bed of the Willamette below Oregon City must be the equivalent of a desert for fish seeking food. Sewage and paper mill wastes have wiped out most underwater plant life of the kind that feeds fish. And the water is so dirty that little light could reach vegetation to keep life processes going.

Portland is not alone in its despoliation of the once beautiful Willamette. Salem, Eugene, Oswego, Newberg, and other cities pour inadequately treated sewage into the river. The Oregon Sanitary Authority has ordered them, like Portland, to abate the nuisance, and Oswego has a project under way.

A Rose by Any Other Name

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I see by the August 4, 1959, issue of Aviation Daily that "members of the Association of Local Transport Airlines have adopted a resolution to refer henceforth to subsidy payments as public service revenues. It is reported that the idea was first set forth by Allegheny Airlines which used the expression in its latest annual report.

Reasoning is that subsidy is actually the cost of providing a public service."

A subsidy is a subsidy no matter what you call it. The only justification for any subsidy is that a public purpose is served. Sometimes the public service aspect of the public service is rather direct and sometimes it is rather indirect. Sometimes it is nonexistent.

Subsidy payments may or may not be public service revenues. This is something that should be examined carefully and constantly in the interests of the taxpayer and the welfare of our country. I do not approve this attempt to obscure plain language by Madison Avenue sugar coating.

Cut Out the Expensive Pamphlets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial suggestion from the Massillon, Ohio, Evening Independent, to the Department of the Army. All Government agencies will do well to take this advice to heart:

CUT OUT THE EXPENSIVE PAMPHLETS

The mailman left quite a package on our desk the other day.

It must have weighed all of a pound or more and it was carried from Washington to this city without the payment of postage—official Government business, you know.

Inside the package were six pamphlets, all of slick surfaced paper—the expensive kind—and with the covers beautifully decked out in two- and three-color designs.

All had to do with the activities of the U.S. Army.

Two carried the title of "Official Army Information Digest, U.S. Army Magazine." One was issued in April, of this year and referred the reader, if there would be one, to the Army budget. The other, issued early this month, carried this notation: "The Chief of Staff Reports."

Another bore this imposing title: "The Professional Army Missile Expert—A Soldier First." Titles on the other three were: "Army Missiles Rockets, Department of the Army Pamphlet No. 355-13, May 1959"; "This Is the Army 59, America's Most Versatile Fighting Force," and "Progress 58, U.S. Army Reports."

Now these six pamphlets probably were distributed to many publications and other news media and perhaps to other organizations and individuals throughout the United States.

It required the work of a lot of people to compile and lay out these various pamphlets. The printing and art work is of the best. It also must have cost a heap of money to have them printed and Uncle Sam's postal service derived not a penny though being assigned the chore of delivering them to their destinations.

And, of course, the taxpayers of the country, as usual, footed the bill.

Now we do not want to leave the impression that we are taking a stand against the development and training of an adequate military force to defend this country if the need ever arises. We would be the last to

argue against such a thing, what with the cold war still a matter of grave concern and Russia becoming more belligerent by the day.

But in these days of \$40 billion defense budgets, which are taxing the American people's ability to pay, we wonder if some of the activities of the Armed Forces, such as flooding the mails with a lot of pamphlets very few people will read, could not be dispensed with in the interest of greater economy in defense spending and greater efficiency in our military preparations.

With newspapers, magazines, television, and radio ready to give the fullest coverage, as they always have been, to all activities of our Armed Forces, which have not been labeled as "top secret" so Russian spies can steal them, we believe our Federal Defense Department could save millions of dollars by eliminating some of its nonessential spending, such as the pamphlets we are writing about.

We believe any vital information about our Defense Department and the progress it is making in shaping a strong defense for this Nation can be adequately relayed to the American public through this country's newspapers and other news media.

And this not only applies to the Defense Department. All other departments in our Federal Government, now swarming with bureaucrats eager to spend every dollar they can squeeze out of the taxpayer, also could save millions by eliminating a lot of their nonessential activities, such as flooding the country with pamphlets no one takes the time to read.

Yes, the American taxpayer could be saved a lot of money and all branches of our Federal Government strengthened if more attention was paid to the things that are essential and eliminate the many that are nonessential.

And by the way, anyone interested in reading the Army's pamphlets can have them by calling at this office in the next few days before we consign them to the round file.

Mr. K

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an editorial written by Mr. Parker M. Merrow, publisher and editor of the Carroll County Independent, Center Ossipee, N.H., on Friday, August 14, 1959, entitled "Mr. K."

This is a most interesting and able statement on the coming visit of Premier Khrushchev to the United States:

MR. K

With all the fanfare in the press about the impending visit of Mr. Khrushchev, we feel that one point has been badly missed, namely, that the visit will give ample opportunity to show the gentleman just what is the United States.

There is good reason for certain segments of our population to hate him bitterly and there is no reason why any of our people should feel it necessary to roll out the red carpet or hit the fatted calf between the eyes with a small sledge hammer.

But it has been repeatedly reported that Mr. Khrushchev has no real concept of the

strength of the United States. Comment has been made that he does not realize either the actual or the potential strength of our Nation. It is felt that if he knew the truth, he would not be rattling the saber of threatening to release forces which could wipe out civilization.

Obviously he has read all manner of reports on the United States. But reading a dry report and seeing for one's self, right on the spot, in person, are two different things entirely.

That is why our great corporations, our military and our governmental agencies, are continually sending their people out, to all parts of the world, to see things as they actually are.

You can read all the statistics you want to about the great New Jersey Turnpike, but you will never know the vital flow of people and good till you stand beside that road on a warm spring morning and hear the almost never ending hum and rumble that is the Jersey Pike, and watch the strings of vehicles, carrying everything from Florida bound vacationists to lumber for New York, roll in endless lines.

You can read all you wish to about the vitality of Chicago, but until you have ridden in 5 o'clock traffic on Lake Shore Drive, you cannot appreciate what that city is.

You can read about Pittsburgh, but until you have driven through Pittsburgh and then the coal towns of Pennsylvania, you just do not have the concept of that great area.

Until you have flown on a clear night over the Washington-Baltimore, Wilmington, Philadelphia, Newark, New York complex you simply cannot visualize the greatness of the area.

You can read and look at pictures for 8 hours, all about our auto industry, but until you have driven through Detroit, you just cannot understand.

All too many of us have our concepts of nations and of national character from old school geographies, stylized funny books and hackneyed movies and TV shows.

From the books of our childhood, we still visualize Russia as a land of great snow-covered plains where horses at a dead run pull sleighs filled with frightened people and a pack of wolves is just three jumps behind.

Of course we have all seen many photos and news reels since those early days, and know far better, but still lingering in the back corner of our mind, is that childish concept of Russia.

W would bet a really good hat that in the back of his mind, Mr. Khrushchev still thinks of the United States as a country where cowboys still chase Indians, where Negroes named Uncle Tom are beaten by cruel masters and where gangsters in snap brim hats, chewing cigars and wearing form fitting Chesterfield coats, step into saloons and cut down the patrons with tommyguns.

There is nothing like a dose of reality, of getting one's feet right on the ground, to know and understand a problem. That is the beginning of wisdom.

We cannot lose anything by wheeling Mr. K. around for a few days. And quite possibly the eyes of the gentleman might be opened.

The Roadbuilding Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, an editorial that appeared in this morning's

New York Times on the question of the roadbuilding tax merits the attention of my colleagues, and I therefore take the liberty of inserting it in the RECORD:

THE ROADBUILDING TAX

The House Ways and Means Committee did not find it easy to take the responsible way of financing the interstate highway building program, but it finally came around. Three days after it had voted 15 to 8 against a temporary increase of 1 cent a gallon in the gasoline tax it reversed itself and voted 16 to 9 to accept a compromise formula that includes the tax rise. So fiscal soundness wins a victory, as does President Eisenhower.

The solution chosen involves imposition of the tax increase from September 1 to June 30, 1961, when the Federal tax on gasoline would return to 3 cents a gallon. On that expiration date the highway trust fund would begin to receive the benefit of a diversion of \$2,500 million (over a 3-year period) in taxes on automobiles, parts, and accessories which now go into the Treasury's general fund. Allocations to States for highway construction would be somewhat cut back in the next 2 years, a disappointment, but one that apparently must be weathered.

So the principle applied to this program from the start, that it would be kept on a pay-as-we-build basis, is maintained. The departure from principle suggested July 29 by the committee, involving a billion-dollar bond issue, and accompanied by diversion of excise taxes needed for Federal budget balancing and drastic reduction of aid allocations for roads, has been repudiated.

The Government would have been better off, and the highway-building program would have been better served, if Congress had approved several months ago immediate imposition of the 1½-cent gasoline tax rise long ago advised by the President. But if it accepts this committee compromise it will have repaired most of the damage. The situation can be reviewed in early 1961 to see whether the Federal budget's condition warrants diversion of automobile excise taxes to the roadbuilding program. If not, the gasoline tax should be raised again.

A Major Event in International Scientific History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from Chancellor Glenn T. Seaborg, of the University of California at Berkeley, with reference to the Century 21 Exposition, a scientific and cultural exposition to be held in Seattle, Wash., from May 1961 to October 1962. We will soon consider H.R. 8374 by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON BROOKS], which would appropriate \$12,500,000 for construction of a hall of science at the Century 21 Exposition, for various exhibits and for other allied costs.

Chancellor Seaborg is the Nobel prize-winning professor of chemistry and associate director of the radiation laboratory at the University of California. Under permission to extend remarks, I include his letter in which he gives his

full endorsement to the Century 21 Exposition:

Congressman JEFFERY COHELAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COHELAN: I have learned that legislation concerning the Century 21 Exposition may be considered in the House of Representatives next week. As a scientist and as a member of the National Science Planning Board of Century 21 Exposition, I feel certain that this exposition will be a major event in international scientific history. The quality of the exhibits and the international participation in their planning and display will certainly justify, in my opinion, every effort made to provide support for the exposition.

Sincerely yours,

GLENN T. SEABORG.

Ukrainian Congress Committee of America Appeals to American Conscience Against Visit of "Hangman of Ukraine"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting news release issued by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, in opposition to Khrushchev's visit to the United States:

NATIONAL GROUP WILL DEMONSTRATE PEACEFULLY—APPEALS TO AMERICAN CONSCIENCE AGAINST VISIT OF "HANGMAN OF UKRAINE"

In a statement sent to President Eisenhower on the visit of Nikita Khrushchev to this country, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee, and also a member of the Republican Committee on Program and Progress, deplored the invitation as "another Russian cold war victory which Moscow is already celebrating as Khrushchev's triumph." He also declared, "This planned action appears now as a cynical sequel to our first observance of Captive Nations Week." A professor in Soviet economics at Georgetown University, Dr. Dobriansky originated the Captive Nations Week resolution which precipitated Khrushchev's outbursts during the Vice President's visit in the Soviet Union. On the real effectiveness of the Captive Nations Week resolution, he pointed out that Khrushchev had to hurry down to Ukraine, while Nixon was in Russia proper, to give a self-reassuring speech.

ANOTHER COLD WAR DEFEAT FOR UNITED STATES

The statement stressed that the invitation constitutes "another cold war defeat for the United States by placing the cloak of respectability and legitimacy on a political criminal, no matter how he is painted. Moreover, Mr. President, it so obviously contradicts your own test, put so often before our people, that you would not meet with Khrushchev unless there were some encouraging progress at Geneva. There was none. What this and a forthcoming summit meeting amount to are a dangerous retreat from the policy you so admirably upheld against all short-sighted pressures when Secretary Dulles was alive."

"This step really ushers in a new phase in our foreign policy," the professor said. "We now seem to be reducing our last and most

potent weapon of clear-cut superiority, our discriminating moral world leadership. Secretary Dulles must have rolled in his grave when this invitation was announced."

TAKE A LEAF FROM THE SCANDINAVIANS

In issuing the statement, Dr. Dobriansky said that "knowing the facts about Khrushchev's crimes, every God-revering American should from here on strongly protest the visit of the Hangman of Ukraine. We Americans can still take a leaf from the Scandinavian peoples and with an equally strong moral conscience disapprove the propaganda and cold war visit of the Hangman."

Appealing to the moral conscience of America, the Ukrainian Congress Committee, with headquarters in New York, is committing its resources to bring these ghastly facts to the American people in order to permit their consciences to decide on how to receive the Hangman. The committee speaks for about 2½ million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry and has branches in New York, Boston, Pittsburgh, Newark, Philadelphia, Buffalo, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Minneapolis, and other major cities.

"Along with other Americans," the professor said, in issuing the statement, "we'll put these questions to the conscience-aroused minds of our fellow citizens:

(1) Would you invite a criminal to your home? Then why Khrushchev to our national home?

(2) Would you have favored Hitler here 20 years ago? Then why the Hangman of Ukraine whose career is based on the genocide of millions of various national patriots, Christians, Jews, and Moslems?

(4) Does a God-dedicated people pay respects to a professional atheist who denies God as the ultimate source of human and national freedom?

SOME CRIMES OF THE HANGMAN OF UKRAINE

The professor's statement to the President emphasized that "it is incredible that a genocidist and political criminal should be extended the official hospitality of this home of the free." It explained why Khrushchev is widely known in Eastern Europe as the Hangman of Ukraine by citing some of his crime:

(1) As a party functionary in the early thirties, he played a brilliant role in the Moscow manmade famine in Ukraine that resulted in the annihilation of some 5 million lives;

(2) For his excellent performances, he was elevated to high party posts in Ukraine and had a hand in the genocide of some 11,000 lives in Vinnitsa, Ukraine, before the war;

(3) Although a Russian, he paved the way to leadership in the party in Ukraine by conducting many purges;

(4) Following World War II, he was specially dispatched by Stalin to quell the patriotic resistance in Ukraine.

"Terrorism comes easy with the Hangman of Ukraine," said Dr. Dobriansky. "He showed it also in Georgia, Poland, and Hungary in 1956. Through his puppets, he showed it in Tibet. Only last month it was against the Ukrainian underground in the Carpathian mountains. Fooling many of our Americans today as Stalin did before fully entrenching himself over 30 years ago, the Hangman continues this terrorism by less conspicuous but more effective methods in the Soviet Union."

ARGUMENTS FOR VISIT INSULTING TO AMERICAN INTELLIGENCE

The Dobriansky statement also rejects the arguments given for Khrushchev's visit here. It states: "It is almost insulting to the intelligence of the American people that we are deemed by some as being naive enough to believe that Khrushchev does not already understand what the United States represents and possesses. Clearly, it didn't take

the Russians long to understand where our atomic and missile secret were. Khrushchev understands our country far more than many of us understand his empire in the Soviet Union itself and his centuries-fashioned methods and techniques. Those, like our visiting Governors to the U.S.S.R., who speak in mythical concepts of the Soviet people and the Soviet nation, and with callous disregard of the Lithuanian, Latvian, Ukrainian, and other captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., may well learn from the late Secretary of State Dulles. 'The Soviet bloc,' he said on October 10, 1955, 'represents an amalgamation of about 900 million people, normally constituting more than 20 distinct national groups.'"

The statement also points out, "It is an illusion to think that this visit and the later calculated summit meeting will relieve pressures on Berlin, the Middle East, Laos, free Korea, free China and, indeed, upon our United States. This action shows how woefully unprepared we are to cope with Moscow's cold war challenge. More than anything else that Khrushchev now wants its respectability and legitimacy to consolidate his empire. He is behaving in a tradition developed long before the Russian Revolution, and we have not even begun to learn the lessons of Russian empire building. Some of us may just as well pay tribute to Ivan the Terrible who was the first to use the friendship and peace tool in his cold war conquest of the Khanate of Kazan in the 16th century."

COMMITTEE'S GROUPS TO DEMONSTRATE PEACEFULLY

"Upon the arrival of the Hangman of Ukraine to this country," said Dr. Dobriansky, upon issuing the statement, "our groups will join with other Americans, churches, veterans in peaceful demonstration of protest and righteous condemnation against the hangman. The tolling of church bells, and wearing of black bands in mourning of the millions the hangman sent to their graves will be urged. In his historic proclamation of Captive Nations Week, the President urged all Americans to study the plight of the captive nations. There is no better occasion for this than now. We call upon all to pass the word. No violence but no approval. Our motto is D.D. with B.B.—dignified disapproval with black bands."

THE STATEMENT TO THE PRESIDENT

AUGUST 7, 1959.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America again cannot thank you enough for your historic proclamation of Captive Nations Week. By act of Congress and your splendid proclamation, the United States has officially recognized for the first time the existence of the many captive non-Russian nations within the empire known as the Soviet Union. This represents a great stride in our real understanding of the prison house of nations parading as the U.S.S.R. It was most significant that while the Vice President was in Russia proper, Khrushchev had to hurry down to Ukraine to give a self-reassuring speech.

We are, however, gravely disturbed by the invitation extended to Mr. Khrushchev to visit this country. In our judgment, this invitation cannot but be deplored as another Russian cold war victory which Moscow is already celebrating as Khrushchev's triumph. To countless Americans, this planned action appears now as a cynical sequel to our first observance of Captive Nations Week.

In the view of this committee, the invitation constitutes another cold war defeat for the United States by placing the cloak of respectability and legitimacy on a political criminal, no matter how he is painted. Moreover, Mr. President, it so obviously contradicts your own test, put so often before our people, that you would not meet with

Khrushchev unless there were some encouraging progress at Geneva. There was none. What this and a forthcoming summit meeting amount to are a dangerous retreat from the policy you so admirably upheld against all shortsighted pressures when Secretary Dulles was alive.

This step really ushers in a new phase in our foreign policy. We now seem to be reducing our last and most potent weapon of clear-cut superiority, our discriminating moral world leadership. Secretary Dulles must have rolled in his grave when this invitation was announced. The pressures that sought to oust him over a year ago, have now, but momentarily, won their first round.

To us, who follow closely developments within the multinational Soviet Union, it is incredible that a genocidist and political criminal should be extended the official hospitality of this home of the free. His record in part shows: (1) as a party functionary in the early 30's, he played a brilliant role in the Moscow manmade famine in Ukraine that resulted in the annihilation of some 5 million lives; (2) for his excellent performances, he was elevated to high party posts in Ukraine and had a hand in the genocide of some 11,000 lives in Vinnitsa, Ukraine, before the war; (3) although a Russian, he paved his way to leadership in the party in Ukraine by conducting many purges; (4) following World War II, he was especially dispatched by Stalin to quell the patriotic national resistance in Ukraine. This partial record explains why he is widely regarded in Eastern Europe as "the Hangman of Ukraine."

Terrorism comes easy with the hangman of Ukraine. He showed it also in Georgia, Poland, and Hungary in 1956. Through his puppets, he showed it in Tibet. Only last month it was against the Ukrainian underground in the Carpathian Mountains. Fooling many of our Americans today as Stalin did before fully entrenching himself over 30 years ago, the hangman continues this terrorism by less conspicuous but more effective methods in the Soviet Union. To assert, as some do, that peaceful methods have featured his regime since the 20th party congress belies the facts.

This committee, doubtless in addition to millions of Americans, regards the arguments offered to justify Khrushchev's visit here as spurious. It is almost insulting to the intelligence of the American people that we are deemed by some as being naive enough to believe that Khrushchev does not already understand what the United States represents and possesses. Clearly, it didn't take the Russians long to understand where our atomic and missile secrets were. Khrushchev understands our country far more than many of us understand his empire in the Soviet Union itself and his centuries-fashioned methods and techniques. Those, like our visiting Governors to the U.S.S.R., who speak in mythical concept of the Soviet people and the Soviet nation, and with callous disregard of the Lithuanian, Latvian, Ukrainian and other captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., may well learn from the late Secretary of State Dulles. "The Soviet bloc," he said on October 10, 1955, "represents an amalgamation of about 900 million people, normally, constituting more than twenty distinct national groups." The untutored harm some of us do to the freedom aspirations of 110 million people making up the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. cannot be too strongly emphasized. The blemish this places on our own traditions and the reciprocal harm it incurs for our own security interests need hardly be stressed.

It is an illusion to think that this visit and the later calculated summit meeting will relieve pressures on Berlin, the Middle

East, Laos, Free Korea, Free China and, indeed, upon our United States. This action shows how woefully unprepared we are to cope with Moscow's cold war challenge. More than anything else that Khrushchev now wants is respectability and legitimacy to consolidate his empire. He is behaving in a tradition developed long before the Russian Revolution and we have not even begun to learn the lessons of Russian empire-building. Some of us may just as well pay tribute to Ivan the Terrible who was the first to use the friendship and peace tool in his cold war conquest of the Khanate of Kazan in the 16th century.

In the light of these facts and reasoned judgments, our conscience moves us to join with other Americans in peaceful demonstration of protest and righteous condemnation against the "hangman." The Russians—and, indeed, the Vice President traveled only in the Russian part of U.S.S.R.—had no crimes to denounce. By any stretch of logic, the "hangman" is no parallel case to our Vice President. We, as indeed many other Americans who will in time voice themselves, cannot but share the moved feelings of Richard Cardinal Cushing, Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Congressman WALTER JUDT and many other outstanding leaders in our society.

In full confidence of your understanding and with God's many blessing upon you, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Chairman, the Ukrainian Congress
Committee of America.

If You Believe!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following article which appeared in the July-August issue of U.S. Lady, published for circulation among service wives, is an excellent description of the accomplishment of the Capehart housing program, started in 1954:

IF YOU BELIEVE!

(By Bonnie Fein Thompson)

Do you believe in miracles? I was somewhat of a skeptic until the first of July 1958 when we moved baggage, six children, boxer dog and ourselves into four-bedroom completely furnished, single house with the label "Navy Quarters."

The miracle began to materialize in the summer of 1957 at the Point Mugu, Calif., Naval Air Missile Test Center.

An architect who believed in California living at its fullest took the 122 acres the Navy had allotted for a 360-unit Capehart housing development and designed ranch style, single family dwellings in 17 diversified architectural plans. He also separated the houses, giving each unit a large front and back yard.

The Capehart bill itself allotted enough money per unit to build large family-size homes and not just adequate housing.

Then, best of all, an interior decorator had the foresight to order different styles and colors of furnishings. Thus the completed units resemble their next door neighbors neither inside nor out.

We watched the houses being built from the day the workmen first poured the concrete slabs until they began nailing the roof

boards. We suffered with the contractor when the torrential spring rains delayed construction and we felt almost a maternal pride as the ground was raked and grass seed was sown.

How will they assign the houses? When will we be able to move? I wonder which house will be mine? These are some of the monumental questions which faced not only the people who were to occupy the houses but the naval coordinators on a base where there had previously been 16 family quarters.

Finally "the word" was out. "Sunday and Monday the houses will be open for inspection."

My husband was called. He was 'luckily one of the first 20 enlisted men allowed to choose his quarters.

Yes, all the rumors of modern conveniences and good planning materialized when we opened the front door, tested the chimneys and entered our miracle.

Each bathroom (every house has at least two) has glassed-in tub and shower enclosures, walls and floors of ceramic tile, and overhead radiant electric heating elements.

The kitchen, a magazine dream kitchen, glistens with built-in ovens, countertop ranges, double sinks, and easy-to-keep-clean natural birch cabinets.

I had to keep pinching myself to believe that this was Government housing and the rent would be only the forfeiture of our quarters' allowance.

Looking through the empty house our 6-year-old son stopped testing the sliding doors in the closets long enough to chastise his younger brothers and sisters.

"You better keep your dirty hands off those walls," he scolded. "This is a nice house."

The date of our actual occupancy was still another month off, but, like a new home-builder, we would pack the family in the station wagon each weekend to investigate how everything was progressing. It certainly was a thrill the time we saw a "Do Not Enter" sign on the front door, peeked through the window and spotted the freshly laid oak block flooring. Then the next weekend we discovered that both the electricity and the hot and cool air systems were already connected.

On July 1, the first set of quarters was occupied. From then on the sight of moving vans and lamps sticking out of car windows became as familiar as the ice cream man, who seemed to have advanced knowledge of a new sales territory.

Civilian movers were authorized under the little known Joint Travel Regulations to transport families' household effects from their civilian homes to the Capehart units. This Department of Defense Bulletin states that when any serviceman moves into Government quarters, he is entitled to have his household goods moved in for him.

What a pleasure it is to have a house with enough storage space. The hall closet is more than 4 feet wide and extends from the ceiling to the floor. I must admit I felt pretty foolish when I inquired of the Navy inspector what the table-level "breadboard" was doing in the linen closet. Still, as I think back, I'd not been in many homes which even had a linen closet, let alone a board to lay the towels and sheets on while placing them on the shelves.

The ceramic-tiled vanity-type lavatory in the family bathroom covers a large storage closet which is perfect for soaps, tissues, and bath towels. The bedroom closets are large enough to both hang clothes and place a large chest of drawers inside. The master bedroom has a double closet. For once my clothes are not squashed between winter greens and summer whites.

In the kitchen every available nook is storage space. This includes a broom closet

large enough for the mops, buckets, furniture polishes, ironing board, vacuum cleaner and the broom.

Even the garage is oversized enough so that, with our large station wagon inside, my husband has room for his tool bench and for the storage of our innumerable footlockers, suitcases and the boxes and boxes of things labeled Christmas, Easter baskets, Halloween costumes, and for later reference.

For a while everything was quite hectic. I must have chased the children off the tender new grass every 5 minutes, and I'd peel the potatoes into the trash can before I'd remember that we had a garbage disposal.

Of course 2 days after we moved the twins contracted intestinal flu; I had an accident with the car, putting that out of commission; there were boxes and barrels yet to unpack, and the Navy sent my husband off to sunny Hawaii for 7 days.

This of course is the rule, not the exception.

Conversation over morning coffee in the early weeks of occupancy was filled with talk of drapes, patio furniture, and the excellent reception of the television sets under the master antenna system.

For days I couldn't get over the sensation of indoor-outdoor living. The perpetual spring-summer atmosphere of southern California is especially accentuated by wall-to-wall, ceiling-to-ceiling windows and sliding glass doors leading to our own private cement patio.

Most of the plans allowed for attached garages but where the garage is a separate building it is bound to the house by a roofed breezeway.

Even more important than the closet space, the built-in kitchens and the pre-softened water, is the fact that for the first time in our 8 years of service living, we finally have privacy.

Every unit sits on approximately a quarter acre and is turned in such a manner that no one actually meets his neighbor when leaving via the back or front door.

Although the lawns were seeded and sprouting, the landscaper watered the growing grass two and three times a day. With twin infants I found it almost impossible to dry diapers in between sprinklings. Then about August 1 the rumor that automatic washers would be installed came true so we "beat the sprinkler man" and put a new electric dryer right beside it.

Installation of modern laundry equipment is simplified because the utility rooms are fitted with both gas and a 220-volt electrical outlet.

The Navy ordered a half million dollars worth of furnishings—enough for 220 of the 360 quarters—almost a year ago, but like many Government contracts it wasn't all in the warehouse when the houses were finally opened.

Many families of all ranks who did not have their own furniture slept with their springs and mattresses on the floor, with no rugs and with clothes still in boxes instead of drawers.

During August and September the furniture started arriving by the freightload and the sight of Navy trucks unloading overstuffed contemporary American furniture in every possible color was a common one. Everything from foam-rubber cushioned sectional couches, walnut bedsteads, maple Mr. and Mrs. dressers and all types of room-size nonskid rugs began to be part of the new homes.

There were 17 furnishing plans to correspond with each individual house plan. Living room, dining room and bedroom furnishings were coordinated according to wood, size of rooms and colors of walls.

A sample master plan of a four-bedroom enlisted man's house reads like this:

Living room: Gray tweed sofa; light olive tweed easy chair; cinnamon tweed high back chair; cinnamon and walnut occasional chair; olive leather brass-studded lamps; two floor, two table; gray tweed rugs throughout house; desk; corner table; end table; coffee table.

Dining room: Walnut table, buffet, arm chair, five straight chairs.

Bedrooms: Two bunk beds, two twin beds, four Mr. and Mrs. dressers, double bed, chest of drawers (wood, light cherry).

Kitchen: Gray chrome dinette set.

Our house is furnished just like this master plan. Only the pictures on the walls, the doilies on the tables and the dishes, the blankets and clothing are ours.

Even the new community is beginning to form. Point Mugu is in the unique position of being located more than 10 miles from the nearest shopping center. It does not yet have any dependents' facilities except a small exchange. For a cut finger or a loaf of bread it is necessary to drive into the Port Hueneme, Calif., C.B.C. base.

Both the Point Mugu Officers' Wives and the Navy Wives Clubs are conducting fund-raising activities to start organizing both a teen-age club and a child care nursery. The Boy Scouts are forming troops in all age brackets as are the Girl Scouts, and the C.P.O. Wives are in the process of making up hospitality kits for the use of incoming families.

We've heard rumors of a commissary and out-patient medical care on the base, and we hope this will soon come to pass.

A new house, new furniture, new appliances and gracious living at its fullest. What more could any woman ask for?

On what used to be wasted swampland a beautiful, active, business-like community has developed—a place I am proud my children call home.

U.S. People and Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. LANE. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting editorial by David Lawrence which appeared in the Washington Star, Washington, D.C., on August 6, 1959:

U.S. PEOPLE AND KHRUSHCHEV: CITIZENS' DISSENT AGAINST VISIT BY DICTATOR HELD CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT

(By David Lawrence)

Do the people of the United States really want Nikita Khrushchev to visit this country? President Eisenhower assumes that they do. The governments of Sweden and other Scandinavian countries recently issued a similar invitation, but the Soviet Premier, after accepting it, decided not to go there because it was evident the people didn't want him to come.

What happened in Sweden between the time the invitation was extended and the announcement that Khrushchev had given up the idea for the present? A letter from Dr. Bela Fabian, written from Geneva a few days ago, tells the story. He is chairman of the Federation of Hungarian Former Political Prisoners and was in Sweden at the time of the planning for the visit of the Soviet Premier. Dr. Fabian writes:

"Naturally, Major General Zacharov, deputy chief of the Soviet security police,

knew that the 'August committees' were preparing mass meetings and demonstrations. In Sweden ten meetings were to be held simultaneously on August 13. The one thing he did not know was whether the Swedish people would demonstrate by ostentatiously staying at home, so that the streets would be empty and there would be no one there except the police, or that there would be enormous crowds who would turn their backs on Khrushchev."

Dr. Fabian writes that the August committees contained a large number of members, among them prominent intellectuals, several Nobel Prize winners, university professors and writers. Many student organizations were represented.

Already there are varying points of view in this country as to what the reaction of the American people will be in the cities to be visited by Khrushchev. Certainly any disorderly demonstrations would only result in worldwide criticism on the theory that the Americans were not as courteous to the Soviet Premier as the people of the Soviet Union have been toward Vice President Nixon. But inside the United States—unlike the situation in the Soviet Union, where everything is controlled by the government—the people have a right under the Constitution to speak. They have a right to picket peacefully, if they like, with placards expressing their ideas.

If the Scandinavian plan were put into effect in the United States by boycotting the parades or by viewing in silence the public events where Khrushchev makes his appearance, an orderly protest could be registered.

There may be some in this country who are willing to "let bygones be bygones," but, among the hundreds of thousands of Americans who came here originally from the lands which now are held captive by the Communist dictatorship, there will be no suppression of emotions. Their point of view toward the Moscow autocracy which has ordered the murder or exile of so many innocent people in the last several years is deeply rooted. They cannot forget.

It is true that, after wars are over, friendly feelings toward former enemies often are developed. But the governments which ruled in Nazi Germany, in militaristic Japan, and Fascist Italy have been removed and free governments established. No such change has occurred in Moscow, where the same kind of regime is in power today as the one that broke the pledges given at Yalta in 1945 and at Geneva in 1955.

"Khrushchev's criminal record exceeds all," wrote Dr. L. E. Dobriansky, professor of economics at Georgetown University, in a letter to President Eisenhower dated July 31. The Georgetown professor was the originator of the resolution adopted by Congress to proclaim Captive Nations Week. Expressing the hope that Khrushchev would not be invited to America, Professor Dobriansky added:

"It is patently naive to believe that a visit by the 'hangman of the Ukraine' would add anything to what he already knows about our country. . . . Moral principle alone should dissuade us from conferring respectability and legitimacy to a dedicated enemy, the attributes he desires in order to extend his empire."

There is talk now of arranging a parade of hearses in each American city where Khrushchev appears. On each hearse would be placarded the statistics of the number of persons murdered or exiled from each of the 14 captive countries in recent years. This is one type of orderly demonstration.

Another which is being suggested is that memorial services be held throughout the Nation to carry out the spirit of the resolution in behalf of the "captive nations" adopted overwhelmingly last month by both Houses of Congress. Nationwide prayers for

the liberation of the "captive" peoples, as well as memorial tributes to the many who have been enslaved or killed by the ruthless Communist dictators, would at least let the rest of the world know that, however polite the Government has to be to any visitor, the people here have the right of free speech. They can express their dissent from the position of their Government, which has invited to free America at this crucial time the man who has threatened war unless the Western forces surrender Berlin and who has never withdrawn that threat.

Industry's Stubbing Its Toe on the Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Laurence Laurent, which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald issue of August 13, 1959, is one with which I completely agree.

If ever there were a need for the equal right to discuss an important public issue, it was in connection with our very recently passed labor legislation.

It is my judgment that the networks behaved badly and did much to undermine the confidence which I had in their objectivity and their fairness. The article referred to follows:

INDUSTRY'S STUBBING ITS TOE ON THE HILL

(By Laurence Laurent)

The television industry, whose spokesmen are highly effective in congressional hearings, manages to fall on its face when dealing with political realities. This falling has been particularly noticeable this summer, with the TV-radio industry trying to persuade the Congress to change the equal political time regulations.

The industry has a good case. There is general agreement that the Federal Communications Commission goofed when it ruled that equal time applied during political campaigns to newscasts. Industry spokesmen have already persuaded the Senate that it should pass amendments to the Communications Act which except newscasts.

But when the same legislation came before the House of Representatives, the industry began taking pratfalls.

Members of the House are much more reluctant than Senators to give the radio-TV operator addition freedom. The Representative runs for reelection every 2 years, and, thus, is constantly concerned about the treatment he gets from news media.

First, there was the incredibly badly managed "Face the Nation" incident with Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota. His friends announced that he would be a candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination, an announcement that could have been a surprise only at, say, Manus in the Admiralty Islands.

CBS canceled Senator HUMPHREY's appearance, "on the advice of attorneys." The advice—to many Congressmen—was bad. Senator HUMPHREY, technically, is not a candidate and, technically, section 315 does not apply.

This incident has been interpreted by several members of the powerful House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee as coercive. They feel that CBS was trying

to force them to amend the equal time law by the threat of a blackout on all candidates.

One Democratic committee member cited last Sunday's two-network performance by Vice President RICHARD NIXON and said: "It may be news to CBS, but everyone else in the country knows that the Vice President hopes to get the Republican presidential nomination in 1960."

He objected to Nixon's network hour, only in the light of the HUMPHREY cancellation.

The current fight over labor reform legislation is causing more bitterness against the networks. First, time was provided for the President to express his views; and this, surely, is beneficial to the public. But when Democrats asked for equal time in the name of the Speaker of the House, the request was denied. Instead, the networks provided forum-programs. This served only to prove what politicians have long felt: Some equal time is more equal than other equal time.

For the most adept hairsplitter, section 315 does not apply to political issues, only to candidates. The sad part, however, is that the TV-radio industry missed a splendid opportunity to show the Congress how well it is prepared to meet its responsibilities.

Worst of all, the mistakes are being made during the summer when the airwaves are filled with tedious repeats. It is the perfect time for lively, controversial public affairs programs. It is the time when radio and TV can best afford to be generous.

DAV Services in Nevada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, an exceptional record of vital rehabilitation services freely extended to thousands of Nevada citizens has recently come to my attention. These splendid humanitarian services are not sufficiently appreciated by those who have benefited thereby, directly and indirectly.

Among the several congressionally chartered veteran organizations, which have State departments and local chapters in Nevada, is the Disabled American Veterans. The DAV is the only such organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war. Formed in 1920, under the leadership of Judge Robert S. Marx, DAV legislative activities have benefited every compensated disabled veteran. Its present national commander is another judge, David B. Williams, of Concord, Mass. Its national adjutant is John E. Feighner, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Its national legislative director is Elmer M. Freudenberger; its national director of claims, Cicero F. Hogan; and its national director of employment relations, John W. Burris—all located at its national service headquarters at 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Inasmuch as less than 10 percent of our country's war veterans are receiving

monthly disability compensation payments for service-connected disabilities—some 2 million—the DAV can never aspire to become the largest of the several veteran organizations. Nevertheless, since shortly after its formation in 1920, the DAV national headquarters, located in Cincinnati, Ohio, has maintained the largest staff of any veteran organization of full-time trained national service officers, 138 of them, who are located in the 63 regional and 3 district offices of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, and in its central office in Washington, D.C. They have ready access to the official claim records of those claimants who have given them their powers of attorney. All of them being war-handicapped veterans themselves, these service officers are sympathetic and alert as to the problems of other less well-informed claimants.

The DAV national service officer in Nevada is Mr. Melvin L. Jacobsen, located at the Veterans' Administration Regional Office, 1000 Locust Street, Reno. The department commander is Mr. Charles F. Hardin, 130 North Virginia Street, Reno, and the Department adjutant is Mr. Charles E. Jackson, 1853 G Street, Sparks, Nev. The DAV VAVS representative is Mr. John Haley.

The Veterans' Administration hospital located in Reno is a 166-bed general medical hospital.

During the last fiscal year, the VA paid out \$6,108,000 for its veteran program in Nevada, including disability compensation to its 2,094 service disabled veterans. The amount of \$1,848,614. These Federal expenditures in Nevada furnish substantial purchasing power in all communities. Only about 12 percent, 253 are members of the 5 DAV chapters in Nevada.

This 12 percent record is strange, in view of the very outstanding record of personalized service activities and accomplishments of the DAV national service officer in behalf of Nevada veterans and dependents during the last 10 fiscal years, as revealed by the following statistics:

Claimants contacted (estimated).....	5,995
Claims folders reviewed.....	4,996
Appearances before Rating Boards.....	2,243
Compensation increases obtained.....	319
Service connections obtained.....	167
Nonservice pensions.....	125
Death benefits obtained.....	18
Total monetary benefits obtained.....	\$178,984.57

These above figures do not include the accomplishments of other national service officers on duty in the Central Office of the Veterans' Administration, handling appeals and reviews, or in its three district offices, handling death and insurance cases. Over the last 10 years, they reported 83,611 claims handled in such district offices, resulting in monetary benefits of \$20,850,335.32, and in the central office, they handled 58,282 reviews and appeals, resulting in monetary benefits of \$5,337,389.05. Proportionate additional benefits were thereby obtained for Nevada veterans, their dependents and their survivors.

These figures fail properly to paint the picture of the extent and value of the individualized advice, counsel and assistance extended to all of the claimants

who have contacted DAV service officers in person, by telephone, and by letter.

Pertinent advice was furnished to all disabled veterans—only about 10 percent of whom were DAV members—their dependents, and others, in response to their varied claims for service connection, disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, insurance, death compensation or pension, VA guarantee loans for homes, farms and businesses, et cetera. Helpful advice was also given as to counseling and placement into suitable useful employment—to utilize their remaining abilities—civil service examinations, appointments, re-entrances, retirement benefits, and multifarious other problems.

Every claim presents different problems. Too few Americans fully realize that governmental benefits are not automatically awarded to disabled veterans—not given on a silver platter. Frequently, because of lack of official records, death or disappearance of former buddies and associates, lapse of memory with the passage of time, lack of information and experience, proof of the legal service connection of a disability becomes extremely difficult—too many times impossible. A claims and rating board can obviously not grant favorable action merely based on the opinions, impression or conclusions of persons who submit notarized affidavits. Specific, detailed, pertinent facts are essential.

The VA, which acts as judge and jury, cannot properly prosecute claims against itself. As the defendant, in effect, the U.S. Veterans' Administration must award the benefits provided under the laws administered by it, only under certain conditions.

A DAV national service officer can and does advise a claimant precisely why his claim may previously have been denied and then specifies what additional evidence is essential. The claimant must necessarily bear the burden of obtaining such fact-giving affidavit evidence. The experienced national service officer will, of course, advise him as to its possible improvement, before presenting same to the adjudication agency, in the light of all of the circumstances and facts, and of the pertinent laws, precedents, regulations, and schedule of disability ratings. No DAV national service officer, I feel certain, ever uses his skill, except in behalf of worthy claimants, with justifiable claims.

The VA has denied more claims than it has allowed—because most claims are not properly prepared. It is very significant, as pointed out by the DAV acting national director of claims, Chester A. Cash, that a much higher percentage of those claims which have been prepared and presented with the aid of a DAV national service officer are eventually favorably acted upon, than is the case as to those claimants who have not given their powers of attorney to any such special advocate.

Another fact not generally known is that, under the overall review of claims inaugurated by the VA some 4 years ago, the disability compensation payments of about 37,200 veterans have been discontinued and reduced, as to

about 27,300 others at an aggregate loss to them of more than \$28 million per year. About one-tenth of 1 percent of such discontinuances and reductions have probably occurred as to disabled veterans in Nevada with a consequent loss of about \$28,000 per year.

Most of these unfortunate claimants were not represented by the DAV or by any other veteran organization. Judging by the past, such unfavorable adjudications will occur as to an additional equal number or more during the next 3 years, before such review is completed. I urge every disabled veteran in Nevada to give his power of attorney to the national service officer of the DAV, or of some other veteran organization, or of the American Red Cross, just as a protective measure.

The average claimant who receives helpful advice probably does not realize the background of training and experience of a competent expert national service officer.

Measured by the DAV's overall costs of about \$12,197,600 during a 10-year period, one would find that it has expended about \$3.50 for each claim folder reviewed, or about \$8.80 for each rating board appearance, or, again, about \$22.70 for each favorable award obtained, or about \$123 for each service connection obtained, or about \$54 for each compensation increase obtained, and has obtained about \$14.10 of direct monetary benefits for claimants for each dollar expended by the DAV for its national service officer setup. Moreover, such benefits will generally continue for many years.

Evidently, most claimants are not aware of the fact that the DAV receives no government subsidy whatsoever. The DAV is enabled to maintain its nationwide staff of expert national service officers primarily because of income from membership dues collected by its local chapters and from the net income on its Identag—miniature automobile license tag—project, owned by the DAV and operated by its employees, most of whom are disabled veterans, their wives, or their widows, or other handicapped Americans—a rehabilitation project in thus furnishing them with useful employment. Incidentally, without checking as to whether they had previously sent in a donation, more than 1,400,000 owners of sets of lost keys have received them back from the DAV's Identag department, 1,354 of whom, during the last 8 years, were Nevada residents.

Every eligible veteran, by becoming a DAV member, and by explaining these factors to fellow citizens, can help the DAV to procure such much-needed public support as well as enable it to maintain its invaluable nationwide service setup on a more adequate basis. So much more could be accomplished for distressed disabled veterans, if the DAV could be enabled, financially, to maintain an expert service officer in every one of the 173 VA hospitals.

During the last 10 years, the DAV has also relied on appropriations from its separately incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, aggregating \$3,300,-

000 exclusively for salaries to its national service officers. Its reserves having been thus nearly exhausted, the DAV Service Foundation is therefore very much in need of the generous support of all "serviced" claimants, DAV members and other social-minded Americans—by direct donations, by designations in insurance policies, by bequests in wills, by assignments of stocks and bonds and by establishing special types of trust funds.

A special type of memorial trust fund originated about 3 years ago with concerned disabled veteran members of the DAV chapter in Butte, Mont., which established the first perpetual rehabilitation fund of \$1,000 with the DAV Service Foundation. Recently it added another \$100 thereto. Since then, every DAV unit in that State has established such a special memorial trust fund, ranging from \$100 to \$1,100 equivalent to about \$5 per DAV member.

Each claimant who has received any such rehabilitation service can help to make it possible for the DAV to continue such excellent rehabilitation services in Nevada by sending in donations to the DAV Service Foundation, 631 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. Every such serviced claimant who is eligible can and should also become a DAV member, preferably a life member, for which the total fee is \$100—\$50 to those born before January 1, 1902, or World War I veterans—payable in installments within 2 full fiscal year periods.

Every American can help to make our Government more representative by being a supporting member of at least one organization which reflects his interests and viewpoints—labor unions, trade associations, and various religious, fraternal, and civic associations. All of America's veterans ought to be members of one or more of the patriotic, service giving veteran organizations. All of America's disabled defenders who are receiving disability compensation, have greatly benefited by their own official voice—the DAV.

Unsound Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Easley Progress, Easley, S.C.:

THEY LAUGH AT THE U.S. DOLLAR

An Easley citizen, traveling over in Canada, writes: "We ate dinner in one of the small resort towns. They had a big sign on the cash register telling us that our money was not as good as their's and that we would be charged the difference. When we paid our bill he attached 5 percent extra and was very careful to give us our change in the sticky U.S. money. It gives you a strange feeling when folks tell you your money isn't any good, and laugh at you about it."

The Greatest Satellite Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to call attention to the following editorial which appeared in the Shreveport Times, Shreveport, La. This fine editorial should be of interest to all of us in this space age:

THE GREATEST SATELLITE SUCCESS

Successful launching of the missile and satellite, Explorer VI, probably is the most important achievement in space rocketry thus far by any nation—this because of the completeness of the electronics laboratory carried in the satellite and the efficiency with which the laboratory has been functioning as its container orbits the earth at a speed of 22,000 miles an hour and at distances ranging from 150 miles to 25,000 miles from the earth.

(And even as this was being written, another American satellite, Discoverer V, was put into orbit.)

But what may be even more important in the whole rocket-space picture from the standpoint of national security was the announcement at the same time by the Navy of the success of its Project Tepee, hitherto probably the most guarded secret possessed by the American military. Through Project Tepee, the Navy stated, it has been able to detect instantaneously more than 95 percent of all atmospheric nuclear weapons tests and rocket launchings anywhere in the world for several months. Actually, the project has been underway since 1954 and has had some success ever since that time.

Tepee still requires refinement, but it is unlikely that, even now, Russia could fire a single missile as a test or as the opening of war without Tepee recording it instantaneously.

The Navy states that it has a number of Tepee stations in operation in various places, but the locations are closely-guarded secrets.

With as much simplicity as can be put into any explanation of functioning of electronics, Tepee operates this way: Radio signals are sent from earth stations against the ionosphere, an ionized layer of upper atmosphere. The radio signals ricochet off this layer of outer space and come bouncing back to earth and then back to the ionosphere—and so on—each bouncing being at an angle so that the radio signal actually travels around the earth's surface in its skip-and-jump course.

The same result comes when the radio signal hits the gases of a rocket trail or any other interference created by rocket launchings and missile or satellite flights. While it has taken quite a few seconds to present even this inadequate explanation, the radio signals would have recorded any interference with their course instantaneously and those on the ground at the Tepee stations would know what it was the signals were recording.

Tepee has been used successfully in literally hundreds of American missile firings, satellite launchings and other space probes from experimental stations in Florida, California and far out into the Pacific since early in 1957. Its possibilities in detecting enemy space action, experimental or otherwise, are almost unlimited.

As for Explorer VI—in no way related to Tepee—unless something goes wrong it will provide at least a year's flow of invaluable

outer space information hitherto unattainable through any electronic devices. It will report particularly concerning radio activity in areas enveloping the earth, information that is essential in planning flights of man into outer space. Such information is essential not merely in that individual project, but to success of many major space objectives which the United States is seeking. It is expected, also, to send back considerable information on the ionosphere—the ionized area against which Tepee bounces its signals.

Just where Explorer VI puts the United States in the space race with Russia is impossible to say and not too important by itself. The United States and Russia are seeking certain space objectives, but by ways vastly different in some instances. What is important to this Nation is whether the objectives are being obtained as rapidly as possible and whether everything needed to further them is being done.

Russia sends dogs into the air and the United States sends monkeys and mice. Russia is concerned with the size of what it sends into outer space where the chief concern of the United States is information that comes back. The end result sought by each is exploration of outer space and thus, in all probability, control of it, particularly from the military standpoint.

If Russia has anything like either Explorer VI or Project Tepee, it has not yet done any boasting about that fact and, if American scientists are right in their assumption, Russia has a long way to go to catch up in the fineness, the delicacy, the accuracy and the capabilities of tiny electronic devices already proven successful in tests by the United States. But the Soviet still seems to have greater thrust—power of propulsion—for its rockets.

Nikita Ought To See

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Neosha (Mo.) Miner & Mechanic containing some suggestions for the Khrushchev visit:

NIKITA OUGHT TO SEE

A full-fledged convention of the AFL-CIO, where the workers of America get things off their chests;

A formal Presidential Press Conference, where the leader of the greatest Nation on earth answers the barbs and bites of questions to which no Kremlin is ever exposed;

A stormy stockholders meeting of the New York-New Haven Railroad;

A debate between Senators PAT McNAMARA, of Michigan, and BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona;

A session of the Oklahoma Legislature;

A movie of Cal Coolidge in action, and of Gov. Earl Long, in person;

The Hoover Dam and Lake Mead;

A Billy Graham rally in Los Angeles Coliseum;

An American election campaign;

Display of the New York Times and Daily Worker, side by side on a newsstand;

A Sunday comic section;

A conversation between Casey Stengel and Charles Van Doren;

Elvis Presley, before and after;

A USAF firepower demonstration at Eglin Field, Fla.

If seeing is believing, Nikita ought to see all that there is to see of the Nation he says can't win in the cold war.

Mud in Your Eye

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune, dated August 15, 1959, entitled "Mud in Your Eye":

MUD IN YOUR EYE

Milwaukee, which has been paraded in sufferable self-righteousness in opposing Federal legislation to grant Chicago a slight boost in water diverted from Lake Michigan, has closed seven of Milwaukee County's bathing beaches. The reason: Pollution from sewage processed through a municipal system which Wisconsin's two Senators only last Friday were describing as the "acme of sewage disposal in the United States."

Those were the words of Senators WILEY and PROXMIRE, but the Milwaukee City Health Commissioner, Dr. E. R. Krumbiegel, does not agree. He says that Milwaukee's sewage disposal system can only be brought up to snuff by an expenditure of half a billion dollars, and that that is economically impossible.

Dr. Krumbiegel intimated that two of the closed beaches will remain permanently shut down because of pollution from human and animal refuse. The county superintendent of parks, Russell Kurtz, stated that the closing orders were necessitated because of the uncertainty of water conditions at the beaches, which was explained more definitely by the health department as endangering the public through exposure to amoebic dysentery and typhoid. Dr. Krumbiegel said that the geographical position of Milwaukee, which returns its treated effluent to the lake, forms a natural cesspool during the summer months.

Now, we do not mention these conditions with any intention to gloat. Indeed, we sympathize with Milwaukee's difficulties in dealing with sewage disposal and maintaining health. This, we might add, is more than Milwaukee is willing to do in considering Chicago's problems, which do not involve any pollution of the lake, inasmuch as the effluent from Chicago's sewage treatment works is discharged through the Illinois Waterway because we had the foresight to reverse the flow of the Chicago River.

But the difficulties of our neighbor to the north do emphasize certain facts which deserve to be underscored. One is that Chicago is no unique culprit, handling its sewage disposal problem in disregard of the welfare of its neighbors and of other States. The movement of the lake current, on the contrary, is likely to dump some of Milwaukee's pollution on our lake front.

Another factor is that Chicago, unlike Milwaukee, has never claimed perfection in its efforts to dispose of wastes from an enormous and highly industrialized area covering 920 square miles and populated by more than 5 million persons. But it does contend that it has made prodigious efforts at great cost to deal effectively with this tremendous problem, and that it has attained a very large degree of success.

The Tribune, in its own independent survey, has not endeavored to conceal that the sanitary district has not been 100 percent effective. But it has established that the district has been 90.6 percent successful in removing impurities from the tremendous volume of waste that is treated.

That a problem remains seems to us to provide only additional justification for the city's request that Congress authorize an increase of 1,000 cubic feet of water diverted each second from the lake. We are now restricted to a modest 1,500 cubic feet, and the added allowance is initially sought only for a test period of 1 year. Yet Milwaukee and the State of Wisconsin, beset by a much more grave problem of pollution, begrudge us this minimal help.

The difficulties of Milwaukee point up the fact that there has been no small amount of hypocrisy in the opposition voiced against Chicago in Congress and before its committees. The bill authorizing increased diversion will be before the Senate Public Works Committee for decision Monday, having already been approved by the House. We trust that the responsible Senators will take due note of the imperfections of some of the bill's holler-than-thou critics.

Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Sylvia Porter should be studied by each of us:

FOREIGN IMPORTS SWAMP U.S.-MADE PRODUCTS
(By Sylvia Porter)

The other evening I went to a stimulating but deeply disquieting dinner party. For, my partner from the start to the good night was Cyrus Ching, head of the Federal Mediation Service under President Truman, and through the hours we debated not only the threat of the steel strike but also the threat of steel imports to our economy.

"The long-range problem is the rising importation of steel," said Ching. "Competition to our steel industry and to steelworkers from lower-cost foreign producers of the metal is what we must face up to . . . It is in this sphere that U.S. industry will get a climactic test."

With my mind pondering the implications of Ching's warnings, I came home and headed for a midnight snack. On the kitchen table I put a plate, a glass pitcher, a glass, and an ash tray—all purchased since June. Before I sat down, I moved from my chair a laundry basket in which there was a cap my husband had picked up a few days ago, my new bathing suit and a silk robe. And suddenly my eyes saw something I hadn't see before.

Every product I had touched in those few minutes in the kitchen had been an import—the plate, glass, and pitcher from England; the ash tray from Denmark, the basket and cap from Japan, the bathing suit from France, the robe from Italy.

And after I had finished racing through the house to check what we had bought in the past 6 months, I got an even greater shock.

OVER 60 PERCENT

Over 60 percent of our recent purchases had been imported from abroad. I, living in a typically American home and buying with a typical American's attention to quality and

price, had gradually become a buyer of foreign products on a scale I hadn't dreamed of. Then Ching's warnings about steel imports came into focus.

Imports are pouring into our land. This year alone, the National Foreign Trade Council has just estimated, imports to us will total a record \$15 billion, up \$1.8 billion from 1958. And the imports are not just the obvious cars, cameras, radios, etc. Stores and factories from coast to coast are loaded with foreign goods which are well-designed, well-made, attractively priced compared with similar U.S. products.

We created this competition for ourselves in the most grandiose gesture of generosity any nation ever made. For, when World War II ended we began pouring billions into the rebuilding of the ruined or obsolete factories of Europe and Japan. With the aid of our dollars and know-how, many countries have now come back and are operating with modern factories, materials, and machines and at much lower wage scales.

WHAT'S THE SOLUTION?

"OK," I mumbled to myself as I sat in the kitchen and mentally continued my debate with Ching. "What do we do about it?"

Raise tariffs and slap on quotas until we force out the competition? Hardly a satisfactory answer.

Freeze wages? Also hardly an imaginative answer.

What then? In all humility, I suggest the answers must be:

1. A much sharper, faster and a sustained rise in modernization and efficiency of production. With increased efficiency, we'll be able to turn out goods competitively priced and still raise wages.

2. A powerful drive for new inventions and improved products—meaning greater emphasis on research. With new inventions and superior productive capacity, we can keep and expand our markets.

3. A realization by all of us that we are into an economic war for the markets of the world—including our own. I'm not proposing an aggressive "Buy American" program, but I readily admit there'll be no more of that 60-40 ratio in purchases I make.

We won't meet the important competition by flinching from it, ignoring it, or putting up walls against it. We will meet it when we vow to lead the world in inventing, modernizing, selling. We'll meet it when we wake up.

The Proposed Khrushchev Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion regarding the coming of Mr. Khrushchev to the United States. I feel that the following editorial which appeared in the *Witness* of August 6 would be considered good reading by many people who are concerned with this impending arrival:

THE PROPOSED KHRUSHCHEV VISIT

The announcement by Mr. Eisenhower of the forthcoming visit of Mr. Nikita Khrushchev to this country carries with it many serious complications.

We firmly believe this country could and would prosper bountifully without having the Premier of the Soviet Union visit our

shores. We believe also that world peace does not hinge on a visit by one man to this country. We should not be made to dance to the tune fiddled by the Soviets.

Mr. Khrushchev is not going to change his mind about Marxism after a short social call to this country. When he returns home he will be more determined than ever to destroy the system which has given generations of millions and millions of Americans the peace and liberty denied the more than 800 million people behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

The visit will, of course, be tremendous propaganda fodder for the Soviet Union. But how will we ever explain to the captive hordes our decision to entertain this international scoundrel?

And who would ever venture a guess what price the American people will have to pay for such a visit.

The present on our shores of a man whose contempt for the basic decencies of life is so well known, will prove embarrassing for the majority of our American citizens. It will be disheartening to the thousands of refugees from communism who have found formerly denied freedom on our protecting shores.

Mr. Khrushchev's disdain for religion will seriously sadden the millions of Americans who daily worship their God freely and openly.

What about the feelings of national groups in this country? The Hungarians, the Czechs, Poles, Lithuanians, and former residents of both Russia and East Germany, whose fatherland now breaks with the burden of communism.

The security problem of protecting a man such as Mr. Khrushchev will be overwhelming.

But will Mr. Khrushchev learn anything when he visits this country? He has been described as an outmoded Marxist. Yet the basic problem remains that he is a Marxist of the first dedication, outmoded or not.

Our progress, our efficiency, our mode of living is awesome to foreigners of any country. Seeing the sights of America will only provide him with information to bark more fiercely about the progress communism will continue to make.

It must be recalled that the Soviet Premier canceled his proposed trip to Scandinavia after the free press and free public opinion criticized it.

If the visit goes through as planned at this stage Khrushchev should be shown the real America. We are told he is ignorant about many basic things which exist in this country. His criticism of the American exhibition in Moscow would seem to confirm this.

It is hard to describe what is typically American. But we sincerely feel that the things denied the Russian people, and which we take so much for granted, should be emphasized very strongly. Let him see the religious fervor of our American people. The great number of churches and church-conducted schools should be displayed to him. Let him know our religious heritage of yesterday and our dedication and determination today to follow the law of God is what has made us free and strong.

Let him see the freedom of the press and freedom of speech. He should be made to taste the genuineness of our liberty and the wealth of opportunity offered our young.

Take him to the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor where he can read this inscription: "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free, the wretched refuse of your teeming shore. Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me. I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

(Incidentally, the reference for the correctness of the above quoted quotation was the *World Almanac*, the book recently banned by the Soviets at our exhibition in Moscow.)

Mr. Khrushchev won't learn much of the real America by looking at skyscrapers and gadgets. He can learn if we prove by fact and deed that we have concern for all races, creeds and color. Housing for the poor, equal rights for Negroes, and social security benefits for millions will make him realize ours is truly a thrice-blessed Nation.

If Nikita Khrushchev comes to the United States it will be difficult for the American people to see the heads of our Government entertaining a man who doesn't even deserve the title of a gentleman.

It will not be easy to have our shores darkened by the image of a man dedicated to destroying us. It will be even more trying to face a man whose crimes have shocked and stunned the entire civilized world. It would take many volumes to detail the havoc and misery this man has cast upon mankind. Josef Stalin, who deported and exterminated 6 million kulaks (farmers) described it as "socialist construction."

Nikita Khrushchev dismisses people from the face of the earth describing their crimes as "socialist illegality."

Tens of millions of people have suffered from the hands of Communist rulers. Yet in trying to justify his terribly evil system, the Soviet dictator says, "some innocent people suffered." He will never admit the crime of the system itself.

If and when the Soviet Premier visits America, Catholics especially should recall, as indeed all Christians should, that this man has spent most of his life fighting religion.

In March of 1958 he is quoted as saying, "I think that there is no God, and for a long time I have had such an idea. I am an adherent of a scientific outlook. Science and the belief in supernatural powers cannot go together, especially if you have a thoroughly logical outlook."

September will not be the usually charming month this year that it most generally is. American Christian hearts will be heavy. For all Christians the time of the visit of Mr. Khrushchev should be a period of intensified prayer, asking God to send the grace of conversion to a man determined to destroy all things men of good will love and cherish.

Charity demands we love our enemies, and those who persecute us. The dictates of charity must be in evidence during these future hectic days.

The Watumull Foundation Contribution to East-West Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BURNS

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, the Johnson-Burns bill, now title VI of the Mutual Security Act of 1959—Public Law 86-108—provides for the establishment in Hawaii of a center for cultural and technical interchange between the Western and the Eastern Worlds—in other words, it provides for the establishment of an East-West university.

It was my high privilege to cosponsor this bill with the very able, knowledgeable and prescient majority leader of the Senate, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas. The able Congressman D. S. SAUND joined in sponsoring the measure in the House.

The purpose of the bill was to utilize to the maximum extent possible the outstanding abilities and to develop to the maximum the exceptional capabilities of the great Americans of Hawaii whose ancestors came from the nations of the Orient, or who themselves came from the Orient.

The geographic position of Hawaii between the shores of Asia and North America accentuates the cultural meeting of East and West in the peoples of Hawaii. Thus, the State-to-be of Hawaii was a most natural locale for the institution envisioned by the very great majority leader and myself—an institution which we sincerely believe can do more to bring peace in the world than any other means, which we believe, is the only means by which true peace in the world can ever be attained.

Ample evidence of the part that the people of Hawaii can play in bringing understanding between the peoples of the East and the West is afforded in private and public efforts already underway in Hawaii as a result of the initiative and vision of the people of Hawaii.

One of the outstanding of these endeavors is the Watumull Foundation. This foundation was founded by G. J. Watumull in 1942 and incorporated in 1956. It is presently administered by a board of trustees whose chairman is Mr. G. J. Watumull, with Mr. Milton Cades, president; Miss Doris E. Bennett, Mr. J. Russell Cades, Mr. Hugh C. Tennent, Mrs. Ellen J. Watumull and Mr. David Watumull as trustees.

On July 10, it was my privilege to attend a special award luncheon of the foundation at which Dr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, Vice President of India, and Dr. Charles A. Moore, sponsor of the recent outstandingly successful East-West International Philosophical Conference, were honored by the foundation with special awards by the Watumull Foundation.

At this luncheon there was presented a history of the Watumull Foundation as well as an account of their awards activities which I included herewith as an example of how the East and West do meet in Hawaii, and the great potential Hawaii has as the bridge between the nations of the East and our own great country.

The Watumull Foundation is indeed a tribute to the initiative, resourcefulness, and charity of Mr. G. J. Watumull and his family.

It is also a tribute to the Watumull family's great love for the United States as well as for their mother land.

The part played by the Watumull Foundation to understanding between India and the United States cannot be underestimated.

HISTORY OF THE WATUMULL FOUNDATION

The Watumull Foundation was established in 1942 by G. J. Watumull of Honolulu with three purposes in view: (1) To promote better understanding between India and the United States (India's independence at that time was only a remote possibility); (2) to increase India's national efficiency (for only 5 percent of her industrial potential was developed at that time, and both agricultural production and educational development were woefully inadequate); and (3) to

support cultural, charitable, and educational programs in Hawaii.

In order to promote better understanding between India and the United States, the Watumull Foundation has sent several distinguished Americans to lecture in Indian universities or to carry on special projects furthering this purpose. Dr. John Haynes Holmes, the great American friend of Mahatma Gandhi, Mr. Merle Curti, the American historian and authority on Federal constitutions, and Dr. Paul Arthur Schlipp, editor of the Library of Living Philosopher series, including "The Philosophy of Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan," are a few who have visited India sponsored by the Watumull Foundation. The most eminent Indian whom the foundation has brought to the United States is Dr. Radhakrishnan, our guest of honor today. He lectured in 14 of our great universities in 1946.

The Watumull Foundation has provided funds to about 30 American universities and colleges for the purchase of books about India for their libraries, available to undergraduate as well as graduate students. And books for similar libraries in India have been purchased in the United States, in order that students and readers in India may know our country. However, most of the books sent to India are technical, medical, and professional, and in no sense propaganda material.

The foundation has also supported special lectureships held by Indians in the United States, notably the American University and the Catholic University of America, both in Washington, D.C.; New York University and the University of Hawaii.

In furtherance of its second purpose of increasing India's national efficiency, the Watumull Foundation initiated a program of bringing fine Indian scholars, mostly university professors, to the United States, for postgraduate studies or postdoctoral research for 1 to 3 years in nation-building fields such as education, medicine, agriculture, dentistry, engineering, chemistry, physics, veterinary medicine, etc. Thirty-five men and women came under this program. Many of them now hold top posts in their fields not only in India, but in Africa, Malaya, WHO, FAO, and even in the United States. The foundation has given innumerable grants-in-aid to Indian students in American universities; has given over 200 scholarships to displaced Hindi students in India (86 in the past year alone), has given 6 beta ray eye applicators to strategic hospitals in India, gave the first spectrophotometer, the first cornhusker, the first electric compost grinder to India. The foundation has had the cooperation of several American industries in providing industrial training for about 10 Indians, has had 18 Indian doctors, men and women, trained in contraceptive techniques at the Margaret Sanger Research Bureau. It also initiated the Third International Planned Parenthood Conference held in Bombay in 1952, which was inaugurated by Dr. Radhakrishnan.

BOOK PRIZE

The foundation program of special interest to this gathering is the biennial book prize awarded through the American Historical Association to the best book about some phase of India's history, politics, economics or related subjects, published in the United States in the 2-year period preceding the award year. A committee of distinguished historians, all members of the association, select the prize-winning book or books. On three occasions the award has been divided between two authors. The prize was first awarded in 1948 to:

1. "Chanhu-Daro Excavations," by Ernest Mackay (awarded posthumously).
2. (a) "A Pageant of India's History," by Gertrude Emerson Sen; (b) "John Company at Work," by Holden Furber.

3. (a) "Life of Mahatma Gandhi," by Louis Fisher; (b) India in the New Era, by T. Walter Wallbank.

4. (a) "The White Umbrella," by D. MacKencie Brown; (b) "The United States, India and Pakistan," by W. Norman Brown.

5. (1958) "Sources of Indian Tradition," edited by Wm. Theodore de Bary.

In addition the Watumull Foundation has on occasion given special awards to works about India, other than historical or political books, notably one by Swami Nikhilananda dealing with the Great Scriptures—and religious and philosophical teachings of the country.

VIVEKANANDA, HIS LIFE AND TEACHINGS

Another special award was given to Miss Juliette May Fraser of Honolulu for her beautiful book "Ke Anueneue."

The foundation also purchases books for distribution to college, university, and public libraries both in the United States and India if, in its estimation, such a book will create better understanding, at least of some aspect of life, between the two countries. A few years ago a philosophical work entitled "Epitomization" by Dr. George Conger was sent to a number of libraries, especially in India. Three authors whose works have received recognition, either by awards or distribution, are with us today—Dr. D. MacKencie Brown, Dr. George P. Conger, and Swami Nikhilananda.

We are gathered here today to present a special award to the editors of "A Source Book in Indian Philosophy," edited jointly by Dr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan and Dr. Charles A. Moore, and published in 1957 by Princeton University Press. In it are included "the chief riches of more than 3,000 years of Indian philosophical thought—the ancient Vedas—the Upanishads—the epics—the treatises of the heterodox and orthodox systems—the commentaries of the scholastic period—and contemporary writings."

Dr. Radhakrishnan, the Vice President of India, and certainly the greatest living Indian philosopher, belongs to the world, not only to his own country. His philosophical works are many, beginning with his first book, developed from his M.A. thesis in 1908. They number nearly 200 including almost 30 books.

His honors also are many, including a knighthood, and honorary degrees from many universities, including the University of Hawaii. His academic career is long and distinguished with professorships in several Indian universities and also at Oxford. He has been vice chancellor of two Indian universities, India's ambassador to the U.S.S.R. from 1949 to 1952, president of UNESCO in 1952, and vice president of India since 1952. In recognition of his great contribution to better understanding between East and West, the Watumull Foundation takes great pride in presenting its citation and accompanying award to Dr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, scholar, philosopher, diplomat.

The Watumull Foundation on this occasion also wishes to recognize the splendid contribution made by Dr. Charles A. Moore, to the "Source Book in Indian Philosophy," for it was he who did the long, painstaking work of choosing the selections, editing them, proofreading the book and raising the funds for its publication. Dr. Moore spent a year at Benares Hindu University in India and in England at Oxford, working with Dr. Radhakrishnan. While in India he also conferred with many other distinguished philosophers, with the result that this work contains the finest selections, in a compact form, of Indian philosophical thought ever brought together in one volume. This book is a must, especially for Western students of Indian thought.

Dr. Moore's talents lie not only in the field of philosophy but also in the administrative field, and it is due to his efforts, in large measure, that three great international phil-

osophical conferences have been held in Honolulu at the University of Hawaii in 1939, 1949 and 1959.

The Watumull Foundation takes great pleasure, therefore, in presenting a citation and special award to Dr. Charles A. Moore, professor of philosophy of the University of Hawaii and director of the Third East-West Philosophers' Conference.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentations be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than

six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. _____ addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]
Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbott, Watkins M., Va.-----
Abernethy, Thomas G., 6278 29th St.
Miss.
Adair, E. Ross, Ind.-----4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., N. J.-----
Albert, Carl, Okla.-----5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., N. C.-----
Alford, Dale, Ark.-----
Alger, Bruce, Tex.-----
Allen, Leo E., Ill.-----University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, Minn.-----4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., Mont.-----911 Beverly Dr.
Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., Ala.-----3108 Cathedral
Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., N. Y.-----
Arends, Leslie C., Ill.-----4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., Ohio-----
Ashmore, Robert T., S. C.-----
Aspinall, Wayne N., Colo.-----Arlington Towers,
Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., N. J.-----113 S. Lee St.,
Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., Kans.-----
Ayres, William H., Ohio-----
Bailey, Cleveland M.,
W. Va.
Baker, Howard H., Tenn.-----
Baldwin, John F., Jr., Calif.-----
Barden, Graham A., N. C.-----2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., Nev.-----
Barr, Joseph W., Ind.-----Tulip Lane and
Glen Mill Rd.,
Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., Pa.-----
Barry, Robert R., N. Y.-----3019 Norman-
stone Drive
Bass, Perkins, N. H.-----
Bass, Ross, Tenn.-----
Bates, William H., Mass.-----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., Ohio-----
Becker, Frank J., N. Y.-----
Beckworth, Lindley, Tex.-----
Belcher, Page, Okla.-----
Bennett, Charles E., Fla.-----1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., Mich.-----3718 Cardiff Rd.,
Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., Mich.-----
Berry, E. Y., S. Dak.-----118 Schotts
Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., Ohio-----
Blatnik, John A., Minn.-----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth,
(Mrs.), Ga.
Boggs, Hale, La.-----
Boland, Edward P., Mass.-----
Bolling, Richard, Mo.-----3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Ohio.
Bonner, Herbert C., N. C.-----Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., N. Y.-----
Bow, Frank T., Ohio-----4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, Conn.-----
Boykin, Frank W., Ala.-----The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., Ill.-----
Brademas, John, Ind.-----
Bray, William G., Ind.-----
Breeding, J. Floyd, Kans.-----
Brewster, Daniel B., Md.-----
Brock, Lawrence, Nebr.-----
Brooks, Jack, Tex.-----
Brooks, Overton, La.-----4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S.,
Mich.
Brown, Charles H., Mo.-----3723 N. Oakland
St., Arlington, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., Ohio-----Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, Ga.-----Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., Va.-----
Buckley, Charles A., N. Y.-----
Budge, Hamer H., Idaho-----
Burdick, Quentin, N. Dak.-----
Burke, Frank W., Ky.-----
Burke, James A., Mass.-----
Burleson, Omar, Tex.-----2737 Devonshire
Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., Pa.-----
Byrne, James A., Pa.-----
Eyrnes, John W., Wis.-----1215 25th St. So.,
Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., N. J.-----

Canfield, Gordon, N. J.-----
Cannon, Clarence, Mo.-----
Carnahan, A. S. J., Mo.-----
Carter, Steven V., Iowa-----
Casey, Bob, Tex.-----
Cederberg, Elford A., Mich.-----
Celler, Emanuel, N. Y.-----The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E.,
Mich.
Chelf, Frank, Ky.-----
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, Colo.-----
Chipperfield, Robert B., Ill.-----1713 House Office
Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt
(Mrs.), Ill.-----2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., Pa.-----3735 Gunston Rd.,
Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, Iowa-----
Coffin, Frank M., Maine-----
Cohelan, Jeffery, Calif.-----2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., Ill.-----
Colmer, William M., Miss.-----
Conte, Silvio O., Mass.-----
Cook, Robert E., Ohio-----
Cooley, Harold D., N. C.-----2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., Pa.-----
Cramer, William C., Fla.-----6714 Joallen Dr.,
Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, Nebr.-----4920 Yorktown
Blvd., Arlington
Va.
Curtin, Willard S., Pa.-----
Curtis, Laurence, Mass.-----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., Mo.-----
Daddario, Emilio Q., Conn.-----
Dague, Paul B., Pa.-----
Daniels, Dominick V., N. J.-----
Davis, Clifford, Tenn.-----4611 Butter-
worth Pl.
Davis, James C., Ga.-----
Dawson, William L., Ill.-----
Delaney, James J., N. Y.-----
Dent, John H., Pa.-----
Denton, Winfield K., Ind.-----
Derounian, Steven B., N. Y.-----
Derwinski, Edward J., Ill.-----
Devine, Samuel L., Ohio-----
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., Mich.-----
Dingell, John D., Mich.-----
Dixon, Henry Aldous, Utah-----1817 N. Quinn St.,
Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, N. Y.-----
Donohue, Harold D., Mass.-----
Dooley, Edwin B., N. Y.-----
Dorn, Francis E., N. Y.-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, S. C.-----
Dowdy, John, Tex.-----
Downing, Thomas N., Va.-----
Doyle, Clyde, Calif.-----3877 30th St. N.,
Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., N. Y.-----
Durham, Carl T., N. C.-----The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.),
N. J.
Edmondson, Ed, Okla.-----
Elliott, Carl, Ala.-----
Everett, Robert A., Tenn.-----
Evins, Joe L., Tenn.-----5044 Klinge St.
Fallon, George H., Md.-----
Farbstein, Leonard, N. Y.-----
Fascell, Dante B., Fla.-----
Feighan, Michael A., Ohio-----
Fenton, Ivor D., Pa.-----3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., N. Y.-----
Fisher, O. C., Tex.-----Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., Pa.-----The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., Wis.-----
Flynt, John J., Jr., Ga.-----
Fogarty, John E., R. I.-----1133 House Office
Building
Foley, John R., Md.-----
Forand, Aime J., R. I.-----4108 Dresden St.,
Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., Mich.-----514 Crown View
Dr., Alexandria,
Va.
Forrester, E. L., Ga.-----
Fountain, L. H., N. C.-----The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., Fairfax Hotel
Tenn.
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., 3014 N St.
N. J.
Friedel, Samuel N., Md.-----
Fulton, James G., Pa.-----
Gallagher, Cornelius E.,
N. J.
Garmatz, Edward A., Md.-----

Gary, J. Vaughan, Va.-----
Gathings, E. C., Ark.-----6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., Pa.-----
George, Newell A., Kans.-----
Gialmo, Robert N., Conn.-----
Glenn, Milton W., N. J.-----Arlington Towers,
Arlington, Va.
Goodell, Charles E., N. Y.-----
Granahan, Kathryn E.
(Mrs.), Pa.
Grant, George M., Ala.-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., Ill.-----
Green, Edith (Mrs.), Oreg.-----
Green, William J., Jr., Pa.-----
Griffin, Robert P., Mich.-----
Griffiths, Martha W.
(Mrs.), Mich.
Gross, H. R., Iowa-----
Gubser, Charles S., Calif.-----
Hagen, Harlan, Calif.-----
Haley, James A., Fla.-----
Hall, David M., N. C.-----
Halleck, Charles A., Ind.-----4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, N. Y.-----
Hardy, Porter, Jr., Va.-----
Hargis, Denver D., Kans.-----
Harmon, Randall S., Ind.-----
Harris, Oren, Ark.-----1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., Va.-----
Hays, Wayne L., Ohio-----1323 Barger Drive,
Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., N. Y.-----
Hébert, F. Edward, La.-----26 Cockrell St.,
Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, W. Va.-----
Hemphill, Robert W., S. C.-----
Henderson, John E., Ohio-----
Herlong, A. S., Jr., Fla.-----
Hess, William E., Ohio-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., Calif.-----
Hoeven, Charles B., Iowa-----100 Maryland
Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., Mich.-----100 Maryland
Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., Ill.-----
Hogan, Earl, Ind.-----5211 Flanders
Ave., Garrett Pk.,
Kensington, Md.
Hollifield, Chet, Calif.-----
Holland, Elmer J., Pa.-----
Holt, Joe, Calif.-----
Holtzman, Lester, N. Y.-----
Horan, Walt, Wash.-----
Hosmer, Craig, Calif.-----
Huddleston, George, Jr.,
Ala.
Hull, W. R., Jr., Mo.-----
Ikard, Frank, Tex.-----
Irwin, Donald J., Conn.-----The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., Calif.-----
Jarman, John, Okla.-----
Jennings, W. Pat, Va.-----
Jensen, Ben F., Iowa-----2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., Mich.-----
Johnson, Byron L., Colo.-----
Johnson, Harold T., Calif.-----
Johnson, Lester R., Wis.-----
Johnson, Thomas F., Md.-----
Jonas, Charles Raper, N. C.-----
Jones, Paul C., Mo.-----1111 Army Navy
Dr., Arlington,
Va.
Jones, Robert E., Ala.-----
Judd, Walter H., Minn.-----3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., Mo.-----
Karth, Joseph E., Minn.-----
Kasem, George A., Calif.-----
Kastenmeyer, Robert W.,
Wis.
Kearns, Carroll D., Pa.-----Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.),
W. Va.
Keith, Hastings, Mass.-----
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), N. Y.-----
Keogh, Eugene J., N. Y.-----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., N. Y.-----
Kilday, Paul J., Tex.-----3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., Tex.-----4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., Calif.-----
King, David S., Utah-----
Kirwan, Michael J., Ohio-----
Kitchin, A. Paul, N. C.-----
Kluczynski, John C., Ill.-----
Knox, Victor A., Mich.-----
Kowalski, Frank, Conn.-----
Lafore, John A., Jr., Pa.-----
Laird, Melvin R., Wis.-----
Landrum, Phil M., Ga.-----

Appendix

Khrushchev's Forthcoming Visit to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there has been much comment from people in public life and from the press regarding Mr. Khrushchev's forthcoming visit to this country. Some of it has been too optimistic, some too pessimistic.

I believe that a particularly sensible and intelligent editorial appeared in the Amarillo Daily News of August 14, 1959, which gave recognition to the views of my friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Nikita May Be Curious To See United States of America, but Many Want To See Him, Too," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NIKITA MAY BE CURIOUS TO SEE UNITED STATES BUT MANY WANT TO SEE HIM, TOO

What do we show Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev? To some extent the Soviet Communist Party boss has answered the question for us: we show him what he wants to see. It is known he has made certain definite specifications. He wants to visit Washington, naturally, and New York, Chicago, and San Francisco—always a favorite with foreign visitors.

Less specifically, he wants to go to California, Texas, Florida, and some farm State in the Middle West. And he would like to see something of smalltown life, say, President Eisenhower's boyhood home of Abilene, Kans.

Other stops on the itinerary will be worked out between the State Department and the Soviet Embassy in Washington. So many invitations have been tendered that this intrinsically unwanted guest begins to appear a social lion. Foy D. Kohler, the veteran Foreign Service officer given the job of coordinator of "Khrushchev's tour, is scarcely to be envied.

Khrushchev's desire to see an example of American agriculture could well be satisfied by an invitation to the Coon Rapids, Iowa, farm of Roswell Garst, who has twice visited Soviet Russia and says of Khrushchev, "It's his turn to come to our house." The Soviet Premier will see America's farms at their booming best despite the brakes of Government controls. He will see lush fields of high-yielding corn, cattle at a record peak in numbers, hog production at a peacetime high, bins crammed full of surplus corn, the most highly mechanized grain harvest in the world.

Khrushchev also wants to see U.S. industry, and the State Department is considering two of the Nation's heaviest industrial complexes, the Pittsburgh and Detroit areas. Here again he will see capitalism booming, with industrial production—at a new peak at midyear—65 percent greater than the average of the 3 years immediately prior to the Korean war. A settlement of the steel strike would make a welcome addition to the picture of overall prosperity.

What might, indeed, most impress Khrushchev would be a flight over one of our great industrial areas, with thousands and thousands of automobiles—worker's automobiles—packed tightly inside plant parking lots.

Invitations continue to come in from hamlets, from villages, and from counties as well as from cities, many of them from chambers of commerce inspired by local pride. At least one plea has been made—by Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, the Oregon Democrat—that Khrushchev be shown "the gentler, more compassionate, and more human side of America."

NEUBERGER says he believes the Communist leader would be more moved by American schoolchildren or by an American seeking an answer to the grim riddle of cancer than by "a panorama of American weapons and factories." To those suggestions could be added many other kinds of individuals and groups who make up our diverse society—labor unions in the meeting hall, granges, PTA's, college students in the healthy frenzy of a football rally. The list is endless; only the brevity of Khrushchev's time here imposes the discipline of selectivity.

Vice Adm. G. D. Murray, USN

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Navy, throughout its great career, has had many outstanding officers, whose names are an important part of the history of our country, and an important part of the history of the U.S. Navy. One of these officers, now deceased, is Vice Adm. G. D. Murray, who gave his entire life in the service of our country, for a period of more than 50 years; from the time of his appointment to the U.S. Naval Academy in 1907 until the time of his retirement. Vice Admiral Murray was not only a great naval leader, but a warrior, and a fighter, and a great American.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include an article about Vice Admiral Murray, which appeared in the Golden Gate Federal News of February-March 1949:

VICE ADM. G. D. MURRAY, WESTERN SEA FRONTIER CHIEF, HAS ILLUSTRIOUS CAREER

Vice Admiral Murray, born in Boston, Mass., July 6, 1889, attended Henry L. Pierce Grammar School and Mechanic Arts High School in Boston before his appointment to the U.S. Naval Academy from his native State in 1907. Graduated in June 1911, he served at sea, as then required by law, before he was commissioned ensign, March 7, 1912. He was promoted to lieutenant (junior grade), March 7, 1915, during the World War received temporary promotion to lieutenant and lieutenant commander, was commissioned in the latter rank February 11, 1922, and subsequently was promoted as follows: Commander, June 4, 1931; captain, July 1, 1939; rear admiral, May 7, 1942; and vice admiral, November 29, 1944.

After graduation in 1911, Vice Admiral Murray served consecutively in the U.S.S. Virginia and the U.S.S. Ammen until December 1914. Following instruction in aeronautics at the works of the Burgess Co., Marblehead, Mass., he reported in February 1915 to the Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla., for flight training. Designated naval aviator No. 22 on September 20, 1915, he has served continuously with naval aviation since that time. Detached from the Pensacola Station in January 1916, he had duty for 3 months as naval inspector of aeronautical material, works of the Burgess Co. at Marblehead, and later at Boston, Mass.

TRANSFERRED

In April 1916, Vice Admiral Murray was transferred to duty as inspector of aeronautical material, works of the Galland Aero-Plane Co., Norwich, Conn., and was serving in that assignment when the United States entered the World War in April 1917. He had duty at the Naval Air Station, Naval Operating Base, Hampton Roads, Va., from January to July 1918, when he became Commander, Naval Air Station, Anacostia, D.C., the first commanding officer of that station. Detached from command of the Anacostia Air Station in November 1919, he served as executive officer of the Naval Air Station, San Diego, Calif., from December of that year until August 1921 when he joined the aircraft tender *Aroostook*. Assigned duty with squadrons attached to that tender, he later commanded Spotting Squadron 5.

CHIEF INSPECTOR

Detached from the *Aroostook* in September 1922, Vice Admiral Murray served as chief inspector, Naval Aircraft Factory, Philadelphia, Pa., the first line officer (naval aviator) to serve in that capacity, until November 1923 when he reported to Aircraft Squadrons, Battle Fleet, San Diego, Calif., for duty in connection with organizing Torpedo Squadron 20. On December 5, 1923, he assumed command of that squadron, the first aircraft squadron ordered to Asiatic station, attached to the U.S.S. *Huron* and later the U.S.S. *Ajazz*. For his services in organizing and administering Torpedo Squadron 20, an assignment which extended to May 13, 1925, he received a letter of commendation from the commander in chief, Asiatic Fleet.

In June 1925, Vice Admiral Murray reported for duty in connection with the inauguration of the course in aeronautics at the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., serving as senior naval aviator for the indoctrinal flight training of midshipmen until December of that

year. He then had duty in the Plans Division, Bureau of Aeronautics, Navy Department, Washington, D.C., until September 1927, with additional duty in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations during the latter part of that period. In October 1927 he reported for duty as aviation aide on the staff of Adm. (now retired) Louis R. de Steiguer, U.S.N., Commander in Chief, Battle Fleet, U.S.S. *California* flagship, continuing that duty when Adm. (now retired) William V. Pratt, U.S.N., succeeded to the command in June 1928. A year later he joined the U.S.S. *Wright*, flagship of Aircraft Squadrons, Scouting Force, serving as her executive officer until December 1929.

From January 1930 until May 1933, Vice Admiral Murray was assistant naval attaché at the American Embassies in London, England; Paris, France; Berlin, Germany; and the Hague, the Netherlands. During that period he was technical assistant for the Navy of the American delegation to the sixth session of the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference at Geneva, Switzerland, in November 1930. After his return to the United States in June 1933, he served for 2 years as head of the air department of the aircraft carrier *Saratoga*, flagship of Aircraft, Battle Force, and Carrier Division 1. In June 1935 he returned to the Pensacola Air Station as superintendent of aviation training when aviation cadet training was established. In June 1936 he became executive officer of the Pensacola Air Station, serving in that capacity until May 1937 when he rejoined the *Saratoga* as executive officer. A year later he assumed command of the U.S.S. *Langley*, converted in 1937 from an experimental aircraft carrier to a seaplane tender. He commanded the *Langley*, operating with Scouting Force, U.S. Fleet, until June 1939 when he again had duty in the Bureau of Aeronautics, Navy Department, serving as head of the personnel division until March 1941.

COMMANDED

Vice Admiral Murray commanded the aircraft carrier *Enterprise* from March 21, 1941, until June 30, 1942. During that period the *Enterprise* was engaged in 1941 in transporting planes and squadrons from the United States to various island bases in the Pacific. Late in November of that year, as part of a force under command of Fleet Adm. (then Vice Adm.) William F. Halsey, USN, she transported Marine fighter planes to Wake Island and was returning to Pearl Harbor at the time of the Japanese attack, December 7, 1941. Delayed by a storm, the *Enterprise* launched planes from her air group 6 that Sunday morning for a scheduled landing on airfields at Pearl Harbor. These planes ran into the midst of the surprise attack and thus became the only carrier-based aircraft to participate in that action and the subsequent unsuccessful search for the fleeing enemy.

"ENTERPRISE"

In February 1942, the *Enterprise*, under command of Vice Admiral Murray and flying the flag of Admiral Halsey, launched her planes in the successful raid on the Marshall and Gilbert Islands. In this, the first combat test ever participated in by an American aircraft carrier and the first offensive blow in the war against the Japanese, her flyers effectively proved the potency of air attack from a mobile, floating base, accounting for 35 Japanese aircraft, 13 auxiliary and patrol vessels, 1 cruiser, 1 seaplane tender and numerous storehouses, hangars, and other land targets. Later in February she participated in the successful raid on Wake Island, in enemy hands since December 22, 1941, and in March made a successful raid on Marcus Island. In April she escorted the carrier *Hornet* to within 800 miles of Tokyo for the *Hornet's* launching of 16 Army bombers for

Lt. Gen. James Doolittle's famous first raid on the Japanese Capital. In the Battle of Midway, June 4-6, 1942, in which the carriers *Enterprise*, *Hornet*, and *Yorktown* took part the air group from the *Enterprise* sank the large enemy carriers *Kaga* and *Akagi*, and together with the *Yorktown* air group, sank the Japanese carrier *Soryu* and damaged an enemy battleship in an engagement which marked the first decisive defeat suffered by the Japanese Navy in 350 years, put an end to the long period of Japanese offensive action and restored the balance of naval power in the Pacific.

For his services in command of the *Enterprise*, Vice Admiral Murray was awarded the Navy Cross, and also received a facsimile of, and is entitled to wear the ribbon for, the Presidential Unit Citation awarded the *Enterprise*. The citations follow.

NAVY CROSS

"For distinguished service in the line of his profession, as commanding officer of the U.S.S. *Enterprise* when, on February 1, 1942, his ship was under a heavy bombing attack in enemy waters. By his courage and resourcefulness he saved his ship from serious damage."

PRESIDENTIAL UNIT CITATION—U.S.S. "ENTERPRISE"

"For consistently outstanding performance and distinguished achievement during repeated action against enemy Japanese forces in the Pacific war area, December 7, 1941, to November 15, 1942. Participating in nearly every major carrier engagement in the first year of the war, the *Enterprise* and her Air Group, exclusive of her farflung destruction of hostile shore installation throughout the battle area, did sink or damage, on her own, a total of 35 Japanese vessels and shoot down a total of 185 Japanese aircraft. Her aggressive spirit and superb combat efficiency are fitting tribute to the officers and men who so gallantly established her as an ahead bulwark in defense of the American Nation."

Gilbert and Marshall Islands raid, February 1942.

Wake Island raid, February 24, 1942.

Marcus Island raid, March 4, 1942.

Battle of Midway, June 4-6, 1942.

Occupation of Guadalcanal, August 7-8, 1942.

Battle of Stewart Islands August 24, 1942.

Battle of Santa Cruz, October 26, 1942.

Battle of Solomon Islands, November 14-15, 1942.

On July 17, 1942, Vice Admiral Murray assumed duty as Commander, Carrier Task Force 17, with the U.S.S. *Hornet* as his flagship. He was abroad that carrier in the Battle of Santa Cruz, October 26, 1942, when his task force wrecked the Japanese invasion fleet bent on driving American forces out of Guadalcanal. In that battle the *Hornet* was so severely damaged that when it became apparent she could not be saved, she was sunk by our own naval forces. For his leadership at Santa Cruz, Vice Admiral Murray was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal with the following citation:

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE MEDAL

"For exceptionally meritorious service to the Government of the United States in a position of great responsibility as commander of a task force in the Battle of Santa Cruz Islands on October 26, 1942. Displaying great tactical skill and outstanding leadership, Rear Admiral Murray directed the excellently coordinated and determined action against Japanese forces with the result that heavy losses were inflicted on enemy ships and air groups, thereby contributing immeasurably to the success of our forces in this engagement. The distinguished service rendered by Rear Admiral Murray and the devotion to duty of the units under his

command reflect great credit upon the U.S. naval service."

In November 1942, Vice Admiral Murray returned to the Pensacola Air Station, where he had won his wings in 1915 to become the first commander of the Naval Air Training Center established there, and at the same time Chief, Air Intermediate Training Command. He relinquished these commands in January 1944 to organize and command the newly created Naval Air Training Command at Pensacola, created to coordinate and direct the entire training program. For his services in these assignments, which extended to August 1944, he was awarded the Legion of Merit with the following citation:

LEGION OF MERIT

"For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service to the Government of the United States as Chief of Naval Air Intermediate Training and Commandant, Naval Air Training Center, Pensacola, Fla., from November 26, 1942, to January 20, 1944, and as Chief of Naval Air Training from January 20 to August 4, 1944. Charged with the urgent task of expanding the intermediate stage of the pilot training program, Vice Admiral (then Rear Admiral) Murray handled the many complex problems of his vital assignment with skill and foresight, developing and maintaining the efficiency of his command with no sacrifice in quality of training, and subsequently, assuming the duties of Chief of Naval Air Training, directed the integration of all stages of the program. By his outstanding ability as an organizer, an administrator and a leader, Vice Admiral Murray contributed essentially to the successful training of large numbers of pilots to meet the requirements of the naval service during its most critical expansion period and to the prosecution of our sustained fleet operations against the enemy."

On August 16, 1944, Vice Admiral Murray became commander, Air Force, Pacific Fleet, charged with assuring that the Navy's aviation units in the Pacific be supplied with personnel and material. For this service in that command he was awarded a Gold Star in lieu of the second Legion of Merit, with the following citation:

GOLD STAR LIEU SECOND LEGION OF MERIT

"For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service as Commander Air Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet from August 1944 through July 1945. He efficiently handled the administrative responsibilities of this great force, and displayed exceptional ability in supervising its organization, and the planning for effective utilization of the material and personnel under his command. He frequently inspected forward operations in order that aircraft requirements might be better understood and complied with; and that advanced methods, gained from everyday experience with a relentless and devising enemy might be developed and incorporated into training programs. His experience and sound judgment were invaluable assets in providing for the improvement and maintenance of fleet aircraft and material. His energetic initiative, professional excellence, and devotion to duty contributed materially toward our defeat of the Japanese Empire, and were at all times in keeping with the highest traditions of the U. S. naval service."

In July 1945, Vice Admiral Murray became Commander, Marianas, and on September 2, 1945, acting for Fleet Adm. Chester M. Nimitz, U.S.N., Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean Areas, accepted the formal capitulation of Truk atoll, the wartime command headquarters for Japanese holdings in the central Pacific. Ceremonies were held aboard the light cruiser *Portland*.

In January 1946, he was ordered to duty as a member of the General Board, Navy Department, Washington, D.C. On March 22, 1946, he assumed duty as Commandant of the Ninth Naval District, Chicago, Ill., and as Commander of the Midwest Naval Area. On July 18, 1947, he was detached under orders to duty as Commander, 1st Task Fleet, to report on August 14, 1947.

Vice Admiral Murray was detached from duty as Commander 1st Task Fleet on October 9, 1948. On October 20, 1948, Admiral Murray assumed duties as Commander Western Sea Frontier and Commander Pacific Reserve Fleet with headquarters at Treasure Island, San Francisco. Admiral Murray was assigned additional duty as Commandant 12th Naval District until relieved of that additional duty on December 8, 1948.

In addition to the Navy Cross, the Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Merit with Gold Star, and the Presidential Unit Citation Ribbon, Vice Admiral Murray has the Mexican Service Medal (U.S.S. Ammen), the Victory Medal, and is entitled to the American Defense Service Medal, Fleet Clasp (U.S.S. Enterprise); the Asiatic-Pacific Area Campaign Medal with Stars for the Marshall-Gilbert raids, Wake Island, Tokyo raids, the Battle of Midway, the defense of Guadalcanal, and the Battle of Santa Cruz; the American Area Campaign Medal; and the World War II Victory Medal.

Retired four-star rank.

Self-Employed Individuals Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, yesterday the junior Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss), appeared before the Senate Finance Committee in support of H.R. 10. This is the bill designed to provide self-employed persons with a voluntary pension plan similar to that now accorded employees covered by employer-financed pension, and is identical to my bill, S. 944.

I am very glad to see the able Senator from Utah giving his invaluable support to this proposal. It is a field that has been too long neglected, Mr. President. Since the Senator from Utah presented such an excellent case for the bill, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the Senator's testimony.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR FRANK E. MOSS, DEMOCRAT, OF UTAH, BEFORE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE, AUGUST 11, 1959:

Re H.R. 10; Self-Employed Individuals Retirement Act.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to testify in support of H.R. 10, the Self-Employed Individual's Retirement Act of 1959.

On June 17 of this year, Mr. David A. Lindsay, Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, appeared before this distinguished committee. As spokesman for the major opponent of this legislation, he said, "The Treasury recognizes that present law does not give self-employed persons tax treatment for

their retirement savings comparable to that now accorded to employees covered by employer-financed pension plans."

In view of this statement, I don't believe it is necessary for me or other proponents of this legislation to waste your valuable time discussing whether or not an inequity exists. The Treasury Department admits it.

The people of Utah are greatly concerned about this situation, and many of them representing an excellent cross-section of the self-employed farm folks, small retailers, lawyers, dentists, doctors, and many others have written me on numerous occasions urging the enactment of H.R. 10.

Naturally, they have given a lot of thought to their old age, and the vast majority of them say that they have nothing other than OASI to live on once they retire. They can't understand why they are being penalized because they are self-employed and do not work for a corporation. Gentlemen, with but few exceptions, these are the average people of my State, the middle-income group often referred to as the backbone of this great country of ours.

I am concerned about this inequity and I believe that the majority of our colleagues feel it is time to remedy it.

H.R. 10 was first introduced in 1951 and has been before the Congress for 8 years. It has always had bipartisan support from Members who feel that enactment of the bill is the best way to deal with this unfair situation.

While the Treasury Department has advanced a number of objections to the bill, their major argument is the one generally offered when all others have failed—"let's wait until the budgetary situation is more favorable for tax reduction." As part of this reasoning, they emphasize a revenue loss of \$365 million, which to the best of my knowledge they are unable to substantiate. Because of my constituents' interest in this legislation, I have read a good part of the hearings on this bill and am inclined to feel that the maximum impact would not exceed \$100 million the first year.

Gentlemen, I am very definitely interested in keeping our economy in a healthy state, as are all the Members of this Congress. Surely the effect of the tax loss in the case of H.R. 10 is small compared with the favorable effect it will have on the 10 million self-employed of this country.

These people are not asking local, State, or Federal governments to take care of them in their retired years. They are asking simply for a postponement of tax liability so that they may be able to set something aside for their old age. They are willing to put up the money when they are able to spare it from the demands of their business. All they are asking of us, the Congress of the United States, is that we offer them the same tax consideration that 18 million corporate employees are receiving, so that they can provide for themselves.

In my opinion, it is imperative that H.R. 10 be enacted in this 86th Congress.

Thanks for your courtesy.

Browbeating House Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the

Northern Virginia Daily published at Strasburg, Va.

Wednesday's Washington Post editorial calls the House Ways and Means Committee members cowardly for their action in opposing both the increase in the gasoline tax for interstate highway financing and the issuance of bonds to further increase the debt of the Federal Government. Such browbeating tactics are distasteful to citizens who are honestly seeking an equitable solution to the problems of government.

The Washington newspapers have a peculiar opportunity to interpret the news of the National Capital, and therefore a greater influence upon the thoughts and actions of the Government than other newspapers throughout the Nation. It is unfortunate when that privilege and opportunity is abused by tactics which smack of intimidation.

Virginia has long suffered from the invasion of its rights by attempts to impose the will of the editors of Washington newspapers upon Virginians. One of the sore spots which has existed throughout the years is the fact that Virginia has furnished national leaders who believe in sound fiscal policies, and governmental honesty in its economic policies.

The Interstate Highway System is important, but so are the highway systems of each State. If there is an increase in the Federal gasoline tax of 1½ cents this will mean the States will have to match more Federal Interstate Highway money. Where will the various States obtain their increased proportion? Certainly the States cannot add another gasoline tax increase.

The argument that the Interstate System will increase highway travel in general, and therefore gasoline taxes to pay for them is fallacious. The overall effect of the system, when completed, will be to cut mileage and reduce gasoline consumption to some small extent. There should naturally be a gradual increase in use of gasoline as the population increases, if the economy remains at its present level.

There are arguments on both sides of the highway finance question, and our Washington editor friend should not assume that all who disagree with him are cowards.

The Farmer's Public Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, some adroit people in our country have what might be called a good press. The American farmer, of late, has been suffering what might be called a bad press. This is described in a thoughtful editorial, entitled "The Farmer's Public Relations," which was published in the Pendleton East Oregonian of Pendleton, Oreg., of August 13, 1959. The editorial admits that some farmers have been amassing considerable wealth. But the editorial also emphasizes that the average farmer has not done well, and it calls attention to the per capita income of American farmers in 1958 of only \$1,027, as compared with \$2,040 for nonfarm residents.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this informative editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FARMER'S PUBLIC RELATIONS

Practically no one at all who's interested in the subject will disagree that the present farm program isn't working as well as it should. Nor are there many, farmers included, who will disagree that it deserves honest criticism. Plenty of people, legislators among them, say they have solutions to the problem.

Too many of these so-called solutions are predicated on the theory the farmer is living in clover and Cadillacs. The answer, too many of these self-styled agricultural experts say, is to chop the farmer off at the pockets by taking away the trough into which—if you believe these pronouncements—practically every farmer has his snout.

"Pull him down to the level of the average wage earner," seems to be the theme.

Hell's fire and blue mud. If the truth were realized, any leveling-off process to bring the farmer's salary into line with his city-dwelling cousin would have to raise the farmer's income.

Last year, for instance, the average per capita income of farmers was \$1,027. This princely sum compared with \$2,040 for non-farm people.

To carry this situation a bit further, those who find the farmer living exclusively off Government handouts, and who allege the price of food is soaring because of the farmer, might take a look at the investment the farmer has in his job in comparison with the investment the average Joe has in his. The price of machinery and other necessary items being what it is, it doesn't take much thinking to get the point.

No, the farmer isn't starving. In fact, he's doing pretty fair in a lot of instances, despite the drawbacks. Here and there you even find one driving that Cadillac every one of them supposedly has. The farmer isn't going to fold up, in most cases, and head for the employment office.

But unless a lot of officials, including the Secretary of Agriculture, don't start telling both sides of the story, farming is going to be the most maligned business the public has heard about in a long time.

One of the most succinct understandings of the problem was voiced by a Pendleton man who said: "I think we all understand that it is exactly that way (the farmer being pictured as on one big gravy train when that's not true) but how to get the 160 million people in the United States to understand it is one that confuses most of us."

He went on to say something with which a majority of farmers probably agree: "Of course, as we all know, our good Secretary of Agriculture has done more to publicize the farm subsidy in a bad light than any other one person that I know of. He has used this publicity to further his farm program ideas. I am not too opposed to many of his ideas and promises for solving some of our farm problems. But I am opposed to his methods of publicity in which he builds up all this bad press and public relationships for the farm people."

The same thing was said in another way recently by Ed Lawrence of Waitsburg at a public relations school for county association of wheatgrowers officials at Spokane. Lawrence is a wheat farmer and chairman of the Washington Association of Wheat Growers Committee on Public Relations. Said he, in part:

"The bombardment aimed at farmers is bewildering when you consider that net farm income slipped from \$17 billion in 1952 to less than \$14 billion in 1957. In the meantime labor and industry are enjoying bigger and better prosperity. The prices of farm products has declined 20 percent in a few short years and yet we're all pictured as rural tycoons.

"Agriculture is still the economic basis for smalltown America. The prosperity of Main Street merchants is largely dependent on how the surrounding farmers make out.

"We want to say that farmers aren't living high on the hog these days and that the corporation-type farm is a rarity. Most of our food production comes from middle-sized farms and they are feeling the pinch of lower prices and higher costs. And the future looks ever worse.

"We should bring out that research, which leads to higher yields, is benefiting the consumer as much or more than the farmer. If we still farmed with the techniques of 1940 there would now be a food shortage in this country and the Nation's food bill, it is estimated, would be \$8 billion higher than it is now.

"It is confusing why so many writers want the farmers to get off at economy junction while most everyone else keeps riding the gravy train. I hear no viewing with alarm the fact that there is now an \$8 billion pile of price-supported metals. It involves almost as much Federal funds as farm surpluses. People aren't perturbed over the Armed Forces \$50 billion stockpile of manufacturer goods, which we might suspect help labor and industry. Both of these accumulations have the advantage of coming under the handy heading of 'national defense.'

"By law, 500 million bushels of wheat are supposed to be reserved for national emergency, but strangely enough no one has ever set it aside. All the wheat the Government has is called just plain 'surplus.' It's all chalked up to the account of the farmer.

"It is unfortunate that the word 'subsidy' seems to be gaining such a poor reputation. Actually there have been subsidies given to certain groups since the founding of our Republic."

There it is in a nutshell. Now if the squirrels could only be made to understand.

Polish Americans Hit Khrushchev Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter to the public by Rt. Rev. L. A. Sikora, national director of the Polish American Congress:

POLISH AMERICANS HIT KHRUSHCHEV VISIT

Millions of Americans do not approve of Khrushchev's visit. Strong voices objecting are heard from the average American citizenry. Religious leaders, both Catholic and non-Catholic, voiced their strong objections. Not a few of our Congressmen and Senators do not see any benefit resulting from this visit. Six million Americans of Polish ancestry know the background of Nikita. That is why we object to his visit here. It is an insult to all subjugated nations for whom America is

the ideal of democracy, a beacon of hope. We have followed the rise of bolshevism and its insidious conquests and its propaganda of infiltration.

We recall how the Soviets stabbed Poland in September 1939, how the Soviets forcibly evacuated 8 million inhabitants of eastern Poland to Siberia and to labor camps. From that time Soviet hands are covered with new bloodsheds. We remember the Katyn murder of 12,000 Polish Army officers. Our own congressional investigating committee made a report on July 1952, calling it the most inhumane massacre of our times.

The defense of Warsaw and the infamous stalemating of American aviators by the Soviets is well known. The subjugating and absorbing of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and other small nations has shocked the American public. It is not revenge that we seek, but the correction of injustices and the return of freedom and liberty to the nations in bondage, conquered and occupied by the Soviets.

We feel this more keenly because this invitation came so soon after Mr. Nixon's visit to Poland, where he was received with such great enthusiasm as a representative of our great democratic Nation. America is the only ray of hope for Poland in this bewildered world. United States of America is their only beacon of freedom. At the American Embassy, Mr. Nixon told the Polish people that he was happy to visit Poland and that relations between our countries have improved and that "we" are working together in the economic area.

After placing a wreath at the Polish Unknown Soldier's tomb, Mr. Nixon wrote in the guestbook: "In tribute to the epic courage and sacrifice of Polish soldiers throughout history." Here a great crowd broke out in emotional shouts: "Long live Nixon. Long live Eisenhower. God bless America." And next day we hear of the invitation extended to Nikita Khrushchev. We fear another Yalta, when Stalin, Roosevelt, and Churchill sold Poland and other nations down the river. One could not do business with Stalin, nor with Hitler, nor can one do business with Khrushchev, who is their natural offspring.

One cannot argue, neither can one convince those international evildoers, set on the conquest of the world. To fight evil, we must be strong, we must pray as we combat moral evils by vigilance and prayer fortified by fasting.

On the vigil of the 20th anniversary of the outbreak of World War II, may we be vigilant, firm with Nikita Khrushchev, and pray that some good may result.

Rt. Rev. L. A. SIKORA,

National Director, Polish American Congress.

Tribute to Judge Clem McClelland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, recently the Houston Chronicle gave recognition to a distinguished jurist and civic leader of Houston, Tex. He is Judge Clem McClelland, who has been judge of the Harris County probate

court for over 9 years. Judge McClelland was appointed to the court shortly after it was created in 1949, and has been elected four times since then, without opposition.

Judge McClelland is widely known and respected for his ability and his compassion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Houston Chronicle of August 14, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEIGHBOR OF NOTE—JUDGE GIVEN COLD WELCOME

(By Bill Porterfield)

It was a freezing New Year's Day, 1940, when Clem McClelland came to Houston to make his mark.

He had a new law degree, and the high dreams of all young men who find themselves searching the great stone faces of the cities. The thought of failure never entered his head.

The towering figure of the Georgia boy appeared at law offices throughout the city, only to be turned away.

Such jobs were scarce, he was told. There was war in Europe.

SAW MOVIE

McClelland bought a paper and read that Finnish ski troops were mopping up Russians on the Arctic front. The new year looked dreary, but only for a moment. McClelland threw the paper in a trash can and went to see Wallace Berry in a movie at the Uptown.

Four months later after filling part-time jobs, McClelland opened his first law office in the then Second National Bank Building, hired a secretary, and started looking for clients.

He married the former Doris Cook, a legal secretary, in 1941.

People in trouble found McClelland to be sympathetic, hardworking and honest. He had one other qualification. He knew law.

In 1947, County Judge Glenn Perry, bogged down in the disposition of probate matters, hired McClelland as an assistant. McClelland buried himself in a study of probate law, took the load off Judge Perry.

APPOINTED TO BENCH

In 1949 the legislature created the first probate court in Texas history.

McClelland was appointed to the bench of the new court here.

He was sworn in January 3, 1950, exactly 10 years and 2 days after setting foot in Houston.

McClelland has held that post through four elective terms without opposition.

He has been a force in overhauling antiquated State probate statutes.

Ask him how he feels about being a judge, and he may tell you, Sir Thomas Noon Talford once wrote:

"Fill the seats of justice with good men, not so absolute in goodness as to forget what human frailty is."

McClelland has said he learned tolerance from his father, now a professor at the University of Arkansas.

He was inspired to enter the law profession by an uncle, a successful attorney in McClelland's birthplace, Griffin, Ga.

McClelland did undergraduate work at the University of Arkansas and completed his law degree at the University of Texas.

Off the bench, Judge McClelland is a tireless civic and fraternal leader. At present, he is illustrious potentate of the Arabia Temple Shrine, a member of the city's youth commission, a member of the Masonic Lodge

and the Scottish Rite bodies, and the First Presbyterian Church. He is also active in Little League baseball.

The judge lives at 4514 Ivanhoe with his wife and three children.

Lake Diversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BOYLE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Public Works Committee has voted out the O'Brien bill, H.R. 1, and in considering the merits of this piece of legislation a recent editorial appearing in the Chicago Tribune should prove both informative and instructive in evaluating the meritorious request for additional water from Lake Michigan on a 1-year trial basis.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Aug. 17, 1959]

COMING TO COURT WITH CLEAN HANDS

The Senate Public Works Committee is to vote Monday on legislation authorizing Chicago to divert an additional 1,000 cubic feet of water a second from Lake Michigan for purposes of improved sanitation and navigation. This authority, already voted by the House, is on a 1-year experimental basis. The additional water would supplement the present authorized diversion of 1,500 cubic second feet.

We trust that the committee itself will not be diverted from Chicago's pressing needs into consideration of the emergency that has arisen at Milwaukee through pollution of the lake. All of that city's lake beaches have been ordered closed because effluent from the Milwaukee sewage treatment works has made the lake a "cesspool," as conditions are described by the Milwaukee health commissioner.

Not that Milwaukee's difficulties are not relevant to Chicago's petition for more diversion to help its sewage treatment program. Milwaukee and the State of Wisconsin have been the most vociferous opponents of help for Chicago. Their spokesmen have represented the Milwaukee treatment program as perfection.

In view of the conditions that have developed on the Milwaukee lake front, we believe it pertinent that the Senate committee review some of the Wisconsin statements and objections to determine whether they are truthful and were made in good faith.

Here is a statement from Oscar Muegge, Wisconsin State sanitary engineer: "Records of the Milwaukee sewerage commission show that the effluent of adequate, properly operated activated sludge plants will contain less than 5 percent of the bacteria initially present. Laboratory tests further show that pouring disinfectants 4 parts per million with 8 to 10 minutes' contact will reduce the bacteria remaining to one-half of 1 percent or less * * *. There is every reason to believe that equally effective purification could be obtained at Chicago."

But Milwaukee bathers are warned that to enter the lake from which Milwaukee obtains its drinking water may expose them to typhoid or amoebic dysentery.

Gov. Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin charged in his statement that Chicago "held down taxes by drifting along with an outmoded sewage disposal system." Yet the Milwaukee

health commissioner, Dr. E. R. Krumbiegel, conceded that it would cost \$500 million to eliminate pollution at Milwaukee. He termed the remedy "economically impossible."

Mayor Frank Zeidler of Milwaukee offered facts which he asserted proved that Chicago's sanitary district "is not taking enough vigorous steps to reduce industrial pollution and * * * has not operated its works at greatest efficiency." He held up the threat that it might be necessary to federalize the Chicago sanitary system. What are the mayor's views about the desirability of federalizing Milwaukee's sanitary system, now that it presents a menace to public health?

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, in his testimony, displayed a jar of liquid taken directly from the pipe the effluent goes in at Milwaukee. He said, "I understand that some people drink this. I am not going to drink this this morning, but I would like to show it to the committee because, as you can see, in the first place it is transparent, there is no color to it. In the second place, this is sealed, but I can assure you there is no odor. It is stable, and we discharge that effluent within a couple of miles of where we take in our drinking water."

The Senate committee should require Senator PROXMIRE to demonstrate his faith by drinking this Milwaukee tonic. From the character of all this Wisconsin testimony, it should be able to establish whether the attack of that State and of the city of Milwaukee on the Chicago diversion plea is honest. Then it should vote Chicago the help it needs to prevent a repetition of the Milwaukee experience.

A Parent's Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Wichita Falls (Tex.) Record-News is known for its fine reporting and distinguished editorials.

Because of my interest in the problem of juvenile delinquency, I took a particular interest in an editorial entitled, "A Parent's Responsibility," which appeared in that newspaper on August 13, 1959. This editorial takes a close look at the meaning of the word "discipline" and I think it shows clearly that freedom and discipline can be properly balanced, and that this is in a child's best interest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PARENT'S RESPONSIBILITY

It's an old story that people in this country love children. It's also getting to be said a little too commonly that Americans are ruled by their children.

No one can quarrel with the basic feelings and attitudes that prompt deep concern with the wellbeing and future of our youngsters. Yet some observers do question whether enough of us act upon that concern in the most sensible way.

They argue, to start with, that it is a mistake to "live for the children" almost entirely, as some parents seem to do.

Any human being worth his salt must have a life of his own. He does not exist merely to guide and provide for his children. He has a responsibility to himself, to develop his personal interests and talents for his own as well as others' enrichment.

Suppose he chooses to live for the kids alone, and they in turn do the same as they grow up. This means that individuals are being born and raised to bear and raise others, and so on, without end.

While this may sound wonderfully unselfish, observers will contend with good sense that it takes too much of the self out of life. If your own individuality is served only when you are young, then your maturity is nearly empty of meaning to you.

Nor, it is argued, is it necessary to the proper development of children that they be given so much room to roam in free of restraint.

A notion has grown up that the ordinary disciplines are somehow old fashioned, that the big thing is to let the child exercise his own free will, to show his creative possibilities, etc.

When discipline does in fact go out of fashion, life will have fallen into complete chaos. Children need much love and encouragement and free rein. They also need the tight rein, and many, many hard lessons. If they do not learn them when they are young, they will suffer them bitterly when they are older.

Parents who do not provide the hard as well as the loving guidance do their children no real favor. They simply pass to the children themselves, and others in society, the painful tasks of training for life's realities.

Rather than living for our children, it seems a better idea to learn to live well for ourselves.

ing that the aid program in Vietnam is a fiasco, and that the administration of that program has been fraught with corruption, mismanagement, and other abuses, has received the subcommittee's immediate attention.

After reviewing these charges in an executive session on July 27, the subcommittee decided to examine them thoroughly. The author of the charges, Mr. Albert Colegrove, Government officials responsible for the administration of the aid program in Vietnam, and other interested persons were invited to testify before the subcommittee.

The hearings which the subcommittee has conducted have thus far failed to bear out the charge that our aid program in Vietnam is a fiasco, and that it has been administered in a scandalous manner.

These accusations, as well as specific charges of wrongdoing, have not been substantiated to date. Many of these charges have been traced to sources which I, for one, must regretfully consider to be less than reliable.

In contrast, the testimony which the subcommittee received from reliable observers who had first-hand knowledge of the aid program in Vietnam, and from executive branch witnesses, indicates strongly that the aid program in Vietnam has been constructive, successful, and responsibly administered.

Because of its desire to be as thorough as possible in examining Mr. Colegrove's charges, and to correct any weaknesses or waste in the aid program, a special study mission of members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, headed by Congressman PILCHER, Democrat, of Georgia, will conduct an on-the-spot investigation of certain items which have not been substantially explained.

The results of the subcommittee's inquiry and its findings will be referred to the Special Subcommittee for Review of the Mutual Security Programs for further examination and appropriate action by that investigating body.

Press-Scimitar told the Atlantic Conference today.

"Hitler would never have struck if the Western democracies had been unified," the Scripps-Howard editor told the 650 delegates.

Of that total, 130 are from the United States. We Americans have been divided into 5 study groups to look into the economic, educational, cultural, scientific, and political cooperation among the 15 nations making up the alliance.

The Atlantic Congress was designed to evaluate the worth of NATO from a non-military point of view. In my study group—the cultural and spiritual committee—are a priest, a rabbi, a college president, and leading laymen of three faiths.

On the plane trip to London, I sat next to economist Leon Keyserling, and while we were winging over the Atlantic at 19,000 feet, I asked this well-known economist what he expected the Atlantic Congress to accomplish.

He said he did not expect it to accomplish many specific things but that there was great value in bringing together 650 citizens to exchange views and to make personal contacts.

NATO is thought generally to be merely a military alliance; it is much more, as this Congress hopes to dramatize.

Fourteen years ago to the very week, I had arrived in London on furlough from Germany. V-E Day and touched off wild celebrations among the Allies. The war had been won.

In the intervening years we have found ourselves in a cold war with a new foe.

ATLANTIC CONGRESS STRESSES SPIRITUAL VALUES
JUNE 10, 1959

The Atlantic Congress, meeting here to assess the value of the NATO alliance, has listed my study group—"The Spiritual and Cultural Values of the Atlantic Community"—as "A-1." What designation could be higher?

The value assigned to us symbolizes the effort made by congress leaders to keep values straight.

These spiritual and cultural values were discussed by Queen Elizabeth in her address to the 650 delegates meeting from 14 of the NATO countries. (Iceland refused to send delegates because of its differences with Britain over fishing rights in North Atlantic waters.)

Said the Queen:
"Two elements have long been the main principles of enlightened European thought and action: Respect for the freedom of the individual and the dignity of human nature and a simple faith in God."

"These principles show more clearly than anything else that the things which divide us are very small and unimportant compared to the things which unite us."

An A-1 speech.
Incidentally, I wondered if the Queen wrote her speech or whether she was told what to say—as is the case when she delivers messages from "Her Majesty's Government."

My new-found British friends were of the opinion that she indeed had spoken her own thoughts, but that she had consulted her husband and advisers before addressing us.

The Congress also heard the Archbishop of York, who also stressed spiritual values. He said:

"We turn to those things first which are not transient but eternal—the things of value that point beyond themselves to a source of divine power."

Again, an A-1 message.
Attending these congress sessions with me are six other delegates from Ohio: Miss Sally Sue Witten of Cleveland, who represents the Girl Scouts; Congressman Wayne Hays (Democrat, Flushing) cochairman of the meeting; Congressman Walter H. Moeller (Democrat, Lancaster); Prof. Howard White of Miami University; Prof. Earl Warren of

Aid Program in Vietnam Not a Fiasco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on July 30, 1959, I had taken the floor to advise the Members that the Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific of the Foreign Affairs Committee would hold hearings to be fully briefed on the situation of our aid program in Vietnam, with particular reference to the series of articles written by Mr. Colegrove and appearing in the Scripps-Howard chain.

The hearings conducted by the subcommittee on the Colegrove articles were completed last Friday, August 14, and at that time I issued the following statement:

The Subcommittee on the Far East has been conducting a continuing review of our aid programs in the area under the subcommittee's jurisdiction. In an effort to be fully informed about progress achieved in this field, the subcommittee has conducted on-the-spot investigations, and supplemented them periodically with hearings.

The U.S. aid program in Vietnam, being within the area of the subcommittee's jurisdiction, has received close and continuing attention.

The series of articles which appeared recently in one of the local newspapers, alleg-

The Atlantic Congress in London

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, one of the U.S. delegates to the recent Atlantic Congress, which met in London last June, was the Reverend Alan J. Davis, minister of the North Royalton Methodist Church, North Royalton, Ohio.

Reverend Davis has sent me five articles which he wrote for the Cleveland Press giving his impressions of the congress. Reverend Davis points out that "The NATO countries must develop into more than just a military alliance."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTICLES IN THE CLEVELAND PRESS REPORTING THE ATLANTIC CONGRESS IN LONDON

(By the Reverend Alan J. Davis)

AREA PASTOR WRITES OF HIGH HOPES AS DELEGATE TO NATO CONFERENCE JUNE 8, 1959

Members of NATO must tighten their political ties to fight communism successfully, Editor Edward J. Meeman of the Memphis

Ohio Wesleyan; and Mrs. Eleanor Stevenson of Oberlin.

London, we have already found, is a fascinating city. But I find one thing lacking—drinking water.

British restaurants do not offer you a glass of water unless you ask for it. Public drinking fountains are scarce, although there are plenty of places you can quench your thirst in other ways.

So I'm always looking for a glass of water.

AREA MINISTER WANTS CONSCIENCE IN NATO JUNE 11, 1959

Our subcommittee here at the Atlantic Congress—on the spiritual and cultural value of the NATO alliance—is concerned with the interpretation which non-NATO countries will place on the purposes of the general meeting.

We know that the congress, made up of 650 delegates, is designed to assess the non-military aspects of the alliance. But what will others think of us?

We want to set forth a statement of spiritual ideals that will capture the minds and hearts of the entire world—especially those people in underdeveloped areas where freedom of the individual is still a vision in the future.

I have been reading reports of how this Atlantic Congress is being interpreted by the Communist press. In its view, the congress is an act of aggression in the cold war.

In an attempt to reach our goal and formalize our statement, I made two speeches in committee debate.

The first was a call to implement the spirit of the NATO community by establishing a permanent section in this organization to serve as the conscience of the Atlantic community.

I told of the recent Indianapolis auto race in our country. After months of preparation the starting time was approached; the gun sounded, the cars sped down the track—all except one that did not move. It was left sitting at the starting line.

NATO can be like that unfortunate car if we are not careful. The structure looks fine. The spirit is there to drive it ahead. But the power must be communicated to the rest of the mechanism if it is to move.

We must prepare to implement our statements of ideals and principles in a way that they may be brought directly to bear on the larger decisions of NATO.

In the second speech I objected to the way concern for trade unionism and assistance to underdeveloped nations were always referred to as the great issues before our committee. It seemed to me the great moral and spiritual issue we were ignoring was NATO's own dependence on atomic weapons.

I argued for a statement in our declaration that would clearly say that we were against the irresponsible use of the armaments of war and uncompromisingly concerned solely with the preservation of peace.

This brought some applause, even from those who probably were not sure just what I had said.

After the evening session I talked with Maurice Van Glabbeke, of Belgium, a member of Parliament. He said, in French, "Let me shake the hand of Reverend Davis, who is from beautiful Ohio."

He had been in Cleveland, he said, at the time of the tragic Cleveland Clinic fire. But from that disaster, laws to regulate hospital safety were enacted all over Europe. He has always given Cleveland credit for this.

MANY FEEL GLOOMY ON NATO, JUNE 12, 1959

As the Atlantic Congress nears its final meeting, I and others among the 650 delegates sense a growing pessimism.

We doubt if NATO as a military structure is strong enough to defend the free world if suddenly attacked.

We also doubt the depth of the friendship we have been counting on from our NATO colleagues.

There is a growing nationalism in Europe reflected here. Even the smaller countries like Denmark and Belgium feel no great dependence upon America, even though we have so greatly assisted them in rebuilding their countries.

I spoke today of this problem with former British Prime Minister Clement Attlee. He senses the same shift in European opinion. "Let America help us," people are saying, "but don't think she can buy our friendship."

The delegates, who last night saw the hit play "My Fair Lady," today have whistled "I Could Have Danced All Night"—one of the songs from the show—but it's just whistling in the dark if we think all's right with NATO.

THREE GOALS DIRECTED TO NATO, JUNE 17, 1959

Circling the domed ceiling of the assembly hall where the Atlantic Congress met were these words etched in gold leaf: "Holy is the true light and passing wonderful, lending radiance to them that endured in the heat of the conflict."

How much true light came from the Congress?

In his closing remarks J. J. Fens of The Netherlands, the presiding officer, rightly said that only history can judge. But we have outlined a program for NATO to follow in the next decade. It is now up to the Parliamentarian's Conference to implement these plans.

As I view it, three concerns have emerged: The NATO countries must develop more than just a military alliance. There must be much greater integration of our political, economic, and cultural interests if we are to build an Atlantic community.

There must be intensified efforts to help the underdeveloped areas of the world help themselves.

Excessive nationalism on the part of NATO countries must not be allowed to confuse our common goals.

So the Congress has ended. The 650 delegates are scattering to their homes.

The most amazing fact of the conference to me was this: the total cost to the international committee of the Atlantic Congress equaled the price of one helicopter or two-thirds the price of one military tank.

Lush Living in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Affairs Committee has received a letter from Mrs. James W. Bayne of Nha Trang, Vietnam, addressed to the U.S. House of Representatives.

Since it is the reply of an American citizen living in Vietnam to the charges of lush living in Vietnam, under leave to extend my remarks I include the letter and commend it to the attention of the Members of the House.

BOITE POSTALE 70,
NHA TRANG, VIETNAM,
August 10, 1959.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As I read "The Times of Vietnam" I get angrier by the minute. This

Colegrove fellow and his articles are truly to be deplored. I am an American housewife, and have been here in Vietnam since June 16 and though I don't pretend to know all the answers, as evidently Mr. Colegrove does, there are a few things I do know firsthand for a fact, and they are:

Any American child of schoolage here pays \$100 for 3 months of school. We have three children. It is a known fact here that there are three prices for anything bought, a regular price for the Vietnamese, a bit higher for the French, and the prices are doubled or tripled for the (rich) American. My husband makes \$650 base pay a month, and we, as his dependents are allowed over here, paying our own way to the tune of over \$1,500 (after first depositing \$2,000 for guarantee fare home). We pay \$170 a month rent plus utilities, we have cement floors in our bedrooms and kitchen, have to carry water from the sink to the washing machine (when the well is dry we carry it from the neighbors), and the city electric is so minute that the refrigerator drips all the time. Our food we buy at the American Commissary in Saigon and have it flown up to us. The only one time we have had lettuce we had to buy 6 heads it was so rotten. (We can't eat local lettuce as we'd get the bug—which is a serious case of dysentery.) I was able to make one small bowl of salad. I haven't received the bill as yet for that rotten lettuce but just you figure it out, how much would you say it's going to be? I'm not griping about all this with the exception of the school. Since we left Saigon before the school term began we got our money back, but those Americans in Saigon are still paying—having to pay through the nose for schooling. Now we have sent for the Calverts course (\$125 per child), and I'll have to teach the children myself. We pay taxes on three pieces of property in California, but now I ask you if this wouldn't make you angry? I'm not against lend-lease, but how about some of our money we are sending you in the line of taxes going for some schooling for our own children here? I pick up the paper and read Mr. Colegrove's preposterous allegations—can't something be done in regards to newspapermen?

To be an attorney, one must pass the bar exams and abide by rules. To be a doctor, one must first pass a test. Even to operate an automobile, one must pass a test and abide by rules which are made to protect others. These things are so for the good of all—then why not a few rules for the press? To me I think this especially essential since the privilege of reporting actual facts in these crucial times should not be let to just anyone. If ever in the past it were true that "these are the times that try men's souls," it, as never before, is true now. And of a certainty the American press, what they say and their opinions are repeated the world over. These people believe in us and look to us as their savior, and it is a very sad day for us, as Americans, when we take lightly our responsibility toward them. I have lived all my life in the United States and had never realized before how some other people live. Not only in poverty but in fear. To these people death, sickness and want are common, yet their tears are as real as yours or mine. Truly we owe them more than half-hazard reporting. My husband works for Johnson Drake & Piper of Vietnam, Inc., building a road here, and if there is lush living I haven't seen it. He leaves the house at 4:45 a.m., and comes home at 5:15 p.m. He works 6 days a week. And there are few recreational activities here. One single feature movie on Saturday and one on Sunday night, both of which are shown at a friend's house. There are four eating places here. At one place the flies are so thick they blacken their displayed wares. (They tell you if you go

at night you don't notice them so much as you eat by candlelight.) One other is owned by a man who was convicted of serving cat and dog in his cafe in Choin, and the other two are fairly clean. But we live lush, do we? Mr. Colegrove must have had a 5-day visa. Please, a few rules for better reporting.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JAMES W. BAYNE.

Some Reflections on a Trip to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, Donald E. Cummings, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Eustace H. Cummings, of Lebanon, N.H., is a young man who grew up in my hometown, graduated from Harvard and Tuck School at Dartmouth, and is a successful businessman in New York. He has recently written a report on his travels in Europe entitled, "Some Reflections on a Trip to Russia." Included in this report is a very striking and clearly phrased reference to the effect of 30 years of socialism on the Scandinavian nations. I commend this brief, well-written article to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME REFLECTIONS ON A TRIP TO RUSSIA

(By Donald E. Cummings)

A visit behind the Iron Curtain is quite an experience—stimulating, enlightening, disheartening, frightening. It was my privilege to be invited to accompany a group of business leaders from Michigan (including my brother) on a visit to Moscow, Leningrad, and Prague, in addition to several Western European cities, for a tour emphasizing a look at industry abroad. With the assistance of American Embassy representatives and local civic and industrial leaders in each of the cities, we were treated to factory visits, lectures and informal talks by qualified officials, as well as a personal look-see at economic and social conditions in free enterprise, socialistic and communistic nations. Recognizing the fact that a quick visit cannot make one an expert on the affairs of Europe, I nevertheless feel that some of my observations, culled from discussions with these individuals, could be of interest or value to others.

The European Common Market Community, comprised of Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg, West Germany, France, and Italy, presents a very encouraging prospect for the future of these nations in solving some of their individual economic problems by pooling their resources and coordinating their endeavors. To have stifled their long-founded and understandable emotional differences sufficiently to permit this joint effort to develop is a great credit to the nations involved. It is not inconceivable that other Western European nations may finally join the Common Market, and the strengthening of their economic position thereby should constitute good news to our country, which has long sponsored reconstruction programs abroad. The obvious hope is that political

joint ventures might grow from this cooperation, but the age-old resentments, the pride of language and customs of sovereignty, the evident urge to protect their unique identities—these comprise strong forces which will probably never permit a situation where, for example, a German might enjoy lawful jurisdiction over a Dutchman. To observe the consequences of the wars and the hatred that developed from the personal and public atrocities wreaked by one people upon another, is to learn understanding and patience for the very real problems these nations face as they strive to deal cooperatively with one another without sacrificing national pride, searching out for themselves a worthy place in a small world of great powers.

The Scandinavian nations after more than 30 years of socialism do not present an enviable picture, despite the pleasantness of these especially appealing people and the admirable program of modest security for the aged which our group surveyed. A national lethargy has developed with the passing of real incentives to work, and the oppressive tax program, now necessarily being levied in full force on the average earners, makes for general discontent, embodying at present a serious problem for these countries. Our own legislators might well be better informed on the dangers of the welfare state and better equipped to vote on related programs if they paid a thoughtful visit to these countries.

The Soviet citizens we encountered informally are as nice as any group of human beings, yet there is no question but that they are fully oriented to respond automatically, as one, to any edict from the hierarchy. Not being satisfied merely to follow the program laid out for us by the Soviet Government travel bureau, Intourist, I wanted to see how the middle class people lived and what they were thinking. Finding the means to slip away from our official watchdog guide, I succeeded in spending 1 full day in the company of Russian students from the University of Leningrad. Education, particularly scientific education, is greatly emphasized in urban Russia, and correspondingly neglected in satellite nations such as Czechoslovakia. I learned that a man's suit of clothes costs about 2 months' average wages; I ate poor food with these students in a public restaurant where a meal for four cost the equivalent of 10 percent of the average Russian's monthly pay. Against official instructions, they took me to their parents' apartments where I found several families sharing apartments built many years ago to accommodate a single family. A professional photographer for a national magazine, his wife and 20-year-old son live in one room, sharing kitchen and toilet facilities (without bathtub) with 2 or 3 other families. Their homes can easily be likened to a slum apartment on Manhattan's lower East Side. It is small wonder that as they engage in one of their few means of recreation—walking along the sidewalk—these people present such a drab, unpressed, unwashed, slovenly appearance.

Virtually all women in the Soviet Union work laying brick, digging ditches, spreading concrete, driving steam rollers, while their younger children are trained in pioneer groups—described to us by our Intourist guide as "away at camp." Uninformed, innocent and naive, Soviet citizens believe they are free, for they cannot recognize that conditions they have so long dealt with constitute for them an absence of personal freedom. They are conditioned to privation, confident that their only hope for protection against the imperialistic intent of capitalistic exploitation lies in their faithful obedience to the directives of their champion leaders. They want peace and friendship, but this is only a dream, and they must be

militarily strong to defend themselves against attack from the atomic bases with which the Americans have surrounded them. They strive resolutely toward 1965 when, they are told, the 7-year plan will bring consumer goods into their lives. Dis-senters are few and dare not talk; to think they could revolt is folly.

These ordinary folk will never travel far from home—the Leningrader is unlikely to be afforded an opportunity to see how Moscow has been dressed up as the Soviet showplace while impoverished Leningrad has been neglected. But the young zealots and party faithful will be treated to a Moscow trip as a prize and, simultaneously, for further subtle indoctrination. In the cultural exchange program, the visitor to the United States will be the carefully selected, dedicated, 100 percent indoctrinated Communist, whose faith in the Soviet command is his only religion. This visitor can view and still not see, so conditioned is his mind. No basic discontent can be expected to grow from his exposure to the comparative wealth and freedom of the U.S. average man, for he is equipped and trained to believe only what he is told by given authorities. The high-ranking Soviet official, however, is to my mind no dedicated idealist. He is strictly a power-hungry individual, taking full advantage of his position to add to his own ugly record. This is the man who should, I suggest, be invited to make a free style visit to our United States, where with his discerning eye he may reappraise his careless opinion as to the strength and determination of a truly free society, in order that he may return sufficiently better informed from personal observation to make him more wary of undertaking irretrievable steps.

The Soviets' campaign to promote trade with the West was vividly emphasized in the course of our meeting with a ranking authority of the Ministry of Foreign Trade in Moscow. It is significant that this is the area of officialdom to which they chose to expose us, and the message they pressed was the supposedly simple question of, "Why won't you trade with us—we are anxious to trade with you." They are very pleased to note that Great Britain has already signed an agreement for limited trade with Russia. On visiting the Volman Machine Tool plant near Prague in Czechoslovakia, our group was particularly forceful in plying questions which brought to the front such facts as—

(1) Management of industry is appointed by and reports to a central Communist party body;

(2) The workers of a plant are organized into a so-called trade union specifically to keep them under control by management-appointed officers; it is these officers who answer to management on questions of productivity within the plant and who dispense discipline on the everyday level to the workers;

(3) No one is free to leave his work without permission, and obtaining reassignment is an involved and lengthy process which may or may not come to fruition.

It appears likely that the near-slave labor output sphere will eventually be widely competing abroad with U.S. production. The European Common Market Community, with its developed steel program, is also an economic force that will need to be considered. Our powerful figures in organized labor, who are certainly more socialistic than democratic, may insidiously lead our inflated economy to a point where our strong competitive position will deteriorate and economic defeat will pave the way for the comparatively peaceful spread of communism in the world. Our average citizen, supporting the wage-price spiral and ultimately undermining our international competitive strength, could turn out to be the unwitting

handyman of men like Nikita Khrushchev. This is the terrifying picture that sticks in my mind—the proposition which I believe deserves serious cogitation by all of us, particularly at this time of rising stock market activity and of seemingly unlimited economic growth in our country.

Mr. G. J. Watumull, East-West Symbol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BURNS

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the 17th, I inserted in the RECORD a brief history of the Watumull Foundation, including a capsule account of some of their activities. Later on the same day I received information that the founder of the Watumull Foundation, Mr. G. J. Watumull had passed away.

From Hawaii's largest evening newspaper comes an editorial which I include herewith for printing in the RECORD. The editorial is a fitting tribute to the story so often written in the pages of America's history of the land of opportunity that is the United States, and the remarkable and splendid people who have contributed so much because they had benefited so greatly.

Mr. G. J. Watumull is indeed an inspiration to those of character and integrity who possess ability and determination. His life is in the best traditions of America and a convincing proof that America is still the land of opportunity for those who are willing to set their sights on a star. Mr. Watumull's philanthropies light the way for others. The editorial follows:

HE FOUND SUCCESS AND FRIENDSHIP IN HAWAII

Hawaii mourns today the death of G. J. Watumull, 68, businessman, philanthropist, and civic leader.

His early life in his native Hyderabad, India, was one of struggle and hardship following an accident which incapacitated his father.

He managed to complete a 2-year engineering course and was working on an irrigation project in India when and older brother, Jhamandas, called him to Hawaii in 1917 to take over management of a small oriental goods store he had established in Honolulu.

The East India Store prospered and, later known as the Watumull Stores, expanded. The Watumull family acquired other business interests. As Mr. Watumull took an increasingly lively interest in civic affairs, he saw many educational and cultural opportunities to share his good fortune.

And so, in 1942, the Watumull Foundation was created. It has given help to such institutions as the Honolulu Academy of Arts and the Honolulu Symphony. It has helped to educate Indian students. It has helped to provide American-Indian lecture tours. It has encouraged birth control in India.

Mr. Watumull lived to see the achievement of two of his most cherished goals—Indian independence, and a new naturalization law giving Indians the privilege of becoming naturalized American citizens.

Mr. Watumull had taken out his first citizenship papers in 1922, but the Oriental Exclusion Act blocked his naturalization at that time. When the naturalization laws were amended in 1946, he was the first Indian to achieve American citizenship.

Much of his civic work was in the field of international understanding. He was a valued member of the World Brotherhood organization and a life member of Lions International. He participated actively in the recent East-West Philosophers' conference at the University of Hawaii.

His high moral principles, his unassuming, cultured, friendly demeanor won him the admiration and respect of all who knew him.

Here was a man of exemplary character who, from humble beginnings, achieved material success and generously shared the fruits of his efforts in projects for the cultural enrichment of his neighbors and the educational advancement of talented scholars.

Hawaii owes much to G. J. Watumull, not only for his philanthropies, but for the example he has set in personal achievement and in East-West friendship.

Retirement of Dr. Alfred Hall as Director of Forest Products Laboratory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on August 31, 1959, Dr. J. Alfred Hall will retire as director of the Forest Products Laboratory in Madison, Wis.

Al Hall has had a distinguished and a varied career, so there is little I can say on this floor of the Senate which will add to the luster of his accomplishments.

As a native Oregonian, I am proud that Al Hall has adopted our State. He served long and well as the Forest Service research director in the Pacific Northwest. His selection of Oregon for his permanent home speaks well of the attractiveness of Oregon and for the judgment of Dr. Hall.

I am doubly pleased today because I can announce that a native Oregonian, Dr. Edward G. Locke, will become the able new director of the laboratory.

The Forest Products Laboratory is one of our most important forestry research centers. It has and will continue to make outstanding national contributions to better wood use.

My warm compliments go to Dr. Hall for a pleasant and rewarding future. To Dr. Locke go my congratulations on his new position, and my best wishes for the success I know he will have.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an informative article from American Forests for August 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The article is entitled "Locke Succeeds Hall at Madison Lab."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOCKE SUCCEEDS HALL AT MADISON LAB

The U.S. Forest Service will lose one of its most colorful directors on August 31 when Dr. J. Alfred Hall retires from his post as head of the world-renowned Forest Products Laboratory in Madison, Wis. Dr. Edward G. Locke, chief of the institution's division of wood chemistry for the past 8 years, will be the new director.

The retiring director plans to settle in Portland, Oreg., so that he may specialize in "duck hunting on the Pacific flyway." Informed sources hint, however, that he may soon become a consultant for one of the Nation's largest industrial forestry firms.

Dr. R. E. McArdle, Chief of the Forest Service, expressed much regret over Dr. Hall's sudden decision to retire, saying, "During Al's tenure as director, the laboratory made significant progress, especially in the development of the cold soda pulping process. We are looking forward to continued achievement under Ed Locke, an eminent scientist in his own right."

The cold soda process is one of the most important pulping developments in recent years because it permits much greater use of low-grade hardwoods for the production of newsprint. The process is already in commercial use at the Bowaters plant in Tennessee and the Coosa River mill in Alabama. For this achievement the Pulp and Paper Division of the Forest Products Laboratory received a distinguished award, the first such award ever given to a governmental unit.

In addition to paper research, the laboratory also covers all aspects of timber utilization, from harvesting and milling to construction, engineering, preservation, packaging, seasoning, gluing, and laminating, chemical processing, and related fields.

Dr. Hall retires as the fifth director in the nearly half a century that the laboratory has been in existence. He began his Forest Service career in 1930 as a biochemist specializing in resin production of southern pines. At that time he predicted the conversion of the naval stores industry's 1,000 or more individual fire stills to the present-day centralized steam distillation plant with its superior product.

After tours of varying duration in the California and Central States Forest Experiment Stations, Dr. Hall served as a research specialist in the Washington office of the Forest Service during the World War II days, and then became director of the Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station.

Dr. Hall is a native of Paoli, Ind. He attended Earlham College, Indiana University, and the University of Wisconsin, receiving the B.A., M.S., and Ph. D. degrees in biochemistry from the latter institution.

Dr. Locke is a native of Portland, Oreg. He majored in chemical engineering at Oregon State College, and received a Ph. D. in organic chemistry from Ohio State University in 1932. After several years as a chemist for the Ohio State Highway Commission, he became assistant professor of chemical engineering at Oregon State College, serving also as technical advisor for the Oregon Forest Products Laboratory. From 1942 to 1944 he was a chemical engineer in the Bonneville Power Administration.

Dr. Locke joined the Forest Service in 1944, working first upon a wood hydrolysis process for production of ethyl alcohol. In 1945, he spent 5 months in Europe investigating the chemical utilization of wood in Germany. Following World War II he became chief of the Forest Utilization Service in the Pacific Northwest Forest Experiment Station.

Since coming to the laboratory 8 years ago, Dr. Locke has supervised a broadly ex-

panded program of research in production of industrial chemicals from low-grade wood, including residues from harvesting and milling. The scientists under his direction have concentrated on breaking wood into its component parts in order to transform it chemically into useful products. One of the most promising achievements has been the isolation of furfural, an oily substance, as a raw material for nylon manufacture.

Dr. Locke is a past national president of the Forest Products Research Society, and a member of the American Institute of Chemical Engineers, the American Chemical Society, and the Cosmos Club.

Congress Blocks Seat for Red China in U.N.

SPEECH
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 369—expressing the sense of Congress against seating Red China as a member of the United Nations, is good common-sense, straight and to the point.

It is clear, forthright, and faithful to American concepts of peace with justice.

The way that our national self-respect has been melting in recent weeks, I was dreading the day when the administration would invite the leaders of Red China to be the honored guests of the United States, and to enjoy our deferential hospitality.

The facts on Red China cannot be hidden. They cannot be changed by any wishful thinking.

Red China has trampled on every human right.

It has violated with cynical contempt, every principle of international law and morality.

The United Nations, after deliberate consideration, found it guilty of aggression against Korea. Every intelligent person knows that Red Russia instigated that attack, encouraged and supported it. But the U.N., frustrated by Soviet vetoes, and intimidated by Soviet threats, did not follow through and indict Red Russia as well as Red China.

The Peiping regime sent troops pouring into Korea to fight against the United Nations. It has failed to obey the mandate of the U.N. and clear itself of aggression by withdrawing its material support of the North Korean Reds.

It wants to gate-crash the U.N., and then blackmail that organization once it gets inside.

This outlaw nation, which is responsible for the deaths of tens of thousands of young Americans, and still keeps American civilians in illegal confinement, scorns all standards of civilized behavior.

Mainland China must never be accepted into the family of nations until the Chinese people purge their country of the brutal Communist oppressors who torture them, and who seek to extend

their power by conspiring against the governments of neighboring nations. This fanatical desire to enslave people is a form of mental derangement. It is a menace to the world.

With no respect whatever for the sanctity of human life, the new class called communism, with its tightly organized power elite in Red China is more repressive and cruel than any emperor or war lord of the old days, because it perverts all the modern knowledge and facilities at its command, to serve evil.

Its power is based upon lies, betrayals, and merciless regimentation of all the human resources under its whip. It is not the chosen government of the Chinese people. It does not represent their true and honorable interests.

I have only one reservation regarding Resolution 369.

It does not go all the way.

Instead of merely expressing opposition to the admission of Red China to the United Nations, it should seize the initiative and denounce Red China for its crimes against humanity.

However, it still has the courage to close the door to an aggressor.

That is a rare and valuable quality in this strange summer of appeasement.

This resolution, by the Congress, will tell the world that the American people are not backtracking.

We know that this world will never be safe for ourselves and other free peoples, and for those who aspire to freedom, until communism mends its ways—if ever—and gives conclusive evidence that it has abandoned permanently, the use of force and subversion as instruments of national policy.

No words will suffice.

We must have guarantees subject to the supervision and effective control of a grownup United Nations.

Until that day, Red China must be quarantined, to protect the uncertain peace.

I consider it a privilege to vote for this resolution that sternly rejects any proposal that Red China should even be considered for admission to the U.N.

Let us make it unanimous.

Migratory Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, a special Senate subcommittee was established this month to study the migratory worker problem in this Nation, and to recommend legislation which may end some of the difficulties which now face these men, women, and children who work for a few weeks or months in one county or State before moving on to farms in other areas. Scheduling of hearings is not yet completed, but it is hoped that the commit-

tee will gather facts from many parts of the Nation.

Some help for the committee's members was given in a very effective way this week by the New York Herald Tribune.

In these articles from the New York Herald Tribune, Mr. Braestrup points out the difficulties and complexities faced by county agencies and church groups in efforts to cope directly with some of the problems. And yet, despite these problems, these articles show that some progress can be made at a local level.

Until we have more awareness that there is a problem, however, and that many steps must be taken to end it, we shall not progress very far in any plan, on a local or a Federal level.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the articles from the New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

THE MIGRANT WORKER—FARM HANDS FIND SUFFOLK COUNTY CONDITIONS BAD, BUT NOT THE WORST

(By Peter Braestrup)

RIVERHEAD, LONG ISLAND, August 15.—"I could get me a steady job down in Virginia," says Robert Lee Hill, "I'd never go on the season. But a man's got to live."

From Huntington to Greenport to the Hamptons, the annual influx of some 5,000 southern Negro and 1,000 Puerto Rican migrant workers to harvest eastern Long Island's crops is hitting full stride.

Suffolk County, famed as a resort area, is also the Nation's No. 3 potato-producing county, and New York State's biggest employer-recruiter of seasonal, low-income farm labor.

As part of the migrant influx, Robert Lee Hill, 37, last month brought north a group of 15 persons, including his wife and three daughters, aged 4 to 9, to a migrant "camp" outside Riverhead.

They came from Suffolk, Va., by way of the May-June strawberry crop in Salisbury, Md., where they earned up to \$40 a week. The strawberries picked, Robert Lee loaded his group aboard his secondhand 1949 Dodge truck, with their pots, pans and bedding, and, avoiding costly toll roads, headed north for his second summer on Long Island, his 15th "on the season."

Lean, serious, soft-spoken, Robert Lee Hill was first recruited for potato picking in Long Island by a Suffolk County farmer last year down in Delaware. This season, that farmer had no work for Robert Lee, and he wound up parking his truck at Charles McKay's camp, on the fringes of a permanent Negro slum a few miles outside Riverhead and only a dozen miles from the beach resorts of Peconic Bay and the Hamptons.

"I got no complaints about the facilities," said Robert Lee's wife, May, "but the rent do seem high."

The drab barrack into which Robert Lee, 10 other adults, and 5 usually barefoot children are crowded is above average for Suffolk County migrant housing: five small bedrooms and a kitchen boast electricity, a refrigerator, hot-and-cold shower (required by law), a gas stove. Not required by the migrant camp law is a bathroom; the group must use a privy.

For this, the cut is \$50 a week plus utilities or over \$200 a month, roughly four times what comparable, rent-controlled housing

(with indoor plumbing) costs in mid-Harlem. At \$3 a person a week, the rent is average for migrant housing in eastern Suffolk County.

The high rent, coupled with little work due to the rains, discouraged Robert Lee and his group. Mr. McKay had no work for them at all. Two of Robert Lee's men left to seek jobs elsewhere. Then Mr. McKay, although he refused to advance Robert Lee any grocery money, agreed to let him pick and grade potatoes for other farmers, at roughly \$1 an hour.

"We make enough to get by on," Robert Lee says. "I hope the potatoes get good soon." Otherwise he will move on.

If all goes well, and the picking's good, Robert Lee hopes to clear \$350 or so for his family by October's end, when he returns to work for the winter at a peanut-processing plant at \$1.10 an hour, in Suffolk, Va. For most migrants, such a steady, if seasonal job down South is unusual; moreover, Robert Lee is both close enough and concerned enough to send his children back home to school while he stays out the harvest.

What about working year-round in Long Island? "Maybe a good inside job," says Robert Lee skeptically. "But it gets cold here, man, and I can't stand the cold."

Chances are that except for Sunday churchgoing ("we sometimes go three times a day") and a rare movie ("costs too much") in Riverhead, Robert Lee and his family will depart Suffolk County as much strangers and outsiders as when they first entered. Robert Lee is resigned to this and to his own life as a migrant. "Everything," he says cautiously, "is all right up to so far."

Of Robert Lee and his fellow migrants, Ray Jefferson, head of the Suffolk County Farm Bureau, representing most of the county's 1,400 farmers, has this to say: "We have to have 'em. There just isn't enough local labor available that wants to do the job."

Suffolk County's seasonal workers—like most of the Nation's estimated 500,000 domestic migrants now "on the season"—still suffer the lowest living standards, welfare benefits and wages (average 1957 income: \$892), of any Americans. Only Mexico's wetbacks and workers imported from the British West Indies do worse. The domestic migrant continues to be what Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell calls living testimonials to the neglect that is possible in a wealthy and aggressive economy.

In New York State, with 35,000 migrants due this season (versus 19,000 in 1949), press exposure of poor conditions in upstate migrant camps has led, since 1956, to some tightening of sanitation and health codes, despite Farm Bureau opposition. But minimum legal living space allowances (as little as 30 square feet a person over age 2) still permits severe overcrowding; and privies and shacks still remain the rule rather than the exception.

NOTES GAPS IN LAW

"The new laws are an improvement," says Eulalie Torres, farm placement director for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in New York City. "But serious gaps still remain in local enforcement."

Suffolk County, according to Mr. Torres and interested private groups such as the National Council of Churches, rates better than most areas. Says Herbert Hill, labor secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People: "Suffolk's not good, but whatever's bad there is 200 percent worse in many areas upstate."

A Herald Tribune survey of migrant conditions in Suffolk County showed that while considerable improvement has been made since 1957, especially in areas policed by lo-

cal health officials, wage and living conditions remain in marked contrast to those enjoyed by this prosperous county's year-round population.

CAN EARN \$50 A WEEK

Hourly wages, as reported by both farmers and workers, range between 75 cents and \$1 for fieldwork, up to \$1.15 for grading potatoes in processing plants. Piece rates vary. Working 10 to 12 hours daily 6 days a week, the relatively well paid Puerto Rican workers at the Steve J. Doroski farm and processing plant outside Greenport can earn up to \$50 in a busy week. On slower weeks, earnings drop as much as 50 percent.

Unlike local church and welfare groups, Paul Erwin, State farm placement officer in Riverhead, takes a sanguine view of migrant wages: "Hell, a man on the farm earning \$45 a week is as well off as a city man making \$85."

Putting migrant workers under a \$1 minimum wage law, as urged by Secretary of Labor Mitchell, would severely jolt Suffolk farmers, says Mr. Jefferson. Farmers are already smarting from last year's potato market, worst in Suffolk history, he adds, with uncertain prospects for 1959.

As Robert Lee's case shows, however, low wages, coupled with the workdays lost to rainy weather, make the Suffolk County migrant's lot even more chancy than the farmer's. The migrant is still unprotected by the benefits that most city workers now take for granted: The above-mentioned minimum wage, unemployment payments, workman's compensation, union fringe benefits, local housing codes, access to public health and education facilities.

Interviewed while resting after a day's potato picking, Robert Lee's lanky nephew, George, 15, made plain his determination to get out of the migrant stream: "I'm going to stay in school, and learn a trade, maybe go on to college. Being on the season gets you no place. On the season, you are nobody."

THE MIGRANT WORKER—SUFFOLK HEALTH DEPARTMENT TRIES HARD TO ENFORCE LAW AT FARM CAMPS

(By Peter Braestrup)

RIVERHEAD, L. I., August 16.—"We have the migrant workers here, we need them here for the potato harvest, and we have to be concerned with them," said John L. Barry, Suffolk County Public Welfare Commissioner and chairman of the county's migrant labor committee.

"Housing and better community relations remain major problems," said Mr. Barry, although, he added, "there has been great improvement."

Policing migrant housing in Suffolk County is the job of the county health department, whose camp inspectors are led by Sidney Beckwith. Roughly 40 percent of the county's estimated migrant population (5,000 southern Negroes, 1,000 Puerto Ricans) benefits from Mr. Beckwith's jurisdiction: Those in the county's 140 camps housing 5 or more persons. These camps, under newly tightened State codes must have a health department permit, hot and cold water, bathing facilities, good drainage, safe heating and cooking facilities. Privies and shacks, however, are still permitted and still prevail.

BEATING THE LAW

To escape State regulations and Mr. Beckwith's jurisdiction, many farmers resort to what Inspector Edwin Werner calls "the magic number game," placing migrant workers in scattered camps housing fewer than five persons apiece. Other operators open bigger camps without permits—often without water, heat, or even privies. Three such

operators have been caught in Suffolk already this season, and persuaded to mend their ways.

"There are still those farmers," said Mr. Beckwith, "who think of the migrants not as fellow Americans but as just an economic commodity. These farmers try to get by with the minimum."

Local and State farm bureau organizations have steadily opposed both local zoning and building laws—designed to upgrade all housing—and tighter State migrant camp codes. "We look at this from a practical point of view," says Ray J. Jefferson, executive secretary of the county farm bureau. "Every new regulation means a cash outlay for the farmer. You can't turn a migrant camp into a Waldorf-Astoria."

SOME ARE GOOD

A New York Herald Tribune survey of some two dozen representative migrant camps showed that the Waldorf has little competition in this area. However, some camps—and camp operators—demonstrate what can be done.

Among the migrant camps visited by this reporter, one of the best was David F. Wicks' camp off Route 25A in St. James. It housed a crew of a dozen Negro workers from Georgia, and far outshone most other camps elsewhere in Suffolk County.

Resembling a good motel, the white, stuccoed Wicks building, on the edge of the potato fields, provides a fully equipped kitchen, curtained casement windows, hot air heating, indoor toilets and showers for each sex, three high-ceilinged, spacious furnished bedrooms for married couples, a big bunkroom for the single men. All for free: Mr. Wicks reward: the experienced crew returns every year, causes no trouble or turnover, works hard, keeps the place clean. Off season the bunkroom is used to store machinery.

GOOD TREATMENT PAYS

"This is the ideal," said Mr. Werner, "and there is no reason every camp couldn't be like this. The expense is minor compared to other farm costs. Wicks treats his people like human beings and it pays off."

Something of a contrast is Suffolk County's largest migrant camp—the Eastern Suffolk Cooperative, Inc., isolated village at East Cutchogue, northeast of Riverhead. With a capacity of 267 persons, its drab wooden barracks and cabins house families and single men from Mississippi, the Carolinas, and Florida who have been recruited by the co-op, contacted through the State employment service, or arrived as "walk-ins" on their own. Many of the buildings, says Mr. Beckwith, should "be bulldozed under," even though occupancy ratios 30 square feet per person) and other criteria match State minimums.

The East Cutchogue camp has its own store—selling beer and plenty of chicken, Vienna sausage, rice, and beans—and its own messhall-style restaurant, the Dixie Belle Inn. Central latrine and shower facilities complete the layout.

UNIQUE SCHOOL

The camp showplace is the spotless school and day care center for migrant children, financed by both public and co-op funds. Migrants leave their children here while the adults work from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. in the fields. The children play games, rest, and get snacks and cod liver oil to offset what is usually a chronically unbalanced diet. The elementary school enrolls children of migrants who stay on into the fall grading season; it is the only such school in the State.

For workers averaging under \$1 per hour, with work interrupted by rain, the cost of living runs high at East Cutchogue. Weekly rent is \$3.50 per person; if meals are eaten

at the Dixie Belle Inn, another \$12 is added. Workers are paid off and these costs deducted in the camp office, says John Murphy, camp supervisor, "otherwise I'd never get any money." Most family groups do their own cooking in their crowded quarters.

Despite the dearth of adult recreation facilities and the camp's isolation, the recurring migrant problems—Saturday night drunkenness, occasional violence, and gambling—are no longer serious, according to Mr. Murphy.

Many farmers, like Charles McKay of Riverhead, charge similar rent, averaging \$3 per person per week for camps with privies but sometimes waive this rent when they cannot provide tenants with work.

Among the other camps visited by the Herald Tribune, many were in worse condition. One young Mattituck farmer, admitted that he expected to house two or three Negro migrants (one was already there) in an 8-by-8-foot shack that not only lacked even a privy, but also stood some 400 yards from the nearest watertap. When a health department inspector said such conditions violated local sanitary laws, even if the migrant camp code did not apply, the farmer expressed surprise: "They got all kinds of new rules."

"There aren't any local building codes or housing inspectors out here," said Mr. Beckwith. "We're about the only protection the migrant and the public has. Within the legal limits, we do pretty well."

THE MIGRANT WORKER—SUFFOLK CLERGY AIDING SHACK FAMILIES (By Peter Braestrup)

RIVERHEAD, L.I., August 17.—Here in Suffolk County, where 5,000 southern Negroes and 1,000 Puerto Ricans have come north to harvest potatoes and cauliflower, young local churchmen are seeking greater community effort to relieve the migrant family's abnormal living conditions, lack of recreation, and general isolation.

Says the Reverend Harry T. Cupp, chairman of the Suffolk County Council of Churches: "The situation has greatly improved, but it has a long way to go."

"One of our major problems here is apathy," said another leading member of the church council. "The established residents—Negro and white—would just as soon ignore the migrant. It's not hard to do. The camps are mostly out of sight, and many migrants are reluctant to venture out of them."

Nevertheless, the Council of Churches is hard at work. Among the projects in which it is involved:

1. Operating a 1-month summer school for some 30 migrant children, ages 6 to 12, at the Riverhead Congregational Church, with two full-time teachers, free transportation and hot lunches. Along with regular classes and games, Rev. Kenneth Nelson, in charge, is stressing simple hygiene education (washing regularly, brushing teeth). "This," he says, "is something which is also needed."

2. Recruiting children for a similar summer session, financed by the New York State Department of Education in the East Cutchogue public school, under the direction of Alfred E. Dart, school principal.

3. Teaching reading and writing English to adult migrants in night classes at the Congregational Church at Acquebogue.

Supplementing these church-state activities is a flourishing community-financed child daycare center for smaller children in Bridgehampton.

Backing up these local efforts is the Reverend Clyde Williams, a chaplain sent out by

the Migrant Ministry of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. Driving a green Migrant Ministry "Harvester" station wagon, Mr. Williams visits his parish, which is the camps themselves. His parish is large; some 130 camps were issued permits last year, and this season the total is expected to go even higher.

For the majority of his parishioners, Mr. Williams and his volunteer aids, provide the only outside human contact—aside from Health Department and State Police inspectors.

Mr. Williams shows movies on social security benefits, offers information on migrants' rights and duties, helps out on family problems and organizes singing groups and games of volleyball, baseball (a Puerto Rican favorite) and horseshoes. To draw a crowd to religious services at a camp, reports Mr. Williams, "we sometimes start off with a good western movie, then start the service."

SLUMS SPRING UP

Not only have churchmen led efforts to ameliorate the migrants' present condition, but they have also led an uphill fight against a major byproduct of the annual migrant influx: clusters of slums and shacks outside Riverhead, Bridgehampton and Greenport which provide the only housing available to the estimated 2,500 Negro migrants, who, over the years, have decided to stay on.

Biggest of the slums is a 200-family development on Riverside Drive outside Riverhead. Bordering the Peconic River marshes it is owned by Hollis V. Warner, once reportedly the world's biggest duck farmer.

Here many tenants are crowded into converted duck brooders next to sheds where thousands of ducks are still being raised by a local cooperative. Rentals run up to \$70 for four small rooms, with cold water and a distant privy. One 50-family section, "Tin City," is totally inaccessible to fire equipment.

OWNER COMMENTS

Interviewed on the premises, Mr. Warner confided: "With integration and all that, that's why they (the Negroes) are all up here. I don't blame those southern Senators for getting upset about it (desegregation). If 90 percent of them (the Negroes) came up here, you'd see how these northern Senators would act."

As a matter of fact, Mr. Warner indicated, he was doing his tenants a favor: "No one else is going to give them a place to live."

He refused further comment. His son John, interviewed later, admitted that "the conditions here might shock someone like you or me. But they (the tenants) are a different class of people. They're all happy with what they have here."

TENANTS DISAGREE

Tenants interviewed vehemently disagree; Riverhead's advisory committee on slum clearance, headed by the Reverend Herbert E. Perry, has condemned Mr. Warner's housing as a fire hazard.

In Bridgehampton, however, sparked by a lawyer, Bryan Hamlin, prospects are brighter. With Kenneth Gibson, president of the Bridgehampton Council, and other community leaders, Mrs. Hamlin has secured public support for a day camp for children in the town's 100-family Narrow Lane slum, helped organize a self-help civic improvement association, got State help on plans for building codes and, possibly, a local housing authority.

"Our task," said Mr. Perry in Riverhead of himself and his fellow ministers, "is to awaken the individual consciences of the community to what needs to be done. We keep trying."

A National Park To Honor the Minutemen of Concord and Lexington

SPEECH OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, this bill is timely.

We need to be reminded of our heritage, and to be inspired by it.

H.R. 5892, has been introduced by Mrs. ROGERS, who represents the district where the war for American independence began.

It will provide for the establishment of Minute Man National Historical Park to honor and perpetuate the scene of these stirring events.

At Concord and Lexington, a few men with faith and determination dared the impossible and won.

They did not take the easy way.

And they did not invite the oppressor of those days to visit the Colonies in the hope that they could persuade him to make a deal that would relax the tension.

They showed that they would not make peace at any price.

Guided by their heroic example that would not compromise with despotism, our Nation has become great and strong, not in material things alone, but in the devotion to liberty for which we are known and respected throughout the civilized world.

The scene of the events that gave birth to the American spirit, is in danger of being overrun by ranchhouses, suburban shopping centers, and express highways.

The bulldozer is practical.

It is unmoved by anything except petroleum products, and the man in the driver's seat, who takes orders from the construction superintendent, who follows specifications.

Is the liberty road useful?

Is it profitable?

Who cares for anything else?

The bulldozer is advancing upon the shrine of American independence.

People who understand the imperative need of strengthening the human spirit against the challenge of materialism are supporting this bill to establish a Minute Man National Historical Park in Massachusetts.

Where we can see unspoiled by modern overlay the scene, and the events associated with it, that the people of Massachusetts honor each year by the celebration of Patriot's Day.

Where the villagers and the farmers, on the 18th and 19th of April, 1775, fired the shots heard 'round the world for the cause of human freedom.

We must rekindle this spirit today, to save our Nation from the complacency and the compromises that threaten our national will and purpose.

We do not have much time.

The bulldozer, symbol and instrument of impersonal materialism, is leveling everything before it.

Need more be said?

Every American who cherishes the memory of those courageous and self-reliant minutemen of 1775 will support this bill to establish a national historical park in Massachusetts.

The Smokejumper Brigade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on August 14 there was published in the Christian Science Monitor an article entitled "Smokejumper Brigade." I wish to point out that the genesis of smokejumping occurred in my hometown of Missoula, Mont. Because of the many improvements which have been made in smokejumping since then, greater effectiveness has been developed in fighting forest fires, which have been so difficult to control in many sections of the country. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMOKEJUMPER BRIGADE

(From a roadside marker, U.S. Route 10, Montana: In 1910 this was a remote neck of the woods and hard to reach. Forest fire protection was relatively new. That dry summer many small fires started. Public apathy together with manpower shortage, lack of organization and good equipment, and inaccessibility permitted them to spread and join.

(Pandemonium broke loose in August. Whipped by 50-mile gales, the combined blaze covered 3,000 square miles in 3 days. Animals were trapped, 87 human lives were lost, settlements and railroad trestles were destroyed, 8 billion board feet of timber burned like kindling. The pungent smoke pall stretched to eastern Montana.

(Some good came from this costly debacle due to inadequate organization, funds, and public understanding. Legislation was enacted, appropriations were increased, cooperative effort was developed, and public became forest-fire conscious.

(Now U.S. Forest Service lookouts and aerial patrols discover fires while small, then smokechasers by trails and smokejumpers by parachute reach and control most of the fires in record time.

(This devastated area has been restocked with trees that will again produce commercial timber, and provide homes for wildlife and recreation for people.

(Fire-protection methods, equipment, and organization capable of handling future threats of dry summers will pay off in healthy watersheds and abundant forest products. An uncontrolled forest fire is a terrifying, destructive thing. Please be careful with your matches and campfires, won't you?)

(By Harlan Trott)

MISSOULA, MONT.—Where there's fire there's a smoke-jumping crew ready to hit

it in less than 20 minutes. That's as long as it takes Earl Cooley's elite corps of parachute firefighters to grab their packs and be off the runway of the U.S. Forest Service's aerial fire depot on the wide-open outskirts of this mountain-rimmed city in northwest Montana.

Missoula's highly trained airborne firemen stand summer-long guard over some 8 million roadless acres of Federal forest lands in Montana and Idaho. And the depot's northern forest fire laboratory is working on a year-round basis developing new equipment and new techniques to combat the menace of forest fires.

When the new forest-fire laboratory is finished next summer, Missoula will become the testing ground for surmounting critical forest and range fires. In fact, it will be a research center for nationwide forest-fire problems as well as special fire problems on 335 million acres of forest and watershed lands encompassing the whole intermountain West and Alaska.

SUNDAY DINNER AT MESS HALL

In a long two-story concrete dormitory, some 150 members of Missoula's airborne forest-fire brigade were sitting down to Sunday dinner in what was for all the world like a military mess hall and barracks.

Ranging from 18 to 28 years old, these seasoned young parachutists are recruited mostly from the colleges. Here they undergo the intensive training, and if need be the hard experience of airborne counterattacks on the forest-fire lines.

Nearby in the riggers' loft young Hal Samsel, of Missoula, a Marine Corps veteran, was overseeing the meticulous work of folding some used parachutes.

He hardly seemed old enough to be assistant loft foreman of this strategic aerial fire depot. But pinned to his GI fatigue cap was the Forest Service's mark of distinction: a little gold emblem of encircling wings with a gold parachute superimposed on a sky-blue enamel background, and the little gold numerals 50.

This signifies that Hal Samsel is a veteran of 50 drops in the skilled and arduous calling of a forest smokejumper.

Some dozen or so in the present force of 150 have earned this badge. They are a tough, seasoned nucleus—the first team, so to speak—in Earl E. Cooley's taut command. The project superintendent is himself a veteran smokejumper. He had 44 jumps to his credit before his promotion to head man.

RECRUITS HANDPICKED

Now he heads a force which averages six jumps a season per man. They are hand-picked recruits from 33 States, Hawaii, Cuba, and the Philippines. Although the smokejumpers have to carry a 47-pound pack when they jump, they are about average in size.

When the reporter remarked that they looked lean and wiry rather than beefy, Mr. Cooley grinned, explaining that a zest for hard work and know-how is what pays off in the hard and hazardous work on the forest-fire lines. "It may surprise you," he added, "but we have very few college athletes here. There's no substitute for enthusiasm."

Actually, the best crews, Mr. Cooley recalls, were the World War crews of 1943, 1944, and 1945. They were Middle West men slightly more mature than the normal crop of summer recruits. All were members of the Civilian Public Service, the wartime group that gave constructive noncombat occupation to conscientious objectors.

"They were mostly Mennonite farmers, Brethren or Friends," said Mr. Cooley. "One was a professor of engineering from Purdue. All had at least 2 years of college. I never saw their equal before or since. They learned quickly and worked hard. They never knew when to quit."

NO PREMIUM PAY

Out of 600 applicants this year, 50 were selected. Another hundred are holdovers from last year's campaigns. Recruits are given a year's trial elsewhere in the Forest Service, then if they still wish to volunteer for smokejumpers, they are considered on the basis of their seniors' personal recommendations.

They get paid \$2 an hour for an 8-hour day. They draw no premium pay for being parachutists. And their hourly pay for work on the firelines in excess of 8 hours is the same straight \$2 wage.

Asked if this has been a good year so far for smokejumpers, meaning have there been fewer than average fires, Mr. Cooley nodded, then added wryly, "but the boys don't think so."

Trained smokejumpers, they react like firehorses when the loudspeakers call them to combat. They don't seem to mind that straight overtime pay, either. Most of them are earning money to keep them in college.

It was just 19 years ago this month that the Forest Service's chief smokejumper jumped onto his first fireline in the Nez Perce Forest of western Idaho.

Everything here is in spectacular and heartening contrast to those times. In the historic 1910 summer, Missoula sent 50 volunteer firefighters afoot to the Selway Forest's fire. It was 10 days before anybody heard from them in the roadless wilderness. Smoke alerts in the Selway today mean that one of Mr. Cooley's teams of two, four, six, or eight smokejumpers can hit the fireline in half an hour.

RECORD OF COUNTERATTACKS

In the big forest blaze north of the Salmon River in Idaho last summer, Missoula's aerial fire depot dropped 50 men. Last year, this station, headquarters of region 1, made about 100 drops altogether. The Forest Service record for smokejumpers is 360 drops in a season.

Region 3, at Deming, N. Mex., has hit 13 fires so far this year. There's a longer dry season. Here at Missoula, June 15 to September 15 is the normal fire season—just right for the college recruits' vacation time availability.

Besides having its own airstrip adjoining Missoula's county airport, region 1 maintains a warehouse big enough to feed and supply airborne supplies for an army of 5,000 forest fighters.

That's how many bedrolls are stacked up in readiness for a major battle. And shovels, messkits, and a whole long checkoff list of tools and miscellaneous items to equip and keep 5,000 men on a major fireline.

Its immaculate shops are constantly working to refurbish the gear. There's even a "grinding room" where the smokejumpers' two-edged pulaskis are sharpened. A pulaski is like a double-bitted ax except it is forged with one blade turned at right angles like a hoe.

SPECIAL EQUIPMENT

Every smokejumper carries a pulaski and a long-handled shovel. The warehouse here is stacked rafters high with special equipment that is parachuted into a sustained battle area. Portable pumps and radio transmitters, bales of canvas files for shelters, oil stoves, kitchen boilers—you name it.

Bed rolls are free dropped. Practically everything else goes in by parachute. If a chute is snagged in a tree with a man in it, a 100-foot let down rope lands the smokejumper. To retrieve his chute or a stranded bundle of supplies, leg spurs, such as telephone linemen use to limb poles, are dropped at the site. Spurs are dropped in long slender cartons with the four sides of the lid secure horizontally so the package will spiral down. There's fiberboard, latticed

edgewise, in the bottom to cushion the landing.

Research, research. All the time, Mr. Cooley's laboratory force is testing new wrinkles in applied smokejumping.

When hungry grasshoppers started feasting on silk parachutes, Missoula came up with a low-porosity nylon fabric. Frank Derry, one-time chief rigger here, designed a chute with slots on one side the better to steer the smokejumper over the target area by accelerating the parachute's forward speed. A Derry even lets a smokejumper turn a full circle aloft.

SAFETY STRESSED

And safety above all is important for the daring young man who wants to finish his college education. In literally thousands of man drops, the U.S. Forest Service has never lost one. Some parachute innovations perfected at Missoula are now standard safety doctrine in military airborne methods.

That's why the Northern Forest Fire Laboratory is so important. Already the concrete foundations are laid. When the building opens in 1960, its fire-combustion wing will inject a new dimension into man's knowledge of forestry's worst enemy.

Forest-fire meteorology research equipment will be an important new adjunct to the aerial fire station President Eisenhower dedicated here in 1954.

Lightning, a major cause of fire in the West's forests, will be studied with the aid of new atmospheric measuring equipment. A radar room will tie in with a new U.S. Weather Bureau radar unit to be installed on the summit of an 8,000-foot peak a few miles north of this spacious meadow.

Mr. Cooley fought the 1949 fires. He remembers how his crew hit a wisp of smoke, started trenching the blaze, then saw the tree crowns "explode" and engulf 6,000 acres in 2 hours. The new laboratory has special meaning to these veteran smokejumpers. They discuss the expansion program with some pride and satisfaction.

Why Helping Hand for Khrushchev?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the August 7, 1959, edition of the Catholic Bulletin of St. Paul, Minn., written by Archbishop William O. Brady:

WHY HELPING HAND FOR KHRUSHCHEV?

MY BELOVED PRIESTS AND PEOPLE OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF ST. PAUL: The people are rarely told what it is that our diplomats are really after. Sometimes we wonder if they know themselves. Our national line is so knotted up with misinformation that we face the coming weeks with dismay.

Our national stomach ought to be all butterflies at the impending visit of Mr. Khrushchev. The feeling is the same that any one of us knows when fear, uncertainty and frustration are mixed. Add now the realization that our diplomats seem blind to the realities of the latest Soviet maneuvers.

That the plans of Mr. K. have matured exactly as he hoped for, who can doubt? If

the United States has been blind, the people of Europe have not.

The responsible people with whom the archbishop talked last May pinpointed what our Government still does not grasp. Mr. K. has been leading from weakness, and he has bluffed us again. Most of all, he has wanted a cloak of respectability and we are going to wrap him in it, at our own suggestion.

How stupid can we get, especially when, almost without understanding why, we had Mr. K. on the defensive? We had a knife in him in a most sensitive spot. It hurt.

But no one has had the sense to follow up the thrust, to twist the knife around, to take advantage of the opportunity and to push the blade in further until it touched a vital spot.

Instead we have pulled back our hand and kissed the scratch.

Never in many years has the Soviet squealed as they have recently done over the action of our Government on the Captive Nations Week. That hurt. The Commies showed they were hurt. Mr. K. was more than annoyed. He was angry.

He let his rage fly openly. Why shouldn't he? We had touched a spot he could not defend. The ring of captive countries is restless and was hopeful. If there has been any laughter in them of late, it was to watch Mr. K. squirm on the TV, froth at the mouth on the radio, and try to turn into a joke what the whole world knows as Communist colonialism and Communist tyranny.

But what did we do about it? Our legislature passed resolutions and they were better than the legislature realized. A Captive Nations Week was organized. The churches were solicited to join prayers to proclamations. The plight of the captive nations was mooned over and moaned over, but just for a day.

Meanwhile, our statesmen did not let the people know the truth. They themselves did not know the sharpness of the steel they had forged.

Our top men began to make toasts, to pour in oil and wine and to cancel their advantage by inviting Mr. K. to a visit which blasts the hopes of captive people everywhere and strengthens the hand that holds them down.

Oh, the shame of it all. As the captive nations notion caught fire, the archbishop began to reproach himself that he had not publicized it more and given an added push to the evident advantage which our beloved but befuddled country sorely needs to have.

But now the archbishop is glad that he did not. The Captive Nations Week proposal has been a fraud. The diplomats did not mean it.

Meanwhile Mr. Nixon smiled and apologized without vigor and explained almost nothing. He knew what was happening. We did not.

He could have followed up the captive nations thrust with some pointed questions, such as why Russia has violated more than 50 of her agreements with us, why there has been no explanation of the shooting down of our planes, why the Soviet forces are in Hungary, in Germany, all through the Baltic and lately come to Albania.

But no. He was extending invitations. He was expressing pious but impractical hopes.

We are now committed to smiles and handshakes, to welcome ceremonies and amiable diplomatic chitchat, all of which will soothe Mr. K.'s wounds and tighten the chains on the captives he has as well as those he plans to secure. It is enough to make one sick at heart.

There is evidently no refuge in statesmanship. Let us continue to take refuge in prayer.

Devotedly in Christ,

WILLIAM O. BRADY,
Archbishop of St. Paul.

H. A. Dunn, of the University of Texas, Distributed Books to the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the example of the life of H. A. Dunn has inspired many people—particularly young students both at the University of Texas and in other countries.

For 30 years Mr. Dunn has been superintendent of various buildings at the University of Texas, including the law building. He is now retiring from his official position, but many former law students will always carry with them memories of his part in the life of the university.

He is a warm friend of many students in many other countries as well because of an unusual service which Mr. Dunn has been rendering our world. He has helped fill a hunger for books by collecting in America and forwarding to the rest of the world nearly 700,000 volumes.

Mr. Dunn was affectionately called Dean by the students at the University of Texas.

Dunn's warmly human action in initiating the distributing of books to the world was showing his real feeling of the people of the world and of the concern which Americans feel for people in other countries. This is person-to-person diplomacy.

In addition, Mr. Dunn also collects and distributes toys and clothing to needy youngsters at Christmas.

H. A. Dunn is a man with ideas of helping others and the ability and willingness to work to bring his dreams to fulfillment. He is a man of action as well as a man of dreams. He has actively aided me in contests for good government in Texas. He is a worker for idealism in action, and for integrity in government.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Austin (Tex.) American for Wednesday, August 12, 1959, entitled "Dean Dunn—Lifter Is Lifted at Fete."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Austin (Tex.) American, Aug. 12, 1959]

DEAN DUNN—"LIFTER" IS LIFTED AT FETE

(By Anita Brewer)

It will take more than 69 years and a day chock full of parties to retire H. A. Dunn.

The slight, kindly, and always cheerful man of many talents was honored at a special law school assembly and reception at the University of Texas' Townes Hall Tuesday as he retired after 30 years as superintendent of various buildings at the university.

He still has 2 days to go at his job as superintendent of the law school building, but

he already has future plans enough to fill up another three score and nine years.

"I may write a book," he says. "If I do I'll name it 'The Uppish Boy.'"

To those who know him that sounds a bit autobiographical, and he admits it. "Folks always said I was a fa'ward young 'un," he says.

And forward he's always been. It takes a special talent, a special forwardness to accomplish all he has. Perhaps he is widest known as the collector and distributor of three-quarters of a million books to reading-hungry peoples all over the world.

Each Christmas he collects and distributes clothing and toys for less fortunate children in East Austin, and he intends to continue his mission work in that area. He has high hopes and dreams of improving the lot of scores of unfortunate children.

Thomas J. Gibson, assistant dean of the law school, was master of ceremonies at a noon assembly Tuesday honoring Mr. and Mrs. Dunn. In tribute he said:

"Because of Dean (they always call him Dean at the law school) Dunn, the United States has many friends behind the Iron Curtain we would not have had if it had not been for him." It is to those countries he sent thousands of books.

Bob Larkin on behalf of the Law School students presented Dunn with a bronze plaque of appreciation.

Law School Dean W. Page Keeton paid the faculty tribute to Dunn. Paraphrasing Oliver Wendell Holmes, Dean Keeton said, "Mr. Dunn has brought to his task a mighty heart and a genuine interest in his work." He presented Dunn with an engraved desk set from the law school faculty and called him the law school's "best public relations."

In acknowledging the honors of his associates, Dunn said:

"I like young people, middle-aged people, old people. In fact, I like people."

He quoted the message he carries on a card in his pocket all the time: "We make our living from the things we get. We make our lives from the things we give."

Although Dunn's life has been and will continue to be one of service, he has been honored at other times—by the great and by just folks. He has letters of praise from U.S. Senators, from heads of state throughout the world and from Drew Pearson.

Ten years ago Pearson said of him: "Dunn's project (the book project) was all his own; no sponsors, no organized drive, no money to help him—which makes him, in this column's eyes, a real servant to brotherhood."

But Dunn says all his work has been successful because of the help of others. Kind and generous people furnished the money—lots of money—to ship the books to embarkation points from where U.S. ships carried them to their destinations.

Although he values the letters and praise from the mighty, the letters that have brought tears to Dunn's eyes have come from students and the hungry—those who needed more than bread.

One such letter came from the Philippines:

"You really lighten my misery."

Another from a student in Brazil:

"I can't just believe that in our days, when everywhere people are speaking of war and other terrible things, there is a man like you, who thinks only of how to help poor foreigner students."

A poet once said there are two kinds of people—the ones who lift and the ones who lean. Dunn is one of those who lift, and that is why hundreds of his friends honored him Tuesday at a noon assembly and at a 2-hour reception in the afternoon.

Statement by Bishop Griffiths on Population and Future U.S. Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, a thought-provoking statement by a high Catholic Church leader has just come to my attention which, I believe, should be of considerable interest to my colleagues. It is a statement on "Population and Future U.S. Policy" by Bishop James H. Griffiths of New York.

Bishop Griffiths' statement is an analysis of an issue raised in the Draper Committee Report on Foreign Aid pertaining to proposals that the Federal Government sponsor birth control programs as part of assistance provided to foreign governments. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert Bishop Griffiths' statement:

POPULATION AND FUTURE U.S. POLICY

I.

The problem

For some 10 years a Neo-Malthusian doctrine—of obvious Anglo-Saxon-Scandinavian inspiration—has been gathering steam in United Nations circles and in organizations interested in United Nations affairs with the apparent purpose:

1. Of influencing national and personal opinion in favor of family planning programs in populous countries;
2. Of utilizing United Nations agencies, i.e., World Health Organization, Food and Agriculture Organization, Technical Assistance Program, UNICEF to assist such countries and their citizens in effecting such programs;
3. Of obtaining world recognition for the morality of such a doctrine and the right to hold and propagate it. Public opinion in the United States is crucial for this purpose. Churches, women, wealthy businessmen, and scientific scholars are being effectively mobilized to produce and guide it.

The underlying fact

The introduction into underdeveloped and mainly agrarian countries by the United Nations and other aid agencies of mass health measures (against malaria, tuberculosis, yaws, infant mortality) and feeding and relief programs has reduced mortality rates significantly without affecting the high fertility rates.

This is especially true of Asia, which is presently most heavily populated, and also of Latin America; official prognostications are for geometrical and frightening increase in two generations. The economic gap between developed countries where scientific progress leaps forward, and the underdeveloped countries, does not lessen but widens.

Arguments advanced by proponents of family planning

Economic: The argument goes that there is not sufficient opportunity for these countries to amass capital, train people, industrialize, and thus raise the general level of living because all available resources go into providing mere subsistence for the ever-increasing number of dependent mouths to

be fed. Even bare necessities such as food must be imported. There are no opportunities to export in relation to the imports necessary. Hard-won advances in economic development are thus wiped out.

Political: This condition of treadmill poverty, it is contended, leaves the way open to Communist agitation, penetration, and eventual domination. People will barter liberty for bread. The example of China, which through its oppressive slavery can produce more food for its vast population than democratic India does by gentler methods for its vast population, is feared. Help to India to slow up its population growth becomes a must.

Racial fear: Rarely admitted, but expressed in his inaugural address by Prof. Robert Matthey, zoologist and new rector of the University of Lausanne, last November, is perhaps an unconscious motive of most Western Neo-Malthusians.

"Overpopulation is a general phenomenon whose rhythm in Asia, Africa, and South America is a rumbling threat to Europe. In the next century * * * there will be four Asians to one European. Surely it is a duty for us Europeans to preserve our human community and save ourselves from being diluted by the tide of peoples whom the ancient Greeks would have called barbarians: Is it really our role to offer ourselves like resigned victims and prepare our succession? Genocide is hideous. Autogenocide, or collective suicide, would it not also be hideous and stupid? So, 2,000 years after the Christian revelation, 100 years after the message of Darwin, the thinker must choose between the scientific law of struggle and the moral law, which for us Europeans means our progressive eviction from the world scene."

Professor Matthey, obsessed, like other scientists and economists, by this danger of overpopulation which he links to the yellow menace, went so far as to deplore the success of the scientific methods of preserving the prolonging life initiated by Pasteur, and to incriminate medicine, hygiene, and social legislation. Losing all sense of human values, Professor Matthey even laments the fact that a growing number of the population is taken off the productive circuit to care for the sick and the old who refuse to die. Finally, he condemns in the name of science, the influence of the soft religions which inculcate a love of one's neighbor and a code of ethics whereby victory is given not to the strong but to the peace-loving. Professor Matthey maintains that he is a Christian.

Economic assistance: In this interdependent world, where aid by the richer to poor countries is necessary for political freedom and world prosperity and trade, apparently many comfortable and wealthy businessmen in the United States regard the undisciplined fecundity of the poorer nations much as their forebearers regarded the large families of slum areas—an unproductive and thoughtless drain on their generosity—"money down a rat hole."

Personal freedom: However mixed the motives of some proponents may be, credit for sincerity must be given to sentimentalists (this includes the great majority of American non-Catholic clubwomen) who see women in Asia and elsewhere with a pitifully low status as to personal freedom (arranged early marriage, polygamy, etc.) and as to educational and economic opportunities chained to an apparently endless routine of slavish childbearing and economic and social misery.

Undoubtedly there are some planned parenthooders in this group, although their favorite arguments are population pressure

and fear of communism. Since fear of communism is now the style, they are linking it for popular appeal, to their cause. This group is gaining respectability and influence. It sends people all over the world to promote its programs, in many cases receives government subsidies, e.g., British West Indies and Singapore.

Parental responsibility: Many Protestant churchmen maintain that parents do not exercise their responsibilities if by having too many children they cannot afford their education and training. This responsibility they maintain extends to the community (by not imposing an unnecessary burden on it), to the future world (by ensuring standing room), and to world peace (by preventing armed quests for lebensraum a la Germany and Japan). The Protestants are elaborating the notion of responsibility into a theological doctrine which envisages birth control within the married state as the will of God. Chief agitator in the United States for an ecumenical movement among the churches in this regard is Richard Fagley of the National Council of Churches of Christ. The Lambeth Conference for the Anglicans on a world scale, the new Anglican bishop of Southwark who is a crusader for the cause and various national or local groups of Lutherans, and other denominations have gone already on record in favor of birth control. Mr. Fagley includes in his ecumenical concept "millions of Catholic laymen who disagree with their church on this matter and who thus provide an effective counterpoise to the erroneous official Roman Catholic position."

The methods used and contemplated to achieve the goal

Local and State Action

Planned Parenthood announced a number of years ago that it would work to get incorporated into every local and State health and welfare board. It has tried also to get accepted on community chests. The measure of its growing strength is not merely acceptance on such boards, but the legal or administrative victories its proponents have won in New York hospitals and the Pittsburgh Board of Public Assistance.

At its recent meeting in New Delhi the International Planned Parenthood announced it would concentrate on getting the repeal of hostile national or State legislation or the enactment of actual new enabling legislation, which would permit sterilization, etc. The North Carolina case is an example of progress. The single-minded (and well-financed) efforts of this organization leave no room for doubt that there will be increasing cases on the local and State level for legal and administrative action to introduce birth control, sterilization, etc., into public institutions as accepted social practice. This will be done apparently not only for the good of these local communities but also to build up national sentiment and precedents so that birth control could be constructed to be a respectable national policy. The work of the churches (both Protestant and Jewish groups) already invests this aim with the mantle of morality. The appeal of responsibility and sound family life, with overt or veiled references to the Catholic Church's benighted lack of interest in the terrifying facts of population increase and their implications among its adherents, contrives to make the church appear an enemy of the people.

National Action

The United States is undoubtedly the key to the hopes of those who would like to give official birth control aid to the populous yellow, brown, and black, or even the Catholic light tan, countries. Therefore, the ultimate target is Congress, which holds the purse strings. Because there is already some sentiment (United States, United Kingdom,

or Scandinavian induced) in favor of birth control aid in the U.N.—Japan, India, Ceylon, Pakistan—it may be hoped to secure action in the U.N. with U.S. backing.

Early efforts to introduce birth control policy in the World Health Organization and the Population Commission were defeated largely, in the first case by the International Committee of Catholic Nurses in Geneva, and in the second, by the World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations in New York. The official policy of the U.N. Secretariat is not to make any formal recommendations in this field. However, Secretariat studies on social progress, health, economic development, and population abound in references which can only be interpreted as allusions to the need for population control by family planning. In regional meetings and seminars, proposals by Government participants have been made, e.g., Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, the Bangkok Seminar on the Participation of Women in Civic Life, but no formal action taken.

Activity Within U.N.

Actually there have been two U.N. projects related in an exploratory way to family planning. At the request of India, the World Health Organization sent Dr. Abraham Stone (recently deceased), a pioneer "birth controller," to that country to study the effectiveness of the rhythm method in limiting families. (He reported it was a dismal failure, so now India has artificial birth control and sterilization as a national policy.) The U.N. Technical Assistance Administration sent a mission to study the effectiveness in family planning services in Barbados. (Conclusion: "highly efficient from the economic point of view as compared with other measures to relieve overpopulation" but will affect the birth rate little "unless and until it reaches younger women with smaller families.") This is a personal conclusion of the expert.

The 12th General Assembly passed a resolution in 1957 asking for studies on the relationship between demographic and development (economic and social) problems of underdeveloped countries. This was introduced by a Peruvian. It can safely be predicted that pressure of facts and studies backed by a growing public sentiment will increase the danger of U.N. involvement.

Official U.S. policy thus far is "hands off."

Activity in U.S. Circles

Many U.S. delegates to the U.N. unofficially but more or less publicly, hold that birth control is necessary. Thus, (1) U.S. delegate to the Population Commission, Kingsley Davis of the University of California, laments in the New York Times magazine, *Foreign Affairs*, and undoubtedly elsewhere, that the United States is prevented from giving help to dampen the population explosion by a medieval obscurantist minority (i.e. the Catholic Church). (2) Years ago (1952) the chief U.S. economic adviser frankly stated in an off-the-record briefing in Paris that overpopulation in Italy was an invitation to the Communists and regretted that only an under-the-counter method to control population could be used. (3) The present U.S. delegate to the Human Rights Commission, Mrs. Mary Pillsbury Lord, comes of a wealthy business family which heavily subsidizes the International Planned Parenthood Federation and makes no secret of her own sympathies to control the terrible population explosion. She travels unofficially extensively in Asia and Africa; her targets for human rights matters are mostly women. The State Department naturally opened all doors possible.

(4) The most recent example of this ill-advised but calculated campaign may be found in the interpretations given by leading U.S. press agencies to recommendations of the Presidentially appointed Draper

Committee on Foreign Aid (see UP story as appearing in Washington Post, July 24, 1959; also New York Times story, same date) to assist economically underdeveloped countries which are experiencing rapid population growth.

The committee chairman, William H. Draper, Jr., is quoted in the UP story, July 24, as saying, when asked if this country is supplying (birth control) information . . . "I presume so—informally, not formally."

(5) Mr. Fagley, executive secretary of the commission of the churches on international affairs of the World Council of Churches and International Missionary Council (who is the world council's representative at the U.N. for technical assistance and economic development matters) states his belief in a constant stream of writings and speeches that birth control should be a part of the U.N. technical assistance program. He does not blame the Congress or the U.N. for not adopting birth control, as long as the churches did not make their will known. He is now in the process of directing that will, with the results noted above.

(6) The Planned Parenthooders of Washington, D.C., recently went on record (meeting in an Episcopal church to hear among others a representative of the New York Council of Churches) as seeking World Health Organization programs in birth control for underdeveloped countries—and our own.

(7) The U.S. committee for the World Health Organization (heavily loaded) met in May to consider among other things the population problem.

(8) The Foreign Policy Association, a private, nonpartisan, educational organization, each year puts out an analysis of foreign policy issues to help American citizens realize more fully the responsibilities they must exercise if this Nation is to act in world affairs with . . . wisdom and . . . realism . . . It disclaims a position on any questions raised. These issues are debated in numerous groups throughout the country in which many Catholics participate. In its 40th anniversary statement (November 1958) it raises the "population explosion" question. Among possible solutions relating to emigration, resettlement, food, water, housing, etc., under the title "Was Malthus Right?" the questions are asked: "Should the United States give financial and scientific support to the intensive search now being made to discover inexpensive contraceptives? To what extent does our experience with Puerto Rico—and with immigrants from that island—serve as an example of what might be accomplished elsewhere?" Newspaper chains and publications throughout the country continue in this vein and exploit the psychology of terror.

II

Some observations on these arguments

From all that has been written above, it will be seen that there is abundant evidence of a systematic, concerted effort to convince U.S. opinion, legislators and policy makers that official U.S. national agencies as well as international bodies, particularly the U.N. should provide, with public funds and support, assistance in promoting artificial birth control for underdeveloped countries. The purpose, as often remarked, is allegedly to prevent a "population explosion" engendered by advance in health techniques and services which has cut down the mortality rate. Although it is recognized that industrial, social and cultural advancement is usually accompanied by a decrease in fertility, the proponents of artificial birth control maintain that the "population explosion" presently endangers economic development and therefore, political freedom and world peace. Their mathematical projections of birth increase take little account

of other factors, including economic, social (e.g., position of women, high rate of illegitimacy, and polygamy) and cultural factors and changes. Moreover, if they claim the right to project population increases, they must concede the right to project production increases of foods as well.

U.S. Catholics and the moral issue

The position of U.S. Catholics in relation to the growing and needy population of the world is grounded in the natural law and respect for the human person, his origin, freedom, responsibility and destiny. They believe the goods of the earth were created for the use of all men and that men should not be arbitrarily tailored to fit a niggling and static image of what they are entitled to by those who are more fortunate, greedy or lazy. The hidden reservoirs of science and of the earth will be uncovered and offered to humanity by the optimists with faith in mankind, and not by those seeking short cuts to comfort.

U.S. Catholics believe the promotion of artificial birth control would be a morally, humanly and politically disastrous approach (ineffective even for its own aims) to a problem, the real solution of which requires sustained effort in a sense of human solidarity. They are prepared to dedicate themselves to this effort, already happily begun in official national and international circles, as well as by nongovernmental groups.

U.S. Catholics will not support any U.S. public assistance to other countries to promote artificial birth control, abortion, sterilization, for whatever purposes, whether through direct aid or by means of international organizations. Nor will they support international technical assistance, health or economic aid agencies or organizations which include such projects in their programs.

The basic reason for this position is conscientious objection to promoting a moral evil.

U.S. Catholic attitudes toward other aspects

However, quite apart from the moral issue there are practical reasons why Catholics would not wish to see any official U.S. favor given such specious methods of assistance.

Social: Man himself is the most valuable productive agent. Therefore, economic development and progress are best promoted by creating conditions favorable to his highest development. Such progress implies discipline, self-control and the disposition to postpone present satisfactions for future gains. The widespread use of contraceptives would hinder rather than promote the acquisition of these qualities necessary for the needed social and economic changes in the economically underdeveloped countries.

Immigration: Immigration and emigration have their role to play as a factor in solving the population problem. Both must be made more free between nations. Likewise, the migration of people from place to place within the same country must be facilitated. Many places lack manpower for economic development. Others have it in excess. Often migration of the surplus is impeded by lack of railroads and road systems. Hence, improvement of communication is an objective also to be studied. It has been said that migration to other countries is no ultimate solution because of difficulties of absorbing populations into other economies. But migration has de facto helped as a solution in the past. Sixty million people migrated successfully from Europe to the Americas in the last 150 years. When the nomadic Indians roamed the uncultivated plains of North America before the coming of these immigrants, the entire country with its estimated Indian population of only 500,000 and shortage of food, according to the norms of present day planned parenthooders, would have been regarded as overpopulated. Yet, the same plains today

are being retired into a land bank because they are overproductive in a land of 175 millions.

Economic: It is a recognized duty for the richer countries to help needy nations so that their people and their nations may live and develop and themselves aid and enrich the worldwide community of peoples. The possibilities of this aid in the form of financial and technical assistance, trade agreements, commodity prices, marketing possibilities, migration opportunities have only begun to be explored by the United States or the United Nations. Technical and scientific advances in our country and other developed States offer ever new possibilities to men of good will and a modicum of imagination and effort. What, for instance, has happened to the food-for-peace plan, and how much is the United States paying to store its surplus grain? Could these rental costs be used instead for transportation costs of the grain to needy areas?

Bad economics too: Despite the promises of birth controllers, contraceptives in terms of the yearly incomes of the citizens in underdeveloped nations are not cheap. In the United States, as far back as 1942, the contraceptive industry totalled \$2 billion. India has recently allocated \$10 million dollars for the promotion of contraception and is attempting to arrange for the construction of two separate factories for the distribution of contraceptives. It has 700 clinics distributing birth control information. It is certainly uneconomic to invest heavily in such nonproductive industry when capital is so badly needed for agricultural and industrial development. The educational drive needed to propagandize for the use of contraceptives could be far more effectively used to change ineffective ancient agricultural practices and to promote technical training.

Political and psychological: Soviet Russia in its wooing of underdeveloped countries does not press artificial birth control propaganda on them as a remedy for their ills. It offers education, loans, technical assistance and trade, and boasts that its economic system is able to use human beings in constructive work and to meet all their needs. The Russian delegate to the recent meeting of the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East said, "The key to progress does not lie in a limitation of population through artificial reduction of the birth rate, but in the speedy defeat of the economic backwardness of these countries." It has been speciously alleged by planned parenthooders that contraception will thwart communism. A little reflection will explode the fallacy of the prophets of "population explosion." Granted that the Soviets have proven in the past to be callous and unscrupulous in liquidating millions of their own population, the great masses in the underdeveloped countries do not know or do not remember this. Hence, their reactions must be as simple as this: If communism tells these presently highly sensitized groups: "The imperialists want to cut down your growth because they are afraid of your increasing numbers and because of the inadequacy of their economic system. We shall feed you no matter what your numbers," while on the other hand, the free world says, "You are overpopulated and cannot be fed. To eat, to live, to progress you must cut down your families and we'll give you the know-how"—shall we be able to blame the gullible and undiscerning if in the future they cast their lot with the Communist bloc?

The question is asked: Why do Americans spend so much time, effort and money seeking a short-cut inherently contemptuous of the human person, when they are continually airing their surplus food problem and their luxurious standard of living while their neighbors are crying for material,

moral, and spiritual solidarity and assistance? If this solidarity and assistance are forthcoming, the dangers of their adopting communism and war as solutions are minimal.

Racial: The West in its passion to control the population is suspected of harboring the same fear and motives expressed recently by Prof. Robert Matthey, rector of the University of Lausanne to whom reference has already been made. This narrow vision of humanity and human relations, and the suspicion that this racist, selfish attitude dominates that part of Western opinion intent on limiting Asian, African, and Latin American fecundity, hurts Western and more specifically U.S. prestige and impedes friendship perhaps even more than stories of racial discrimination in the United States.

Asian women visiting the United States on Government exchanges have been programmed to birth control organizations. Suspicion of motive follows on such a directed tour of what may be sold merely as the American way of life.

Concern for the human community and the sound development of international organization

The United States is an important member of the United Nations, which thus becomes a part of U.S. policy. Great numbers of U.S. Catholics, from motives of patriotism and from a sense of the universal solidarity of the human race, wish to see the United Nations improved and perfected and increase its effectiveness as an instrument of international justice: Of defense of the human person and his dignity, and of world peace. These persons do not wish to ignore or minimize the problem of population pressure. But these U.S. Catholics do deplore and object to the efforts of all those and especially Americans, who, however sincerely mistaken, would prostitute the United Nations and its agencies to unworthy and uncertain programs by using every fantastic argument, every hysterical fear and terrorism, bland misrepresentations of data, naive misunderstandings of real issues to bolster the fixations of birth controllers.

These latter, for example, do not place in proper focus the idea of increasing the acreage and the acreage yield to meet the food demands of an increasing population, by stating that this requires extensive education, a lengthy period of time, new distribution methods, and the elimination of apathy, greed and superstition. This is pure begging of the question. It never seems to dawn on them (or does it?) that in a chronic condition where we have more people than food, the logical answer would be, not to decrease the number of people but to increase the food supply (or as G. K. Chesterton put it: We cannot solve the problem of uncovered heads by cutting off the heads but only by producing more hats). Is this too much work—or do people simply not count? * * * especially if they are peoples of pigmentation?

If the problem of population is simply the one of feeding people, the potential is almost unlimited. Estimates of land areas which could be brought under cultivation vary from 4 to 11 billion acres. With scientific methods acreage yields can be increased to fabulous proportions. Rarely if ever are mentioned the equally expert opinions of renowned scientists. By way of example, Prof. Colin Clark of Oxford University concludes that the earth could now provide a standard of living comparable to that of Holland for a population of 10 times the present population of the world. This type of agricultural development is already at hand despite the fact that a relatively small amount of money has been invested in agricultural research. Total agricultural research in the United States has a budget of about \$100

million, roughly the cost of one atomic submarine.

CONCLUSION

In these observations we have attempted to face realistically the problems connected with a growing world population within a morally acceptable framework. We have made no allusion to the marvelous discoveries which are just around the corner. For example, we shall soon be able to convert sea water for industry and irrigation at a price competitive with present water supplies. We have not even touched on the tremendous potential of atomic energy. We have not spoken of farming the seas as they can now be farmed for plankton. The problem would seem to be primarily economic, and not genetic unless the goal is genocidal. We must not permit the United States to be stampeded or terrorized into an international policy inimical to human dignity, based on the unilateral "guesstimates" of special pleaders who could win for us from underdeveloped peoples, the accusation of suavity and hypocritically plotting for them a form of urbane, furtive but nonetheless effective genocide.

The Need for Refugee Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the August issue of the American Federationist contains an excellent article by Hyman H. Bookbinder clearly presenting the need for refugee legislation. It points out how desperate is the situation of the 2 million refugees and how urgent it is that we participate in World Refugee Year by a modest program such as is contained in the Walter bill in the House and the Kennedy bill in the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Federationist]

LET'S HUMANIZE OUR IMMIGRATION LAWS
(By H. H. Bookbinder, AFL-CIO legislative representative)

Since July 1, 52 nations around the globe—including the United States—have been observing World Refugee Year. The result of a resolution adopted by the United Nations General Assembly, World Refugee Year is a "human year"—in contrast to the scientific aspects of the recently concluded International Geophysical Year.

"What a refugee wants most is to cease being a refugee."

This is the way the tragic problem of the world's millions of refugees was summed up by Claude de Kemoularia, special representative of the U.N. Secretary General for the World Refugee Year.

"We have a home, sir. What we need is a house to put it in."

This the way it was summed up to visitors to a refugee camp by a 10-year-old who with her family had lived all her life in the camp.

And another girl, one who probably has already become the world's best known and most honored refugee in modern times, has summed up both the despair and the pray-

ers of the world's refugees. Anne Frank, the 13-year-old escapee from Hitler Germany, wrote in her diary, 8 months before her death in a concentration camp:

"It's really a wonder that I haven't dropped all my ideals, because they seem so absurd and impossible to carry out. Yet I keep them, because in spite of everything I still believe that people are really good at heart. I simply can't build up my hopes on a foundation consisting of confusion, misery, and death."

"I see the world gradually being turned into a wilderness. I hear the ever-approaching thunder, which will destroy us, too. I can feel the sufferings of millions. And yet, if I look up into the heavens, I think that it will all come right, that this cruelty too will end, and that peace and tranquility will return again."

"In the meantime, I must uphold my ideals, for perhaps the time will come when I shall be able to carry them out."

Anne Frank's words of hope should inspire us all to redouble our efforts during World Refugee Year.

The Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, Jr., dean of the Washington Cathedral, is chairman of the U.S. Committee for Refugees, the group which has the major responsibility for American participation in World Refugee Year. AFL-CIO President George Meany serves as vice president of the committee and Joseph Beirne, chairman of the AFL-CIO Community Services Committee, is a member of its board of directors.

On the last Sunday before July 1, Dean Sayre devoted his sermon at the Cathedral to World Refugee Year. In a special litany for refugees, Dr. Sayre reminded us of the many areas in the world which cry out for help:

"For those who await salvation in the camps of Europe;

"For Chinese who have abandoned familiar paths to seek freedom among strangers;

"For children of Arabs whose lives are enclosed in barricades of bitterness;

"For pilgrims of Tibet who brave the mountain passes to keep their souls in liberty;

"For Algerians and Koreans fleeing from the ravages of war;

"For Jews and Gentiles who struggle against tyranny and oppression;

"For the destitute migrants of India and Pakistan;

"Lord, hear our prayer."

The U.S. Committee for Refugees has formulated a modest governmental program for American participation in World Refugee Year. AFL-CIO President Meany has endorsed this program as "the very least that the administration and the Congress should approve."

Needless to say, it cannot be expected that the world's millions of miserable, homeless refugees will find complete solutions to their problems during the next 12 months. But it can be hoped that during this period there can be an acceleration of our efforts so that a sizable number of refugees can begin to live in dignity, in comfort and, most of all, in hope.

During this World Refugee Year, moreover, it is to be hoped that a greater understanding of the refugee problem can be achieved among all the peoples of the world, including the United States, and that the proper basis may be laid for helping us meet our continuing responsibility in this crucial area for years to come.

In a recent statement before the Senate Judiciary Committee, the AFL-CIO testified that the most meaningful, most lasting and most appropriate thing Congress could do during World Refugee Year is to liberalize and humanize our basic immigration policies.

Immigration reform is only one facet of the total refugee problem. Relatively few of the world's homeless will ever have the opportunity, or the desire, to come to the United States. Their hopes lie rather in finding a secure haven either in the land where they now are, in some other land culturally and otherwise bound to the country of their birth, or in returning to their native land.

But just as immigration is only part of the broad refugee problem, so refugee relief is only a part of the broad immigration problem. Even if there were no homeless groups of human beings driven from or escaping from all types of tyrannies, or the tragic consequences of wars, the United States would still be faced with the challenge of modifying its immigration laws.

Our basic immigration law, the Walter-McCarran Act of 1952, has not reflected either the humanitarian, compassionate, democratic convictions of most Americans or the actual practices of the United States Government.

During the period since the adoption of the Walter-McCarran Act, over a Presidential veto, there have been many harsh words spoken about that act—words spoken by both its defenders and its critics. As is so often true in political debate, neither side has been the model of objectivity.

If it is true that the act reflects discredited notions of racial superiority, as I believe it does, it does not follow that its authors or its supporters are "bigots" or "racists."

And, on the other hand, if it is true that the act's critics desire to change the law in order to allow more people, with less difficulty, to get to the United States, as I do desire, it is not true that we advocate unlimited numbers of immigrants or that we don't care whether subversives or criminal elements come in.

Although there are significant differences between these defenders and these critics of our basic immigration law, I do not believe that the differences are so irreconcilable that we cannot make substantial progress in bringing our law into harmony with American humanitarianism and actual American practice.

The AFL-CIO, from its very formation in 1955, has called upon Congress to "revise and liberalize the Walter-McCarran Act to reflect the democratic and humanitarian traditions of our country and to provide an immigration policy attuned to the present requirements of our Nation and of the entire free world."

The AFL-CIO believes that the number of quota immigrants admitted annually can be increased from the present quota of 155,000 to 250,000 without undermining employment opportunities for American workers.

The AFL-CIO is fully conscious of its responsibilities to its membership when it makes this recommendation. We do not overlook the fact that there are still more than 3 million American workers totally unemployed. It does come to our attention every now and then that a recent immigrant is working at a given job while an "American" is without work. But we are just as conscious of the fact that other "Americans" are at jobs created by some creative, imaginative "immigrant."

We do not forget that thousands of "Americans" are able to retain their jobs because thousands of "immigrants" are buying shoes and milk and television sets and are going to the movies and eating in restaurants and sending their laundry out.

What are we talking about when we talk about 250,000 immigrants? We are talking about one-seventh of 1 percent of the present American population. We are talking about 1 new American added to 700 other Americans.

We are talking about one-sixteenth as many new Americans from outside our bor-

ders as will be born inside our borders. Yes, we are talking about 250,000 persons born all over the world to join with 4 million born each year to American parents here at home.

It is difficult for me to understand why our rapidly expanding native population is listed by economists and other observers of the social scene as an unmitigated blessing, but an increase in our population one-sixteenth as great looms in some people's minds as a national calamity.

In this connection, it must not be forgotten that only a portion of all immigrants—sometimes no more than a fourth or a third—are jobseekers. But every immigrant is a potential customer for the products of American workers.

And, of course, every employed immigrant is a producer who contributes to our total wealth, and with his earnings he becomes the customer for himself and his family.

To put it another way—what makes America the prosperous Nation that it is? It is the combination of its labor force and the material resources of the Nation brought together by creative management. The more there is of each of these factors, the greater is the wealth potential of the country. This is not just theory. The great waves of immigration to this country were always followed by great gains in our national prosperity.

The key to continuing prosperity in the United States does not lie in protectionism—neither the protectionism of tariffs nor of immigration restrictions. It lies rather in keeping our economic system properly balanced between production and consumption, so that the full production potential of the factors of production are properly matched by the consumption demands of our people.

We do recognize, however, that a sudden, major increase in our labor force could cause dislocations. We no longer have uncrossed frontiers. Automation has eliminated many jobs. There are dozens of economically distressed communities. For these reasons, the AFL-CIO does not advocate unrestricted immigration. We cannot be indifferent to short-run distress of our people. But we can afford to be much more generous than we are now.

The heart of our present immigration policy is the "national origins" quota system. It is significant that this approach was enacted following the First World War and was reenacted following the Second World War. During both of these periods this country was experiencing reaction to international entanglements, suspicion of foreigners and general intolerance of new ideas.

The essence of the national origins quota system is that quotas are assigned to the nations of the world in proportion to the numbers of Americans in 1920 who came from or are descended from those who came from those countries. As a result, countries like England and Germany and Ireland have large quotas which never get filled, while countries like Poland and Italy and Greece have never been able to meet more than a small part of their requests for visas.

The national origins quota system, regardless of the conscious motivation of some of its backers, is based upon two false notions which the AFL-CIO thoroughly rejects: (1) that the population "mix" of 1920 is exactly right and anything else is "un-American," and (2) that there are some nations in the world which will provide better Americans than others.

As to the first, that America as it was in 1920 has some very special virtue, this is arrogance and unrealism of the worst sort. The population of America before 1920 was different from what it was in 1920, and the population after 1920 has changed every year since then. And it will—as it should—continue to change.

One of the unfortunate things in our history is that almost every generation of Americans has viewed succeeding ones with suspicion. The English immigrants distrusted the Irish; together they suspected the Germans; then all of them joined together in vilifying the Italians, and then the Slavs, and then the Chinese, and the Jews, and the Greeks.

Despite this history of initial distrust of new peoples, the record of adjustment, of integration, of accommodation is a glorious story. What we once used to refer to as the melting pot of America is now more appropriately and accurately described as the mosaic of American culture.

Assimilation and integration do not mean uniformity. It means that generation after generation America has shown its ingenuity in working out harmonious relationships between different cultural strains. Together, these strains have given us a composite known as American.

If there is anything like a purebred Anglo-Saxon American, he is probably like Martin Arrowsmith, whom Sinclair Lewis described as a union of German, French, Scotch-Irish, perhaps a little Spanish, conceivably a little of the strains lumped together as Jewish, and a great deal of English, which is itself a combination of primitive Briton, Celt, Phoenician, Roman, German, Dane, and Swede.

For more than 400 years, starting with Christopher Columbus and his fellow voyagers, each wave of immigrants has brought something to add to the American story. There have been many great periods in American history. But only 1 year in its long and proud history is numbered 1920. What is so particularly attractive about that year?

Perhaps even more appropriate than the mosaic, the true image of America is the kaleidoscope. It is a mosaic of human beings that is always changing but encased in a basic framework of freedom, of brotherhood, of tolerance, of creativity.

The fact is that we couldn't retain the 1920 "mix" even if we were all determined to do so. The large quotas assigned to some countries just do not get filled, while those of other nations are always exhausted. Special acts by Congress have permitted large numbers of refugees and relatives of American citizens to come in, without regard to national origins quotas. And even if we closed our borders completely and let no immigrants come in, we could do little about assuring a continuation of the existing "mix."

Hitler's plans for preserving the racial pattern in Nazi Germany were crude and inhuman. But his nonsense about the so-called Aryan race is based upon the same myths which explain the initial formulation of the national origins quota system.

Every serious study of this question has concluded that there is no such thing as racial superiority. Each race and each people produces a wide range of ability and intelligence. Behavioral patterns reflect the tensions and the opportunities of the respective societies.

There is nothing in the individual's genes which explains criminality or intolerance or subversiveness. For every criminal or subversive with a foreign-sounding name, the records are replete with hundreds of scientists, musicians, industrialists and every other type of positive contributor to the American way of life.

The national origins quota system has no place on the American statute books. It reflects an un-American policy of racial superiority; it fails to reflect the needs of a democratic America in a changing world.

In the absence of unrestricted immigration, there must be some criteria for selection of those who can be admitted in the

place of the national origins quota system. We would support any standards which flow from this basic consideration:

Which people does America need most, and which people need America most?

Earlier this year Congress itself most eloquently rejected the philosophy of the national origins system when it voted to admit Hawaii as a State. Our newest State has an Oriental majority. Of the 600,000 Hawaiians, 38 percent are Japanese and only 20 percent are white. Among these whites are not only Americans but Norwegians, Germans, Russians, Poles and Portuguese. And there are Filipinos, Chinese, Puerto Ricans and Koreans.

All of these Hawaiians have lived in peace and in harmony for many years. Now they will continue to do so, but as full-fledged American citizens.

Because of the belief—a belief which we hope is unjustified—that Congress is not ready to make basic changes in the immigration law at this time, most of the bills in the 86th Congress deal with only limited aspects of the problem. Only two bills (the Celler bill in the House and the Kennedy bill in the Senate) strike directly at the national origins quota system, although almost all proposals would strike at it indirectly by giving special consideration to certain groups of applicants.

Almost every one of these "halfway" bills contains worthwhile improvements in our present law. Some would increase the number of immigrants; some would permit the "pooling" of unused quotas and thus yield extra numbers to some countries; some would provide special arrangements for refugee-escapees; some would facilitate family reunification.

The AFL-CIO hopes that this Congress will defy the predictions of the pessimists and vote a basic immigration reform. If it does not do so, we do want to see progress toward that goal. When the suffering of human beings is involved, when families are waiting to be united, when refugees who have never seen a private home continue to yearn, we would not advise Congress to wait until a completely satisfactory bill can be passed. But we do earnestly hope that Congress will give its serious consideration to basic changes in the law and then go just as far as possible in the development of an immigration law consistent with democracy and humanitarianism.

Oneonta (N.Y.) Star Describes Work of Hébert Investigating Subcommittee as Well Worth Pursuing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the work which the Special Investigations Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee under the chairmanship of the able gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] has been doing in looking into defense contract practices has gained the attention of the whole country.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Record a thoughtful analysis of the work of this committee which appeared editorially in the Oneonta Star of August 17, 1959:

[From the Oneonta (N.Y.) Star,
Aug. 17, 1959]

HÉBERT COMMITTEE PROBE IS WELL WORTH PURSUING

The billions spent on military equipment and supplies are acknowledged to be an essential part of the price we pay for defense in an uncertain world. Because of this, few Americans object to these tremendous expenditures. The very magnitude of defense contracting heightens the chances of abuse, however.

Instances of overcharging of the Government have come to light in recent months. Now it appears that other kinds of unethical behavior in connection with defense contracts may also be widespread.

A House Armed Services Subcommittee of which Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT, of Louisiana, is chairman, has started to probe the activities of former military officers and Defense Department employees now working for defense contractors. The committee wants to know what kind of work such persons do, and whether there is a connection between their employment and the defense contracts their firms get.

The mere fact that an investigation has begun does not mean that there has necessarily been wrongdoing. The number and variety of complaints about possible defense contract maneuvering suggest, however, that something is wrong. The Hébert committee probe is well worth pursuing.

University of Wisconsin Researchers Plan More Antarctic Trips

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that in view of the worldwide efforts of communism to gain footholds wherever it can, it is important that we keep a watchful eye on its progress all around the globe.

Too, it is important that we protect U.S. rights, as well as promote efforts to assure that new lands and resources be utilized, insofar as possible, for peaceful purposes to serve mankind.

Today, I refer specifically to the Continent of Antarctica. My colleagues will recall that earlier this session I introduced a bill, S. 764, to establish a commission for coordinating our antarctic program—until now, unfortunately, scattered among 14 different agencies of the Government. The purpose of the proposal was to provide the foundation for as effective a policy as possible in relation to Antarctica.

Currently, a recommendation is under consideration to put our antarctic program under the National Science Foundation. The transfer would provide the Foundation with authority similar to that provided in my bill S. 764.

If the transfer occurs, I sincerely hope it would succeed in adoption of as effective a policy as possible for protecting U.S. rights on the Great White Continent.

I am, however, adopting a wait and see attitude.

In view of the fact that the Soviet Union is extremely active in Antarctica, I believe it imperative that we be alert to protect U.S. interests.

As a matter of fact, I am frank to say that, in the past, I have had some misgivings about the lack of a clearer definition of our antarctic policy.

Despite this hazy situation, it is gratifying to note that U.S. exploration of the area is going forward. Recently, the New York Times carried an article entitled "U.S. Explorers To Map Unknown Antarctica." The article reveals a number of the explorative projects underway, including greater emphasis on exploration relating to geology, cartography, and biology of the antarctic region.

Particularly, I am proud to point out that the University of Wisconsin has played a significant role in research of the continent at the bottom of the world. Recently, the Milwaukee Journal, also, carried a fine article by Laurence C. Eklund entitled "University of Wisconsin Researchers Plan More Antarctic Trips."

As fine illustrations of the research and exploratory programs, I ask unanimous consent to have the articles printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 17, 1959]
U.S. EXPLORERS TO MAP UNKNOWN ANTARCTIC—SCIENTISTS TO STUDY NEW FIELDS ON TRIP—START IN OCTOBER

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON, August 16.—The United States in the coming year will explore unknown areas of Antarctica, attempt to determine if the frozen continent is divided, and study the birds and fishes of the polar region.

These plans for the exploration in 1959-60 were announced today by the National Science Foundation, which has been given responsibility for directing the U.S. antarctic research program.

The program for scientific exploration, beginning in October, calls for greater emphasis to be placed than in the past on geology, cartography, and biology of the antarctic region.

In explaining the shift in scientific emphasis, Dr. Alan T. Waterman, Director of the Foundation, pointed out that during the International Geophysical Year, the investigations had been primarily in the field of geophysics.

"Many very basic questions about the Antarctica remain unanswered, as for example the locations of mountain ranges and the types of marine life around the continent," he said. "Work during the forthcoming year will attempt to fill in many of these gaps in our knowledge."

The Foundation announced the award of \$3,170,069 in grants to support the program of scientific research and exploration. The funds will go for 29 projects ranging from extensive oversnow traverses of the continent to a study of the nasal discharges of the penguin.

Logistic support for the scientific program will be provided once again by the Navy, which is preparing to send another fleet of supply ships and icebreakers to Antarctica as part of Deepfreeze 60. The naval support force will be under the command of Rear Adm. David M. Tyree.

Two Navy icebreakers will attempt to penetrate the previously unexplored waters of the Bellingshausen Sea. Aboard the ships will be a team of scientists to gather information in biology, geology, cartography, oceanography, and glaciology.

The U.S. research program will be carried out at seven installations in Antarctica, some of which are operated jointly with the Governments of New Zealand, Argentina, and Australia. Thirty-five U.S. scientists will remain through the 1960 antarctic winter. Twice that number will be doing research in the coming summer.

The research program will get underway in October—the start of the antarctic summer. Two oversnow traverses by snow tractors are planned for the summer. One traverse party, consisting of seven or eight scientists, will climb the Skelton Glacier from McMurdo Sound for a 3-month survey of Victoria Land. This is a desolate, ice-capped expanse, 7,000 to 8,000 feet high. Seismic sounding and gravity, magnetic and glaciological studies will be made along the route in addition to geological investigation in the Skelton and Hallett areas.

A second party will leave Byrd Station in October for a 1,200-mile traverse of Marie Byrd Land to the coast near the Amundsen Sea. Geological and geodetic studies will be conducted in the executive committee and Hal Flood Ranges.

In addition, there will be an airborne traverse. On this, scientists of the University of Wisconsin will land by plane at 8 to 12 points along the 88th West Meridian between Horlick and Sentinel Mountain. They will carry out seismic, gravity, and magnetic investigations, these may establish whether the continent is divided by a trough running between the Weddell Sea and the Ross Sea.

The Foundation also announced that preparations are underway for two traverses in the 1960-61 season. One of these would go from the Byrd Station to the coast of the Bellingshausen Sea and the other penetrate the high polar plateau in the area between McMurdo, the Soviet station Vostok, and the South Pole station.

As part of the biological research program, studies will be made on the ecology of the Ross Sea area, the fish in McMurdo Sound, the sexual behavior and orientation of the Adélie penguin. Also to be studied is the theory that salt taken in by the penguin is eliminated through nasal discharges.

The programs of U.S. scientists during the 1960 winter season, starting in March, will be as follows:

Byrd Station: Eleven scientists will winter at Byrd Station pursuing studies in atmospheric noise, aurora, geomagnetism, glaciology, ionospheric physics, meteorology, and seismology.

Amundsen-Scott Station: Nine scientists will carry out investigations in aurora, geomagnetism, glaciology, ionospheric physics, and seismology as well as special studies in solar radiation, ozone measurements, carbon dioxide, and nuclear radiation.

Naval Air facility, McMurdo: Four scientists will investigate cosmic rays, conduct glaciological measurements, perform seismic soundings, and operate the biological laboratory there.

Hallett Station: In cooperation with three New Zealand scientists who will carry out auroral, geomagnetic, ionospheric, and seismic observations, two U.S. civilian meteorologists and three naval aerographers will make daily upper air and surface weather observations and conduct research in solar radiation.

Ellsworth Station: With Argentine scientists, who will operate the station, four U.S. scientists will do research on the aurora, cosmic radiation, geomagnetism, ionospheric physics, and meteorology.

Wilkes Station: Australian and U.S. scientists will carry out projects in auroral investigation, biology, geomagnetism, ionospheric physics, meteorology, and seismology at this Australian-operated station.

Scott Station: At this New Zealand post, two U.S. oceanographers will investigate the waters and the ocean bottom of McMurdo Sound. A U.S. physicist will work with a New Zealand scientist on problems of auroral physics.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Aug. 16, 1959]

UW RESEARCHERS PLAN MORE ANTARCTIC TRIPS—SCHOOL HAS BECOME ONE OF THE NATION'S IMPORTANT CENTERS IN SUCH STUDIES.

(By Laurence C. Eklund)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The University of Wisconsin has become one of the most important antarctic research centers in the country as the result of the allocation of more than \$700,000 in Federal funds to the university.

The National Science Foundation, which allocated a total of \$3,170,069 for scientific research in Antarctica, beginning October 1, granted the University of Wisconsin \$566,985 to prepare for geophysical traverse programs in 1960 and 1961. The money will be spent for field work as well as research at Madison.

One traverse will leave the Byrd Station in the antarctic in November 1960, for the Bellingshausen seacoast, through a region never before explored.

Another traverse will seek to penetrate the high polar plateau between the U.S. Navy air facility at McMurdo Sound and the Russian station Vostok.

NOW AT WILKES STATION

Plans for those field studies are being worked out at the University of Wisconsin under the direction of Drs. G. P. Woollard, Charles R. Bentley and Edward C. Thiel, a native of Wausau, Wis.

Under a second grant of \$135,930 to the university, the same three investigators will continue to reduce the seismic gravity and magnetic data collected on the traverses.

A third grant of \$20,023 to the University of Wisconsin will finance a study of the climatology of the antarctic by Dr. Glenn P. Trewartha.

Richard L. Penny, who is working on a Ph.D. degree at the University of Wisconsin, is now at the Wilkes Station in the antarctic investigating orientation in the Adélie penguin and the parental and sexual behavior of the Adélie.

Penny's work will be carried on during the new exploration year beginning October 1 at the U.S. Hallett Station. The Wilkes Station was established by the United States but the American scientific program there is now being carried on cooperatively with the Australian Government.

HOPE FOR PROFILE

Probably the most dramatic undertaking of the new expedition will be an air borne traverse for seismic, gravity and magnetic investigations to be put into the field by the University of Wisconsin.

This project could determine whether the antarctic continent is divided into East and West Antarctica by a deep, ice filled trough between the Weddell and Ross Seas.

Dr. Thiel, who will direct the project, will be flown with two assistants along the 88th west meridian between the Horlick Mountains, named for the Racine (Wis.) malted milk family, and the Sentinel Mountains.

Their plane will be equipped with instruments, recently developed and refined, which, it is hoped, will enable them to take a profile of the land mass below. Thiel and his assistants will be landed at from 8 to 12 points along their route.

Thiel, now 31, got his doctorate at the University of Wisconsin in 1955. Before that he studied glaciers in Alaska. In 1956 he took a leave of absence from a teaching job at the University of Utah to do scientific work at the Weddell Station.

On that expedition Thiel, while on a traverse, used seismic soundings to detect a deep trough extending inland toward the Ross Sea from the Filchner ice shelf.

The bottom of the trough was found to average almost 4,000 feet below sea level, and Thiel's traverse party reported that the trough continued beyond the southerly limits of the traverse, swinging toward the southwest.

This may represent the Weddell Sea side of the hypothetical transantarctic trough.

DEPTH OF 4,400 FEET

More recently Bently led a traverse from the Byrd Station to the Horlick Mountains in a further effort to solve the problem of the trough's existence and exact location.

The newest evidence that the continent is separated by a trough was the discovery recently of the greatest bottom depth yet found beneath the Ross ice shelf.

A traverse party led by Albert P. Cray, chief scientist of the U.S. antarctic program, measured a record depth of 4,400 feet below sea level by a seismic sounding.

The existence of the trough was first suggested by Griffith Taylor, geologist with the 1901-04 British national antarctic expedition, led by Robert F. Scott.

Taylor's theory was based on studies of antarctic geography and the geology and geography of the nearby continents of South America and Australia.

The trough's existence is also suggested by the deep penetration into the interior of Antarctica of the Ross Sea on the Pacific side and the Weddell Sea on the Atlantic side.

THREE THOUSAND MEN INVOLVED

The Navy said Saturday that Operation Deep Freeze '60, the new name for its antarctic operation in support of our scientific program, will get underway this month.

Eight ships, three dozen aircraft and 3,000 men will be involved. There will be four icebreakers, two cargo ships, a tanker, and a destroyer escort.

Most of the scientists, including those from Wisconsin, are expected to fly to Christchurch, New Zealand, whence they will be flown to McMurdo Sound about October 1.

TASS REPORTS EXPEDITION

Ships of the task force will begin their unloading and loading operations December 10. They will all stage through New Zealand ports.

The icebreakers *Glacier* and *Burton Island*, said the Navy, will attempt to penetrate the Bellingshausen-Amundsen seacoasts in February to obtain oceanographic, cartographic and geological data of that unknown area.

Tass, the Russian news agency, said last week that the All-Union Arctic and Antarctic Research Institute in Leningrad had begun preparation for the Soviet Union's fifth expedition to the Antarctic, where the Russians maintain five stations.

Rear Adm. David M. Tyree: New Commander, U.S. Naval Support Force, Antarctic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in a statement to the House of Representatives on July 28, 1959, I included a biographical sketch by Harry

W. Frantz, distinguished foreign correspondent of the United Press International, of Rear Adm. George J. Dufek, the retiring commander of the U.S. Naval Support Force, Antarctica.

A sequel to that news story is another informative biographical sketch also by Mr. Frantz of United Press International of Rear Adm. David M. Tyree, who, on April 14, 1959, succeeded Rear Admiral Dufek as commander of this important task force for antarctic exploration.

Under leave to extend, I quote the indicated news story, which is most informative:

REAR ADM. DAVID M. TYREE: NEW COMMANDER, U.S. NAVAL SUPPORT FORCE, ANTARCTICA

(By Harry W. Frantz)

WASHINGTON.—Rear Adm. David M. Tyree foresees an era of development on the Antarctic Continent, leading toward permanent human habitation and utility to world science, communications, and economy.

Tyree became commander of the U.S. Naval Support Force, Antarctica, at New York on April 14, 1959, relieving Rear Adm. George Dufek, who commanded Operations Deep Freeze I, II, III, and IV. He also serves as U.S. antarctic projects officer, by Presidential appointment.

He is now making the plans for Deep Freeze 1960. The Roman numeral system has been abandoned in favor of identification by fiscal years: thus 1960 is the 12 months ending June 30, 1960.

Tyree will leave Washington September 10 for New Zealand, and on October 1 will fly to the U.S. McMurdo Sound Base. In the approaching antarctic season, 8 ships, 35 airplanes, several helicopters, and about 3,000 men will be engaged in the support operations for the scientific program sponsored by the National Science Foundation.

The year is considered extremely important in the evolution of Antarctica's future. Twelve countries which engaged in antarctic projects during the International Geophysical Year, 1957-58 intend to continue their antarctic researches.

They presently cooperate through an international special committee for antarctic research. On October 15, representatives of 12 nations including the Soviet Union will meet at Washington to attempt negotiation of an international treaty, proposed by President Eisenhower, for cooperation in scientific and other peaceful purposes. Territorial claims in Antarctica would be kept in the status quo.

Like his naval predecessors in the antarctic support operations, Admiral Tyree is not directly involved in antarctic diplomacy which is handled by the State Department, except as technical advice is required.

Tyree already has brought unusual technical viewpoints and a novel philosophy to bear upon the United States outlook toward Antarctica.

"We are approaching a new era in Antarctica, and looking to the future," he said to the United Press International. "If the new international treaty is concluded, there will be a long period of international scientific cooperation."

"We would hope that in the years to come we could organize our efforts on an economic basis, and obtain the scientific knowledge that the world needs. Who knows what Antarctica may mean in the coming 'space age'?"

"There will be a rising interest in the future need for air routes across Antarctica, such as have already been established in northern polar regions."

Tyree believes that nuclear reactors, to be used for heating buildings and to melt

ice for clean water supplies, could greatly increase the possibilities of permanent human habitations at the Antarctic stations. There is a possibility that a nuclear reactor may be installed at the McMurdo Sound Base early in 1961.

The admiral said that for a century world interest in Antarctica was chiefly directed to the geographical exploration of the unknown continent. Later there developed a combined interest in exploration and the advancement of scientific knowledge, which culminated in the International Geophysical Year program of 1957-58.

"Now," he concluded, "we are on the threshold of what may be called an era of development, with prospects for completion of the exploration and many opportunities for advances in scientific and other peaceful enterprises."

Apart from his distinguished service as a line officer in Pacific theaters during World War II and the Korean conflict, Admiral Tyree is especially known in the Navy for his technical contributions in the field of explosives and propulsion materials. A graduate at Annapolis in 1925, he later received the degree of Master of Science at the University of Michigan in 1934, and he also had advanced courses in the National War College.

His official duties have involved long contact with scientific institutions and with technical establishments of the Navy. His reputation for successful collaboration with scientists was an important consideration in his appointment as commander of naval support operations in Antarctica.

The continent is sometimes called a great scientific laboratory. Good will and effective collaboration between the scientists and the Navy is indispensable to maximum success of the U.S. program.

International cooperation in Antarctica puts a premium on diplomacy. Admiral Tyree is a quiet-mannered man who thinks before he talks. While under his command, the U.S.S. *Rennville* in the Java Sea was used for the successful cease-fire operations between the Netherlands and Indonesia under auspices of the United Nations.

The Government of the Netherlands awarded him the Order of the Orange of Nassau, rank of commander.

Admiral Tyree was born in Washington, D.C., January 23, 1904.

In 1943 he was awarded the Legion of Merit for participation in all phases of the Solomon Islands campaign and fulfillment of extremely hazardous assignments at the occupation of the Russell Islands and the assault on New Georgia.

In 1944 he was commended for his staff services in training, planning and conducting operations of the Third Amphibious Force against the Japanese at islands in the Bougainville area.

In June 1944 he was assigned to the Bureau of Ordnance, Navy Department, and in the same year he was Navy member of the Army's Chemical Warfare Committee. He was commended by both services.

For operations of the U.S.S. *New Jersey* during the Korean conflict he was cited for brilliant leadership, sound judgment and inspiring devotion to duty.

Improving Housing Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as we give further consideration to the hous-

ing legislation, I would like to call attention to provisions relating to the loan authority for the FHA program.

Over the years, the FHA has performed a splendid service to the people of the country. During its lifetime, the FHA—through its mortgage insurance programs—has helped to provide homes for millions of American families, and housing for hundreds of thousands of other families in rental and cooperative projects.

In Wisconsin, over 3,000 home mortgages, amounting to over \$37 million, were processed in 1958 alone. During the period 1935-58, the FHA insured 39,671 mortgages in our Badger State.

Overall, this program has helped to make it possible for three out of every five American families to own their own homes. Although a federally sponsored program, it is significant to the American taxpayer that the FHA is self-supporting.

Important, to, is the fact that there have been relatively few loan delinquencies. As a matter of fact, a nationwide survey recently indicated that currently, the delinquency rate for FHA—as well as the GI home loan program—has been at an all-time low during the 3-month period preceding June 30, 1959.

Although I frankly feel that the FHA authorization should be put on a permanent basis—as recommended by the administration—the amendment adopted yesterday to provide an additional \$8 billion loan authorization and extend the program until October 1, 1960, will at least carry the program forward.

At this time, I am pleased to point out that my home State of Wisconsin—not continually looking to Uncle Sam to meet the problems of its citizens—has sponsored a fine housing program that, too, is helping folks in our Badger State to own their own homes.

Recently, this program—permitting second mortgage loans to veterans, at liberal repayment terms—celebrated its 10th anniversary. During its 10-year lifetime, it has helped more than 20,000 Wisconsin veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict to get additional money for home purchases.

Recent editions of the Milwaukee Journal carried two articles:

First. Showing the low rates of delinquencies under the FHA and VA programs; and

Second. Outlining this fine State-sponsored program for assisting veterans and their families to own homes.

I ask unanimous consent to have these articles printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Aug. 16, 1959]

FHA, VA LOAN DELINQUENCIES LOW

Home buyers in the United States with GI mortgages and Federal Housing Administration (FHA) insured loans set new records for keeping their loan payments current in the 3-month period ending last June 30.

In a nationwide survey of 2,664,688 loans the Mortgage Bankers Association of America (MBA) said that the overall delinquency ratio for FHA and GI loans was at an all-time low for the 3-month period.

Only FHA loans that were 3 months overdue were more delinquent this year than last, the survey showed. The MBA said the delinquency rate for 1,128,792 GI loans studied was the lowest since the survey was started 6 years ago.

The MBA said that only 1.83 percent of all GI loans were 1 month overdue, 0.37 percent for 2 months and only 0.28 percent for 3 months. At the same time last year, GI delinquencies were 2.06 percent for 30 days, 0.42 percent for 60 days, and 0.34 percent for 90 days.

Only 1.30 percent of the FHA insured mortgages surveyed were 1 month overdue, 0.24 percent for 2 months and 0.17 percent for 3 months, up slightly from last year. Last year's figures were 1.43 percent, 0.27 percent, and 0.13 percent, respectively.

Comparable figures for the State were not available from the Milwaukee offices of the FHA and Veterans' Administration (VA). As of July 31, there were 138 FHA-type home loans in the State reported in arrears, compared to 128 last year. There were 995 GI loans delinquent so far this year, compared to 857 at the same time last year, the VA said.

While spokesmen for both agencies here estimated that the Wisconsin delinquency ratio probably was near or lower than the national average, they said they had no figures on their total number of loans still outstanding to develop percentages.

On conventional loans, the MBA's survey showed a 1-month delinquency rate of 1.01 percent; for 2 months, 0.26 percent, and for 3 months, 0.16 percent.

The national delinquency rate on all types of loans was 1.98 percent as against 2.19 percent a year ago, the association said.

[From the Milwaukee, Wis. Journal, Aug. 9, 1959]

STATE AIDED 20,000 GI'S TO GET HOMES

(By Chris Lecos)

The 10th anniversary of a State program that has helped more than 20,000 Wisconsin veterans of World War II and the Korean war get additional money to buy houses slipped by last week with little fanfare.

It was on August 5, 1949, that former Gov. Oscar A. Rennebohm signed into law the bill that permitted the State to make second mortgage loans to veterans at liberal interest and repayment terms.

Between then and June 30, 1959, the State made 20,251 loans to Wisconsin veterans for a total of \$54,193,353—an average of slightly less than \$2,700 per loan.

Slightly more than one-fourth of the number—5,189—were loans made to Milwaukee County veterans for a total of \$14,525,326.

Approximately 35 percent of all loans being made at the present time are going to Milwaukee County applicants, according to Gordon A. Huseby, Madison, director of the State Department of Veterans' Affairs, which administers the program.

Several major changes have been made in the law in the last 10 years. At the start, a veteran could borrow only up to \$2,000. He now can get up to \$3,500. The original interest rate—2 percent a year on the unpaid balance—and the maximum term—20 years—has been unchanged.

When the law was passed it limited State second mortgage loans to the "purchase, improvement or construction" of a house that did not exceed \$10,000 in price, including the cost of the land.

In 1951, the limit was raised to \$15,000. A legislative attempt to boost that to \$17,500 last year failed to get out of committee.

Basically unchanged over the years have been these provisions:

The veteran must have at least one dependent—wife, parent, etc.

He must have been honorably discharged after at least 90 days of service from August

27, 1940, to July 25, 1947, or from June 27, 1950, to January 31, 1955. A veteran discharged because of a service connected disability but with less than 90 days service is eligible also.

The veteran must have been a resident of the State when he entered service, or he must have lived in Wisconsin 10 years since his discharge and must not have received a veteran's bonus from another State.

RECORD SET IN 1951

Statistics provided by Huseby showed that more veterans received loans in the first few years of the program than in more recent years.

For example, from October 1949 to June 1951 (while the price ceiling was \$10,000), the State made 2,715 loans. The year the State boosted the ceiling to \$15,000—1951—the largest volume was recorded—6,752 loans for a total of \$20,367,000.

Since then, the number of loans made each year has dropped. Between 1953 and 1959, the number of loans ranged between a high of 2,663 and a low of 1,201. In the fiscal year ending last June 30, the total was 1,614 loans.

Huseby said the drop in volume was not entirely due to lack of veteran interest. The inability of some counties to continue making loans contributed to the dip, he said.

LAW HAS BEEN CHANGED

During the peak 1951 period, 12 of the State's 71 counties exhausted allocated funds and had to stop making loans. By 1957, the figure had risen to 32 counties. Last year, 11 more counties ran out of funds.

The legislature took steps this year to provide a "more reasonable distribution" of funds.

It amended the law to provide that all the counties must turn in leftover funds to the State for redistribution to the 71 counties each March. Redistribution still will be on the basis of the veteran population in each county. Milwaukee County now gets the largest, single share—26.59 percent.

The first allocation under the new law was made April 1, when Milwaukee County received \$1,261,000, slightly more than it had actually turned in, said Jack Luban, Milwaukee County veterans service officer.

SIX HUNDRED AND SIXTY-TWO THOUSAND DOLLARS ON HAND

Only once in the 10-year history of the program has Milwaukee County run out of funds, Luban noted. That was between August 1952 and December 1953, he said. At present, the county has an estimated \$662,000 for loans to veterans.

Luban cited several factors that could tend to deter or prevent some veterans from obtaining loans from the State.

One is a rise in home prices, particularly in the Milwaukee area. Since the \$15,000 ceiling covers the house and lot, plus well and septic tank costs, if these are required, the veteran has a smaller field of housing to choose from, it was indicated.

Luban said the great majority of the loans were used for purchase of an existing house.

Also, the need for State secondary financing aid may not be as great, he observed. Some veterans undoubtedly have been able to find satisfactory financing through the low down payment loans backed by the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) or the Veterans' Administration (VA), Luban said.

INCOME REQUIREMENT

Other potential borrowers could be blocked by a requirement that total monthly payments for both the first mortgage and the State loan cannot exceed 25 percent of the veteran's gross monthly income, he added.

Overtime pay, part-time earnings and even a wife's income cannot be considered. Luban added that "excessive" indebtedness also could affect a veteran's eligibility.

But, despite the various factors that affect volume, officials said, the program has helped veterans, particularly those who wanted low priced houses and who had the required minimum 5 percent of the total cost available as a down payment.

The program has "probably been one of the prime and best factors of rehabilitation that the State has developed in getting a veteran into his own home," Huseby said. "We believe that home ownership is a very potent factor in getting a veteran stabilized as a self-supporting citizen in his community, because that is where his rehabilitation must take place."

Wisconsin veterans have proved to be reliable risks. Last October, Huseby told the legislative council's judiciary committee that only 47 out of 19,332 second mortgage loans made by the State had been written off as losses.

How Scandinavia Solved the Khrushchev Embarrassment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. MOELLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that more and more of the people of America are beginning to share the concern I expressed in my remarks of August 10 with respect to the impending visit of Nikita Khrushchev, and the impact such a visit will have here and abroad. That was also the attitude of the people of the Scandinavian countries when he was scheduled to visit them in July. However, in the case of Scandinavia before things went too far respected persons in religious, court, and parliamentary circles exerted their efforts and their influence to alert public opinion and forestall the visit. The results gained world wide publicity.

At this time I would like to insert a part of a statement from the MRA Information Service bulletin of August 1, 1959, which relates the sequence of events which led to the cancellation of the Khrushchev visit to Scandinavia.

Facts which led to the cancellation of Soviet Premier Khrushchev's trip to Scandinavia were given July 21 by Bror Johnson of Sweden at the Summit Strategy Conference for Moral Rearmament, Mackinac Island, Michigan. He is the son of Bishop Bengt Jonzon, one of the men whose ideological stand made the Soviet Premier change his plans.

In an official Soviet report the Moscow Government said it believed now is not the opportune moment for the visit of the Soviet Premier in view of the position taken by the press and certain personalities in the northern countries. The Government hopes that the atmosphere will be more favorable in some years' time.

Among the personalities referred to are James Dickson, a Member of the Swedish Parliament and a Chamberlain to the King of Sweden; Bishop Jonzon, for 19 years bishop of the largest Swedish diocese in-

cluding the strategic iron ore mines of northern Sweden; and Ole Bjorn Kraft, Vice President of the Danish Parliament, former Foreign Minister and Chairman of NATO during 1952-53.

Dickson issued a statement at the summit Strategy Conference at Mackinac, widely quoted in the Swedish and world press, that he had made a serious mistake in Parliament last year when he said he would not oppose Khrushchev's visit to Sweden this summer.

"Khrushchev should not come to Scandinavia and the invitation should be withdrawn," said Dickson. "His visit is not meant to be merely a social visit. It is part of the ideological war he himself has proclaimed. This time it is against Scandinavia. Next time it might be against the United States. So America should be prepared."

"I had not considered how such a visit would affect the nations of Africa and Asia. Our official invitation would set a precedent of acceptance to other areas of the world to entertain communism and its leaders."

Ideological trap. Dickson went from Mackinac to the parallel meeting of the summit strategy conference at Caux, Switzerland, where he met with Bishop Jonzon and other Nordic leaders. They planned how to alert public opinion to the ideological trap concealed in Khrushchev's visit.

Bishop Jonzon then issued an open letter to the leadership of Scandinavia simultaneously from Caux and Mackinac 2 weeks ago. He said, "Inviting Khrushchev to our country is the same as letting the enemy through the frontline in a shooting war. It is wrong, unwise and stupid. The only alternative to communism is to choose moral rearmament and live it as individuals and nations."

Bishop Jonzon said in his statement, "People say peaceful coexistence is possible, but the third world war—ideological war—is being waged now, and the Communists believe they will carry it to victory even by military means if necessary."

"Every word and action of Khrushchev serves a definite purpose; to split the free world, to confuse our judgment, to break down the will to resist, to encourage defeatism, through trade to bind our economy to the Communist bloc and finance our final incorporation in the Soviet system."

"It was shaking to see with what supreme skill Mikoyan played on every string during his visit to America—idealism, love of peace, sentimentality, naivete, sensation, vanity, business sense, Mammon."

"There are two world centers where people are planning and working night and day to make God's will effective in the life of every nation in order to break the materialism in West and East, and create an ideologically sound world for free people. These places are the MRA Assembly centers at Mackinac Island, Mich., and Caux, Switzerland."

"If we don't choose to live moral rearmament both as individuals and as nations, we choose communism as Khrushchev wants and intends by his visit. For as William Penn said, 'Men must choose to be governed by God or they condemn themselves to be ruled by tyrants.'"

Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that an informed and aroused public opinion can have its effect, even upon so insensitive a person as Nikita Khrushchev. Let us hope that a similar outcry from the people of the United States will let him know that he is not welcome here. Perhaps it would induce him to become conveniently indisposed and force him to call off his plans to impose his undesirable presence upon us.

Forests Take Vision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in the August edition of American Forests magazine, there is an article by a West Virginian which gives a good illustration of the myriad of benefits which can accrue from home-style, do-it-yourself forestry.

The article recounts how the author, Robert E. Bowers, and his partner purchased 123 acres of timber in Roane County, W. Va., and have nurtured it into manifold productivity. It also tells of the great personal satisfaction which the two have received from working in cooperation with the Mother Earth.

Mr. President, I am a strong supporter of nationwide forestry efforts; I am a cosponsor of the wilderness bill and the Youth Conservation Corps bill, and I have worked for broadening of our national forest system. Yet, I feel that it is also important that the American people, as individuals and as owners of woodland property, should actively partake in the preservation and management of the green heritage which we have been given in our forests. Such personal endeavor and responsible ownership can greatly assist our Federal efforts to meet the mushrooming forest demands of the years ahead.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Forests Take Vision," may be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORESTS TAKE VISION

(By Robert E. Bowers)

For as long as memory can recall, autumn has been my favorite season. The painted forests have drawn me into the hinterlands on every occasion possible, for truly there is no time of greater natural beauty. Last year, however, the trees in Roane County, W. Va., seemed a bit brighter; the beauty somewhat more glowing; the air slightly sweeter. Sugar trees were a deeper gold; hickories slightly browner. Across the valley and up the mountain, the richness of the season was more pronounced and the woods were more enticing. In seasons before, I had walked upon these lands, but the soil and the trees had belonged to somebody else. Last fall, the land upon which I ambled and the trees which I admired were all my own.

It is difficult to express the feeling of such ownership to a man who has never owned anything but a city lot. But the responsibility I felt for my land and the pride it gave me were something which I had never before known.

Sentiment, you ask? Hardly. This land with all its fascinations is now a business. The beauty of it is something extra which cannot be evaluated on any business ledger, but which is certainly a part of the venture. And it is not taxable.

Sentiment? Sure, forest land has sentiment with it, and if it doesn't it resolves itself into just another impersonal business investment. Too often forest land is nothing more than "a business" which must produce the most revenue as quickly as possible with the least effort in the long run. To me, however, my forest is my son and daughter's future education, and their children's education as well, and that's about as personal as a man can get.

If somehow people more than 50 years old could impart their hindsight to youngsters, the future of our children and our natural resources would be secure. That is a conclusion reached by my partner, Walter Mitchell, and me after little more than a year of managing 123 acres of forest land. We bought the land with no hope of realizing any monetary return for more than 10 years, and with the possibility that it would take 15 years. Our children are now about to reach school age. Our plan was to improve our timber through thinnings and plantings, figuring that our first timber sale would coincide with the entrance of our youngsters into college.

Walter and I have tried to enlist the aid and advice of every man or agency who has dealt with forest problems. We have had problems, but professional guidance should keep us from any catastrophic occurrences.

We bought our 123 acres of timber from an oldtimer who was indeed a rare individual. He, despite his age, could see merit in waiting for his forest land investment to pay off. "If I were 20 years younger," he told us, "I'd never have let that land go." Unfortunately, most landowners in this same county don't look at their forests that way. They own them now, and many always have owned them. But to the average man, his timber is either "worthless brush" or "ready to cut." There is no in between. Most of these people cannot see beyond the immediate sale of timber.

The land we purchased had been cut some 7 years before. The timber cutters had high-graded it, and slaughtered the young stuff in the process. When they left, it must have been a desolate sight to behold. However, the land was coming back. Young yellow poplars had shoved through the slash and debris, reaching for the sun from the moist valley floor. The field where the sawmill had been contained several dozen husky 7-year-old black walnut trees, which stood nearly 10 feet tall. Another 3 years and they would bear their first harvestable crop of nuts.

Along the drier ridges and on the thin soils of the southern exposure, white oak and hickory predominated. The oaks formed a heavy coppice on every stump, while a few 8-inch trees had the markings of future timber. Intermingled with the poplars were young beech, walnuts, and locusts. Down in one hollow, an abundance of azaleas flowered in profusion, adding a touch of color. We earmarked them for future house plants. Everybody loves flowering plants, and healthy wild ones of this variety have special enticement. Ten acres of 16- to 18-inch beech appeared sound and offered some immediate potential for timber.

A county road crosses our land, separating 3 acres of goldenrod and bramble from the woods. It borders on 1,500 feet of the Little Poca River, a fine smallmouth bass and muskie stream.

Each time we walked over our land we learned something new about it. Soon each rock and stump and tree took on a meaning within itself. The land soon became more personal, and its potential and problems more apparent. We are proud of our choice of areas. It was not the best in the country; neither was it the worst. One might have called it typical of most cutover land in the eight-county area surrounding us. If we

could make a go of our project, make it pay, and cite it as an example, there was a good chance of making forestry prominent in our section. We were, and still are, completely confident that we can. In fact, nearly a dozen individuals just like us have begun investigating land for future purchase, simply because they have been convinced that we know what we are talking about. That, in itself, is a sign of progress.

In 1 year's time, our enterprise has proven the wisdom of our judgment. During that time, however, many frustrations lay in our path.

First of all, we were attempting to operate a business while living 75 miles from our homes. Such a distance kills working hours one could put to good use by taking them up in travel. We had considered this before we invested, but since land is somewhat less expensive at that distance from Charleston, limited funds forced us to buy it there. We got the same quality property for about one-half the price of similar land within 50 miles of our homes.

Secondly, we encountered a minor difficulty the first time we visited the area. We were caught in a heavy rainstorm and became lost for nearly 3 hours. That just about washed out our enthusiasm. Later on, during the winter freezing and thawing, our cars became mired axle deep in mud four times. Each time, however, some kind soul pulled us out.

Our land is typical of the 5 million acres of West Virginia. It is neither good land nor bad land. Nor does its potential differ greatly from any area in the surrounding counties. Yet, we wouldn't sell our 123 acres for \$50 an acre now, while much of the land surrounding us could be purchased for \$30 or less per acre.

Most of the land around us is owned by farmers who have spent their lives there. Some have been there for generations, yet we can draw a more detailed picture of our woodland than most of them. Their woodlands have been nothing more than fenceposts or firewood to them these many years. When someone offered a price for the big trees they sold for what they could get. Thereafter, the brush that seeded in was forgotten or cleared away to make room for grass. Fortunately, these people are not inclined to burn every spring and fall.

We bought our forest; these people got theirs by inheritance. Ours was intentional; theirs was accidental. Theirs was taken for granted; ours was to assure our children a college education 15 years from now. They see little future in their woods; our 123 acres will pay off the mortgage in 10 years. From then on our harvest will be profit. Most of these forest owners sit and hope for a buyer for their big trees; we go looking for markets for every product from our land, and there is certainly much more than timber.

When we bought our land in 1958, the mines were down. This killed one major market for 4- to 10-inch oak and hickory saplings. Most timber owners closed their shops to await return of the good times again. We studied every product we had, from timber to nuts to flowering shrubs. Then we inquired about markets in all directions.

The first nontimber use we recognized was our black walnut crop. There are about 100 large walnut trees on the area. They are gnarled, and are bypassed by the cutters. Yet, they have produced from 1 to 20 bushels of nuts per year, averaging about 5 bushels per tree. Walnuts sell in West Virginia for \$3 per hundred pounds. That meant that our annual crop had a potential value of approximately \$400. Time involved in harvesting, distance from market, and transportation costs would eat into this gross

value heavily, but the future would work these problems out.

A survey indicated that we could cut 10 cords of firewood or mine props per acre without hurting the growing stock. This amount could be removed in our initial improvement cuttings, which were aimed at increasing the growth increment of the trees left for future timber. There is an excellent firewood market in my home town, but 75 miles is a long way to haul timber. Nevertheless, more than 1,000 cords at \$16 to \$18 per cord cannot be overlooked. One drawback has faced us constantly. We can get enough orders for firewood, but we don't own a truck. We don't dare hire a truck and then look for orders, and we can't take orders in advance as we may not get enough to pay the transportation charges. The solution: we are going to get a truck, but not for awhile.

The need for the improvement cutting was exemplified by a 14-inch chestnut oak which had been released to some degree back in 1951. A core drilling showed that during the 10 years preceding the 1951 cut, the oak had grown one-quarter inch on a side. After release, it had grown three-quarters inch in 7 years. Such findings expedited the initial improvement cutting. We contacted the Agricultural Conservation Program office in Spencer. We hoped to sign up under the cost-sharing plan, for 25 acres the first year. The ACP pays up to \$10 per acre for labor costs involved in timber stand improvement. At that time, we were the only ones to sign up for timber-improvement during 1958, which pointed up the lack of understanding among the people for their forest potential. The ACP man decided he would allow us 15 acres, instead of 25. We were disappointed, but left the office eager to get started. When the approval came through it was for only 10 acres. At that rate it would take us 12 years to improve our entire 123 acres. We accepted the acreage figure as approved, and planned to sign up for 25 acres in 1959.

It was probably just as well we only got 10 acres approved, because the work had to be done by December 31, 1958. Our approval arrived on December 12. Vacation time, weekends, and free time of our neighbors were imposed upon, but we finished our work with axes under the deadline. Blisters and calluses covered our hands and feet, and scars from flying chips pock-marked our arms, but we did it!

Within 30 days a check arrived for \$114 as repayment for the labor involved in the stand improvement. This was our first return from the property, even though more than that had been spent for labor, travel and equipment. When we bought the area we didn't have one tool. We now have three double-bitted axes, two shovels, one brush hook, and a rake. We hope to purchase a powersaw before starting the next cutting. An office man just can't stand to sit all week then cut trees with an axe all day on weekends.

As quickly as the check arrived, we signed up under the ACP program for tree planting. We had some erosion problems and about seven acres of bramble land that needed planting. This spring we planted 7,300 conifer seedlings, for which we are to receive \$20 per acre, or \$140, from the ACP. By the time the trees were in the ground, more than \$238 had been invested: \$139 for a three-man crew to plant them, \$86 for the trees, and \$12 for a man to plow furrows in the bottomland for planting.

This planting was done for three reasons: beautification, Christmas trees, and pulpwood. Beauty would take a year, Christmas trees 6 years, and pulpwood at least 15 years. Because we try not to be too optimistic, we count on only two-thirds of the trees surviving to maturity or at least to useful size. Christmas trees at 6 years of age should

bring an average of \$1 per tree, if properly pruned and shaped. Our hope is to harvest about 500 Christmas trees in 6 years, 500 in 7 years, and 1,500 in 8 years. From these we hope to obtain \$2,500 in gross income. The remaining pines, white, Scotch, red, and Virginia, will be left to grow into pulpwood, which should produce about 20 cords per acre in 15-20 years. The 750 Norway spruce will be lifted at about 5 years of age and sold alive for house base plants and lawn decoration. We hope to harvest 500 for this purpose at an average of \$3 per tree. Good ones will bring \$5, but the average will be \$3. Our spruce should bring us a total of \$1,500 in 5 or 6 years. This market is almost assured, as there is heavy demand for such decorations in our area.

The pessimists have told us that the Christmas tree market will be flooded by the time our trees mature. I don't believe it. We'll have competition. Here's hoping we'll have plenty of it by then. In fact, if we had our way, every eroded hillside in Roane County would be competing with us in the next 6 years. We hope our example will sell farmers on planting those barren, nonproductive slopes to trees of some kind. We hope they will see the wisdom in it by our example. So far as competition is concerned, however, we don't worry about it. West Virginia is now growing several million Christmas trees, but still two-thirds of our annual purchases come from other States.

Our first appraisal was quite like anybody else's. But after a closer look we began to consider our acreage as a group of units, each having its own personality and characteristics which had to be considered for maximum yield and income.

For instance, we could slaughter the beech and sell it cheaply, because at present there is not a great market for it. We think that there will be someday, and we can wait. If not, we'll have a beautiful squirrel woods, and that is worth something. So we'll thin the beech and let it grow. It is fair-sized now; it will grow faster in the future.

When we started a critical analysis of our property, we envisioned it as a multiple use area in which every possible outlet must be considered. Improvement of the stand was our first consideration, with the thinnings as firewood and possibly pulp. Of course, we hoped for some sideline hunting during the interim. That was one facet we really underestimated. One month after buying the area, we jumped a covey of 18 quail and 2 grouse one morning not 50 feet from the road. On opening day of the squirrel season, six of us killed 13 squirrels and spotted nearly 50 on a 10-acre plot of beech hickory. By afternoon we had killed nearly 20. More than this, that October day the four visitors, whom we didn't know until then, caught a nice string of smallmouth bass and panfish from our river. If nothing more, we had purchased a really fine hunting and fishing area which in itself is rewarding in these days of hunting and fishing pressures and posted land.

One of the frustrations of our venture came from our hunter friends. Four of them stayed all night in our shack and we had to sleep in our car. That wasn't bad, but they also had our stands by the time we got into the woods. We forgave them. Next day, they had a notion about running us off our own property, until they found out we owned it. When we requested that they clean up the garbage around the shack before they returned to hunting, they all agreed nicely. We returned to the woods to hunt. Upon our return, our friends were gone but the garbage remained. In fact, bottles were broken, the shack floor had been used as a bathroom, and the place was an unsightly mess.

Walter and I decided that the vandals were not typical, so the land remains open

to anyone who cares to hunt or fish. After all, one doesn't write about brotherly love among landowners and sportsmen for 8 years, and then lose his religion at the first infringement upon his property rights. My faith in humanity was dimmed for awhile, but I recovered.

Watching the squirrels work on hickory nuts opened up another aspect of forest ownership which we will investigate to the fullest. We have about 300 hickory trees, and at least 50 of them produce a heavy crop of nuts. These are relatively thin shelled shagbark nuts which taste almost like pecans. Market possibilities are in doubt at present. If, however, there is no demand, we will create one. The nuts are just too good to waste.

Walter and I each spent 20 hours removing grapevines and suppressing growth from 3 dozen healthy young walnut trees last fall. The trees had seeded in naturally after the logging operation 8 years ago. They should be producing nuts in 2 or 3 years, which we can add to our growing list of possible sales. We are cultivating them for the future. They are close to the road and accessible, which adds incentive to our project of releasing special trees.

Speaking of nuts, last November we planted several hundred Chinese chestnut seeds. This spring they came through the ground in fine fashion, and we should have several hundred seedlings for sale this fall or next spring. We hope to use the money to buy fertilizer to put on the chestnut trees we keep for our orchard. On June 1, 1959, our seedlings stood almost a foot high. They should be from 2 to 3 feet high this fall. The squirrels dug up a few, but that's part of the price you pay for having a multiple-use area. We already have a half-dozen orders for our young chestnut seedlings this fall.

It is not my claim that I was born with any special wisdom about land and trees and such. Nor is it my claim that I have any great ability to predict the future. In fact despite hard work and planning, this whole venture may fall flat on its face, but I doubt it. My one claim is that I know something about land and something about trees, and my faith in both is as deeply implanted as the roots of a 300-year-old white oak which marks a corner of our land. And I believe in my State and in my Nation. There is no sounder investment than land and forests.

Personal Guilt of Communist Dictator Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in a Senate speech last week I tried to point out the personal guilt of Communist dictator Khrushchev for a series of atrocities against the people of Hungary and their leaders in the revolt of 1956.

Today's Washington Post and Times Herald carries a report of eight additional murders to be charged against Khrushchev.

Eight additional murders do not constitute a large entry in the record of one who is involved either directly or indirectly in the murder of millions. But I call it to the attention of the Senate

as one more reminder of the kind of man we are welcoming to our shores as an honored guest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the August 18 edition of the Washington Post and Times Herald be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUNGARY EXECUTES EIGHT LINKED TO 1956 REBELLION

BUDAPEST, August 17.—Communist Hungary has executed eight men recently convicted of political crimes, according to an unconfirmed report circulating today among Western diplomats.

The report of the executions is the final chapter of a secret trial story that has been heard in Western circles since last spring. It has been impossible to verify the reports through official sources.

A Foreign Ministry spokesman would neither confirm nor deny the reports of the executions.

The trial rumors never clearly spelled out the charges on which the men were supposedly brought to court. They allegedly stemmed from the Hungarian revolt of 1956.

According to the most persistent reports, the men involved were mostly workers from Ujpest, an industrial suburb of Budapest.

Ten were reported sentenced to death in the original trial but two of these sentences were reduced to life imprisonment in an appeal hearing last month. About 15 other persons reportedly received prison sentences.

Sources for the execution reports were unable to give any names.

Poison in Your Water—No. 156

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Oregon Journal of Portland, Oreg., of May 26, 1959, entitled "Dirty River Cleanup Job Partly Done."

DIRTY RIVER CLEANUP JOB PARTLY DONE

(By Watford Reed)

Portland residents sighed with pride early in 1955 when the city neared completion of its \$19,000 sewage disposal project. They thought the job was done.

It was as though a football team reached its opponents' 10-yard line, the rooting section sang the school song and the team trotted off the field while the opposing team kept on playing.

The job was only partly done.

With the Columbia River and Portland Harbor polluted 97 times above accepted standards for swimming, Portland is exposing its residents and neighbors who water ski or use the streams for other purposes to the threat of serious illness.

A small part of Portland's woes have been inherited. The annexation of Garthwick in 1950 added 300 residents whose sewage still is dumped straight into the Willamette. The annexation of the Vermont Hills area added a few hundred, although most of the district's sewage is treated by

a plant built before the area joined Portland.

The city's sewage disposal plant provides only primary treatment for the sewage that is poured into the Columbia. Primary treatment means screening and sedimentation, which takes 30 to 35 percent of the total organic matter and about 65 percent of the suspended matter out of sewage.

State officials say that henceforth secondary treatment will be required of all sewage where the effluent is dumped into the Willamette. This kind of treatment, which depends mainly on the work of bacteria, can remove from 85 to 95 percent of the organic matter in sewage, depending on the degree of treatment—and almost 100 percent of the germs.

Milwaukee, Wis., makes commercial fertilizer from its sewage to avoid contaminating Lake Michigan. The sale of the fertilizer reduces the cost of treatment to the city, although it does not yield an overall profit.

In the case of Portland, sanitary officials would be satisfied at present if the city would chlorinate effluent dumped into the Columbia.

Nor is Portland the only city on which Federal and State authorities are "lowering the boom." The public health service has taken steps involving St. Joseph, Mo.; Washington, D.C.; Omaha, Nebr., and Council Bluffs, Iowa; Kansas City, St. Louis, Sioux City, Iowa, and others. Most of the cities have cooperated.

In Portland, city officials estimate the cost of covering those last 10 yards to the goal line at \$5 million. They profess to believe that the city's voters would rebel at proposals to spend that much more.

Yet \$5 million is slightly more than the cost of 1 mile of city freeway, and scores of miles of freeway are projected for Portland.

City officials may be right, however, for Portland voters have shown a preference for frills that look nice over necessities that are not conspicuous. In 1956, for instance, they voted down a \$5 million proposal to rebuild overloaded sewers that already had burst and flooded basements. And at the same election they joined the rest of the county in voting money for a new western approach to the Hawthorne bridge.

City officials believe that the voters were against spending money for sewage disposal when they killed a \$39,500,000 "package" plan last November. State officials are convinced that the voters would have approved the \$5 million items for sewage disposal if it had been on the ballot alone.

All over the country increasing numbers of people are becoming convinced that if mankind is going to use nature's gifts, such as streams it has a duty to keep them in condition almost as good in that in which human beings first found them.

And whether the State wins or loses its legal action to force Portland to abate pollution, the issue cannot be delayed much longer.

Harry Golden Pays Tribute to the Late Harold Duane Jacobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the Carolina Israelite for August 1959, the noted editor and author, Harry Golden, has paid tribute to a news-

paperman of integrity and ability, the late Harold Duane Jacobs of the Baltimore Post. All who knew Harold Jacobs—as I was privileged to do—respected his devotion to the cause of the fourth estate. He practiced journalism as a great profession, and to it he brought genuine distinction and credit.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the editorial entitled "Harold Duane Jacobs of Grey Rock," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAROLD DUANE JACOBS OF GREY ROCK

In 1946, about 4 years after I had founded the Carolina Israelite, I received a letter from a subscriber who introduced himself as Harold Duane Jacobs. He lived in Pikesville, Md., 20 miles outside of Baltimore. Mr. Jacobs said he had been a managing editor and closed with, "Boy, what I could have done with you if I were still a managing ed." In this business it is not the money. You can always borrow a few hundred from someone, or exchange postdated checks with a friend. What is important is to receive letters from a man like Harold Duane Jacobs who tells you you are on the right track. It is hard to explain but a letter of this kind is like acquiring a partner whose investment solves all your financial problems. I am not exaggerating. An oldtime professional newsman tells you you are making a contribution to American journalism. That is what is important, and you go on.

Harold Duane Jacobs came to Baltimore in the 1920's. He edited the Baltimore Post. He started from scratch. Before he left, the Post had a daily circulation of 90,000.

Just a few years before the publication of my first book, "Only in America," I met my subscriber, Mr. Jacobs for the first time. He invited me for a weekend to his home. Mr. Jacobs and his wife, the former Ethel Epstein, gave me a stimulating and gracious weekend. The winner was held in my honor in the main dining hall of their famous colonial estate, Grey Rock. The Governor of Maryland came, Federal Judge Sobeloff, the mayor of Baltimore, the chief of police, and many of the editors and civic leaders of that great city. At the head of the table sat the grand old master of the American essay, Gerald Johnson, who introduced me. This was my connection with Harold Duane Jacobs, who died a few days ago.

I mourn his loss.

Veto of Oil Leasing Bill for Alaska Unwarranted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that President Eisenhower's veto of H.R. 6940, a bill which would have increased the maximum allowable acreage for oil and gas leasing in Alaska from 300,000 acres to 600,000 acres was ill-advised and uncalled for. Alaska's size, equaling five western States, plus the need for incentives to bring about exploration of remote areas subject to the high costs which prevail

in Alaska, requires an increase from 300,000 to 600,000 acres.

The fact that the Department of the Interior expresses preference for a package bill to increase lease rentals and abolish the existing waiver of rentals for the second and third year has nothing whatsoever to do with my bill which has been vetoed. Interior's package plan could, in the wisdom of Congress, be put into effect regardless of the provisions of H.R. 6940. The maximum allowable acreage in Alaska has nothing to do with rental rates and waivers or nonwaivers of rentals. It is admitted that this veto will deprive the State of needed income by curbing increased leasing at this time, but is plausibly justified on the theory that it will be better for the State and the Nation in the long run.

The Interior Department made only a meager showing regarding the bill during the House and Senate committee hearings, expressing no firm position regarding monopolies, and could not justify its proposal that a separate leasing area be established for that part of Alaska north of the Brooks Range. That this is true is evidenced by the favorable reports made by both the Senate and House committees which conducted the hearings. The House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, was unanimous in finding that the increased acreage would not be monopolistic and that the legislation would be conducive to orderly, yet accelerated development of the oil resources of Alaska. The evidence also showed that there was no unanimity of opinion within the Department of the Interior itself, and that the opinion expressed by the witness for the Department, at the hearings, that there should be a separate leasing area north of the Brooks Range, was only a makeshift.

The President's action is a reflection of departmental arrogance directed at the House and Senate Interior Committees—and the Congress of the United States—for having the temerity to legislate with a slight variance from the conclusion submitted by the Interior Department. I consider this veto to be an unwarranted overriding of congressional discretion and judgment.

Ninety-Cents-on-the-Buck Come-On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I am privileged to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Birmingham (Ala.) News of Sunday, August 9, 1959, entitled, "90-Cents-on-the-Buck Come-On." This editorial, as its title implies, deals with the proposal of President Eisenhower to increase the Federal gasoline tax an additional 1½ cents per gallon. I recommend this editorial to

the careful study of every Member of the House:

NINETY-CENTS-ON-THE-BUCK COME-ON

The great attraction of the Federal highway program, now underway, is that Uncle Samuel puts up 90 cents of every dollar spent on this nationwide project.

Right now the Federal Government finds itself without necessary funds to insure continuation of the program. In State after State the howls are going up because the pinch is being felt or is about to be felt. Such highway funds generally are committed some time in advance, since highway development is a long-time piece of business.

To provide the needed money to keep up this gargantuan program, Mr. Eisenhower has asked for a 1½-cent gasoline tax hike, which would put the Federal levy at 4½ cents. The House Ways and Means Committee has refused to go along with this. Instead it recommends a billion-dollar bond issue and cutting the annual expenditure rate to \$600 million next year with a graduated increase. This would see the sum of \$2,200 million allocated not until 1969. But the Public Works Committee, responsible for deciding how far, how fast, is stiffly turning down this plan. The Public Works Committee wants construction maintained at \$2,200 million a year steadily.

The Ways and Means Committee proposal also would stretch out the construction beyond the 1972 terminal date of the program.

We have no idea how best to find the money, though we see little to recommend the Ike-asked gas tax increase. The bond issue Ways and Means proposes would be paid for by transferring one-fifth of the present 10-percent manufacturers' new auto excise tax from the general fund to bond retirement. One-fifth of that tax would come to about \$250 million a year. Obviously we would be paying for the new highways for some time; that is not necessarily bad for they would be used for a long time.

The entire situation is muddled by the fact that the program got going hastily when unemployment was up, there were recession evidences all about, and the highway program seemed a good pump primer. As it is, though, we now find ourselves short of money and face the question whether we want to go in debt more. Our own tendency would be to cut the program back. If it seems we would be turning our backs on a 90-percent Federal handout, let us ask ourselves whether we ever will stop Federal spending in gigantic figures unless we make do with something less than the maximum. You can't keep dishing it out at a high rate and ever expect to control Federal spending.

A Man and His Wealth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, a great American passed away. The individual of whom I speak is the late Michael L. Benedum, who during his lifetime perhaps was responsible for the discovery of more oil than any other man living or dead. He was a great humanitarian and philanthropist. His love for his native State of West Virginia, while evident during his lifetime, has become all the more evident upon the spreading of his last will and testament upon the record.

That last will and testament is a monument to America and all that we seek to safeguard here in these great Halls of Congress.

Thomas O'Brien Flynn, the editor of the editorial page of the outstanding West Virginia paper, the Wheeling Intelligencer, has set out in a brief article, "A Man and His Wealth," several paragraphs of this great man's last words which I want to include in my remarks and respectfully urge my colleagues in the House to take a few minutes to read. This editorial should confirm to all of us here that while our jobs are most difficult and trying at times, that as long as America has men such as Michael L. Benedum, ours is an easy undertaking:

A MAN AND HIS WEALTH

Those who share the divide-the-wealth views of some of our modern social planners who would limit the personal acquisition of riches either through direct limitation of income as proposed by the late President Roosevelt or by the imposition of punitive taxes or other Government restrictions, would do well to read the last will and testament of the late Michael L. Benedum.

In disposing of a fortune estimated at \$100 million, Mr. Benedum made some observations on the subject of property and its use which the prophets of a new social order might consider with profit.

"If I could have looked upon my material goods as personal property," wrote Mr. Benedum, "belonging to me alone, my task would have been immeasurably lighter. But I have never regarded my possessions in that light. Providence gives no fee simple title to such possessions. As I have seen it, all of the elements of the earth belong to the Creator of all things, and He has, as part of the divine purpose, distributed them unevenly among His children, holding each relatively responsible for their wise use and disposition. I have always felt that I have been only a trustee for such material wealth as providence has placed in my hands."

Can anybody seriously believe that laws or a political system which would have made impossible the career of a Mike Benedum or a Henry Ford or an Andrew Mellon or a John D. Rockefeller or an Andrew Carnegie would be in the public interest? Because these were wise men who took their responsibilities seriously, their management and disposition brought benefit to untold millions. The wealth of others who were not so wise or who were succeeded in its management by lesser men, has been dissipated. In either case, the millionaire's personal use of the wealth he had amassed was relatively trivial, the benefit to others, directly or indirectly, immense. The point is that under a political system denying these men the freedom of action they enjoyed much of the wealth which their genius created and managed, and which in the last analysis went to the benefit of others, never would have come into existence.

Letter to the French Ambassador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on August 6, 1959, a story was published in the press that 16 Members of the House of Representatives urged the French

Government to enter into negotiations to end the Algerian war and my name was listed as one of the 16 House Members. I have no knowledge of having signed such statement and do not subscribe to the views as expressed in that statement.

I have informed the French Ambassador that I am not in accord with the contents of the statement. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to insert the text of my letter to the French Ambassador as follows:

AUGUST 13, 1959.

His Excellency Mr. HERVE ALPHAND,
Ambassador of France,
French Embassy, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: Since writing to you on August 4, my attention has been called by my good friend Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, and also by Mr. Joseph M. Levy, that on August 6, 2 days after writing to you such letter lauding President de Gaulle, I allegedly joined 15 other Congressmen in a statement concerning Algeria.

I have no knowledge of signing such letter and am unable to check whether my secretary signed such statement without my knowledge, since she is presently away on vacation.

However, since the contents of such statement has now been made known to me, I wish to state emphatically that I am not in accord with its contents since it demonstrates interference with the internal and domestic policies of our great ally, the French Republic.

I repeat that, regardless of what my feelings toward France may have been prior to President De Gaulle, I am now convinced and have been since President de Gaulle came into power, that we are dealing with a new France, with a united country under the splendid leadership of a great friend of the United States and a staunch foe of communism.

With warm regards, I remain,
Sincerely yours,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors Urge Congressional Committee To Expedite Approval of Federal Aid to Highway Bill, Making Funds Now Available for Critically Needed Highway Improvements, Dated Tuesday, August 11, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I present the text of a communication received by me dated August 11, 1959, from the Board of Supervisors, Los Angeles County, Calif. The great 23d district which I represent, in this my 13th year of membership in this great legislative body, is all located geographically within the great county of Los Angeles. Hence, my receipt from the board of supervisors of this communication dealing with the very pres-

ent and urgent need of Federal aid to highways.

The text of the resolution speaks loudly and clearly of the urgency of the subject matter regarding the continued immediate financing of the federally aided highway program. It is to be noted that the motion for this resolution was proposed by Supervisor Hahn, whose supervisorial district geographically is located partially within my congressional district.

RESOLUTION URGING WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AND OTHER COMMITTEES, TO EXPEDITE APPROVAL OF FEDERAL AID TO HIGHWAYS BILL MAKING FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR CRITICALLY NEEDED HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS

On motion of Supervisor Hahn for Supervisor Bonelli, unanimously carried, it is ordered that the following resolution be and the same is hereby adopted:

"Whereas a stalemate has occurred between Congress and the administration regarding financing of the Federal highway aid program; and

"Whereas this stalemate has resulted in a halt of all new State highway construction in California until the details of financing the Federal program are resolved; and

"Whereas approximately \$200 million of highway construction in California are affected by this stalemate, including \$90 million in Los Angeles County alone; and

"Whereas these amounts include in excess of \$15 million for the Golden State Freeway, excess of \$5 million for the San Bernardino Freeway, excess of \$15 million for the San Diego Freeway, excess of \$14 million for the Glendale Freeway, excess of \$34 million for the Santa Monica Freeway, \$250,000 to improve U.S. 101 Alternate, and \$350,000 for Palmdale Boulevard: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, That the Ways and Means Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives and other appropriate congressional committees be urged to expedite approval of the Federal aid to highways bill making funds available for the critically needed highway improvements in Los Angeles County; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Vice President RICHARD NIXON and members of the Los Angeles County congressional delegation urging their support of an expeditious settlement and passage of the Federal Aid to Highways Act."

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of a resolution which was adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, on August 11, 1959, and entered in the minutes of said board.

HAROLD J. OSTLY,
County Clerk of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, and ex officio Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Said County.

By GORDON T. NESVIG,
Deputy Clerk.

Walter Lee, Legislative Assistant to the House Committee on the Judiciary, To Retire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was sorry to learn that Mr. Walter Lee,

legislative assistant to the House Committee on the Judiciary, will soon retire from this position which he has held for more than 21 years.

The name of Walter Lee is synonymous with warm friendship, wholehearted cooperation, and diligent, effective work for the committee to which he is assigned and for the membership of the House as a whole.

During my public service, I have never known a finer more sincere, more devoted, more dedicated public servant than Walter Lee, and I am profoundly grateful to him for his outstanding service and for the many instances in which he has personally assisted me with my work. He has indeed made noteworthy contributions to vital work of the Congress.

I heartily congratulate him and his family upon the completion of his magnificent service and wish for them every success and happiness in the future. Godspeed and good fortune to our dear, able, and esteemed friend, Walter Lee.

Birmingham, Ala.: A Name and a Prophecy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Southern Railway System magazine, Ties, for August 1959. The article deals with the founding of the city of Birmingham, the hub of my district and also the industrial center of the Southeastern States:

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.: A NAME AND A PROPHECY

Better known as the Magic City and the City of Destiny, Birmingham, Ala., could with equal justice be called the City That Grew From a Railroad Crossover.

The steel capital of the South was incorporated as a city on December 9, 1871. But almost 4 years before that, while it was nothing more than an expanse of fields and swamps, a president of one of Southern's predecessor lines prophetically referred to the mineral-rich area in which the city was later built as destined to be the Birmingham of America.

The railroad pioneer who made the remark was Sam Tate, fourth president of the Memphis & Charleston Railroad (now Southern's Memphis division). He foretold not only the name but also the city's future growth in an annual report to the M. & C. stockholders for the year ended July 1, 1867.

While his railway was not directly involved with the coal and iron fields of north central Alabama, Tate envisioned increased traffic for his road through a connection at Decatur with the South and North Alabama Railroad (now part of the Louisville & Nashville) which was to be built from Decatur southward through what is now Birmingham to the State capital of Montgomery.

The location of Birmingham was actually determined by the crossing of the South and North Alabama and the Alabama and Chattanooga Railroad (now Southern's Alabama Great Southern) then being completed between Chattanooga and Meridian.

After the intersecting point of the two roads was definitely set about 2 miles east of the town of Elyton, a group of businessmen and financiers—including Sam Tate—formed the Elyton Land Co. and bought a large section of land around the proposed crossing. They reasoned correctly that transportation was the key to the vast underground mineral wealth which, though long known, had been hardly scratched.

Particularly fitting for a city built on, by and with the ingredients of steel, Birmingham began with a steel backbone. The act of incorporation defined the city limits as "All the territory within 3,000 feet of the Alabama and Chattanooga Railroad on each side of the same extending from 26th Street in said city to the eastern boundary of the city of Elyton." (Elyton, which later became a part of Birmingham, is sometimes mistakenly referred to as Birmingham's predecessor.)

Today the city named for the seat of iron and steel manufacture in England is served by nine major railroads (including two divisions of the Southern). Among its hundreds of railroad crossovers it would be difficult to find the original one from which the city grew. But Birmingham, the second largest city in the South, has well carried out Sam Tate's prediction in his annual message to the Memphis & Charleston stockholders in 1867 when he said, in part: " * * * this vast field of mineral wealth * * * will open up new sources of wealth and employment, that will draw to it millions of capital, and an immense population of industrious and enterprising citizens for its development."

Not Our Friend, Just Our Guest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, one of the country's outstanding Polish language newspapers is *Obywatel Amerykanski*, the American Citizen. On August 13, 1959, the American Citizen published a front-page editorial entitled "Not Our Friend, Just Our Guest," which discusses the forthcoming visit of Soviet Premier Khrushchev to the United States.

In view of the multitude of reasons which the Polish people have for their distrust and hatred of Soviet communism, reasons which are shared by other Eastern European peoples who have also suffered from Soviet domination and tyranny, I commend this editorial to our colleagues as a most significant example of sound commonsense, great restraint, and an impressive ability to understand the real issues involved in the visit.

At the time President Eisenhower invited the Soviet Premier, I commented in response to a newspaperman's question that "we do not propose to honor Khrushchev, we propose to inform him." This same distinction, I believe, is admirably set forth in American Citizen's editorial.

Since the American Citizen editorial contains such a wealth of wisdom and good judgment, it should be allowed to speak for itself.

The editorial follows:

NOT OUR FRIEND, JUST OUR GUEST

The Presidential invitation to Nikita Khrushchev to visit America presents many problems with as many overtones. Crushing Poland's freedom, the brutal extermination of Hungary's brave fight for freedom, the violent eruption in Korea, the repeated Communist threats to the whole world, the lies and double talk of Soviet diplomacy—are only a few of the problems that immediately arise in dealing with any Communist.

The whole hydra-headed history of communism comes to the surface with every Communist meeting.

However, President Eisenhower's invitation to Premier Khrushchev is the act of the head of the free world to try to maintain peace and to save the world from total annihilation by war.

Most of us will have to exercise great restraint when Khrushchev visits America. But this we owe to the President, to man's eternal hope for peace, and to the constant search we must maintain for a solution of the wide differences between free peoples and the Communists.

Every avenue must be explored for the search for a stable peace. The President must be encouraged in this search.

Americans have learned the hard way that the Communist only understands one thing—strength. For that reason, we will always have to be armed to the teeth so long as communism exists, whether in Russia, China, or any place else, for that matter. The President may pacify Khrushchev, showing him the road to peace, but the virus of communism has already been implanted in another potential giant—Communist China. So, even if the world could miraculously expect peace from Communist Russia, it still has to face the virulent virus that has been implanted in China.

The free world, if it is to remain free, must remain strong. We can never let our guard down, even in our search for peace.

The face-to-face meeting between President Eisenhower and Khrushchev may ease many tensions. For that reason alone it should be encouraged. For some, it may be a complete waste of time, accomplishing nothing. For others, it may be the beginning of negotiations; for others still it may mean the real hope for a lasting peace.

The grim reality of history tells us that not one of these will be accomplished by the visit.

One thing will happen, however, the Russian dictator will be able to talk about the kind of peace the Americans expect. This he will not only hear from the President, but he will hear it from the American people, too.

We do not want a peace that will make Russia strong and us weak; that will allow Russia to gobble up Europe and Asia, isolating us in the narrow rim of our own freedom. We do not want a peace that would place communism at our back door in South America.

We want a peace that the free world can live in, move in, breathe in without fear and with self-respect.

Mr. Khrushchev will learn that we want to keep the door open to peace, even have it ajar more. But we do not want appeasement for peace, capitulation of our ideals and love for freedom for peace, that we have solemn obligations to ourselves and the free world that we will not trade for peace.

Mr. Khrushchev will learn that we have many weaknesses as free individuals, but that as a Nation we are strong and determined to stay that way.

The Communist game has been played out. We have learned too much from the brutal lessons of our recent history to be fooled again, again, and again. It's time for Mr. Khrushchev to learn this, too.

For the moment, therefore, we should subdue our feelings of the past and be ready to treat him as the head of a state who has been invited to visit us by the head of our Nation. He may not be our friend, but he is our guest and our conduct should be governed accordingly. He has yet to prove that he is our friend—only deeds can prove that.

Schenectady (N.Y.) Little League Baseball Team Once Again New York State Champions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming almost a habit, and I may say a very pleasant habit, for me to rise to point out to my colleagues in the House the fact that another baseball team from my district has been accorded outstanding honors. Only the other day I pointed out to the Members of the House that the Babe Ruth All-Star team from Johnstown, N.Y., had been declared the winners of the New York State Babe Ruth League championship tournament. Today it is my pleasant duty to advise the Members of this House that the Schenectady Little League All-Stars from my home city of Schenectady have clinched the New York State Little League championship and move on, on Thursday, to the regional games scheduled to be played at the Hy Turkin Memorial Field, Staten Island, at 3:30 p.m.

Perhaps one of the reasons why we develop such excellent baseball teams in the 32d Congressional District is that our district, as I have frequently mentioned, includes the home of our great national game, Cooperstown, N.Y., where the national baseball Hall of Fame and Memorial are located.

The Schenectady Little League team carries on this year, Mr. Speaker, in a great tradition. The Schenectady team in 1954 won the Little League World Series, and I am confident that this year's team will make an equally excellent showing.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include a news article from the Schenectady (N.Y.) Union-Star of Monday, August 17, describing the game in which the Schenectady team won the State championship:

STATE CHAMPS, SCHENECTADY LITTLE LEAGUERS, HEAD FOR REGIONALS
(By Larry Serrell)

POUGHKEEPSIE, August 17.—The Schenectady Little League All-Stars, New York State champions via a 4-1 victory over Elmont, Long Island, Saturday, make their regional bow Thursday afternoon at 3:30 on Hy Turkin Memorial Field, Staten Island, against the Barry, Vt., versus Brockton, Mass., winners, the latter contest being played tonight at Franklin, Mass.

In the regional opener at 1:30, Suburban Chester, Pa., goes against the East Rutherford, N.J.-Bridgeport, Conn., victor. Regional competition is one step away from

the Little League World Series at Williamsport, Pa. There, representatives from the Pacific, Europe, Canada, Latin America and the north, east, south and western portions of the United States will open the new Little League Stadium. Should Schnectady take the regionals they will meet Canada or Latin America, minus Mexico City, which recently was disqualified after being national champions for 2 consecutive years.

Billy Neidel was the mound winner in Schnectady's victory over Elmont. The righthander worked five and one-third innings, allowed three hits, walked one and fanned six. He pitched one-hit ball over the first five frames.

First Baseman Mike McGarry turned pitcher in the sixth inning with the tying run at the plate and one out. He struck out Jimmy Smith then got Tom Reilly on a soft fly to Stan Stringham at second base to end the game. McGarry has yet to give up a hit, run, or walk in all-star play.

Schnectady faced its toughest mound opponent since it beat Bellevue's Dick Pidgeon, 1-0, in the first game of the section 12 playoffs in the person of Elmont's Smith. The lanky right-handed curve baller set a personal record for walks, five in the contest, and couldn't get needed support in the Schnectady second. He already had thrown two all-star no-hitters this year.

Elmont drew first blood in the top of the second when Reilly was safe on Stringham's error at second. Jack Brink cracked a single to center that DiNoia let go through his legs, Reilly scoring. Neidel settled down and ended the inning by striking out Neil Silver, Ed Schunk, and Tom Fagan.

The winners came back with three in their half of the frame. Doug Wilkins got on through an infield single, went to second on Russ Moskal's sacrifice and third on Bill Jahnle's grounder to the shortstop. Tom Plotrowski bounced a ground-rule double over the right field fence to bring Wilkins across. Neidel sent what could be considered the winning run home on a single, then went to second on the throw and third on a wild pitch.

An error, a safe bunt, and a hit batsman loaded the bases in the fourth inning for Schnectady. Tom Wood brought the last run home on an infield grounder.

Elmont's threat in the sixth developed after one out. Tommy Pugh walked and Paul McGarry singled him to second. That's where McGarry came in and Schnectady left for Staten Island.

Labor Begins To See

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial in the New York Mirror, under date of August 18, under the caption "Labor Begins To See."

The editorial is a flat endorsement of the idea that we need more protection for American industries and American jobs.

The editorial follows:

LABOR BEGINS TO SEE

Organized labor has, in a large measure, in recent years, been responsible for sup-

porting the Rooseveltian policy of reciprocal trade agreements which have worked out so disadvantageously to the United States.

Already one effect of these treaties is that last year as many automobiles were imported as exported and the United States is importing such a product as steel.

The real sufferer from these treaties, agreements, quotas, exchange arrangements, etc., is the American worker.

For many years, conservatives have been cautioning labor that they have embarked on a dangerous course when they supported political measures disadvantageous to them. But having adopted labor internationalism, they would not retreat.

However, some unions are beginning to realize their peril. What they call imports from sweatshop countries have always been coming in from the same sweatshop countries. The only difference was that during the war and the early postwar years, businessmen were afraid to go to those countries, invest American capital in them, and then ship the goods back here to compete with the American worker, who generally lost out.

It is interesting to note that the great free trade unions, the International Ladies Garment Workers Union; the Amalgamated Clothing Workers; the United Hatters, Cap & Millinery Workers International, and the Textile Workers are leading in this reconsideration of a policy that has always been disadvantageous to the American worker.

A few points need to be made concerning this:

1. Most mass production work can be done as efficiently by low-wage workers as by high-wage workers. Therefore, unless the high-wage worker is in some manner protected, he will outprice himself;

2. In the semiskilled industries, the ability and efficiency of the workers play a small part in the total product; the bigger part is contributed by the machine which can be operated as well by less efficient workers, thus making the product cheaper to sell in the American market;

3. Since the Roosevelt regime everything has been done to make the phrase "Buy American" unpopular, with the result that Americans buy what is made in Hong Kong or Japan or Czechoslovakia as readily as they buy American goods.

It is nonsense for American unions to believe that they can solve this problem by stimulating campaigns in other countries to increase wages there. They will be told to mind their own business. Not all standards of living are the same and not all people approve of the American standard of living which includes many inflationary factors.

The soundest protection against the dumping of cheap goods into the world's greatest market is a protective tariff—and it would be startling, but it is foreseeable, that American labor will come to that.

A Symbol of Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the publisher of the Philadelphia Jewish Times, Mrs. Esther Klein, raised a very interesting question in her weekly editorial of August 14, 1959, concerning the effect which the proposed visit of the Soviet leader may have on our people. She asks whether the invitation will aid or deter

the world peace which we are seeking. Is the invitation to the leader of Soviet Russia a boost to his position in the world, as well as to the Communist philosophy?

Mrs. Klein's questions are searching, her position on the subject is good food for thought, and I hope her editorial, which appears below, will be read and seriously considered:

THE PUBLISHER SPEAKS

(By Esther Klein)

Nikita Khrushchev has accomplished his aim. He has been invited to the United States. He is being hailed as a symbol of peace.

This belligerent bully, whose entire career has been indicative of cruel and barbarous treatment, in a few short hours, has become the savior of world peace. In a startling new diplomacy he has achieved an open door to our choicest American citadels.

In a carefully planned dramatic vehicle, Khrushchev emerged the hero rather than the villain he has enacted before the world for years. Nixon's tour of Russia with a barrage of brilliant American newspaper men and women, radio commentators, and television experts, obtained a million-dollar publicity campaign for Khrushchev.

All the horrors of the Hungarian debacle, the Tibet betrayal, and the vicious Soviet colonization as well as desperate state of the vast Russian population, were lost in the benign hospitality extended with fanfare to our American delegation. Each day of the tour was fraught with incidents to arouse publicity for the hosts.

It wasn't surprising that the Soviet leader, whose personal travels have been concentrated on Soviet territory or in countries behind or within the Iron Curtain, should seek an invitation to the United States. He obtained the invitation simultaneously with the conclusion of our allies meeting in Geneva. He was ready with his acceptance and also specified the cities he wished to visit. He had contrived to get firsthand inspection of certain American metropolitan centers.

Our gullible State Department thought a coup had been accomplished by getting Khrushchev here but it was a carefully contrived Soviet plan. It is beyond my comprehension that our American leaders are rejoicing that this new exchange of visits will bring about world peace. Is this plan of "you entertain us and we'll have you back" the straw of hope to prevent the world from drowning in another flood, this time induced by nuclear weapons?

When Khrushchev announced the cities for his tour, there was no mention of Philadelphia, the cradle of American liberty. He had no desire to touch the Liberty Bell, the symbol of freedom that brought our country into the world as a democracy. He has no reverence for the Declaration of Independence that inspired the freedom-loving colonists to rebel against a cruel and vicious monarch.

What effect has the proposed Soviet leader's visit had so far on our people? They are being lulled into complacency. Now that the American and Soviet rulers are becoming buddy buddy there will be no war, certainly the cold war is of the past. Look at the effect on our stock market. Defense stocks which had been zooming are down. The stock market is the criterion to indicate the relaxed status of our people.

Forgotten are Khrushchev edicts opposing religion, the threatened destruction of the Jewish and Catholic faiths in the vast Soviet territory. Forgotten also was the opportunity for the American delegation to attend services during the tour. There was no mention of the officials or the attending press stepping within the holy confines of the

cathedral or the synagogue. This was the golden occasion to emphasize a great American privilege, freedom of religion.

Khrushchev's often repeated prediction that our grandchildren in the United States will live under communism, was frequently reiterated during his talks with Nixon. Having this shocking statement made 5,000 miles away in the confines of Soviet Russia strikes terror to our hearts. Giving this conniving world leader the opportunity to come here and repeat it constantly to our American citizenry is a deplorable situation.

When Khrushchev and company arrive, he will achieve his international objective of spreading communism at the invitation of the greatest democracy in the world. Could such an aggressive act aid or deter the world peace that we are seeking?

The Khrushchev-Eisenhower Visits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on August 7, 1959, Mr. Frank H. Bartholomew, president of the United Press International, spoke to the Commonwealth Club of California in San Francisco; and I am sure excerpts from his very able presentation will be of interest to everyone:

"WE SEEM SUSCEPTIBLE TO ANY OLIVE BRANCH," SAYS BARTHOLOMEW, BUT SEES HOPE IN KHRUSHCHEV-LIKE VISITS

(Address by Frank H. Bartholomew, president, United Press International)

At Geneva, I could not but be impressed by the attitude of the Swiss nation. They have escaped two world wars; have had, I think, no war in 500 years.

This is not because of any deals, but because they apparently are ready at all times to defend themselves.

They have one of the largest standing armies in Europe; my impression is the largest.

Friends of all, they have no intention of dropping their guard.

Contrast this with the emotional attitude of our own people. We are wont to think of the Latins as being emotional, but we ourselves are subject to gigantic swings of popular feeling.

We seem to be susceptible to anyone who extends an olive branch.

This was illustrated in Korea after World War II, when, in a seeming calm, we withdrew General Hodges and his three divisions. The vacuum was almost immediately filled by Communist invaders from the north.

Russia wanted a Geneva conference, insisted on it, got it, and then set about preventing one single facet of accomplishment.

We Americans usually credit the Russians with seriousness; with following a policy line so deep we cannot understand it. I'm beginning to wonder if they don't baffle themselves as much as the rest of the world!

I talked with Secretary Herter at the end of the third day. He said he expected no accomplishments, had not been optimistic beforehand, and therefore was not disappointed.

I was in Berlin the day the Russian ultimatum expired. Khrushchev had launched the crisis by giving us 6 months to pull out of Berlin.

INTERVIEWED ULBRICHT

On the day the ultimatum expired, I had asked for an interview with the chief of the Communist Party of East Germany, Walter Ulbricht.

On the way we passed Hitler's bunker, under an upended slab of concrete which was sort of a memorial to Hitler and all he stood for. In East Berlin we went through block after block of ruins.

The gloom and darkness of the headquarters building seemed to express the drabness of communism. We were escorted down a long corridor, crisscrossed every 10 feet by neon lights, but only 1 of 12 was lighted.

Ulbricht may loom large in world events to come. He is an odd little man and could be extremely dangerous.

Ulbricht was a colonel in the Russian army of occupation. A German, he lived in Russia so long he speaks German with a Russian accent.

COULD BE DANGEROUS

There is no question that Khrushchev thought he had hit upon the perfect device for blackmailing the West out of Berlin by turning it over to East Germany.

This does not mean any real government, but an organization that remains in power only because of the nearness of the Red army. It could not stand an election or a plebiscite.

TOOK IT SERIOUSLY

While Khrushchev may have looked upon his ultimatum as a means of blackmailing the West, Ulbricht took it seriously.

I have no doubt that he pressures Khrushchev at every opportunity to bring about the removal of the West. Unquestionably he opposes the suggestion of a 2-year extension because he cannot survive 2 years.

West Berlin was formerly a suburb which has been converted into a metropolis. East Berlin was the main city. The contrast is embarrassing to the Communists of East Germany.

MILES OF NEW APARTMENTS

Anyone can go from East to West Berlin and see what capitalism has done for West Berlin. The control is not on casual visits but on the families who remain.

First impression of Moscow was of the large airport and cavernous concrete buildings. We traveled a bumpy concrete road into the city.

On every side were mile after mile of new apartment buildings just completed or under construction. There is nothing like it in the world.

I was told the engineering and architecture was good, but the construction workers were not up to the design. Plaster was off the walls, floors buckled. But the apartments are occupied, with up to four in a single room.

Moscow has jumped from 1.5 million to 5 million inhabitants in a brief time. Therefore traffic into the city has been cut off. No housing permits are issued, and the migration is stopped.

I expected to see a drab city, but not so. They are doing a lot to beautify it. Buildings have been taken out and shade trees planted.

The people are too well fed. With the lifting of food rations, they eat too much and are too fat.

But they are badly clothed. None of the women are chic, and they don't seem to care too much. Yet when a beauty parlor was proposed at the U.S. exhibit, exhibitors were advised it would create a riot beyond the ability of the police to cope.

SHORTENED COURSES

The minister of education told me they had to shorten courses to accommodate the thousands and thousands of youngsters desiring an education.

Until recently, apparently, any Russian could have the equivalent of a college education and become a doctor or scientist, but now they have had to divert two-thirds of the students into the factories at the equivalent of a high-school education.

There is nothing in Moscow to evidence that the Russian people have been conditioned for a war. In all Moscow there is not an air-raid shelter or a siren. They have never had an air-raid drill.

The papers are filled with the achievements of the 7-year plan—people are urged to help fulfill the 7-year plan, and the Government will undertake to see that the Western warmongers do not attack.

Khrushchev seems to have bet on his ability to guarantee peace.

This must mean a dual policy: one of peace at home and one of threats and bluff for export—bluff, except for the fact that they do have atomic weapons.

I am personally convinced the Russian people would be the most surprised in the world if they found themselves in a war today.

NO DAMAGE, SOME GOOD?

My own conclusion is that no damage and some positive good may come from the exchange of visits between Khrushchev and Eisenhower. Bill Knowland, and Adm. Charles M. Cooke,¹ whom I profoundly respect, disagree.

If we don't drop our guard, I think the effect of Eisenhower's personality on the Russian people—his warmth and sincerity will far outweigh any Russian gain.

The fall of 1959 holds improved hope for peace. These are precarious times, times of great tensions, but let us, in the shadow of Theodore Roosevelt, walk softly but carry a big stick.

ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM FLOOR

Question (L. B. Worthington): "Will Nixon visit result in any lasting improvement?"

Answer: "Yes. Most valuable result was to force Soviet papers and radio to carry large portions of what he said. This is the first time Russians ever heard anything like that."

Question: "Did Nixon get through to Russian people?"

Answer: "Large sections were in Pravda and Izvestia, which have tremendous circulations. Chances are a good deal got through."

Question: "How were newsmen who accompanied Nixon selected?"

Answer: "For the wire services, generally on their knowledge of Nixon and ability to get the news out (very important for a foreign correspondent). Normally in Russia a correspondent must write in quadruplicate; he gets back the fourth carbon showing how his dispatch was censored. Some say, deletions are made to change the context; others that additional deletions are made. Some stories never get through."

Question (Hilary H. Crawford): "If Russians cut our corridor to West Berlin, why not get allies to close Dardanelles and back them to limit?"

Answer: "Put my name on that and send it to Pentagon. If we'd do more to take the initiative rather than counter or defend, there'd be better balance."

Question (Mike Ranney): "Manpower shortage?"

Answer: "Shortage of technicians very evident. People were busy."

Question: "Herter?"

Answer: "I had felt his nomination was half-hearted. Now I think he has great moral strength and willpower; won't be pushed around. He may go down in history as a great American statesman."

¹ Former commander, 7th Fleet, who addressed club last Sept. 26.

U.S. Passport Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, of New York, appeared today before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and presented an excellent statement on proposed U.S. passport legislation. Many bills have been filed to limit the travel of certain U.S. citizens abroad, whose travel and activities might be detrimental to the security and basic foreign policies of the United States.

Congressman LINDSAY is well qualified to appear as an expert witness on passport legislation because of his top-level legal background and experience. He has served from 1955 to 1957 as executive assistant to the Attorney General of the United States. Mr. LINDSAY is a graduate of the Yale Law School and as an outstanding attorney, is admitted to the New York bar, the bar of U.S. Supreme Court, and the District of Columbia bar.

Mr. LINDSAY is a member of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, the New York State Bar Association, and the American Bar Association. Mr. LINDSAY is making a fine record as a Member of the 86th Congress.

I am submitting this material for my colleagues in the Congress as well as the people of the United States so that these views can be carefully considered in working out the constitutional basis, and the correct legal method in obtaining good legislation in this important field of passport authorization and issuance.

The above mentioned follows:

U.S. PASSPORT LEGISLATION

(Statement of U.S. Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY of New York before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Tuesday, August 18, 1959)

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the opportunity to appearing before this distinguished committee. I share your concern, and that of the Department of State whose representatives have already testified, over the absence of legislation, consistent with the decisions of the Supreme Court in the Kent, Briehl, and Dayton cases, to authorize the Secretary of State to exercise some measure of discretion in the issuance of passports. I am aware as we all are, that the matter of passports and their issuance, is necessarily an aspect of the conduct of foreign affairs, and in that sense, bears upon national and international security.

But in approaching the problem of devising legislation, I start with the premise that we are dealing here with a constitutional right. I am in firm agreement with the opinion of the Supreme Court in the Kent, Briehl, and Dayton cases. While not deciding those cases on constitutional grounds, the Court nevertheless stated that "the right to travel is part of the liberty of which a citizen cannot be deprived without the due process of law of the fifth amendment." I agree wholeheartedly with that statement. I believe also that the right to travel is con-

joint with and part of the first amendment—freedom of speech and assembly. I believe it to be the duty of this committee to study the substance of the right to travel with great care, realizing that any measures restricting this right are certain to be tested in the courts sooner or later—probably sooner. And I am particularly disturbed by what I feel are constitutional inadequacies in the legislation endorsed to you by the Department of State.

What is the right to travel? In my book it is one of the most fundamental liberties that we have. The Supreme Court tells us that it is "part of the liberty protected by the due process clause of the fifth amendment." The Solicitor General of the United States conceded as much in his argument before the Court in Kent and Dayton. But, as I stated at the outset, I would suggest also that it is a part of the first amendment. Of all the freedoms that we have, the one I should most hate to lose is freedom of speech. Speech is communication, and communication in this modern day is impossible without locomotion. Speech is meaningless unless thought of in the context of the physical and social aspects of human existence.

Constitutional sources strongly suggest that early Americans recognized a freedom to move beyond national frontiers. However uncertain its basis may have been, however unclear its limitations, the English recognized that freedom long before they crossed the Atlantic. The people of the Colonies, moreover, evidently took the freedom for granted; witness the constant movement between Colonies and to the West. That may explain why the freedom was not more clearly recognized in writing. The Declaration of Independence goes no further than to list as a grievance the restrictions which George the Third placed upon emigration. The Articles of Confederation merely guaranteed free movement between different colonies, though the Colonies, not yet joined in a more perfect union, were more like foreign countries to each other than the United States are today. Perhaps the most direct documentary evidence is to be found in the Pennsylvania Constitution of 1790 which declared "that emigration from the State shall not be prohibited."

These sources, taken together, and viewed in the light of the ninth amendment, warrant the assumption that omission of the words "right to travel," was not intended to eliminate the right. Nor is the omission inconsistent with a specific intention to include the right in free speech. The Constitution was designed to guide the United States for an indefinite period of time. It would have been impossible to enumerate the variety of ways in which free speech might be abridged—and the framers recognized this in the generality of the first amendment's language.

The specific problem your committee must wrestle with, Mr. Chairman, is that of finding a constitutional way of preventing hard-core, dedicated Communists from abusing the travel right by actively striving against our most supreme national interests.

Now let me make it absolutely clear that we are not here talking about anyone who is under indictment for the commission of any crime, or is under restraining order of any kind by any court, or has been stripped of any right or liberty by due process of law. As to these, we all agree that the right to travel ought to be, and can constitutionally be, curtailed. The nonindicted, non-court-restrained Communist present a more difficult case. There may well be risks inherent in allowing a member of the Communist Party, or one identified as such by our intelligence units, free exit from our shores to travel abroad. But it is necessary to point out that this is true when Communists travel from Chicago to New York or from New York to the Bahamas, or from Dallas to

Mexico, or from San Francisco to Buenos Aires or to any other South American country, none of which places requires a passport for exit or entry. It should be pointed out also that under the McCarran-Walter Act we are required to deport alien members of the Communist Party and we go to elaborate efforts to secure their removal after they have been traveling freely in this country for years. Well and good enough. Yet under our passport procedures, until the Supreme Court decided otherwise, we have insisted that it is essential to the national security to keep citizen members of the party confined to our shores. The point is that there could possibly be something wrong with our reasoning; and when we are dealing with limitations on constitutional rights it is important that our reasoning be compelling and logical. You must consider whether the bills before you will in fact accomplish their purpose of confining trained subversives to these shores. You must remember, also, that the President has in the past stressed the importance of taking every reasonable step that will facilitate international travel and exchange, e.g., the abolition of the requirement of finger printing for transients through, and temporary visitors to, this country.

I do not differ to widely in substance from the position taken by the administration, as presented by the State Department through its spokesman, Mr. Hanes in his testimony here. I shall come to the differences shortly, and although seemingly small, they are important ones. I do differ widely in emphasis. I would emphasize the obligation of the Department of State—for that matter, of every executive department—to scrupulously avoid to the greatest extent possible any intrusion on the precious rights of American citizens. The right to travel, although it has been around a long while, is just beginning to be articulated. We must be careful not to let a cavalier approach lead us to legislative decisions which the courts may undo, and quite properly so.

I agree with the State Department that it is indeed fundamental that the liberty guaranteed by the Constitution is not absolute. "Civil liberties," says the Supreme Court "imply the existence of an organized society maintaining public order without which liberty itself would be lost in the excesses of unrestrained abuses." Freedom to travel, like other liberties, is subject to reasonable regulation and control in the interests of the public welfare. I am not sure that it is possible to draw up absolutely fixed rules which will in advance strike a proper balance which will meet the exigencies of every case, protect the public interest, and yet stay within constitutional limitations. Circumstances and the times vary and "due process of law has never been a term of fixed and invariable content." But let's make sure we don't "throw out the baby with the bath." I should like therefore to restate what I believe to be the guideposts which should guide the Congress in its consideration of this subject:

First, the right to travel—to communicate—is a constitutionally protected right which may not be abrogated by the State except under the general war power, which normally may be invoked only in time of extreme emergency, usually involving armed conflict between nations. The right is a concomitant of, and conjoint with, the first amendment of the Constitution. A denial of a passport therefore, may result in violations of both the fifth and first amendments.

Second, neither the right of the citizen to have issued, nor the right of the Secretary of State to deny issuance of, a passport is an absolute right.

Third, a general standard under which the Secretary of State is authorized to deny the issuance of a passport whenever he finds that its issuance would be contrary to the

national welfare, safety or security, or otherwise be prejudicial to the interests of the United States is too indefinite a standard when applied to a right as firmly grounded among our basic liberties as is freedom of speech and assembly. In the past we have too often seen examples of executive arbitrariness under the umbrella of the national security and the conduct of foreign relations.

Fourth, a refusal to issue a passport may not rest upon confidential undisclosed information, under a blanket, unlimited authority to use the same. Such a refusal would, in all probability, be a denial of due process of law under the fifth amendment. The authority to use confidential information in the administrative process, under imprecise standards, coupled with the power to delegate authority to subordinates, and without full judicial review, can result in a breeding ground of arbitrariness in the course of which innocent people may, and undoubtedly will, suffer.

You will note that I have spoken here of blanket, unlimited authority to use confidential information. There may be room for an exception to cover the hard core Communist case, under which the Secretary of State or the Under Secretary, personally, will certify, first, that disclosure will expose a "double" or "buried" agent of tested and known reliability; second, that such exposure will be prejudicial to the national interests; and third, that the case may not be decided without resort to such evidence. But even then, full access to the evidence in question should be given upon judicial review to the court, under seal, for examination by the court in camera.

Thus the two important points of difference between the Department of State's views and mine are (1) I would permit confidential information to be used only upon certification at the highest level of its special necessity, and (2) I would require that the whole of the confidential information be laid under seal before the reviewing judge in chambers. In my judgment, anything less might violate the due process requirement of the fifth amendment.

Turning then to the bills before this committee, to the extent that time has permitted me to review them, I believe that H.R. 7006, which the State Department has endorsed, is lacking in the necessary procedural safeguards of a constitutional right. Since H.R. 2468 contains no review provision at all, it seems deficient in this respect, as well as in the others enumerated by the Department. Nor does H.R. 5455 provide such safeguards in my judgment.

I find that H.R. 55, in its present form, contains the words "on the record" at line 11, page 3, which are ambiguous. I understand from Mr. Hanes' statement that there is legislative history behind these words, and if they can fairly be deemed to mean "on the record, open and closed," that bill contains, at least in part, the standards I should like to see applied.

The best approach to the procedural problem of the bills presently before you, in my opinion, is contained in title III of H.R. 8329. In its requirement in section 308(b) that the Secretary of State himself make the final administrative determination upholding a refusal to issue, or a revocation of, a passport, it goes far toward providing for due caution in the evaluation of confidential information. And its section 807 provides what no other House bill I have examined does: the kind of judicial review necessary, in my judgment, to meet the constitutional test of due process.

I have not in this discussion tried to spell out an entire code to govern the issuance of passports, or to draft legislation. My purpose here has been only to state my views on some of the fundamentals, and I would hope

that consideration of this matter in the Congress would be guided by those fundamentals. Neither have I touched upon the whole subject of area restrictions, except indirectly. Here I would recommend the report of the special committee to study passport procedures of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, an excellent report, prepared by a distinguished committee of lawyers. Its conclusion on the subject of area restraints is as follows:

"Travel abroad by all U.S. citizens may be prohibited in areas where the Secretary of State determines that such prohibitions should be imposed in the national interest, but only in situations of exceptional gravity. The imposition of area restrictions should be accompanied by a statement by the Secretary of State setting forth the reasons therefor. Exceptions to general area prohibitions, permitting travel by particular individuals or groups, may be made by the Secretary of State in his discretion."

In closing, I should like to make reference to a document of great importance which is too seldom invoked. It is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which this year celebrated its 10th anniversary. Article 13 of the declaration reads as follows:

"ART. 13. (1) Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state. (2) Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country."

The United States along with the other member nations, has pledged itself to achieve, in cooperation with the United Nations, the promotion of universal respect and observance of the human rights and fundamental freedoms set forth in the declaration. Let us in the United States be faithful to our pledge.

MATS Mission—ATA Mission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, August 17, 1959, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I entitled my extension "MATS Mission, Support Our Fighting Forces—ATA Mission, Destroy MATS." Included in the above-mentioned extension, Mr. Speaker, was a statement emanating from the office of the Air Transport Association entitled "H.R. 7978." This circular was designed to deprive MATS of money vitally necessary to modernize its present MATS fleet. This circular was given to selected members of the Appropriations Committee. It was written so as to persuade Members of Congress that the private airlines can do the job for which MATS is designed. Mr. Speaker, this is an insidious, hypocritical, and unpatriotic effort on the part of those responsible in ATA to put the dollar before the security of the Nation.

For some unknown reason this circular did not appear in my remarks. It disappeared between the Capitol and the time the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was published the following day. Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include this circular entitled "H.R.

7978." I want the Congress and the Nation to know that the mission of the MATS is to support SAC, the fighting men and women of this country, and the Armed Forces of the free world. The mission of the ATA is to destroy MATS in its capacity to fulfill its wartime mission. I leave it to the Nation to decide whether the MATS is set up to serve the Nation or whether the ATA places the dollar before the security of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I include herewith the MATS mission as referred to in the above article so that both the circular of the ATA and the mission of the MATS can appear as originally intended so that the reader can understand exactly what faces the Military Air Transport Command in its fight for survival. Mr. Speaker, there is not any way under the sun that the private airlines can undertake and fulfill the mission which the MATS does. There is not any way on earth for a private airline to be ordered into a combat zone. There is not any way on earth for a private airline to fulfill rescue missions which MATS undertakes. There is not any way on earth for the private airlines to do the weather service which MATS does. Mr. Speaker, MATS is a combat force designed to serve America. The hauling of passengers and freight is just incidental to MATS' global and astronomical mission. ATA wants to get the passenger and freight business of MATS and leave the other responsibilities to a nonexistent skeleton.

H.R. 7978

Senate amendment No. 34, to the supplemental appropriation bill, is an item of \$30 million for modernization of the Military Air Transport Service fleet. This item should be eliminated.

It had already been turned down by both Houses in the regular defense appropriation bill. However, while the regular defense appropriation bill was pending in conference, the Air Force requested, and Senator CANNON made a personal plea to the Senate Appropriations Committee for, inclusion of \$50 million for the procurement of jet aircraft for MATS. The committee included \$30 million.

Testimony indicates that the Air Force plan calls for two or three squadrons of jet aircraft of essentially the same types as have already been bought by the airlines. Aircraft of this type cost between \$5 and \$6 million each and the amount initially required here would be only the beginning of a large expenditure. Testimony further indicates that the aircraft would be used mainly for the regular MATS mission which the Air Force views as an airline type of scheduled operation all over the world. This expenditure, if allowed, will be only an initial downpayment on a bill which may be expected to reach as much as a billion dollars.

The regular scheduled transportation of Defense personnel and cargo can be met without capital investment by the Government. At a cost of over \$2 billion of private capital, the scheduled airlines are already acquiring a huge fleet of jet aircraft for the transportation of passengers. In addition, many of the airlines have already ordered modern turbine-powered cargo aircraft. They will acquire additional airplanes with private funds if they are given the opportunity to carry Defense Department traffic. If the Air Force would use the airlines to perform the scheduled transport needs of

the Defense Department instead of running the MATS airline in competition with the civil airlines, MATS would be better prepared for emergencies. Under its present system of operating, it is not well prepared.

MATS AND THE MISSION

(By Bill Borklund)

(Although the importance of its mission is the key to its entire operation, the Military Air Transport Service has been caught this year in a never before equaled barrage of diversionary charges—most, if not all, of them secondary and misleading. Until the underbrush is cleared away, MATS, and the Air Force, are going to have a hard time reaching, with much desired commercial airline help, a much needed program for use of all U.S. support air power in the time of war.)

Bombed, badgered, and besieged as were few military outfits this year, the Military Air Transport Service enters the final round, this month, of a summer-long congressional hassle over how much money it should be spending on commercial airlift, how much of its military job it should do itself.

At the same time, undaunted by the battering it has taken, MATS is reentering the Washington, D.C., arena with two far-reaching proposals of its own. One: A \$53 million supplemental appropriation request for 10 jet-powered aircraft (which Capitol Hill whacked out of the original Defense money request) to start the long-overdue MATS modernization program. Two: a proposal that Defense start airlifting all personnel overseas (present levels—37 percent of Army, 50 percent of Navy, 94 percent of Air Force), double the amount of overseas shipping by air of high value hardware.

Either idea will be enough to start the whole argument again, an argument that centers around what MATS does and why. Strangely enough, all the mountains of obfuscating manuscript produced this year have done little to clarify the MATS mission, key to the whole argument. The result: means are discussed as ends, the result is called the cause and headline-hunting critics have led a big chunk of Congress (and most of the American public) down a bramble-strewn path of misinformation.

Among the baubles: MATS is the world's largest airline. It isn't even close. Soviet Russia's Aeroflot is No. 1 among the real leaders. In addition, only about 30,000 of MATS' 120,000 Navy, Air Force, and civilian personnel and half its 1,198 assigned aircraft handle the strategic air transport mission. The rest take care of MATS' less-publicized services—Air Weather, Air Photographic and Charting, Air Rescue, Airways and Air Communications, and Aeromedical Evacuation.

MATS runs a plushy airline. The three VC-137A jet passenger planes which prompted this blast are indeed plushy, were built for the Air Force to fly the President, Congress, and high level U.S. dignitaries around the world, are actually off-the-shelf Boeing 707's with standard executive interiors. Assigned to MATS for administrative purposes only, the aircraft are actually under control of the Joint Chiefs of Staff organization. Nearly all other MATS passengers travel the austere equivalent of commercial tourist class.

MATS is competing with commercial airlines for passengers. Total passengers carried by MATS last year amounted to less than 1 percent of the 49 million annual passenger load carried by U.S. airlines alone.

MATS, like any other military organization, has a wartime mission, assigned by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The mission: be ready to move troops, missiles, and other heavy weapons and supplies in any war emergency to support other Air Force components, the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. JCS estimates wartime airlift requirements specifies

those that are critical, i.e., must be handled by military aircraft and crews, pegs the rest essential, i.e., can be done by either MATS or civil carriers.

Given a half-day to reach predesignated spots around the globe to cover the critical tasks (primarily resupplying Strategic Air Command bombers returning from their first bombing run), MATS keeps an alert force in on-the-flight-line readiness, runs the rest of its airlift through practical training exercises. It is, in essence, a SAC-like supply operation with one exception. SAC must take pictures rather than drop its bombs. MATS can haul and process in peacetime training the same supplies it will actually carry if the big war should start.

To handle the bulk of the essential role, it has organized a Civil Reserve Air Fleet. Primary CRAF duty, at the moment: hauling passengers. CRAF list of planes varies depending on predicted requirements, is currently (fiscal year 1960) made up of 242 aircraft under assignment from 27 different civil carriers—primarily DC-4's for cargo, DC-7's for passengers. There is a slight hooker: For MATS to use any of the CRAF planes, under current agreements with the airlines, it must take them all. Result: MATS must take care of most limited war situations pretty much on its own.

To MATS its realistic training program is an absolute necessity if it is to have any chance at all of meeting its wartime obligation. Said one colonel, "Letting pilots fly the aircraft is the very tiniest part of this whole training effort. We've got to train the traffic people, the maintenance men, cargo handlers, the whole crew."

"We have to know what we can move where and how efficiently. (Biggest problem right now is the terminal operation.) You can't mothball an operation like this, any more than you can SAC, then push a button and have it spring into operation in the wink of an eye—which is how fast we'd have to get going on D-day."

Requesting 6 hours originally, MATS is allowed a 5-hour per day per aircraft utilization rate for training, has reasons for believing this isn't enough. Studies by Rand Corp., and such men as Dr. Paul Cherington of Harvard Business School indicate MATS could not boost this training rate to that required if a hot war started, far less than the 10 hours demanded by JCS, and MATS could maintain this rate for at best 30 days. Their own Korean war experience tends to corroborate this finding. Asked for a 10-hour per aircraft per day operating rate MATS, in the initial and crucial stages of the war, was able to boost its 2.8-hour prewar level to only slightly over 4 hours.

Thus, they are being asked to do what some of the best brains in the country say can't be done. In spite of this, MATS maintains it has the capability the JCS says it should, but, added one officer (in reference to oft-quoted ex-Army Chief of Staff Maxwell Taylor's demand for more troop airlift), "We don't have the capability to move everything everyone wants us to move."

MATS supply backlog, one mark of efficiency, in any given airport is running less than 3-day maximum currently acceptable to MATS headquarters. They're thinking of revising that goal to 1 day. And, in response to the Capitol Hill charges that MATS is running scheduled flights overseas along the same routes as commercial carriers, one officer snorted, "A schedule is nothing more than a program any good manager uses to see if he can do what he says he wants to do. As for the routes, although we don't use the same bases, there's usually one one efficient economical way to cross an ocean. We use the same route as the airlines for the same reason."

Beyond its realistic readiness training and the supplemental CRAF program, MATS, in

its role as single manager for military air transport, buys a large chunk of commercial airlift. Among the reasons: military air transport demands are higher than the by-product—airlift—of MATS training program can handle; MATS wants only to be able to do its assigned war mission, wants a strong civil air fleet ready to back it up after the first few days or weeks of an all-out war.

Of the \$200 million paid by Defense to civil carriers for contract, charter and common carriage airlift in fiscal year 1959, MATS signed the tab for over half (\$105 million). Of that quantity, \$70.8 million was Congress-appropriated money spent backing up MATS' own peacetime operation. The rest it spent as procurement officer for Logair, Quicktrans and the Air Force Ballistic Missile Division.

Even if the requirement for airlift does not increase (and it's likely to), MATS will soon be spending more of Defense's airlift dollar as it phases in Northeastern North America intertheater airlift overseas, eventually will be responsible for the whole \$200 million. All procurements are advertised, all carriers are eligible to bid. Commented one procurement officer, "We don't care, initially, what capability they have."

When the contract is let, however, MATS keeps two things in mind:

1. Placing as much business as possible on a fixed, long-term basis (to get better pricing, make contract administration easier for both the carrier and MATS).

2. The report of MATS Capability Survey Committee which visits carriers' facilities, verifies that they can produce as they say they will. We want to make awards only to responsible and capable carriers. To a good many commanders buying airlift, performance is a lot more important than cost.

But, if MATS has as good a case as any other military organization for existing, that \$70.8 million, and growing, prize has been too much for the commercial airlines to view with clear-cut business acumen. Strangest twist, to MATS officers, in the whole Capitol Hill cacophony is that the very people in Washington who should be helping MATS sell increased use of airlift are, instead, pounding MATS with every brickbat they own.

Like a recalcitrant bulldog, the commercial airlines, through their powerful association lobbyists, are leaning hard on Congress to get them a bigger share of the large MATS business—in spite of MATS' boss Lt. Gen. William H. Tunner's statement that "there just is no more business—unless MATS flies its aircraft empty."

And if MATS flies empty? Ignoring for the moment its crippling effect on MATS preparedness, the cost of defense airlift to the U.S. taxpayer would skyrocket to nearly \$1 billion—something the Pentagon thinks he would take a rather dim view of. Even though MATS used 80 percent of its passenger, 74.8 percent of its cargo capacity during the last fiscal year, commercial airlines still hauled 40 percent of MATS's passengers, 10 percent of its cargo.

This is a far cry from MATS commercial augmentation in 1955 when it spent only \$4.5 million on civil airlines to haul 1.5 percent of its passengers, 6.6 percent of its cargo and mail. In the past 5 years, MATS has reduced its airlift by 107 planes, cut its personnel strength some 2,400 persons. Yet, charges of MATS' persistent expansion, to the detriment of commercial airlines, persist.

False charges are not MATS' only headache. Attracted by the mushrooming market, MATS' bidders list has jumped from 41 carriers in 1957 to 86 this year, is expected to reach 122 in 1960. Most of the additions are briefcase operators with one or two ob-

solescent aircraft, at most, purchased solely to get MATS business.

Operating under a part 45 certification (called one of the great rackets in the aviation industry by Oklahoma's Senator MIKE MONROE) and not subject to Civil Aeronautics Board control, these "tissue paper" firms come under the benevolent protection of a Small Business Administration umbrella—and most of the unreliable outfits are spotted by the contract survey committee as in this category.

Said one procurement officer, "These small business set-asides are encouraging the use of old aircraft, discouraging the forward looking companies—and, on top of all that, we figure we pay about a 10-percent premium to give them business."

These quick-hit-and-die operators have prompted an intramural fight among the carriers. But, as reflected in a Congress trying to keep everybody happy, the fight has become something far more ominous. Said South Carolina's Senator THURMOND, "Excessive (governmental) concern with commercial aviation has caused us to progressively nibble away at the Military Air Transport Service."

MATS' request for 10 C-jets (estimated cost: \$53 million) hit a blank wall first time around—for precisely the same reason MATS has been in trouble all summer; national defense mission keeps being obscured by politics and considerations of false economy.

To MATS the argument for C-jets seems pretty clear cut. Says Tunner, "We need both a racehorse and a workhorse." They are getting the workhorse, the C-133. For the other: "It doesn't make much sense to us to try to support a 600-knot-an-hour bomber with a 190-knot transport. We're trying to support a rocket (SAC) with a kiddie car."

Adds Tunner, "The transport plane now in the inventory, being piston-driven would be many hours distant from the friendly base with needed materiel and personnel at the time the SAC bomber arrived. It is precisely the difference in speed between a jet-propelled plane and a piston-driven plane. The SAC plane would therefore be threatened with immobilization after one strike at a target."

And there's the advantage of economy. Ten C-jets will do the same job as 42 of the C-124's which comprise the bulk of today's strategic transport fleet, are nearly obsolete and costly to maintain.

MATS has already heard, in the wings, the yells of the civil airlines. "What they tell us basically," said one MATS officer, "is they want us to do a good job—but not too good." Tunner insists that MATS is not fighting the commercial airlines: "We need them. We are counting on a strong airline industry to backstop us in time of war." But if MATS is not in a fight, it is showing a lot of unexplainable bruises.

What rankles MATS men most, and some of the most knowledgeable men in the airlift business today are in Tunner's organization is that the MATS record is about 180 degrees opposite from the picture painted of it by commercial interests; is, in fact, far better than the so-far performance in war situations of private carriers demanding they be given more of the job to do.

Among the quotable:

On claims industry could do the job cheaper: "Assuming the same operational training level, if we split the cargo-passenger business equally with the civil carriers, Defense airlift bill would jump another \$300 million. If we flew empty, the taxpayers would shell out \$750 million more."

Could do it better?: "Ten times during July, August, and September last year MATS went looking for commercial airlift augmentation, couldn't find it. During the Lebanon and Far East crisis, all bids in some offerings were so high they all had to be rejected. We had to haul the supplies and people ourselves working overtime. It was the tourist

season, if you'll recall. During 1 week last November when they were on strike, all but four TWA scheduled flights were handled by MATS. We do not consider this the proper way to maintain military readiness."

MATS' "competitive" setup is preventing civil carriers from developing a cargo capability: "They want us to give them the money to build the aircraft, then guarantee them a profit on the business. The airlines built an incomparably efficient passenger service under a free enterprise system. Passenger business in this country is a drop in the bucket, compared to the commercial cargo they could haul. Why don't they go out and develop it instead of going to Washington looking for a Defense Department dole?"

What about Congress?: "If they buy this civil carrier idea to pare down MATS even more, they'll be behind the biggest eight ball they've ever seen. We already have letters indicating every transport outfit in the country, steamship lines, railroads, buses, will jump on the bandwagon—and you couldn't blame them."

MATS 4-ENGINE STRATEGIC TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT

C-97-----	48
C-118-----	126
C-121-----	71
C-124 (troop carrier)-----	143
C-124-----	310
C-133-----	23
Total-----	578

Against Seating Communist China in U.N.

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, the best that can be said about the resolution before us, in my opinion, is that it shows questionable judgment and reflects an astonishing lack of self-confidence.

We are told that the single purpose of this resolution is "to reaffirm the attitude of the Congress that it is opposed to the seating of Communist China in the United Nations." The same proposition goes on to point out that since 1948, the House on 15 occasions has approved language opposing the admission of the Communist regime in China to the U.N.

This is an average of 1.3 times per year for the past 11 years, Mr. Speaker, and I am constrained to wonder if this almost routine expression of opposition is really necessary or desirable.

Does the legislative branch of our Government so distrust the executive, which is charged with the conduct of our foreign policy, that it finds it necessary to continuously reestablish and emphasize such guidelines as contained in the resolution before us?

I have not noticed any tendency on the part of the administration to be soft on communism or to favor the admission of Red China to the United Nations, either in the past or at the present time. For this reason, the resolution before us appears to me to be totally unnecessary.

But maybe I am wrong about this, Mr. Speaker. Maybe the drafters of this

resolution detect a slight quavering on the part of the administration in its conduct of the cold war. If so, then there might be a very real question as to whether 1.3 times per year is actually often enough for us to express congressional opposition to Red China's admission to the U.N. If the distinguished Committee on Foreign Affairs detects such a quavering, perhaps we should incorporate an expression of congressional opposition as part of our daily routine. Just after the morning prayer or perhaps prior to adjournment each day.

Mr. Speaker, I can see where some Members may feel that a difficult question is raised by the House record of 15 protestations on this subject in the last 11 years. After all, if we do not continue to maintain a batting average of 1.3 protests per year our constituents may find cause to question our resolve and determination in freedom's fight against totalitarianism.

I am happy to say, Mr. Speaker, that I don't think the people whom I have the privilege of representing in Ohio would be terribly upset even if our batting average falls to less than one resolution on this subject per year. Nor do I think that our neighbors in the U.N. would construe such inaction as an affirmative indication that the United States wants China in the United Nations. Our position is perfectly clear on this score and there is no reason whatever to suppose it in doubt.

The resolution, as I see it, is undesirable as well as unnecessary. It is undesirable because it interjects Congress into the conduct of our foreign affairs in a manner which serves no constructive purpose whatever. If we persist in this kind of nonsense, Mr. Speaker, every vestige of flexibility in the conduct of our foreign policy stands to be destroyed. It is time we recognize that such infringements by Congress upon Presidential authority can lead to confusion, if not disintegration, in the implementation of an affirmative foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, many of us here are vehemently opposed to the admission of Red China as a member of the U.N. at this time. But it does not follow that we must therefore cast an affirmative vote for the resolution before us. I am sure that if the membership of the House is careful to distinguish between the question of whether Red China should at this time be a member of the U.N. and whether or not the legislation before us can serve any proper or useful purpose, an intelligent decision on the resolution will be reached.

Roads to Nowhere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, the Mansfield News-Journal, of Mansfield, Ohio, is a fine independent newspaper, which truly strives to come to grips with

many of our problems. Most of all, it deals with major national issues in simple, everyday terms that make it possible for our citizens to think clearly about complex subjects.

On Sunday, August 9, 1959, the Mansfield News-Journal carried an editorial entitled, "Roads to Nowhere," which I believe is well worthy of the consideration of my colleagues, who shortly will be considering legislation to finance the needed highway program. Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting this editorial, written by my friend Ken Woodman.

The material follows:

[From the Mansfield News-Journal, Aug. 9, 1959]

ROADS TO NOWHERE

Is the United States going to be full of stretches of fine double highway that start nowhere and wind up at the edge of a cornfield?

It will be if the Democrats in Congress don't quit squabbling about the Federal highway program.

Ohio has already called off bidding on all contracts where Federal funds are involved. A serious crimp has been put in the State's public road program.

California stopped advertising for bids in May and put \$187 million worth of projects on the shelf.

South Dakota is stymied on plans for \$36 million in highways.

Thus it goes across the Nation.

Big highways half-built; needed highways stopped cold on the planning table. And why? Largely because the Democrats in Congress who are perfectly willing to give away \$3 billion in U.S. money to foreign lands, will not come up with an adequate program for financing this essential improvement at home.

Last January, President Eisenhower saw that the road program was going into the red, mainly because the Democrats had jumped it from \$2.2 billion to \$2.5 billion last year to "prime the national pump"—without providing any additional taxes to foot the bill.

Mr. Eisenhower suggested a 1½-cent hike in the gasoline tax to keep the road program rolling. With a Presidential election coming up next year the Democrats wanted no part of a tax increase. Issue bonds, they said. But with Federal spending outstripping Federal income and the debt soaring, nobody is rushing to buy Government bonds.

On July 1, the Federal Government was supposed to begin passing out this fiscal year's \$2.5 billion to the States, but it had only \$500 million.

If Congress lacks the courage to levy necessary taxes (preferably on road users through a gasoline tax), then it should shut up shop on roadbuilding and let the States take over.

Ohio, for instance, could readily finance an adequate major highway program. The wealth to do so is here. It cannot be done, however, in the face of uncertainty as to what the Federal Government will do.

And since the Federal program is started, there may be valid reasons to continue it—if it is soundly financed.

Is this a vague, uninteresting problem to you?

Just drive out and take a look at beautiful Ohio Route 1. Completed, it would take you to the Ohio and New York turnpikes so that you could drive from here to New England or Wisconsin without ever encountering a traffic light. Now it goes nowhere. It fizzles out north of Medina and somewhere south toward Columbus.

It's an expensive road to go nowhere. It would be a highly valuable road to us all if it were open and completed.

This story is being repeated all over the country. And just in case our Congressmen don't know it, the folks back home are going to be pretty sore when they see what legislative dalliance has done.

Family Life With the Strategic Air Command

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include an article entitled "Family Life With the Strategic Air Command," by Mary Lee O'Neal, appearing in the Christian Science Monitor of August 17. Outlined in the article are some of the everyday events that are faced by the wives and families of the crew members of SAC. To a great number of Americans who themselves must shoulder the burdens of everyday life the sacrifices of that one particular group, who constantly are on the alert to protect American shores, are distant, impersonal. Yet, Americans will always be grateful to those whose devotion to duty make it possible for us to go about our assignments with a feeling of added security—and our appreciation is extended to those loved ones who day in and day out anxiously await the return of these heroes.

The article follows:

FAMILY LIFE WITH THE STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

(By Mary Lee O'Neal)

"Next week we are going on alert." "Our crew is going to Europe next month." "Don't save dinner for me." And so it goes. Familiar words to an Air Force wife married to a pilot in the Strategic Air Command.

Familiar words, repetitious words, tiresome words, depressing words. But they are words we have to live with. They comprise the highs and lows of our daily existence.

Recent newspapers have carried items about the possibility of SAC's going on a partial alert wherein a certain portion of its force would be in the air 24 hours a day. I have often wondered if the average citizen reading such items realizes how SAC families are affected by the alerts and missions already in effect.

In the past 2 years, in addition to his regular flying missions, my husband has been gone from home on several reflex trips abroad, and has been confined to the air base with his B-47 crew on frequent home alerts.

He has been gone from home on Father's Day twice, on a birthday, our anniversary, Memorial Day, Labor Day, and the 4th of July. We have eaten months of dinners without him, and he has missed many of the little triumphs and tears mothers like to share with fathers concerning their children.

One week he left home as the baby was tentatively stepping out alone. When he returned 3 weeks later he found a sure-footed little girl. All the fun in between he never saw.

There are parties I have not attended, shows I have missed, and meetings I have been forced to forgo. I couldn't go minus a husband, or I couldn't find a baby sitter.

Recently we moved into a new home all our own. My husband lived in it for 2 days. Then he went on home alert for a week. Two days later he was off to an oversea station. Three weeks later he was home for 3 days; then he was off to Oklahoma and was delayed there 6 days. Upon his return he flew a night mission, and 3 hours later he went on home alert. And so the year goes.

Last month I waited for him to find time to help me plant morning glories for a trellis on my back stoop. It became evident to me he might be here to help me build a snowman, but if I wanted morning glories I would have to dig out the rocks, sift the dirt, and prepare the flowerbed myself. I did.

I have painted furniture, hung pictures, burned garbage in the snow, trudged across town with two tired children to complete Christmas shopping, waited in numerous barbershop chairs for my son's haircuts, serviced the car, coped with it when it wouldn't start, stacked belongings above floodwaters in our basement, and made all sorts of decisions. Perhaps many wives do these things anyway, but when he is home my husband does them, and I miss his help.

Our little girl, just learning to talk, doesn't say "Dada," but adds "Dada br-r-r-r," which is her way of saying Daddy has gone bye-bye in an airplane. She has accepted his being gone as normal; his coming home as something special.

On the other hand, my son misses his father acutely, and it is a continuous challenge to me to compensate for his father's absences. There are times when a boy needs a male influence, and mothers are poor substitutes.

Last Christmas Eve when families were gathering together to share this night of nights, I was sitting in a squadron dayroom waiting for a plane that would be my husband's—waiting for my Christmas to begin. Finally the truck brought up my husband's crew from the snowswept ramp where they had landed their big jet bomber, and I knew our little family would have Christmas after all. It didn't matter that my husband reached home too late to see the children hang their stockings, or that he was too tired from having flown the Atlantic to know it was Christmas. He was with us.

Many times I ask myself why we have to live like this and how much longer it will go on. There is little security in living day by day knowing our plans will go awry at any moment; that vacations may be canceled; that holidays will never be shared. It helps me little to realize that since civilization began wives with husbands in the service of their country have existed like this. Somehow the bonds of the centuries bring little comfort.

There are times I wish I were married to a businessman who caught the 5:15 every night of the week, walked in the door precisely at 6:04, and sat down to dinner with us at 6:30.

And yet there are other times when I wonder if I would want my life to be any different.

It is on the special occasions when we wives are allowed to wait out on the ramp and watch our husbands land their aircraft upon their return from overseas. Here are no ordinary businessmen returning from a cushioned job. Here are no workers returning from the regular grind. As that huge sweeping plan descends, we know it is carrying men who have gone beyond the normal routine. They have been pursuing the cause of peace in a way only they themselves can know.

They are warriors who haven't fought any battles. They are heroes who haven't done anything heroic.

And when my husband waves to me from the canopy of his jet bomber, that's when I am really sure. I wouldn't want my life to be any different.

Abundance Results From Impartial Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to read the following article by Byron Brinton, editor, *Record-Courier*, Baker, Oreg., and member of the Oregon Water Resources Board. The article, "Abundance Results From Impartial Development," appeared in the August 1959 issue of the *Powder River Sportsman*. Mr. Brinton's article clearly demonstrates his keen and thorough understanding of the multiple-use principle of resource management. Need I add that I am in complete agreement with this article? It is imperative that selfish and inadequate development of all our natural resources cease and that a national policy of comprehensive planning and impartial multiple-purpose development be adopted.

The article follows:

ABUNDANCE RESULTS FROM IMPARTIAL DEVELOPMENT, SAYS WATER BOARD MEMBER

(By Byron C. Brinton)

In the past the pursuit of abundant conditions for fish and game has not been a pursuit at all but a retreat. It has been a thrill to go up beyond the road and cast a fly into virgin water, unspoiled by an advanced civilization.

But we have had to go farther and farther back to escape the advance; and the next few years—sooner than Oregonians realize—even in our great Northwest we will become an area where we too must enhance our lives by developing water supplies and not by despoiling what we futilely have or grasping for the return of natural conditions.

The value of water is not peculiar to the sportsman alone, in fact he is probably the last to put a practical value upon it because until recently he has been unique among all people in not specifically appropriating land or water for his use. He has watched others appropriate it by placing such values upon the resources as to warrant investing in dams for diversions upon the stream or improvements upon the land, essentially for other purposes than recreation. He has not been able to compete for appropriation, but has won marked recognition for the principle of multiple-use in recent years. And oddly enough, particularly in developed storage, he has discovered that a share in a conserved and plentiful resource is of far greater benefit to him than bitter controversy over scarcity resulting from resource competition and inadequate and selfish development.

Once you accept the logic of the development approach to resource conservation you become one who realizes there is work to be done, you cease to be one who fights progress, you no longer want to turn clocks back, you want to hasten your objectives and not merely dream of your utopia.

The development approach is not a charted route. In the fields of big game it is almost sure to incur the immediate ire of the rancher, or in the field of intensified

range management, it is almost sure to arouse the ire of the sportsmen. Yet the common objective of maximum use of the dwindling per capita land, soil, and water resources calls for the most understanding tolerance of divergent interests. In the field of fish, the development approach upon our waterways has amounted upon some streams to open warfare. Yet the crying need for water conservation through implementation is so critical that if the fish resource keeps pace with the development approach upon the streams of Oregon it must undertake the most intensified research effort in history. The search for compatible conditions must not be clouded by divergent competition but it must be stimulated by the common purpose of the achievement of maximum results from our water—maximum storage control, maximum irrigation, maximum power, maximum temperature and quality conditions, maximum consumptive supplies, and maximum fish life production and recreational advantages.

I am not one to say that some game range must not be acquired but it must be accompanied by a recognition of commensurate intensification in domestic stock capacity on other areas. I am not one to oppose the increase by fivefold through improvement the carrying capacity of the stock ranges, but I always point out that this potential only emphasizes that if the sportsman is to maintain equal values on his behalf he must demonstrate a know-how and an ability to apply equivalent improvement to enhance the capacity of all multiple-use areas or reserved lands assigned to game. I am not one to oppose high storage dams in our rivers, but never have I advocated less than the maximum attention to tolerance for fish while I have favored these great conservation projects. You cannot under any circumstances pull out of the mud with the power only on one wheel.

The development approach must be kept in balance. Fish and wildlife agencies are fully aware that their tasks of rationing and regulating are so tremendous that little, if any, effort has been permitted them in the fields of basic research. Without this specific factual data equivalent to the justification by other claimants through appropriation for the State's water values, the protection of the recreation values in water can only be generalities and we can only cry for moratoriums and temporary expedients. Without facts, a full water program for Oregon cannot be developed including adequate provision for fish life. Without facts desirable conditions with respect to spawning beds and flows and impoundments and passages cannot be advocated. And, without participation, recreation cannot claim its full share in a multiple-use equality under development projects.

Impartial development is the only route to the abundance of resources for fish and game. As intense competition sets in for soil and water we must be impartial, we must be tolerant. Opposition to multiple-purpose water resource projects is all too unnecessary.

Decisions of the Supreme Court That Have Attempted To Alter and Revise the Constitution of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my re-

marks in the Appendix of the *RECORD*, I wish to include therein a series of three Washington reports made by my colleague, the Honorable JAMES B. UTT, of California. These reports treat with the dangers of this Republic by reason of a long line of judicial decisions handed down by the Supreme Court over the last several years which tend to decrease the sovereign powers of the several States by denying the States the right to legislate in areas not under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

Mr. UTT also attacks the Court for attempting to write new words and phrases into the Constitution which are not there, and which if accepted as law would greatly weaken the Constitution which is the very foundation of the political life of this Republic.

The above-mentioned Washington reports follow:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman JAMES B. UTT)

AUGUST 6, 1959.

For some time I have been torn between two admonitions of significant virtue; one by my father when he said, "Son, if you can't speak well of someone, don't speak at all," the second one by Abraham Lincoln when he said, "To keep silent when one has the duty to speak out is a sin." Believing that tolerance can be a sin as well as a virtue, I have resolved this dilemma by accepting the Lincoln doctrine as a responsibility of the highest magnitude. There is always a straw which breaks the camel's back and a catalyst which sets off a mental or physical explosion.

The catalyst in this case was the undignified performance of Chief Justice Earl Warren at a Sunday evening cocktail party in which he called Earl Mazo "a damned liar" when Mazo denied that in his new biography of Vice President Nixon he was spotlighting Nixon at the expense of the Chief Justice. Mazo asked the Chief Justice if he had read the book. The Chief Justice replied "No," and Mazo's rejoinder was, "I hope to God for the sake of the country that your decisions are based on much more full and accurate evidence than judgments on a book you haven't even read."

This last rejoinder must have struck a tender spot, as it must be recalled that in the desegregation opinion which overthrew the 53-year-old Supreme Court doctrine, the Chief Justice, after citing certain authorities, added, "And see, generally, Myrdal, 'Our American Dilemma.'"

While I am opposed to segregation, I am unalterably opposed to having the Supreme Court rely upon sociology instead of legal authorities. The Swedish sociologist, Gunnar Myrdal, in his book cited by Warren's opinion as an authority, also stated that the Constitution of the United States is "impractical and unsuited to modern conditions, and that its adoption was nearly a plot against the common people." What hogwash. What poppycock. And what a slander against our Founding Fathers. Any student of our Constitution should know that it was founded upon Judeo-Christian religion, with a profound reverence for the Greek philosophers, B.C., the Roman law, and above all, the Magna Carta of 1215, and the Common Law of England, and was beamed to protect and increase the freedom and dignity of the individual under a God-ordained universe.

At this point I wish to make it abundantly clear that I am not attacking the Supreme Court as an institution, but rather my remarks are leveled at the members of the present Court and their sociological philosophies upon which they have based so many of their opinions, in some of the most amaz-

ing decisions ever handed down by that august body. Contrary to popular opinion, the Supreme Court rulings are in no sense the supreme law of the land. The supreme law of the land is referred to in an article of the Constitution which does not even mention the Supreme Court at all.

Article III provides: "The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as Congress may from time to time ordain and establish." The judicial power is not indivisible. Article III, section 2, says that "The Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and to fact, with such exceptions and under such regulations as the Congress shall make." Congress, therefore, is given the sole right to divide this judicial power between the Supreme Court and the lower courts. The Constitution and some of the amendments are full of limitations upon the Supreme Court.

Article VI defines the supreme law of the land by saying, "This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land." You will note that the Supreme Court is not even mentioned in this definition. No Federal court is given any authority under the Constitution to change it by a single word nor to evade it by subterfuge, and any attempt to do so is as unlawful as rape, and just as despicable, even though perpetrated by prima donnas.

Speaking of prima donnas, in 1957 when the American Bar met in London to pay tribute to the signing of the Magna Carta by King John, the Chief Justice was an invited guest. After accepting the invitation, he heard that Vice President Nixon was also an invited guest, and the Chief Justice notified his London host that if Nixon was going to be there, he, the Chief Justice, would decline to attend. The reason? Under protocol, the Vice President outranks the Chief Justice. How horrible. The Chief Justice was not the least concerned over the embarrassment this caused his hosts in making it necessary for them to recall their invitation to the Vice President of the United States. However, if it were not for this trait, Mr. Warren would not be Chief Justice, because when he was promised the first vacancy on the Supreme Court, and that vacancy was created by the death of Chief Justice Vinson, he demanded this appointment as Chief Justice, and would not accept an appointment as an Associate Justice.

The Supreme Court has no authority to question the wisdom of any law. It can only determine its constitutionality. It is an equal and coordinate branch of our Government, and therefore has no authority to invade the jurisdiction of the executive branch, nor the legislative branch, and yet an examination of a score or two of the decisions of the present members of the Supreme Court establishes a record of invasion upon the rights, duties, privileges, and immunities of the other two branches. More than that, examination will prove that the Court has entered upon an attempt to repeal and rewrite many articles and amendments to the Constitution.

This duplicity is so outstanding that it comes within the purview of Lincoln's admonition that "to keep silent when one has a duty to speak out is a sin." A partial list of these decisions and their effect upon our Constitution will be included in next week's report. These decisions strike at the very heart of our Government, and tend to destroy the right of the individual to have a voice in his government at the State and community level.

WASHINGTON REPORT (By Congressman JAMES B. UTT)

AUGUST 13, 1959.

In my report last week I indicated that I would cite several recent decisions of the Supreme Court which strike at the very foundation upon which our republic is built, and which create a sociological philosophy that the Constitution was created to defend the Court rather than that the Court was created to defend the Constitution. The Constitution must be supreme over the Court, and not the Court over the Constitution.

The Constitution is a document of strict limitations, and prohibits the Federal Government from doing anything not permitted by the Constitution. The 10th amendment states: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Now comes the Supreme Court with the opinion that none of the States can enact and enforce laws dealing with Communist subversion and antiseditious laws, because Congress had legislated in that field, and therefore preempted it. This decision involved the case of Steve Nelson who was convicted under Pennsylvania antiseditious laws. He was an admitted Communist leader, but the Court held that because Congress had passed the Smith Act (an antiseditious law) any State law dealing with this subject was henceforth null and void. Under that decision the previous convictions of the 10 top Communists in California, which were under appeal, were automatically reversed, and these Communists were set free. The Smith Act in no sentence or paragraph indicated that Congress intended to preempt this field, nor are such laws prohibited to the States by the Constitution. How then could the Supreme Court reach such a conclusion?

Under this "doctrine of preemption" no State could enact and enforce a little Lindbergh kidnapping law, because Congress has legislated in this field, and the enactment and enforcement of our State narcotics control laws are likewise in jeopardy under this doctrine.

The great political strength of this country lies in the fact that it has 50 separate States, each with its constitution, its own legislature, its own constabulary, and its own legal department, so that just in case the Federal Government should be subverted there would yet remain 50 distinct entities with exactly the same character. No "coup" could take place in this country such as have taken place in many countries, and for the very reason just stated.

In *Sweezy v. New Hampshire* the Supreme Court held that the attorney general of that State had no right to question a college professor about subversive activities, and held further, in *Raley et al v. Ohio* that the State could not punish a witness for contempt for his refusal to answer questions by its legislature regarding his subversive activities. This line of decisions has given aid and comfort to the Communists, and follows the social philosophy of some members of the Supreme Court rather than the rule of law.

I said last week that the Supreme Court had no authority to add one word nor to delete a word from the Constitution, yet in the Watkins case it attempted to do just that. Congress had voted a contempt action against John T. Watkins for refusing to answer questions of the Un-American Activities Committee. In the opinion written by Chief Justice Warren, he said, "... nor can the first amendment freedoms of speech, press, religion, or political belief or association be abridged." Now the first amendment does guarantee freedom of speech, press, religion, and assembly, but where, oh where in the first amendment are listed freedoms of "po-

litical belief" and "association"? These words simply do not appear in the Constitution, and yet the Supreme Court is attempting to solidify this into accepted law.

I could cite a dozen other cases which I feel constitute a frontal attack against our Constitution, and it is shocking to know that none of the Justices of the Supreme Court has ever taken an oath to support and defend the Constitution, as members of the other branches of government do, and as required by the Constitution itself. They simply sign a watered-down version to administer justice according to the best of their ability and understanding, agreeably to the Constitution and laws of the United States.

I have introduced legislation to require all Federal judges and justices to take the oath of office prescribed by the Constitution, and which I have taken as a Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON REPORT (By Congressman JAMES B. UTT)

AUGUST 20, 1959.

This report concludes a series of three relative to decisions of the Supreme Court that have attempted to alter and revise the Constitution of the United States. Additional opinions to those heretofore cited are set forth in this final report. I do not believe that the general public is aware of the serious effect which has resulted to law enforcement agencies and others by striking down the right of the States to legislate and enforce laws which rightly fall within the jurisdiction of the State. Until the effect strikes you individually, you will continue to be complacent.

The Mallory case is one in point. After Mallory was convicted of rape, and there was no question of his guilt, as he had confessed, nevertheless the Supreme Court ordered him freed because the arresting officers had detained him for questioning before indictment. It was impossible to have a new trial because the same defense would obtain, and there was nothing to do but wait for Mr. Mallory to strike again, which he did within a few months after his release. If it had been your daughter who was the victim of this assault, you would not feel kindly toward the judges who released him, knowing that he was guilty in the first instance.

In the case of Clinton E. Jencks, who had been convicted of Communist activities, he was released by the Supreme Court because the trial judge refused to make the Federal Bureau of Investigation open its files on the matter. In this case there could have been a new trial had the FBI been willing to open its complete files. The Justice Department felt that it would reveal its sources of evidence on other investigations, and would destroy the effectiveness of the FBI. So, rather than comply with the admonition of the Court, they did not bring Jencks to trial again. Mr. Jencks is now attending the University of California under a foundation grant for the purpose of obtaining teacher's credentials qualifying him to teach your children and mine, and under the rulings of the Court he cannot be denied a teacher's certificate on the grounds of Communist association.

This is one area where the present Supreme Court has reversed an interpretation of the free speech amendment which has long been an accepted doctrine. In *Gitlow v. New York*, U.S. Reports, page 667, the opinion by Justice Sanford reads in part: "And, for yet more imperative reasons, a State may punish utterances endangering the foundations of organized government and threatening its overthrow by unlawful means. These imperil its own existence as a constitutional State. Freedom of speech and press * * * does not protect disturbances to the public peace or the attempt to subvert the Government. It does not protect publications or

teachings which tend to subvert or imperil the Government or to impede or hinder it in the performance of its governmental duties." In other words, it has always been the rule that the right of free speech guaranteed by the first amendment did not give sanctuary to those people whose purpose is to overthrow the Government by force and violence, thereby destroying the Government which gave them the right of free speech. However, under the recent rulings which include cases of subversion and cases involving the right to teach an idea, even though that idea could be adultery, as in the "Lady Chatterley's Lover" case, sabotage, or effective methods of overthrowing the Government by force and violence, the limit of free speech is not breached until an overt act has been committed, implementing the teaching of the idea. In other words, you can teach the overthrow of the Government by force and violence, but you are not a criminal until you light the fuse.

One final case of incompetency of the Court was revealed in one of the shortest opinions on record. In the matter of the *Evetts Haley, Jr.* case, reversing Federal Judge T. Winfield Davidson's decision, the opinion in full is herewith stated: "The judgment is reversed. *Wickard v. Filburn*, 317 U.S. 111." It is my candid opinion that any freshman in law school who would cite *Wickard v. Filburn* as an authority for reversing the Haley case would be washed out of school as an incompetent. I do not say that the Court might not have reached the same conclusion under the broad powers granted under the "commerce" clause of the Constitution, but surely the reversal of Judge Davidson's decision merited more than four words.

The Haley case involved the planting of wheat and its consumption on the farm without an allotment from the Department of Agriculture. The Government had imposed a fine of \$508.11 against Haley because he grew 43 acres of wheat on his 1680-acre cattle ranch. Mr. Haley had never received any subsidies for anything on his farm, and in the case which the Supreme Court cited as authority for reversal, the defendant, *Filburn*, had received subsidies by way of parity payments, and fed his wheat, grown on the surplus acreage, to his livestock. In that case, the Court used 23 pages of opinion to arrive at its conclusion, and on page 131 of that decision stated, "It is hardly lack of due process for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes." On page 133 of that decision the Court concluded "that appellee is the worse off for the aggregate of this legislation does not appear; it only appears that, if he could get all that the Government gives and do nothing that the Government asks, he would be better off than this law allows."

There you have it. The *Filburn* case was based on the Government's right to control that which it subsidizes, and in the Haley case, no subsidy whatsoever was involved, and for the Court to cite the *Filburn* case as an authority for reversal is simply juvenile.

James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the August 1 issue of the

New York World-Telegram and Sun, following the return of Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., from an extended business trip to Europe:

HARDLY PAUSES TO REFRESH: JIM FARLEY, ON THE GO AS ALWAYS, SELLS COKE AND GOOD WILL ABROAD

James A. Farley returned to New York this week from a 6-week trip to Europe. This dispatch by a British writer presents a fresh view of the veteran business executive-political figure.

(By Patricia Lewis, London Express staff writer, special to World-Telegram and Sun)

LONDON, August 1.—"Have a Coke?" beamed the receptionist, bustling to a giant cooler, selecting a bottle, opening it and spiking it with straws in one well-practiced movement.

I sipped and explained I wished to track down James A. Farley, chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., for a chat about the part his product is playing in making friends all over the world.

"Well, now, Mr. Farley's itinerary is very tightly packed," said the girl consulting a sheaf of papers. "He is in Oxford today, Stratford tonight, Norwich the next day, but maybe he can fit you in breakfast time day after tomorrow."

When I met Mr. Farley—a tall, well-set-up tycoon in a light navy suit—we had neither breakfast nor cokes. Instead this quick-actioned, swift-thinking, 71-year-old reeled off a list of the 19 places, 22 cities he'd visited on his trip to see the Pope. He also met various ex-kings and current dictators.

PICTURE WITH POPE

Chuckling at the memory, Jim Farley said of Pope John: "We had our picture taken together and . . . as you can see . . . I'm quite a big fellow. Well, when the photographer started to get busy he just moved over and stood on a dais. That made him a bit taller than me—it also made a pretty good picture."

Spain is another important call on Mr. Farley's list, and this usually includes a talk with Franco . . . "through an interpreter, of course, but somehow it's all so easy it doesn't seem as if the interpreter's there."

Dinner with ex-King Umberto of Italy . . . you'd think it's amazing what a man can do with a soft drink in one hand and the say-so for opening new plants in the other. But with Jim Farley it's more than that. For Farley is a politician, too.

He mused a moment. "I hope I'll live to see next year's Democratic Convention in Los Angeles because if I do I'll have been to every one this past 40 years. Hmm—40 years."

SEEMS TIRELESS

There's no doubt in my mind that Mr. Farley will be in there pitching come next July. He seems tireless. ("I've never had a holiday in my life—and if you think traveling is a vacation just follow me around.") He doesn't smoke . . . he doesn't drink ("just Coca-Cola and lots of coffee and milk") . . . he's a widower with nine grandchildren . . . and he wears a straw boater with just as much aplomb—if not more—than Maurice Chevalier.

From his connections with American politics you might think Mr. Farley a golf addict. But walking and studying advertisements are, he considers, more worth while.

"Golf's a terrible timekiller," he told me. "The men I know take it so seriously they get no relaxation—most seem to get more tense about their scores than about their work."

"Walking is the best thing—Harry Truman always used to walk miles each morn-

ing and I don't think he was any the worse for not playing golf."

But if golf fails to fascinate Mr. Farley—one of our British ads certainly does.

"I think the one with the man holding up a whale on his finger is very good," he said. "It does what the product does—it gets that feeling of strength over. Our aim, you know, is to sell Coke as a cool, refreshing drink—not that you use enough refrigeration over here."

Suddenly I realized Mr. Farley had been looking at his watch for quite some time. "Got some people to see . . . then a lunch . . . then a lot of reading to catch up on before I fly back to New York," he said. "And once I'm there I'll be straight in the office to get through 6 weeks' accumulated mail—enough to keep five secretaries busy."

Effective Legislation in the Field of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, as one who has supported the Landrum-Griffin bill in the House, I am very much interested in the enactment of effective legislation in the field of labor before the adjournment of this session of the 86th Congress. The battle is not over and I hope that the people of this Nation who demanded, and received from the House, effective labor-reform legislation will not celebrate a premature victory. The fate of this measure is now in the hands of the House-Senate conference committee, and I trust that an effective measure will soon be reported back to both Houses of the Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excellent article by Roscoe Drummond which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of August 17, 1959:

LABOR REFORM—LEGISLATION ISN'T CERTAIN YET

(By Roscoe Drummond)

It is still too soon to say that the public has won its victory for a labor-reform law despite the fact that both Senate and House have acted favorably.

Because there are now two versions of the same legislation with appreciable differences between them, these two bills must go before a House-Senate conference to be reconciled, merged, or diluted.

Most correspondents expect that an acceptable compromise will be reached. But this is not certain and it is only realistic to report that anything can happen—or nothing.

These are the possibilities:

Either the Senate, which passed almost unanimously the less ambitious Kennedy-Ervin bill, will accept a substantial part of the stronger provisions of the House's Landrum-Griffin bill;

Or, the conference and the House and Senate will let themselves get into an irreconcilable wrangle resulting in no compromise, no legislation, nothing.

In the wake of the mounting disclosures of the McClellan committee on how racketeering and corruption have bludgeoned their way into many unions and in face of an alerted public opinion which, if much longer

frustrated, may well demand sterner measures, it would seem to me egregiously unwise and harmful to the country, to labor, and to both parties to let labor reform law go down the drain of an election-minded political stalemate.

The argument which the Democratic congressional leaders used against the House Republicans only a week ago is now equally applicable to the new and unexpected position in which they find themselves.

You may remember that the Democratic contention was that the Republicans, under the whiplash leadership of House Minority Leader CHARLES HALLECK, was implacably and partisanly intent upon an all-or-nothing strategy. The Democrats said they could see plainly that HALLECK was aiming at the goal of either getting exactly as tough a bill as he wanted or preventing any bill at all from being enacted.

Well, the administration bill is now the majority will of the House, passed by the decisive vote of 305 to 125, and it is certainly pertinent to ask of the Democratic leaders, who did not want the Landrum-Griffin version, whether they are going to take the position which they recently accused HALLECK of taking or whether they are going to take their own advice.

In other words, are Speaker SAM RAYBURN and Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, now denied the kind of labor bill they most wanted in the House, going to yield to the strategy they condemned and say to their followers: Since we can't have our way, let's block the way to any bill? Or will they act to thwart their own extremists and help bring about a constructive compromise?

For RAYBURN and JOHNSON to pursue an all-or-nothing policy and try to block a reasonable compromise would seem to me wholly out of character.

It would be my judgment that the labor reform bill which passed the House reflects not only the majority will of Congress but the majority will of the country. I doubt if many, but the irrevocably committed, will be impressed by the epithets—like punitive and antilabor—thrown at the Landrum-Griffin bill by some union leaders.

Labor isn't weak; it is powerful. Big labor has shown that it needs some regulation just as big business showed it needed some regulation a quarter century ago. Now is the time to do it.

From Poland's Heart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a recent editorial from the New York Times entitled "From Poland's Heart" which recounts Vice President Nixon's reception in that great nation.

All lovers of freedom can take great encouragement from the spontaneous reception which Poland accorded to our able and distinguished Vice President.

This warm and wholehearted welcome was something more, of course, than a personal tribute.

It was a demonstration of affection for our own Nation as the leader of the free world, an outburst of enthusiastic support for the freedom we represent

and a fervent plea for our continued sponsorship of liberation and freedom for the captive nations. It was a great showing of confidence and admiration we must never betray.

The Polish people trust the United States. They know we seek no selfish territorial gains, that we stand for freedom and humane treatment for all nations, great and small.

In this great demonstration of loyalty to our cause, trust, and affection for our Nation and its people, Poland again stretches out its hands in friendship and devotion appealing for our sympathy and help. From their hearts and on their knees, the Polish people plead and pray for our help.

If we as proud Americans, sons and daughters of freedom, a people favored by the Almighty, above all others are to be true to our blessed heritage, if we are to be responsive to the promptings of our own souls, we must not fail them and the other captive peoples who remember our commitments for self-determination, universal freedom and a free, peaceful world.

[From the New York Times]

FROM POLAND'S HEART

Americans must be deeply moved by the incredible reception the people of Warsaw gave Vice President Nixon yesterday. In the heart of Communist-ruled Eastern Europe, in a nation with Soviet troops on its soil and with Soviet troops on its eastern and western borders, about 100,000 people turned out spontaneously to cheer and throw flowers to the Vice President of the United States.

This happened in a city which but a few weeks ago gave only a tepid welcome to Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev, for whose reception the Polish Government had mobilized all its resources. Once again truth has shown itself to be stranger than fiction.

No one planned it that way, but yesterday's outpouring of friendship from Poland's heart toward our country symbolized by Mr. Nixon was the most effective answer possible to Premier Khrushchev's gibes at our celebration of Captive Nations Week.

The Polish Government is a member of Moscow's Warsaw pact. Wladyslaw Gomulka and his fellow leaders have time and again associated themselves with Khrushchev's denunciation of American "imperialism" and his threats against the West's position in Berlin. For nearly a decade and a half the Polish people have been indoctrinated with Communist propaganda from almost every possible organ of education and communication. But yesterday the people of Warsaw gave Mr. Nixon what may well have been the warmest welcome an American leader has received in a foreign nation for a decade or longer. The political implications are unmistakable and will be understood by peoples and leaders wherever the facts are known.

At the end of World War II we did not use our power to compel Stalin to live up to his promises of a democratic Poland, but instead permitted him to enslave its people and destroy all public opposition. And almost 3 years ago, in October 1956, we contributed nothing but verbal encouragement to the Polish people as they defied Khrushchev's threats and set a new course, of which Gomulka was then the symbol. Nor have we done anything of crucial importance these past 3 years, in which the concessions of the Polish October have been steadily whittled away or abolished. Yet, as Warsaw proved yesterday, the Polish people still see in us the beacon of their hopes for a better tomorrow.

The cynical may argue that nothing really important was changed yesterday. Poland's

unenviable geographic position between occupied East Germany and the Soviet Union was not altered by an inch. The harsh realities of the nuclear age which make any talk of liberation by force of arms unthinkable are as terrible this morning as they were yesterday before Mr. Nixon arrived in Warsaw.

But the cynics are wrong; something of great importance was changed yesterday. By their welcome the people of Warsaw destroyed the propaganda campaign which has sought so hard to prove that Communist totalitarianism has won over the people of Eastern Europe so there can be no more talk of captive nations. In 1 hour of truth, as the Nixon caravan rode from the airport to the city, the friends of freedom and democracy gained new courage and new heart, which cannot but affect profoundly the world political scene.

Secretary of State Herter at Santiago Ministers' Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address by Secretary of State Christian A. Herter at the fifth meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the American States, at Santiago, Chile, on August 12, 1959, in response to the address of welcome by President Jorge Alessandri Rodriguez of Chile and in behalf of the Foreign Ministers:

Your Excellency, in behalf of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs meeting here in this hospitable capital I am honored to be entrusted with our collective expression of gratitude for the welcome extended by you and your Government. Your cordial words of greeting warm our hearts. No place could be more appropriate for sessions consecrated to preserving the peace and freedom of America. The devotion of the Chilean people to Pan American ideals of peace and cooperation, their dedicated efforts and achievements in economic and social progress, and their firm adherence to democratic principles, are widely recognized throughout our American community of nations. As long ago as 1541, when this noble and beautiful city of Santiago was founded by Pedro de Valdivia, that far-sighted hero struck a prophetic and truly American note when he declared in a letter to the King that Santiago would grow and flourish provided only that nobody should be sent out from Spain or from other areas of the New World to interfere with its affairs.

Against the heroic background of Chilean history looms Chile's cultural achievements. It is no accident that in her universities were trained many political and intellectual leaders from other American countries. The agricultural and technical development here has been accompanied, indeed has been stimulated, by the imaginative energy of a creative people. It is an augury of success that our sessions are being held in such an environment.

I appreciate Your Excellency's expression of Chile's sympathetic interest in the efforts of the great powers to seek a stable world peace through discussion of their differences. As you know, I have just returned from a meeting of this kind in Geneva. In contrast

to that gathering, however, I think the issues to be decided at the meeting of Foreign Ministers in this city appear more capable of early solution. Your Excellency brilliantly summarized the issues before us by stating that we should seek a formula that harmonizes our heartfelt desire never to see human rights violated with our absolute respect for the principle of nonintervention, thus guaranteeing an international liberty indispensable for living together harmoniously and sanely in this hemisphere. As Your Excellency states, this international democratic policy can be fortified by the fullest utilization of our economic capabilities.

At their informal meeting in Washington last year the Foreign Ministers of the American Republics reaffirmed their recognition that inter-American solidarity is an essential factor in the stability not only of our hemisphere but of the world. They likewise affirmed the present need for a renewed dedication by our peoples and our governments to the inter-American ideals of independence, political liberty, and economic and cultural progress and for a renewed faith in our capacity to achieve them. On December 24, 1958, the Eighth International Conference of American States approved "the Declaration of Lima." That declaration begins with the forthright statement "that the peoples of America have achieved spiritual unity through the similarity of their republican institutions, their unshakeable will for peace, their profound sentiment of humanity and tolerance and, through their absolute adherence to the principles of international law, of the equal sovereignty of states and of individual liberty without religious or racial prejudice." It closes with a provision for meetings of consultation of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics when deemed desirable and at the initiative of any one of them.

We may say that the Declaration of Lima comes of age this current year, the 21st since its adoption. During these 21 years, our 21 Republics have convoked 5 meetings, for consultation of their Foreign Ministers for the purpose of maintaining the peace and independence of the hemisphere and preserving our freedom and progress toward a better life.

That has always been the American ideal. Peace is our chosen environment, freedom and progress our chosen way of life. The American peoples have never believed that one could be valid without the other. Our Republics are founded on the concept of independence with law, freedom with order. Our revolutions were fought—all of them—to attain a freedom both for states and for individuals dedicated to the development of the progress which can be achieved only through peace.

It is in response to that undeviating concept—peace with freedom and progress—that we are met in this historical capital of a free progressive and peace-loving country. The convocation of a meeting of consultation of the Foreign Ministers is in itself evidence that a crisis exists. It is at the same time proof of our united belief, supported by our experience, that the crisis can be met and its problems solved if dealt with cooperatively in a spirit of reason and good will.

Let us remember that there have been in all the course of our common history very few armed conflicts across national boundaries in this hemisphere. No comparable area of the world so large in extent, so great in population, with so many basic mutual interests, affording nevertheless such varied surface points of difference, has ever developed into an international neighborhood like that of the Americas. The unguarded frontier is a commonplace of national life with most of our peoples. The Christ of the Andes represents not only a lofty inter-

national ideal but a customary international relationship, the same ideal and relationship which farther to the North—Mexico, Canada and my own country attest to with bridges across the boundary rivers.

Just as there is no comparable area of the world living so harmoniously with its neighbors as the American Republics, there is none other that has so long a record of freedom. Our 21 nations, neighbors by the accident of geography, free and independent by instinct and by choice, have been closely and freely associated friendly peoples. From their republican beginnings, independence has been fortified and augmented by cooperation through increased contacts between our peoples in all fields of life. We have developed wider areas of mutual understanding. Cooperation in economic and social fields has been intensified, moving forward with both national and international efforts toward the achievement of greater productivity and higher living standards for our peoples. The progress made this past year in this field of inter-American economic cooperation, particularly under the inspiration of Operation Pan America, has been highly significant and holds out the promise of further gains in the future.

Nor has any other comparable area achieved an international organization like ours—an organization voluntary, continuous, and potent as a matter of historic fact. We all know that the development of the United Nations and other international organizations owed much to the experience of the Organization of the American States, precisely because of the proved effectiveness of our own inter-American experience. The 21 American Republics became charter members of the United Nations. In that body's councils, year after year we have stood together in defense of the free world and in the maintenance of peace and security.

Our inter-American system has worked well. At various times in its history it has faced crises and surmounted them with renewed vitality and increased capacity for constructive achievement. The balance of peace with freedom and progress that has characterized our system has constituted an inspiring demonstration to the entire world of how nations large and small may live and work together toward the common goals of humanity.

Our present meeting here in Santiago comes at a time when our inter-American system again faces a critical moment in history. We are called upon as we have been called upon in the past to renew and revitalize in the light of present conditions and forces the principles that have made our great achievements possible.

Four of these principles which are expressed in the charter of the Organization of American States are particularly pertinent to the situation facing the Organization today. There is first the principle of nonintervention, which has served as a foundation stone for the relations between our countries. Second is the principle of collective security. Together these two principles form the basis for peace and independence on this continent. Third is the principle of the effective exercise of representative democracy and respect for human rights. Fourth is cooperation for economic and social progress. This is of particular pertinence to our time. Together these latter two underlie the achievement of freedom and progress. Our problem today is to restore the traditional balance between peace on the one hand and freedom and progress on the other by giving a proper emphasis to each of these four outstanding principles. We have recognized these four principles as valid in themselves and have learned that our separate, no less than our mutual well-being depends in large measure upon them. When any of these principles is threatened, the individual independence and the collective peace of the American peoples

is threatened as is their capacity to progress toward better human life. Against such threats the American nations must at all times marshal their collective effort to insure their continued progress.

We are gathered together here to examine and analyze in a spirit of objectivity and with a common purpose. We will not let ourselves be deluded into mistaking a temporary disorder for a cancer in the heart of peace or for a permanent paralysis of the sinews of freedom. Neither will we permit ourselves to be deceived into dismissing negligently symptoms of a disorder that might adversely affect us all. The American hemisphere is a community of freedom under law and so it must remain for our own generation and for our children's children.

This year in my country we are celebrating the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, whose faith in freedom and devotion to peace have caused other American countries to commemorate his anniversary. At the outset of our proceedings at this meeting we may well recall his exhortation: "Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us; our defense is in the spirit which prized liberty as the heritage of all men in all lands everywhere."

Hunger Amidst Plenty: Caribbean Paradox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, today is expected to mark the close of the American Foreign Ministers meeting in Santiago, attended by our Secretary of State. From reports, there will emerge from these discussions the reactivation of a peace commission originally established in 1940, to investigate reports of trouble in any country in the Caribbean threatened by revolution or aggression and to examine the relationship between economic underdevelopment and political instability.

Timely and pertinent to these reports is an editorial from the Miami News which I proudly call to the attention of my colleagues. Bill Baggs, editor of the Miami News, is one of our better known and highly respected international writers. He is outspoken and blunt in his criticism of "revolution for the sake of revolution" where it is not accompanied by some tangible improvement in the living conditions of the people. In presenting this frank statement on the paradoxical situation of people living in one of the most fertile and naturally endowed areas of the world being in desperate need of medical care for their sick, better schools for their children, more food and more opportunities for all the people, Bill Baggs ably expresses the frustrations of many of us who want to and try to help but feel that new, more effective ways must be found.

It may be that the peace commission is the answer to the tragedy of the Caribbean paradox thoughtfully presented in the editorial which follows:

HUNGER AMIDST PLENTY: CARIBBEAN PARADOX (By Bill Baggs)

Everyday living across the street in the Caribbean neighborhood is not bad. It is ridiculous.

Millions of the people are hungry and yet they live on some of the most fertile lands of the earth.

Several of the countries in the Caribbean are very nearly bankrupt and yet their hills and mountains are treasuries of minerals needed by the industrial societies of the world.

A most kind climate presides over the Caribbean. There is fresh water. Magnificent harbors.

POOR, HARASSED

Looking down on the lovely green countries under the sun in the Caribbean, a visitor to earth might think that the people who live there are certainly fortunate people. Well, they should be. But they are not. They are poor, harassed human beings. The Indians who resided there five centuries ago enjoyed a much finer life.

It is tragic. But most of all, it is ridiculous.

At the moment, revolution or the threat of revolution can be heard in Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Guatemala, and Haiti.

Mostly, the people who plot to overthrow the governments of these countries are no better than the present proprietors. Worse, they manage a turmoil which has become the customary atmosphere in the Caribbean.

POINTLESS REVOLTS

If one measures by history, it was inevitable that revolt was coming to the Caribbean. The people have lived in somewhat of an economic and political jailhouse since the Europeans came to settle the countries four and a half centuries ago. But the shame of what we are seeing today is that these revolutions so often appear pointless. Or almost pointless.

For instance, what benefit for the people of the Dominican Republic if they sacked Trujillo in a revolution and got a leftwing dictatorship to succeed the present rightwing dictatorship? Would these mean better schools, medical care, more food, more opportunities for the people?

A Somoza succeeded a Somoza in Nicaragua. Violence in Haiti and then a new president. In Guatemala, the old liberals were heaved out and new conservatives came in, people died and others suffered hunger and privation, but is there more food, more schools, better jobs?

Revolts simmer in Honduras, but very little changes. Also in Panama.

Then, the largest example, which is Cuba. Who would argue that Batista promoted a better life for more Cubans? I certainly would not. The list of crimes against democratic ideals when he presided is long and dreary. Under Castro, at least the wanton torture has stopped, but once again, do the people have more food, what about better schools for the children, medical care for the sick?

Revolution for the sake of revolution, or revolution which does not change affairs for the better, is a horrible event.

LESSON FOR CASTRO

In Mexico, there was a revolution which carried on a social change and Mexico slowly emerges as a strong, stable society in our hemisphere. The same in Costa Rica. And now in Venezuela. Ah, there is a lesson in Venezuela for Fidel Castro and all the other revolutionists.

A few days ago, Betancourt announced a land reform program for Venezuela. There was not the burly, nasty, and vicious reaction which greeted Dr. Castro's land reform program. Why? Simply because Betan-

court did not attempt to reform land ownership over the weekend throughout Venezuela. He is taking it slow, and making his steps certain.

IS IT NECESSARY?

Someday, the millions of abused people out there across the street in the Caribbean neighborhood are going to back off from these revolutions and ask themselves a question:

Is this one necessary?

If so, where does this revolution lead? What is the point of this revolution? How will it make the lives of the people better?

Only then can we end this great paradox of people impoverished living in wealthy countries, because only then will revolutions become instruments to develop the lands for agriculture, the mountains for mines, the harbors for ships.

The Invisible Retreat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the first scene is the White House, Washington, D.C., United States of America.

It is an evening late in June 1959.

The quiet hum of motor cars in the distance has the beat of time, rising and falling, as the cars come and go.

The President is alone at his desk.

It is a warm, humid twilight. Even the sightseers have been forced to seek air-conditioned relief from the accumulated heat of the day.

One motorist turns on his lights prematurely, eager for the help of night.

The President is tired. He has worked a long, hard day, and the news has not been good.

He picks up a dispatch from his desk.

"Soviet delegate won't yield an inch. Geneva Conference adjourns in stalemate. No progress expected when talks resume."

The President reaches for a sheet of White House stationery. The time has come to do something different. Perhaps a face-to-face meeting with Khrushchev will soothe his pride and make him more cooperative. If I invite him to the United States and arrange for him to view our industrial might and our military power, and let him see all the comforts and luxuries that our people enjoy, he will realize that our people are happy in their personal progress, and have no thought for anything else. That should impress him as to our peaceful intentions. The friendship approach will accomplish more than months of stiff, formal, and fruitless debate.

He starts to write, then looks up quickly, listening.

It sounded like a cry out there—a man's cry—suddenly choked off.

But as far as he can see in the deepening dusk, there is only the chain of passing headlights, broken by the bushes and the trees that are more substantial than the night.

He waits but the voice does not cry out again.

Where did it come from?

He listens but there is no human sound above the hum of the motor traffic, rising and falling, like mechanical breathing.

"Strange. That cry in the night. I'd swear that someone was trying to warn me, but I must be mistaken. Just nerves," he said to himself.

The President frowned, then relaxed.

And went on writing the invitation to Khrushchev.

Scene 2, the Kremlin, Moscow, U.S.S.R.

It is after 9 p.m. in Washington, but 4 a.m. of the following day in an office within the fortress walls of the Soviet capitol.

Red Square is empty.

Except for the security police and the guards who are blended with the night, there is no sign of life. But the people of Moscow, after replenishing their energies through sleep, will soon rise and breakfast and hurry to work. They will continue their heroic efforts to strengthen Mother Russia and protect her against the aggressive plots of the capitalist warmongers. Or so they will be told, over and over again, by their Communist bosses. But they will work hard. They are used to it. They have no other choice.

The bald-headed man who got up early to digest the evening-before news from Washington, pushes his chair away from the desk, and folds his hands across his paunch which is round and firm, like half a globe. His voice is vigorous and jubilant.

"Comrade Secretary, you are the first to know of the great Soviet victory."

The Secretary, who was sifting papers on the desk, dropped them in his surprise and confusion. Was the leader of Communist imperialism in earnest, or was he joking? One could never be sure. And it was dangerous to guess wrong.

"But, if you will excuse me, Comrade Khrushchev, there has been no special report from Deputy Premier Kozlov in Washington."

Khrushchev smiled at his aid's ignorance and bewilderment. When people are uncertain and afraid, like this honest bureaucrat, they can be manipulated so easily.

Khrushchev wagged his finger. "One must be ahead of developments, with the nose to smell them before they can be seen. The President of the United States is going to invite me to visit Washington because I planned it that way."

The Secretary stared, not knowing what to say.

"I can see, Comrade, that you do not understand the efficiency of our methods," Khrushchev said. "With these Americans, who are thin on patience, it is only a matter of time before we wear them down. Gromyko has done well at Geneva. He has been our Gibraltar, a face of stone, deaf to the arguments of the Western diplomats, causing them frustration and loss of confidence. And when the Americans cannot find a solution, they think that friendship will 'melt' us. How childish. They have so

much to learn, but they are so impatient. They think that I will be impressed, like some peasant, when I see their luxuries. But I will be using them, and I will be exploiting their weaknesses every minute, for the greatest propaganda triumph in the history of Communist Russia."

"Would you say then," the Secretary began, but stopped, dazzled by the prospects.

"Go on, Comrade."

"Would you say that this marks the strategic breakthrough for your psychological war against the West?"

Khrushchev grinned.

"We have induced the United States to tranquilize itself. The President and his advisers do not know that we have fooled them into making the invisible retreat."

Shoreline Recreation Areas for Public Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on July 30, 1959, I introduced H.R. 8445, which provides for Federal acquisition of 10 shoreline recreation areas located on the Atlantic, the Pacific, the gulf, and the Great Lakes. Among the areas to be acquired and the maximum authorized acreage are Cape Cod, Mass., 30,000 acres; Padre Island, Tex., 60,000 acres; Oregon Dunes, Oreg., 35,000 acres; Lake Michigan Dunes, Ind., 5,000 acres; Point Reyes, Calif., 35,000 acres; Cumberland Island, Ga., 25,000 acres; Huron Mountains, Mich., 90,000 acres; Channel Islands, Calif., 76,000 acres; Pictured Rocks-Grand Sable Dunes, Mich., 100,000 acres; and Sleeping Bear Dunes, Mich., 25,000 acres. The bill also authorizes the Park Service to make studies of the possibility of including in the Government acquisition the following areas: Fire Island, N.Y., 3,450 acres; Cape Flat-tory, Wash., 16,000 acres; Leadbetter Point, Wash., 4,250 acres; Mosquito Lagoon, Fla., 9,700 acres; Pigeon Point, Minn., 6,400 acres; Debidue Island, S.C., 8,400 acres; Kiawah Island, S.C., 7,300 acres; Popham-St. John, Maine, 1,100 acres; Parramore Island, Va., 6,250 acres; and Smith Island, N.C., 11,900 acres.

Enactment of this bill or substantially identical legislation into law is made imperative by the fact that shorelines available for public use are being developed and subdivided at an astronomical rate. An interesting point is that public shore on the east coast amounts to one-half inch for each person within 50 miles of the beaches. Over the entire Nation there is only one-third of an inch of undeveloped shore per person, or a mile for about every 220,000 people.

In 1935 some 70 miles of beach on the Delaware-Maryland shore could have been acquired for \$2 a front foot. Most of this beach is now beyond reach having been long since subdivided and developed.

The bill authorizes appropriations not to exceed \$10 million as required from year to year for assistance to the States in acquiring shore areas for public use and authorizes appropriation of a sum not to exceed \$50 million to acquire the above-mentioned areas. The total cost of all areas concerned will be some \$85 million if the bill is enacted and the purchases made promptly. It is hoped that the Park Service can secure the \$35 million between the authorized sum and the needed sum through gifts and public donations.

Similar legislation has been introduced in the Senate sponsored by the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and 16 cosponsors.

I ask permission to insert a letter received from the Izaak Walton League of America in support of this measure:

THE IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA,

Washington, D.C., August 13, 1959.

The Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: The Izaak Walton League of America wishes to congratulate you on the introduction of H.R. 8445, a bill to save our shorelines.

Studies made in recent years by the National Park Service and comparable State agencies reveal the appalling fact that the public is fast losing the opportunity to use beneficially our great shorelines of the Atlantic, gulf, and Pacific coasts, the Great Lakes and major inland waterways. More and more shoreline areas heretofore available to the public for recreation have been lost to private development for industry, commerce, and community expansion. At the same time the population burgeons, leisure, and real wages increase with a more than corresponding increase in public demand and need for shoreline recreation.

It is clear that a comprehensive and coordinated Federal-State program will be required, if we hope to preserve even some of these opportunities for present and future generations. Moreover, it is clear that except as we do implement very quickly such a program as H.R. 8445 proposes, the chance to do so may be lost entirely or rendered infeasible due to constantly rising costs of shoreline real estate. To put it crudely, such lands, however costly, can never again be acquired as cheaply as today. Senator MURRAY has cited the instance of an area the Park Service could have acquired 20 years ago at \$9,000 a mile which would now cost \$110,000 per mile, illustrating what has already occurred. In this connection, I noted recently an advertisement offering a Florida property, stated to be the last 5-mile stretch of undeveloped shoreline between Miami and Daytona Beach, for "\$1 million down, terms for the balance."

The bill approaches the problem on three important fronts: (1) It lists several areas which have already been studied and proposes their consideration for authorization; (2) proposes a cooperative program by which the States can be assisted in expediting their State park and shoreline programs; and (3) lists additional areas for study to determine whether they are suitable for national or State shoreline designation. We are pleased that the bill recognizes that regulations established for national shoreline areas should permit continuation of present recreational uses such as hunting, fishing, water-fowling, and the like where appropriate. In effect, then, the legislation would establish in the park system under congressional policy a new category of public area, so successfully pioneered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.

We are pleased that the legislation sets fairly broad acreage limitations on the areas to be considered for authorization within which, if authorized, the Secretary of Interior may acquire lands. This is a sound method as has been demonstrated at Big Bend, Cape Hatteras, Everglades, Virgin Islands, Fort Clatsop, Shenandoah, and other national parks and monuments established under similar or identical procedures. During the course of hearings, of course, the committee will be able to study specific boundaries in more detail and may, if it appears desirable, describe them with more preciseness. We note also that the Secretary, before designating any authorized area, would be required to consult with the Governor of the State concerned, and to hold local hearings. Beyond this, and before the Secretary could spend any Federal funds for land acquisition, he would be required to come before Congress, in the usual appropriation process, for funds. This provides Congress with still another opportunity to assure itself that the program is being carried out soundly and within the congressional intent. These appear to be adequate safeguards against any possibility of abuse of administrative authority. At the same time it provides means at the administrative level whereby the most sensible areas can be worked out in terms of national, State, and local interests.

It is an unfortunate fact that the Nation's national park system protects and preserves in the broad public interest little of our shoreline. This great gap has been filled to only a slight degree by State park programs, splendid as they are. The save-our-shorelines bill is designed to expedite Federal and State programs cooperatively before it is too late. It is a most worthwhile objective in which all thinking Americans should and will, I am sure, join forces to support.

Sincerely,

J. W. PENFOLD,
Conservation Director, IWLA.

Smathers-Keogh-Simpson Legislation: Retirement Savings for the Self-Employed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include a most interesting and very illuminating article on a subject matter that has been under consideration by the Congress for several years which concerns a tax inequity discrimination against self-employed individuals. This well-stated review was written by Attorney F. Joseph Donohue, a member of the District of Columbia bar for 34 years who was formerly from Lynn, Mass. He served as Chairman of the Board of Commissioners for the District of Columbia, and has taught economics and law at Catholic University and economics and banking at the American Institute for Banking. He has also served as chairman of the American Bar Association Special Committee on Retirement Benefits and also chairman of the executive committee of the American Thrift Association.

This dissertation that appeared in the American Bar Association Journal of

August 1959 will be of interest to all members of the bar but will also be most helpful to the Members of the Congress:

SMATHERS-KEOGH-SIMPSON LEGISLATION: RETIREMENT SAVINGS FOR THE SELF-EMPLOYED
(By F. Joseph Donohue of the District of Columbia Bar)

(Mr. Donohue traces the 9-year legislative effort to correct an admitted tax inequity which discriminates against self-employed individuals. Legislation to remove this inequity has passed the House of Representatives and is pending before the Senate Finance Committee. He highlights the arguments advanced at recent hearings before the Senate Finance Committee and gives reasons why this legislation, which is supported by the American Bar Association and over 60 other national associations, should be enacted by the 86th Congress without further delay.)

As a practicing lawyer, you are among the millions of self-employed persons who by law cannot do that which may be done by every other working individual. Economic pressure is being applied against you because of your status as a self-employed individual. There is at present before the U.S. Senate legislation (H.R. 10) to correct an admitted inequity in the tax laws which discriminates against self-employed individuals.

An example of the present tax treatment of retirement savings clearly illustrates this inequity.

Assume that a practicing lawyer, or other self-employed person, age 35, married, has a taxable income of \$10,000 after deductions. If he were to earn an additional \$1,000, his tax on this would be \$260, leaving \$740 in actual income. Assume that he invests this \$740 each year for 30 years at a 4-percent compound interest rate. He would accumulate, by age 65, a total of \$36,900.

But if he were employed by a company, and his employer deposited \$1,000 for him in a qualified pension or profit-sharing plan, and had the same 4 percent interest, the fund would be \$58,300 at age 65.

Under H.R. 10, this lawyer could have \$58,300 rather than \$36,900 at age 65. The retirement income, of course, would be subject to tax as paid out. By the enactment of H.R. 10, the attorney, farmer, merchant, or other self-employed individual would no longer be forced to give up his status as a self-employed person in order to have an opportunity to build up retirement savings comparable to that which he could enjoy as an employee covered by a pension plan approved by the Treasury Department.

In 1942 the Congress, cognizant of the desirability of encouraging the establishment of private retirement funds to supplement social security benefits, revised the provisions for private pension plans by amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to allow substantial tax benefits to corporations and their employees in the establishment of pension plans. Actually there have been provisions for pension plans since the 1924 Revenue Act. The 1942 revision was reenacted with some modifications in the 1954 code. Specific rules set forth in detail the circumstances under which a pension plan may be set up and qualified. The tax effects of such plans when qualified by the Treasury Department are: (1) The contributions by the employer, although in the nature of additional compensation, are not taxable to the employee until the retirement benefits are actually received; (2) at the time the contributions are made they are tax deductible to the employer, and (3) the earnings from the funds are tax exempt until distributed. This is an obvious advantage to the employee since he would normally be in a lower tax bracket when the benefits are received. The full employer payment, without being re-

duced by taxes, is available to earn income to the fund. A tremendous growth in pension plans has resulted since the 1942 act. Over 45,000 plans, covering more than 18 million employees, are now in existence, and coverage is increasing at the rate of approximately 1 million employees yearly. In 1957, contributions to such plans totaled \$4.6 billion, 85 percent of which was contributed by employers. This was 15 times greater than the contributions in 1940. Total reserves amounted to \$34.8 billion.

It was not long until the self-employed persons realized that they were apparently forgotten under this new law, since they were the only group precluded by law from the privilege of deferring taxes on contributions to retirement plans.

By 1950, an American Bar Association committee undertook a study and legislation was drafted to correct the tax discrimination against the millions of self-employed. In 1951, Congressman EUGENE KEOGH, Democrat, New York, and the late Daniel Reed, Republican, New York, introduced legislation to allow tax deferral for a limited amount of income set aside by a self-employed person into a restricted retirement fund. Since its original introduction this legislation has had strong bipartisan support.

When Representative Reed became chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Thomas Jenkins, of Ohio, a ranking Republican member of the committee, joined with Congressman KEOGH in the introduction of identical bills which became popularly known as the Jenkins-Keogh legislation. This legislation was overwhelmingly passed by the House of Representatives on July 29, 1958, but was not acted on by the Senate Finance Committee during the closing days of the 85th Congress.

In the 86th Congress, RICHARD SIMPSON, of Pennsylvania, ranking Republican member of the Ways and Means Committee, cosponsored the legislation with Mr. KEOGH. The committee gave early approval to H.R. 10 and the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed the measure on March 16, 1959.

Senators KEFAUVER, Democrat, Tennessee, MORTON, Republican, Kentucky, and SMATHERS, Democrat, Florida, introduced Senate bills similar to H.R. 10. Senator SMATHERS, a member of the Senate Finance Committee, introduced S. 1979, identical to H.R. 10 as passed by the House except that it would be effective for the taxable year 1961. In explaining his proposal, Senator SMATHERS said:

"Many in the Congress, while favoring the principle embodied in the legislation have a reluctance, in view of the Treasury Department's opposition, plus the high cost of Government today, to support the measure in their desire to bring about a balanced budget. There is an attitude of postponement until such time as the budget becomes balanced.

"To meet this objection, which appears to be the major obstacle in the path of its adoption, I have modified the proposed bill so that it will be effective for the taxable year 1961. This would remove from the consideration of those thinking along this line, any feeling that they would have a further unbalanced budget this year, and yet make it possible for them to adopt a principle of fairness and tax equality for all of our citizens. Discrimination in our tax laws cannot morally be perpetuated indefinitely when a just and economically defensible revision is warranted."

The Senate Finance Committee conducted hearings on H.R. 10 on June 17 and 18, 1959. This was the first opportunity for proponents to present their views to the Senate committee on this legislation since its original introduction in 1951. Approximately 50 organizations representing self-employed persons requested an opportunity

to testify before the committee. Some 20 witnesses were heard in the 2-day hearings, and the committee determined that further hearings would be necessary to obtain the views of all interested parties.

The Treasury Department has consistently opposed this legislation, its principal objection being revenue loss. Yet Treasury officials concede that there is an inequity in the tax treatment of retirement savings which discriminates against self-employed persons.

On June 17, David A. Lindsay, assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, appearing before the Senate Finance Committee, stated:

"The Treasury recognizes that present law does not give self-employed persons tax treatment for their retirement savings comparable to that now accorded to employees covered by employer-financed pension plans. Employee pension plans, if arranged on a nondiscriminatory basis, receive favorable tax treatment.

"At present, employers are permitted to take current deductions in computing their taxable incomes for contributions which they make to nondiscriminating pension funds for the benefit of their employees. No tax is imposed on the employee until the pensions are received after retirement. The opportunity to postpone the receipt and the taxation of income currently set aside in pension funds makes it possible for employees who are covered by such plans to secure larger net retirement incomes after tax from any given payment by an employer.

"Qualified pension trusts have a further tax advantage. The investment income earned on the funds held by the pension trusts is tax exempt until received by employees as part of their pensions. There is, in effect, a tax-free build up on nontaxed earnings. Though there is no final tax exemption of the income paid by employers, or of the income earned on accumulated funds, the advantages of postponement of tax on both are important, and combine to increase materially the net retirement income of employees."

In spite of this recognition of preferential tax treatment under qualified pension plans, the Treasury has made no proposal to correct this inequity.

The Treasury has estimated the revenue loss under H.R. 10 to be \$365 million on a full year's basis. About \$100 million of this would be accounted for by the extra deductions granted to those already 50 years of age or over on the effective date of the bill.

In discussing the impact of H.R. 10 on revenue before the Senate Finance Committee on June 18, Dr. Roger F. Murray, a foremost authority in the field of savings and pension plans, professor of banking and finance, Columbia University, and director, pension research project, National Bureau of Economic Research, appearing for the American Thrift Assembly, stated:

"We are being asked to consider this bill on the assumption that in the next year or two, self-employed individuals will make payments to restricted retirement plans in amounts of \$1 billion a year.

"What about this as an assumption? It seems totally unrealistic. Experience shows that it takes many years of aggressive promotion to develop anything like this flow of funds. Because saving habits are slow to change and because new plans require education and personal solicitation, it is a conservative statement to say that this level of deposits under restricted retirement plans for the self-employed is not likely to be reached for 5 years or more. * * * A billion dollars in average deposits of, say, \$1,000 means that a million self-employed will have to be educated and sold on this new savings plan. * * *

"For the first year following adoption of this plan, I would estimate the tax deferral at \$75 to \$100 million as a reasonable upper

level of estimate. In the light of the record of experience with savings plans, the time required to make the necessary arrangements to receive deposits, and the results of our survey on the subject, it seems clear that the Treasury Department's estimate of a \$365 million tax deferral is unrealistic and inadequately supported by objective evidence. Actual experience is likely to be similar to that in Great Britain where the tax deferral in the second year of a similar plan turned out to be about one-sixth of the Inland Revenue's advance estimate. I should add that my estimate is supported by leading economists who have studied the question."

That there is an inequity in the tax treatment of pension plans is no longer in dispute. It could be argued therefore that even if the legislation would defer revenue amounting to \$365 million, an estimate which is not supported by any survey or experience, the Federal Government is not entitled to this revenue, since it is unjustly obtained. It also has been estimated that the revenue loss resulting from existing pension plans exceeds \$1.8 billion per year. It is difficult to understand why the Treasury is concerned with revenue loss only when tax savings would benefit the self-employed.

Another objection brought forth by the Treasury Department is that this legislation does not cover the pensionless employed. On this point, Ross L. Malone, president of the American Bar Association, told the Senate Finance Committee on June 17, that in connection with the 1955 hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, the Treasury Department, while conceding that both the pensionless employed and the self-employed were being discriminated against under existing law, said that on balance it might be better to limit the benefits of any new provision to the self-employed since employees, at least potentially, may benefit from qualified pension plans set up by their employers. "Tax relief," the Department said, "seems most clearly indicated for self-employed individuals who do not have even potential tax benefits under existing law in providing themselves with retirement income."

H.R. 10 has been criticized because it would not cover the employees of self-employed persons. In answer to this contention, Dr. Roger Murray stated to the Finance Committee:

"This is obviously true for the simple reason that such employees already stand to benefit under existing legislation providing for the deferment of taxes on their employers' contributions to qualified pension plans. This encouragement is already provided under the Internal Revenue Code. In any event, it is difficult to imagine anything more encouraging to the establishment of such benefits for the employees of the self-employed than to permit the self-employed to have their own retirement programs."

"If the Treasury Department is sincerely concerned about the people not now covered by programs other than OASDI, it would seem that the extension of the tax-deferment benefit to the self-employed should be welcomed as a plan to encourage supplemental old-age protection to the largest single group not now being reached in increasing numbers. Is it not reasonable to rely upon competition in the terms of employment and existing legislation to assure the continued spread of coverage to the employed?"

Congressman KEOGH, commenting before the Finance Committee on this contention, said:

"Mr. Chairman, much has been said today about requiring the self-employed to include their employees in such plans. That is a radical and novel departure from the basic and historical concept of retirement legislation. The 165 plans under the 1939

code, the 401 plans under the 1954 code, have never been made compulsory. Those are voluntary plans. This is the typical, historical American way of permitting one person voluntarily to do for himself that which people more and more want the Government to do for them."

"Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that we are dealing with this group of seven million people for whom nothing has been done. And certainly, obvious equity and fairness should impel us to do something for them before more is done for those for whom so much more has been permitted."

It has even been stated that this is class legislation; that is, the principal beneficiaries are said to be professional persons in the upper income brackets. On this contention, Dr. Murray told the committee:

"With a highly progressive personal income tax structure, it is, of course, self-evident that the application of any uniform pattern of tax deferment will provide greater dollar and proportionate benefits to those in the higher income brackets. But is this a relevant argument? Is not the correct comparison between the successful self-employed individual and the successful employed individual? This bill is designed to place them on the same footing, except, of course, for the eliminations in the case of the self-employed. It is designed to remove the economic pressure which is being exerted against working for one's self."

"I think that we need to be very careful in interpreting any of these figures on income distribution. The individual who might qualify for the full \$2,500 deduction this year may have spent 20 or 30 years of his life earning substantially less than \$25,000 a year. His lifetime benefit can hardly be appraised on the basis of his peak earning capacity. The groups classified by income are by no means static, particularly among the self-employed. We are in danger of misreading the facts if we do not recognize this to be true. Furthermore, the breadth of support for this legislation suggests that numerically we are discussing a proposal predominantly for the benefit of middle-income groups."

And, in answer to a question on this point, David Lindsay, spokesman for the Treasury Department, told the committee: "I think so long as you have progressive income tax rates where the more you make the more you pay, it is not unfair to have the benefits go in the same direction where there is an appropriate deduction."

It should also be pointed out that only 1 person out of 17 who are self-employed is from the legal-medical-dental professions.

There has been some criticism of H.R. 10 because it does not extend to contributions made by employees. But this is not the issue raised by this measure. The purpose of H.R. 10 is to allow a tax deferment on the employer contribution. Since the self-employed is both employer and principal employee, H.R. 10 seeks only to provide for the self-employed person tax treatment comparable to that enjoyed by the employee with respect to the employer's contributions.

The 10 percent contribution allowed under H.R. 10 is not an unreasonably high employer contribution. This is apparent when a comparison is made with qualified corporate plans. Most corporate pension plans are noncontributory; that is, the employer pays the entire amount to maintain the fund. Under a qualified profit-sharing plan, an employer may contribute up to 15 percent of an employee's salary. In the case of qualified pension plans, there is no definite limit; if it is actually set up, the employer contribution could be as high as 25 percent of an employee's salary.

For example, an employee earning \$7,000 could have contributed annually for him over \$1,000 in a qualified profit-sharing plan or as much as \$1,750 under a qualified pen-

sion plan. H.R. 10 would limit the deductible contribution to the self-employed person earning \$7,000 to 10 percent or \$700. In the case of a person earning \$50,000, the difference is much greater. The self-employed is limited under H.R. 10 to a ceiling of \$2,500. Yet the \$50,000 executive could have contributed for him each year by his company as much as \$7,500 in a qualified profit-sharing plan or \$12,500 in a qualified pension plan, and the tax would be deferred on such contributions until paid out as retirement income.

One other contention which has been made is that consideration should be deferred until general tax reduction is possible. This completely disregards the fact that a general tax reduction would not remove, but would only perpetuate, the present discrimination against the self-employed.

After reviewing the arguments brought forth during the hearings before the Senate Finance Committee, one would conclude that this legislation is a fair and reasonable approach to the correction of an admitted inequity in our tax laws which has existed for more than a quarter of a century. The passage of H.R. 10 by the U.S. Senate is not only of direct concern to the lawyer, but is of equal importance to the many self-employed businessmen and farmers in his community.

There is a definite trend away from the professions and small business into corporate and government employment, due in a large part to the retirement advantages and other fringe benefits which are not available to self-employed persons. Certainly it is not unreasonable to expect the Congress to remove a gross inequity in our tax laws and thus encourage individual enterprise, initiative and thrift.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]
Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., Va.-----
Abernethy, Thomas G., 6278 29th St.
Miss.
Adair, E. Ross, Ind.-----4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., N. J.-----
Albert, Carl, Okla.-----5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., N. C.-----
Alford, Dale, Ark.-----
Alger, Bruce, Tex.-----
Allen, Leo E., Ill.-----University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, Minn.-----4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., Mont.-----911 Beverly Dr.,
Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., Ala.-----3108 Cathedral
Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., N. Y.-----
Arends, Leslie C., Ill.-----4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., Ohio-----
Ashmore, Robert T., S. C.-----
Aspinall, Wayne N., Colo.-----Arlington Towers,
Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., N. J.-----113 S. Lee St.,
Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., Kans.-----
Ayres, William H., Ohio-----
Bailey, Cleveland M.,
W. Va.-----
Baker, Howard H., Tenn.-----
Baldwin, John F., Jr., Calif.-----
Barden, Graham A., N. C.-----2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., Nev.-----
Barr, Joseph W., Ind.-----Tulip Lane and
Glen Mill Rd.,
Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., Pa.-----
Barry, Robert R., N. Y.-----3019 Norman-
stone Drive
Bass, Perkins, N. H.-----
Bass, Ross, Tenn.-----
Bates, William H., Mass.-----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., Ohio-----
Becker, Frank J., N. Y.-----
Beckworth, Lindley, Tex.-----
Belcher, Page, Okla.-----
Bennett, Charles E., Fla.-----1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., Mich.-----3718 Cardiff Rd.,
Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., Mich.-----
Berry, E. Y., S. Dak.-----118 Schotts
Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., Ohio-----
Blatnik, John A., Minn.-----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth,
(Mrs.), Ga.-----
Boggs, Hale, La.-----
Boland, Edward P., Mass.-----
Bolling, Richard, Mo.-----3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Ohio.
Bonner, Herbert C., N. C.-----Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., N. Y.-----
Bow, Frank T., Ohio.-----4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, Conn.-----
Boykin, Frank W., Ala.-----The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., Ill.-----
Brademas, John, Ind.-----
Bray, William G., Ind.-----
Breeding, J. Floyd, Kans.-----
Brewster, Daniel B., Md.-----
Brock, Lawrence, Nebr.-----
Brooks, Jack, Tex.-----
Brooks, Overton, La.-----4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S.,
Mich.-----
Brown, Charles H., Mo.-----3723 N. Oakland
St., Arlington, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., Ohio.-----Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, Ga.-----Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., Va.-----
Buckley, Charles A., N. Y.-----
Budge, Hamer H., Idaho-----
Burdick, Quentin, N. Dak.-----
Burke, Frank W., Ky.-----
Burke, James A., Mass.-----
Burleson, Omar, Tex.-----2737 Devonshire
Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., Pa.-----
Byrne, James A., Pa.-----
Byrnes, John W., Wis.-----1215 25th St. So.,
Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., N. J.-----

Canfield, Gordon, N. J.-----
Cannon, Clarence, Mo.-----
Carnahan, A. S. J., Mo.-----
Carter, Steven V., Iowa-----
Casey, Bob, Tex.-----
Cederberg, Elford A., Mich.-----
Celler, Emanuel, N. Y.-----The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E.,
Mich.-----
Chelf, Frank, Ky.-----
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, Colo.-----
Chipperfield, Robert B., Ill.-----1713 House Office
Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt 2122 Mass. Ave.
(Mrs.), Ill.-----
Clark, Frank M., Pa.-----3735 Gunston Rd.,
Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, Iowa-----
Coffin, Frank M., Maine-----
Cohelan, Jeffery, Calif.-----2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., Ill.-----
Colmer, William M., Miss.-----
Conte, Silvio O., Mass.-----
Cook, Robert E., Ohio-----
Cooley, Harold D., N. C.-----2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., Pa.-----
Cramer, William C., Fla.-----6714 Joallen Dr.,
Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, Nebr.-----4920 Yorktown
Blvd., Arlington
Va.
Curtin, Willard S., Pa.-----
Curtis, Laurence, Mass.-----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., Mo.-----
Daddario, Emilio Q., Conn.-----
Dague, Paul B., Pa.-----
Daniels, Dominick V., N. J.-----
Davis, Clifford, Tenn.-----4611 Butter-
worth Pl.
Davis, James C., Ga.-----
Dawson, William L., Ill.-----
Delaney, James J., N. Y.-----
Dent, John H., Pa.-----
Denton, Winfield K., Ind.-----
Derounian, Steven B., N. Y.-----
Derwinski, Edward J., Ill.-----
Devine, Samuel L., Ohio-----
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., Mich.-----
Dingell, John D., Mich.-----
Dixon, Henry Aldous, Utah.-----1817 N. Quinn St.,
Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, N. Y.-----
Donohue, Harold D., Mass.-----
Dooley, Edwin B., N. Y.-----
Dorn, Francis E., N. Y.-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, S. C.-----
Dowdy, John, Tex.-----
Downing, Thomas N., Va.-----
Doyle, Clyde, Calif.-----3877 30th St. N.,
Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., N. Y.-----
Durham, Carl T., N. C.-----The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.),
N. J.-----
Edmondson, Ed, Okla.-----
Elliott, Carl, Ala.-----
Everett, Robert A., Tenn.-----
Evins, Joe L., Tenn.-----5044 Klingie St.
Fallon, George H., Md.-----
Farbstein, Leonard, N. Y.-----
Fascell, Dante B., Fla.-----
Feighan, Michael A., Ohio-----
Fenton, Ivor D., Pa.-----3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., N. Y.-----
Fisher, O. C., Tex.-----Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., Pa.-----The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., Wis.-----
Flynt, John J., Jr., Ga.-----
Fogarty, John E., R. I.-----1133 House Office
Building
Foley, John R., Md.-----
Forand, Aime J., R. I.-----4108 Dresden St.,
Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., Mich.-----514 Crown View
Dr., Alexandria,
Va.
Forrester, E. L., Ga.-----
Fountain, L. H., N. C.-----The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., Fairfax Hotel
Tenn.-----
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., 3014 N St.
N. J.-----
Friedel, Samuel N., Md.-----
Fulton, James G., Pa.-----
Gallagher, Cornelius E.,
N. J.-----
Garmatz, Edward A., Md.-----

Gary, J. Vaughan, Va.-----
Gathings, E. C., Ark.-----6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., Pa.-----
George, Newell A., Kans.-----
Gialmo, Robert N., Conn.-----
Glenn, Milton W., N. J.-----Arlington Towers,
Arlington, Va.
Goodell, Charles E., N. Y.-----
Granahan, Kathryn E.
(Mrs.), Pa.-----
Grant, George M., Ala.-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., Ill.-----
Green, Edith (Mrs.), Oreg.-----
Green, William J., Jr., Pa.-----
Griffin, Robert P., Mich.-----
Griffiths, Martha W.
(Mrs.), Mich.-----
Gross, H. R., Iowa-----
Gubser, Charles S., Calif.-----
Hagen, Harlan, Calif.-----
Haley, James A., Fla.-----
Hall, David M., N. C.-----
Halleck, Charles A., Ind.-----4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, N. Y.-----
Hardy, Porter, Jr., Va.-----
Hargis, Denver D., Kans.-----
Harmon, Randall S., Ind.-----
Harris, Oren, Ark.-----1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., Va.-----
Hays, Wayne L., Ohio.-----1323 Barger Drive,
Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., N. Y.-----
Hébert, F. Edward, La.-----26 Cockrell St.,
Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, W. Va.-----
Hemphill, Robert W., S. C.-----
Henderson, John E., Ohio-----
Herlong, A. S., Jr., Fla.-----
Hess, William E., Ohio-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., Calif.-----
Hoeven, Charles B., Iowa.-----100 Maryland
Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., Mich.-----100 Maryland
Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., Ill.-----
Hogan, Earl, Ind.-----5211 Flanders
Ave., Garrett Pk.,
Kensington, Md.
Hollifield, Chet, Calif.-----
Holland, Elmer J., Pa.-----
Holt, Joe, Calif.-----
Holtzman, Lester, N. Y.-----
Horan, Walt, Wash.-----
Hosmer, Craig, Calif.-----
Huddleston, George, Jr.,
Ala.-----
Hull, W. R., Jr., Mo.-----
Ikard, Frank, Tex.-----
Irwin, Donald J., Conn.-----The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., Calif.-----
Jarman, John, Okla.-----
Jennings, W. Pat, Va.-----2120 16th St.
Jensen, Ben F., Iowa-----
Johansen, August E., Mich.-----
Johnson, Byron L., Colo.-----
Johnson, Harold T., Calif.-----
Johnson, Lester R., Wis.-----
Johnson, Thomas F., Md.-----
Jonas, Charles Raper, N. C.-----
Jones, Paul C., Mo.-----1111 Army Navy
Dr., Arlington,
Va.
Jones, Robert E., Ala.-----
Judd, Walter H., Minn.-----3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., Mo.-----
Karth, Joseph E., Minn.-----
Kasem, George A., Calif.-----
Kastenmeier, Robert W.,
Wis.-----
Kearns, Carroll D., Pa.-----Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.),
W. Va.-----
Keith, Hastings, Mass.-----
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), N. Y.-----
Keogh, Eugene J., N. Y.-----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., N. Y.-----
Kilday, Paul J., Tex.-----3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., Tex.-----4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., Calif.-----
King, David S., Utah-----
Kirwan, Michael J., Ohio-----
Kitchin, A. Paul, N. C.-----
Kluczyński, John C., Ill.-----
Knox, Victor A., Mich.-----
Kowalski, Frank, Conn.-----
Lafore, John A., Jr., Pa.-----
Laird, Melvin R., Wis.-----
Landrum, Phil M., Ga.-----

Appendix

Santa Clara University Engineering Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, recently I inserted, under leave to extend my remarks, a résumé of the history of the University of Santa Clara, and a report on the splendid course of study which is currently offered students at this old institution of higher learning in the State of California.

I am proud to say that this university is not resting on its laurels but is constantly improving and building for the future. Today I should like to present portions of a publication which presents plans for the new and modern engineering center at Santa Clara:

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY ENGINEERING CENTER

One hundred and eight years ago a Jesuit priest, Father John Nobili, arrived at the Mission Santa Clara with \$150 in his purse to lay the foundations of a new college.

Today we are blessed with the fruits of his labors—the oldest institution of higher learning in the State of California, founded in 1851, chartered as Santa Clara College in 1855, and as the University of Santa Clara in 1912.

Here thousands of students have studied, worshiped, and lived, emerging as men imbued with the Christian ideals and the trained intellect envisioned in the university motto:

"To mold men after the model of the Man-God, and thus form them to serve their fellow men, their country, and their God."

A CENTER FOR CREATIVE THINKING

Another milestone in the development of an old and great university is the start of construction of Santa Clara's new engineering center—a monument to the spirit of creative thinking which has long permeated the historic campus.

While the enrollment will continue to be highly selective, the new facility will make possible the acceptance of twice the current number of candidates for undergraduate engineering degrees, provide room for expanded research activities, allow initiation of graduate programs in engineering, and offer additional services to the engineering profession.

Modern in design, complete in facilities, the engineering center will give to the Far West a new facility for training the truly creative engineer—more than a draftsman, more than a skilled technician—a professional man in the finest sense.

AN HISTORIC DATE: APRIL 29, 1939

The historic ground-breaking date selected for the new engineering center—April 29—

has long had special significance at Santa Clara and in the scientific world.

Just 54 years ago to the day, the first pilot-controlled glider flight in history came to a successful conclusion with a landing on the old Eberhard tannery property across from the University of Santa Clara.

The cornerstone of the engineering center will be set where the 45-pound glider—designed by a Santa Clara professor, John J. Montgomery, and flown by an adventurous Irish employee of the university, Daniel Maloney—completed the first flight of a heavier-than-air craft to a designated spot.

April 29, 1905, marked an event hailed by Victor Loughheed (pronounced "Lockheed," as in the aircraft firm which now bears his name) as the "greatest single advance in the history of aerial navigation."

The same day in 1959 will be commemorated by future generations as the beginning of a new era in the training and development of men for outstanding and specialized engineering careers.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOROUGHLY TRAINED ENGINEERS READY FOR POSITIONS EVERY YEAR

Purpose of the new engineering center is to provide sufficient facilities to graduate each year 150 men—trained in the Santa Clara tradition.

These graduate engineers will not only possess the finest technical education possible, but also will have been taught basic principles of living, such as respect for authority, willingness to take responsibility, and the return of a full measure of work for the salary received. Santa Clara's engineering center will continue to be one of the few nationally accredited colleges of engineering—under Catholic auspices, but open to students of all faiths.

CURRICULUM FOR A PROFESSION

Offering degrees in civil, electrical, and mechanical engineering, the engineering center curriculum naturally will continue the Santa Clara tradition of thorough grounding in mathematics, physics, and chemistry.

As in the past, the curriculum will include a sound liberal arts program so that students can properly express themselves orally and in writing, and gain a broad knowledge of the humanities, including social sciences and philosophy.

Finally, the upper division program will offer the faculty, classrooms, laboratories and other facilities to make possible further development in distinctive phases in the basic branches of engineering.

Added to these the requirement that students spend at least two summers on practical engineering work; also that they write an acceptable senior thesis on a subject approved by the college, and you see emerging each year from the new Santa Clara Engineering Center, 150 graduate engineers intensively trained to assume positions of responsibility in their particular field of creative thinking.

For the more talented students there will be "premasters" and "predoctorate" courses. These lead to the possibility that Engineering Center graduates may seek advanced degrees oriented toward research and development, or to engineering management. Because of the wealth of nearby industrial firms with strong engineering programs, it

would be possible to make use of qualified industry-employed instructors, and to schedule graduate work at hours convenient to industry and business employees.

EXPANDING TO INCREASE OPPORTUNITY

Despite its great accomplishments of the past, the College of Engineering now is physically inadequate in the light of present and future needs.

The Montgomery Laboratories, built in 1924, the second floor added in 1930, and the Alumni Science Hall, built in 1924, are not only outmoded, but also limit enrollment, faculty research and addition of new courses.

Construction of the new Engineering Center will make it possible to add new and desirable engineering laboratory facilities which will allow expansion of the senior thesis program. These facilities will further enrich the undergraduate education through research in such fields as electronics, nuclear physics, municipal design and planning, data processing and high energy propulsion.

It is almost tragic, in light of the demand for trained engineers and scientists, to note that although the present freshman engineering class had the highest academic standing of any in the history of the college, a number of highly qualified and equally promising applicants could not be admitted.

NEEDED: A LARGER PLANT

This calls for construction of four engineering units, a science annex and the provision of utilities for them.

The planned units will form a quadrangle. One side will consist of a two-story unit of classrooms, lecture hall, and administrative and faculty offices. Opposite will be the mechanical engineering laboratories. The third and fourth sides of the quad will be occupied by the electrical and civil engineering and mechanics laboratories. Total space will be 70,000 square feet. These buildings will double classroom space, provide reading rooms, drafting rooms, seminar and conference rooms.

CREATIVE THINKING: A SANTA CLARA TRADITION

The University of Santa Clara always has endeavored to attract and hold outstanding lay and Jesuit teachers. Its history is marked with distinguished men: Rev. J. Neri, S.J., who installed San Francisco's first arc-light system; Rev. Joseph Bayma, S.J., professor of mathematics, who John Tyndall said "is a hundred years ahead of his time in the science of mathematics"; Rev. Richard H. Bell, S.J., whose experiments in wireless telegraphy verified those of Marconi; and Prof. John J. Montgomery who designed and flew the first heavier-than-air machine, antedating the Wright Brothers flight by 2 years.

Added to the list of Santa Clara greats should be Rev. Jerome S. Ricard, S.J., "Padre of the Rains," famous for his sunspot theory; and still active, the world-renowned "Glacier Priest," Rev. Bernard Hubbard, S.J.

A half a century ago, the first lectures in engineering were instituted at Santa Clara; 4 years later, in 1911, the college of engineering was established.

Thus, as construction begins on a new engineering center at the University of Santa Clara, we find that creative thinking already is a university tradition, with a long record of accomplishment.

Our Responsibilities and America's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine address entitled "Our Responsibilities and America's Future," delivered by the Postmaster General in the city of Washington, D.C., on August 12 of this year, wherein he addressed himself to our responsibilities and America's future.

The address was delivered before the 55th Annual Convention of the National Rural Letter Carriers Association, in Washington, D.C., on August 12, 1959.

It is such a fine address that I am sure many people in the country would like to have the benefit of it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR RESPONSIBILITIES AND AMERICA'S FUTURE
(Address by the Honorable Arthur E. Summerfield, Postmaster General of the United States, on occasion of the 55th National Convention of the National Rural Letter Carriers Association, Washington, D.C., August 12, 1959)

It is a real pleasure to be with you tonight. I know that you have been amply welcomed before, but let me just say again that we are very happy for this opportunity to get together with you.

The rural letter carriers of the U.S. Post Office Department are a vitally important part of the great service we are proud to render to our Nation.

Over the years, your faithful performance of your duties, your very warm and neighborly relationships with the people on your mail routes, and your leadership as outstanding citizens in your community's affairs, have added greatly to the prestige and traditions of the Post Office Department.

And may I also express our admiration and respect to your splendid ladies auxiliary, which over the years has contributed so much to better civic life.

The presence here tonight of so many Members of the Congress is a well deserved tribute to your organizations. I join with these distinguished leaders of the Congress in saluting you as good Americans and outstanding public servants.

We are delighted that you have come here to your great Nation's Capital for your convention. I know that your stay has been inspiring as well as most pleasant and highly informative.

I am well aware of the fact that you are citizens in the fullest meaning of that word. I know that you maintain a deep interest in matters of importance not only to the postal service, but to the strength and progress of our Nation.

It is for this reason that I should like to discuss with you tonight three subjects that go beyond their immediate concern to us, to be of utmost significance to all our people.

These are, first, the Department's crusade against the most insidious racket of our time—the sending of obscene materials through the mails, especially to the children of America.

Secondly, I should like to discuss with you briefly the critical problem of inflation, and the means of successfully meeting it.

And third, I believe this evening you would like me to touch upon the future of the U.S. Post Office Department, the world's greatest communication system, of which you are so much a part.

You are familiar, I know, with the war we have declared on the use of the U.S. mail for the conduct of mail-order business in obscene and pornographic material. Many of you have taken an active part in this campaign in your communities.

This vicious business—the mailing of filth to children—is a challenge to every decent-minded American citizen. And it can be met only by the firm, positive action of our people, in all parts of the country.

It gives me some satisfaction to report that our efforts against this racket have made encouraging progress. This progress is due, in large part, to the broad support we have received from the Members of Congress, from the Nation's newspapers, radio and television commentators, civic-minded organizations and the public.

Congress has intensified its serious study of the problem, and many Members have taken active leadership in bringing this matter to the attention of their constituents.

Throughout the country, the press has not only described the growing menace of mail-order obscenity in the news columns, but has urged the public to action in editorial columns as well.

Civil and religious organizations, deeply shocked by the concentration of this racket on children, have mobilized their members for programs to help meet the challenge.

Within just the past 2 months, I have had determined verbal expressions from the leaders of many of these organizations. I have received copies of resolutions adopted by many groups which pledge their vigorous assistance in this effort.

We are deeply gratified by this support.

I think you will agree that this, indeed, is a good start. But I cannot emphasize too greatly the importance of conducting this war to the finish. Persistent, intelligent, intensive action on a nationwide scale will be absolutely necessary for a long time to come, to cope with the determined plans of the filth racketeers to continue expanding their operations.

Even as we are striving to rally the American people to put them out of business, these vicious racketeers are continuing to violate the homes of the Nation with complete arrogance.

Our inspection service estimates that as many as 1 million children will receive obscene material in the family mailbox during this year. This is 1 out of every 35 school-age children in America.

In large part, this smut will be sent to children without their advance knowledge or consent, in the form of lewd solicitation literature seeking to sell them even more obscene trash.

The volume of business done by these racketeers has tripled since World War II; it has doubled in just the last 5 years; and unless we put a stop to it, it can double again over just the next 4 years. In that event, it would amount to over \$1 billion a year.

In due time, if we do not fight to rid ourselves of this blight, we may expect that organized crime will take over the obscenity racket, with its vast revenue, to a far greater and more vicious extent.

It will victimize more and more of our children, adding to the already swollen rolls of juvenile delinquency. The undermining of the moral fiber of our young people will spread, with the poisoning of increasing millions of minds.

Sex crimes will become far more prevalent than they are even today.

And overall, as the effects spread throughout our society, we could expect an ultimate breakdown in moral strength and order and decency in this country.

My friends, this monstrous crime has got to be stopped.

How can we do it? What do we need to meet this problem?

We need legislation adequate to deal effectively with these vile criminals.

We need the conscientious support of law enforcement authorities and courts.

We need the dedicated efforts of you who make up our postal service.

And, of course, we need the support and cooperation of parents and decent-minded citizens throughout our country.

To this end, we are carrying forward a continuing program that is fourfold:

1. To draw maximum public attention to the menace of this racket;

2. To urge parents to help us apprehend the mailers of filth to their children;

3. To help mobilize community support behind adequate law enforcement of local ordinances or State laws when these purveyors are apprehended and brought to court;

4. To rally public opinion behind new and stiffer legislation on obscenity.

With respect to this fourth point, I should point out that Congress last year passed legislation which has been extremely helpful, and that the current Congress is giving earnest and sympathetic attention to proposed legislation which can close loopholes and help further to bring the mail-order obscenity racketeers to account.

In the past, these smut merchants have had little difficulty evading punishment.

In certain large cities, the courts set a pattern of soft rulings which established virtual sanctuaries for them.

Usually, even those few offenders who were convicted were let off with a slap on the wrist—a light fine or a brief jail term. To racketeers operating on a big scale, this kind of sentence is nothing more than a minor discomfort.

If we are to drive these vultures out of business, we must convince them that they are no longer going to be tolerated or coddled anywhere. A consistent pattern of stiff sentences, wherever they are convicted, is the one sure way to meet their defiant challenge.

I would ask that all the members of this organization continue to take part actively in this crusade, working in your own communities to further the four points of this program. I know that the ladies auxiliary has been active in this effort. I want to compliment all of you on what you are doing, and to urge you to continue your good and most essential work. We dare not fail.

May I turn now to another problem which also demands the attention and earnest effort to all of us.

Over the past year, I have taken every opportunity afforded me to urge that every American serve in the battleline against inflation.

I feel that especially I should not neglect the opportunity to discuss this vital subject with you.

I know I do not have to persuade this audience that the American people must maintain a sound economic philosophy, within which the Government must provide sound economic policies.

But I do want to emphasize the utter importance of keeping these convictions foremost in our minds, and in the minds of all our fellow citizens.

We know how inflation has wrecked other nations in the past.

We have seen what the ravages of this deadly force can do here in our own country.

We have seen it make our money worth less and the things we have to buy cost more.

We have found it boosting our cost of living by 100 percent in a period of 20 years.

We have seen it rob our dollars of their real value—and rob every American of that value in the process.

We have seen inflation feed on the incomes and savings of every individual, every family and every enterprise in America.

We have observed how it deals most cruelly with those who can least protect themselves.

I suspect almost everyone in this room knows of someone whose savings, insurance, social security, or retirement income—carefully nurtured through half a lifetime—now is tragically inadequate to meet his needs.

As rural community leaders, you are only too well aware of what inflation brings in rising costs and taxes.

And finally, I would point out that the problem affects in equal measure the cost of maintaining the operations of our Government.

Never have the American people faced a greater challenge than this one of bringing a rampant inflationary momentum under control.

Over recent months, our people have rallied vigorously to the fight to do all that must be done.

There is now a vast public consciousness of the scope of the menace that inflation presents. There is ever-increasing expression of the desire for fiscal policies, on the part of our people and our Government, that will keep our country on a sound, strong, and progressive economic course.

At present, our Nation has reached the highest level of prosperity in our history. We have the healthiest, strongest economy America has yet known.

Our people are enjoying higher wages and better living standards than ever before.

Overall output is at record levels, and rising steadily.

Employment is rising steeply. Unemployment is falling sharply.

For more than a year, the cost of living has remained generally stable.

The battle for a sound dollar is closer to success than at any time in the past two decades.

These are bright and encouraging facts, but we cannot allow them to mislead us.

They do not mean that our battle against inflation is over. Rather, they mean that we have gained a strong vantage point from which to carry on the offensive.

We face constant, heavy pressures for a continuation of the inflationary process. As a people, we must be sure to move together along courses that we know will surmount these pressures.

I believe our people are in wide agreement as to our Government's role. Our Government must maintain sound fiscal policies, with respect to spending, balancing the budget, taxation, financing, debt management—in short, throughout its vast economic operations.

This applies every bit as much to local and State governments as to our Federal Government.

Our governments must meet all the legitimate needs of our people. But this must be done within the framework of prudent spending, on a pay-as-you-go basis, without extravagance, without incurring deficits which add to the already staggering public debts that exist.

We must, in fact, maintain as one of our prime goals the reduction of the national debt.

It is vital, also, that we practice good sense in our civilian economy—our business economy—to keep prices from spiraling upward.

We must insist upon real statesmanship by all who are in position to influence the

factors that bear on prices, and thus the cost of living.

I urge you to keep these matters in mind as you go about your activities at home. As good citizens, building your own future and the future of our country, stand up strongly for fiscal wisdom—for the same sound financial practice in Government that you follow in your own economic affairs.

In this you will contribute to the strong and steady growth of our country. And we are indeed a fast-growing nation. We can see this fact quite clearly in the demands upon the postal service.

With this in mind, let me devote the remaining time to my final subject—a brief look into the future of the Post Office Department and the better mail service it can, and should, render in the years ahead.

In any consideration of the future, one paramount fact overshadows all others: our constantly growing volume of mail is expected, in 25 years, to double today's enormous annual load of over 61 billion pieces of mail, and more than a billion parcels.

Any plans for the future must, in my judgment, be based on this fact—that adequate facilities, post offices, terminals, and other means, must be available to handle twice as much mail by 1985. And it must be done with the efficiency that the American people well know and deserve in the years ahead.

As you know, some 3,000 new post offices have been built in the past 6½ years, financed by private industry and leased to the Department.

Many of you are now working out of these new post offices, and you know intimately how much better and more efficient they are than the obsolete structures they replaced. You are also familiar with the greatly improved working conditions in these new facilities.

This program, of course, is on a nationwide basis. To meet the needs that face us, it will be necessary to modernize, replace or build in new communities, from 12,000 to 15,000 post offices in the years immediately ahead.

Not only do we need to replace obsolete post offices in expanding communities, in every State of the Union, but we must mechanize the sorting and distribution of the mails—especially in the large gateway post offices, which handle such a large proportion of our volume.

Fortunately, we have reached and moved beyond the breakthrough stage in mechanizing postal operations.

The essential first step was the development of modern methods, comparable to those so effectively used by industry.

This has been done to an impressive degree, as I believe anyone will agree who visits our post office here in Washington, D.C. This is now the world's most mechanized post office, but even it does not represent a plateau in our program. In that same building you will find even more advanced machines under test in our new laboratory operations.

If there are any of you who have not visited the post office here, I would urge you to do so. I am sure it would be one of the most important and enlightening highlights of your visit.

From the development of these modern methods, the next step is to apply them in key post offices throughout the country.

This, of necessity, will take time and funds.

But the important fact is that, after many years of neglect in research, engineering, and equipment development, a responsive Congress is cooperating with the Post Office Department in launching a major long-range program.

The time has come when we have put a full-scale effort underway to provide the

best, most modern and most efficient service of which the Post Office should be capable.

Many people do not fully realize how important this development is to the provision of better mail service to people who do not live in the large metropolitan areas.

In Michigan, for example, nearly two-thirds of all the mail going into that State passes through the postal facilities in Detroit.

In Oregon, about one-half of the State's mail goes through the postal facilities of Portland.

In Pennsylvania, approximately three-fifths of the State's mail flows through the postal facilities of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.

It is readily apparent that any improvement in the handling of mail in these gateway facilities will result in better and speedier service in the smallest communities.

Modern mechanization of mail handling is so vital to better service that our Department now has under contract, for completion by the fall of next year, a completely new working-laboratory post office in Providence, R.I.

Serious consideration is being given to another laboratory post office, using different concepts and techniques, in another part of the country.

Engineers and postal experts in these two post offices, as well as those in our laboratory here, will be constantly developing and checking mail handling machines and methods—so that the U.S. Post Office, the world's greatest communication system, will keep abreast of the opportunities provided by modern science and industry.

As you know, the ultimate goal of your Post Office is the next day delivery of letter mail.

The Nation is now nearly blanketed with our new metropolitan plan, which assures next day delivery of letter mail in the large metropolitan areas.

By next June, we estimate that 85 metropolitan areas, serving some 125 million people, will be providing next day delivery.

We are confident that we have established the know-how to provide next day delivery throughout our service. We feel certain that, with the help of a cooperative Congress, ways will be found to finance the necessary expenditures to assure this service to the American people.

My good colleagues in the Post Office Department, let me sum up now by saying just this:

All of us believe that our people will continue to build the strongest, freest way of life the world will know.

We are determined that our grandchildren will inherit this way of life, and no other.

To assure this future, we must keep our Nation morally and economically strong.

We must give our children a wholesome climate, of dignity and decency, in which to mature into tomorrow's citizens.

We must continue to build a sound and solid economy, free of inflation, which assures the greatest opportunities for all our people.

We must continue to advance in science and technology, in Government operations as well as industry—an advance in which our postal progress will be an important part.

Communications are the soil in which knowledge is rooted, and we who operate this great communications system have a high responsibility indeed.

Let us make certain we uphold this trust. Let us continue to add luster to the proud traditions of the U.S. Post Office Department.

I know you will do your part—and more. And in the doing, you will have the gratitude of 175 million fellow Americans you help to serve so well.

Private Industry and Redevelopment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. MUMMA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, the question of redevelopment over large sections of our country is a situation almost daily discussed in the Congress by either the other body or the House. This morning there came over my desk a release addressed to the industrial realtors and bankers. This went on to say that under the auspices of the Pennsylvania Power & Light, a group of these businessmen were going to be conducted over one of the major areas needing redevelopment in the country—that is, the Pennsylvania hard coal fields. The reading of this enclosed notice will give you an idea of what they are going to do. It is quite commendable.

This is an approach to the situation which I think may enable these districts to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps with a limited amount of aid from the State and Federal Government. I commend this to your reading as I think it is something new, worthwhile, and should produce results. It is as follows: INDUSTRIAL REALTORS, BANKERS TO TOUR AREA COMMUNITIES

One of the largest promotions in years to attract new industry and payrolls to this area will take place August 27 and 28 when approximately 70 industrial realtors and bankers will tour communities in the Scranton, Wilkes-Barre, Hazleton, and Williamsport areas to inspect available shell buildings and industrial parks.

The industrial realtors and bankers will be brought here from the New York, Philadelphia, Newark, and Baltimore areas under the sponsorship of Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. After arriving here, they will be the guests of local chambers of commerce.

Many of these industrial realtors and bankers represent large, nationally known industries in their real estate and new plant transactions. Such people are, therefore, highly important to the area's industrial development and economic expansion.

Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. personnel and the cooperating chambers of commerce plan to dramatically demonstrate the industrial potentials of these communities with the aim of attracting reputable and financially sound new industries. The tour features the fact that better buildings are available in central eastern Pennsylvania at costs which are less than in comparable areas, and that the available shell buildings and the growing industrial parks are suitable for almost all types of industry.

The tour has been so scheduled that communities will be given sufficient time to promote and sell their communities and facilities. Detailed data and information on all industrial parks as well as outstanding, available buildings and sites will be supplied all the visitors. A chartered, 80-passenger airplane, will provide transportation so that the group may spend the maximum amount of time in its inspections.

The industrial realtors and bankers, together with their Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. escorts, will arrive at Avoca Airport, Thursday morning, August 27, to inspect the Scranton, Wilkes-Barre, and Hazleton areas.

The tour will include a new shell building in Old Forge. The group will then travel by bus to Wilkes-Barre to inspect Crestwood Industrial Park, and the Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce will host the group for lunch at the Sterling Hotel. In the afternoon, the group will go by bus to Hazleton to tour Valmont Industrial Park. An inspection of an available industrial building in Freeland will follow. Dinner has been arranged at the Scranton Country Club with the Scranton Chamber of Commerce as host. The visitors will spend the night at the Hotel Casey, Scranton.

Friday morning, the visitors will enplane for Williamsport. There, they will inspect a shell building in the Williamsport Industrial Park; the new, most modern plant of Vidmar, Inc. If time permits, they will also visit the Williamsport Technical Institute. In the afternoon, the group will attend the Little League world series, followed by dinner at Williamsport Country Club with the Greater Williamsport Chamber of Commerce as host. Immediately following the dinner, the tour guests will be flown back to Philadelphia and Newark airports.

Labor Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, by and large the people of my State and the daily newspapers which are circulated in my State favor passage of a strong and effective labor reform bill. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a sampling of editorial comment from various newspapers on the recent passage by the House of Representatives of the Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill. These editorials are as follows: "The People's Victory," from the August 14, 1959, issue of the Evening Herald, Rock Hill, S.C.; "Six Congressmen Vote Right on Labor Bill," from the August 16, 1959, issue of the State, Columbia, S.C.; "The Solid Front," from the August 15, 1959, issue of the Greenville News, Greenville, S.C.; "Georgian in the Spotlight," from the August 15, 1959, issue of the Augusta Chronicle, Augusta, Ga.; "House Vote on Labor Bill Responds to People's Demand for Reforms," from the August 15, 1959, issue of the News and Courier, Charleston, S.C.; "Now Up to U.S. Senate," from the August 15, 1959, issue of the Charleston Evening Post, Charleston, S.C.; "Will of the People Pays Off in Congress," from the August 15, 1959, issue of the Spartanburg Herald, Spartanburg, S.C.; "Plenty of Back-Home Support for Curbing Union Racketeers," from the August 16, 1959, issue of the Anderson Independent, Anderson, S.C.

In addition I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news column by the distinguished writer, Mr. David Lawrence. It appeared in the August 15, 1959, issue of the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rock Hill (S.C.) Evening Herald, Aug. 14, 1959]

THE PEOPLE'S VICTORY

When the U.S. House of Representatives yesterday approved the Landrum-Griffin labor bill, many newspapers termed it a smashing victory for President Eisenhower.

It is not Eisenhower's victory. It is a victory for the people and for union members. Eisenhower certainly had an instrumental part in the victory. His nationwide television address in which he threw his support behind the bill was undoubtedly a major factor in passage of the bill.

The bill is a comparatively strong piece of legislation aimed at ending corruption in labor unions. The bill contains clauses intended to protect the rights of rank-and-file union members, to ban blackmail picketing and to require union financial reporting.

What separates the Landrum-Griffin bill from others and makes it the toughest of the lot is that it goes further than the others. It would forbid most forms of organizational picketing, would ban all secondary boycotts and all forms of hot-cargo agreements, and provide criminal penalties for union officials who violate members' rights.

The bill is a comparatively tough one but apparently it is one which is needed to curb the power of the likes of Jimmy Hoffa of the Teamsters Union.

The real winners yesterday were the people who need to be protected from union leaders who use their power for their own benefit.

[From the State, Columbia, S.C., Aug. 16, 1959]

SIX CONGRESSMEN VOTE RIGHT ON LABOR BILL

We commend the six Members of the House of Representatives from South Carolina for their forthright "yes" vote on the labor reform bill.

ASHMORE, DORN, HEMPHILL, McMILLAN, RILEY, and RIVERS, each answered in the affirmative when the roll was called. And they are to be praised for being in their seats and casting weight on the right side.

Encouraging is the fact that when the bill came up for passage on Friday the margin of victory was considerably wider than when on Thursday the House had substituted the administration-backed proposal for the milder measure supported by Democratic policy leaders. On Thursday the vote was 229 to 201, but on third reading Friday the House sent the tougher bill to the Senate by a 305 to 125 decision, a majority gain overnight of from 28 to 86. This, we hope, is a significant omen.

The question of labor reform is now up to the Senate. Let's hope the upper House will do as well as the lower. Let's hope we can say that the South Carolina delegation in the Senate—JOHNSTON and THURMOND—voted as a unit, too, in favor of the stronger legislation.

In the House it was a coalition of southern Democrats and Republicans that brought about this great victory. Let's hope the southern Democrats and Republicans will team up as effectively in the Senate. It would be a blow to good government for the House-approved bill to fall in the upper body.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Aug. 15, 1959]

THE SOLID FRONT

South Carolina's six Congressmen are to be congratulated for their unanimous vote in favor of the antiracketeering union bill which was passed by the House Friday.

By their vote, the Representatives struck a heavy and necessary blow at the corruption, brutality which has invaded the union movement, and they moved the Federal Government toward restoration of balance in management-labor disputes.

It was, we are sure, not an easy vote for some of them to make. The House Democratic leadership, and the labor union bosses themselves, bitterly opposed the bill and used every device at their disposal to put pressure on all Members.

The six South Carolinians are all Democrats, but they are South Carolinians first and they knew that what their constituents wanted was not a "sweetheart" bill like the one proposed by the Democratic leadership but a really meaningful one; one with some teeth in it to gnaw away at the Hoffas and the Dios and the monopolistic unions which already hold life-and-death power over much of the economy.

The bill is much stiffer than the one passed by the Senate, and it now has gone to a Senate-House compromise committee. It is not likely that any compromise can be reached, and it seems likely that the House-approved version will come before the Senate for action sooner or later.

The battle there promises to be as hot and furious as it was in the House. And the prospect for Senate approval is not at all reassuring in view of the number of liberals on the Democratic side of the aisle.

The eyes of South Carolinians will be directed on their two Senators and their vote on the union-control measure. Senators JOHNSON and THURMOND have a handy guide to show them the way; the unanimous vote of their colleagues in the House.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, Aug. 15, 1959]

GEORGIAN IN THE SPOTLIGHT

Georgians are proud of the fact that a Georgian is one of the cosponsors of the labor reform bill passed in the House of Representatives this week. Representative PHIL M. LANDRUM, Jasper, Ga., attorney, is not as widely known nationally as are some other Members of Congress. The chances are, however, that he will be more and more in the forefront of national affairs from now on.

Mr. LANDRUM has already gained a reputation in the inner circles of Congress as a hardworking representative of the people, quite capable of making sound decisions and of acting courageously to sustain his convictions.

Representative ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, of Michigan, cosponsor of the labor reform bill, also is expected to forge farther forward into the national spotlight. He is a Republican and LANDRUM, of course, is a Democrat. They made an effective pair when they teamed up to get action on needed labor reforms.

The Landrum-Griffin bill, of course, does not cover all angles of the labor problem but it does go farther than any of the several other bills which were introduced in the House. It will, if Senate concurrence can be secured, curb some of the evils that beset the Nation in connection with the abuse of power by labor union leaders.

If the Senate should decide to adopt the House bill, the measure could be sent on quickly to the White House for the President's signature. Predictions have been made, however, that the Senate will not endorse the House bill. In that case a conference will be needed to secure an agreement on a compromise bill. The prediction has been made that no strong bill can be passed in the Senate.

That remains to be seen. It is now up to the Senators of the United States to prove to the People that they are not the stooges of labor union leaders who boast of their

power to control legislation and utter threats against those who oppose their dictums.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Aug. 15, 1959]

HOUSE VOTE ON LABOR BILL RESPONDS TO PEOPLE'S DEMAND FOR REFORMS

No matter what course the Senate takes, approval of the Landrum-Griffin bill by the House of Representatives has brought stern pressure on labor leaders to reform. The House vote reflected an uncompromising popular demand for new standards of justice in union dealings with employers, employees, and the public.

Of the 303 Representatives who joined the conservative coalition to support the Landrum-Griffin bill, a substantial number might have ridiculed such a suggestion a few weeks ago. They have been underestimating the force of public sentiment favoring an anticorruption measure with teeth.

As late as Thursday morning, the day of decision, experienced political observers failed to count correctly the number of Representatives whose minds were changing in response to demands from back home. Informed opinion held that the vote might go either way. The prediction was for a margin of victory razor thin. The bill passed by 178 votes.

It is not surprising that the temper of the Nation was so misjudged. Forty years have passed since the behavior of labor unions was called into question by substantial numbers of voters. The signs of a changing climate have been forgotten.

It is fitting that the Members of the House should have been the first to recognize and act in accordance with the new sentiment. That was the way the Founding Fathers hoped things would work. They arranged the structure of the Constitution to make the House sensitive to the wishes of the people.

The shock of the setback handed to the union bosses may be felt even in the Senate. There the people's representatives are insulated to some extent from the currents of popular opinion.

A straw in the wind is a hint from Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts. Senator KENNEDY has steadfastly opposed the tough provisions of the Griffin-Landrum bill. He is a contender for the presidential nomination. Naturally he prefers the Kennedy-Ervin bill, a weaker measure already passed by the Senate which he helped to write. After hearing results in the House, Senator KENNEDY began to talk of compromise.

Sitting with Senator KENNEDY in the Upper Chamber are other Senators who are presidential hopefuls. Some of them may consider that the House action puts them in an awkward spot.

Before making up their minds how they will vote, they will study the character of the groundswell of public opinion which is battering the labor bosses. Though it was slow to gather, it has developed great force. We predict it will be slow to recede. The people will remember for a long time how their Senators vote on this crucial issue of effective labor regulation.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) Evening Post, Aug. 15, 1959]

NOW UP TO U.S. SENATE

If the U.S. Senate concurs with the House of Representatives an effective blow will be delivered against corruption and other abuses in labor unions.

The House, backing President Eisenhower's plea, passed a bill aimed at vicious practices that have been exposed in certain fields of labor-management relations.

If enacted into law, it will ban secondary boycotts, blackmail picketing, and hot cargo

agreements; and it will provide criminal penalties for union officials who violate members' rights. These evils have been particularly flagrant in the James Hoffa Teamsters' regime, but by no means confined to his organization. It is a matter of protecting not only union members, but nonunion workers, employers, and the general public also.

A milder bill was passed by the Senate some weeks ago. Thus differences remain to be settled between the two legislative bodies. The fight has thus been shifted from the House to the Senate. It may be that widespread public sentiment favoring the House bill will prompt the Senate to adopt the latter measure. The House majority resisted tremendous pressure from union lobbyists, which suggests that the lawmakers had heard from the folks back home. AFL-CIO President George Meany opposed even the milder Senate measure and a tepid bill approved by a House committee. The bill voted by the House had been introduced on a bipartisan basis, by Representatives PHIL LANDRUM, Georgia Democrat, and Representative ROBERT GRIFFIN, Michigan Republican.

The outcome of the House vote was another demonstration of the power of a coalition of Republicans and Southern Democrats. Most of the 95 Democrats who backed the bill on the first and crucial test were from this section. They included all six representatives from South Carolina, and we believe they merit strong commendation.

[From the Spartanburg (S.C.) Herald, Aug. 15, 1959]

WILL OF THE PEOPLE PAYS OFF IN CONGRESS

The will of the people has had its day in Congress.

The House dramatically reflected the force of public opinion in its adoption of the Landrum-Griffin bill Thursday. This was the only effective, and the strongest, labor reform bill introduced.

The victory was in the face of such opposition as:

1. Such powerful Democratic leadership as House Speaker Sam Rayburn, who usually has his way.

(2) Concentrated Big Labor lobbying, the like of which seldom has been witnessed on Capitol Hill.

3. A Senate bill of much milder nature, championed by the crusading Kennedy brothers; and the threat that strong House bill would invite uncompromising opposition, resulting in no reform bill at all.

But these forces were out of step with the American people. The people are fed up.

They have seen enough of Big Labor leaders' arrogance and contempt for the rights of individuals—union and nonunion alike. The crime, cruelty, crookedness and ugliness they have seen emerge from high union officers has sickened them.

The hierarchy of Big Labor, even the "clean" leaders, have shown their scorn of public opinion by an insistent stand against any effective legislation. They have not cleaned up the outrages we have seen, and we have seen too much.

Southern Congressmen deserve commendation from their people for standing strong on this issue. The Herald particularly congratulates the six representatives from South Carolina. All of them stood for the Landrum-Griffin bill.

They are Representatives ROBERT T. ASHMORE, ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, L. MENDEL RIVERS, JOHN J. RILEY, and JOHN L. McMillan.

The scene now shifts to a Senate-House conference committee. Its duty will be to compromise the labor legislation passed by the two branches and recommend a single measure.

But the Senate itself is more the center of battle. The voice of the people has become more urgent, and easier heard, than

it was when the Senate passed its compromising legislation.

Senators and through them the members of the committee will do well to listen again. The people are fed up and they are looking for action.

South Carolina's Senator J. STROM THURMOND is firmly on record in favor of effective labor reform legislation. The position of Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON is not so clear.

We hope they get the same opportunity to be counted as the House Members did. And the vote of the House should provide a good clue as to how the people back home feel about this thing.

[From the Anderson (S.C.) Independent, Aug. 16, 1959]

PLENTY OF BACK-HOME SUPPORT FOR CURBING UNION RACKETEERS

House approval of the Griffin-Landrum labor bill marks a bipartisan victory for the people over the union czarism threatening to strangle the Nation at a crucial period in history.

The House was confronted by three versions of legislation. Proponents claimed each version was sufficient to curb racketeering by labor union leaders.

The House Labor Committee's version, known as the Elliott bill, had the support of the House leadership.

The Shelley bill was a creature of the labor union leaders.

The Griffin-Landrum bill, authored by Representative LANDRUM, of Georgia, a Democrat, and Representative GRIFFIN, of Michigan, a Republican, was the "tough" version; i.e., the bill with sufficient teeth to change the pattern of union activities in the disorderly fields of mass picketing and secondary boycott, just the kind of two-fisted legislation needed to cope with this problem.

Terrific pressure was exerted by the labor union leaders to block this bill.

In addition to proposing curbs for union excesses, the bill also provided a say-so in union affairs for rank-and-file members.

If there is one thing the union leader bigwigs do not want it is democratic rule within the unions, from the locals on up.

While millions of American workers belong to unions—in many cases they are forced to belong if they want to work—they have steadily lost voice in the way union affairs are run.

The legislation passed by the House is designed to return some measure of union control to the workers, where it belongs. The bill had plenty of back-home support among union members themselves, or else it never would have passed.

The South Carolina House delegation voted solidly for the Griffin-Landrum measure, the Third District's Representative BRYAN DORN among them.

We commend the South Carolina delegation for its stand on this vital issue.

The time has come to call a halt to union abuses.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, Aug. 15, 1959]

FAILURE TO ENACT LABOR REFORM BILL WILL RESULT IN UNDERWORLD TYRANNY

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Are the American people really aware of the disgraceful conduct of certain labor-union leaders and of the menace which they present today to this country? Will the public be fooled by the claim that corrective legislation is not needed because there are only a few gangsters and by the propaganda cry that legitimate unionism might be harmed by new laws?

The answers to these questions deal with a phase of human rights that is more important than any other problem now before Congress. For if public opinion falters after

the sensational disclosures by the Senate Investigating Committee headed by Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, then a period of labor anarchy and under-world tyranny may be expected to develop in the coming years.

President Eisenhower has appealed to the Nation to back him as he asks that Members of Congress, irrespective of party, be told by the people that the country wants strong legislation to correct abuses. The type of thing which, unfortunately, the labor unions themselves have been unable to remedy is fully explained by the report of the McClellan committee. In commenting on the affairs of the Teamsters Union—the largest in the country—the committee report says in part:

"The power of the Teamsters Union president is so extraordinary that the committee finds the fact this power is now lodged in the hands of a man such as Hoffa tragic for the Teamsters Union, and dangerous for the country at large. . . .

"In fact, the 1958 hearings produced testimony of an even more sordid nature than that of the previous year.

"Ignominy was piled on ignominy as the testimony wove through stories of violence, financial manipulations, callous repression of democratic rights and racketeer control.

"This is an ugly situation. The continuing attitude of Hoffa and other teamster leaders that they are above the law can only serve to intensify the apprehensions of decent union members and decent people throughout the country. . . .

"Time and time again the committee has found Hoffa to be faithless to the members of his own union. He has betrayed these members so frequently that it has become abundantly clear that Hoffa's chief interest is his own advancement and that of his friends and cronies—a great number of whom are racketeers. . . .

"In addition, Hoffa has used union funds for his own benefit and that of his friends.

"Hoffa has consistently supported the interests of racketeer friends over those of his own members.

"Hoffa and his chief aids have consistently repressed democratic rights within the union.

"Hoffa has connived with and maneuvered union insurance to racketeer friends, bringing these friends gigantic profits. While the cost of insurance has risen, the benefits to the members of his union were drastically reduced.

"In the history of this country it would be hard to find a labor leader who has so shamelessly abused his members or his trust. . . .

"The committee is convinced that if Hoffa remains unchecked, he will successfully destroy the decent labor movement in the United States. Further than that, because of the tremendous economic power of the teamsters, it will place the underworld in a position to dominate American economic life in a period when the vitality of the American economy is necessary to this country's preservation in an era of world crisis. This Hoffa cannot be allowed to do."

What have the decent labor-union leaders done about all this? They have, of course, criticized Hoffa and have deplored what he has done. But they are not willing to back the kind of legislation President Eisenhower says is really needed to prevent Hoffa and his ilk from continuing to exploit the rank and file of American workmen.

No group likes restrictive legislation. Big business doesn't like antimonopoly laws, and big unionism doesn't like the prospect of any restriction either. But it is the public as a whole which is damaged by any abuses of power exercised by private groups.

It will be interesting to see whether the majority in Congress will rise to the occasion or whether the labor unions, with their

political pull and promises of bigger campaign contributions to those who do their bidding, will be able to scare Members of the House and Senate away from the legislation that ought to be passed in order to end the rule of dictators, tyrants and crooks inside the labor-union movement in free America.

Puerto Rico Is Different

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, by any human measure of ability and character Luis Muñoz-Marín is one of the giants among the world's leaders. In an article in the New York Times Sunday magazine, August 16, 1959, he discusses why "Puerto Rico Does Not Want To Be a State," which under unanimous consent is included hereafter.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 16, 1959]

PUERTO RICO DOES NOT WANT TO BE A STATE—DESPITE THE EXAMPLES OF ALASKA AND HAWAII, SAYS GOV. MUÑOZ MARÍN, ITS PRESIDENT COMMONWEALTH STATUS BEST FITS BOTH THE ISLAND AND THE UNITED STATES

(By Luis Muñoz-Marín)

(Luis Muñoz-Marín became the first elected Governor of Puerto Rico in 1948. He was re-elected Governor in 1952 after the territory had been designated a Commonwealth.)

SAN JUAN, P.R.—Puerto Rico, now a vigorous self-governing Commonwealth within the American political system, would be smothered if some of its misguided stateside wellwishers, like Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ of New Mexico and Representative VICTOR ANRUSO of New York, had their way. They have introduced or proposed to introduce bills for Puerto Rican statehood. The bills have no chance of approval in Congress, and only minority support in Puerto Rico.

Recently, in the lobby of a Washington hotel, an old friend greeted me, "Well, Governor, pretty soon we should be seeing you up on the Hill as a Senator from the 51st State." He meant it as a high compliment to Puerto Rico, and I was touched by both his warmth and enthusiasm. In the wake of Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood, a similar status for Puerto Rico seemed logical, simple, and desirable to him. He melted into the milling crowd of the lobby before I had an opportunity to outline to him the great complexities of Puerto Rico's circumstances, which make statehood neither logical nor desirable for Puerto Rico or the United States.

When I say that it is far better for Puerto Rico to remain a Commonwealth, it is with no insensitivity to the high honor which statehood implies. Nor is it because we seek independence—we definitely do not. Nor does it mean we are content to be less than a federated state—because, definitely, we are not less, but only different. Nor is it because we do not wish to share in the common expenses of the Federal Union, of which we are a part in a new way—since Puerto Rico is now proposing a formula by which it would begin to pay into the Federal Treasury as its economic growth allows it to do so.

Puerto Rico's history has been far different from that of Alaska and Hawaii, and the understandable tendency to speculate on possible statehood for Puerto Rico after the

rapid accession of Alaska and Hawaii can lead men of goodwill far astray. Puerto Rico was a populous island with a long history and well-defined culture when it first came into the American orbit in 1898 following the Spanish-American War. Alaska and Hawaii, on the other hand, were sparsely settled and ripe for colonizing from the mainland.

Alaska and Hawaii became incorporated Territories, clearly destined for cultural integration and eventual statehood. Puerto Rico's special circumstances were early recognized when it became the first unincorporated Territory, which implied that it would not be slated for statehood. At the same time it would have been obviously contrary to the American spirit that Puerto Rico should remain a colony forever.

Economic factors were very different, too. Both Alaska and Hawaii have been for many years notably wealthier than Puerto Rico is even now after 14 years of rapid economic progress since the end of World War II. The net annual average income of Hawaii, and probably of Alaska, is more than \$1,800, very little below the 1957 national average of \$2,027. Puerto Rico's per capita income of \$470 is still less than half of that of the lowest income State of the Union, Mississippi. Puerto Rico has little land in relation to population, no fuels, no significant mineral resources. That is why we have called the program by which we progress Operation Bootstrap.

These economic and cultural factors have, since 1898, made Puerto Rico's political evolution unique, and clearly different from that of Alaska and Hawaii. Indeed, as late as 1940, many sober, informed men in the United States considered Puerto Rico's economic and political problems insoluble, and were resigned to Puerto Rico's being a dependent poorhouse on a kind of permanent dole from the Federal Treasury, a place where poverty and hopelessness would constantly churn up social and political instability.

It took a double-barreled attack on these problems in Puerto Rico itself to lead to the relative prosperity of today, and to the visible social and political health and vigor of the island. First came the attack on poverty, temporarily foreclosing political debate. Only when Operation Bootstrap was well under way did Puerto Rico address itself to finding a political status which answered the needs of its special relationship with the United States and its own economic and cultural circumstances.

To those who forget that peoples are the creators of political formulas and not their slaves, Puerto Rico seemed to have no way to turn. Continued existence as a Territory or colony was impossible. The corrosive effects of colonialism, even a benevolent colonialism, could no longer be accepted, especially in the post-war period. Neither dignity, nor the swift course of history, nor commonsense, nor the American tradition, would permit the continuation of such a system in the American context.

In contemplation of the inevitable end of colonialism, a sterile debate had raged for many years in the island between adherents of independence and those of statehood. The great majority of Puerto Ricans rejected independence on two counts: Puerto Rico's economy was by then so integrated with that of the United States that separation would have meant economic suicide and, equally important, Puerto Ricans had developed a deep and genuine attachment for their fellow United States citizens and for United States political institutions.

The great majority also rejected the possibility of statehood as totally unrealistic. Economically, statehood then would have meant another form of ruin for Puerto Rico—and still would, as we shall see in a moment.

The circumstances called for the same kind of political pioneering which created the Original Thirteen States themselves—a new projection which would be in the spirit of the 20th century, taking due recognition of the mutual interests of both the United States and Puerto Rico. The concept of a self-governing commonwealth had been foreseen as long ago as 1912 by Henry L. Stimson, then Secretary of War under President Taft. With farsighted statesmanship, Stimson observed that he saw no inconsistency between U.S. citizenship for Puerto Ricans and the ideal that Puerto Rico should have, when ready for it, completely autonomous local government within the American system.

This is essentially what happened when Puerto Rico became a commonwealth in 1952. The official Spanish translation is *Estado Libre Asociado*—Associated Free State: Puerto Rico, in the generic sense of the term, is a new kind of state. Puerto Ricans are U.S. citizens, sharing with their fellow citizens in the continental United States a common defense, a common foreign policy, a common market, a common currency, and the operation of practically all Federal laws. Puerto Ricans differ from other Americans in that they do not vote in national elections, have no voting representation in Congress, and have, on the other hand, autonomy in directing their local affairs, including the collecting and spending of their own taxes.

Nearly 7 years after its hopeful inception, how is the Commonwealth doing? It is doing remarkably well, I am happy to report. "Operation Bootstrap" has raised the per capita income from \$121 in 1940 to today's \$470. Living standards have virtually doubled in 15 years, perhaps the most rapid economic advance in any underdeveloped region in the world.

Certainly development has been dramatic enough to attract high officials, technicians, and students from all over the world to study our methods. Nearly 9,000 visitors from 107 different countries—from Nepal to Saudi Arabia, from Morocco to Bolivia—have studied how we have raised life expectancy from 46 years in 1940 to 68 years today, how we are rapidly winning the fight against illiteracy and how a whole people can be raised, in a few years, from despair and deepest poverty to relative prosperity and dynamic purposefulness.

The creation of the Commonwealth had political as well as economic lessons for the world. It was a notable achievement, in the postwar era, to end a colonial relationship in such a constructive, fruitful manner, devoid of the bitterness and violence which characterized the end of colonialism in many parts of Asia, the Near East, and Africa. Puerto Rico clearly gave the lie to the persons (Communists and others) who are always ready to raise the cry of "imperialism" against the United States. It was patently impossible to square imperial exploitation with a people who are self-governing, who sent 40,000 of their sons into the Armed Forces during the Korean conflict (50 percent of them volunteers) and who are so effectively dramatizing the quality of U.S. democracy to thousands of earnest observers from all over the world.

The dignity of self-government has not only engendered an explosion of energy in economic affairs in Puerto Rico but has seen a lively ferment in cultural realms as well. No one who has visited Puerto Rico recently can be immune to the feeling that things are happening. The *Casals Festival*, lively drama, ballet, opera, and symphony orchestra seasons are all part of the energized local scene. Puerto Rican painting and writing are in obvious renaissance. A people with new pride and new confidence and new creativity are clearly on the march.

In the light of this progress, it may seem strange that the sterile debate regarding possible statehood at any time in the foreseeable future should have been revived in Puerto Rico. Certainly persons who make any serious study of Puerto Rico's economics are aware that statehood, at this time, or for many generations to come, would mean a fatal crash for the island. It would be like a fully loaded airplane about to be airborne having half its motors suddenly stopped.

Federal taxes would about double the already high taxload that the Commonwealth must impose upon itself in order to keep its public works and public services in line with its rapid economic development. Federated statehood would mean either breaking the back of the taxpayer and thus making further economic development impossible or cutting the public services so drastically that their decay would constitute a bottleneck for private enterprise and economic development.

There has been nothing automatic about Puerto Rico's progress to date. Only hard, uphill work has brought it about. And while this progress has been notable enough to attract interest in many countries, our living standards, as I have indicated, are still far below those of the mainland United States.

The Federal Government has long been cognizant of the different economic situations of Puerto Rico and the harsh handicaps imposed by a population concentration of 658 persons per square mile in a mountainous island with virtually no resources. Never, since Puerto Rico was first associated with the United States, has the Federal Government applied Federal taxes here. This was to give the island a chance of economic development as well as to honor the principle of "no taxation without representation." Without this to compensate for the other disadvantages I have mentioned, Puerto Rico would still be in deepest poverty.

Most Federal grants-in-aid apply in Puerto Rico. These grants, like those allowed to the States, are apportioned on the theory that they will benefit the United States as a whole. Matching funds for building certain roads and for hospital construction are cases in point.

The United States tariff is collected in Puerto Rico on foreign imports—which, by the way, are few, since most of our trade is with the United States—but the receipts go into the Commonwealth treasury after the cost of collection is deducted. In this way American manufacturers are protected from foreign competition while the Puerto Rican treasury is benefited. This is important because Puerto Rico is one of the world's greatest per-capita consumers of United States products, spending \$700 million a year on them. The Federal excise tax on Puerto Rican rum, while it serves to protect American distillers, also reverts to the Commonwealth.

On the other hand, our association with the United States imposes some penalties on the Puerto Rican economy, for which our treasury is not compensated. Under the Sugar Act of 1946, for example, Puerto Rico loses considerable potential income by being denied the right to refine more than 11 percent of its own sugar production. In addition, shipping rates between Puerto Rico and U.S. ports are artificially high because they are governed by the coastwise shipping laws confining cargoes to American vessels. While these laws have the legitimate objective of subsidizing U.S. shipping for defense purposes, in practice they place a heavy share of this defense load on Puerto Rican consumers.

From the U.S. point of view, the accession of a state unable to pay Federal taxes except at the cost of economic ruin is obviously inconceivable. Puerto Rico, which as a Commonwealth is a showcase of American de-

mocracy before the world, would, as a federated state, become exactly the opposite: an economy in shambles, having to be kept alive by a W.P.A. type of charity, with a people far more hopeless than during the worst of the great depression.

Nor has the United States the desire or interest to force the cultural assimilation of Puerto Ricans in Puerto Rico. Indeed, the fact that Puerto Ricans are probably the most bilingual people in the hemisphere, with deep understanding of and ties to both their fellow U.S. citizens and their Latin neighbors, has made Puerto Rico a valuable meeting place for people and ideas at a time when Latin America is in a state of far-reaching flux. Its unique position has been an undoubted asset for the United States in sensing changing currents in Latin America, and in translating its hemisphere policy into action.

But even now, however limited our means, Puerto Rico wants to make it clear that it intends to begin contributing to the Federal Treasury as its economic circumstances permit. There is now a bill before Congress whose purpose is to define the permanent association of Puerto Rico with the United States. One principle is clearly established: That Puerto Rico wishes, of its own accord and within its abilities, to help shoulder the Federal burden by contributing money to the Federal Government and by performing some functions in Puerto Rico now underwritten by U.S. taxpayers.

Puerto Rico is not looking for a free ride. On the contrary, it is just as anxious to carry its share of the financial load as its sons were to risk their lives in Europe and Korea—as a matter of pride and dignity, as our contribution to the whole.

When the strident chorus of nationalism begins to fade in Europe, Asia, Latin America and Africa, some ingenious formula may permit the rational regrouping of new and old sovereign units on a sounder economic basis, just as the United States and Puerto Rico found a workable formula. The world has become too small, too complex, too interdependent to permit indefinite political fragmentation at the price of widespread poverty. Where blind insistence on rigid, 19th century style sovereignty exists in defiance of economic logic, new forms of federalism are called for. Puerto Ricans are proud that they are contributing to the American political system a new form of federalism.

In dedicating the Puerto Rico Supreme Court Building, Chief Justice Earl Warren expressed this in words that remind us of the creative political genius of the United States:

"In the sense that our American system is not static, in the sense that it is not an end but the means to an end—in the sense that it is an organism intended to grow and expand to meet varying conditions and times in a large country—in the sense that every governmental effort of ours is an experiment—so the new institutions of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico represent an experiment—the newest experiment and perhaps the most notable of American governmental experiments in our lifetimes."

A new way of abolishing colonialism has been born.

Problems of the Migratory Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Washington Post and

Times Herald published this week three articles which should be of interest to all who are concerned about economic and social justice. The author, Laurence Stern, discusses the migratory workers of Maryland. He tells why most citizens ignore the problems of migratory workers, and why a few are deeply concerned. He also describes the initial moves made by the Maryland Commission on Migratory Labor.

I ask unanimous consent to have the first two articles of this series printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald]

MARYLAND'S MIGRANTS HIT BY BAD WEATHER—HUNGER SPECTER RAISED FOR VAST FORGOTTEN HORDE

(By Laurence Stern)

Tally McNeil lives in a dingy, one-room shack on the Eastern Shore with his pregnant wife, five children and his worries.

They share three cots, a two-burner stove and a gnawing uncertainty over where the next dollar will come from.

"In the last 2 days I ain't picked more than \$2 worth of tomatoes," said Tally, head hunched between his husky shoulders. "That don't buy us much."

When the harvest is good, a migrant picks until his knees are sore and his back aches. In a bad season, there is the specter of empty stomachs for himself and his family.

Maryland's newly established Commission on Migratory Labor is looking into the living and working conditions of thousands of migrants like Tally who annually pour into the Shore's great truck farming belt.

DROUGHT, RAINS HALVE CROP

This summer the Shore has been hit by a devastating combination of drought and heavy rain. Because of the weather, there has been only half the usual crop of tomatoes, cucumbers, beans and peppers.

Nevertheless, Tally McNeil, his parents, five brothers and two sisters will be back from Pompano, Fla., next year to gamble again with nature, just as they have for the last 11 years.

Last summer 5,455 migrants swarmed into Maryland to pick the crops and haul them to canneries and other markets. Most are Negroes from Florida. Others come from Mississippi, Alabama, and Louisiana.

The tri-State Eastern Shore lies along one of the three broad corridors through which some 1 million American and foreign migrants stream northward each year as crops ripen.

Another wave moves upward through the tier of Midwestern States and a third comes up through California.

Waddell's Migratory Camp, where the McNells live, was built by the Federal Government to house Bahamians and Jamaicans brought there during the war years to relieve the farm manpower shortage.

It was taken over by the Dorchester County Truck Growers Association and is operated by the State department of employment security.

BETTER THAN MOST CAMPS

Waddell's may be worse than some camps in a three-county area surveyed by the Washington Post. But it is better than most.

There are 53 weathered frame shacks jammed into a large, circular clearing. As many as 140 laborers, their wives and children make their home there during the peak of the 4-month harvesting season.

The camp yard is littered with empty half-pint bottles, beer cans, and other debris. A group of children play around a smoldering pile of leaves.

Inside a cabin you hear a woman singing and several pairs of hands clap in rhythmic unison.

At each corner of the camp stands a row of outdoor privies, doors yawning open.

Living accommodations at Waddell's and nearby Preston camp come in two sizes.

Most of the migrants live in small shacks, 8- by 10-foot cubicles equipped with cots, a small cook stove and a light bulb. Rent, \$2 a week.

LARGER FAMILY MODEL

The model for larger families is almost double the floor area and has a higher roof. Rent \$4.

This price distinction is not respected by the swarms of mosquitoes and flies which infest the camps. Officials say that all the cabins were once screened.

Sometimes screens are ripped out so that it is easier to toss out garbage or dirty dishwater. Or else they just deteriorated.

"The migrants have become adjusted to this life," said the Rev. Carlton W. Veazey, a 23-year-old Howard University divinity student. As a member of the National Council of Churches migrant ministry, Mr. Veazey has five migrant camps under his supervision.

"I know deep in my heart that they want better things. They are doing an important job in harvesting the crops. I feel they are entitled to better facilities," he said.

With the help of the camp managers, the young minister fixed up a room for religious services where half of the camp's inhabitants come to worship each week.

Across Route 331 from Waddell's camp a group of pickers combed a field for small "Italian" tomatoes—the remnants of this year's spoiled harvest.

A picker gets 15 cents a basket for small tomatoes and 10 cents for large ones. An additional 3 to 5 cents a basket goes to his crew leader—the man who recruited him and brought him North.

ONE HUNDRED BASKETS A HEAD

When the harvest is plentiful a hardworking crew will pick from early morning to twilight, averaging as much as 100 baskets a head.

"You crawl along on your knees," explained William McNeil. "When they begin to hurt you stand up and pick. When your back starts bothering you, down on your knees again."

Beulah Simmons, a graying, dignified woman in her mid-forties keeps count of the baskets. Other women and children pick in the fields along with the men.

"We can't count children as workers," explained one camp official. "But whether we count them or not, they'll be picking in the fields with their parents."

For infants and toddlers, makeshift nurseries are set up in the trucks and buses which carry the migrant to the fields.

Geraldine Simmons is a bright, attractive 13-year-old. She had to drop out of her sixth grade class in Apaka, Fla., 2 weeks early to come north with her parents.

Next month she will enroll at Hurlock School, some 3 miles from the camp, until they leave for home in mid-October.

"Do you have much trouble catching up with your schoolwork when you get home?" she was asked.

"Naw," she replied. "Not too much."

MARYLAND'S MIGRATORY WORKERS—CREW LEADER'S ROLE PUTS HIM IN MIDDLE

(By Laurence Stern)

Each spring, crew leader John Graham loads up his battered schoolbus with workers and hauls them from Florida to Maryland's Eastern Shore.

To the 55 pickers in his crew, Graham is a combination of policeman, father, banker and boss.

A grizzled, friendly man of 50, he has a reputation of dealing fairly with his workers. Some crew leaders, on the other hand, are known to exploit their crews ruthlessly.

Crew leaders like Graham form the elite of an army of 1 million migrant workers who harvest the Nation's crops. The farmer depends on him for manpower and the picker looks to him for a livelihood.

I talked to crew leaders and pickers alike in the three Eastern Shore counties where Maryland's migratory population is most heavily concentrated, Dorchester, Somerset, and Caroline.

One leader at Somerset Migratory Camp near Princess Anne drives a shiny, new Oldsmobile and owns a fleet of six trucks. Another was barely scraping along with a dilapidated moving van.

PEOPLE PENNED IN TRUCKS

Most of the trucks in the migratory camps had neither seats nor benches. As many as 40 men, women and children are penned into these vehicles for the 900-mile trip. If they are lucky they may find a bean hamper to sit on.

In June, 1957, a truck carrying 41 migrant workers crashed in North Carolina. The death toll was 21.

Six months later the Interstate Commerce Commission adopted a safety code for transportation of migrants. Among other things, it requires that a secure seat be furnished for each passenger.

Each winter Graham and other crew leaders sit down with Maryland employment officials in Florida and chart a work schedule for the following year. The labor procurement agent is armed with a list of work orders from farmers back home.

A crew leader's earnings may run as high as \$10,000 in a season or as low as \$800, depending on the quality of the harvest and the size of his work force.

The basic economic cards of the migratory labor system are stacked heavily in his favor.

GETS FLAT COMMISSION

A crew leader is paid a flat commission for each basket of tomatoes. This share varies from 3 to 5 cents a basket. The picker gets 10 cents.

By the season's end the crew leader may earn more than 10 times as much as one of his laborers. In the field he oversees the workers but does not do any picking himself.

Migrant workers first came to the Shore during World War II when the pinch on agricultural manpower was at its worst. They have been coming back ever since.

Until the farmer can harvest his tomato, bean, cucumber, and pepper crops by machine there will always be a market for the migrant.

He is the cement that holds the Shore's farming economy together. The farmer is first to admit it.

"Without the migrant our canning industry would just have to shut down," maintains Robert McWilliams, who runs 6 farms sprawling over nearly 1,000 acres in upper Dorchester County.

CANNERY IS KING

In the Eastern Shore's agricultural breadbasket, the cannery is king.

Not everyone agrees that the migrant is either necessary or desirable, least of all Charles Cornish who is lone Negro member of the Cambridge city council.

"The migrant undercuts our domestic labor," said Cornish. "These people are being exploited by their own crew leaders. If the farmer was willing to pay a decent wage, he would be able to get plenty of local help."

Cornish owns a bus service. In the days before the migrants arrived he carried local farm laborers to the fields.

"A good many of the local Negroes feel the way I do," said Cornish. "The migrants have taken something away from them."

Soviets in Secret Places

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Los Angeles Herald Express calls attention to our peculiar inclination to show off our innermost secrets to our worst enemies. The editorial also pays tribute to our distinguished colleague, the Honorable GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, for his protest to the State Department and the Atomic Energy Commission for allowing visiting Communists to see and photograph our industrial secrets.

The editorial follows:

SOVIETS IN SECRET PLACES

In these modern days when the tendency in some quarters is to hand the Communists (American and foreign) whatever they desire, it is encouraging to know that we have at least some congressional watchdogs on the job.

Los Angeles Congressman GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB has protested sharply to the State Department and the Atomic Energy Commission, and has demanded to know who authorized the tour of the University of California Radiation Laboratory by Soviet Deputy Premier Kozlov.

Declaring that "we're just too soft," Congressman LIPSCOMB remarked:

"It is ridiculous for us to go ahead blindly showing them all over the Nation when there is no place they go that they are not looking for information to advance their cause—the destruction of our form of government."

It seems like playing with fire to invite our enemies into our A-laboratories, even though some officials assert the Soviet visitor only saw "fundamental unclassified research equipment." If it was so unimportant, why not just show him the Golden Gate Bridge?

Adding fuel to the fire were other dangerous incidents.

Soviet photographers were allowed to photograph at close range in steel and automobile factories, focusing on intricate automation and other machinery, which one steel official called industrial espionage.

They also photographed industrial and defense areas which easily could become pictorial targets of destruction in the event of a Soviet-United States war.

And it was clearly evident that anti-United States propaganda for the Russian people was being produced in wholesale quantity, with the Soviet cameramen photographing only hovels, slums, poorly dressed children and older people as illustrations of "living standards."

Meanwhile, Vice President NIXON is getting a cautious reception from Soviet officials to his request to be allowed to visit Russian areas rarely opened to foreigners.

And Soviet Premier Khrushchev continues to voice loud threats of Soviet destruction

of the United States unless we toe the proper marks.

Mr. NIXON correctly analyzed the situation when, at the recent dedication of the Los Angeles Sports Arena, he declared:

"While Kozlov is talking peace here, Khrushchev is talking war and blackmail in Moscow. . . . We should be courteous but under no circumstances fall to stand up for what we believe."

Mayor Mariani, of Detroit, and Governor Williams, of Michigan, may not have been so adroit or diplomatic in their reception of the Soviet visitor. But they made it plain that many Americans do not go along with the attitude of some official and private bigwigs who scrape and bow every time a Soviet higher-up deigns to smile at them.

Dam at Rampart on the Yukon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST GRUENING

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the public works appropriation bill, an excellent bill, which we trust will shortly become law, contains an item of great importance not only to Alaska but to our entire Nation. It is a \$50,000 appropriation for further studies leading to the construction of a great dam at Rampart on the Yukon.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address on the subject of this dam entitled "The Big One," by Harold L. Moats, Chief of the Civil Works Planning Branch of the Corps of Engineers, which was delivered at the eighth annual meeting of the Alaska Rural Electric Cooperative Association on August 7, 1959.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE BIG ONE

It has been said that without dreamers there is no progress. I would like to spend a few minutes discussing a dream which is truly fabulous.

For some years people have spoken of a dam in Rampart Canyon on the Yukon about 100 air miles northwest of Fairbanks. Lots of talk, but nothing accomplished.

It was not until the Corps of Engineers started our report on the water resources of the Yukon and Kuskokwim River Basins in the fall of 1954 that any serious consideration was given at this site.

With a small staff and little money we have made a preliminary evaluation of the water resources of the Yukon and Kuskokwim River Basins. The report is now nearing final form and we expect that it will be submitted in late November or early December. In our studies of the water resources of Alaska we have found it possible to develop about 18,500,000 kilowatts of hydropower. This, compared to the 25,500,000 installed hydropower in the smaller 48, provides our long-range planners with some interesting facts to play with.

The major part of this potential power, some 11,300,000 kilowatts, is found at nine sites in the Yukon and Kuskokwim River basins.

This morning I would like to tell you of some of the things our preliminary studies have revealed about the big one.

The Rampart Canyon site on the main stem of the Yukon River can be developed to produce about 3,700,000 kilowatts of prime power. The installed capacity would be 4,760,000 kilowatts. A concrete gravity dam 1,300 feet long at present water level, 2,700 feet long at the crest and 500 feet high will develop a usable head of about 440 feet. The regulated flow would be about 118,000 cubic feet per second.

Big figures alone mean little to most of us; let us relate them to others that most of us have seen.

At Rampart Canyon, the dam, with only about three-fourths of the volume of the dam at Grand Coulee, will impound enough water to warrant an installed capacity of 4,760,000 kilowatts; about $2\frac{1}{2}$ times the present installed capacity at Grand Coulee.

The area and capacity of the reservoir is interesting. The reservoir will cover an area of about 10,700 square miles, or an area about 10 percent greater than Lake Erie. Due to the great area of the reservoir, it is anticipated that the seasonal drawdown will be under 4 feet. The total reservoir storage will be about 1,300 million acre-feet, better than 40 times the storage at Lake Mead behind Hoover Dam.

There are many interesting areas of speculation that open up as we study this tremendous project.

What, if any, will be the effect of this large reservoir on the climatic regime? It is almost certain that this area of water would increase precipitation to some extent. The water mass would cause the mean annual temperature to rise—how much we cannot say—but assuming that it might be 2 or 3 degrees, it is interesting to note that a few days longer growing season would enhance the agricultural potential of the region.

It has been said that the reservoir area contains enough timber to sustain a small pulp mill during the filling period.

The short but extremely pleasant summer weather of the region might well induce recreational activities here that would compare favorably with those at some of the popular reservoirs in more populated areas.

Let us look more closely at the structure itself. The dam will be a gravity arch structure with adequate fish-handling facilities. Cargo-handling facilities would be constructed in lieu of locks. Because of the huge reservoir capacity, it is anticipated that a spillway, required for safety, will never be used, and it is tentatively planned that the spillway function will be provided by a rupture section in the low earth levee which will close the saddle in the Texas Creek drainage opposite the main dam.

Power will be developed by seventeen 280,000-kilowatt generators.

It is anticipated that ultra high voltage transmission, probably about 500,000 volts, will serve ice free industrial sites at Valdez, Anchorage, Whittier, and Seward. Fairbanks and other interior communities, as well as many mining operations, will be served by conventional transmission lines.

The construction of the dam in stages will probably not prove feasible because of the high cost of mobilizing men and equipment. Our tentative plan therefore is to initially construct the entire dam and to install four or five of the 280,000-kilowatt generators. Installation of the remaining generators will follow as the load develops.

Preliminary estimates indicate that the cost of this initial installation, including transmission to one ice-free tidewater industrial site will be about \$900 million and that the delivered cost will be about 5 mills per kilowatt-hour. The total installation will cost about \$1,340 million and the kilowatt hour cost at the tidewater sites mentioned above will be reduced to about $3\frac{1}{2}$ mills.

Based primarily on these results of our preliminary studies, the Public Works Committee of the Senate, at the request of Senator GRUENING, on April 24 of this year, directed that the Corps of Engineers make a detailed study of the Rampart Canyon hydroelectric site. We anticipate that this study will require 4 years to complete and that we will receive an initial allotment of funds to start the work this fiscal year.

Many times during the last few years I have been told we were wasting our time and the taxpayers' dollars, dreaming of a dam that would never be built.

Years ago, skeptics talked just like that about development of the Columbia River and the Pacific Northwest. It is my firm belief that industrialists are just as alert as they were 25 years ago. I know that the power demand is now much greater than it was then and it is inconceivable that this mighty giant will continue to lie dormant in the face of such need.

Rampart Canyon, the big one, is Alaska's most valuable resource, and as it is developed Alaska will take her rightful place in the family of States contributing richly to the economy of the Nation and to the welfare of the whole free world.

What I Believe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., which appeared in the June 1959 issue of the Atlantic Monthly:

WHAT I BELIEVE

(By James A. Farley)

(A lifelong Democrat who was born at Grassy Point, N.Y., 71 years ago, James A. Farley received his first appointment under Gov. Alfred E. Smith as port warden of New York in 1918. He served as chairman of the Democratic National Committee from 1932 to 1940, and he bore the heaviest political responsibility in the advent and development of the New Deal. He mastered the complexity of party organization with a direct, man-to-man approach. In this article he tells how he went about it.)

I was born at Grassy Point, N.Y., on the west bank of the Hudson. My parents were of Irish descent and profoundly religious. I inherited from both a strong physique, a good home, and I hope, some sense of humor. While I was still a very young boy, my father died as the result of a kick from a horse. But the benediction of his affection and the example of his personal honor had already descended to his children. My mother never faltered as the full burden of responsibility fell upon her young shoulders. She taught us that working was part of living and both were the gift of God. "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread" was not God's punishment to Adam but the first step to man's salvation, at least as taught in the Farley household.

Of course, we didn't have much choice, but under my mother's leadership we spent no time or energy lamenting the lack of it. At that time, the principal way to improve your affairs was by improving yourself. Some ex-

pensive psychological excuses have been developed in the latter decades, but I am old-fashioned enough to think that the most reasonable of excuses are not substitutes for Ben Franklin's yardstick of actual performance.

I early became interested in politics. Grassy Point was a misnomer, politically; it was the one thing neither party allowed to grow under its feet. This was particularly true of a Democrat in Rockland County. Grassy Point is a community in the town of Stony Point, up which Mad Anthony Wayne was carried on a litter to victory. All of his sentries together couldn't have marched as many miles as I did, door to door, in the forlorn cause of the Stony Point Democrats. And General Wayne couldn't possibly have felt a fuller flush of victory than I when I was elected town clerk. This face-to-face personal contact I believe to be the heart and core of the American system. There is no substitute for it. In the week prior to the 1936 election I mailed more than 8,000 letters to every county chairman, vice chairman, city chairman, State chairman, and the members of the Democratic National Committee. In a few weeks following the election I sent more than 26,000 letters of congratulation and thanks to the successful Democratic candidates for county, city, State, legislative, congressional, and senatorial offices. I knew the contents of the letters, which I signed myself because many were going to men and women whom I knew intimately and who were active in the Democratic Party and instrumental in its great victories. I signed all the letters "Jim" because I realized that the personal touch would be helpful and, incidentally, save time instead of signing my full name. At any rate, no one had to instruct me on the importance of the postal system when I became postmaster general.

On the east bank of the Hudson, some time before the loss of my father, another young boy, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, had lost his father. We were to be joined by the flow of events, far more than by the river which flowed past our doors. Oddly, we were to separate eventually (against a third term) into which his grandfather had been born and into which my grandfather had come as an immigrant.

So much has been written about the split between F. D. R. and myself that our long years of close cooperation are often overlooked. Actually, when Mr. Roosevelt took office to handle the crisis of 1933, the Jeffersonian concept of complete unity of legislative and executive departments through a party responsible to the people was the *modus operandi*. The President delegated the passage of legislation to me as chairman of the Democratic National Committee. It is interesting to note, as Speaker RAYBURN has pointed out, that of the hundred and more major acts passed at that time, not one has been repealed and by far the overwhelming majority have been accepted by both parties as basic legislation.

But here and now, I should like to identify the philosophy, as I saw it, behind that social legislation. On March 4, 1933, when Mr. Roosevelt took his oath of office, there were serious flaws in our national patterns, moral as well as economic. By moral, I mean that a vast preponderance of the American people over the age of 60 were dependent upon relatives for support. Also, millions of children who should have been at school were working. Collective bargaining was a theoretical illusion. Company towns and company stores were a polite expression for economic serfdom. We eliminated these sinkholes. But it seems to me that the philosophy underlying these programs has been badly twisted out of its original meaning and intent. More particularly, to build a floor over a community of quicksand is quite different

from putting a ceiling over the productive and creative elements of the individual. It is one thing to put in a minimum wage-level, it is quite another to put a ceiling on personal incentives, which our present hodgepodge tax system does.

At cradle and for some time after, and at graveside and for some time before, a human being often needs assistance. People occasionally need crutches, too, but these aids are only a substitute for the moment when the person can stand on his own two feet. Accordingly, to see purely remedial measures transformed into a cradle-to-grave philosophy under the so-called security programs of welfare states is, in my opinion, as silly as to argue that crutches were invented as substitutes for legs. Welfare states develop a wheelchair philosophy in able-bodied people, and I am against both. It seems to me it is American to hate dependence of any kind. The Indians no longer accept the idea of the Great White Father at Washington; indeed, they now have good reason to know there never was one. Idols, including welfare states, notoriously have feet of clay. The best insurance against the clay feet of idols is to stand on your own.

Ironically enough, because I have favored—and favor—every bit of progressive legislation to distribute risk, the conservatives regard me as a liberal. And because I insist that the distribution of common risk can never be a substitute for individual effort, the liberals regard me as a conservative.

A great deal has been written about the personal teamwork of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and myself, much of it inaccurate. I know the warm comradeship which existed between us, and he was as close a friend of mine as I was of his. We fought together in his first two presidential campaigns. During those first two terms we worked side by side, and there was never a question of either, as a man, being below or above the other.

But when our paths separated in 1940, our different backgrounds were contrasted in reams and reams of copy. Those who had no insight into the facts offered the erroneous explanation that a great social gulf had always existed between us. I practically had to repel the continued suggestion that I was the injured underdog, a barefoot boy done wrong by an unfeeling Grotonian. What particularly irked me were the background articles emphasizing my quote humble unquote beginnings. I am an American of Irish descent. I have known many people of Irish descent. Fat, thin, tall, short—loquacious, taciturn, ebullient, and morose—but never in my life have I met a humble one. It just doesn't run in the strain. The fact is that I have met few men of Irish descent who were not their own figurative secretaries of state. Whatever else they may lack, it isn't opinions or the willingness to fight for them. As to authenticity as Americans, while the *Mayflower* passenger list will be combed in vain for their names, 16 Kellys, 17 Murphys, and hundreds of others of old sod ancestry have won the Congressional Medal of Honor—enough to assure even the unimpaired that the credentials of Americans of Irish descent are in order.

And, frankly, I resented the inference that those whose fathers' homes happened to be more propertied than my mother's were more endowed than I. As to material advantages, the same three R's were taught at Grassy Point as at Groton and St. Marks. There is no royal road to learning, whether your seat is in the family kitchen or in an endowed library. It is the individual himself who counts. A youth who isn't willing to make an effort via the commuters' train to New York isn't very likely to make much more of an effort in the marble halls of a great university. As Mr. Lincoln demon-

strated, if a person has the will to improve himself, the back of a slate will serve as a writing pad. In any event, I want to make it clear, if only for the future thinking of my grandchildren, that while my mother couldn't afford my tuition to college, I wouldn't exchange her teaching for the biggest financial endowment in the country.

Actually, it seems to me that it is as hard for a boy to survive his advantages as it is his adversities. I often thought when I was chairman of the New York State Athletic Commission that having an important family name is somewhat like being a champion fighter. That is, all a title can do is get a man into the ring. But when the gong sounds, the title doesn't fight—the man must win by himself. Rich or poor, the test of a champion is his heart, his ability to get up off the floor and go on to win. To become Governor of New York, Al Smith of Fulton Fish Market and Nelson Rockefeller of Pocantico Hills had to fight the same fight in the same ring; and in the great American tradition of fair play the people of New York judged each on the size of his fighting heart, not on his banking account.

Human beings, like political parties, have basic platforms. I consider myself an indomitable, and careful, optimist. As a human being, I think this is my fundamental approach; only an egomaniac could be a cynic about mankind, particularly in the 20th century. Every jet in the sky, every miracle drug, every electronic device testifies to the miraculous progress of the race as a whole. On the other hand, no intelligent man can be other than a skeptic. This is nothing more than saying that for every experiment which produces a magnificent discovery a thousand fail. The courage of one's convictions is noble; uncoupled with the vigor of one's doubts, however, it is static and hence frequently fruitless.

For example, the great sweep of a suspension bridge across a bay is a majestic sight. To most people it appears as almost a symbol of effortless grace and character. But it seems fair to suppose that a bridge engineer sees far more than the beauty which meets the eyes of the layman, and additional beauty not on its apparent strength but on its non-apparent resiliencies, its flexibilities, and its expansions, without which its arches would crash. Built rigidly for either the summer's heat or the winter's cold, and without regard to the wind, its great towers would topple.

So it seems to me a nation, any nation, is like a suspension bridge, whose rigidity and flexibilities must be and are in a constant state of balance and rebalance, though not readily apparent to the naked eye.

Now, to carry the bridge analogy further, what makes the American Republic the most beautiful political structure in the history of man is not only the lofty intellectual towers erected by the Founding Fathers but the magnificently ingenious built-in devices of flexibility by which each succeeding generation could bring its own faculties to bear on its own problems. The beauty of the American Republic is that the past provided for the future by permitting the present to take care of itself. It is argued that it is not businesslike. It wasn't intended to be. Constitutional friction was designed to provide the continuing sparks of liberty.

Naturally, this concept can scarcely be described as a tenet of the Republican Party or for that matter a guiding concept of the Democratic Party, but it most certainly is the reason why James A. Farley consistently urged the value of the two-party system. Of this, a few scholars who have taken the trouble to read my papers are thoroughly aware, although that great American President and my close friend, F.D.R., was not among them. Fundamentally, it was upon this concept that we parted. As I see it, the

conservative needs the pressure of the liberal to expand, and the liberal needs the pressure of the conservative to keep from shattering by explosion. The reciprocal pressure of each upon the other is needed by a healthy state, the liberal to provide the yeast of growth and the conservative to insure the continuity of form. Great oaks from little acorns grow; between the liberal demanding a full-grown tree and the conservative reluctantly yielding each new advance, continued form and reasonable predictability are part of a wholesome growth.

Since I believe that such ordered growth of the Nation does not depend on one party, I obviously still less would subscribe to the thesis that it depends upon any one man, and it was on this basis that I resisted the third term of F.D.R. Even more particularly, I refused to bolt the party when I failed. I thought, and I think, that the two-party system is more important to the effective expression of the American people than F.D.R. and certainly James A. Farley.

Accordingly, I view with satisfaction the 22d amendment, which prohibits a third term, on the premise of reciprocal action which I have set forth. Furthermore, I reject the hypothesis that the whole equilibrium and hence continuity of the American state should be predicated on the heartbeat of any one mortal man. It is the fundamental character of the American people from which is derived the mightiness of the American state. The American people will be out of character, and the American state will be out of balance, if the tragic day ever comes when they accept the belief that their character is derived from the mightiness of their state and, even worse, any single man who runs it.

Any declaration of principle on the body politic ought to be accompanied by some definition of terms. What, then, is the American democracy? To me, it is the guarantee of an equal chance to every citizen. But an equal chance is a long, long way from enforced equality; indeed, it is quite the opposite. I conceive of our democracy as an equilibrium of human beings, not an equality of mass distribution. Thus I think of our democracy as a system by which a person rises or falls according to his own worth, talents, and industry. If this definition is accepted, it follows that the American democracy is the only system which allows for the bloodless rise of an aristocracy based upon effective functioning.

It seems to me that to say that the 20th century is the era of the common man merely points to the great benefits derived from the common heritage of broadening culture. For example, an ordinary citizen can buy at a corner drugstore, for a very small sum, a magic drug for which Louis XIV would have given half of France. But the fact that this is the so-called century of the common man does not mean that being average should be held forth as an ideal to our youth. This term, "century of the common man," marks the debt of us average human beings to the very uncommon men whose genius makes this modern world possible. By any standard, Edison, Marconi, Pasteur, Burbank, and Salk were more gifted than us ordinary mortals, and certainly we all enjoy the fruits of their genius. Accordingly, it will be a sad day for our country if the only ideal before our youth is to be an ordinary man in the century of the common man. Our youth should have before it the ideas of deepening its talents, in order to excel and to compete, with the bright possibility that devotion and perseverance may result in a contribution to the general culture to which we are all so deeply indebted. In simple terms, what man could weave his own suit or construct his own electric light? Yet all these things are at an American's elbow. These con-

veniences, boons, and unearned rewards are so much a part of our daily lives that while I concur in our national motto, "In God We Trust," it seems to me that each individual citizen's daily prayer should be "Forgive me, O Lord, for taking so much for granted."

It follows that I deplore the entrance into our language, particularly for the young, of the word "security." In the first place, if this means a safe-conduct pass through life, there is no such thing; and, in the second, if there is, it is alien to the American spirit. There was precious little security for the signers of the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776, and what little there was was thrown to the winds when John Hancock picked up his pen. Gen. George Washington forsook the material security of Mount Vernon for the chance bullets of Bunker Hill and the snows of Valley Forge. In the 19th century, no Americans looked for safety on the decks of the *Constitution*, nor were the prairie schooners breaking out in the new frontier safe fortresses of comfort for the magnificent men and women who made the West. It is time that the grand old colonial adage, "Beaten paths are for beaten men," be dusted off and placed before American youths. The fact is, the greater the responsibility and duty the less the security. After all, every man in a battle fleet knows exactly what he must do except the admiral who must give the command. To him comes the agony of responsibility in constantly reviewing the calculated risks. Chance—and therefore insecurity—is the heavy price of command. Chance means challenge. A person who refuses the challenge of life has died without ever living.

Politics to me is the supreme challenge of American life. Some men find full expression as professional engineers; I find full expression in affairs of state. I recognize that "politics" is an unpopular word. However, I consider the science of government at least as useful and honorable as, and in most respects more difficult than, any other calling. Certainly a profession which numbers among its practitioners Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Cleveland, F. D. R., Churchill, and Adenauer has little for which to apologize.

I regard politics as among the highest and most useful callings open to American youth. It is my further opinion that there is no line of endeavor more mobile, and by this I mean none in which merit rises so quickly to its proper recognition. I believe that in the long run, counting all factors and even hard luck, the better man will win.

From this, I hope it appears that however much people may disagree with me, neither friend nor foe need guess where I stand. To my own satisfaction, at least, I have never stood in the middle of the road, as a result of which I have never been very far from the middle of the fight.

Maryland Migratory Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the third article in a series by Laurence Stern of the Washington Post and Times Herald concludes a discussion of Maryland migratory workers. I believe that this article gives a clear account of some of the difficulties facing

all who would do something to end or ease the hardships often faced by these wandering workers. The concluding paragraph, I think, sums up an important truth.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Aug. 18, 1959]

MARYLAND'S MIGRATORY WORKERS—FEW CONCERNED OVER CONDITIONS

(By Laurence Stern)

Robert McWilliams bought an abandoned church camp at Shiloh, Md., last year and converted it into housing for his migrant labor crews.

The effect on the good villagers was electrifying.

They swooped down on the Dorchester County Commissioners with complaints that the migrants would infect their community with crime, filth, and disease.

Yet migrants have been working in the fields near Shiloh since World War II when local farm manpower became scarce. Several labor camps have operated for years just a few miles away.

Most of the camps are hidden away along side roads on the outskirts of town. Many migrants live right on the farm at which they work.

It's easy for the average citizen to forget about the migrant's existence—until he reads about a stabbing or sex attack in a labor camp or finds an empty half-pint bottle on his property.

WELL-BEHAVED AND EDUCATED

The farmer sometimes talks about the migrants with touching solicitude.

"He's a human being, just as civilized, well-behaved and educated as our local workers," said McWilliams, who is Dorchester County's biggest employer of migrants.

Nevertheless the farmer is first to howl against any effort to guarantee minimum standards of decency to the migrant in housing, health, or education.

This summer McWilliams bought 70 beds, 100 mattresses and paid \$100-a-month electrical bills for his migrants. The water they drink, he insists, is just as good as his own.

McWilliams cannot understand why anyone wants to force him to observe minimum housing standards.

In 1957 the Maryland Department of Health made an exhaustive study of migrant living conditions. It found that 66 percent of the camps had unapproved water systems. Privies in 72 percent of the camps were below minimum sanitary standards.

Housing in general was found to be in an unsound and dilapidated state.

A survey of the three Eastern Shore counties, Dorchester, Caroline and Somerset, which depend most heavily on migrant labor, did not refute these findings.

HEALTH OFFICIALS POWERLESS

Yet health officials are powerless to act since labor camps are not under their control. Without a vote, the migrant is readily overlooked by the politician.

"I've never been in a migrant camp in my life," said Senator Frederick C. Malkus, who has represented Dorchester County in the legislature for 13 years. Malkus thinks the migrant is a local problem in which he, as a lawmaker, should not meddle.

If a migrant is hurt on the job, there is no formal machinery for getting him into a hospital. At best he gets medical attention through the back door, with the help of a minister.

Local citizens, who know the migrant cannot pay his hospital bill, are resentful.

As a nonresident agricultural worker, he is exempt from workmen's compensation, unemployment and minimum wage safeguards. Organized labor sometimes looks sympathetically at his plight, but has made no serious attempt to do anything about it.

Maryland this year took its first step toward opening a window into the forgotten world of the migrant. Last winter the legislature and Governor J. Millard Tawes created a Commission on Migratory Labor similar to agencies that exist in 23 other States.

MINIMUM HOUSING CODE

This group 2 weeks ago proposed a minimum housing code, such as Pennsylvania, Delaware, New Jersey, and New York have already adopted.

When it is unveiled at public hearings, it will probably be denounced by the Eastern Shore's growers.

There have been a few exceptions to the general apathy over the migrant's lot. Foremost is the National Council of Churches which has attempted, through its "Migrant Ministry," to cultivate "a sense of personal worth, belonging and responsibility" in the migrant.

"Considering the amount of work the migrant does and the money he brings into an area, State and county officials should take more responsibility for his welfare," said the Reverend Carlton W. Veazey, a 23-year-old Howard University divinity student serving on the Migrant Ministry.

At Westover Camp near Princess Anne the council runs a model day care center for migrant children. Two more are in operation at Hurlock, Md., and Staytonville, Del.

CENTER IS IMMACULATE

The Westover center is staffed all summer by two Somerset County teachers. Each child has a desk and clean cot. The center, once a ramshackle farm cabin, is kept in immaculate condition. But most migrant children who are too young to pick still wait for their parents in the bus or the truck which carries them to the field, just as other children have for years.

At Preston in Caroline County, the State Health Department has opened a clinic for expectant and new mothers. Migrants are also being tested for venereal disease and tuberculosis.

"There are still many gaps left uncovered," said the Reverend Samuel A. Snyder, Jr., the Migrant Ministry's southeast regional director.

"The basic problem of the migrant is his nonresident status," added Mr. Snyder. "Help comes to him only on an emergency basis."

Invite to Khrushchev—The Pearl Harbor of 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, in ancient times, an army was laying siege to a walled city.

Finally realizing that it could not conquer the city by direct attack, it conceived the stratagem of building a huge wooden horse and presenting it to the people of the city, as a sign of friendship and coexistence.

Impressed, the people pulled the generous gift inside the walls, but made sure to lock the gate. That night, when all but the guards on the walls were asleep, secret doors in the hollow horse were opened, and armed men poured out to capture the city from within.

Our Government, in 1959, says: "Why not make it easier?"

And so it has opened the gates and has invited the besieger—Khrushchev—to come in and enjoy the hospitality of his intended captives. Wearing the mask of friendship while respectability is conferred upon him by those who are so anxious to appease, he will score the greatest propaganda victory in the history of communism.

Not all Americans or editorial writers agree with this open-the-door policy toward communism.

The Lawrence Sunday Sun, published in Lawrence, Mass., believes this invitation to be a political blunder that is similar to the visit of two Japanese diplomats in 1941 who were talking peace at the very moment that their air fleets were taking off to bomb Pearl Harbor.

I recommend for your attention the hard-hitting editorial titled "The Baby Kissers," from the August 16 issue of the Lawrence Sunday Sun:

THE BABY KISSERS

Not too long ago, some wag in the newspaper field typified the provincial American politician as an arch baby kisser, on the presumption that seekers of public office could win more votes by paying attention to youngsters in carriages than by direct vocal appeal to the parents. It could be that this holds true today, because most adults like to bask in the imagined sunshine of the fellow who happens at the moment to hold the center of the stage.

In center stage today is a character known as Nikita (Nick) Khrushchev, the No. 1 figure in Russian politics.

Nick is preening his feathers and strutting around the international barnyard in preparation for his visit to the United States of America next month, on which occasion the powers-that-be in this land of the free will roll out the long Red welcome mat and spread the board lavishly with vodka, caviar, champagne and all the other fixin's which are a familiar part of our way of doing things on this side of the world. Thankfully, we have plenty of these items. The bill for them will be included in the national budget and you and we shall find ourselves picking up the check.

Nick will grow fat during his stay in our dining room. He will feast on the best things of life. More importantly, he will dine to the gorging point on the propaganda which the world will pour over his communistic head.

We'll qualify that last statement. He will wax fat on the tears of all the millions of people of the far-off places of our sphere who have been existing under the heel of and in the yoke of the most brutal government and political philosophy in all of history.

Looking back nearly 20 years, we have fresh in our memory a "friendly" visit by two Japanese diplomats to Washington. While they were here on a mission of good will, the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor occurred, setting off a worldwide armed conflict that cost millions of lives.

Do you remember how long it took Russia—Red Russia—to get into that fight? The wily Commies waited until they were sure of which side was winning, and they stepped

in and grabbed all the glory that was lying around—grabbed all the booty they could get, and that was plenty.

It has been estimated that some 10 million Russians died in that war; not necessarily men bearing arms, but the people of the bombed-out cities; the women and children enslaved by Nick and his gang. Even "Uncle Joe" Stalin was a sacrifice to the insatiable Commie lust for gain.

Is there any reason why we should trust Nick today after the manner in which we placed our innocent confidence in the two Japanese delegates who were patting Roosevelt on the head while their bombs were dropping on our Pacific Fleet and on Henderson Field nearly two decades ago?

Nikita Khrushchev is a rat representing a swarm of rats in the gang which has set itself up as the representatives of the good people of Russia. He and his mob figure there is a lot of choice cheese in the United States of America, and that once they have tunneled their way into this almost-last bastion of democracy, they can undermine it and pull the rest of the world down with it. That is the avowed aim of communism: To dominate the world. It's not a new objective by any stretch of the imagination. Ages ago, Genghis Khan tried it and slaughtered his way to the gates of Rome, all away across the blood-drenched fields from the Orient to the seat of Western culture.

The Caesars tried it and eventually came to doom, only to be overrun by the Huns they set out to vanquish.

Napoleon ventured into the matter of world conquest and eventually was smeared.

The infamous Kaiser Wilhelm responded to the urge to subjugate the world and what happened to him is still fresh in the minds of multiple millions of people living today.

The Japanese Empire fell into the same terrible trap.

The Communists are still riding high, wide, and handsome—tall in the saddle—over the graves of millions of people slaughtered in the now enslaved little nations of our increasingly small world.

Now, in a futile gesture to give some assurance of peace within our time, we are going to entertain Nick-the-Knifer in this wonderful, free land of ours in exchange for the welcome given RICHARD NIXON in Russia—a visit that backfired even on the propaganda experts of the Commie regime. Let us give him as his only welcoming "honor guard" the Hungarian refugees who have sought sanctuary here.

The Great Disillusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that an important battle between freedom and communism is taking place in the vast reservoir of land, natural resources, and people in Asia.

With cultural, educational, religious, philosophical, and other traditions differing from our own, Asia has been a particular challenge for the free world in terms of combating communistic penetrations, by efforts to present our own ideas and ideals of freedom.

Fortunately, a substantial number of countries and people of Asia speak the

language of freedom. Through these voices, as well as through our own policies and programs, efforts are underway to counter the offensive of communism.

Unwittingly, the Communist ideology, itself, sometimes serves as its own enemy. The crushing of the people of Tibet by the Chinese Communists is a prime—but terrible—example of communistic ruthlessness that is rudely awakening the Asian people to the dangers of communism. In addition, among Asiatic nations there is an increasing awareness of the real threat which that despotic, atheistic way of life poses for them.

Although the signs of a new awakening in Asia to the dangers of communism are heartening, we must not delude ourselves that victory will soon be achieved—and all by itself. Rather, our policies and programs designed at blocking expansion tactics of the Communists must be continued—and, as necessary, expanded—to deal effectively with the challenges in that area of the globe.

The New York Times of August 17 published an informative editorial entitled "The Great Disillusion." The editorial outlines the ways in which the Asian people and nations are becoming increasingly aware of the great dangers of communism. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE GREAT DISILLUSION

The great change in Asian attitudes toward communism since the days when Premier Chou of Communist China beguiled the Bandung conference of 1955 with his pleas for peaceful coexistence is demonstrated anew by some of the latest developments. The change, building up slowly as Asia watched China sink into slavery, received a tremendous impetus from the Chinese Communist rape of Tibet, which was to Asia what Czechoslovakia and Hungary were to the West. Now more and more Asian countries begin to feel the hot breath of the Chinese Communist dragon and are beginning to look to their defenses.

The most notable convert to this new attitude is Prime Minister Nehru of India, long a defender of Communist China and still a proponent of its admission to the United Nations. Having had to oust the Communist regime in the Indian state of Kerala, he now sees the Chinese Communists massing troops in Tibet, violating Indian trade agreements with that country and vowing to "liberate" Indian territories while at the same time launching a virulent propaganda campaign against Indian imperialism. As a result, despite continued caution Mr. Nehru has been compelled to tell Parliament that he has protested to Peiping against both the propaganda and the violations and to serve notice that India will defend its borders against any Communist encroachment.

Increased defense measures against Communist infiltration from Tibet have also been announced by Premier Koirala of Nepal.

In Laos, which is actively fighting a Communist rebellion and a Communist invasion from North Vietnam, crowds at the national capital cheer Premier Phoumi and roar defiance to the Communists. Burma, after 6 years of rejecting it, has now asked for American aid. And even in Indonesia, where President Sukarno has been flirting with the Communists, the tide is turning and the Communists have been told by the military authorities to cancel their party congress.

This recognition of a common danger has not yet ripened into a common defense front. But the way the wind is blowing is indicated by Premier Kishi of Japan who, after studying the collective defense arrangements in Europe, is pressing for a firm military alliance between his country and the United States in which Japan would assume added defense responsibilities. And talks are apparently underway for a new alliance linking Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, and Taiwan. Asia is awakening, not to Communist siren calls but to the Communist thunder, and the free nations are beginning to see more clearly eye to eye on the great issue confronting them.

Widespread Significance of Home Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, although the issue of home rule for the District of Columbia has played a prominent part in the news reporting and editorial comment and in reporting by other news media in the District of Columbia, it has not been a matter given major coverage in most other parts of our country. Nevertheless the vigor of the basic principles upon which our great Nation was founded continues unabated throughout our land, as manifested by the following resolution adopted by the City Council of Anchorage, Alaska, urging action by the Congress to bring about home rule for the District of Columbia. The resolution follows:

CITY OF ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, RESOLUTION 1059 URGING ADOPTION OF HOME RULE LEGISLATION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Whereas local self-government is the bedrock of free government;

Whereas the rights and benefits of local self-government should be available to all American citizens;

Whereas the residents of the District of Columbia are denied the rights and benefits of local self-government;

Whereas the Congress of the United States has the authority to assure local self-government by granting home rule to the District of Columbia;

Whereas the principle of home rule has been endorsed by a substantial majority of the residents of the District of Columbia;

Whereas the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia have unanimously endorsed proposals for granting home rule to their city; and

Whereas the Senate has passed a home rule bill for the District of Columbia five times during the last 10 years, while in the same period such measures have been bottled up in the District Committee of the House of Representatives, and no hearings held: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Anchorage, Alaska:

1. That the Congress be, and it is hereby, urged to approve home rule legislation to assure local self-government to the residents of the District of Columbia; and be it

2. Resolved further, That members of the House of Representatives be urged to sign a discharge petition so that the Commissioners' bill, otherwise known as the Territorial bill, be brought on to the floor of the

House so that the full membership can have the opportunity at last to vote on the measure; and be it further

3. Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the majority and minority floor leaders of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and to the State delegation to Congress.

Publication of this resolution shall be made by posting a copy hereof on the city hall bulletin board for a period of 10 days following its passage and approval.

Passed and approved by the City Council of the City of Anchorage, Alaska, the 11th day of August 1959.

HEWITT V. LOUNSBURY, Mayor.

Attest:

B. W. BOEKE, City Clerk.

Labor Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, yesterday I offered for insertion in the Appendix of the Record a number of editorials from daily newspapers which are circulated in South Carolina on the subject of the need for favorable Senate action on a strong and effective labor reform bill.

Since that time another editorial from another South Carolina newspaper has come to my attention. The editorial entitled "House Action on Landrum-Griffin Bill Promises Labor Legislation" was published in the August 18, 1959, issue of the Florence Morning News of Florence, S.C. I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Florence (S.C.) Morning News, Aug. 18, 1959]

HOUSE ACTION ON LANDRUM-GRIFFIN BILL PROMISES LABOR LEGISLATION

After the House passed the Landrum-Griffin bill by a safe majority, on a vote said by the Democratic whip to have been the largest in that Chamber's history, the conference committee should encounter no insurmountable difficulties in reconciling it with the Senate's Kennedy-Ervin measure.

For one thing, the size of the total vote serves notice that the American people want a labor reform law and will have little patience with any deadlock over anything that to them might appear relatively minor. For another, the House debates and several votes have made clear how close together the three bills—the Landrum-Griffin, the Elliott, and the Kennedy-Ervin—have been in all save one major area. All three have dealt in relative degrees of firmness and detail with safeguards around union funds, democratic procedures in conduct of union internal affairs, and against convicted felons occupying official positions in unions, in employer associations, or as labor-management consultants.

The major area of difference now pertinent between the House and Senate measures embraces secondary boycotts and blackmail

picketing. The former extends Taft-Hartley prohibitions to all industries and to threats as well as to actual strikes against secondary employers. By an extraordinary, prearranged colloquy with the sponsors of the Landrum-Griffin bill the House put into the record for the guidance of courts and, no doubt, of the conference committee, a clue to its intention not to draw a hard, fast line around its definition of secondary.

As for blackmail picketing: The two bills differ chiefly in the length of time they require after a representation election before any union not thus chosen may picket for recognition.

By amendments the House made a move toward the Senate's position by striking out injunctive authority in enforcement given the Secretary of Labor, and away from the text (although toward the tone) of the Senate bill by reducing the severity of criminal penalties for violations of the bill of rights.

The Senate had dealt lightly with secondary boycotts and picketing, hesitating to write restrictions that might upset the balance in bargaining strength between industry and labor. The House evidently felt that these tactics have been so exploited by the wrong kind of union leadership to keep itself in posts of power that they should be curbed in the interests of decent unions and honest labor-management dealings.

But the Landrum-Griffin bill is not a watered-down bill as industry should view it. And, reconciled with the Kennedy-Ervin bill, it should not be a tough, certainly not an unfair, bill from the standpoint of labor. Much will depend on how the precise wording of the final product works out as applied to specific situations. The administrative bodies and the courts are usually reasonable. And should major revision later prove needed there will come other Congresses.

Irresponsibility in the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the New York Herald Tribune, entitled "Irresponsibility in the House," described the action taken in the Ways and Means Committee on interest rate ceiling, a matter of grave importance to our Nation. I submit it to my colleagues and to the people as an accurate and brief analysis of the facts:

IRRESPONSIBILITY IN THE HOUSE

The House Ways and Means Committee last week voted 15 to 10 in favor of a compromise bill giving the President authority, for 3 years, to lift the present 4½-percent interest rate ceiling on Government bonds when necessary. Behind this was the simple fact that going market rates are above 4½ percent, meaning that the Treasury has been unable to market long-term securities—the only ones to which the ceiling applies. Yesterday the same committee suddenly reversed itself, voting 14 to 11 to pigeonhole the measure it had previously approved. All 14 votes for pigeonholing were cast by Democrats.

From the start congressional Democrats have treated the interest rate issue as a political football, hoping to use it as a means of pinning on the Republicans a phony "high interest party" label.

But interest rates are merely the price of borrowed money, and are set by the forces of a free market. Without freedom to adjust to these forces the Treasury hasn't the means to manage the national debt soundly. Yesterday's action was not only fiscally imprudent but politically irresponsible.

Youth Conservation Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, one of the most successful projects of the Roosevelt administration was the establishment of the Civilian Conservation Corps. And I am glad to know that the experience we gained from the job the CCC did prior to World War II in giving useful employment and at the same time rehabilitating and improving our national forests and parks has not been lost. I refer, of course, to the bill to establish a Youth Conservation Corps which passed this body last week.

Sponsored by the senior Senator from Minnesota, the ideas embodied in the original CCC have been updated to solve the growing conservation needs of our nation and, at the same time, help our youths who are faced with uncertainties as to employment as they leave school.

I believe this extremely worthwhile program will insure a better future for many Americans.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Camden Courier Post of August 19 which describes the job this corps can do.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVIVED CCC MIGHT DO GREAT JOB

By the narrow margin of 47 to 45, the Senate has voted to approve a program that would amount to a revival of the Civilian Conservation Corps. It may be recalled that this was one of the most successful New Deal projects in the early administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The program would start with 50,000 boys between the ages of 16 and 21, and grow to 150,000. It would be a Federal-State operation, with participating States required to match Federal expenditures. The latter are estimated at \$125 million for the first year, growing to \$375 million in the third and later years.

Youths enrolled in the program would receive \$60 a month plus subsistence, with increases for those who reenrolled, for leaders, and for those showing special skills.

The program is sponsored by Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, 19 other Democrats and 1 Republican. Its principal objective is declared to be the development and conservation of natural resources and maintenance of rest and recreational facilities in the national parks, forests, and wildlife refuges.

Second, the program is advanced as "an investment not only in conservation of natural resources, but in the conservation of youths who face uncertainties as to employ-

ment as they leave school." Its proponents say the number of youths in the 16-21 age group is increasing faster than employment opportunities. This, they say, creates the chance of a large number of them being turned out on the streets to become potential juvenile delinquents.

"The corps would not be juvenile delinquency oriented," says one sponsoring Senator, but "is not intended to exclude young men because they have been apprehended by juvenile authorities."

Recruits for the corps would come in part from areas of substantial unemployment and in part from other areas under a State-by-State quota system.

Opponents of the plan, mostly Republicans, say it would amount to instituting a depression program during an era of prosperity. They claim it is deceptive in that its main aim is actually to help solve the delinquency problem, not conservation of natural resources as its advocates assert. They predict that President Eisenhower will veto the bill if the House passes it.

The prediction may turn out to be erroneous. Both the objectives of the bill seem worthy enough. It doesn't particularly matter which is the main objective and which the secondary.

The CCC did a great job of giving useful work to idle hands during the years prior to World War II. It also did a great job, which has not been adequately done since, in rehabilitating and improving our national parks and forests. The money the Senate has proposed to spend in reviving this youth corps might turn out to be exceedingly well spent.

Amending Section 5801 of the Internal Revenue Code

SPEECH

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 4029 is to amend the National Firearms Act to eliminate the proration of the occupational tax on persons dealing in machineguns and certain other firearms, to reduce the occupational and transfer taxes on certain firearms, to make the transferor and transferee jointly liable for the transfer tax on firearms, and to make certain technical changes in the definition of the term "firearm."

The National Firearms Act—sometimes referred to as the Machinegun Act—was enacted by the 73d Congress in 1934 to provide a making and transfer tax of \$200 on machineguns and certain specified firearms which has become a national crime problem in the prohibition era. In addition to machineguns, the act applies to a silencer for a firearm and to sawed-off rifles and shotguns. The law does not apply to pistols and revolvers or to ordinary sporting rifles and shotguns. Any weapon defined as a firearm by the National Firearms Act is required to be registered with the Department of the Treasury and becomes subject to the prohibitive tax provision of the act. Several technical provisions of the law have resulted in a severe hardship on law-abiding gun owners and par-

ticularly gun collectors without adding to the effectiveness of the act as a crime prevention measure. Also, at least one provision in the law has left open a loophole by means of which unscrupulous persons have been able to evade the tax which Congress decreed should be placed upon the transfer of machineguns. It is the purpose of my bill to correct these technical shortcomings.

The National Firearms Act provides in part that a shotgun or rifle having a barrel of less than 18 inches in length is a firearm and subject to the \$200 making and transfer tax, except that rifles of .22 caliber are exempt if the barrel length is 16 inches. An area of inequity arises here from the fact that a number of popular sporting rifles and a number of rifles having great value to gun collectors have barrel lengths just slightly under 18 inches. While such rifles could not be considered concealable, and while they do not enter into the crime picture, they still must be classed as a firearm subject to the taxation provisions of the law. It is one of the purposes of my bill so to amend the definition of the term "firearm" under the law that it will not apply to any rifle which has a barrel of at least 16 inches in length. This will mean that all rifles having a barrel length of at least 16 inches will be exempt from the law, not .22-caliber rifles alone as at present.

Another area of inequity from the standpoint of law-abiding shooters and gun collectors arises from the provision in the law which defines as a firearm, in addition to a machinegun or sawed-off rifle or shotgun, "any other weapon, except a pistol or revolver, from which a shot is discharged by an explosive if such weapon is capable of being concealed on the person." It is apparent from this language that Congress did not intend the prohibitive tax provision of the Machinegun Act to apply to pistols or revolvers. The law, however, does not define the terms pistol or revolver; and it, therefore, becomes a matter of administrative interpretation as to what is a pistol, excepted under the act, and what is any other weapon, prohibited under the act. We see here a complex administrative problem. If a particular weapon is clearly recognizable as a pistol or revolver, it meets a specific exception in the National Firearms Act. However, if the weapon is concealable and is not clearly recognizable as a pistol or revolver, then it must fall into the loose category of "any other weapon" and become immediately subject to a prohibitive \$200 transfer tax.

Highly valued items to gun collectors are the guns which mark stages in the development of firearms from their earliest beginning. In the process of experimentation, trial and error, and plain American inventiveness which have led to the modern pistol and revolver, many strange firearms have had brief moments on the scene. Some are clearly recognizable as a step in the development of a modern pistol; others are not. Many, by administrative edict, now fall in the "any other weapon" category under the National Firearms Act and are, therefore, subject to its prohibitive controls.

Since pistols and revolvers make up the vast majority of weapons capable of being concealed on the person and, since for good and sufficient reasons the Congress felt that pistols and revolvers should not be included in the Machinegun Act, it would seem just and equitable that the full \$200 transfer tax not be applied to the very small minority of concealable weapons which may be interpreted to be neither a pistol nor a revolver. To the contrary, it would appear that the purpose of the act would be better served by a nominal tax on this category of weapon which would permit them to be possessed and traded by gun collectors while retaining the records and controls now maintained by the Department of the Treasury under the National Firearms Act.

Experience through the years has demonstrated that the type of concealable weapon controlled under the National Firearms Act which has most frequently figured as a crime problem is the weapon that is made from a rifle or shotgun by cutting it down in length so as to make it concealable on the person. Under the present law, if a rifle or shotgun is altered by cutting off the barrels so that the barrel length is less than that prescribed in the definition of a "firearm," then the weapon clearly becomes subject to the criminal provisions of the law. In many cases, however, the criminal not only cuts off the barrel of a conventional rifle or shotgun but also may cut off the shoulder stock and thus create a one-hand weapon of greater concealability than had he sawed off the barrel alone. In the past, criminals apprehended with such weapons attempted to avoid prosecution on the ground that the weapon they created by cutting off the barrel and the stock of a shotgun or a rifle was in fact a pistol since it was a one-hand weapon. In the view that it was just this type of criminal weapon that Congress sought to control in the National Firearms Act, I am suggesting an amendment to the definition of the term "firearm" by adding the language, "or any weapon made from a rifle or shotgun—whether by alteration, modification, or otherwise—if such weapon as modified has an overall length of less than 25 inches."

The National Firearms Act provides for an annual \$200 tax for persons engaged in the business of dealing in machineguns and those categories of weapons defined as "firearms." At present the payment of this occupational tax may be prorated on a monthly basis established on the fiscal year. It has been called to my attention that certain persons other than bona fide dealers have been able to take advantage of this provision to avoid the payment of the transfer tax on machineguns by paying the dealers' occupational tax for 1 month only. A person engaged in the business of dealing in machineguns and who has qualified for and paid the occupational tax provided for in the law is permitted an exemption from the transfer tax. As the law now stands, a man may qualify as a machinegun dealer in June by paying only one-twelfth of the normal \$200 dealers oc-

cupational tax. He may then purchase machineguns without paying the \$200 transfer tax and, at the end of June, may simply elect not to renew his dealer's status by paying his occupational tax for the following year. It is one of the purposes of my bill to remove the pro rata feature with respect to the occupational tax so that a person qualifying as a dealer, engaged in the business of dealing in machineguns, will pay the \$200 occupational tax for a year or fraction thereof.

Another weakness in the present language of the law has been that the transferor alone has been responsible for the transfer tax on machineguns. If, through false pretenses, an individual not actually a bona fide dealer has been able to secure a machinegun transfer tax exempt, the Government has no recourse since no liability for the tax rested on the transferee. The purpose of my bill is to correct this by providing that, if a firearm is transferred without payment of the transfer tax, the transferor and transferee shall become jointly and severally liable for the tax.

The amendments I suggest will improve the enforcement of the National Firearms Act with respect to machineguns and sawed-off shotguns and will at the same time, alleviate some of the inequities that plague gun collectors and shooter-sportsmen without contributing to the effectiveness of the law.

Visit of Premier Khrushchev to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, a few days ago I received a letter from the mayor of Bristol, Conn., the Honorable James P. Casey, a letter which was characterized in the Connecticut press as an attempt to dissuade me from my opposition to the visit of Nikita Khrushchev to this country.

Mayor Casey's letter is an illustrative example of the widespread misunderstanding of the position of those who oppose this visit, and it is representative of what I consider to be the confused thinking of many well-meaning and influential Americans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mayor Casey's letter and my reply be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CITY OF BRISTOL,

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,

Bristol, Conn., August 11, 1958.

The Honorable THOMAS J. DODD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR TOM: Remember when Harry Truman in 1948 was counted out by the political

wiseacres and Tom Dewey enshrined in the White House even before voters went to the polls? In a "give 'em hell" campaign the former President got up off the deck and proceeded to knock the stuffings out of Dewey with a total disregard for the Marquis of Queensbury rules.

It was a grand, rough and tumble brawl. The American people responded with cheers and huzzahs for the little guy who took on the Republican behemoth, then Governor of New York State. As I recall, you were the only politician in Connecticut who gave Truman a chance in the elections, and, in fact, seconded his nomination at Philadelphia. The rest of the Connecticut delegation floundered around ready to throw its support to any one but the man who made it—even to one man name of Dwight David Eisenhower.

It seems to me that, lacking a crystal ball, no one can predict the results of Nikita Khrushchev's grand tour of the United States. The Communists after 40 years of intensive propaganda, brainwashing, and wholesale butchery have failed conspicuously to convert the people in the satellite countries to the joys to be had in the workers paradise.

Consequently, I don't think that at this point the American people are going to be infected by the Communist virus if Nikita in the Kremlin shows his face in America. A look at the greatness, the power and the glory of the United States and a realization of the spiritual forces which inspire men and women here may deter him from throwing his Sunday punch. After all, a talkathon between President Eisenhower and the Russian Premier is preferable to extermination by a hydrogen bomb.

This brings us to DICK NIXON and the union of the United States and Poland, and Lord knows how many more of the enslaved peoples of Europe and Asia. Nixon took on Khrushchev in the latter's own back yard, on the home grounds so to speak, not in a contest of haughty words and stinging phrases, with 5,000 miles separating the combatants. Nixon slugged it out toe-to-toe with Nikita and the "you-don't-know-everything" retort was a crack heard round the world.

Nixon's tumultuous reception in Poland was also a startling revelation. Americans have always felt confident and sure that, in an abstract way, the people in that benighted country were on our side. The instant, spontaneous expression of love and friendship, in the face of their oppressors, I believe, however, to be unprecedented in the whole history of mankind. The Poles love the United States and its people. They want to identify themselves with us and this in defiance of the Kremlin gangsters. Nixon was a symbol of America and, while it truthfully may be said that any other man, officially representing the United States as Vice President, would have been received in like manner, the fact is that it was he who brought it off.

Poland, like Ireland during the massacres in the mid-17th century, has through history suffered one terrifying blood bath after another and, in each instance, has emerged more than ever determined to fight for a freedom that is so essential to man's salvation.

In the Warsaw demonstration there has been unveiled a secret weapon on the Communist front that scientific research or inventiveness can neither create nor destroy; namely, the spiritual fire which consumes a devout people in its fight for peace, freedom and justice. It is as though the old and neglected Christian virtues had taken on new life and vigor in an age wherein materialistic values have seemed to be transcendent.

Americans cannot help but rejoice with the Polish people in their collective, bulldog resistance to the power and barbaric tyranny of the Communists. Newsmen with NIXON

have reported that, with the exception of Moscow, the American entourage was warmly and enthusiastically received in cities throughout Russia and this in itself should give pause to the more reckless impulses of Nikita and the bureaucrats in the Kremlin.

Khrushchev had better take another look into the mind and soul of his Russian subjects and those in adjacent areas before he embarks on further adventures in his quest for other worlds to conquer.

Your many friends in Bristol hope and pray that you have recovered from the food poisoning which recently caused you to be hospitalized and that as of now you are well.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES P. CASEY.

AUGUST 14, 1959.

The Honorable JAMES P. CASEY,
Mayor of Bristol, Conn.

DEAR JIM: I have received your letter after already reading the published version of it in the Connecticut press.

You say that you don't think "the American people are going to be infected by the Communist virus if Nikita in the Kremlin shows his face in America." Apparently you are suggesting that this is my view. If that is your inference, then I must say that it is an absurd caricature of the position which many of us hold concerning Khrushchev's visit. I do not believe the American people will be infected or converted by Khrushchev, but I do feel that they will be disarmed and put off their guard.

I oppose the visit for a number of reasons.

First, a White House summit meeting with Khrushchev represents a major diplomatic defeat. Our Government, which has insisted that there could be no such meeting without prior concessions by the Communists, has backed down, and the world knows it.

Second, it is a major moral defeat. Our people are asked to welcome to our shores as an honored guest an infamous dictator who was personally responsible for the murder of countless thousands and who is the embodiment of the system of atheistic tyranny which is the mortal enemy of all decent people.

Third, it is a major propaganda defeat. Khrushchev's visit will be made to appear as a great personal triumph which will discourage our friends in the satellite nations, confuse and soften up the people of the free world, and signify to the people of uncommitted nations that communism is legitimate, accepted, and in the ascendancy.

Fourth, it is a major ideological defeat. Our response to the challenge of communism has been ineffective because so many of the world's people do not understand the essential evil of communism and the inherent good of freedom. Visits by Khrushchev to the United States and other non-Communist nations will further blur understanding of the fundamental antithesis between communism and freedom.

Fifth, it will have the effect of a major military defeat. It will help delude the free world into thinking that all is well and that there is no need for the heavy sacrifices required to build up military strength.

I do not share your admiration for the conduct of Vice President Nixon in Russia. I thought that far too many of the Vice President's statements were superficial and weak.

He told the Russian people that Khrushchev was "a self-made man who worked himself up from the bottom," as if it were unimportant that he had done so through mass murder, treachery and the betrayal of his own people. He placed primary emphasis on the luxuries and conveniences which our people enjoy, when he should have been talking about our freedom and our faith in God.

I am surprised that you should consider the pro-American reception which Nixon received in Poland as a startling revelation. Anyone who has followed conditions in Poland should have expected it. Approval for the United States was one way in which the Polish people could publicly express their hatred for the Communist system which has enslaved them. The Nixon reception was merely a verification of what many of us have been trying to bring home to the American people for many years. I am sure that our act of welcoming Khrushchev to the United States will dishearten the Polish patriots who greeted Nixon.

This morning's Washington Post carried an account of the arrangements which our Government is now making to procure Communist flags which will be flown all over Washington during Khrushchev's visit. You perhaps regard this sort of thing as a step forward but I do not share your enthusiasm.

I know that you must have spent some time in preparing your letter and I have, therefore, tried to answer it in detail.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS J. DODD.

Paying as We Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, may I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to an excellent editorial appearing in the August 14, 1959, edition of the Oxnard (Calif.) Press-Courier, entitled "Paying as We Go":

PAYING AS WE GO

Yesterday's news from the House Ways and Means Committee indicated that the Federal highway program would be continued without fastening a new bonded debt upon the Nation.

The compromise the committee agreed to would sustain the principle of pay-as-you-go highway building. The gasoline tax would be increased from 3 cents to 4, for a period of 22 months, beginning September 1. Then a part of the automobile excise tax would be diverted from the general fund to the highway fund.

The higher gasoline tax maintains the practice of asking the motorists who use the highways to pay for them. They don't object too much, although the automobile associations and the oil companies and the automobile makers don't like it.

By agreeing to take a bite out of the excise tax on automobiles the House committee, in effect, said that there would be no early reduction or elimination of this tax. That, too, is a continuing hardship on the automotive industry, which would like to eliminate the excise tax and thus save the customer 10 percent of the cost of the automobile.

But what would you do? There is a clamor for the Federal highway program. The traffic load on the highways grows daily—and so do the risks of motoring. The ambitious Federal program will do much to relieve this congestion. Continuing the program will continue employment and help the industries that supply the materials. The Governors a few days ago in

Puerto Rico, when they got down to business other than weighing Nelson Rockefeller's presidential chances, asked that the highway program be maintained, suggesting bond issues.

If we want these desirable things, we ought to be willing to pay for them. If we need them badly, then again we ought to be willing to pay the cost to satisfy the need. It is a sorry custom to pass on to our children and grandchildren the burden of payment. They have no voice in accepting or rejecting the burden.

The compromise agreed to by the committee may not get through Congress, which is still largely populated by Members who want to order all kinds of projects "for the public good" without providing ways of paying for them.

The compromise on the highway program is not all that the President wanted. He asked for a straight cent-and-one-half increase in Federal gasoline taxes. It is not what the gay spenders wanted; they tried to think of financing measures that would postpone paying the bill with no tax hike. The compromise finally agreed to provides at least for using cash and not promises to pay in the future.

There could be another benefit, although only an optimist would hope it will come to pass. When part of the automobile excise money is taken from the general fund and devoted to the highway program, the general fund will be shorted millions of dollars.

How will that be made up? The optimist will say that when this fund diversion begins, in about 2 years, Uncle Sam will cut down on some of his spending from the general fund, because he won't have as much cash as he has been accustomed to.

That may be a foolish hope. And yet economic sanity is gaining support, bit by bit. If the next President will fight for it as wholeheartedly as President Eisenhower is doing, the highways may yet be built and finished, and be paid for when they are done, and the national debt won't have a few more hundreds of millions of dollars piled on to the present staggering total.

Monroney's Brainchild

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. MIKE MANSFIELD OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a timely article on the proposal of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] as carried in the Washington Post and Times Herald of August 19, 1959. The program of loans, not grants, is the key point in the setting up of an International Development Bank—IDA—as originally propounded by Senator MONRONEY several years ago. Carroll Kilpatrick refers to it—and it is—"MONRONEY'S Brainchild."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MONRONEY'S BRAINCHILD—PROGRAM OF LOANS, NOT AID, KEY POINT OF INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT BANK

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

Secretary of the Treasury Robert A. Anderson's proposal for a billion-dollar Inter-

national Development Association (IDA), which will be the chief subject of debate at the annual meeting of the World Bank here next month, has three principal objectives:

1. To provide a new source of free world funds for the underdeveloped countries.
2. To persuade Western European countries and Japan to put more capital into these development programs.
3. To make fuller use of the so-called "soft" currencies which the United States is accumulating at an increasing rate every year.

IDA is the brainchild of Senator A. S. (Mike) MONRONEY, Democrat, Oklahoma, who first conceived the idea several years ago after a trip to Southeast Asia.

FROM AID TO LOANS

MONRONEY thought it was important to shift from a program aid to one of loans. At the same time, he was impressed by the growing accumulation by the United States of foreign currencies, mainly from the sale of surplus commodities.

If these currencies could be used, MONRONEY argued, they would help promote American foreign policy without in any way hurting the American taxpayer. The United States is now holding about \$2 billion in soft currencies. MONRONEY has estimated that in another year the total may reach \$5 billion.

"A valuable new source of development funds may be opened," MONRONEY said. "With 30 or 40 local currencies to choose from, borrowers can work out ways to use larger quantities of these currencies by shopping in the world market for items they require for their development projects."

At first, the administration was cool to the MONRONEY idea. It began to take it seriously after the Senate Banking and Currency Committee held a series of hearings and strong support developed in the Senate.

Anderson's acceptance of the idea has drawn considerable criticism, however, mainly along these lines:

Most of the foreign currencies which the United States has accumulated really are of very little value, particularly when it comes to using them for purchases to help develop the backward countries.

The Europeans and Japanese won't put up enough capital for long-term, low-interest loans to have much effect on the tremendous need for capital that exists in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

A lending institution with a capital of only \$1 billion can make only a token effort. MONRONEY himself is on record as saying IDA should have "2 billion or more in hard currencies."

It is misleading to contend that a loan repaid in a soft currency is in fact fully repaid. It would be more honest to call the loan a giveaway in the first place.

All these questions have been argued back and forth for almost a year between Treasury officials and representatives of foreign countries. The debate will be continued when the annual World Bank meeting convenes here September 28.

AGENCY OF BANK

Anderson has sent a "guidelines paper" setting forth this country's views to the 67 other members of the Bank. Under the proposal, IDA would be established as an agency of the Bank to be administered by President Eugene R. Black, who has the full confidence not only of American officials but of many foreign financial authorities as well.

The World Bank makes loans on a strictly bankable basis. They must be repaid in 20 or 25 years at 5½ percent interest, and repayments must be in hard currency.

IDA would be authorized to make loans repayable perhaps over 40 years at rates as low as 2 percent in a mixture of hard and soft currencies. According to MONRONEY, the

World Bank "needs this secondary institution." It would serve to supplement hard loans with second mortgage financing, he said.

"The borrowing nation might be short on dollar or other hard currency earnings, and thus unable to repay 100 percent of the project cost in these scarce currencies over the short repayment time," MONRONEY said. "It would be permitted to repay IDA's second mortgage loan over a longer time at lower interest, partly in hard currency and partly in its own or other local currencies."

"An important part of this proposal is that IDA would mix hard and soft currencies when necessary in its loans and be repaid in a similar ratio."

Some of the sharpest critics of IDA are found in the World Bank's sister institution, the International Monetary Fund. Their criticisms may be reflected in the debates at the Fund and Bank annual meetings next month. But apparently Anderson believes that he has overcome the major resistance both in Europe and Japan and in the soft currency countries.

Not Sufficient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, as we drone on to an uneasy adjournment, it might be well to look back and note how successive Congresses have piled monetary agencies and committees one on top of the other until no one is responsible for anything and we have developed the greatest "buck passing" carousel in all history. How and why did we get into such a situation?

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the following editorial in the Wall Street Journal of August 19 gives the answer: "Not Sufficient."

And at the last, the power and wealth of the United States may prove to be not sufficient:

NOT SUFFICIENT

Once upon a time there was established the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund.

This was during World War II and the idea, in case you have forgotten, was to provide a capital fund for economic development loans and for currency loans to the war-torn countries and the underdeveloped countries of the world.

But this did not prove sufficient, and so we had the U.S. loan to Britain, the U.S. loans and grants under the Marshall plan and the U.S. loans and grants under the many names of what is now the International Cooperation Administration.

But this was not sufficient, and so we increased the resources of the U.S. Export-Import Bank.

But this was not sufficient, and so we set up the U.S. Development Loan Fund to make "easy" loan repayable in local currencies.

But that was not sufficient, and so the World Bank was broadened to include an International Finance Corporation to invest in special enterprises in underdeveloped countries.

But this was not sufficient, and so we are now organizing a Latin American Bank to make special loans south of the border, and we have proposed a similar Middle Eastern Fund to make special loans in that part of the world.

But this was not sufficient, and so this week the United States launched a campaign to establish a \$1 billion world agency to be called the International Development Association. It will be used to spur economic development in underdeveloped countries on easier terms than those poor countries can get from the World Bank, the Monetary Fund, the Export-Import Bank, the U.S. Development Loan Fund, the Latin American Bank or the Middle Eastern Fund or the International Finance Corporation or from the International Cooperation Administration.

We just thought you'd be interested in knowing, since all of these roads lead directly to the U.S. Treasury, of what might be called the U.S. Taxpayers Cooperative Funds. The question in the end, we suppose, is whether that fund will be sufficient.

Eulogy to U.S. Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address given in my home State, New Jersey, by Lee A. Wiley, at Atlantic City on July 7, and "Eulogy to U.S. Flag," by a former Member of this body, the Honorable Albert W. Hawkes.

There being no objection, the address and eulogy were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE APRON OF FREEDOM

(Address by Lee A. Wiley, illustrious potentate, Crescent Temple, A.A.O.N.M.S., Trenton, N.J., at the opening services of the 1959 imperial council session in Atlantic City on July 7)

Most worshipful grand master, Imperial sir, illustrious sirs, distinguished guests, nobles, and ladies, I bring you the greetings of the more than 11,600 Masons who are members of Crescent Temple. Many of them are in Atlantic City for this great meeting of our Imperial Council of the Shrine of North America. They are prepared and eager to help you in every way possible.

At the parades, in the hotels, along the boardwalk and on the beaches, activity and happiness of every kind beckon you and your gracious ladies and we sincerely hope your stay here will be a most pleasant one in every way. Even though our beautiful mosque is located 75 miles away in the capital city of Trenton, Atlantic City is an important part of the oasis of Crescent Temple. On behalf of our Nobility, we cordially invite you to visit the Delaware Valley area as you return home from this pilgrimage. On your way up the Delaware River, you will find Burlington, the location of our beautiful Masonic home. In historic Trenton, you will find, in addition to our magnificent mosque, the oldest Masonic temple still standing in the State of New Jersey and one of the oldest along the Atlantic seaboard. It is used now as a museum and stands next to the present handsome Trenton Masonic Temple in close proximity to our

state house. After leaving Trenton, and on the outskirts of Philadelphia, you will see the Philadelphia unit of our Shriners Hospitals for Crippled Children.

We extend these invitations with pride because Crescent Temple has grown to be the tenth largest in our great fraternity in an area fraught with history and filled with indications of thoughtfulness of others.

The Shrine was formed, we are told, to find a means to relax from the more arduous work in the symbolic lodges. But no matter what relaxation the Shrine has given, Shriners themselves owe and give their first devotion to the most honored badge in the world, which we have chosen to call at this convention, the apron of freedom.

The Reverend Joseph Fort Newton in his book "The Builders," perhaps expresses the sentiment best. He said:

"Some day, when the cloud of prejudice has been dispelled by the searchlight of truth, the world will honor Masonry for its services to freedom of thought and the liberty of faith. . . . Down through the centuries . . . often in times when the highest crime was not murder, but thinking, and the human conscience was a captive dragged at the wheel of an ecclesiastical chariot . . . always and everywhere Masonry has stood for the right of the soul to know the truth. . . . Not freedom from faith but freedom of faith has been the watchword, on the ground that as despotism is the mother of anarchy, so bigoted dogmatism is the prolific source of scepticism. . . . Against those who would fetter thought in order to perpetuate an effete authority, who would give the skinny hand of the past a scepter to rule the aspiring and prophetic present and seal the lips of living scholars with the dicta of dead scholastics, Masonry will never ground her arms. Her plea is for government without tyranny and religion without superstition."

Government without tyranny and who has fought through the years for this great precept? We must say the fight has been by those who wear the apron of freedom.

Here in the United States, we are all well aware of the tremendous contributions made by Masons in the founding and development of our great country. In every country and in every clime, when tyrannical men raise their ugly heads to whip a docile people into submission, the first organization to be banned is the society of Freemasons. From Jacques DeMolay to Hitler and communism, it has been Freemasons, banded together by their esoteric symbolism, who have clung tenaciously to truth and freedom, and have fought to preserve them. God willing, it will always be true.

But more than political freedom, wearers of this apron of freedom have sought to bring other types of freedom to their fellowmen. In all elements of human freedom, education, medical research, and the relief of the distressed, our brethren of grand lodges, the York Rite and the Scottish Rite have done a tremendous amount of good.

To this we may add the great contribution that we are wearers of the red fez and this proud apron, have added with our work in freeing thousands of crippled children from their unfortunate bodily defects. Without the great work already accomplished, in the process of being done, and being planned by all of our brethren in various bodies, countless thousands would be unable to enjoy true freedom.

Channing said, "The only freedom worth possessing is that which gives enlargement to a peoples energy, intellect, and virtues. . . . Progress, the growth of intelligence, and power, is the end and boon of liberty." And so, Freemasonry has shown and is show-

ing that it does believe in freedom, an all-inclusive freedom that is worth possessing. Masonry teaches love of our fellowman, a love that is translated in the help Freemasons ever have given to those less fortunate, whether they be members of our order or not. The blue lodges, the rites, and the Shrine have given of themselves and their treasures that the glow of happiness might shine from the faces of those they touch.

The apron of freedom is not within the gift of prince or potentate; of commoner or president; of rich or poor; of saint or sinner. It must be sought by those who have faith that the light of truth must eventually prevail; that love of neighbor must be greater than love of self; that the soul is immortal and is the property of the individual, not the state. And once sought and received, it must be remembered that the receipt of this apron does not make a man a Mason, it only means that he is a member of a Masonic lodge.

Listen to these words from the Scottish Rite: "To sow that others may reap, to work for those who shall labor after we are dead, to be an inspiration in the lives of men yet unborn, to bless with the glorious gifts of truth and light and liberty those who will never know the giver . . . this, is the true office of a Mason and the proudest destiny of a man." And so there hangs on this stage a badge, a symbol—one of the greatest the world has never known—the apron of freedom, the theme chosen by our Imperial Potentate to permeate this session of the Imperial Council of the Ancient Arabic Order, Nobles of the Mystic Shrine.

Thank you.

EULOGY TO U.S. FLAG

(By Hon. Albert W. Hawkes, former U.S. Senator from New Jersey)

I salute our beautiful American flag, emblem of each of our citizens and symbol of liberty, justice and human dignity.

In this dark hour of history, when the ungodly, brute forces in man are seeking to impose their evil will, on people of good will, thereby destroying life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, and equality under a rule of laws—your stars and stripes shine out more beautifully than ever.

Your silence is golden—you do not speak in words, but in the deeds which created you. Your 13 stripes of red and white, with a star for the sovereignty of each State, stand for decency in human relations, unity and strength, honor, loyalty, and courage to make the supreme sacrifice whenever necessary to preserve the principles announced in the Declaration of Independence and recorded in our Constitution, then guaranteed by the Bill of Rights.

The flag, speaking as it waves aloft, says to each citizen:

"I represent you all in honesty, justice, and the spirit of the Golden Rule. I can be no more, than you by your deeds, make me. Remember, up to date all nations which have ascended to leadership have ultimately failed and disappeared on the horizon of history. Perhaps, because they put the mad race for money, place and power in first place, and relegated character, morals, adherence to principle, and their trust in God to second place.

"I will remain with you always, if you keep faith with the principles under which I was born, and if you and each succeeding generation teach the next to do the same. Teach them never to forget the little white markers all over the world, and to keep faith with those men, and the millions of others, who offered to make the supreme sacrifice. Teach them the only way to keep faith with those who created our blessings and freedoms

is to exercise their right of suffrage intelligently and have eternal vigilance, coupled with action on time.

"You will survive to do good on earth in perpetuity, only if you follow the rules of equity that flow from God's Commandments and the Golden Rule; only if you make our way of life good enough to impel any fair-minded citizen to make the supreme sacrifice, when necessary to preserve it.

"We have been blessed with fine neighbors to the North and to the South, whose announced objectives are similar to ours.

"God grant us and others the power to put first things first—avoid temptation—and in His name help humanity to rise to higher levels and better standards in Freedom's institutions here on earth."

A Bill To Expand the Advisory Board of the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation From Five to Six Members

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. BARR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, when the St. Lawrence Seaway Act was approved on May 13, 1954, it provided for certain administrative officers and an Advisory Board consisting of five men. There are eight States which are directly affected by the St. Lawrence Seaway—New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois, Minnesota and Indiana. Every one of these States fronts either on the Great Lakes or on the seaway. When the Seaway Corporation was put together the Advisory Board was made up of men from Michigan, Wisconsin, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New York. Illinois was represented by the Administrator and Minnesota was represented by the Deputy Administrator. Of all the States having a direct interest in the seaway, only Indiana was omitted.

I have this date introduced a bill which expands the Advisory Board of the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation from five to six members. I am advocating this expansion in the hope that the sixth man will be chosen from the State of Indiana, so that Indiana can be represented in the development of this enormously significant undertaking.

The St. Lawrence Seaway still faces a tremendous number of problems. The locks are probably not as large as they should have been; the Welland Canal is proving a bottleneck that only permits a maximum of 28 ships a day to pass through its locks; and the canal itself is too narrow to permit the safe passage of ocean vessels moving in opposite directions. No one knows for certain whether or not the seaway will turn out to be as successful as we all hope.

The State of Indiana has a vital stake in making this seaway successful. I believe that it deserves to be represented on the Advisory Board.

The Halbouty Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Michel T. Halbouty of Houston, Tex., is an outstanding pioneer and leader in his profession—the oil industry. His activities have helped provide this Nation with the vitally needed petroleum products to keep the wheels of industry and—when necessary—weapons for freedom operating.

Mr. Halbouty has showed his leadership in many fields; geology, research, mechanics, and other phases of the complex industry.

Recently, the *Inch* magazine told the story of Mr. Halbouty's outstanding contributions to the oil industry. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the *Record* an article from the spring 1959 edition of the *Inch* entitled "The Halbouty Story."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

THE HALBOUTY STORY

Genius, someone has said, consists partly of doing the right thing at the appropriate time.

In the oil business, Michel T. Halbouty is known as something of a genius. Whether it's taking just one more core, drilling in an area surrounded by dry holes, or risking millions on leases in an untested oil domain, Mike Halbouty seems to make the right move instinctively.

As a result, the dynamic Mr. Halbouty is recognized as one of the most outstanding geologists and petroleum engineers in the Nation, and is internationally respected for his scientific ability to find oil and gas. An authority on the geological and engineering problems of the gulf coast of Louisiana and Texas, he ranks as one of the top experts on the geology of piercement-type salt domes, those underground monuments to the earth's eccentricity that have trapped so much petroleum.

Rounding out his reputation as a triple-threat oil man, Halbouty is one of the most aggressive and successful independent oil operators in the country. Geologically responsible for the discovery of oil and gas fields and extensions all over the world, he is one of the growing number of producers who supply natural gas to Texas Eastern Transmission Corp.

A fearless individualist, Halbouty has become almost a legend in his own time by his refusal to develop preconceptions about Mother Nature. He doesn't subscribe to geological theories simply because others accept them. What's more, he always backs up his sometimes revolutionary experiments with his own money. On an amazing number of occasions, his ideas prove out.

Statistically, how does Halbouty stack up in a competitive, high-stake game where the dice are loaded 9 to 1 against finding oil or gas with a wildcat well? Pretty fair,

according to the record. Over the past 10-year period, he's hit 44 percent of his wildcats, 86 percent of field development wells, and 67 percent of all wells drilled. Hardly anybody has taken such tremendous strides toward making an exact science of geology, generally considered an inexact one.

It's a giant step from a newsboy's bailiwick to a position of prominence in the rugged oil business. Mike Halbouty made it with a combination of scientific preparation, dogged perseverance, supreme confidence in his own judgment, and—as Halbouty is the first to admit—a generous helping of good luck. To understand how he did it, you have to go back 50 years. It's quite a story.

Born Michel Thomas Halbouty in Beaumont on June 21, 1909, Mike was one of six children of a hard-working Lebanese grocer. He grew up in a town where the smell of oil was heavy, and the wooden derricks of Spindletop were not too far distant. People stood on street corners and spoke of the geologic derring-do of Patillo Higgins and Capt. Anthony Lucas just as they do today.

When he was 6 years old, young Halbouty became a newsboy for both the Beaumont Enterprise and Journal. Even then, he was a hustler and a two-fisted scrapper. Some of the other newsboys didn't like the way he parted his hair (which, even today, is distinctly right down the middle). More especially, they didn't like the fact that his hawking spot, the old post-office corner, was the best in town. But Mike didn't relinquish that corner until several years later, when he went to work at the Magnolia Refinery, loading gondolas with coke in his spare time.

When he was 14 and a junior in Beaumont High School, Mike took his first job (a summer one) in the oilfields. It was 1925, during the second boom at Spindletop, and Halbouty hired on as a dollar-a-day waterboy with the Yount-Lee Oil Co. Even then, Mike wanted to be a scientist—a geologist and an engineer—in the oil business.

So, at 15, giving up a contract with the old Beaumont Oiler Baseball Club of the Texas League, he headed for Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College. There he earned a bachelor of science degree in geology and petroleum engineering in 1930, and a master of science degree a year later, having been granted a fellowship for outstanding scholastic work. Twenty-five years later, in 1956, he was to receive a professional degree in geological engineering from his alma mater (the first to be conferred by Texas A. & M.).

On the College Station campus, he was president of five undergraduate societies and editor-in-chief of the yearbook which won all-American honors as the best college or university annual in the country. While an undergraduate, Halbouty further distinguished himself by working out the geology of Atascosa County, and making the first base map of the Charlotte-Jordanton-Leming fault system, where Humble Oil & Refining Co. was later to discover two major oilfields.

The story of Halbouty's first big break already an oil industry classic, has a strong Horatio Alger flavor. Just out of college, Mike had taken the lowliest job in the oilfields as rear rodman on a surveying chain gang and later moved up to roustabout and roughneck. Then, at High Island salt dome in Galveston County, it happened.

A drilling crew of Yount-Lee Oil Co. had hit what they thought was "suitcase sand" and were about to abandon site. But Halbouty noticed a small oil stain at the bottom of the last core and begged the drilling superintendent to take one more core. "Can't do it," said the superintendent. "My orders are to tear the rig down."

Undaunted, 22-year-old Mike Halbouty jumped into his model-T and raced 60 miles across rough country roads to talk to Mr. Frank Yount himself. Yount, already a famous wildcatter, was giving a garden party

at his Beaumont mansion for Jan Paderewski, world-famous pianist and Polish premier. Halbouty barged right in and cornered Yount in the kitchen. "Mr. Yount, there's oil down there," he said. "Let me prove it."

Yount had given birth to the second Spindletop boom in 1928, and probably knew more about gulf coast salt domes than any other man alive, but he liked the headstrong spirit of this brash young man. "All right," he said, and then he called High Island to order another core. The result was the discovery of an overhang in the old salt dome and a rich oil reservoir was found.

Halbouty, as he himself puts it, was in. Yount made him chief geologist and petroleum engineer, built him the finest geological laboratory in the Southwest, gave him a free hand in research, and was his frequent companion. During this period, the Yount-Lee Oil Co. was the largest independent oil company in the world, and discoverer of many fields on the Texas-Louisiana gulf coast.

While he headed up Yount-Lee experimental lab, Halbouty was responsible for the development of a complex set of drilling mud formulas. These formulas, worked out to solve the company's "heaving shale" problem, were never patented. If they had been, Mike guesses he would be making more money off them today than he is from his many oil wells. As it is, he derives a great deal of pride from the fact that his mud formulas have become standard throughout the drilling industry.

With the untimely death of Mr. Yount, Yount-Lee Oil Co. was sold to Stanolind, now Pan American Petroleum Corp. Halbouty, figuring a major company would cramp his style, wasn't in the bargain. Instead, he took the advice of W. E. Lee of Houston, Yount's surviving partner, and entered business with Mr. Lee's son-in-law—another phenomenal young man who was destined for big things in the oil business. His name: Glenn McCarthy.

Halbouty, who had attended Texas A. & M. with McCarthy, was Glenn's chief geologist and petroleum engineer, vice president, and general manager for 2 years. Halbouty recommended Anahuac, where McCarthy made his first million, and then West Beaumont, which was even bigger. There was also North Cotton Lake, and Palacios.

"Glenn and I made a good team," says Halbouty, "because we were much alike in some ways. But then the time came for the parting of the ways, and we did."

Halbouty still holds the greatest respect for the dethroned king of wildcaters, especially for his uncanny business intuition. Mike tells the following story to illustrate the point:

"We had just found the West Beaumont field, and we went out to check on our second well. Everything seemed fine, but Glenn was uneasy. Nothing I said shook him out of his premonition that something was wrong.

"That night he paced and repaced the floor of our hotel room. He was unable to sleep and full of worry about the well. Finally, he woke me up and excitedly pointed to a red reflection in the west. I told him it was probably just a gas flare, but Glenn didn't agree. At that precise moment, the telephone rang. It was the company toolpusher saying our No. 2 Longe had blown out and caught fire."

Out on his own as a consulting geologist and petroleum engineer in 1937, Halbouty saved enough to stake his first wildcat, in the Cedar Bayou structure of Chambers County. That first venture is a dramatic portrayal of the fact that the oil game is a gamble, and no bed of roses.

"The first well was a dry hole," Mike remembers. "So was the second, third, and fourth. By that time I had blown \$125,000, was flat broke, and had to go back to consulting work. And you know something?

Right this minute there are 52 flowering wells in the same area I had to leave for lack of money. "That," he says with a shrug, "is the oil business for you."

Then came World War II. Immediately after the bombing of Pearl Harbor, Reserve Officer Halbouty was ordered to Fort Benning, Ga., Infantry School. Earlier, he had brushed aside civilian status via an "essential occupation" deferment. At Fort Benning, in competition with regular Army officers, Captain Halbouty was the top graduate of the battalion commanders and staff officers school.

Just before Halbouty was to ship out overseas, the War Department's Joint Chiefs of Staff stepped in to name him chief of the production section of the Army-Navy Petroleum Board, with duties to coordinate foreign and domestic oil production. It was a big job and Halbouty performed it well. By war's end, he had a lieutenant colonel's rating and a good part of the credit for boosting production in Caribbean and South American oil fields, at a time when vast quantities of oil were vital to Allied victory.

Halbouty returned from the service determined to make a go of it as an independent oil operator. After one dry hole, he drilled his first successful wildcat in Natchitoches Parish, La., and found the Ashland oilfield at 3,228 feet of the Woodbine sand (the only field yet found in Natchitoches Parish). It was Louisiana's first well for the year 1946, coming in but 4 minutes after midnight on January 1. A few months later, he brought in another wildcat in Red River Parish. Then at old Pine Island field he completed 48 wells, using a new acidizing idea in getting production from the old sands.

In the 13 years since he has been drilling wells as an independent oil operator, Halbouty has discovered 33 new oil and gas fields and extensions on the Texas-Louisiana gulf coast. They include such prolific oil producing fields as the South Boling field, Wharton County; the northeast and northwest extensions of the South Liberty field, Liberty County; West Saratoga field, Hardin County; Pheasant and Citrus Grove fields, Matagorda County; Port Acres field, Jefferson County; Fostoria field, Montgomery County; and the Orange field, Orange County—all in Texas. There are also the West Hackberry field, Cameron Parish, and the South Bell City (Cibicides Zone) field, Calcasieu Parish—both in Louisiana. Halbouty owns an interest in and operates producing wells in 40 oil and gas fields in Texas and Louisiana, and there are more than 200 producing oil and gas wells on these leases.

The hub of Halbouty's farflung operations is a rambling, T-shaped office building in southwest Houston. Built at a cost of \$400,000 in 1956, it reflects Mike's aesthetic taste, both in architecture and interior decoration. A tile mosaic cross section of the Spindletop salt dome in vibrant greens and blues dominates the colorful and functional outer lobby.

Mike's personal office is a far cry from that of the old days when he worked out of a one-room cubbyhole in Houston's Shell Building. Visitors are awestruck by a massive mural on one wall which depicts the search for oil in the gulf coast area. Mike dreamed up its design himself. At one corner of the mural a hand out of nowhere is grasping a rock. "Symbolizes the never-ending challenge of finding oil," Halbouty explains.

Another wall holds one of the best petroleum libraries in the country; still another is covered with dozens of framed photographs of Mike's family, friends, and business associates; and the fourth, of glass, looks out onto a palm-surrounded patio.

Mike, the man, hardly fits the popular conception of the Texas oil millionaire.

Conservative in dress and manner, he might be taken for a banker or a real estate executive. He is, in truth, both of these. Dark, handsome, and graying at 50, Halbouty is a dynamo of human energy. Even when sitting still (which isn't often) he's a man who seems to be in a hurry. He doesn't smoke, he says, because he simply doesn't have the time.

Keeping his hustling organization in high gear in nine States and Canada, from Louisiana to Alaska, Halbouty makes or receives more than 100 telephone calls each day and puts in 40 to 50 flying hours each month. A January itinerary took him to 15 major U.S. cities on business matters. He has his own airplane, but it goes aloft only in the best of weather.

Despite his rigorous schedule, Halbouty finds time to be active in 15 professional societies, a number of social organizations, and many civic functions. Ex-president of the Houston Petroleum Club, he is a member of the board of trustees of St. Luke's Episcopal Hospital, where he donated a special ward for premature babies. Education, too, is close to his heart. In 1948, he established three Texas A. & M. scholarships in geology and petroleum engineering. He also backed an educational TV series "The World and Physics," narrated by Dr. Edward Teller of the University of California.

If Halbouty has a pastime, it's golf. Shooting a good game, he still comes in second to his attractive wife, an excellent amateur tournament golfer. She is the former Fay Renfro of Shawnee and Tulsa. Their two children are 9-year-old Linda Fay, and Tommy Kelly, 28, who is a resident geologist for the Halbouty firm in Anchorage, Alaska.

Right-hand man in the Halbouty organization is George C. Hardin, Jr., with the title of manager of exploration, production, and lands. Hardin is a noted geologist and engineer in his own right; many technical papers, in fact, carry the double byline of Halbouty and Hardin.

Members of the Halbouty executive team, all recognized as dynamic men in their respective fields, are James Ward, drilling superintendent; Ted Dobson, chief engineer; Jim Etheridge, head of the land department; John Walters, division geologist; Abe Wagner, division geologist; James Noel, general counsel; Frank Bruce, manager of the Halbouty Alaskan Investments; Neil Parks, comptroller; and Louis Darlek. In all, 130 employees work for Halbouty; 62 of them in the Houston headquarters.

That Mike Halbouty believes in sharing scientific knowledge is evidenced by his many papers in professional and trade journals. He has written and published 48 technical articles as well as a scientific book with the jaw-breaking title of "Petrographic and Physical Characteristics of Sands From Seven Gulf Coast Producing Horizons."

He's something of a petroleum historian, too. With his Beaumont boyhood pal, James A. Clark, he is the co-author of "Spindletop," the story of the well that ushered in the modern oil industry and one of the best-selling books on petroleum ever written. Halbouty and Clark are currently at work on two more books. "The Last Boom" is the story of the fabulous east Texas oil field, and "The Book of Oil" will be a layman's handbook on the oil industry.

Oil Writer Clark, whose "Tales of the Oil Country" column appears in a Houston newspaper, knows Halbouty as no other man does. "The first time I saw Mike," Clark recalls, "he was pulling a gang of rowdies off me. I sold newspapers in Beaumont, too, and my corner was almost as good as Mike's."

Clark attributes Halbouty's success to boundless energy, a high degree of intelligence, and a burning enthusiasm for any job he tackles. "He would have made a go

of anything he tried. Journalism. Sports. Politics. You name it."

"Another thing that sets him apart," says Clark, "is that meticulous honesty of his. He'd go a thousand miles out of the way and lose money to be sure he's doing the right thing by everybody. His word is his bond. That's the mark of a majority of our great independent oil operators."

Mike, much in demand as a speaker before industry as well as nonoil groups, is an eloquent spokesman for the new breed of independent oil men who believe in the scientific approach to oil-finding. In an era when many are sounding the death knell for the independent, Halbouty says the species is not dying out—not the good ones.

"Independents are the heart of the domestic oil industry," he says. "They drill 80 percent of the wells and find two out of three new oil fields. Those who modernize their operations and update their own thinking are the ones who will survive. The oil patch is not a protected playground. It's a tough and changing world."

Halbouty scoffs at predictions that the country is running out of oil. "I believe there are thousands of major untapped sources of oil right here in this country," he says. "The old salt domes, for instance, have given up only a fraction of what they will give up when man finally learns to solve all of their mysteries."

Halbouty began to realize the potential of natural gas early in his career, when it was being flared as a waste product. Today, he is even more emphatic about its future. "Natural gas is destined to become the greatest of all natural energies—with the possible exception of solar and atomic energy. Oil, in many cases, is rapidly becoming secondary. There's no question that natural gas will be the greatest immediate source of energy for the next 20 years."

Mike's newest project is the multimillion dollar Halbouty Alaskan Oil Co., christened Halasko. One of the first Texans to become interested in the newest State, he and his associates own substantial acreage in oil leases covering some of the more promising geological basins. Halbouty was also the first independent to move a rig into Alaska during the present boom; his first well is now being drilled on the Kenai Peninsula.

Halbouty, who plans to build a skyscraping hotel and office building overlooking Cook's Bay in Anchorage, believes Alaska is America's last frontier. "I believe the Klondike gold rush was child's play compared with what is coming," he says. "Alaska has 31 of the 33 strategic minerals, and none of them have been developed to any extent." Hardly anybody doubts that Mike Halbouty knows what he is talking about.

Mike admits he is an incurable optimist. "Maybe," he explains, "that is because I can't think of a single pessimist who ever succeeded in the oil business, and only a few realists who have made the grade. That is because of the surprises you are bound to find in any quest into the unknown. And hunting for oil and gas is an unknown."

If Mike Halbouty has a personal philosophy about the search for oil, it was expressed a couple of years back by Father James Keller when Halbouty appeared on the Christopher television program alongside singer Giselle McKensie and actor James Cagney. Father Keller, whose Christopher theme maintains it is better to light one little candle of hope than to curse the darkness, said he believed that God placed oil and gas in the earth for men of faith to find and help make a better life for mankind.

In the oil business, Michel T. Halbouty—geologist, petroleum engineer, and independent oil man—has already lighted some mighty big candles. The biggest and most brilliant, probably, are yet to come.

Americans Should Know the Answers to Communists' False Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, leading citizens have called attention to the need for more teaching in our schools about the differences between communism and democracy.

It is shocking to read a news report, under a Los Angeles dateline, stating that a majority of high school seniors, when asked to choose a statement best representing their ideas of an economic system, quoted Marxist dogma: "From each according to his ability, and to each according to his need." What kind of teaching have they received?

I include as part of these remarks my newsletter of August 12, 1959, which comments on the above, and cites other examples which indicate the need for better teaching about communism and about our heritage of freedom and democracy, as follows:

Half the Americans over here in Europe have not the slightest idea of why they are Americans or what a democracy actually is. Most of them cannot say a word against communism. . . . The American schools . . . have missed the basic issues with those civics courses. . . . We are told over here that the only person the Communists fear is the one who thoroughly understands the system.

So wrote a chaplain in the U.S. Armed Forces stationed in Berlin. He was expressing his support of Cardinal Cushing's proposal that young people should be taught about communism and the answers to its false doctrines. A previous newsletter quoted from the Cardinal's television address on that subject.

A news story from Los Angeles published here gives striking confirmation of the need. Under the headline, "Students' Attitudes Called Shocking," it said:

In a survey of 86 high schools, members of the senior classes were asked to indicate their preferences for various statements descriptive of economic systems. Fifty-five percent selected the old socialist slogan, "From each according to his ability and to each according to his need."

This slogan is Marxist dogma, and could be enforced only by police state methods. Who would determine whether people were contributing according to their abilities, or what their needs were? Imposition of such a system would require a Communist form of government. Apparently these students did not have the background of information necessary to figure that out.

Further confirmation of the need for teaching about the answers to communism was given by Mr. Lloyd Wright of California, former president of the American Bar Association, and recently chairman of the President's Commission on Government Security. Testifying this

spring before a Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, he said:

Our children are not being taught in the schools sufficiently the true philosophy of our Government. They have been brainwashed with infiltrated textbooks, some of which go so far as to advocate that it is wrong to be proud to be an American citizen, but rather you should consider yourself a citizen of the world.

Patriotic Americans will surely support and applaud the timely suggestion that young people should be taught about communism.

The cost of living was recently reported at a new high. At his news conference, the President said that even a tiny increase could bring about "a new high," but that since 1953 "the curve of increase has been so much less."

High prices and dollar devaluation are two sides of the same coin. Taking the 1939 dollar as 100 cents, the course of its devaluation has run as follows: 1942 85.2 cents; 1945, 77.2 cents; 1948, 57.8 cents; 1953—under Eisenhower—51.9 cents; 1957, January, 50.3 cents; 1958, January, 48.6 cents; 1959, January, 48 cents; 1959, June, 47.7 cents—the most recent figure and the publicized "new high."

In other words, during the 14 years before Eisenhower became President the value of the dollar dropped about 48 cents, and during nearly 7 years since he became President, it has dropped about 4½ cents. The President is fighting to stop this drift and maintain a sound and stable dollar.

The heat is really on Members of Congress in connection with labor legislation. We have to remember former President Truman's warning: "If you can't stand the heat, you had better get out of the kitchen."

As Castro and Communists Take Over Cuba's Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I send to the desk an article from the U.S. News & World Report of August 17, which deals with the problem of Communists in Cuba taking over that nation's unions. This article relates how followers of Fidel Castro working with Communists now run the unions and how former labor leaders have been placed in jail or have fled the country in exile. The article states that organized labor has become a tool of the Government and that Communists are seen gaining steadily in prestige and power within the Cuban unions.

I likewise send to the desk an editorial from the State of August 14 dealing with the general situation of the Castro regime in Cuba. I think the editor of the State sums up precisely and correctly

the situation in Cuba. I quote from that editorial:

Today, the Castro regime stands revealed as another dictatorship, but potentially the most dangerous movement that has gained success in Latin America to date.

Mr. President, 2 years ago I filed a report in the Senate dealing with the threats of communism in Latin America. At that time the large liberal newspapers such as the New York Times ridiculed my position. They promoted the Castro revolution declaring that it was one of freedom loving people and that there was no Communist element among its followers. Today we know better but I fear that it is too late.

I hope that the Santiago, Chile, conference will be able to cope with the extremely dangerous situation that has developed in the Caribbean. If the elements of war are not deterred in the Caribbean, I fear that the situation there will spread to other areas in Latin America and our Pan American Union will fall apart at the seams.

Nothing would please the Communists more and nothing would give them a greater advantage to move into other nations in Latin America and build up the threat to our security.

Mr. President, I ask that the article from the U.S. News & World Report entitled "As Castro and Communists Take Over Cuba's Unions" and the editorial from the State entitled "Revealing Himself" be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Aug. 17, 1959]

AS CASTRO AND COMMUNISTS TAKE OVER CUBA'S UNIONS

(Take a look at what has happened to labor unions in Cuba since the revolution. Castro's men, working with Communists, now run those unions. Former labor leaders are in jail, or in exile. Organized labor is becoming a tool of the Government. Result, for United States and Cuban employers: Labor troubles of all kinds are mushrooming.)

HAVANA.—Fidel Castro and the Communists now are completing a joint conquest of Cuba's once independent labor unions—and troubles here are mounting for employers.

Elections going on at present in the 33 national labor federations show this:

Two-thirds of the federations, so far, have voted. In each case, slates organized by Castro's 26th of July movement have been swept into office.

CASTRO MEN AND REDS

These slates usually are made up of a combination of Castro's followers, and Communists. Reds now are estimated to hold as many as one-fourth of all the posts in the various federations. They also have a foothold in the powerful Cuban Confederation of Labor, which controls the 33 federations and Cuba's 1.2 million organized workers.

Today, organized labor is becoming a tool of the Government.

The Castro government has given itself power to settle any and all labor disputes by decree. In one such ruling, it ordered junior officers and other key employees in both foreign and Cuban-owned banks to join the bank employees' union.

Employees are forbidden to fire workers, no matter how inefficient they may be or

whether there is any need for them. Some companies have been forced to rehire all workers fired—whatever the reason—during the regime of former President Fulgencio Batista. One sugar company reportedly had to take back 100 former employees.

MORE SICK LEAVE

An executive of this company said that the volume of sick leaves in his mills is five times what it used to be. He added:

"Quiet a few of our men have been pretending that they're sick. They have the right to send a substitute who gets full pay. The 'sick' man gets full sick pay—and we know that substitutes often kick back part of their pay to the regular employee."

In the past, he explained, workmen claiming to be "sick" had to be certified as ill by the company physician or have a letter from a local doctor. That provision can no longer be enforced.

Under Batista, unions were relatively non-political and were considered stronger than most unions elsewhere in Latin America. Now Castro's 26th of July Movement has barred opposing political movements in unions, except for a small Catholic group.

EXILED LEADERS

At least 95 percent of the men who ran unions during the Batista regime have been eliminated. About half have escaped the country. The former secretary general of the confederation is hiding somewhere in Europe.

The Castro government has jailed, on three different occasions, Ignacio Gonzales Tellechea, who had been reelected last December to his third term as president of the Inter-American Labor Organization. He is now in hiding. A visiting official of that organization found that 25 to 30 other former labor leaders are being held in jail here with no charges entered against them. Still others have been expelled from unions—some for 10 years, others for life.

These included many leaders, particularly in the electrical, transport and telephone workers' unions, who had been against Batista for years but were not affiliated with Castro's rebellion.

ANTI-AMERICAN LEFTIST

Now emerging as the single most important man in Cuban labor is David Salvador, acting secretary of the Cuban Confederation of Labor. Once he belonged to the Communist youth organization. Some say that he has been expelled from the party, but it is widely agreed that he is still a leftist revolutionary—and virulently anti-American.

When Castro came into power, a 22-man directorate headed by Salvador and including five known Communists ran the confederation. Then the group was reorganized into a nine-man body. Known Communists were dropped—but Salvador remained.

When all of the federations have held their elections, they are to call a national congress to elect an executive council of the confederation. As most observers see it, Salvador is certain to be elected secretary general of the confederation.

BIG TROUBLE AHEAD

All of this is seen as raising serious problems, not only for American and Cuban employers but for the nation's economy. The sugar industry now is paying wages based on an assumed price of 4.7 cents a pound—at a time when the average price is only about 4 cents.

No end to this squeeze is foreseen at the present time. Communists are seen as gaining steadily in prestige and power within the unions as they become instruments of Fidel Castro's government.

[From the State, Columbia, S.C., Aug. 14, 1959]

REVEALING HIMSELF

In the early days of his guerrilla campaign against the Batista government, Fidel Castro was praised by many as a man who wanted to restore democratic government in Cuba. The State noted that Castro was an unknown quantity, and that he might be no improvement.

Later, there was some fairly widespread hope that Castro himself might be less dictatorial than Batista, but this hope shortly dimmed when it was learned how many avowed and suspected Communists were serving as Castro lieutenants and advisers.

The executions of Batista followers shocked a good many people who had been supporting Castro, partially because the executions were staged as big shows for the masses. Public opinion apparently forced Castro to drop the matter momentarily.

Now it appears at least 3,000 "counter-revolutionary plotters" have been rounded up. Their fate is unknown. However, it is known that the Communists and pro-Communists in the Castro regime are gaining influence and power. Government announcements reflect more and more the language and concepts of Marxism.

Castro and his subordinates are imposing a rule quite as harsh and arbitrary as the one they fought to depose. In fact, economic conditions are said to be much worse than they were under Batista. And there have been no elections since the "revolution."

Today, the Castro regime stands revealed as another dictatorship, but potentially the most dangerous movement that has gained success in Latin America to date.

Resolution of Town Council of Bloomfield, N.J., in Support of H.R. 5596

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herein a letter from Mr. H. Joseph North, town clerk of Bloomfield, N.J., and a resolution adopted by the Town Council of Bloomfield in support of H.R. 5596:

THE TOWN OF BLOOMFIELD, N.J.

August 6, 1959.

The Honorable PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. RODINO: Enclosed please find copy of a resolution adopted at the meeting of the town council held August 3, 1959.

Respectfully yours,

H. JOSEPH NORTH,
Town Clerk.

"Whereas by virtue of the provisions of the Transportation Act of 1958 it is permissible for certain railroads to discontinue passenger service of interstate trains (or ferries) without first applying to the Interstate Commerce Commission for permission and without public hearing with respect thereto; and

"Whereas Senate bill 1331 and a companion bill in the House of Representatives (H.R.

5596) are pending and such bills would amend the Transportation Act of 1958 to provide for public hearing before an approval by the Interstate Commerce Commission to discontinue passenger service; and

"Whereas it appears that the aforesaid amendment is salutary and in the public interest: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Town Council of the Town of Bloomfield, N.J., That said council expresses its approval and urges the passage of the two bills pending in the Federal Legislature and known as Senate bill 1331 and H.R. 5596; and, the town clerk is directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the Senators from New Jersey and to the Member of the House of Representatives of the 10th Congressional District."

I hereby certify that the above resolution was duly adopted by the Town Council of the Town of Bloomfield at a meeting of said town council held August 3, 1959.

H. JOSEPH NORTH,

Town Clerk of the Town of Bloomfield.

I hereby approve the above resolution.

DONALD H. SCOTT,

Mayor of the Town of Bloomfield.

Parkinson's Law and Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, a recent editorial "Parkinson's Law," which was published in the Washington Daily News, a member of the Scripps-Howard league of newspapers, on August 17, 1959, is worthy of careful study.

This great newspaper and the entire Scripps-Howard league have long been aware of the waste and the danger in our civil defense program, and have repeatedly called for its complete overhaul.

I believe the editorial presents convincingly the waste of taxpayers' money on an ever-increasing futile bureaucracy which will only perpetuate the already useless and inept Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. It points out clearly the danger in allowing any further expansion of this bureaucracy along the line of its present and past operations.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I commend this to my colleagues in the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARKINSON'S LAW

Give the House credit for a stout fight against a \$12 million boondoggle which may yet be avoided.

This is the proposal to finance a new army of civil defense employees, working at the State level, paid half by the States, half by the Federal Government.

The Senate has approved the project. The House turned it down yesterday, for the third time. Something has to give. The item is part of the independent offices appropriation bill, containing money for a variety of essential Government operations.

We hope the House holds the line because this \$12 million is only a foot in the door, opening the way for still further expansion of this especially futile bureaucracy.

Insistent pressure for this needless addition to the public payroll is best explained in terms of the law expounded by C. Northcote Parkinson, Raffles professor of history at Malaya University in Singapore, as follows:

"In any public administration or organization, the number of new subordinates increases at a predictable rate, irrespective of any variation in the amount of work (if any) to be done."

A Minority View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, several months ago the Joint Economic Committee issued a report evidencing the alarm of some people about the economic future of our country. At the time this report was published, not much credence was given to the minority report. Today, Mr. Speaker, the minority report has proved to be overwhelmingly sound and has without doubt let the air out of the alarmists who wanted to go on a big spending spree. Following is an article which appeared in the August 17, 1959, issue of the *New York Times*:

A MINORITY VIEW—AN APPRAISAL OF THE DISSENTING STAND IN A CONGRESSIONAL REPORT

(By Edward H. Collins)

"The *New York Times* has published two or three very thoughtful editorials and your column" writes a correspondent, "which have discussed the errors in the majority findings of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. I am respectfully puzzled as to why you have never given credit or identification to the minority report, prepared by Representative Thomas B. Curtis, Republican of Missouri, which proved to be correct."

There is a good deal to be said for the point raised by this correspondent. That fact is strongly confirmed when one re-reads this document today, 5 months after its publication, over the signatures of, besides Representative Curtis, Representative Clarence E. Kilburn, Republican, of New York; Representative William B. Widnall, Republican, of New Jersey; Senator Prescott Bush, Republican, of Connecticut; Senator John Marshall Butler, Republican, of Maryland, and Senator Jacob K. Javits, Republican, of New York (who concurred with reservations and attached a statement of certain additional views of his own).

A STRIKING CONTRAST

In one vital area in particular does the closely reasoned argument of the minority contrast strikingly with the air of wishful thinking and straw-grasping that permeates the statement of the majority. This is its tranchant discussion of the nature of economic growth, and its development of the thesis that, if one accepts its premises on this point—premises that are hardly open to serious dispute—then the conclusion that sound fiscal policy calls for a balancing of the Federal budget in 1960 becomes logically inescapable.

The majority report had contended that "principal emphasis on public policy this year should be placed on prompt and full recovery from the 1957-58 recession. Achieving maximum employment and pro-

duction, therefore, should be given the highest priority." To its authors what did this mean in terms, let us say, of monetary and fiscal policy? With respect to monetary policy it meant, one finds, that the Federal Reserve should abandon what the report referred to as its "restrictive" program, and that it should resume the pumping of additional money into the economy on the scale traditionally reserved for periods of recession. As to fiscal policy, this typical passage is perhaps illustrative of the majority's general attitude:

"While a balanced budget, or even a surplus, is desirable in times of maximum employment, neither the soundness of our money nor our potential for economic growth and stability . . . necessarily depends on balancing a \$77 billion budget in fiscal 1960."

For their part the authors of the minority report argued:

"In our opinion, the surest way now to provide additional job opportunities is precisely that called for under the Employment Act of 1946, namely, to create a climate in which industry, agriculture, and the service trades will be enabled to expand, thereby creating jobs and the purchasing power with which the products of maximum production may be moved."

As to the question of economic growth, the minority had no quarrel with the definition of the majority as "the process of capital accumulation." However, it had very definite ideas concerning the conditions prerequisite to achieving this process. Capital accumulation (or formation), it pointed out, requires two things. "It requires (1) the incentive to invest . . . and (2) the real savings needed to finance such investment." It added: "It is useless to urge a higher rate of growth for the economy if we are unwilling to take the steps necessary to provide the conditions under which private investment incentive and real savings will be adequate for this purpose." On the closely related subject of inflation it observes:

"Stabilizing the price level is not an alternative objective to achieving a higher rate of economic growth. On the contrary, it is a basic requisite for continuing growth without violent swings in the level of employment in a free economy."

Commenting on the President's proposal for a balanced budget and its bearing on stable prices, the minority finds the latter is fundamental to achieving this aim. "The consensus of the experts testifying before this committee," it notes, "was that the economy would reach high and record levels of employment, production, and purchasing power in the period covered by the President's budget. Failure to achieve a balanced budget under such conditions of record-breaking prosperity, as the minority sees it, would be regarded as a green light by everyone who was looking for a sign from the Government as to whether it was genuinely determined to leave no stone unturned in its fight on inflation."

GROWTH AND INFLATION

The August issue of the *Monthly Review* of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York carries the third of a series of studies dealing with the relationship between economic growth and inflation. The two earlier studies were titled, respectively, "Creeping Inflation" and "Growth Without Inflation in Britain." The current inquiry concerns the incidence of inflation on one specific category of countries—the underdeveloped countries. While the observations of the minority committee on the Economic Report are not similarly confined, they become particularly impressive when considered against the background of this pioneering piece of research. After considering the case histories of 16 more or less typical and diversified examples of underdeveloped countries over the period 1950-57, the authors of the study find justification in its results for two

broad, though qualified, generalizations. They find that (1) in countries where price advances have been comparatively nominal or nonexistent, rates of economic expansion, "which, by and large were steady," clustered around an average of 6 percent. They find that (2) by contrast, in countries where sustained inflationary pressures developed during the period, rates of growth showed widely varying and somewhat sporadic gains. Average rates of expansion ranged from less than 1 percent to as high as 7 percent, with the group average about 4 percent. In short, if these studies have any meaning, the report concludes (in words that are almost an echo of those employed by the minority report of the congressional Economic Committee), it is that they lend no support to the contention that price stability (in underdeveloped countries at least) is incompatible with rapid economic expansion. On the contrary, they would seem to confirm the view that, while stable prices tend to promote an orderly and fairly rapid expansion in output, inflation tends to lead to uneven and often lagging, rates of overall growth.

Admiral's Flags Are Furlled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

AND

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the death of Adm. William F. Halsey has saddened all Americans and many friends of Americans in other nations.

In Elizabeth, N.J., the news was particularly poignant because this was the admiral's home city, the city of his youth.

Since both of New Jersey's U.S. Senators are residents of Union County, and because we are proud to live in a county where Admiral Halsey once lived, we ask in this joint statement for unanimous consent to have this editorial from the August 18 issue of the *Elizabeth Daily Journal* printed in the *Record*.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

[From the *Elizabeth (N.J.) Daily Journal*, Aug. 18, 1959]

ADMIRAL'S FLAGS ARE FURLED

The admiral's flags have been furlled. Never again will they wave in triumphant glory from his beloved *Enterprise*, the flagship he loved so dearly and fought in vain to preserve. Adm. William F. Halsey is dead.

The square-rigged old salt, who took his place among the greatest naval heroes of all time and who became an inspiring symbol of the American fighting spirit when he cleared the Pacific of the Japanese fleet in the Second World War, died with his "boots off" and in his sleep. It was a prosaic ending for the warrior who had lived so close to death in so many places since he went off to don the Navy blue of an Annapolis midshipman.

What stories have been revived for the hometown folk since the news of his unexpected death reached Elizabeth Sunday—the old Brewster home in West Jersey Street,

where his mother lived until her marriage to Lt. William F. Halsey and where the admiral himself was born; his own home around the corner in Chilton Street, where "Billy left the gate open" and his unattended younger cousin, Henry Bayard Clark, got a memorable tumble; the Pingry days, Annapolis, and the solid midday in his summer whites returning for a stay with his maternal grandparents and to visit the family of his father's brother, Charles H. K. Halsey, the bank president.

Always there were those home ties, the ties of family, of the native health remaining strong and calling him back no matter where duty sent him and regardless of honors. One of the touching human interest stories of the Second World War was the meeting far out on a Pacific island between Admiral Halsey and Pfc. Christy DeMaio, the stout boy from Peterstown, fondly remembered by pre-war boxing fans as the "Pants House Kid." But let Christy tell it again.

"I'm standing by the side of the road and I give the thumb to a car coming straight at me. Then I'd like to die. It stopped and who looked out at me, but the big boy from Elizabeth himself—Admiral Halsey. So, he said, 'All right, soldier, get in.' And when he found out that I was from Elizabeth too, boy, did we cut it up for 25 miles. Real pals, we were. No brass. What a guy he is."

"What a guy" he was to the thousands who claimed every possible vantage point to see and cheer our greatest hero on that memorable November 7 in 1945 when Admiral Halsey returned to his own people and his old hometown while the rest of the country looked on in envy. We were bursting with pride that autumn afternoon and bursting with promises that have not been fulfilled.

We are bursting with pride now, even as we grieve, while newspaper headlines the world over tell the story of the Elizabeth boy who led naval forces in exploits President Eisenhower has termed "a brilliant part of American military history"—of whom Adm. Chester Nimitz has said "he has left for all of us a shining example of courage and service."

What has he left us here in Elizabeth aside from the reflected glory of his immortal deeds? Is it enough that we clogged the streets, 100,000 strong to cheer when he returned a hero acclaimed by the world? Is it enough that we swell with the pride of possession as the same world bows in sorrow at the passing of the Pingry lad who scaled heights few attain?

It is not enough. If ever a community was mandated to perpetuate through fitting memorial the example and the inspiration Admiral Halsey has left available for all the future generations of hometown boys Elizabeth has been given its directive. If we have forgotten the promises of 1945, Elizabeth now has the charge anew to erect a living memorial to the native son a few remaining oldtimers knew as "Billy" Halsey. But make it a living memorial. The marble shafts have never been more than just resting places for pigeons.

The Khrushchev-Eisenhower Visits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the world was electrified by the announcement that

Khrushchev and our President were trading visits.

I, like many others, had very mixed emotions on this visit.

On August 18th the American people were informed that Hungary executed eight men who had been involved in the freedom fight in that unfortunate country.

Now does anyone have any idea that the philosophy of government in Russia or the satellite countries has been changed by these impending visits?

Mr. Speaker, I am worried that the American people may relax when this smiling and happy extrovert, Mr. Khrushchev has completed his tour of America.

I want to believe these Communist countries want peace but such demonstrations as this in Hungary prove once again that this tour of America—I fear—is just a new disguise for Communist world domination.

I include the following news item:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 18, 1959]

HUNGARY EXECUTES 8 LINKED TO 1956 REBELLION

BUDAPEST, August 17.—Communist Hungary has executed eight men recently convicted of political crimes, according to an unconfirmed report circulating today among Western diplomats.

The report of the executions is the final chapter of a secret trial story that has been heard in western circles since last spring. It has been impossible to verify the reports through official sources.

A Foreign Ministry spokesman would neither confirm nor deny the reports of the executions.

The trial rumors never clearly spelled out the charges on which the men were supposedly brought to court. They allegedly stemmed from the Hungarian revolt of 1956.

According to the most persistent reports, the men involved were mostly workers from Ujpest, an industrial suburb of Budapest.

Ten were reported sentenced to death in the original trial but two of these sentences were reduced to life imprisonment in an appeal hearing last month. About 15 other persons reportedly received prison sentences.

Sources for the execution reports were unable to give any names.

Why Special Loyalty Oaths for Students Only?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thoughtful editorial from the Medford Mail-Tribune of July 28, 1959, on the question of special loyalty oaths in the national defense scholarship bill.

This editorial quotes two eminent and outstanding Americans in support of repeal of such an oath—Senator John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts, and ex-Gov. Charles A. Sprague of Oregon. One of these leaders is a Democrat, the other is a Republican, but both are men of

wisdom and sound and intelligent liberalism.

The author of the editorial in the Medford Mail-Tribune is Eric Allen, managing editor of that daily newspaper, which is published in Medford, Oreg.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPRAGUE, KENNEDY AGREE

Quite by coincidence, statements by two writers concerning the so-called loyalty oath now required of recipients of educational aid from the Federal Government, came across the desk yesterday morning.

Also coincidentally, the writers are of opposite political faiths. One is Charles A. Sprague, editor and publisher of the Oregon Statesman in Salem, former Republican Governor of Oregon. The other is JOHN F. KENNEDY, U.S. Senator from Massachusetts and a leading contender for the Democratic nomination for President next year.

Both, Republican ex-Governor, and Democratic Senator, are highly intelligent, literate, and thoughtful men. And both think the loyalty oath is silly.

Here are excerpts from Sprague's editorial: "After the national defense education bill was passed last year, colleges woke up to the fact that it required students receiving loans or scholarships and fellowships to take a loyalty oath. . . . It is not the simple oath pledging loyalty to the Constitution and laws but one of those adjuring oaths which have caused serious commotion in academic circles—professors are willing to take oaths of loyalty . . . but dislike swearing to some negative oath. . . . Affirmative loyalty oaths, yes; negative oaths, no."

Senator KENNEDY's views were contained in a letter, a portion of which follows:

"It seems to me that we must encourage the development of all the best minds of our Nation, regardless of student tendencies toward nonconformity or other personal objections to signing this vague, unworkable and almost meaningless declaration. Though there are still those who favor reverting to the age of the test oaths that were already discredited when our Constitution was written, it is dangerous to permit such anachronisms in this hour when building up our intellectual resources has become crucial."

He also referred to attempts to repeal the oath as an important step toward the elimination of the atmosphere of suspicion and fear that has for many years enveloped many of our national attitudes.

We agree with both of these distinguished men. Disloyal people have no objection to signing a perjured oath. But many honest and conscientious people do object to the negativism of the present requirement.

The sad postscript is that last week the Senate voted, 49 to 42, to send the repealer bill back to committee, thus killing it for this session.

The Foreign Aid Funnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I want to insert an editorial from the August 7, 1959, issue of the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News deal-

ing with a subject, foreign aid, which I feel is most pertinent and should be brought to the attention of my colleagues.

This editorial is entitled, "Taking a Harder Look," and I believe it accurately reflects the fears of many, many individuals that too much of our foreign aid money has been frittered away, either through outright errors on important, needed projects, or careful expenditures of funds in countries where we should not be spending the money in the first place. Many of the countries that have been getting our help actually are using this capital to get into a position to undercut U.S. producers in their own home market and to push them out of auxiliary foreign markets. Thus, U.S. workers suffer through the competition of our own capital.

I commend this editorial to my colleagues.

The material follows:

[From the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News, Aug. 7, 1959]

TAKING HARDER LOOK

Evidence of public restlessness over the vast expenditures for foreign aid and congressional suspicion of the manner in which specific sums are being dispensed and handled have caused Congress to take a harder look at the whole foreign aid program at the current session.

Any fair-minded person will agree that foreign aid is necessary as a means of holding the free world together and putting itself in a position to fight back effectively if attacked.

But there are widespread reports that a great deal of the money is being wasted by both dispensers and recipients of the aid money. That is not fair to the American taxpayer out of whose pocket comes every penny of the funds sent to foreign countries.

Neither is it fair to give economic aid to those countries whose economics are already in such flourishing condition that they have become competitors of the United States in world markets. Every time a sale of competitive products is made by a foreign country, which has been supported by American money and which would have ordinarily gone to an American industry or business, it deprives American interests of revenue and American workmen of jobs.

If they can compete with us in world markets, including the United States, they most certainly should be able to stand on their own feet, economically speaking.

Military aid is an entirely different matter. There are few free world countries, outside the United States, which can afford to support great military machines without levying taxes to the point where decent living standards could not be provided by their peoples.

America needs the military strength of these nations to back it up if war should break out and arming allied countries is multiplying our own strength to the extent that foreign allies are able to increase their own power.

There are exceptions, of course. These exceptions are poverty-stricken nations where human beings are slowly starving to death and where disease, due to lack of proper medical care, is taking a heavy toll. They should be helped for purely humanitarian reasons.

But there seems to be no question that there has been great waste in our foreign aid programs. Congress is particularly concerned about this. Foreign aid legislation now on its way through the legislative halls provides for a \$19,000-a-year inspector gen-

eral and comptroller for the International Cooperation Administration, the agency now in charge of distribution of foreign aid money.

If he can eliminate the major share of the waste reputed to exist he will have earned his salary many times over, plus the undying admiration of the American people.

YDC Told of Pitfalls at Rally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two newspaper accounts of a speech delivered by Senator GALE McGEE, of Wyoming, on August 8, 1959, at a statewide rally of Young Democrats in Durham, N.C. Senator McGEE delivered a thought provoking and inspiring address that was unusually well received.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News, Aug. 8, 1959]

YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUBS TOLD OF PITFALLS AT RALLY—TALK BY McGEE HEARD BY GROUP

(By Guy Munger)

DURHAM, August 8.—Senator GALE W. McGEE, Democrat, of Wyoming, tonight urged Democrats to develop a long-range national program and not try to build a political party on the blunders of the Republicans.

McGEE was the principal speaker at a dinner which concluded a summer rally of State Young Democratic Clubs here. We were introduced by North Carolina's Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN.

Governor Hodges and numerous State officers and legislators were among the more than 200 persons who attended the dinner.

McGEE said that "while the temptation will be great to get even with the Republicans for winning two presidential elections" in 1952 and 1956, Democrats should resist any "mink, pinks, and stinks" attacks such as the GOP used in its campaigns.

"I don't think you can build a political party on the mistakes of the opposition," the freshman Senator said.

OUTLINES ISSUES

In an interview before the speech, McGEE outlined some of the issues that he thought should be included in the long-range Democratic program:

1. An honest balanced budget, not a Madison Avenue balance. McGEE said the Democrats should survey the Nation's needs, considering national security and demands of a growing population, then draw up a budget that will do the job.

A. An effort to solve the problem of the so-called surpluses in agriculture. McGEE said the surpluses were really failures in distribution.

3. A foreign relations program that will accentuate the positive. For too long, said McGEE, the United States has had a foreign policy which is primarily a negative reaction to the Russian threat. He said the final test will come, not on how the United States has responded to Russian initiative but on how this Nation has approached the problem of

living standards, human beings, people, helping others to help themselves.

McGEE also called for passage of a moderate civil rights bill and effective controls on labor unions. Despite criticism of Senator LYNDON JOHNSON by some Democrats, McGEE said he thought JOHNSON had done a masterful job as Senate majority leader in putting together the variety of opinions of all segments of the party.

[From the Durham Morning Herald, Aug. 9, 1959]

McGEE URGES SPEEDUP AGAINST REDS

(By Herald Staff)

The United States must take a more positive stand in foreign relations and make a dynamic expansion in its domestic economy if it is to meet the challenge of Communist Russia, Senator GALE McGEE, Democrat of Wyoming, asserted here Saturday night.

McGEE, addressing a statewide rally of young Democrats, pointed out that the Soviet Union has been increasing its productive capacity at a rate of 10 percent a year while the U.S. economy has been advancing a mere one and a half percent.

He called for a speedup rather than a slowdown of American production, both industrial and agriculture.

As for international affairs, McGEE warned that the United States too long has taken only a negative stand against communism, "as we should have," but had failed to stress this Nation's own political and economic stature.

"Our resources," said McGEE, "are not armies or jets. The greatest weapon in our armory is ideas."

In an era of awakening peoples, McGEE said, "our Declaration of Independence has fired more revolutions than the Communist manifesto ever did."

What former colonial peoples want, he added, "has nothing to do with Karl Marx or communism or Mr. K."

Rather, he contended, they want the kind of political freedom for which the American colonies fought.

Adding his encouragement to exchanges with the Soviets, the Senator said that "what we have is infectious."

His recommendation for American tourists visiting Russia was that they carry Montgomery Ward catalogs and American magazines—even such Republican periodicals as Time.

McGEE, who visited Russia 3 years ago, praised North Carolina's Gov. Luther Hodges and eight other American Governors who recently urged the upcoming Eisenhower-Khrushchev exchange visits.

Hodges, who attended the Young Democratic Clubs rally, commended McGEE for his blunt address and commented: "That's the kind of talk I would like to hear in the keynote speech at the Democratic convention next year."

The Governor gave the Senator mementoes of North Carolina, including a package of Bull Durham, which made this city and this State famous.

McGEE was introduced by Tar Heel Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN.

Other political leaders here for the rally included Attorney General Malcolm B. Seawell, Labor Commissioner Frank Crane, State Treasurer Edwin Gill, and Insurance Commissioner Charles Gold.

Mrs. B. B. Everett of Palmyra, national committeewoman, and Mrs. Mary Laurens Richardson of Raleigh, vice chairman of the senior party, spoke briefly at the banquet.

Art Vann of Durham, State Young Democratic Clubs president, presided.

The Young Democratic Clubs executive committee chose Asheville as the site for the State Young Democratic Clubs convention to be held October 1, 2, and 3.

In his advocacy of an expanding American economy, McGEE recalled the World War II days when people thought Franklin Roosevelt was crazy for demanding 30,000 planes a year.

Actually, noted the Senator, F.D.R. got 50,000 planes in the all-out effort by American industry.

McGEE also recalled that "another crazy man, Henry A. Wallace" had called for 60 million jobs in postwar America.

Actually, the Nation's industries are employing many more than Wallace's prediction, the Senator pointed out.

The need for expansion, the Senator argued, is imperative because the Soviet Union has gone from the ox cart to the space age in one great leap.

Aid to Federally Impacted School Districts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. MOELLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I made this morning before the Subcommittee on General Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor. That subcommittee is now considering administration proposals to weaken the benefits presently available to school districts with a school age population which includes a substantial number of children of employees of Federal installations. I believe that the effect of these damaging proposals in my district is of sufficient interest to warrant publication in the RECORD as a means of helping to forestall approval of the proposed legislation.

The statement follows:

FEDERAL AID TO IMPACTED SCHOOLS

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the privilege of appearing before you this morning and testifying in behalf of the school systems in my district with respect to proposed changes in Public Laws 874 and 875. I know that you have received a great deal of testimony on this most important problem and I do not wish to take up too much of your time. However, because of the adverse effect the proposals made by the administration to reduce benefits would have on the schools in my district, I do wish to make this brief statement.

Approximately 20 separate school systems in my district have been receiving Federal funds to help support their schools because of the increased school enrollments caused by the influx of people employed by Federal establishments or firms having defense contracts with the Federal Government. These include schools operated by cities, by local school districts, and by certain of our counties. The total amount involved each year, about \$102,000 according to the figures I have at hand, is not large by the standards of many areas or when compared to the total amount of such assistance rendered to all the schools in the United States. However, it bulks extremely large in the tax structure of our local areas which are not among the most prosperous in this country.

Approximately 1,200 school age children of parents employed directly or indirectly by the Federal Government provide the basis for this aid to our schools. By far the largest percentage of these are the children of parents who work in Federal installations not actually located in the school district. The few others are the children of people employed by defense contractors. In any event, they are all so-called B category cases.

Thus, the effect of the administration proposals embodied in the Kearns bill, H.R. 7140, would be to cut the funds our schools are receiving almost exactly in half—from \$102,000 to \$51,000 per year. To impose such an additional tax burden on these 20 school districts would be extremely difficult. I fear that the net result would be a lowering of the standards of education instead. This penalty would apply to all of the children alike, whether their parents were or were not newcomers to the district or were or were not employees of the Federal Government. It is manifestly unfair to ask the citizens of my district or of any area to assume such a penalty, or to shoulder an additional burden of taxes to maintain the standard of education in their schools, when the increased cost of operating the schools can be traced directly to a Federal activity, which must be the case under the present terms of Public Law 874 to make them eligible for the aid they are now getting.

The problem is similar with respect to funds for equipping new school buildings in these areas under Public Law 815. It is expected that increased school enrollments will require abandoning some of our smaller schools and the construction of new consolidated schools to accommodate to the changing conditions. At least a part of such increased enrollments are traceable to the Federal activities of which I have been speaking. I strongly oppose any changes in the present law which would deprive us of the minimum amount of Federal aid in financing this new construction to which we are entitled under the present law.

To address myself for a moment to the philosophy behind Public Laws 874 and 815, it seems to me self evident that when the Federal Government engages in an activity which has among its results the addition of an appreciable number of children to the school rolls in an area, then the citizens of that area have every right to expect that they shall not be required to bear alone the cost of providing for the education of such children. After a great many years, when all the effects of this radical change in the community structure have worn off; when the employment at the Federal activity has been stabilized for a long period of time; when the newly arrived Federal employees have become property owners and have been absorbed into the community completely, with particular respect to their bearing a full share of the tax load; and when the costs of expanded school operations have been completely amortized; then we may think of reducing the amount of Federal aid required. At present, however, the funds we have received from the Government do not begin to pay the fair share of the additional cost which might be expected.

Certainly the time has not yet come when school districts located adjacent to or near other districts in which a Federal installation is actually located should be discriminated against. Where large installations are involved particularly, such as Lockbourne Air Force Base and Whitehall Army Depot near my district, the problem raised is actually greater than that for a school district which may have a part of the installation within its geographic area. These establishments are of such size and employ so many persons that it would be physically impossible for any large percentage of their employees to live in a school district which

at the same time overlaps the installation's boundaries. Thus, the heavier burden is thrown on those nearby communities which house the employees. This is the case for communities in Fairfield County in my district and in Lancaster, the county seat, where I reside. To a lesser extent it involves also school districts in Hocking, Jackson, and Athens Counties.

For that reason I am particularly opposed to the aspects of the Kearns bill which give preferential treatment to school districts within whose bounds a Federal property is located.

As a supplement to these remarks I wish to introduce for the record of these hearings two letters I have received from Mr. J. E. Brown, Superintendent of Schools in Lancaster, Ohio, and from Mr. Paul R. Cummins, Superintendent of the Fairfield County Schools, which give more explicit details with respect to the situation in their jurisdictions.

Thank you Mr. Chairman for your courtesy in hearing me this morning.

Report No. 1's Disturbing Goal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Donald I. Rogers, business and financial editor of the New York Herald Tribune. Mr. Rogers' article appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of August 19, 1959:

REPORT NO. 1'S DISTURBING GOAL

(By Donald I. Rogers)

Most Americans were unaware, undoubtedly, of the existence of an august little Washington group known as the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth, an operation headed by none less than the United States and dedicated to the attainment of a utopian existence in some misty economic Shangri-La.

There has been presented, now, report No. 1 from this Cabinet Committee, for the edification of the rest of us who are presumed to be less thoughtful than those who have spent months contemplating the functioning and malfunctioning of the economic machinery of the land.

The 1,600-word initial document issued by the Cabinet Committee, was entitled "What Do We Really Want From Our Economy?" In case you don't know what you want, it tells you what you should want, if you're a normal American who wants something from his economy.

If you are not a normal American and don't want anything in particular from your economy, it won't benefit you to read the treatise, anyway, chances are you read something like it, or even wrote something like it when you were in high school.

According to a spokesman for the Cabinet group—as you know Cabinet-rank spokesmen must be protected from identity—the primary concern of the committee is to promote the growth of the economy.

This reassuring attitude on the part of the administration will be welcomed by all who might have feared that some Cabinet members were opposed to growth in the economy.

LISTS THREE GOALS

The Nixon task force has come to grips with the whole terrible problem of business

administration in a free society. It decided that rather than come right out with some suggestions, it should first condition us with some educational discussions on the subject. It lists three economic goals of the Republic: (1) Economic growth—that is, a large and expanding output of goods and services; (2) maximum employment opportunities, meaning not only a chance to work, but a chance to hold a kind of job that suits you best; (3) reasonable stability of the price level.

The first two of these goals, revolutionary though they are, sound vaguely familiar. Personally I can't see myself, at my age, doing much about expanding my own output of goods and services. And as for the job that suits me best, I am positively sterling at clipping coupons.

It is the last goal, however, which is disturbing.

Price stability should be no real objective in a truly expanding economy. The words sound nice, like that wonderful bearded phrase of predepression days, "sound fiscal policy," and they're just about as meaningful.

OUTLAWED BY COURTS

The courts did away with fixed prices. They were found unfair and unsatisfactory. Prices that are not fixed are generally "unstable" in the true meaning of the word.

If prices fluctuate in this free economy, it's no more than we can expect, for we do not want to discourage other factors from fluctuating—like wages and production costs.

If what the Nixon committee means is that we should be wary of a too-rapid increase in prices because of inflation, or a too-rapid decrease in prices because of resulting recession, then they're on the right track.

But nowhere in the report is the word "inflation" mentioned.

Maybe it'll be in lesson No. 2.

Slave Labor in Russia Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Khrushchev is visiting America, I am wondering if anyone in a high place will have the courage to call on him to explain why this peace-loving government which he heads continues the terrifying practice of slave labor.

On this subject I would like to include here an open letter to Mr. Harriman which is taken from the American Bulletin which is published by the Czechoslovak National Council of America.

The letter follows discussing slave labor:

OPEN LETTER TO MR. HARRIMAN

Threats were hurled at Mr. Averell Harriman, former U.S. Ambassador to the U.S.S.R., by Mr. Khrushchev himself.

Prior to the interview, Mr. Harriman had written a number of articles on his Russian visit to the New York Times. One dealt with a visit to Krjukovo near Moscow, a "correction center" (June 3). Mr. Khrushchev assured the American visitor that forced labor camps had been dissolved.

Khrushchev's statement is flatly denied in an open letter by Dr. Frank Polak, an escapee from Communist Czechoslovakia,

who had spent 7 years in Soviet slave-labor camps.

"Nikita Khrushchev knew why he permitted Mr. Harriman to inspect the camp in Krjukovo and not a slave camp in Vorkuta, the Urals, or Siberia where millions of inmates still work on construction projects and communications, in factories and mines. In Siberian Norilsk hundreds of thousands of Soviet slaves still work under incredible living conditions. Instead, Mr. Harriman was shown a model labor camp near Moscow where 1,000 inmates live behind barbed-wire fences and work in the camp factory or on constructions. The security chief did not explain, however, that by camp discipline he meant 'the discipline of work,' a favorite Soviet practice of withholding food from a worker if he fails to fulfill his quota, and that nonobservance of the working order is punished by the cat-o-nine-tails treatment, solitary confinement up to 5 days, or transfer to one of the other stricter camps. He did, however, inadvertently admit that there are camps with much harsher regimes. Another important confession unwittingly made by the camp chief concerned work compensation for it shows that there is no difference whatsoever between forced labor camps and the newly labeled 'colonies of correction.' If an inmate completes his norm, he is paid 200 rubles a month from which the authorities deduct 92 rubles for food and clothing (poor as it is). The work output of colony inmates is as high, and often higher, as that of the free workers whose monthly wages, according to Soviet statistics, amount to 700 rubles. In other words an inmate receives only 35 percent of a free worker's wage. The difference between forced and free labor wages is clear profit for the regime and for this reason the Soviet Union does not intend to give up slave labor. Furthermore, without forced labor it would be impossible to colonize and exploit economically the far north and other remote regions."

"The question of forced labor in the U.S.S.R. and the satellites cannot be solved by denying its existence or by giving it another name," writes Dr. Polak, author of two books on slave-labor camps and Communist practices in the Soviet Union. "If the Soviets have dissolved forced labor camps, as they claim, why not permit an impartial Western commission to investigate conditions? The last time the Soviets made such a claim, the United Nations Commission found the opposite to be true and a resolution, condemning Soviet practice, was passed by the General Assembly on December 7, 1954. There the matter rests as nothing has changed."

Walter Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, along with my colleagues and many friends of Walter Lee, I am sorry to learn of his retirement at the end of this session of Congress as Legislative Assistant to the House Subcommittee on Claims.

I have known Walter Lee ever since his arrival on Capitol Hill some 21 years ago. I have always found him to be most affable, most friendly, and most helpful to Members and their staffs. His straightforward advice with regard to the merits of any proposed legislation

was always appreciated. I will miss Walter from the Capitol Hill scene, and I know it will be so with many others, but in his well-earned retirement I wish for him and his family many years of good health and happiness.

Hon. Ken Regan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we in the Texas delegation lost a good friend last week with the passing of our former colleague, Ken Regan. Ken had a brilliant and colorful career and under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include an article from his hometown newspaper:

HON. KEN REGAN

Former U.S. Representative Kenneth M. Regan, 66, died at 7 a.m. Saturday in a Santa Fe, N. Mex., hospital after a long illness. He underwent extensive surgery in Washington last April from which he never recovered.

The colorful Midlander had maintained a home in Santa Fe as well as this city since 1958.

Funeral services will be held at 4 p.m. Monday in the First Presbyterian Church of Midland with the pastor, Dr. R. Matthew Lynn, officiating. Interment is planned in Resthaven Memorial Park.

TEXAN SINCE 1920

The body will be brought overland to Midland Sunday. Newbie W. Ellis Chapel has charge of arrangements here.

Last January, Regan returned to Washington as a representative of Texas railroads.

The former Congressman had come to Texas in 1920 after service as a Signal Corps flier in World War I. He first studied dentistry but decided against drilling teeth and came to Texas to drill for oil instead.

His first well found oil but produced only briefly. Then came a succession of dry holes, but finally he struck and got on his feet.

The wildcatter was elected Pecos city alderman and then served several terms as mayor. He went to bat for ranchers in Austin over an adverse Supreme Court decision on mineral rights, and the ranchmen helped elect him to the Texas Senate.

In the senate, he played an important part in adjustment of inequalities for land left vacant by early surveys and refunds to cotton farmers for pink bollworm protection. He also had a part in acquiring the first land for the Big Bend Park.

Regan served 4 years in the senate, starting in 1933, but did not seek reelection. He was given the unusual honor of being elected president pro tempore as a freshman member. The honor usually goes to a veteran.

WORLD WAR II CAPTAIN

In World War II, Regan was an intelligence officer in the Air Corps, rising to captain. After the war, he moved to Midland, where he continued oil operations. The family home is at 1207 West Texas Street.

The tall, affable Regan went to Congress in 1947 after winning a special election to fill the vacancy when R. Ewing Thomason, of El Paso, resigned to take the Federal bench. He won his first term in 1948, serving the 19-county 16th Congressional District two more terms. He was defeated by

the present Representative, J. T. Rutherford, of Odessa.

NATIVE OF ILLINOIS

Regan was born in Mount Morris, Ill. After coming to west Texas, he acquired farm and ranch lands along with extensive oil properties.

Active in civic circles here, he was a chamber of commerce director, a Mason and Shriner, and a Rotarian.

Survivors include the widow, Roberta, and two brothers in California.

Debt Management Legislation Debacle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on June 8, 1959, the President sent a message to the Congress outlining a legislative recommendation designed to provide for economical management of the public debt. Since that time the Committee on Ways and Means has conducted 3 days of public hearings and spent 11 days in executive session which have, by virtue of a Democratic House leadership decision, produced absolutely nothing. That decision of the majority party came to light yesterday when the majority members of the Committee on Ways and Means, with one exception, voted to suspend any further action on the President's legislative request.

I sincerely regret that the majority party has taken this irresponsible attitude in regard to this urgent legislation. The Democratic decision to do nothing means that the holders of series E and H bonds will be denied a fair return on their investment in America's future, means that the Federal Government will have to continue to finance the huge public debt in the short-term money market in competition with the borrowing needs of small business and consumers, and means that the cost of debt management will be higher than it would have been if this proposal had been favorably acted on.

The Democratic Party must take sole responsibility for this decision. The Democrats have thwarted endeavors by the Republican members of the committee to have favorable action taken on this legislation, and they have rebuffed Republican pledges of support to the leadership on this important proposal.

Mr. Speaker, in this morning's New York Times there was an editorial dealing with this subject. This editorial should receive the thoughtful consideration of the public and certainly of those individuals in positions of responsibility on the Democratic side of the aisle who refused to deal responsibly with this important issue of debt management and fiscal policy.

The editorial follows:

INVITING INFLATION

The House Ways and Means Committee acted yesterday to pigeonhole the request of President Eisenhower that it authorize him to raise the prevailing ceiling on Government bond interest rates, which are 4½ percent in the case of marketable securities and 3.26 percent for savings bonds.

This move, which reverses the committee's approval of such a request only last week, comes not only as a complete surprise but as an extraordinary example of fiscal irresponsibility. It makes strange reading, indeed, when one considers it against the background of the general directive the committee included in last week's approval of the President's request.

"It is the sense of Congress," declared that directive, "that the Government shall take into account . . . the importance of achieving the maximum sustainable rate of economic growth, maintaining reasonable stability of the purchasing power of the dollar, and assuring that the cost of managing the public debt is kept to the minimum consistent with these vital objectives."

In the early postwar years, when the Treasury was insisting on the maintenance of "pegged" rates on Government securities, at least it confined its arguments to (1) the low cost at which the Treasury was able to raise its money, and (2) the bugaboo of a possible collapse of the Government bond market if the "peg" should be removed. Its policies were indefensible in terms of fiscal policy, but at least the Government was not hypocritical enough to argue that it was pursuing this program in the knowledge and belief that it was furthering the policy of "achieving the maximum of sustainable rates of economic growth" coincident with "the maintenance of reasonable stability in the purchasing power of the dollar."

What yesterday's action by the Ways and Means Committee means is that, by denying the Treasury the authority to liberalize the terms under which it can raise the funds it has to raise in the months ahead through the sale of long or medium long securities, thus tapping to that extent the savings of the people, it has compelled it to raise such funds through the sale of short-term paper. Since such paper finds its way largely into the commercial banking system, it is "purchased" by credit created for the purpose—that is, by an inflation of the supply of credit.

Amending Section 5801 of the Internal Revenue Code

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years there has been a need for clarification of firearms legislation to remove inequities which have been shown to exist in present laws. I am very pleased to see the bill which is now before us and which comes to the House with a unanimous favorable report of the Committee on Ways and Means. Identical bills were introduced by me and by other Members of the House following a series of conferences between representatives of the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax

Division, the National Rifle Association, Sporting Arms and Ammunition Manufacturers Institute, American Gun Dealers Association, Importers Association, National Chiefs of Police Association, Metropolitan Police Department, and many individual sportsmen and collectors. It was as a result of these meetings that the legislation now before us was written. I believe that a much better understanding now exists between the various segments of the firearms industry and that there is general agreement that the proposed legislation will be beneficial.

It has taken several years of hard word to get this bill to the floor. One problem has been the difficulty of getting a favorable report from the Treasury Department where there seems to have existed a great deal of misconception regarding the purposes of the legislation and the need for a revision of present legislation. Fortunately, there does exist a better understanding in that agency at this time and I am very glad to note the cooperation which the agency is now giving.

Collectors and sportsmen will benefit in particular from the new language; there can be very little, if any, loss of revenue to the Government by virtue of the reductions of some excessive fees which presently are charged and I can see nothing in this bill that would provide any measure of satisfaction for the criminal element or open any loopholes to them which they do not now possess. In fact, some loopholes will be closed.

The amendments which were added by the committee are in my opinion sound and I trust that the bill as it now appears will speedily be adopted by the House and the Senate and that it will become law.

Politically Potent Rural Postal Men Heartily Welcomed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the Washington Post and Times Herald: [From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Aug. 16, 1959]

POLITICALLY POTENT RURAL POSTAL MEN
HEARTILY WELCOMED
(By Jerry Klutz)

A relatively small group of Federal employees which packs a big political wallop is the Independent National Rural Letter Carriers' Association.

Official Washington, from the President down, went out of its way to give hearty greetings to the nearly 3,000 delegates to NRLCA's 55th annual convention which ended over the weekend.

Few organizations of any kind have come even close to matching NRLCA's long list of distinguished and influential guests who attended its banquet at the Sheraton-Park.

Vice President RICHARD NIXON praised the public service of the group in recalling the extra little favors by the rural carrier who served his family for many years in Whittier, Calif.

But it was House Speaker SAM RAYBURN who expressed the sentiments of many of the 21 Senators and 150 House Members present. Said he:

"Rural carriers are most popular. They take the farmers something they want and they never ask for anything. But when you give them something they always let you know they appreciate it. In contrast, some other groups will say you should have given it to them sooner."

Robert Ramspeck, the toastmaster, recalled that when he was first elected to Congress 30 years ago a politically wise Member had advised him "to stick to the rural carriers because they have more friends than anyone else."

Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield and his top postal staff were generous in their praise of the rural carriers and their organizations. Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, Democrat, of South Carolina, and Representative TOM MURRAY, Democrat, of Tennessee, the respective chairmen of the Senate and House Post Office and Civil Service Committees, joined in heaping praise on the group.

The NRLCA, an organization of 37,000 members, or nearly all active rural carriers, has the respect and good will alike of Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives. It works quietly and effectively with the different political factions to gain its goals. It refuses to indulge in name calling when someone disagrees with it.

NRLCA doesn't give its president a chance to entrench himself and to dominate it. Its presidents usually serve 2-year terms and they return to their rural routes. Half a dozen former presidents, most of them back carrying mail, attended the convention.

Another interesting fact is that rural carriers usually are not selected under a pure civil service system, although their jobs are under the merit system. In fact, the selection process is politically tainted in most instances. The political party in power usually manages to appoint its followers to rural carrier openings in spite of the civil service system.

Charles R. Larson was reelected president for a second 1-year term; Tommy Martin, vice president, and John W. Emeigh, secretary, by the convention. They have offices here in the Warner Building.

Here We Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am certain a recent editorial printed in the Record-Courier of Baker, Oreg., will be of interest to my colleagues. Many of them will recall a contention made by the Idaho Power Co., during the Hells Canyon fight, that private development of the Middle Snake River would be accomplished "at no cost to the United States."

Yet legislation is now before Congress which would pay a Federal subsidy to

the Idaho Power Co. and to other private upstream dam operators for alleged benefits received by the Government at Federal downstream projects. I am unalterably opposed to such legislation and, as I pointed out in my statement before the House Subcommittee on Communications and Power—

It was a mistake to grant a Federal license to this company [Idaho Power Co.] to underdevelop this stretch of the Middle Snake in the first place; it would compound the tragedy to play Santa Claus again and hand the Idaho Power Co. an unanticipated windfall amounting to millions of dollars.

Mr. Byron Brinton, editor of the Record-Courier, is to be commended for his excellent editorial on this subject. I trust his comments will be carefully read by my colleagues:

[From the Baker (Oreg.) Record-Courier, Aug. 6, 1959]

HERE WE GO

During the heat of the recent river resource battle in which a private utility was given Snake River damsites, there crept into the discussion the then-pending legislation which would have granted upstream power companies financial benefits for any water that subsequently went through public project generators lower down the river. The legislation was sidetracked, obviously, so that Idaho Power Co. could avoid any charge that they intended to exert control over the river, because part of the low dam issue was whether the private Wall Street financiers or the people would control the Nation's water.

Sufficient time has now elapsed that the financial interests, thinking the public has forgotten and acting through President Eisenhower's Federal Power Commission, have now reactivated the legislation which would not only permit upstream utilities to have their dam sites and all the power they produce, but would also have the lower power projects belonging to the people pay the non-Federal utilities for the public water that goes through the private dams.

As these ghosts of the Hells Canyon fight come up, we are privileged to from time to time to remind the area that "we told you so." Idaho Power Co. then denied any contention it was seeking a water right. Now the claim to downstream benefits is based on the assumption it has a claim on the water. If that claim is validated by legislation it will cost the public millions of dollars to use its own water for which some of us at least fought so hard to try to get the public to keep.

Not only do the non-Federal utilities expect to exert the water rights granted them—even though they promised they wouldn't, but also they intend to make the taxpayer pay through the nose even though the private low dams were supposed to be a gift of private enterprise to the Nation at no cost to the taxpayer.

And a third ghost of the bitter dam fight is also incorporated in this new effort to gouge the public to the benefit of the private dams. It has to do with the sacredness of obligations. The FPC license has only a few things in it as to what the low dams are to do. One of them in a feeble way attempted to compel the utility to make good its boast that its low dam would be a comprehensive, full development of the river. The license required the company to operate the project and its system in coordination with the Northwest power pool. Now the non-Federal utility people through water legislation are attempting to make the public reimburse them from downstream for water stored upstream when in fact their very license, as one of the condi-

tions of the low-dam grant, required them to coordinate the project hydraulically.

Here we go again. One year it was a river giveaway, then a quick tax writeoff, then a 40-percent tax-free dividend gimmick, now a downstream benefits bill. Thanks to a few of our Congressmen and Senators some of these raids on the taxpayer by the low-dam scheme have not worked. But give the financial crowd time and lower the guard and they'll own the whole river, Grand Coulee, Bonneville, and all. That's the big plum. The little raids on the taxpayer—like the claiming of water rights, tax-free dividends, etc.—are merely little battles along the way—to make the public so calloused it won't know what the big job looks like when it does come.

Politics and the Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, I include Columnist Joseph Alsop's article on labor reform legislation in the Washington Post of August 19, 1959. In this and previous analyses, Mr. Alsop has thoughtfully outlined the key points of view bearing on this issue and, for this reason, his remarks should be made part of the permanent RECORD:

POLITICS AND THE LABOR BILL

(By Joseph Alsop)

The next act in the great labor bill drama is going to be dominated by two forces, one obvious, the other as yet unseen. The force that has emerged already is the conviction of the Congress that the voters want a strong labor reform bill.

The other force will emerge soon. It is the determination of Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, to fight to the end against the specially severe prohibitions of organizational picketing and secondary boycotts that the House of Representatives included in the labor bill.

As the author of the original labor reform bill, and as chairman of the Senate conferees, KENNEDY has the power to deadlock the Senate-House conference. He does not want to do so. He is not opposed to regulation of organizational picketing and secondary boycotts. He wants a compromise. But KENNEDY is convinced that in their present form, the picketing and boycott clauses in the House bill go decidedly too far and are even, in patches at least, doubtfully constitutional.

"What everybody ought to understand," he says, "is that these clauses in the House bill won't make a dime's worth of difference to big labor, including Jimmy Hoffa and his Teamsters. What they will do is bring the union movement in the South to a dead, screeching halt. And I'm not going to vote for that, much as I want labor reform."

If he can get no compromise of the sort he wants, KENNEDY can deadlock the conference, because he can be sure of the support of the Senate's other Democratic conferees. By the same token, a majority of the House conferees will surely support their leader, Representative GRAHAM A. BARDEN, of North Carolina. BARDEN wants the labor reform bill to be as severe as possible, and is far from adverse to impeding the unionization of the South.

As KENNEDY will deadlock the conference if he cannot get a compromise, the question really is whether BARDEN and company will offer a compromise. The answer quite largely depends, in turn, on the estimates of the legislative temper of the House and Senate reached by BARDEN's Republican allies, such as Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona.

The most natural result of a deadlock in conference will be to present the Senate with a choice between no labor reform bill at all, or acceptance, en bloc, of the labor bill passed by the House. If GOLDWATER thinks the Senate will take the unchanged House bill, he is likely to want a conference deadlock. It is not at all impossible that just this conclusion will be reached by GOLDWATER and his fellow Republican conferee, Senate Minority Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois.

Besides all the sectional and labor-management strains, the labor reform bill is also supercharged with presidential politics. On the Republican side, the House's affirmative response to President Eisenhower's plea for a strong bill was very fine ointment, but there was a civil rights fly in it all the same.

House Republican Leader CHARLES HALLECK almost tearfully, and quite unconvincingly, denied any deal to obtain southern support by helping to block action on civil rights. Almost within minutes, the Republican-southern Democratic coalition downright proudly exhibited its unity and power. This kind of thing is not a source of unalloyed delight to Republicans like Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, who think civil rights ought to be a vote-getting Republican issue.

On the Democratic side, Senator KENNEDY's position is painful, but it is slightly less painful than the positions of his rivals. He and his brother, Robert, have worked hard and successfully to make labor reforms their family issue. If KENNEDY votes against the House bill on a matter of principle, he can still hope to retain much of the support he has gained by his own and his brother's work. For the Senate's other Democratic presidential aspirants, however, the choice can lie between being against labor reform, which the country wants, or being against labor, which will have much power at the Democratic convention.

The choice is especially painful for the leading unavowed and inactive candidate, Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas. His State is so desirous of a strong bill that most of the Texas Congressmen, including the Member from JOHNSON's own district, refused to support their revered chief, Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN. Yet labor opposition, if added to JOHNSON's southern handicaps, would be a severe blow to JOHNSON's presidential hopes.

As JOHNSON is in the middle, however, and as he has a genius for finding ways out of dilemmas of this sort, a compromise both he and KENNEDY can vote for may perhaps be agreed on somehow.

The Labor Bill

SPEECH
OF

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8342) to provide for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration

of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, I am in full accord with what I believe to be the overwhelming desire and determination of the people of the United States and the Members of this House to put an end to the racketeering and abuses in the field of labor-management relations as exposed by the McClellan committee.

I long have been ready and am prepared today, if given an opportunity, to vote for a strong and effective bill to drive out the racketeers, chiselers, and hoodlums who have established themselves in the labor movement against the wishes and over the opposition of the great number of legitimate and honest leaders and members of organized labor.

I am equally determined to do all I can to put an end to the just as despicable activities of conniving, bribing, and extortion by middlemen and management in the field of labor relations, as are the overwhelming number of legitimate and honest businessmen.

However, I will not vote for any legislation that, in the guise of racketeering reform, would actually cripple the legitimate activities of millions of honorable union officials and workers.

Last year I voted for the Kennedy-Ives bill which was designed to cure the abuses exposed by the McClellan committee. This bill was approved by a 88 to 1 vote of the Senate but it died in the House on a 190 to 198 rollcall when certain interests decided they would prefer to have an election issue rather than labor legislation.

Of the measures before us today, it is generally agreed that there are really only two choices—the Elliott committee bill, H.R. 8342, and the substitute Landrum-Griffin bill, H.R. 8400.

Robert F. Kennedy, chief counsel for the McClellan committee, and the man who knows the abuses uncovered by the committee better than any other man, has given his all-out support to the committee bill.

Kennedy, whose opposition to labor racketeering has reached the point of a personal crusade, said yesterday that the committee bill would carry out all of the recommendations of the McClellan committee.

Kennedy said the committee bill would provide:

First. Safeguards for union funds, with appropriate penalties for the falsification or destruction of union records and the embezzlement of union dues.

Second. Safeguards for union member rights and democratic procedures, including secret ballots, regular elections and an opportunity for opposing nominations.

Third. Safeguards against secret conflict of interest transactions by, or loans to, union officers.

Fourth. Safeguards against employer payoffs to interfere with union organization, or for sweetheart contracts.

Fifth. Safeguards against the abuse and prolongation of union trusteeships.

Sixth. Safeguards against the use of felons as union officers.

Seventh. Safeguards against the use of picket lines to extort money.

Eighth. Safeguards against hot cargo contracts and fictitious unloading fees.

Ninth. Safeguards against surreptitious and improper activities of undisclosed management middlemen.

While differing in some detail, the Elliott bill and the Landrum-Griffin substitute, as well as the Shelley bill, all agree pretty well on the above points. Page after page of the language is identical. The issue of corruption is well handled in each of the measures.

But the issue before us today is not shall there be labor-racketeering reform. On that point we are all agreed.

The issue is whether or not we should follow the dictates of those whose economic position would be bettered by handicapping the union movement to place in the law under the excuse of "labor reform" legislation that would cancel out the historic balances of basic labor-management relations that over the years have resulted in the greatest opportunities, the greatest advances, and the greatest prosperity for both business and unions that this Nation has ever known.

The same forces that have tried to foster the right-to-work philosophy on this country want that kind of a bill.

The Landrum-Griffin substitute is their bill.

Among other defects, this proposal would virtually put an end to legitimate organizational picketing, a historic right of unions, even under the Taft-Hartley Act. It would impose impossible criminal penalties for actions in the internal working of union meetings. It would leave the vast majority of small unions and managements in the so-called "no man's land" without any uniform relief from the NLRB.

I am in favor of the middle-of-the-road approach advocated by our Speaker and will oppose the unduly restrictive Landrum substitute.

There are three areas in which it is most oppressive:

First. No man's land: The Landrum language on the no man's land is conflicting and generally unsatisfactory. It would pass on to the States the authority to arbitrate cases that the National Labor Relations Board did not accept. Uniform justice would not be possible under this setup. More than half the States now have no machinery for such action. State laws vary widely. The committee bill takes the reasonable approach that every union and management, no matter how small, should have the right to NLRB processes, and calls for the expansion of the NLRB and directs it not to refuse to handle any case.

Second. Hot cargo and secondary boycotts: The Landrum substitute, by unqualifiedly barring hot cargo contracts in all trucking, makes strikebreakers out of all Teamsters and requires them to cross picket lines of any union. The Elliott bill had the same provision applicable to interstate carriers but added wording to specify that the hot cargo contract ban did not apply to a member's right not to cross a primary picket line without losing his job and did not re-

quire a union member to cross a primary picket line.

The Landrum bill made illegal all secondary boycotts in all industries and even banned a union from encouraging individual members to engage in a secondary boycott. Acting in concert to encourage secondary boycotts is banned by present law, which forbids secondary boycotts.

Third, Picketing. The Landrum language would make it virtually impossible for an honest union to picket for organizational or recognition purposes, to advertise by peaceful picketing as "unfair to union labor," despite Supreme Court decisions that permit this as an exercise of free speech.

Specifically, it would outlaw recognition or organizational picketing if the employer recognized another union, if there was a valid election in the past 12 months, if the union could not demonstrate a "sufficient showing of interest"—signed cards of 30 percent—to support a petition for a recognition election or where picketing had been going on for a reasonable time—up to 30 days—and no petition for election had been filed. It contained no provision for a defense if the employer was charged with unfair practices in the election.

The Elliott bill restricted organization picketing but not so severely. It outlawed organizational picketing by a union only if another union was validly recognized by the employer or the picketing union had lost a recognition election within the preceding nine months, and could not show that it had since come to represent a majority of the employees. A charge that the employer had engaged in unfair labor practices in the election would be a defense against an allegation of illegal picketing.

Extortion or blackmail picketing would be banned by both bills.

Should the Landrum-Griffin substitute be finally adopted, the bill will go to conference along with the Kennedy-Ervin bill adopted by the Senate earlier this year.

It is my deep and sincere hope that reasonable minds and responsible attitudes will prevail and out of this conference will emerge a sound, workable and fair bill which will bring about real reform in the labor-management field but which will not destroy the ability of labor to achieve its legitimate objectives.

Labor Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in view of the concern over labor reform legislation among Members of Congress, I would like to call attention to a resolution on labor reform adopted by the Board of Social and Economic Re-

lations of the Methodist Church on April 23, 1959. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the full text of this comprehensive resolution:

LABOR REFORM

The disclosure of corruption, racketeering, and collusion in labor-management relations is of concern to the Christian conscience. The historical teachings of the Judeo-Christian tradition of justice and righteousness call the Christian to appraise the ethical issues involved. The church early recognized the right of workers and employers alike to organize to safeguard and promote their interests (par. 2020, "the Methodist Discipline"). The church has a like concern when irresponsibility and malpractice is uncovered in labor-management relations. The concern of the church is not alone with the intentional graft and abuses that have been uncovered but also with some of the unintentional abuses that can creep into every organization and can be overlooked or concealed by the complexity of the institution.

The values of a materialistic society are revealed in the disclosed racketeering and violations of trust in some labor unions. This same behavior can be found in certain segments of the business community as well. The church calls an entire society to repent when society stresses the status of those who are affluent, rewards those who "get ahead" and are a "success" regardless of the means employed; when society places social approval on acquisitiveness for its own sake and rewards the gaining of profit regardless of the social effects. These are the temptations of other segments of society beside the labor unions. However, this can in no way become an excuse for the labor unions to fail to remove the abuses and corruption for which they are responsible.

It is important to recognize that though we are rightfully concerned with the evident abuses in labor unions, these evils are not a general practice of most labor unions and are found only in a minority of cases. The Senate committee investigating labor-management corruption cautioned in its published report that it, "in no way intended to reflect on the overwhelming majority of the labor unions and businessmen of the Nation, of whose integrity the committee is firmly convinced." We should beware of the danger that in suggesting reforms we go beyond those which are necessary and wise and actually hamper and harm the legitimate role labor unions play in the development of our economy.

Among the abuses that need correction within certain sections of labor-management relations are:

1. Lack of democratic procedure in some unions.
2. Unwarranted control by an international over local union.
3. The misuse of union funds, particularly expense accounts, pension funds, and health and welfare funds.
4. Collusion between employers and union leaders.
5. Illegal and improper actions by certain managements, unions, and certain industrial relations consultants.
6. Infiltration of gangsters into some unions.
7. Lax policies of law enforcement.

If these problems are to be met adequately and in ways by which a continuing program of correction is made possible, both now and in the future, reform will have to take place at least on four levels:

I. PERSONAL INTEGRITY

When dealing with labor reform, no legislation by the Government nor changes within the corporate structure of the union are ever a substitute for the basic need of personal

integrity. This need for personal integrity and responsibility is universal and is most needed in people elected to positions of leadership. The church must encourage men of integrity who are presently in leadership in labor unions and encourage others of similar qualities to be willing to accept leadership. There is also a need for personal integrity and responsibility on the part of the rank and file of the union members. A responsible union is one in which the members do actively participate. Only with basic integrity on the part of union members and leaders will the labor movement continually be able to play its proper and constructive role in our economic life.

II. WHAT THE UNIONS CAN DO

We recognize and wish to encourage the move on the part of unions to institute internal reform measures, such as, AFL-CIO Ethical Practices Committee, the Appeal Board of the International Upholstery Union, and the Public Review Board of the UAW.

There are other reforms which unions can institute:

1. Giving honest respect to opposition within unions by creating a climate of free discussion and debate where minority viewpoints are freely welcomed. (This may demand that some unions will have to remove from their constitutions any provisions which prohibit criticism of leadership and limit the freedom of members during union elections. This would demand specific guarantees in the constitutions of these unions of freedom of speech, expression and right of petition.)
2. Regular elections of officers by secret ballot.
3. Full public disclosure of union funds, and particularly such as pension, health and welfare funds.
4. Creation of public review agencies to which aggrieved union members can appeal.

III. ENFORCEMENT OF EXISTING LAWS (Federal and State)

Enforcement of existing laws is sometimes bypassed by both labor and management. At the same time both seek legislation to control their opposites while decrying legislation affecting themselves as meddling in the affairs of free men.

Regulatory laws, Federal and State, are in existence which if properly enforced would control many of the malpractices which have developed in labor-management relations.

Just laws serve the Nation and protect and extend the freedom of persons in the community. Their effective enforcement will aid in the development of good labor-management relations.

IV. SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR NEEDED LEGISLATION

There are areas of labor-management reform which should be covered by new legislation if the public good and the welfare of workers and management is to be protected. Existing statutes regulating these relationships should be amended in the light of 12 years of court and agency decisions. Constructive legislation to provide for labor-management reform should include:

1. A requirement for all unions to hold elections at regular intervals (not less than every 4 years) conducted by secret ballot, without restraint and upon due notice and to conduct the business meetings of the union according to customary democratic procedures.
2. A requirement for all unions to file with the Department of Labor, and/or proper State authorities adequate financial reports, these reports to be furnished to all union members.
3. A requirement for financial reports of all pension, health, and welfare funds, including those administered by management, to be filed with the Secretary of Labor and/or proper State authorities. For example, the report should include the amount of rebates

and commissions and to whom and when paid.

4. In order that there be no conflict of interest, a requirement for unions, union officers, and employers to file with the Secretary of Labor and/or local State authorities reports of any financial transactions between them other than bargaining agreements.

5. A requirement for a clear delineation of the rights and authority of the international and member local unions one to another.

6. A requirement for a secret ballot on all strike votes with due notice to the entire membership.

7. A requirement that striking union members may participate in decertification elections.¹

8. A requirement that unions may strike "farmed-out work."²

9. A requirement that there be proper supervision of union trusteeships.

¹ When a manufacturer or producer accepts work from a plant on strike, then the union should have the right to use sanctions against that producer or manufacturer.

² When in a strike situation an employer hires new workers to take the jobs of those on strike, the striking workers should have the right also to participate in an NLRB election to determine the legitimate bargaining agent.

Pandora's Box in the Caribbean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, much has been written about the Dominican Republic in the last couple of years, both good and bad, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and in the press. Peter Edson, in the Washington Daily News for August 14, 1959, has summed up the two points of view rather neatly. If we could leave the box he speaks of unopened and just enjoy the outside, it would be pleasant indeed. However, it is perfectly natural to want to see what the box contains, and inside we find the sordidness described with some restraint by Mr. Edson.

Under a previous consent I include his article:

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC RIDDLE

(By Peter Edson)

The United States is in something of a box over its relations with the Dominican Republic.

The outward appearance of the box shows this little country costing the United States less money and trouble than any other Latin American government. Its aid program is under \$200,000 a year. This all goes to 13 Americans giving technical assistance in education.

The United States signed a military assistance agreement with the Dominican Republic in 1956. It had a U.S. Air Force mission for 5 years. Now there is only a 13-man naval mission, running a training program on antisubmarine warfare. Arms shipments to the Dominican Republic are embargoed.

The United States has made no loans to the Dominican Republic. Its economy is one of

the solidest in Latin America. Up to now it has had a favorable trade balance with the United States exporting principally sugar, coffee and cacao.

Private American investments in the little country—under three million people in an area about the size of Vermont and New Hampshire, east of Haiti on the Island of Hispaniola—are \$100 million. There are 6,000 Americans there, many of them Puerto Rican.

Diplomatic relations are correct under the U.S. policy of maintaining friendship with all Latin American countries without intervening or implying either approval or disapproval of their internal form of government.

That is the good side of the United States-Dominican Republic relations—the outside of the box, so to speak. The inside of the box makes an entirely different story and it smells terrible. This may come out at the current Santiago, Chile, conference of Latin American foreign ministers, with dire consequences.

U.S. relations with the Dominican Republic's dictator Trujillo regime began to go to pot in 1956 over a succession of incidents.

First was the disappearance of Gerald Lester Murphy, an American pilot believed to have flown a drugged revolutionary leader, Jesus Gallindez, back to an unknown fate in the Dominican Republic.

Second was the failure of Rafael L. Trujillo, Jr., son of the Dominican Republic's Generalissimo, to win a diploma from the U.S. Army Command and Staff School at Fort Leavenworth. This followed his goings-on with Kim Novak and Zsa Zsa Gabor in Hollywood.

This caused the Dominican Congress to pass a resolution denouncing all U.S. aid agreements. This was never put in effect by the Dominican executive branch of government and it was later revoked.

But in October 1958 it was revealed that the Dominican Secretary of Commerce had written eight U.S. chambers of commerce—with copies to the State governors—recommending action against Congressmen "vilifying the Dominican Republic."

Finally, the Dominican Republic granted asylum to dictators Juan Peron of the Argentine, Perez Jimenez of Venezuela, Fulgencio Batista of Cuba and Rojas Pinilla of Colombia. This did not endear Trujillo in Latin America.

Liquor on Airplanes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, there has been a considerable amount of discussion in regard to the serving of liquor on the airlines, and I would like to take this opportunity to let my colleagues know my feelings on this matter.

Effective regulation of the consumption of alcoholic beverages on domestic airplane flights has become increasingly difficult since the practice has become more prevalent. This fact has been attested to by those who should know best, namely, the Airline Pilots Association and the Airline Stewards and Stewardesses Association. It is their contention that the practice of serving alcoholic

beverages on airplanes is a deterrent to the efficient operation of the crew and that it creates a potential safety hazard.

There are also many passengers who object to the serving of alcoholic beverages in the close confines of an airplane where they can neither avoid the obnoxious inebriate nor can they be certain that the disgusting "drunk" will not be a danger in the event of an emergency. He may, in fact, even create an emergency.

Strict regulation, or curtailment, of the practice of selling or serving alcoholic beverages on airplanes has been urged by these groups, then, not on moral grounds as a prohibition measure, but because the practice causes unnecessary discomfort to other passengers, interferes with the efficient operation of a flight, and constitutes a potential safety hazard.

In hearings held by the 85th Congress about this same problem, the testimony of many witnesses supports the view that self-regulation by airlines has not appreciably remedied the situation. The airlines usually adopt one of two codes in an effort to control alcoholic consumption on flights. One code specifies that only two drinks may be sold or served to any one passenger. The other code places no specific limitation on the number of drinks which may be sold or served to any one passenger except that only two may be sold to any passenger who appears to have become intoxicated. In all codes, however, the airline crew is cautioned to be careful never to imply to a passenger that he is intoxicated. According to the testimony of airline crew members, this latter stipulation has rendered the administration of most rules controlling the consumption and sale of alcoholic beverages on flights virtually impracticable. For instance, the present regulations which allow the serving and sale of alcoholic beverages on flights have left effective control of the passenger who brings his own alcohol on board in a virtual "no man's land." When alcoholic beverages are sold on a plane it is also very difficult, if not impossible, to refuse to allow a passenger on board who has obviously been drinking unless he is intoxicated. Two drinks for this passenger may be too many.

It is true that the captain of a plane has the authority to deplane an obnoxious or unruly imbibor. But the physical operation of this rule makes it a "last resort" in that obviously, it is not always possible to land a plane immediately. The very fact that alcohol is served on airplanes makes such rules ambiguous, and, of necessity, the crew is more lax in invoking the measure of either deplaning an inebriated passenger or refusing him aboard the plane.

According to pilots', stewards', and stewardesses' testimony, the present regulations do not afford them a truly practicable means of controlling alcohol in the air. For instance, in one of the few incidents cited in which an inebriated passenger was deplaned, this procedure was invoked because the man was waving a gun and had become violent. An-

other inebriated passenger removed himself voluntarily when he mistook the main cabin exit for another door.

The problem of controlling the unpleasant or even potentially dangerous results of allowing the consumption of alcoholic beverages on flights is uniquely related to compact size of an airplane. There can be no separated club car or an isolated lounge as there can be on a train or an ocean liner. Only one obnoxious drinker may cause extreme embarrassment and difficulty on an airplane, whereas on an ocean liner or a train, the situation may be remedied more readily as there are more facilities for separating such a passenger from others.

An airplane is built and manned with a view toward maximum efficiency and safety. Yet the actions of one inebriate may even require that the pilot leave the controls to cope with him. This clearly is neither safe nor efficient, but it has occurred on those flights which serve alcoholic beverages. Although there has been no airplane accident which was conclusively attributed to the actions of an inebriate, it was pointed out by many qualified witnesses during the hearings that it hardly seems necessary to wait for an accident before we make any provisions to prevent one.

I share the opinion of many, including the majority of airline pilots, stewards, and stewardesses, that the only effective way to control the unique problems resulting from the consumption of alcohol by passengers on airplanes is to completely prohibit it. It is, I am convinced, the responsibility of this Congress to provide the necessary legislation to prevent a practice which affects the safety and well-being of many Americans and their families.

Herbert Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Herbert Hoover is one of the greatest men in the history of the world. His life and service is an inspiration to me personally in my work here in the Congress. I doubt if any contemporary world figure could have endured the false charges and abuse with the same dignity, lack of vindictiveness, and total absence of bitterness. Mr. Hoover's character, patriotism and forgiving spirit should be emulated by every young American. The following article by Jim Bishop is a great tribute to our former President on his 85th birthday. I wish for Herbert Hoover many more happy birthdays and years of outstanding service to the United States.

The article follows:

HERBERT HOOVER: A BIRTHDAY SALUTE (By Jim Bishop)

The pencil whirls, dances, pirouettes. It fashions the letters, the words, the sentences, the thoughts of the man behind it. He sits impassively at a catercornered desk 31 stories above Park Avenue in New York City, writing another book. He does all of his own writing. Herbert Hoover, at the age of 85, has four books in the making. He is, from any angle, a 170-pound slab of stone which only a mining engineer could identify.

This is an enduring rock, one which has known the crashing foam of adversity and the warm flow of public acclaim. The edges of the rock have been worn smooth by these contrary actions and now, in the late years, Herbert Hoover appears to be a bigger, better, sounder statesman than ever.

The pencil stops. The 31st President of the United States stands. He selects some finished sheets, and gives them to the little lady with the big eyes, Miss Bernice Miller. She is Mr. Hoover's longtime chief secretary. She is also his fence of barbed wire against the rude intrusions which plague all authors.

"I will file these papers," Mr. Hoover says. He lifts some from his desk and drops them into a wastebasket. "My filing cabinet," he says, looking solemnly at Miss Miller. He walks around the edge of the desk to one of the two radios in the room. There is a steady, deliberate quality in almost everything that Mr. Hoover does.

His step is brittle, but the face and frame have not aged in keeping with the tick of time. Any child who studies American history would be able to pick the face of Herbert Hoover out of a crowd. The thick shock of hair is now white and thin and combed straight back. The brows are thicker and heavy with frost. The face is square, as always, and the skin is like a polished apple. The blue eyes, now more deeply set, twinkle with humor. The stiff collar has been replaced with a soft one, but the tie, as always, hangs slightly to the right of center. The hands, big and well muscled, are as certain reaching for his pipe as they once were reaching for a piece of quartz.

Hard work and curiosity, it would appear, keep the ex-President young. He puts in 10 or 11 hours at work in any normal way. If, in the middle of the night, he awakens with what he thinks is a good thought, he will get out of bed, walk into the combination living room and office in the Waldorf Towers, and write. But he says most 4 a.m. thoughts go into the wastebasket at 9 a.m.

His curiosity, especially in the field of public affairs, is insatiable. He listens to news broadcasts almost as frequently as a foreign monitor. Sometimes, he will tune in on the hourly news and then, 30 minutes later, listen to another broadcast hoping for later dispatches.

Added to this, he uses all mealtimes to invite statesmen, domestic and foreign, for conversation and an exchange of views. The Chief, as almost everyone calls him, is a good listener and an able oral fencer. People are invited to sit with him at breakfast, at lunch, and at dinner.

He seldom listens to television, unless a public affairs program is shown, or a baseball game. Mr. Hoover is a San Francisco Giants fan. That is his hometown. Long ago, in college, The Chief played shortstop. He could not have been clever because, as a matter of fact and tact, his teammates talked him off the field by offering to make him manager.

He sits near the radio, facing an oil portrait of Lou Henry Hoover, his late wife. The blue eyes flicker over the sweet face, but not a word of sentiment passes the lips of this

man. His personal feelings are his own, and he shares them with no one. She died 15 years ago, and the portrait remains young as he grows older and older.

Miss Henry was a good student at Stanford. She, as well as her future husband, earned a bachelor's degree. He was a young and very serious mining engineer. She became a whiz at languages, including Chinese. The first book Mr. Hoover published was "Principles of Mining" still a college textbook. But more important was a translation from the Latin of "De Re Metallica," a book about mining written in 1556. The translation bears Mrs. Hoover's name as well as his.

There were 44 years of marriage before Mrs. Hoover died in 1944. There are two sons, both engineers. Herbert Junior was Under Secretary of State; Allan is with a banking firm. There are six grandchildren; nine great-grandchildren.

Mrs. Hoover's blue Chinese porcelain pieces now stand in his livingroom, cherished cups and bowls hundreds of years old selected over a long period during and after the time they lived in China. Mr. Hoover studies them, smiles a little, and says: "They belong to my daughters-in-law. I'm allowed to keep them as long as I live here."

This man, gracious and impersonal, first came to public attention in World War I, when he was 43. President Woodrow Wilson appointed him to be U.S. Food Administrator. Hoover fed millions of undernourished people in Europe so well that President Wilson, a Democrat, moved the young Republican up step-by-step in his economic councils.

Hoover did not hold press conferences, make claims or take bows. He was the cloistered monk of the Wilson and Harding regimes. Even today, if his name comes up in conversation, someone is bound to say: "Love the way he runs that FBI."

This particular Hoover always had a couple of jobs running simultaneously. In 1921, he was Secretary of Commerce. At the same time, he was Chairman of the Colorado River Commission, a member of the Federal Narcotics Board, on the Federal Board for Vocational Education, on the Committee on Organization of the Executive Department and a member of the Advisory Committee for the Limitation of Armaments Conference.

Mr. Hoover cut down on his outside work when he served as President of the United States in 1929-33. Many people blamed him personally for a worldwide depression which was in the making before he assumed this high office. From 1933 until 1946, when the Democrats mentioned his name, it was with malicious glee. The Republicans tried not to think of him.

Then Harry Truman brought the chief out of obscurity. The Missourian has respect for anyone who holds high office and, although it is hardly in the province of a Democrat to resurrect a Republican, Mr. Truman asked Mr. Hoover to be Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. The chief, then 73, thanked him and went to work. He served in the same capacity again in 1953-55 and did himself and his Nation proud.

Little by little, the Republican Party began to take the chief to its heart. Convention by convention, the welcomes became louder, more vociferous. Herbert Hoover was one of the two living former Presidents in 1956, when the Republicans in San Francisco gave him a bigger ovation than they did Eisenhower.

Still, work is the last of Herbert Hoover's old friends. He labors a full day in his hotel suite and covers a few miles walking from

his desk to the other parts of the office. The suite of rooms is large and comfortable. As Hoover's activities grew in the post-Presidential years, so did the space requirements. Four of the rooms are offices. There are two bedrooms (one for visiting children), a dining room, a living room and a service kitchenette. Mr. Hoover works in the south side. The staff is on the north side.

There are seven persons—all women—working for Mr. Hoover. Miss Miller runs the office. Mrs. Loretta Camp, of Florence, N.J., has been secretary to Mr. Hoover for 20 years. Miss Marietta Fuller of Brooklyn and Miss Ellen Brumback of Toledo, Ohio, assist him in research. The others are assistant secretaries. Among former secretaries of Mr. Hoover who did well in life are Lewis Strauss, Robert A. Taft and Christian Herter.

Appointments are kept to the minute. Should a friend be invited to lunch at 1 p.m., Mr. Hoover doesn't expect him at 12:55 or 1:05. He is as conscious of time as a navigator. His daily life is an instrument of precision with little tolerance.

He is out of bed shortly after 7 a.m. Most men of his station have a valet; a man of 85 would be expected to have some assistance. Mr. Hoover does everything for himself. By 8 he is in the living room reading the morning newspapers. He reads them column by column, page by page.

At 9, his guests are present for breakfast. It may be a foreign minister, a university president, a journalist—it may be all three. The Chief talks softly, steadily, eyes veiled under the brows, a small part of his attention devoted to the food. The others speak a little loudly, because Mr. Hoover's hearing is impaired. He does not wear a hearing aid.

Within an hour, the breakfast is over and the morning mail ready. Letters are stacked on his desk in four piles. The first is fan mail; he reads practically all of it. Invitations are in a second pile; across some of these, he scrawls, "decline with thanks," across others, "decline gently." Mail which does not require his immediate attention, but is written by people known to the Chief, is in a third pile. Important mail makes up the fourth pile.

He disposes of this chore quickly. Neither words nor minutes are wasted. He knows what is in his mind to do, and there is no hesitation. When it is done, he reaches into a deep dish filled with yellow pencils. He picks one, sets out some sheets of paper, and marshals his thoughts. No phone calls except the most urgent are put through as Mr. Hoover works on his book.

This one is called "An American Epic," and treats of American relief work in Belgium and France and, more than that, will deal comprehensively with American relief all over the world in the last 45 years. He works steadily, referring to charts and statistical tables and published research. Should he tire, or the fluid thought congeal, he stops, stands and tunes in a news broadcast.

Or he may do a little work on the Boys Clubs of America, of which he is chairman, or put in a little work on a few of the dozen charities, scientific institutions and universities of which he has management responsibilities. After he passed his 80th year, Mr. Hoover tried to trim his workload and resigned from all 12 temples of learning and science. Not one would accept the resignation.

"The idea behind the Boys Clubs," he says, "is to teach young boys that it is better to join a team than a gang." When the Chief assumed the direction of these clubs—most of which are located in slum areas—the organization included 50 clubs. It now has 529 clubs with an increase of from 140,000 boys to over 800,000.

"In one part of Chicago," he said, "the court required 10 men just to book juvenile delinquents, and 85 percent of the boys were in the hands of the police during a year. We put a Boys Club in that area. Not long ago I was in Chicago. The magistrate called on me. He said that only one man is needed for work in juvenile delinquency and the crime rate was under 12 percent."

At 1 p.m. lunch is served in the dining room and a few guests sit with Mr. Hoover for up to an hour. At 2, he moves off to his room for a nap. At 3 he is back at work with a fresh pencil.

Word by word, page by page, the new book comes to life. He seldom indicts anyone, even a political enemy. No one hurt Hoover more than Franklin D. Roosevelt, who not only defeated him in the campaign of 1932, but who also blamed him for the depression. Still, in the Hoover books, he quotes the Roosevelt charges and says with gallantry, he was "misinformed"; he was "mistaken."

In spite of the great humanitarian work Mr. Hoover has done for the world, he is one of the least known of American Presidents, and this is his fault because the side he has chosen to present to the public is one of cold dignity. I sat talking with him one noon about the ovation he received at the Republican National Convention in 1956 at San Francisco. He smiled a little. "Yes," he said softly, looking down at his napkin, "that was immediately after the autograph incident."

"The autograph incident?" I said.

He nodded. "At the foot of the ramp, behind the speaker's platform, two men were ready to escort me up. The music started. A spotlight was turned on. At that moment"—he looked up, the twinkle was back in his eyes—"a lady came up to me and asked if I would give her my autograph."

"I said 'Yes, if you have a pen and some paper.' The men were pulling at me and the lady was rummaging through her purse. She found a pen, but she couldn't find a piece of paper. It was embarrassing. I said that I would have to go on. She looked at me and held up one of her knees and smoothed the hem of her skirt on it. 'Would you please autograph this?' she said."

Mr. Hoover chuckled.

"Tell me," I said, "did you autograph the hem?"

"Of course I did," he said laughing. "At my age a man doesn't get many joyous moments like that."

He works unremittingly until 5:30, when the afternoon newspapers are brought in.

At 7:15 guests arrive for dinner. A dry martini is served, and Mr. Hoover sits happily and expectantly, like a schoolboy at a picnic. He enjoys the exchanges of ideas with people who have earned his respect. An entire hour is given to this meal.

By 8:30 Mr. Hoover and his guests are in the living room. It is always a small group, from three to five persons on the average. If there are more, and two or more speak at once, he cannot understand and it irritates him to miss anything.

Sometimes he will suggest a game of canasta. Sometimes the guests will sit on the broad settees and talk. At 10 p.m. the guests begin to make their farewells. Coats and hats are brought in, and the Chief leads the way to the door. His right hand comes up in half-salute and he bows to the ladies. In a half hour Mr. Hoover is in his room getting ready for bed.

He is alone, yet not lonesome. He is accustomed to doing his own thinking, and his own work. At the age of 85, no one helps this man—this rock—with his shoes or his tie. He believes in God and he subscribes to the credo that God will help those who help themselves. Don't forget, he plans to complete four more books.

Freedom in the Western Hemisphere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a most interesting and impressive article from a recent edition of Latin American Events entitled "A Brief Sketch of Editor Dr. Nunez Portuondo."

I think that we will all agree upon the great desirability and the need of maintaining the most cordial, friendly, and mutually helpful relationships with our Latin American neighbors.

We are bound together as members of the Western Hemisphere community of nations and we truly cannot do too much to further and advance the great cause of hemisphere friendship and solidarity.

Nor can we do too much to combat the malignant and evil activities of the Marxists conspiracy whose minions are so busily engaged in trying to divide us from our Latin American friends so that communism can destroy free institutions and control and dominate free nations.

We must be deeply interested, too, in supporting and helping honest and sincere democratic governments and leaders in this hemisphere dedicated to the high aims of preserving our free religious, economic, social, and political institutions.

We must not only view with alarm the presence of terror and ruthless dictatorship, murder, and corruption, but as a matter of national policy, we must be committed to join with all truly liberty-loving God-fearing, democratic-minded peoples to safeguard and preserve the free heritage of democracy and justice which is currently so gravely threatened and imperiled by monolithic communism.

We must ever continue to recognize that freedom is the central theme of the all-American political systems. Wherever it is threatened or repudiated by force, violence, and conspiracy, that great, priceless freedom of ours is in danger.

The article follows:

A BRIEF SKETCH OF EDITOR, DR. NÚÑEZ PORTUONDO

After a lifetime dedicated to international problems and principally devoted to the annihilation of the most damnable plague of the centuries—communism; and after trying to bring about a better understanding between the countries and Governments of Latin America and the United States of America, I have come to the conclusion that the majority of mistakes, many of which have caused incalculable damages to the solidarity between the Americas and have facilitated the development of Russian imperialism, that they are the result principally of the lack of adequate information about the problems and aspirations of these countries and governments.

For the last 7 years I have been the permanent representative of Cuba to the United Nations; I have been, during a 2-year period, a member of the Security Council of the United Nations and of its Disarmament Com-

mission. I have presided at each body on two occasions: in the difficult days of the conflict for the Suez Canal and during the barbaric invasion of Hungary by the Soviet hordes. For 3 years, I also represented my country in the Socio-Economic Council of the United Nations. I have attended, as a delegate of Cuba, a great many inter-American conferences.

I have always been of the opinion that it is necessary to unite all the countries and governments of the world to stop the advance of international communism. I feel, for many reasons, the United States of America is the natural and logical leader for the democratic cause and freedom throughout the world. Precisely because I have held firmly to this opinion, the spokesmen of the Moscow government has singled me out as the No. 1 enemy of international communism in Latin America. They have pictured me through their press, magazines, radio, and television as an unconditional servant of the United States of America and its foreign policy. Of course, this accusation is false. It is enough to read the minutes of the diaries of the sessions of the General Assembly, of the Socio-Economic Council, and of the Security Council of the United Nations to prove that no state no matter how powerful has acted in a more independent manner than Cuba in the last 7 years. I never undermined a vital interest of the United States because I feel that anything that may weaken it in these tragic times in which we live means helping the Soviet Union, her satellites, and secret allies so that they will succeed in their objective to convert all the world into a vast concentration camp.

With the same sincerity I must offer my opinion that I have been able to ascertain that the American people and its ruling bodies, as a general rule, lack the proper information about the existing problems beyond the confines of their geographical frontiers. This ignorance about Latin America and its political affairs, economic and social problems, is surprising and sad. There are some in America who consider us semi-savages with a very low standard of civilization and culture, incapable of enjoying the fruits of freedom and democracy.

The main obstacle to the rightful understanding between Latin Americans and North Americans is the erroneous concept of many American citizens that think that their way of life, their culture, their philosophy, and their science are unique and perfect. These groups of Americans feel that we must follow their guidance because we are incapable of doing for ourselves. They cannot see that the Anglo-Saxon countries have to be different, in virtues as well as in defects, from the Latin Americans, of Latin origin. Different but one not necessarily better than the other. This is also the main obstacle between a better understanding between the rest of the world and the United States of America.

I believe that the United States has made the mistake of not appreciating adequately the importance of Latin America, from the political point of view as well as from the economic point of view. Military alliances of great importance may be made outside America, but it is quite obvious that in case of war with the Soviet Union, the position of the United States would be untenable without the loyal adherence of all the Latin American nations. To count with this loyal adherence as a sure thing and unconditional is an error of incalculable consequences.

When a pro-Communist and anti-American regime took over in my country and I resigned irrevocably the office of Ambassador from Cuba to the United Nations, I find it a duty, following the trajectory of all my life, to try to inform in a truthful and impartial way the public and the ruling bodies of

the United States what I think are the true conditions in the countries and governments of Latin America. I will also inform the Latin Americans of the true intentions of the United States in their relations with us.

To this end we are going to start our task by publishing a weekly letter, in English, which we will send to anyone interested in knowing our opinions, and facts about our America, and on some occasions we will give our opinions on world problems. Later, we will publish weekly letters in Spanish with different contents, trying to inform the different Latin American countries about events and decisions of the Government in Washington which may require explanations so that they can be rightfully interpreted. Fundamentally, because we think it is the most important, we will expose the gigantic maneuver which the Kremlin is undertaking to gain important factions of the public opinion and territories in the Latin American nations.

Labor-Management Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8342) to provide for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, what we are voting on today is the industrial survival of the North. Let us put the cards face up on the table.

Our distinguished colleagues from the Southland know exactly what they are doing, and at least they are loyal to their constituents. If they can hoodwink Republican Congressmen of the North into joining with them in the raid on northern industries, I cannot withhold the compliment of saying that they are smarter than their allies.

And yet, Mr. Chairman, while they are smart on one front, I sometimes wonder if on another front they exhibit the same evidence of awareness.

While to the industrial advantage of the South in its economic cold war with the North they are playing cronies with northern Republicans, very quietly, very cleverly, very effectively northern Republicans have infiltrated into ownership and control of the great newspapers of the South. Today most of the great daily newspapers south of the Mason and Dixon line are owned and controlled by northern Republicans. Temporarily the local managements of these Republican-owned newspapers play the southern game, taking on the garb of virtuous independence and seemingly adopting southern viewpoints, but when the shots are called on matters that count the command comes from Republican ownership north of Mason and Dixon.

I am not quarreling with the march of progress. I merely am pointing out the outlines of that progress that those who take the trouble to note what I am saying may make their own appraisements. The fact is that the old southern editors, men like the late Col. P. J. H. Mooney of the Scimitar in Memphis, are gone. Northern Republicans call the shots.

So when I see northern Republicans march up the aisle with southern Democrats, who no matter how much they may differ with their northern brethren in some areas do have a common share in the democratic heritage of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, I wonder really who is being hoodwinked and who is being duped.

PRICE OF THE PRESIDENCY IN 1952

It may gain a temporary political advantage for northern Republicans to gang up with southern Democrats to speed the departure of mills and factories from Illinois, Michigan, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and the other States in the Middle West, the East, New England. Conceivably in the election of 1960 the alliance might bring a repetition of 1952 when Southern States gave their electoral votes to General Eisenhower and the price was paid in full by northern Republicans voting with southern Democrats to give to four Southern States the tidelands oil potentially worth twice the amount of the national debt and which thrice the Supreme Court of the United States had decreed belonged to all the people of the United States.

In those tideland oils was the wealth to carry the heavy load of popular education for all the children of all the States in the Union. There was the wealth, once the properties were developed, to pay off the huge national debt and restore this country to a condition of solvency, when every citizen could go to bed at night in the calm reflection that his country owed to no man as much as 1 red penny.

The alliance still holds that gave these properties, thrice by the Supreme Court of the United States declared to be the properties of all the people, to Southern States for their exclusive use and advantage.

I see no inconsistency with what is happening now with the giveaway of the tidelands oils properties to pay a Republican political debt.

SOUTH CONSCIOUS OF GREAT CHANGES

A great change is taking place in our United States, and of some of the repercussions the South is conscious and its Members in the Congress are alert. I am not as sure as the Republican leadership that the North is asleep in its complacency. There is too much talk in my own city of Chicago of industries planning the hike southward to contradict the Republican gamble on a complacent North. What happened to the textile industry of New England can happen to the industry of the Middle West.

From 1946 to 1954 there was an alarming migration of textile plants to the South.

In the Mid-Atlantic States—New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania—some 190 textile firms employing 56,000 textile workers were liquidated in that period. These figures only refer to liquidations and do not take into consideration the hundreds of firms whose plants in 1954 were only operated from 50 to 75 percent of normal operations. In fact, the textile industry which employed around 1,280,000 in 1948, 6 years later employed some 950,000, a total loss of some 330,000 jobs.

In a speech before a meeting of the American Management Association in the fall of 1955, John C. Whitaker, chairman of the board of R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. of North Carolina, condemned some southern communities for trying to lure plants from the North with promises of cheap labor and tax concessions.

"Such companies do not make good employers or first-class neighbors, no matter where they are located," Mr. Whitaker was quoted as saying in the New York Times of September 29, 1955.

Since 1955 the drive has been intensified. Its threat holds over the city of Chicago. It is a real, an immediate threat. As industrial plants need modernizing, just as the textile plants faced that need, Southern States reach out for them with the inducement of tax exemptions and cheap nonunion labor. Let my Republican colleagues from the North who today are voting with the South to take industries from the North and replant them in the South not underestimate the intelligence of our northern people.

MULTI-BILLION-DOLLAR DRIVE

I have said that inducements to northern industry to run away to the South are: First, financial help in relocation and exemption from taxes, and second, low nonunion labor. From the northern standpoint, one is bad enough, the two together can be fatal.

Newsweek in its edition of February 11, 1957 said:

In the multi-billion-dollar contest for new plants, every (Southern) State except two has a tax-supported agency to sing its siren song.

Tennessee offers tax-free factories to new industries through issuance of municipal bonds which are exempt from Federal taxation. There the taxpayers throughout the United States unwittingly give a subsidy to industries moving into Southern States.

Mayfield, Ky., offered \$9,500,000 in industrial building revenue bonds for constructing an industrial building project "to be leased and used by the General Tire & Rubber Co."—Bond Buyer, April 4, 1959.

Delhi, La., offered \$200,000 in bonds for the purpose of "acquiring an industrial plant building and providing necessary appurtenances therefor to be used for the purpose of manufacturing boats and trailers and leased by the town to Delhi Manufacturing Corp."—Bond Buyer, March 21, 1959.

Mississippi: As of 1955 built 99 new plants with the aid of a municipal bond issue. January 31, 1959, Bond Buyer

listed industrial bond sales for the State totaling \$1,790,000.

FIFTY-CENT-AN-HOUR WAGE SAVING

Challenge, December 1955, reported that Greenville Mills, Inc., saved \$170,000 a year in municipal taxes and 50 cents an hour on average employees' wages, and was able to set higher work quotas because of the absence of organized labor.

Gainesville, Fla., is financing the construction of a Sperry plant with funds from the city employees' retirement fund.

Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi all allow tax exemption of new manufacturing establishments.

South Carolina allows a 5-year exemption on all but school levies.

Arkansas permits a 7-year tax exemption in textile mills. Source: National Municipal Review, March 1957; Dunn's Review, and Modern Industry, April 1958.

This is only part of the picture. It is sufficient, however, to show to our people in the industrial North that this is no child's play on the part of the South. The South is playing dead earnest and for keeps. Newsweek describes it as a multi-billion-dollar drive. My distinguished northern Republican colleagues, who either unwittingly or to grasp for a fleeting political advantage, are aiding and abetting, it seems to me are gambling pretty recklessly that their constituents are not smart enough to read the writing on the wall. I know men and women in the North pretty thoroughly. There are not any smarter people anywhere in the world and when you give them the facts you can bank your life on their common sense.

LOW WAGES THE CLINCHER

So much for the financial help and tax exemption part of the South's drive on the industries of the North. That threat, serious as it is, and certainly not to be laughed off, in itself would not be sufficient. The North might be forced to meet money with money, tax exemption with tax exemption, all of which would place greater and ruinous tax burdens on our States and communities.

But the clincher in the South's drive is the other half of the lure—cheap nonunion wages.

I want every section of our great country to prosper, and I want every section of our country to share in the bounties of the greatest land on earth. But I want every section to get its share in fair competition with other sections. I do not like what is now happening. I do not like to see Northern Republicans, in their grasp for a passing political advantage, walk up the aisle arm in arm with a Southern bloc that has the objective, worthy enough from the Southern standpoint, to take from the North its industries. Nor do I think that it is healthy in a democracy for any section of our great country to swap away control of its newspapers, which are expected eventually to influence if not content public sentiment, for a bunch of run-away factories.

In the Middle West our industries are unionized. Collective bargaining has given to our workers wages and working

conditions that we wish to maintain. They cannot be maintained if the goods they produce must come into competition with the wares from factories where each individual worker must deal with his employer and accept what he is offered or go unemployed.

GOOD WAGES BENEFIT EVERYONE

Everyone in the Middle West has a stake in the outcome of the present economic cold war between the North and the South. Management and labor, of course, but in equal measure the merchants, who benefit from the buying power of a well-paid labor force. If organized labor should be crushed the clock in every home in Chicago would be set back half a century or more.

Hence in Chicago we have a real, a personal interest in the enactment of strong legislation that will strike effectively at crooks, scoundrels and racketeers, whether they operate within labor or within management. Because so many of our people are members of unions, and because all our people share in the benefits to our economy, we want to back up honest and responsible labor with legislation that will assure, as far as it is in human power, absolute integrity and full opportunity for democratic participation by the rank and file.

Our distinguished colleagues from the South who are backing the Landrum-Griffin bill do not have that interest. Their interest is not in remedying labor abuses, but in no unions at all. As long as the South can keep out the labor organizations, it will have a powerful weapon in the economic cold war with the North. My colleagues from the South know exactly what they are doing. I give them credit for astuteness.

LITTLE KNOWN ABOUT BILL

The Landrum-Griffin bill came from goodness knows where. It was never presented to the committee. It has been discussed very little in this debate, and then only in broad outlines. Busy as he is, I would venture to say the President of the United States has never read the bill. That is no reflection on the President. There are not many Members on this floor that have read the bill. And everybody who has read the bill seems agreed that it will require interpretation by the Supreme Court to determine what some of the language really means. It is probable that the Court will hold that under the terminology of the bill all peaceful picketing is prohibited. Some smart lawyers say so. I do not know. No one knows. In fact, no one knows very much about the Landrum-Griffin bill in detail.

But it does two things that have no relation to labor abuses and that bear directly on the issues of the economic cold war of the North and the South.

First, it makes almost impossible the unionizing of runaway plants from the North by providing that no work of organizing such as the posting of a peaceful picket line shall proceed until 30 percent of the employees have come out in the open. Under such circumstances, workers when their jobs are at stake, and their families may suffer, are not likely to venture far in bringing up their

wages to those of the North. If southern industries do not pay the same wages as northern industries to workers doing the same work on products that meet in competition on the national market it is self-evident that either the North will lose its industries or that low nonunion wages will be forced on the North to the tragic ruin of our economy.

The Landrum-Griffin bill throws every roadblock in the way of legitimate union organization. And until labor is organized in the South as it is in the North, so that one American worker gets the same pay for doing the same work, regardless of the State in which he works, the North will be under an unfair disadvantage. Provisions tucked in the Landrum-Griffin bill stack the cards against both management and labor in northern industry.

SOUTHERN COURTS TO DECIDE

Secondly, the Landrum-Griffin bill will take certain labor disputes from Federal jurisdiction and throw them into State courts for determination. That, as a writer in one of Chicago's great daily newspapers says, in the South probably could mean the end of many unions. In a State determined to keep out unions in order to attract industries from the North, the legal means are supplied for plenty of discouragement to labor organizers.

Mr. Chairman, I have tried sincerely to be fair to my colleagues from the South. I think they realize that the time will come when industry in their section will be organized as it is in my section, but in their justifiable ambition to have an industrial South they understandably want to ward off the inevitable long enough to get a full haul of Northern factories with the lure of low wages, no unions.

CURRENT NEWS FROM SOUTH CAROLINA

If the North is not alert, there is every evidence of alertness in the South. I have in my hand a copy of the Charlotte Observer of August 7, 1959. That is certainly current—the news up to a week ago. Permit me to read from a dispatch in that newspaper from its correspondent at Columbia, the capital of South Carolina. Here is the dispatch:

Can a community discourage one plant with union affiliation and encourage another with union ties?

This is a problem that may confront this South Carolina capital soon.

It is a problem that could grow out of the way Columbia handles its present problem.

For this industry-hungry city is now tempted by a choice morsel to which it may have to say: "No thank you."

The possibility has been raised with the prospect that one of the Nation's largest shirt manufacturers, Cluett-Peabody, may locate a sewing plant here.

The company, maker of Arrow shirts, is highly reputable and responsible. But its plant would be the first unionized sewing shop in an area where other established plants have resisted the unions.

Suppose Cluett-Peabody was politely and courteously told about the local problem and asked to look elsewhere.

And, suppose a week later a giant Detroit automobile manufacturer would announce plans to build a plant here.

Would that industry be welcomed?

The automobile plant would bring more jobs, more money. It would be a tremendous shot in the arm to the local economy.

But it would bring in bigger and stronger unions.

AND A LETTER FROM MISSISSIPPI

That, Mr. Chairman, is the current situation in the fair city of Columbia in the great State of South Carolina. But the lure of low wages, no unions has been held out to northern industrialists from the very beginning of the economic cold war. Here is a letter of 5 years ago from a town in Mississippi, photostatic copies of which have been published:

PELAHATCHIE, Miss., June 10, 1954.

Mr. HOBART J. HENDRICK,
President, H. B. Ives Co.,
New Haven, Conn.:

Greetings, Mr. Hendrick, as we cordially invite you to visit our beautiful community. We want your company to have the harmonious and highly successful experiences of operating in a veritable industrial paradise, and see how our wholehearted co-operation will do it for you.

For either a main or branch plant, we will provide the site and building just as you want them, make the carrying charges easy—eventually becoming as low as \$1 per year, with taxes being exempted up to 99 years, and you make no capital outlay for them.

Then our wonderful labor, 98 percent native born, mostly high school graduates, will lower average hourly industrial wage rates 6 to 49 cents below other Southern States, and from 50 to 95 cents below Northern States. You will also get a much higher man production, some plants even getting double what they got in their northern plants. This labor is truly American, not inflicted with the something-for-nothing idea and works together joyously with management for the success of both.

Here you will also enjoy savings in power, fuel, utility, tax, and other costs. Raw materials are convenient, transportation facilities are good. No one will tell you whom you must employ and all detrimental State laws for industrial operations have been repealed. The closed union shop has just been outlawed in Mississippi.

You would be located in the heart of the entire southern area with its great markets for your products and not much competitive production of them in it. For a number of years ahead, the percentage of growth of these markets will probably be greater than in any other section of the United States. With the large savings in wage, production, and operating costs, while your plant is operating peacefully and successfully, it will put your company into a most favorable competitive position not only in the entire South but also over most of the country.

Our deep spirit of warm, friendly cooperation always behind your company will surely be an inspiration to your for its phenomenal success, which many industries in our State now enjoy. So we again most cordially invite you to visit our wideawake town. When you visit us, you will be delighted to see how we can make good on this and you, too, may like very much to join with us and together achieve and enjoy that phenomenal success. Will you come?

Sincerely,

TOWN OF PELAHATCHIE, Miss.
H. C. RHODES, Mayor.

TURNING BACK THE CLOCK

Mr. Chairman, I have finished. The Landrum-Griffin bill seems assured of passage. I shall vote against it, and I shall hope and pray that when the bill goes to conference with the Senate the good in the bill will be left and the bad,

or the ill advised because inadequately considered, will be extracted.

I am 77. I have been through the fight of our people of many long years to bring the wages and working conditions of labor in the North to the present standards under which the worker enjoys dignity and the community benefits from the buying power of labor. I will not be a party to turning back the clock. I have put too much of my life into a cause which, to me, has been worthwhile in broadening the horizons of human contentment.

The South has advantages in climate, nearness to international markets, many advantages, and industry inevitably will be divided, according to the circumstances and requirements of each industry, between North and South. The economic cold war between North and South will terminate in advantage to both. But it will reach no such termination until the worker in the South receives, for the same work, the same pay as the worker in the North. Nor will the economy in the South be on the same wholesome basis as that in the North; nor will the southern merchant benefit from the same market with similar buying power, until organization of honest labor has rescued the southern worker from the condition of bargaining individually with his employer and accepting what he is offered or going unemployed.

Today the average annual income of an American in the State of Mississippi, after personal taxes and basic expenditures, is \$418 as compared with \$5,691 in the State of Illinois, according to the 1958 report of the U.S. Department of Commerce. When I was Lieutenant Governor of Illinois in the period beginning in 1913, and chairman of a commission investigating the wages of the workers of our country, the average annual wage of all workers in Illinois was slightly over \$600. But for organized labor we would still be in a condition comparable to that now of Mississippi.

With all respect for the loyalty to the South of my southern colleagues, I must respectfully remind them that in the present economic cold war the loyalty of the gentleman from Illinois is to Illinois and his constituents in the city of Chicago.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

A Portrait of Individualism: The Student Is

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, every State is proud of its university, and particularly of its State university. Texans are proud of the University of Texas for many reasons—for its progressive educational policies, for its stimulating atmosphere, and for its distinguished faculty.

The University of Texas has, in addition, an excellent newspaper, and I ask unanimous consent that an article from that paper, the *Daily Texan*, of August 14, 1959, entitled, "A Portrait of Individualism: The Student Is" which describes life at the university, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PORTRAIT OF INDIVIDUALISM: THE STUDENT IS
(By Jo Eickmann)

We are the students of the University of Texas.

In one respect we are all alike—we are students, in the United States and, more specifically, in Texas. This you can say about us all. But here you must stop. For this is the point at which classification breaks down, at which you must no longer refer to us as the student body as a whole but instead as the student body individually.

For one thing is certain. We are individuals. Those who seek to pigeonhole us with the words, "beat, irresponsible, going to the dogs, conformists, security seekers, radicals" or any other of the thousand oversimplified labels, do so because they do not know us.

Being American students, we form a cross section of our society. We cannot be justly compared to our contemporaries in Europe. They are often the intellectual elite or the economic aristocrats of their countries. We are not.

Do not sneer and say that we are not as politically conscious, as well-informed, as thirsty for knowledge as they. Some of us are. Do not look for all 18,000 of us to unite in some great student movement to protest this action or to lead the fight against that injustice. Chances are that we will not.

Don't look for any action by the whole student body. The entire student body will never act, only individuals or groups (sometimes large) of individuals within it. When you look at us as a whole, we are deceiving. We appear to have no causes to support, no ideals to fulfill, no goals to seek. When you look at us as a composite picture, we cancel out each other's attitudes and beliefs—the segregationist is balanced by the integrationist, the liberal by the conservative, the States-righter by the civil righter.

We are a plurality, not a unity.

Oh, there are trends that unite us, ideas that we hold in common, fashions of thought and action that bind some of us into "a majority of the students."

For instance, we are weary of a good many of the things that were the essence of college life in our parents' days. We are not as interested as we "should be" in the activities that people think we should be concerned about. The raccoon coat and college pennant are not gone, but they certainly are hidden in the closet. The school spirit that we haul out each fall at football games is as much of an act as the frightening poise with which some of us meet the "older generation."

Without really being blasé, we are not ready to get excited about things. We are not so anxious to picket the President's Office or march on the Capitol as we once might have been. We have fewer "causes" and are less willing to support tenaciously any single idea or plan of actions as "the only way."

Perhaps it is because we are complacent. Many of us are having too much fun to be concerned about anything. But some of us are vitally concerned about—international politics, religion, art—a thousand interests. Still, we are less intense than we might be, less fanatical than the traditional view of the student. Perhaps this is because our worlds have broadened, because we are more cosmopolitan.

At the university we meet people not only from all parts of American life, but also from most of the cultures and countries of the world. Provincialism has to yield, if only a little bit, under the influence of these contacts.

There are unifying norms of "accepted" behavior that bind us together with a common slang, a Saturday football game, a coffee break, and a school "uniform." We wear our white socks and fraternity pins in a frantic search for acceptance and group identity. There is a security in this superficial conformity that most of us find comforting.

But always some of us find the accepted patterns stifling and become loud rebels. Like fetishes we wear our "individualism" on the sleeves of our boat-necked tee shirts and form our own, equally rigid code of behavior; organize our own groups.

Perhaps because the university is big, we can never become the student body as a whole. Perhaps we can never establish a bond of spirit to unite us in a common purpose. You see, many of us never see the university as a whole. For 4 or more years we isolate ourselves from the big picture by revolving in our own little spheres of activity.

We stick our noses deep into our special corners of the campus—athletics, sorority or fraternity, boardinghouse, church foundation, library—and take care never to come out. Thus we live in a vacuum, and some of us are contented. Some of us are lonely. But right or wrong, we are isolated.

Yet even in our isolation, we are a paradox, for superficially we are the friendliest, most open people in the world. Our loneliness, our inability to communicate with one another are hidden behind a smiling facade of southwestern hospitality and American informality.

There is not, of course, the warmth of a small college atmosphere about the 40

acres. The university is too large for that. But the "big hello" is practiced by more students than campus politicians, and a smile from a stranger is not too hard to come by. Granted, one must make the first effort but friendship is there for the taking if one seeks it out.

The openness, however, is only smile deep. For love of privacy or fear of being hurt, many of us sharply close the door on more meaningful friendships. We keep our souls a secret, and are afraid or unable to tell each other about the things that matter most to us.

Some of us don't care. Some of us are content with bridge playing or beer-drinking buddies. For some, "college is a blast, man, and what's this bit about communicating anyway?"

But deep inside, after all the endless talk about quizzes, dates, sports, and sex is over, some of us are still unsatisfied knowing how lonely we are. So we talk more. And perhaps we find the right people to talk to. We feel accepted, and we know that with these few friends at least, no one will reject us for anything heretical or disappointing that we may say.

These are the times when we stay up all night discussing and questioning—our existence, our society, our religious beliefs. Perhaps for the first time we really share our dreams and ambitions and feel satisfied—knowing that someone understands.

We have come to the university for a thousand different reasons—because we wanted an education; because Mom and Dad wanted us to come; because "a college education is a good thing to have;" because "you need a degree to get a good job;" because we wanted to get married.

Too many of us have come here with only the after-commencement future in mind. We see the university as 4 more years of an educational period separate from living, not as a vital part of life itself. When we get out, probably we will be not so much interested in a better world as we are in a more comfortable one.

A few of us have come to learn. We are excited by knowledge. We will sometimes abuse the sacred cows of class routine to explore books and ideas on our own. For us graduation will be commencement—a beginning of a continuing process of learning.

Some of us will starve for knowledge in the midst of its abundance simply because no one has ever awakened us from the complacency of getting by.

Some of us are good students who deceive our friends and professors into thinking that we are exceptional because we have learned how to regurgitate enough facts and ideas to make good grades. Others are on so pro because we are hopelessly unprepared for college work.

There are those of us here who will discover the university in its totality, who will graduate having tasted of the finest things Texas has to offer. We will have known and loved university traditions. We will have found the rich human personality of the campus in a hundred scrub women, professors, secretaries, campus policemen, deans, and newsboys. From the university's libraries, art galleries, and cultural events, we will have taken the equipment for enjoying a full life in a world full of beauty.

On the other hand, some of us will be lost here. Overwhelmed by the idea of being one in 18,000, we will learn to know only a handful of people. When we leave, it will be with a sigh of relief that it is over.

We are the students of the University of Texas. Being people, we are different from each other. Rich, poor, world-weary or eager, we blaze our paths or follow our ruts in the world—individually. And you cannot classify us justly, for we are, first of all, ourselves.

A Bill To Eliminate Stock Dividend Exclusion Provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN V. CARTER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill in the House today which would eliminate the present provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which allow an individual to exclude from his gross income for income tax purposes the first \$50 of dividends received in a taxable year. In other words, what this amounts to is a repeal of section 116 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

I would like to explain my reasons for introducing this particular piece of legislation. First, let me go into the circumstances which led to the presence of this provision in the 1954 act. It was put there not so much as a benefit to the individual taxpayer as it was a gesture toward eliminating double taxation on corporate profits. Now, I am as much against the idea of double taxation as anyone else, where it can possibly be achieved. However, this particular provision is not of any real help to the taxpayers who derive benefits from stock dividends. The amount which is allowed for exclusion is entirely too small to be of benefit either to the small investor to the large. In fact, there is no real distinction that can be made between the benefits that each one gets, except perhaps that it is proportionally greater for the small investor than for the large one. So what we are really doing under this section of the act, Mr. Speaker, is depriving the Federal Treasury of several million dollars per year in the rather empty gesture, as I said before, of attempting to avoid double taxation. And yet we are not really being of any material assistance to the individual taxpayer. Hence, my reasons for introducing this bill.

Now, to get to the crux of the matter, I completely agree that we should avoid double taxation on corporate profits. However, I think this should be done by either completely exempting stock dividend funds of corporations, or we should levy the full tax upon such funds prior to their distribution, and then after distribution, exempt the individual taxpayer from having to pay any taxes on the money he received.

I am aware that the House Ways and Means Committee is going to undertake a thorough reexamination of our Internal Revenue Code during the adjournment of Congress. I therefore realize that this bill and others which I have introduced affecting our present tax structure will probably never be enacted into law. However, I want to have these particular things a matter of record, and I sincerely hope that the House Ways and Means Committee will see fit to take all pending bills affecting the Internal Revenue Code under study at the time that they deal with this complex but highly important problem.

Payment in Lieu of Taxes to Communities Where Federal Property Is Located

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that today the high costs are hitting not only the individual American and Uncle Sam, but also State and local governments attempting to meet the needs of ever-increasing populations.

As a matter of fact, a great many local communities are having difficulties in finding the tax money to provide needed water, sewage and other public services.

The difficulty becomes particularly acute in areas in which there is substantial amount of Federal, non-tax-paying property. The existence of such property not only deprives the community of a tax source; it also amounts to an expense since often the area must be provided regular community services.

We recall that earlier this year, the Government Operations Committee held hearings on a bill S. 910—which I was pleased to cosponsor—to provide that under certain conditions the Government would make payments to communities in lieu of the taxes that would normally have derived from Federal property in the area.

As I understand it, the Treasury Department has now withdrawn its objections to enactment of this bill. I would hope, therefore, that the Government Operations Committee will find it possible to give consideration to it as early as possible.

We are aware, of course, that Uncle Sam, too, is having difficulties in finding enough income to meet the outgo. However, the question arises as to whether or not Uncle Sam's money problems can justify the existence of an inequitable situation in which communities are deprived of tax sources as the result of Federal non-tax-paying property. As a matter of fact, such Federal property not only results in loss of revenue, but in addition, adds expense to the local community by requiring public services.

I am aware, of course, that there is on the calendar a bill, S. 2026, which would establish a commission which would have as one of its objectives resolving these problems between local, State, and Federal Governments.

Frankly, I feel the establishment of the commission would contribute toward clarification of these intergovernmental relations. Meanwhile, I would hope that expeditious consideration could be given to the bill S. 910 which would initiate action toward providing greater equity to communities where Federal property is located.

We recognize, of course, that this is extremely important to local governments throughout the country.

This morning, I received a telegram from Mr. B. F. Hillenbrand, executive director of the National Association of County Officials, urging action on S. 910. I ask unanimous consent to have the telegram printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., August 19, 1959.

Senator WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Administration through Treasury Department now supports payments in lieu of taxes bill, S. 910. Major breakthrough. As cosponsors of S. 910 counties urge you request immediate favorable action by Government Operations Committee.

B. F. HILLENBRAND,
Executive Director, National Association
of County Officials.

Textile Imports From Low-Wage Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Lancaster News, Lancaster, S.C., of August 13, 1959:

OFF THE RECORD

A point made: This week 245,000 Japanese textile employees went on strike for a 15 percent increase in wages. On the basis of American pay scales, this is a whopping big demand. But the Japs, who are averaging only \$40 a month, are asking just a \$6 monthly raise.

Japanese textile manufacturers oppose the increase. They say it would cause a 2 or 3 percent rise in the cost of Japanese textile products and that this would seriously impair the competitive position of the mills in the world market.

Even if this claim of the Jap mill owners is only partly true, it sums up a situation which Congress and the administration in Washington have persistently ignored. Japanese mills have been modernized and rebuilt since World War II. They can buy American cotton under the subsidy program at 8

cents less a pound than can American mills. And, as the strike demands indicated, Jap labor can be hired at \$9.25 a week, or less than the average American textile employee earns in a single day.

If the Japs, with all these factors in their favor, fear for their competitive position in the world market, then it should be obvious that the American mills have no competitive position whatever. They can sell in the world market only those products the low-wage countries are presently unable to supply.

American aid programs are working around the clock to build up textile production in the underdeveloped countries. As each mill begins spinning and weaving, the output of that mill must be added to the supply of textile products available in the world market. Because these are low-wage products, the demand for American textiles will be reduced in direct ratio. Japan and India may compete for sales with other low-wage countries but America will be out of the running.

Loss of export sales will be a serious blow to the American textile industry. But even this is minor compared to the damage that will result if Congress and the administration permit any serious invasion of the domestic market by the textile products of these low-wage countries. Japan has already demonstrated her ability to wreck prices in the United States. Imports of textiles must be strictly controlled unless the American textile industry is to be written off as expendable.

Death of Dr. Irvin B. Hill, Director, Fairview Home for Retarded Children, Near Salem, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, not all heroes serve on the field of battle, amidst shot and shell. Some are in surgeries, hospital wards, and even nurseries. Such a man was Dr. Irvin B. Hill, superintendent of the Fairview Hospital for retarded children, in our State. Dr. Hill died last week at the tragically young age of 44.

He was a frail, wisp of a man whose physical strength had been sapped by an early bout with tuberculosis, from which he never wholly recovered his original health. Yet he carried on indomitably, dedicated to his young patients and to their eventual return—if at all possible—to mental stability and full recovery.

As a member of the Oregon State Legislature, my wife, Maurine, worked closely with Irvin Hill in sponsoring legislation for the benefit of the retarded children in his care. She and I mourn his passing. We wish we had the benefit of his brave spirit in helping us to promote, at the Federal level, bills which I have introduced to increase grants for the training of teachers who will assist retarded boys and girls.

Mr. President, an eloquent tribute to the gallantry of Dr. Irvin Hill was pub-

lished in the Oregon Daily Statesman of Salem for August 18, 1959. This editorial is entitled "Well Done." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record in memory of our friend, Irvin B. Hill, doctor of medicine and friend of mankind.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WELL DONE

Dr. Irvin B. Hill's figure was so thin it seemed as though a strong wind would carry him away. While he had to live under a careful regimen due to an earlier bout with tuberculosis, actually he kept himself quite fit for his duties as superintendent of Fairview, the State's home for subnormal persons. That is, until this year when he suffered from pneumonia. He returned to duty, but a combination of pulmonary trouble and a weakened heart claimed his life Monday.

As superintendent of Fairview, Dr. Hill carried very successfully a heavy load of administration. He supervised its postwar expansion which brought many notable improvements: a new hospital, new administration building, new cottages. The enrollment kept growing too, but Dr. Hill's goal was to provide facilities so the applications would be kept current. Dr. Hill combined professional skill and administrative talent with human sympathy which is indispensable in ministering properly to the inmates of Fairview, mostly children and youth. Called from duty at the comparatively early age of 44, he deserves the accolade, "well done."

Unjustified Delay in Confirming of Presidential Appointees to the Federal Bench

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] performed a service when he spoke out in protest against the continuing delay on the part of the majority side of the Senate in respect of the confirmation of 19 Presidential appointees to the Federal bench.

The protracted and wholly unjustifiable delay in the southern district of New York is particularly outrageous. President Eisenhower has nominated three outstanding members of the legal profession to the Federal bench in New York. To the U.S. Court of Appeals, Second Circuit, he nominated Henry Friendly, one of New York's most distinguished lawyers. Incidentally, the Senate subcommittee has not even seen fit to call a hearing for Mr. Friendly. This particular court, because of the volume and type of appellate cases it hears, is not exceeded in importance by any other.

Two other distinguished lawyers, Charles M. Metzner and Lloyd McMahon await confirmation to the Federal District Court for the Southern District of New York. This court is the busiest Fed-

eral trial court in the country. As of June 30 of this year there were 10,937 civil cases pending in this court as yet untried. Under present circumstances it will take 2 years for any one of these cases to reach the top of the trial calendar. This is a condition which has existed for a long time and which everyone agree requires immediate attention. Everyone agrees that justice delayed is justice denied. Everyone agrees that not only should these vacancies be filled, but that additional Federal judges are needed. Nor, is it disputed, even by those who share in the responsibility for foot-dragging on these confirmations, that the nominees for this court, as in the case of Mr. Friendly for the court of appeals, are eminently qualified.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that these remarks are directed toward the hardship caused the public by this inordinate delay. It is worth noting, however the personal and professional hardships caused these distinguished gentlemen who have been nominated for these posts.

Mr. Speaker, it is beginning to look as if those Senators on the majority side who are in a position to push the buttons which would spring loose these nominations from the political web in which they are ensnared are satisfied to let the matter drift as long as there is an absence of outraged public indignations. If public pressure and indignation are necessary to make the powers that be bestir themselves, then let us start generating it. The public—and that includes me—has had enough "politicizing" with the administration of justice.

Southwest Texas Dean Nolle Retiring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, after 40 years of service, Dr. Alfred H. Nolle is retiring this fall as dean of Southwest Texas State College at San Marcos, Tex.

This school, Mr. President, is my alma mater.

To me, as he has been to thousands, Dean Nolle was a guide, a counselor, a friend, and a great inspiration.

Announcement of this good man's approaching retirement was carried August 16, 1959, in the Austin (Tex.) American Statesman, in an article entitled "Southwest Texas Dean Nolle Retiring," and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SOUTHWEST TEXAS DEAN NOLLE RETIRING

SAN MARCOS.—Dr. Alfred H. Nolle, dean of Southwest Texas State College, will retire this fall after 40 years of service to the college, 37 of them as dean.

Dr. Nolle came to Southwest Texas in 1919 as a professor of German and became dean of the college in 1922.

Dr. Nolle, a native of Missouri, earned both the bachelor of arts and bachelor of science degrees in education at the University of Missouri. At the University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn., he received his master of arts degree. He earned his Ph. D. degree from the University of Pennsylvania.

Before coming to Southwest Texas, Dr. Nolle studied at the Universities of Berlin and Jena in Germany, where he met his wife, the former Brenda Stewart Wilson, of Washington, D.C. She was a piano student at the Stern Conservatory.

The Nolles have one son, Alfred H., Jr., who is now professor of physics, research scientist (consultant), defense research laboratory, and director of research in properties of liquids and solids at the University of Texas.

Dr. Nolle has taught German at the Universities of the South, Pennsylvania, and Missouri. He wears the Phi Beta Kappa and the Alpha Chi keys, and is a member of Phi Delta Kappa and Phi Mu Alpha.

While in Missouri, Dean Nolle was an instructor in the Student Army Training Corps, the World War I equivalent of ROTC and held the rank of major. He was a charter member and one-time chairman of the Conference of Academic Deans of the United States. He was a charter member of the San Marcos Kiwanis Club and a member of the Kiwanis Legion of Honor.

Dr. and Mrs. Nolle are members of the St. Mark's Episcopal Church in San Marcos. Dr. Nolle, a lay reader, has been a member of the executive board of the diocese of west Texas, and chairman of the West Texas Diocese Committee on the State of the Church.

Highlighting his recent years was the presentation of the honorary doctor of laws degree at East Texas Baptist College in 1957. The dean received many letters of congratulations on that occasion, which have been bound and presented to him.

He carried the nickname "Knuckles Nolle" due to a story about a suspected (though false) "ring of card sharks and gamblers among the progressors" which appeared in the Southwest Texas newspaper in 1947. He was presented a pair of brass knuckles with his name engraved on them.

The dean is quick to correct any notion that his retirement will be inactive. He will move from his present office in the administration building to a new one in the library, where he will attend his duties as executive secretary of Alpha Chi.

He will also continue as the Alpha Chi representative on the National Honors Council and chairman of the committee on standards and classification for the Association of Texas Colleges, of which he has formerly been secretary, vice president, and president.

The Panama Canal and the Monroe Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bulletin of the Southern States Industrial Council, dated August 15, 1959, and

written by Mr. J. Clifford Miller, Jr., president of the council:

THE PANAMA CANAL AND THE MONROE DOCTRINE

In its recent declaration of policy the council emphasized its opposition to any surrender of the ownership of the United States in the Panama Canal, and it urged the Congress not to surrender in any degree the jurisdiction over and control of the Canal Zone vested in this Nation under its contract (1903) by treaty with the Panamanian Government.

This course was prompted by action of the Republic of Panama through its National Assembly, incited by Nationalists and other politicians, over the protest of the United States, in extending its territorial waters from the internationally recognized 3-mile limit to a 12-mile limit, and thus asserting control over a 9-mile stretch of ocean between the canal terminals and the open sea.

On January 9, 1959, Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat of Pennsylvania, a recognized authority on the Panama Canal, told the House of Representatives that this is only one of many recent moves by Panama to undermine our control of the canal. He said:

"This is a matter that cannot safely be ignored. We must not permit the creation of another Berlin at this artery of world commerce."

According to an article by Demaree Bess (Saturday Evening Post, May 9, 1959.) "The Panama Danger Zone." "However, other Members of Congress did ignore his warning. Not one of them publicly commented on his speech, and it did not get a single line in Washington and New York newspapers which specialize in foreign news."

The only other voice we have heard raised on this situation is that of Senator THOMAS E. MARTIN, of Iowa, who, on May 12, 1959, had excerpts from the Demaree Bess article referred to printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

On July 7, 1959, Mr. FLOOD again brought this matter to the attention of the House, and put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of July 4, 1959, which began with this challenging statement:

"For some reason it has been difficult to arouse much concern, among either politicians or the public, about what is going on to the south of us in Latin America."

And it continues, if "a Communist beachhead is being attempted in this hemisphere" the challenge "would have to be met by this country on the principle" of the Monroe Doctrine.

There can be little, if any, question about the dangers confronting us all over the Caribbean. And the fact that we are either ignorant of these disturbing elements or just don't care about their effect on the future of our country is highly disturbing.

Have we become so absorbed in our effort to save Europe, the Mideast, and Far East from communism, that the spirit, as well as the letter of the Monroe Doctrine are as dead as the proverbial dodo? If you say the Monroe Doctrine applied only to European imperialism, I ask, was that imperialism more dangerous to our liberties than is the imperialistic slavery sought to be imposed on this hemisphere by international communism?

In the words of the Monroe Doctrine, we "declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere, as dangerous to our peace and safety."

Sincerely yours,

J. CLIFFORD MILLER,

President.

Reclamation Projects Yield Wide Variety of Essential Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, most of us here in the Congress understand why western reclamation is of economic importance to the whole country as well as essential to the development of the West. But not all of our national press does, particularly in the East.

No writers can express the point more clearly than the editors of the McClatchy newspapers in California which publish papers in Sacramento, Modesto, and Fresno. As an excellent statement of the reasons for continuing and expanding western reclamation, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial from the Sacramento Bee of August 9, 1959, entitled "Reclamation Projects Yield Wide Variety of Essential Benefits."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, Aug. 9, 1959]

RECLAMATION PROJECTS YIELD WIDE VARIETY OF ESSENTIAL BENEFITS

In this drought year of 1959, when the main rivers of California would be a series of dry sandbars were it not for projects such as the Shasta and Folsom Dams, it is no less than amazing that there are those who are critical of the western reclamation program.

A recent Washington, D.C., Post editorial deserves note because it reflects the astigmatic view shared by many in the East that the Federal program should be reexamined on the ground it brings more land into agricultural production while the Nation has large surpluses in wheat, corn, cotton, etc.

This is totally fallacious and shows a lack of knowledge of the true nature and overall purposes of these projects.

A quick answer, of course, is to point out the fact the crops largely produced on lands irrigated by those big Federal dams are not in surplus and are not under any Government program. That in itself should be enough but there is much more to the story.

These great multipurpose projects provide a vast variety of benefits aside from irrigation.

They provide flood control. Without Shasta, Folsom, Friant, and other dams, California would have been subjected to a series of catastrophic floods during the last decade. The floods which did occur happened because projected dams had not been built.

They produce electric power. They aid navigation. They hold back the salt water from the sea which otherwise might spell ruin for the fabulously rich Sacramento-San Joaquin delta. They provide recreation for the people. And of extreme importance, they give many communities dependable supplies of domestic and industrial water.

Without the reclamation projects the great development of the West would have been seriously restricted. For example, without its allocation of 390 million gallons a day from Colorado River water stored behind Hoover Dam, Los Angeles would have

reached the maximum of its population and industrial growth some time ago.

To a large extent the reclamation projects in California have not added significant acreages to agricultural production.

They have provided surface supplies to already producing lands which had been irrigated by pumping but which were threatened with extinction due to the failure of the underground supplies.

And in some cases the introduction of reclamation water has made it possible to transform land formerly devoted to grains, which are in surplus, to the production of fruits and vegetables, which are not.

The Post says it is time Congress gave thought to retiring land from cultivation instead of adding more. And by inference one could gather the Post believes it might be a good thing to let the area to be served by the proposed San Luis project dry up.

It is hard to imagine anything more foolish. If ample water were provided, much of the land growing grain and cotton inevitably would be turned to orchards and vegetable crops.

But even were cotton to be the chosen crop, the Post's point still falls flat. The San Joaquin Valley produces a long staple cotton which is in much demand, and the per acre yield is from 5 to 10 times that of some cotton-growing sections of the South.

If there is need to retire cotton land from production, it certainly would make more sense to retire some of the poor and tired land in the South than to let the extremely fertile acres in the San Luis area revert to a desert, which they will without San Luis water.

Moreover, in respect to the Federal San Luis project, while it is designed primarily for irrigation, it also is to be an integral part of a bigger plan to transport water to southern California where it will be needed for domestic and industrial purposes a little more than a decade hence.

The Post is generous enough in its appraisal to say the reclamation projects for the most part pay for themselves.

They do, and more. Not only do the users pay for the projects but the great developments which spring from these projects contribute vastly to the economy of the Nation in general and to the Federal Treasury in particular in the way of taxes.

For one to say the reclamation program is a case of the Government putting out money to produce surplus crops on which the Government must put out more money is missing the point at both ends. Such a statement either is due to ignorance or is rank misrepresentation.

Youth Conservation Corps Act Would Fill a Vital Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the other body recently adopted S. 812, an act providing for the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps, a group which would serve not only to train young men in healthful outdoor conservation activities at a time when employment prospects in many sections of our country are low, but which would also contribute greatly to the promotion of

reforestation and conservation projects in many of the key outdoor mountain areas of our country.

Some weeks ago I introduced similar legislation in the House, H.R. 7686. I believe that no finer job could be performed by Congress than passing this legislation before we adjourn for this session.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a thoughtful editorial from the Oneonta Star of August 18, 1959, stressing the positive contributions of such a corps in the beautiful mountain and outdoor regions of Otsego County in New York State, and also an editorial which appeared in this morning's Washington Post:

[From the Oneonta Star, Aug. 18, 1959]
SENATE CONSIDERING BILL TO ESTABLISH
YOUTH CORPS

The Senate is again considering a bill to establish a Youth Conservation Corps which would enable thousands of young men to work in Federal parks, forests, and wildlife areas, and on other conservation projects. The only sensible argument thus far advanced against this measure is that such a program would be expensive.

In evaluating this argument, one must consider what the program is intended to accomplish, and what it might in fact accomplish. The new youth corps is patterned after the Civilian Conservation Corps of two decades ago, but some of its objectives are different from those of the old CCC. The differences are important.

The CCC was essentially an economic measure, a plan to give employment to young men who otherwise would have been idle. It did have great side benefits for the public; some of the work done by the CCC youths, such as tree planting at Gilbert Lake State Park, is valuable to this day. The Youth Conservation Corps now envisioned would be mainly that—a means of getting young men off the streets and into healthful, productive, character-building outdoor work. And as before, the work done would be of general public benefit.

It is true that the program would be expensive—\$375 million annually after the first couple of years. This must be balanced against the benefits in terms of the conservation, both human and material, that would result.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 20, 1959]
YOUTH AND THE LAND

The plan approved by the Senate to establish a Youth Conservation Corps similar to the depression-born Civilian Conservation Corps deserves to be judged in broader terms than its opponents, including the President, have apparently employed so far. Their objections to the cost of the venture need to be considered, of course, but we cannot for a moment believe that the expense would be anything like the astronomical scare figures cited by Senate Republicans. Indeed, is it not possible that the plan would result in some real—if not bookkeeping—economies?

The proposal is to enlist volunteer boys from 16 to 21 years of age for work in the national parks, forests, and wildlife refuges at basic pay of \$60 a month. Make work ought of course to be avoided—but considering the enormous public land holdings and the growing public demands upon national park facilities this ought not to be difficult. An efficiently administered program should increase the value of the parks and refuges in a most economical way, at the same time affording exceptional opportunities for young men to learn useful skills and to round out their own mental and

physical development in a wholesome atmosphere. We think the plan could be a happy blending of two of the country's greatest assets—its land and its youth—and that the measure ought to be enacted.

Nixon Missed Great Opportunity in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I send to the desk an editorial from the Anderson Independent newspaper of Anderson, S.C., of August 19, 1959, entitled "Nixon Missed Great Opportunity in Russia."

I believe this editorial has pointed up a tremendous advantage that the United States missed in teaching the Russian people a lesson that we Americans depend on God in our daily living.

This editorial points out that no news came from Russia to indicate that Vice President Nixon attended church on Sunday while he was in Russia. There is no criticism of Mr. Nixon personally for not having attended church, because we all know he is a regular attender of church in the United States; the point is that Mr. Nixon missed a terrific propaganda opportunity when he failed to attend church in Russia.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Anderson (S.C.) Independent,
Aug. 19, 1959]

NIXON MISSED GREAT OPPORTUNITY IN RUSSIA

Mr. NIXON, who has drawn nothing but praise for his travels in Russia, in our opinion missed one great chance to show the Russians the solid rock upon which this country has built its greatness.

To the best of our knowledge he did not go to a church service while over there.

We read in detail about his spending one Sunday at the country dacha or villa of Premier Khrushchev, the boat rides on the river, the walks in the flower gardens, and all that. If he had been in Washington he and his family would probably have been at church, for he attends regularly. Once, on tour of Florida, he worshipped in beautiful Christ Methodist Church, St. Petersburg, of which Dr. Paul R. Horta, well known in Anderson, is pastor.

If Mr. Nixon had simply told his Russian hosts that he would like to go to one of the few churches that are left in Russia and in fact had insisted on it and gone, we believe there would have been a different feeling toward him and this country than there is today. The Russian leader may not have liked this procedure, but we believe that he would have appreciated his visitor all the more.

America owes all its greatness to the goodness of God. Its founders realized this gift and acknowledged it. They looked upon God as a partner in their efforts toward liberty and freedom. "In God We Trust" is our motto. America's churches are its strongest

bulwark against any anti-God rule, such as Russia has today.

We don't know what the plans are for Mr. Khrushchev, but we do hope that someone guides him toward a church on a Sabbath morning where he can see freedom-loving people worship according to the dictates of their conscience and in their own way. We have an idea that the Premier, who claims to be an agnostic, but who is a smart man withal, would understand and maybe appreciate the service. We could recommend a large number of churches here in this favored region that would give him a quick insight into the power that religion wields in our lives.

Mr. Nixon could have set the pattern by going to church in Russia even though the Russians might have scoffed at him. Most of all he could have shown the Russians that Americans depend on God in their daily lives.

Deplorable Lack of Empathy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, a letter which appeared in the August 8, 1959, issue of the *Waukesha Daily Freeman* vividly illustrates the lack of empathy among so many of us. The author, Mr. Tom Miglantsch, chides the editor of the *Daily Freeman*, which is an outstanding newspaper published in my congressional district in Wisconsin, for his criticism of the Kennedy-Morse bill to raise the minimum wage to \$1.25 and of the Forand bill to provide medical and hospital care for our senior citizens. However, it seems to me that Mr. Miglantsch's comments should be read by all of us in Congress, since our inaction on these matters, perhaps, indicates an equal lack of empathy. It is for this reason that I am inserting his thoughtful letter in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*. The letter follows:

HAPPY FREEMAN HAS DISCOVERED EMPATHY
TO THE FREEMAN:

It is gratifying to note that the *Freeman* has editorially discovered the word "empathy"—I quote "the imaginative projection of one's own consciousness into another being (putting yourself in the shoes of someone else)." During years of reading the *Freeman* editorially, I have been frustrated by the lack of that very quality—empathy.

For example: In recent weeks you have had not one, but two editorials criticizing the proposed increase in the Federal minimum wage from \$1 to \$1.25 an hour as "inflationary." Now \$1.25 an hour—that's \$50 for a 40-hour week, or about \$40 a week take-home pay—is roughly \$2,000 annual salary. This is inflationary? Management salaries run to \$50,000, \$100,000—even \$500,000 a year. No *Freeman* editorial has criticized them—they presumably are not inflationary. If the *Freeman* editors lack empathy for the person or family that must subsist on \$2,000 income a year, they are obviously not completely without empathy.

Recently the press reported the suicide of an elderly couple. The woman left a note explaining that they were both desperately ill and had no money for medical care. Her closing remarks were, "For God's sake do something to give medical care to old people." Well, the "do-gooders," those "spenders"

down in Washington are trying to do just that. They have a bill—the Forand bill—which would provide free medical and hospital care to those retired on social security. Our elder citizens in their day worked—not 8, but 10 and 12 hours, 6 days a week to build this productive America which now gives most of us an abundant life with increased leisure. Yet most retired couples live on less than \$1,000 income per year. If it were not for social security (that Socialist bill passed by the "spenders")—millions would be absolute destitute. It takes "empathy" to feel the plight of these aged citizens. The *Freeman*? They editorially attacked the Forand bill as "the opening wedge to socialize medicine." The American Medical Association (AMA) triggered its members to flood Congressmen with letters against this free medical and hospital care for the aged—the bill died in committee.

I have often wondered why the great American free press has largely gravitated into the hands of those who have such empathy for the well-to-do taxpayer, and so little for those in the lower third of our society. Any student of economics knows that a basic reason for our recurring depressions is the lack of adequate purchasing power among the lower one-third to buy needed goods to clear the retailers' shelves so the inventories don't back up to the factory and throw men out of work. From the very practical and selfish standpoint of keeping ahead of Russia, which has no unemployment, we should subsidize our less privileged citizens if necessary to keep consumption equal to production. It would be so much more gracious if such generosity were inspired instead by empathy—or by that old-fashioned term by which I know it—Christian love of one's fellow men. Nevertheless, it is gratifying that the *Freeman* editions have become poignantly cognizant of "empathy"—may it be more generously reflected in future editorial policy.

TOM MIGLAUTSCH.

OCONOMOWOC.

Politics Is Still Hobby of Former Governor Hobby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, Texas is fortunate in having seven living ex-Governors.

Included in this notable group is former Gov. W. P. Hobby, a man whose achievements in both public and private life have already secured for him memorable recognition in the history of my State.

Some of these achievements are recounted in an article by Frank X. Tolbert in the August 17, 1959, *Dallas Morning News*, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article be printed in the Appendix of the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

POLITICS IS STILL HOBBY OF FORMER GOVERNOR HOBBY

(By Frank X. Tolbert)

HOUSTON, Tex.—A close friend of William Pettus Hobby, Sr., said: "To show what kind of a modest, good-humored fellow Will Hobby is his favorite nickname is 'Guv.' To me this illustrates why he was one of Texas' greatest Governors. He ran the State the

way he runs a newspaper in an informal, casual and yet very efficient fashion."

Before a biography of the 1917-1921 Governor of Texas was published recently, Will Hobby told the authors, James A. Clark and Weldon Hart, that he'd like the book to be called simple, "Guv." Finally, he was talked into another title, "The Tactful Texan," which is also very descriptive of this smiling, 81-year-old native of Moscow—the city of Moscow that is in the pine forests of Polk County, Tex.

Mr. Hobby is primarily a newspaperman. Today he is chairman of the board of the Houston Post. He joined that paper on Texas Independence Day, March 1892, at \$8 a week. He was in the circulation department yet his real interest was in the editorial staff. The boy's favorite of the Post's news-writers was a fellow named William Sydney Porter. Some years ago, Guv was guest columnist for the Post Card while the regular columnist, George Fuernmann, was on vacation. And the publisher wrote in affectionate detail how he used to visit the little cubicle office of the future short story writer, and O. Henry would often send the boy out for coffee and sandwiches and they would have dinner together.

Will Hobby calls politics his hobby. He has an almost incredible knack for analyzing the outcomes of political races. His biographers say that a prominent El Paso politician named Adrian Pool used to call Will Hobby every election day eve to get his predictions. "Almost invariably Hobby called the turn," said Adrian Pool.

Politics might have continued to be Mr. Hobby's hobby if he hadn't been argued into running for lieutenant governor in 1914. He didn't get into the race until near the deadline for filing. He was elected by about 20,000 votes and made such a good record he had no opposition for a second term. The reluctant politician became Governor on August 25, 1917 after James E. Ferguson was impeached from that office. Ferguson ran against Hobby in 1918. And Guv won by 461,479 to 217,012 votes, the most one-sided victory in the Texas Governor's race up to that date. Some said this was because Will Hobby appealed to the ladies, who were getting to vote for the first time.

In the early part of this century, Mr. Hobby rose from that \$8 a week job to managing editor of the Houston Post. He left the Post to become editor and eventually full owner of the Beaumont Enterprise. In 1922 he came back to the Post, as publisher and part owner. And this is now very much a Hobby enterprise.

His famous wife, Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, is president and editor, and works with the same dedication she gave her former jobs as World War II commanding officer of the Woman's Army Corps and as a member of President Eisenhower's Cabinet. Their daughter, Mrs. Jessica Hobby Catto, is a director. Will Hobby, Jr., is an associate editor, and has his desk in the midst of the busy city room. And Will, Jr.'s attractive wife, Mrs. Diana Poteat Hobby, edits one of the better book sections in the Southwest.

Home for Oveta and Will, Sr., is a huge, 3-storied brick mansion at No. 2 Remington Lane in Houston, and the former Governor has the whole third floor for an office. This was once the home of an early day Houston oil pioneer, J. S. Cullinan, a fellow who flew a skull and crossbones flag from his oil company headquarters. (The Jolly Roger was flown at half mast from Houston's Petroleum Building when Mr. Cullinan died.)

When he lived in the mansion, Mr. Cullinan had the driveway 75 yards from the front gallery because he didn't like to smell the gas fumes of early day automobiles. When Will Hobby bought the house in 1947 he moved the driveway in closer to the gallery.

"The Guv didn't want his friends to have to hike when they came to see him," said close friends.

Crime Ratio of 13 Major Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a statement from the Federal Bureau of Investigation giving the crime ratio in 13 of the cities in the United States with a population of

500,000 to 1 million. We are all delighted to see that the Washington Metropolitan Police force has made an excellent record in solving crimes here in the Nation's Capital.

We all fully realize that the Police Department in the city of Washington is confronted with problems different and of a greater magnitude than the police department of any other city. We have embassies from every country in the world located here in the city of Washington and we have people from every country in the world and every State in

the Union. We also have the NAACP headquarters, the heads of all the labor unions, the heads of all the Government departments and the Congress located here in the Nation's Capital.

We realize that we have far too much crime in the Nation's Capital at the present time; however, it is refreshing to know that our excellent police force is solving the majority of the major crimes committed in the city of Washington. We really should have a larger force since crime seems to be increasing in all sections of the country.

Crime index offenses reported,¹ cities 500,000 to 1,000,000 population, by calendar years

City	Calendar year					Percent change			
	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1954-58	1955-58	1956-58	1957-58
Baltimore	15,322	16,330	17,151	15,424	15,303	-0.1	-6.3	-10.8	-0.8
Boston	6,122	8,551	10,195	11,439	11,393	+86.1	+33.2	+11.8	-4
Buffalo	3,367	3,406	3,457	3,706	3,628	+7.8	+6.5	+4.9	-2.1
Cincinnati	3,869	3,869	4,113	4,082	3,998	+3.3	+3.3	-2.8	-2.0
Cleveland	6,477	5,174	6,741	8,261	7,994	+23.4	+54.5	+18.6	-3.2
Houston	9,355	9,968	10,675	13,274	15,620	+67.0	+56.7	+46.3	+17.9
Milwaukee	3,717	3,493	4,444	5,057	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)
Minneapolis	6,221	5,435	6,380	6,406	7,437	+19.5	+30.8	+15.6	+16.1
New Orleans	7,532	8,391	12,123	12,277	13,905	+84.6	+65.7	+14.7	+13.3
Pittsburgh	6,961	8,252	9,247	10,500	11,496	+64.7	+38.9	+24.0	+9.2
St. Louis	16,866	18,177	19,458	21,628	23,354	+38.5	+28.5	+20.0	+8.0
San Francisco	12,490	14,281	15,391	15,762	17,088	+36.9	+19.6	+11.0	+8.4
Washington	12,036	11,357	10,038	10,109	9,629	-20.0	-15.2	-4.1	-5.3
Average percent change ¹						+32.1	+24.4	+12.7	+6.0

¹ Includes murder, nonnegligent manslaughter, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny (\$50 and over), and auto theft. The FBI did not report forcible rape data for individual cities prior to 1958; therefore, that category is omitted from this report.

² Data for Milwaukee for 1958 not reported by the FBI.

³ Milwaukee is excluded from computation of the average percent change.

Source: FBI reports.

Offenses known to police

[Crime Index of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Calendar Year 1958]

CITIES 250,000 TO 500,000 POPULATION

City	1,000 population 1950 census	Crime index offenses	Offenses per 1,000 population
Akron	275	3,958	14.4
Atlanta	331	9,516	28.7
Birmingham	326	5,408	16.6
Columbus	376	7,088	18.8
Dallas	434	7,904	18.2
Denver	416	10,974	26.4
Fort Worth	279	6,187	18.6
Indianapolis	462	7,842	17.0
Jersey City	299	2,538	8.5
Kansas City, Mo.	437	4,538	9.9
Long Beach	251	7,979	31.8
Louisville	369	8,244	22.3
Memphis	407	5,254	12.9
Newark	439	11,948	27.2
Oakland	385	5,516	14.3
Omaha	251	2,457	9.8
Portland	374	6,511	17.4
Rochester	332	2,425	7.3
St. Paul	311	3,669	11.8
San Antonio	408	9,501	23.3
San Diego	494	6,555	13.3
Seattle	468	10,220	21.8
Toledo	304	4,497	14.8

CITIES 500,000 TO 1,000,000 POPULATION

City	1,000 population 1950 census	Crime index offenses	Offenses per 1,000 population
Baltimore	950	15,399	16.2
Boston	801	11,457	14.3
Buffalo	589	3,644	6.3
Cincinnati	504	4,083	8.1
Cleveland	915	8,044	8.8
Houston	895	15,730	20.4
Milwaukee	637	(¹)	
Minneapolis	522	7,433	14.3
New Orleans	570	14,022	24.6
Pittsburgh	677	11,590	17.1
St. Louis	857	23,574	27.5
San Francisco	775	17,232	22.2
Washington	802	9,687	12.1

¹ Not reported.

Offenses cleared by arrest, calendar year 1958

Classification	Percent cleared	
	District of Columbia	National Average ¹
Murder, nonnegligent manslaughter	97	94
Manslaughter by negligence	100	90
Forcible rape	84	73
Robbery	78	43
Aggravated assault	90	79
Burglary, breaking or entering	62	39
Larceny-theft	44	20
Auto theft	41	27
Total	57	(²)

¹ Average clearance rate of 1,972 cities reported by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

² Not reported.

Crime index offenses reported,¹ cities 500,000 to 1,000,000 population, by calendar years

City	Calendar year				
	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958
Baltimore	15,322	16,330	17,151	15,424	15,303
Boston	6,122	8,551	10,195	11,439	11,393
Buffalo	3,367	3,406	3,457	3,706	3,628
Cincinnati	3,869	3,869	4,113	4,082	3,998
Cleveland	6,477	5,174	6,741	8,261	7,994
Houston	9,355	9,968	10,675	13,274	15,620
Milwaukee	3,717	3,493	4,444	5,057	(²)
Minneapolis	6,221	5,435	6,380	6,406	7,437
New Orleans	7,532	8,391	12,123	12,277	13,905
Pittsburgh	6,961	8,252	9,247	10,500	11,496
St. Louis	16,866	18,177	19,458	21,628	23,354
San Francisco	12,490	14,281	15,391	15,762	17,088
Washington	12,036	11,357	10,038	10,109	9,629

¹ Includes murder, nonnegligent manslaughter, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny (\$50 and over), and auto theft. The FBI did not report forcible rape for individual cities prior to 1958; therefore, that category is excluded from this report.

² Not reported by the FBI.

Source: FBI Reports.

Offenses known to police, cities 500,000 to 1,000,000 population, calendar year 1958

	1950 population, 1,000	Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter	Forcible rape	Robbery	Aggravated assault	Burglary	Larceny over \$50	Auto theft	Total
Baltimore.....	950	100	96	798	2,224	3,807	3,923	4,451	15,399
Boston.....	801	27	64	523	448	3,113	2,739	4,543	11,457
Buffalo.....	580	19	16	191	247	1,184	380	1,607	3,644
Cincinnati.....	504	30	85	242	288	1,379	1,141	918	4,083
Cleveland.....	915	73	50	1,107	524	2,939	1,026	2,325	8,044
Houston.....	596	117	110	597	1,130	7,790	2,593	3,393	15,730
Milwaukee.....	637	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Minneapolis.....	522	8	16	389	95	3,449	1,948	1,548	7,453
New Orleans.....	570	55	117	1,191	625	4,417	3,059	4,558	14,022
Pittsburgh.....	677	27	94	884	671	4,499	2,378	3,007	11,500
St. Louis.....	857	91	220	2,222	2,432	9,543	4,583	4,483	23,574
San Francisco.....	775	34	144	1,518	1,217	6,087	2,303	5,929	17,232
Washington.....	802	74	58	639	2,329	3,316	1,548	1,723	9,687

* Only 11 months of reports received by the FBI.

Source: FBI reports.

The White Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we are receiving literally thousands of letters in support of the Great White Fleet proposal which was advanced in a resolution introduced by myself and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and in the other body by Representatives EDMUNDSON and BATES. The editorial support of the Great White Fleet proposal is broad and enthusiastic. One of the good editorials which has come to my attention on this subject was published in the Faribault Daily News, of Faribault, Minn., on July 31.

Mr. President, I asked my staff this morning how many communications we had received on the Great White Fleet proposal. The number is more than 11,000. So the proposal has had a considerable amount of enthusiastic support as a result of the publicity given to it and the information about it which was published in Life magazine.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Faribault (Minn.) Daily News, July 31, 1959]

AN IDEA WORTH CONSIDERING

The Great White Fleet idea to foster world peace through humanitarian service has been revived and the idea deserves wholehearted consideration from all citizens.

In 1907 President Theodore Roosevelt sent 16 American battleships on a cruise around the world. The "Great White Fleet" (American warships were then painted white in peacetime) carried its intended message: That the United States was emerging from an era of preoccupation with recovering from its own great civil conflict and with developing a continent under a network of railroads—from an era of taken-for-granted security behind the British Navy—and that it now was a world power.

Today an idea initiated by a young Navy commander, Frank Manson, and now sponsored by Senators Humphrey, Minnesota, and Aiken, Vermont, and Representatives Bates and Edmondson—a bipartisan group—

is being framed into a resolution asking President Eisenhower to recommitment from ships now in mothballs a modern "Great White Fleet."

This would carry aid to disaster-stricken areas throughout the world and technical assistance to nations which welcome it.

There are, of course, practical problems to be solved. Except for emergency rescues, care of the injured, food and shelter, the needs arising from disasters vary greatly. And the fleet could be a long way off from the place it would be needed. But these difficulties are not wholly unsolvable. Even tardy, partial aid would not necessarily be futile. And technical assistance (instruction) could be a continuation service.

As a dramatic, impressive, traveling advertisement of Americans' dominant desire to be helpful, not warlike, the idea has enormous possibilities.

It certainly should be seriously explored and considered.

Need for Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a concurrent resolution calling for the creation of a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy.

I sincerely hope that the resolution, which has also been introduced by a number of my colleagues, will be approved at this session of the Congress.

There is an urgent need, Mr. Speaker, for the Government to formulate a fuels policy. We have an oil and gas policy and a policy for the development of atomic energy. But the Federal Government has never determined just what the national policy for coal should be. Nor has it determined just how each of these fuels shall be fitted into a national picture.

Tremendous demands for fuels of all kinds can be expected in the future. The United States has a rapidly expanding economy. And we can all agree, I am sure, that adequate fuels are essential to the national security.

The National Coal Policy Committee is strongly supporting this resolution.

This new organization represents all segments of the coal industry—mine operators, miners, coal-carrying railroads, and machinery manufacturers.

The new Coal Policy Committee is naturally interested in the growth and development of the coal industry. But more importantly, it is interested in seeing that a national policy, making full use of all of our fuels, is worked out.

I can think of no better way to accomplish this objective than by entrusting the difficult job to a joint congressional committee.

Exchange of Classroom Teachers Would Aid International Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, while peace is fought with different weapons than war, man-to-man contact is an essential factor in both.

In recognition of this fact, our Government has sponsored or supported a series of programs designed to better acquaint people of other lands with America and increase knowledge on the part of our citizens of different nations. Experts in a multitude of fields have been sent abroad to exchange views with their counterparts in another country. Similarly, the United States has played host to numerous foreign delegations. The result has been better understanding.

One field where such meetings have realized spectacular success is education. Many myths regarding Russian education have been dispelled due to knowledge gained by American educators who visited the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, at the annual convention of the National Education Association held in St. Louis earlier this year, the NEA Department of Classroom Teachers approved a resolution which I believe would increase our opportunity to gain from exchange visits. The resolution urged that groups of classroom teachers be sent abroad to communicate directly with teachers of other lands.

I think this is an excellent proposal. I hope that the Office of Education will act upon it. As Ewald Turner, president of the Department of Classroom Teachers and a resident of Pendleton, Oreg., in my State, stated to me in a recent letter:

We feel that selected classroom teachers, by the very nature of their professional experience, are uniquely experienced in the field of human relations and could do much toward building international understanding.

I subscribe to Mr. Turner's sentiments. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution approved by the NEA Department of Classroom Teachers be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Department of Classroom Teachers, National Education Association]

INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

The department believes that improved human relations are vitally important to the increasingly significant role our country is playing in world affairs and that it is the responsibility of each teacher to develop and foster in American children respect for the cultures of other peoples.

The department commends the U.S. Office of Education for sending educational officials abroad to study school systems and to promote international understanding. It respectfully proposes that the U.S. Office of Education and other agencies give consideration to sending groups of classroom teachers abroad to observe educational methods and instructional procedures in classrooms and to communicate directly with teachers of other lands.

The Venue Provisions of the Federal Employers' Liability Act Should Be Changed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, under the present provisions of the Federal Employers Liability Act an action against railroads for wrongful death or personal injuries may be brought in a district court of the United States, in the district of the residence of the defendant, or in which the cause of action arose, or in which the defendant shall be doing business at the time of commencing such action. The jurisdiction of the courts of the United States under this act shall be concurrent with that of the courts of the several States, and no case arising under this act and brought in any State court of competent jurisdiction shall be removed to any court of the United States.

The bill I have today introduced would provide somewhat different venue in actions brought in State and Federal courts. Under the bill an action could be brought only in a district court of the United States within or in a State court of competent jurisdiction of first, the

State in which the action arose, or second, the State in which the person suffering injury or death was a resident at the time the cause of action arose. The bill adds a proviso to the effect that if, at any time within the period during which suit on any such cause of action shall not be barred by limitation, the railroad against which the cause of action is asserted shall either not be doing business within the State in which the cause of action arose or shall not be doing business within the State of which the person suffering injury or death was a resident at the time the cause of action arose, in that event such suit may at such time be brought in any district court of the United States within, or in a State court of competent jurisdiction or, any State in which such carrier is doing business.

The purpose of this legislation is to bring to an end the widespread and ever-increasing practice of solicitation and transportation of lawsuits to jurisdictions remote from the localities in which the causes of action arose. It will result in lawsuits being handled by the local lawyers in the communities where the accident occurs rather than by a few soliciting lawyers who improperly take advantage of the unique provision now contained in the Federal Employers' Liability Act.

The public interest will be promoted by the elimination of a practice which has proved to be unjust and burdensome and which has interfered in many instances with efficient railroad operation.

As long ago as June 1946 the Bar Association of Knoxville, Tenn., became aroused as the result of the flagrant practice of solicitation of cases and passed a resolution in favor of limitation of venue under the Federal Employers' Liability Act. Subsequently the Tennessee Bar Association passed a similar resolution. These resolutions led to the introduction in the 80th Congress of H.R. 1639, the so-called Jennings bill. That measure, while not identical with the bill here introduced, contained substantially similar provisions.

Subsequent to the introduction of the Jennings bill, the American Bar Association and the bar associations of 39 States went on record as endorsing the principles of the bill. In addition, hundreds of city and county bar associations and hundreds of practicing lawyers endorsed the bill.

Hearings on H.R. 1639 were held before the House Committee on the Judiciary. The bill, in amended form, was reported and passed the House of Representatives. A subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary held hearings and favorably reported an amended bill to the full committee, but the Jennings bill never reached the floor of the Senate.

Many railroads operate through 8 or 10, or more, States, and maintain offices and officers in still other States. It follows, under the law as it now stands, that a suit may be filed in a jurisdiction hundreds and even thousands of miles from the locality where the injured person lives and the accident happened. There is thus afforded an opportunity

for abuse by unscrupulous "solicity" lawyers.

The testimony presented at the hearings on the Jennings bill revealed that these opportunities of misusing the judicial processes has not been overlooked. Both the House and Senate committees found that certain unethical attorneys solicited cases under the Federal Employers' Liability Act and transported them to far-distant places for trial and that such lawyers employed runners or touts to solicit business for them, all to the detriment of the legal profession, the railroad workers, the railroads and the general public. The evidence at the hearings showed that the legal business under this act was concentrated in the hands of a relatively small number of practicing attorneys in the United States and that such actions were customarily brought in a restricted number of communities in the country. This situation which was shown to exist in 1947 has not improved. If anything it is worse today than ever before.

Disbarment proceedings have been filed against various attorneys who have degraded their profession by the solicitation of personal injury status against railroads, and injunction proceedings have been instituted against other attorneys to prevent their further prosecution of other cases. Many attorneys have been censured, some have been disbarred, and others have been ordered to return fees which they have collected. While such actions are of some effect, it is only through the legislative process that lasting relief from these vicious practices can be obtained.

The railroads are also the victims of the pernicious practice of solicitation and transportation of causes of action. The difficulties of trying a lawsuit in a jurisdiction from the community where the cause of action arose are obvious. The bringing of a lawsuit in a distant forum, so chosen by the plaintiff, places the railroad at an unfair disadvantage. As only one example, in order to obtain an adequate and reasonable presentation of the facts in the case the defendant railroad must bring its witnesses for long distances in order that they may testify. Because witnesses who live in one State cannot be compelled to testify in the courts of another State, their attendance can be obtained only by meeting their own terms of compensation and expense allowances; and the cost of procuring their personal attendance in a foreign State may be and frequently is excessive, burdensome, and out of all proportion to the actual value of the claim in litigation.

It should be added that in virtually every case in which an action is brought against a railroad for wrongful death or personal injuries many of the railroads' witnesses are persons engaged in actual railroad operation. That operation is necessarily impaired, and the public interest suffers when those witnesses are required to be absent from their regular duties for long periods of time for the purpose of attending trials at far distant points.

There can be no doubt but that the bringing of lawsuits far from the place

where the cause of action arose constitutes an undue burden on interstate commerce and an unreasonable interference with efficient operation of the national transportation system.

In correcting the evils referred to above, the proposed legislation does not deny to claimants the opportunity to have their cases tried in an appropriate forum. One of the traditional guarantees of a fair trial under our Anglo-Saxon system of law has always been that the trial shall take place where the act complained of occurred, before a jury composed of the peers of the parties. This procedure would save much expense to litigants. It would seem both unusual and extraordinary if, as a general proposition, it would not be to the advantage of a claimant to try his claim in the area in which he lived or in which the accident occurred. The bill here introduced meets these traditional concepts of venue and provides the only choice of a forum which a claimant or his attorney should, in the interest of the parties and the orderly and economical administration of justice, be permitted to have in the enforcement of his rights.

Life at Airbase in Turkey Interesting to Texas Girl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on August 14, the Amarillo Daily News published an article entitled, "Life at Airbase in Turkey Interesting to Texas Girl." I found this article most interesting and I recommend it to all Members of Congress for good, objective, descriptive reporting.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIFE AT AIRBASE IN TURKEY INTERESTING TO TEXAS GIRL

(By Bob Beames)

Life for an American in Turkey is described as "difficult, but interesting," by an Air Force officer's wife who has spent the past 17 months in Turkey. A huge smile was sufficient to express her feelings about returning to America for a visit.

Mrs. Archie A. Acree, formerly of Wichita Falls, currently is visiting her sister, Mrs. Porter Oakes, 2605 Travis, here. She is the wife of Maj. Archie Acree, now assigned as a technical adviser to the Turkish Language School in Izmir, Turkey. The couple received the assignment in February 1958, and this is Mrs. Acree's first visit home since then. The duty tour to Turkey will end next March.

The trip home for Mrs. Acree was a birthday present from her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Earl Clayton of Pampa. She also has been visiting them and plans a trip to Wichita Falls before returning to Izmir on August 27.

The vivacious visitor admitted that the American military wives in Turkey suffer no real hardships while living in Turkey, but added that many conveniences are lacking. Among the items she missed most are telephones, abundant pure water and head lettuce and corn.

Sanitation in Turkey was described as being greatly inferior to American health standards. For instance, U.S. military personnel stationed in Izmir are allowed to eat no Turkish meats except lamb, and are required to soak fresh vegetables in a strong solution before cooking.

Americans there also must boil all water. This, says Mrs. Acree, is because the sewer and water lines are laid side by side and the frequent earthquakes cause seepage in the lines.

Another major difference between the two countries is in bathing facilities. Because the equipment is not adequate, the visitor said baths are much less frequent among Turks than among Americans.

Military personnel going to Turkey are required to take a 2-year supply of clothing. Mrs. Acree said. She explained that Americans bought few if any clothes there because of style and quality differences. But she mentioned that the PX there has some clothing in stock. Discussing the poor cleaning service available in Izmir, Mrs. Acree said "I send all of my cleaning home for service."

Transportation in the Near East country was described as crude and composed mostly of horses, donkeys and carts. Although there are not enough roads there, Mrs. Acree said most of them were good. However, she added that animal traffic clogged the roads and made travel dangerous.

The illiteracy rate in Turkey is high, says Mrs. Acree, and after the first few years of public education the students are charged a fee to continue. "Of course, the fee is high to these people."

Inflation was described as a major difficulty in Turkey, and Mrs. Acree said it got a big boost some 8 months ago when the lira rate was changed. It is now 9 to 1 and "when it was doubled the prices also were doubled."

Television is unknown in Turkey, but there is some radio available and "the Turks love movies," she said. She added the American wives there generally made their own recreation, usually bridge or similar games. There are some nightclubs in Izmir, but regulations on Turkish food and drinks keep most American military families away, she added.

One fascinating sight in Turkey related Mrs. Acree, is the "public oven." The Turks, and most other living there, have only a one-burner stove. For baking, they use publicly-owned public ovens where one and all bring their food. She described the Turks as good cooks and said "they manage nicely with what they have."

Tobacco was mentioned as the big thing in Turkey and much of the country's economy is built around it. Another big crop is olives, but Mrs. Acree said the Turks can grow almost anything. She described the climate as ideal with little or no rain falling from May through October. "The summers are hot, but the winters are more mild than here," she said. When asked if the dust blew there, she said, "That's an understatement."

Major and Mrs. Acree live, as do most other Americans in Turkey, in an apartment. Pictures of the apartment give the idea that nothing more could be desired, but she said the housing was not at all adequate. Particularly, she dislikes the two to four flights of stairs that must be climbed, and injected the fact that there are only three elevators in town.

Izmir is located on the west coast of Turkey and is surrounded on three sides by

mountains. Much of the country is rocky and land is at a premium. With a population of more than 200,000, Izmir is one of the three major cities in Turkey and is a pretty town, according to Mrs. Acree.

Although Turkey is a strange and distant land, it is relatively close travelwise. Mrs. Acree left Izmir August 2 and arrived in Amarillo the next day. During the two-day flight she passed through Athens, Istanbul, Rome, Paris and New York City. She plans to return to Izmir on August 27.

"Yes, I've enjoyed it; I've loved it," she said, but continued "there is nothing like the 'land of the big PX,'" as military personnel there refer to the United States.

Need Law To Halt Appraisal Abuse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, when the Congress switched the Federal-State matching formula from 50-50 to 90-10 in the highway program, many people felt that this was an invitation to the States to not be too careful about expenditures. A possible indication of this being the result is now coming to the fore in St. Louis County where appraisers' fees, mostly in regard to the interstate program, have been exorbitant.

The primary point is that the State highway commission which could have appealed these cases failed to appeal them. One local circuit court judge was quoted as saying: "I don't know why everyone should get so excited. After all this is just Federal money."

I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of August 18, 1959, calling attention to this abuse. I agree that there certainly should be State law to govern appraisal fees but above all we need to change the 90-10 formula so that there will be a greater incentive on the part of the States to police expenditures.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Aug. 18, 1959]

NEED LAW TO HALT APPRAISAL ABUSE

A conference next month of the eight St. Louis County circuit judges is a discerning approach to a situation that over the past 3 years has become greatly imbalanced—to a point of public protest.

This is the matter of excessive fees to condemnation commissioners in fixing land and property values in highway construction projects. The Globe-Democrat in recent days has pointed out the wide variance between proportionate fees paid in St. Louis and those paid in St. Louis County.

Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS finds the amount of the county fees shocking.

Some of them are. The situation as it has been permitted to develop is appalling. These high rates of pay, in one instance almost 25 percent of the determined value of the property, have been made for relatively brief periods of the appraiser's time, or far in excess of established average rates paid elsewhere in Missouri.

In a few cases the appraisal fee was many times greater than value put on the property.

The State Highway Commission's general counsel has requested an exploratory conference with the county's circuit judges. It will be held after the judges have conferred en banc on their awards, which have been publicized in detail in the last 2 weeks.

This situation would not have developed had there been a regulatory standard by which remunerations to the condemnation commissioners could have been judged.

What is needed is a definite yardstick which can be applied easily and fairly in every condemnation proceeding.

The situation calls for a state law establishing a fee not to exceed \$100 a day for each day of a commissioner's time on the appraising job. This we propose in order to revise the indiscriminate court-applied payments.

Such a basic compulsory fee would be fair to all. It would eliminate out-of-line awards through political preference or favoritism. It would eliminate spiraling precedents.

In short, it would relieve courts from the responsibility of arriving at an arbitrary figure.

It should prevent such variances as these: \$22,500 in fees to a three-man commission for 10 days of work in appraising 28 acres valued at \$216,250; \$13,500 in fees for appraising 54 parcels of property valued at only \$46,520; \$34,500 in fees for 41 parcels of State-acquired property with a valuation of \$1,305,350; a \$900 fee for establishing a nominal value of \$8 in a Daniel Boone Expressway right-of-way dispute.

By contrast in the city, \$1,500 was paid for work on property valued at \$176,020, the same amount for property valued at \$316,500, and \$5,250 for property valued at \$880,455.

These are among the more disproportionate of the county cases, but they illustrate the difference between the 1-percent rate usually averaged in the city and the much higher rate of the county.

Not all of the condemnation commissioners are, by any means, trained, experienced appraisers. The courts have shown an inclination to appoint political friends and acquaintances, attorneys, State legislators, subsequent holders of county and city offices, and leaders of political parties.

Expert appraisers, members of the American Institute of Real Estate Appraisers, receive \$100 a day, and usually \$50 to \$75 per parcel.

State law provides the commissioners are to receive a reasonable compensation. A fee of \$100 fixed by State law would meet that requirement. It certainly would put a halt to the arbitrary manner in which fees have been determined in the past.

The eight county circuit judges are meeting today in an informal discussion preliminary to September's en banc session. It will be an excellent time to consider such a law.

Appraisal fees awarded by the courts are paid by the State highway commission out of State funds. The commission and taxpayers have been abused by the excessive fees in past cases. Further abuses cannot be condoned.

Southerners Can Steady Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, during the past few days I have placed in

the Appendix of the RECORD editorials from almost every newspaper in South Carolina on the subject of the need for a strong and effective labor reform bill. I ask unanimous consent to have another editorial entitled "Southerners Can Steady Country" printed in the Appendix to the RECORD. This excellent editorial was published in the August 18, 1959, issue of the Columbia Record, Columbia, S.C., which is ably edited by Mr. Henry Cauthen.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record, Aug. 18, 1959]

SOUTHERNERS CAN STEADY COUNTRY

Regardless of the forthcoming action of the Senate, pro or con, on the labor reform bill, the demonstration of good sense and its recognition of excesses by the House of Representatives will remain an important development.

One branch of the Congress moving to restore order and restraint to the sphere of trade unionism discloses importantly an interest in the country as a whole. For some years now what have been regarded as the interests of labor, only, have enjoyed favor in the Congress.

It should not be forgotten by the people, and especially by the rank-and-file members of unions, that laws strongly favoring trade unionism will remain on the books. The whole structure of contemporary trade unionism is supported by these laws, many of which are regarded as decidedly unfair to everybody else and some of which, despite Supreme Court approval, are held to be unconstitutional.

The action of the House of Representatives in passing what is regarded as a "strong" labor reform bill could represent a decisive change in this country. It could reflect the country's recognition of too much power for any one group and the people's desire to see correction.

How deeply this will impress itself upon the Senate conferees and the Senate itself remains to be seen. But the decision there is likely to show once more that southerners are sound, that they consider the stability of the country as a whole and that much of the generally adverse verdict as to the South by outsiders has not been a just verdict.

The South and its people offer a nucleus for a return to reason in this country. It is notable that the leaders of labor who are most concerned about the action of the House are men who time after time have attacked the South and have joined in the crusade to change, by force, our section of the country.

Perhaps not all southern Senators will vote for an effective labor reform bill in the Senate. There are some whose past records strongly indicate they will join the northern and western "liberals" in the Senate to reduce the House bill to one of weakness.

We believe those southern Senators who would so vote are not correctly reading the minds of thousands in their own section of the country.

They would seem justified, as southerners, in joining in what could be a southern leadership of the country—and in the right direction. Meanwhile, they would be supporting, not opposing that which they have always purported to support.

Southern Members of the House of Representatives, in concert with Republicans, passed the reform bill in the House, with all of South Carolina's six Members voting for it. This was admirable, and the sample of steadying influence for the country.

Current Activities of Communist Party, U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report on the Communist Party, U.S.A.:

CURRENT ACTIVITIES OF COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.

The Communist Party, U.S.A. is currently intensifying its agitation program, designed to weaken America's national security. A close examination of recent Communist moves indicates that the Party is working on a well-planned program. Every American citizen should be acquainted with these sinister moves in order to protect our democratic freedoms.

VISITS OF COMMUNIST LEADERS IN RUSSIA

Since January 1959, a number of ranking American Communist leaders have visited in Russia. This is most significant since it enables the Soviets to personally issue instructions to Communists in the United States. Moreover, this new development is reminiscent of the personal contacts between American and Russian Communists in the days of the Comintern when Party leaders in America, such as Earl Browder and William Z. Foster, streamed to Moscow. This obviously means a much closer affiliation between the Communist Party, U.S.A., and the Kremlin. The highest ranking American Communist to visit Moscow was James Edward Jackson, Jr., presently head of the Negro Affairs Committee. In fact, Jackson, as an official delegate of the Communist Party, U.S.A., addressed the 21st Congress of the Soviet Union on February 2, 1959. At that time, he expressed fraternal greetings to the Soviets and stated that Communists in the United States found great inspiration in the Russian Party. He promised that the Communist Party, U.S.A., would struggle to help in the so-called fight for peace (which is Moscow's presented propaganda line). Jackson was also at the Third Congress of the Polish Communist Party. This visit occurred after leaving Russia. The Worker on April 12, 1959, reported that Jackson, in a speech before the Polish Party Congress, predicted that the day will come when the "workers" in the United States will bring socialism to this country.

AFTERMATH OF JACKSON'S VISIT AMONG COMMUNISTS IN THE UNITED STATES

Jackson's visit to Soviet Russia has served as an invigorating tonic to communism in the United States. Actually, Communist activity has been greatly stimulated with the party (1) consolidating its own internal organizational structure, and (2) increasing agitational activity against non-Communists. It appears obvious that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is presently implementing instructions received in Moscow.

Among indications of increased Communist activity in the United States are the following:

1. Party schools: The party is conducting a number of leadership schools among its membership. The Communists realize that a strong party is based on strong leadership. Leaders must be well versed in Marxist-Leninist principles. This means that they must be thoroughly indoctrinated in party history, Marxist ideology and organizational techniques.

Hyman Lumer, national education director of the party, has recently conducted a number of party schools throughout the country. For example, in June 1959, he conducted a party school in New York City; later that month in Detroit, and Los Angeles, and in July, in Seattle. Topics taught included, among others, class struggle, imperialism, socialism, Communist Party organizational problems and Negro questions. Basic Communist classics were utilized such as the works of Karl Marx and V. I. Lenin.

2. Youth activities: Historically the party has always been interested in young people. The party must recruit, train, and influence young people in order to survive. Plans are underway for a Communist-sponsored youth conference in the fall of 1959. Likewise, the party is interested in starting a Communist youth organization for the purpose of working among young people.

3. Strategy in industry: The party is increasingly interested in infiltrating the Nation's basic industries. Primary targets include, among others, the railroad, steel and automobile industries. The party realizes that to exert influence it must have members in labor unions and in strategic positions in industry. Currently national party headquarters is instructing local units to increase efforts to consolidate party influence in industry.

As proof of the party's interest in this field, a number of party "commission" meetings have been held where specific problems of infiltration have been discussed. The non-Communist industrial leader probably does not realize how closely the party will study his company for the purpose of locating an opportunity to infiltrate. Party leaders are constantly alert for a chance to "get a job" for a Communist member in some strategic industry.

Further proof of the party's interest is the activity of a national labor secretary who is exclusively devoting his time to party industrial work.

As is well-known, labor unions are a favorite target of the Communists. In the past the party has achieved considerable strength in certain unions. During the post-World War II years, much of this strength was lost. At the present time, the party is working strenuously to recapture positions of strength in the labor movement.

4. Negro matters: Another favorite field of communism is the Negro. The party is always attempting to represent itself as the protector of the Negro. Today the party is again trumpeting its so-called interest in Negroes, hoping to build party strength among Negro groups. However, the party is never sincerely interested in the Negro, but only hoping to exploit Negroes to build Communist strength.

5. Future plans: At present the Communist Party, U.S.A., is planning to hold another national convention, the 17th, in December. The party organizational apparatus is being geared to that end. Very recently a national committee meeting of the Communist Party was held which discussed, among other things, plans for the national convention. The party is proposing to publicize a draft program which will set forth the party's line on current national and international issues.

A national convention is always used by the party as a technique to drum up enthusiasm among the membership. Delegates are elected from various party units and they come to the convention to vote on party problems. The occasion is used to increase party financial contributions and propaganda.

Of course, a party national convention is certainly not a true convention in the sense of the operation of free government. Actually the delegates vote slavishly as the leaders indicate. Discussion is limited to minor details, for the convention will adopt the program desired by the leading clique.

In other words, the national convention is actually a window dressing designed to show the party as a democratic organization.

INFILTRATION INTO MASS ORGANIZATIONS

The party is increasing its tempo of infiltrating non-Communist mass organizations. The purpose in this technique is to increase party influence and power.

As recently as June 1959, for example, the press carried dispatches concerning an individual by the name of Mr. Sidney T. Efron who had been elected as president of the Glen Haven Elementary School (Silver Spring, Md.) PTA. Efron was summoned before the House Committee on Un-American Activities to answer allegations that he was a former Communist member. At that time Efron invoked the fifth amendment 39 times and later submitted his resignation as president of the PTA.

At the House committee meeting, a sworn statement of a former FBI informant in Ohio was read into the record. The informant, in this statement, identified Efron as an individual whom he had known as a Communist and as head of a faction of the steel cell of the Communist Party.

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

William Z. Foster is currently chairman emeritus of the Communist Party, U.S.A. He is an old-time party leader and has been a prominent voice in American communism ever since the founding of the party.

In 1948 Foster, along with 11 other leaders of the Communist Party, was indicted for violation of the Smith Act. Foster has never been prosecuted because of ill health.

Foster is now advanced in years but still is able, despite his claims of ill health, to carry on many party activities. He is a prime policymaker and has stood for a strong Marxist-Leninist base for the Communist Party, U.S.A. To show Foster's current activity, for example, Political Affairs (theoretical publication of the party) has carried feature articles under Foster's name in six of the seven issues published during 1959. If a man is able to write so consistently, he must not be in such bad health. It seems that there has been a miscarriage of justice in not bringing William Z. Foster to trial. Foster is presently endeavoring to secure court permission to go to Moscow, ostensibly for medical treatment.

FIDEL CASTRO

To read press comments concerning events in Cuba, the average American may gain the impression that he is witnessing a flamboyant circus—often with more than the traditional three rings. He hears about giant rallies of Cubans, with overtones of drama; the ousting of high officials in the Government on short notice; high-sounding speeches in which neighbors are threatened.

In fact, the Castro regime is a circus—a very deadly and serious circus. It is a "circus" in the sense that Americans have been greatly attracted by what is going on. It is a serious matter in that Fidel Castro may represent a very great danger to the security of the United States. From all indications, this young, bearded revolutionary is greatly influenced by communism. This means that America may wake up some morning and find the island of Cuba a Communist bastion on our very doorstep.

The fact must be remembered that Castro gained power, not by democratic processes, but by the sword—a revolutionary military campaign. As is well known, Castro's revolution was based on a small but disciplined minority. From a mere handful of some 12 men, a military group sprang which led to the overthrow of the legitimate government. The Castro government is living proof of the ability of a small but dedicated minority to overthrow governmental institutions. Press dispatches indicate that Fidel Castro has associated with individuals who have Communist affiliations. For example, his brother, Raul Castro, reportedly addressed the Communist-directed International Conference for

Defense of the Rights of Youths in Vienna in 1953. Later, he reportedly attended the World Festival of Youths and Students at Bucharest. On his way home he visited other Iron Curtain countries. As a student in Havana he associated with Communists.

Another associate, Ernesto "Che" Guevara, also reportedly is of Communist sympathies. He reportedly was active in the Russo-Mexican Institute of Cultural Relations and is believed to be the primary link between Fidel Castro and international communism.

Still another associate known to be connected with Communists is Camilo Cienfuegos y Gorriaran. This individual was arrested in January 1956 while serving as the director of the Havana Communist front, "frente popular."

The leftwing connections of these individuals point out the dangers America faces. Likewise, the Castro regime has brought forth violent anti-American agitation. This country should have the very best of relations with our neighbors. To hear Fidel Castro and his henchmen criticize the United States is to realize that Cuba is a trouble spot which may cause America much grief in the future.

Preston J. Moore, national commander of the American Legion, last June brought valuable facts to the American people concerning Fidel Castro. He said:

"The Communist Party, previously outlawed, now enjoys Government recognition and encouragement.

"The army is peppered with Communists. An ardent Communist commands it. Another has directed the execution of more than 600 Batista henchmen and enemies of the revolution, as the charge was sometimes phrased.

"Communists and fellow travelers dominate a number of national labor unions. Known Communists control some of the largest newspapers. In the communications field—radio and television—and in education at every level, there is active Red penetration. History textbooks for use in the schools are to be rewritten—under the guidance of a commission headed by a fellow traveler.

"This is not hearsay. It is a boiled-down, composite picture of the present situation in Cuba as reported by veteran American newsmen and others on the scene."

Mr. Moore asked this pertinent question: "What would a Communist Cuba mean to us? It would mean, at least, a massive staging center in our front yard from which Moscow could direct economic and political broadsides against the Americas. It would place an intolerable pressure upon our military defenses in the Caribbean and Panama Canal areas. It would lead inevitably, I believe, to the active commitment of our Armed Forces.

"Pray that the power of our Government and of an aroused public opinion will be asserted to head off these eventualities. When the Red Chinese threatened to take over a couple of islands half a world away from us, we stood up and were counted. We shouldn't need a Communist gun in our ribs to remind us that Cuba is less than half an hour away."

Branch Rickey: Key to the Success of the Continental League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a key to the success of the third major league

is its newly appointed president, the irrepressible Branch Rickey. Mr. Rickey with his rich background of baseball experience and his proved ability as a pioneer, provides the know-how the Continental League needs to become a reality.

Not the least of Branch Rickey's attributes is his charm—a quality which was displayed very prominently to us during the recent hearings of the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation. The Rickey charm and eloquence will be important factors in the progress of the Continental League and will particularly stand in good stead in the new league's dealings with Congress.

These and other facets of Branch Rickey's personality and career were dealt with in an interesting column written by Jimmy Powers, the outstanding sportswriter of the New York Daily News. I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Daily News, Aug. 19, 1959]

THE POWERHOUSE

(By Jimmy Powers)

One of the criticisms of the Continental League was that it did not have experienced baseball men in its top echelon. This flaw was promptly removed yesterday by the appointment of Branch Rickey. The man who brought the Negro into baseball and who founded baseball's great incubating system, is an ideal choice as president. He knows how to organize, how to direct, and how to deal with the backstage maneuvers so necessary to any going circuit but most vital to a new one.

With all due respect to Bill Shea, the original sparkplug of the new setup, Bill is not in the same class with baseball's elder statesman. In his field Bill is excellent. He can round up the capital and smooth the way politically through the various city councils along the route. But Rickey is the man with the tremendous prestige needed to guide the Continental in what will probably be a long series of conferences with Commissioner Ford Frick, the American and National executive committees as well as congressional subcommittee members.

This last group is most important. Rickey with all his charm will need the power of Congress behind him if he is going to make any headway at all. And by the same token, if Rickey cannot pull it off, no one else on the immediate horizon can.

Anyone who has suffered any illness and is along in years will agree with Rickey's philosophy that he feels he will live just as long active as inactive. It was this philosophy that prompted President Eisenhower to resume his duties in the White House and to continue to play his usual 18 holes of golf.

HE'S NO OUT-OF-WORK VETERAN

Bill Shea is not hiring an out-of-work veteran standing on the sidelines hat in hand. Rickey's \$50,000 a year contract at Pittsburgh still had 16 months to run. Although 77, Rickey could be well worth every penny of that and more.

Rickey has a reputation of installing a system so well his successors were able to coast along for years under the momentum he set up. In 1917, when he went to the

Cardinals as general manager, he and the new owner, Sam Breadon, found the club \$175,000 in debt. It was a challenge the bushy browed former lawyer and Chautauqua temperance speaker accepted with relish.

He was unable to compete on even terms with the big money clubs, so his clever mind devised the farm system. He developed it and expended it to the point where the Cards rosters were soon overflowing with talent.

He not only left the Rickey stamp on Rickey-trained players, but on Rickey-trained executives as well. He gave Larry MacPhail his first baseball job at Columbus. He started Warren Giles at St. Joseph, Mo. Gabe Paul, George Trautman, and many, many others followed.

He didn't always have a favorable press, but this did not deter him. He came up with a National League championship and won the World Series in 1926 and from that point on his record was one of new challenges and new successes.

Until he left the Cardinals in 1942 the team finished out of the first division only three times. They collected five more pennants and won three of the next 4 years after he left.

This last is highly significant. When he left St. Louis the momentum was so great and the organizational work so sound the team won without him. When he left the Dodgers the momentum was equally as great and the key farm figures were so shrewdly stationed that the Dodgers won without him.

If he can organize the Continental League and can install league supervisory personnel of his training and choosing then the old gentleman can bow out in a few years secure in the knowledge that the new organization can stand on its own feet and weather any storm.

Rickey always has an eye out for emergencies. He knows how to take appropriate steps. He came to Brooklyn during World War II and immediately began signing bright young men to contracts before they entered the service. When the war was over he had an ample supply of talent. These green youngsters, mixed with a sprinkling of veterans, were good enough to give the Dodgers their second pennant in 27 years in 1947.

RICKEY STARTED DODGER SUCCESS

The Dodgers finished no worse than third until Rickey left in 1950. The Dodgers have been a threat ever since and most siddlers agree Rickey put the organization on its feet and is deserving of some credit for its subsequent success.

Rickey sold his Brooklyn stock for \$1,025,000 and signed a 5-year contract with the Pirates at \$100,000 a year. He spent \$496,000 for talent in his first year, but the Pirates did not immediately improve. Rickey quit as general manager and at the end of his 5-year contract took a reduced salary as chairman of the board.

Rickey still may be vindicated. The Pirates finished second last year. They are in the first division this year.

Rickey may be persuasive enough to induce certain National League owners to cooperate with him in noncompetitive areas. He can charm entire boards of directors. He has demonstrated great success specializing in raising underdogs into challenging positions. He is too big to be snubbed by Frick, the National League or the American League. They wouldn't dare. He knows where too many bodies are buried.

This Continental League may be right down his alley. If anyone is going to put it across, it has to be a man with Rickey's ability to con the help, con the boss who writes the checks, and con the customers who turn out to see the new show.

Operation Bootstrap—Reservation Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD an editorial from the August 10, 1959, issue of the Salt Lake City Deseret News, which strongly supports the plan for Indian self-help which I have copied from Operation Bootstrap in Puerto Rico. The editorial is as follows:

OPERATION BOOTSTRAP FOR INDIANS

The Government of the United States has spent \$180 million on Indian welfare programs during the 1959 fiscal year and this amount is expected to increase rapidly in future years. Yet, some 535,000 Indians remain our "poor country cousins," living on remote agriculturally-based reservations, virtually untouched by our vast industrial economy.

The time has come to do something about industrializing and diversifying the Indian economy—if these, our original Americans, can be said to have any economy. Many of them are permanently on relief, because so few jobs are available to them. Approximately 80 percent of our reservation Indians have little or no job opportunities.

Representative E. Y. BERRY (Republican of South Dakota), whose home is on the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation, the old stamping grounds of Sitting Bull, has been living with this problem for upward of 10 years. He has come up with a plan which seems to us a logical and practical solution. The South Dakotan proposes a program that would put the Indian in business, a setup something after the order of Puerto Rico's Operation Bootstrap.

Puerto Rico launched Operation Bootstrap in 1946, a facility under which the Commonwealth government offered long-term tax exemptions and long-term sales or leases on industrial plants to bring new industries to the island. Some 600 new industries have located in Puerto Rico under its now-famous bootstrap program. Now, instead of being "the poorhouse of the Caribbean," Puerto Rico has the second highest standard of living in Latin America. The island has risen from a burden on the U.S. Treasury to sixth place as a major customer for American goods.

It is reasonably certain that Operation Bootstrap could be fashioned to meet the needs of the American Indian. After talks with Puerto Rico's Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín, Representative BERRY introduced a bill in the House, which would authorize the tribes to sell or lease property for industrial plants on a long-term basis. Of course all this would be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior. Any industries moving in on Indian lands would receive complete exemption from Federal, State, and local taxes for 10 years.

If the setup appears a bit impractical, it should be remembered that Puerto Rico has proved to the world that such an industrialization can be made to work. No question about it, most Indians on a reservation, especially the young folk who have had the advantage of the new schooling opportunities, would gladly swap a Government dole for a weekly paycheck.

The splendid thing about the Berry Indian program is that it requires nary a dol-

lar of the taxpayers' money. If it can change the status of our Indian citizens from dependents on the Federal Treasury, to self-supporting producers, as it did the Puerto Ricans, it should be given prompt and preferred consideration by the Congress.

World Challenge to American Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, we know that Medico—Medical International Cooperation—was organized by American physicians for the fundamental purposes of voluntarily giving their professional services on the most basic physician-to-patient level to peoples of the world in need of these services. As a division of the International Rescue Committee, Medico offers to other peoples the great strength of this Nation, not only in medical knowledge, skill, and materials, but in the humanitarian instincts, the generosity, and the compassion of our people.

Dr. Peter D. Comanduras, the distinguished Secretary-General of Medico, recently composed an editorial for the July 1959 edition of Medical Annals of the District of Columbia. Speaking from the background of his experiences with Medico, Dr. Comanduras in this editorial concisely and clearly spells out "The World Challenge to American Medicine."

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Comanduras' article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WORLD CHALLENGE TO AMERICAN MEDICINE

(By Peter D. Comanduras)

Alfred North Whitehead, the late mathematician-philosopher, said at one time, "No period of history has ever been great or can ever be that does not act on some sort of high idealistic motives. Idealism in our time has been set aside and we are paying the penalty for it."

An opportunity and a challenge are being presented to the American medical profession today to espouse idealistic and humanitarian motives, worldwide in extent, and universal in their implications. This opportunity is offered by the organization known as MEDICO, or Medical International Cooperation. MEDICO was organized a little over a year ago, on February 4, 1958, as a division of the International Rescue Committee. A national group of American physicians, devoted to international good will, and acutely conscious of the appalling discrepancy between medical care and practice in this country and the distressing medical conditions prevalent in the rest of the world, especially in the newly developing countries of Asia and Africa, decided to go into effective action.

One of the compelling reasons for initiating MEDICO was based on the shocking appreciation of the fact that one-half of the world—over 1 billion people—from the moment they are born until they die have no

access to medical care at all. There are areas in the world where the physician-population ratio runs from 1:20,000 to 1:200,000 and over. (The physician-population ratio in the United States is 1:700.) More than three-fourths of the people of the world, with the exception of Western Europe, the North American Continent, and Australia, are born in poverty and misery, eke out an existence during the greater part of their lifetime in semistarvation and semipollution, and, if not crippled, blinded, or deformed during infancy and adolescence by diseases long since preventable, die prematurely from illnesses which are curable in other more fortunate parts of the world. Epidemics of smallpox, diphtheria, cholera, and typhoid fever, which are practically never seen in this country, rage sporadically and extensively in the villages and cities of Asia and Africa, taking an awesome toll of human life. From the Mediterranean to the Pacific, across the entire land mass of Asia, tuberculosis is the No. 1 health problem in every country.

These constitute only a partial segment of some of the medical facts of 20th century life in the larger and more populous sections of the world. They cannot be easily dismissed or quietly deplored. They must be met realistically and pragmatically. The privileges of freedom and democracy cannot remain viable in an atmosphere of poverty, illiteracy, and consuming and persistent disease. The vast and wide chasm that separates the daily life of the American people from the despicable existence that constitutes the burden of the individual in more than three-fourths of the globe is a dire and dangerous situation that has not been sympathetically acknowledged or properly understood and noted by the great majority of the American people. There is not sufficient awareness that in the 20th century when we boast of our scientific advances, the largest element of humanity on this planet does not enjoy the minimum needs of basic subsistence. This is the medical and humanitarian challenge which presents itself to the American medical world today, and which MEDICO accepted 1 year ago when it was founded.

A part of this challenge has been met by international medical organizations such as WHO, ICA, and some private foundations. However, the main emphasis of all these existing medical organizations, with the exception of the religious missionary groups, has been along the line of public health, preventive medicine, and medical education. Until MEDICO came along, there had been no existing international medical machinery to utilize the services and talents of practicing physicians and private specialists in the United States. Here was a large, impressive pool of close to 200,000 physicians lying fallow while the world fairly shrieked its demands for more doctors for its unfortunate and sick millions. It is difficult to imagine and impossible to believe that American private medicine possesses little or no social conscience, no evidence of altruism, no humanitarian tendencies, and no regard for the medical problems in more than three-fourths of the world.

In MEDICO a means now exists which provides opportunities for the expression of these beneficent human qualities. MEDICO is acutely aware of the obvious fact—that the world has shrunk too much in the modern jet age to allow Americans to live "in an isolated mansion in the midst of world slums." MEDICO is fully cognizant that medicine has become a powerful instrument for international friendship. With medicine we can project our humanitarian impulses across national boundaries in a way often unrealizable by the desperately needed but frequently impersonal Government aid programs. The rising expectations of the peo-

ples of Asia and Africa for a better and a longer life have become the most dynamic human force in the world today. We can ignore this universal demand for freedom from disease, privation, and suffering only at the peril of our humanity, and our national existence.

The hand of the healer from time immemorial has inevitably formed firm and lasting bonds of friendship and affection between men. These emotional, intimate bonds between man and man are needed today more than ever. The men of medicine, in the spirit of Schweitzer, through the direct efforts of MEDICO, are extending their hands to peoples all over the world, offering no erudite philosophies, no shining utopias, no ultimate panaceas, and no economic supremacy. The men of medicine extend their hands hoping that the gesture will be accepted by the peoples of the world in kindness and in amity, in mutual respect, tolerance and understanding. In the achievement of these goals, the hopes for world unity and world peace will be inevitably advanced.

Buffalo Heroes Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently the city of Buffalo was honored in having a heavy cruiser, the U.S.S. *Macon*, visit its port. The *Macon* is the flagship of the Operation Inland Seas fleet of the Navy, and one of the first great ships to transit fresh waters.

An impressive ceremony was held aboard the *Macon* to honor two Buffalo heroes. One was Adam Plewacki, the first Buffalo soldier to fall in World War I, and the other was Raymond Pawlowski, a Buffalo sailor who died aboard the U.S.S. *Arizona*, along with 1,100 other crewmen of the battleship when the Japs unleashed their attack against 88 ships at anchor in Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941.

Invited aboard the *Macon* to pay respects to Mr. and Mrs. Robert Pawlowski, parents of Raymond, was a delegation from the Adam Plewacki American Legion Post 799, named after the World War I hero, which included Post Commander Robert Gredzicki and Past Commanders Walter Sokolowski, Matthew Stukowski, and Leonard Jaskowiak.

Others attending the ceremony were Henry Polanski, Sons of Legion chairman; Raymond Bazamowski, Erie County American Legion finance officer; Eugene Kayne, past 8th district Legion commander; Mrs. Helen Bojanowski, post auxiliary president; Under Sheriff B. John Tutuska; and Representative THADDEUS J. DULSKI of the 41st District. The new generation was represented by a group of 25 young men enrolled in the Sons of Legion.

On behalf of the Secretary of the Navy, Capt. J. C. Wylie, commanding officer of the *Macon*, presented to the parents of Raymond Pawlowski a flag

which had been flown over the sunken Arizona. Flags fly from the devastated battleship's superstructure which rises from the wreckage. A Marine guard saluted the flag presentation ceremony.

Young Plewacki, buried in the American Cemetery at St. Mihiel, was killed in action near St. Mihiel April 3, 1918, shortly after he had received the Croix de Guerre from the French Government. He had lived at 753 Best Street and was among the first in the city to enlist.

Oregon: The Permanent Memorial to Gen. Joseph Lane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in this session of Congress, while Oregon is still celebrating its 100 years of statehood, it seems to me an especially fitting time to call to attention the accomplishments of Gen. Joseph Lane, whose colorful military career and leading role in the fight for statehood for Oregon, followed by many years of statesmanlike leadership in the political life of the young State, qualify him for an honored niche in the history of Oregon and of the Nation.

An outstanding and respected member of the Legislature of Indiana for 24 years, Lane gave up the security of his position to enlist in the Army, at the age of 45, as a private. Two years later, as a general, he was appointed by President Polk as Territorial Governor of the vast Oregon territory, and from that time until his death more than 30 years later, he unfailingly served the interests of his adopted home.

In the selfless efforts of the many who have worked for statehood for Alaska and Hawaii during the past years, we have a reflection of the task which confronted Joe Lane 100 years ago, and in their success, we see more clearly the achievement of Joseph Lane, who gave himself completely, first as Territorial Governor and later as Territorial Delegate in Congress, to that objective. For this service to his State, he was rewarded with election as one of Oregon's first Senators; for his service to his country, he was given the Vice Presidential slot on the Democratic ticket which opposed Lincoln in the crucial election of 1860.

Concrete memorials to this man are few; There is a county in the State of Oregon today called Lane, in memory of and honor to him; his tomb, in Roseburg, Oreg., has been restored by a historical organization, the Descendants of Gen. Joe Lane. Yet a single grand unique symbol of his life and achievements stands as a kind of monument to him—the State of Oregon. The people of Oregon pay special tribute this year to General Lane and those like him, who laid the foundations upon which we are building our State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a biographical sketch of Gen. Joseph Lane, prepared by Mrs. Marjorie Lane Shantz of Wenatchee, Wash., a great-granddaughter of Joseph Lane, and secretary of the Descendants of Gen. Joe Lane.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

GEN. JOSEPH LANE

(By Marjorie Lane Shantz)

I

Joseph Lane was born in Buncombe County, N.C., in 1801. When he was 4 years of age, his family moved to Kentucky and located near Henderson on the Ohio River. At 17 years of age, he moved near to Evansville, Ind., where he worked for various people in stores, etc., and he was very soon elected to the Indiana Legislature. For the next 24 years, he represented his district in the Indiana Legislature, and became a very prominent and influential member of the same.

In 1846, when war was declared with Mexico, he volunteered as a private, and was almost immediately appointed colonel of the Indiana 2d volunteer regiment by the Governor of Indiana. His regiment was moved to Texas, and placed in Gen. Zachary Taylor's army. He fought in the battle of Buena Vista with great distinction, and was badly wounded in the right arm. Because of his ability and bravery, he was commissioned by President Polk a brigadier general. He also engaged in several other battles, participating in the capture of Monterey.

The strategy of the Mexican War changed, and Vera Cruz was picked as the point of landing in order for the American troops to capture Mexico City. General Scott landed and set out for Mexico City. President Polk, in order to reinforce Scott, ordered General Lane's brigade to Vera Cruz, and in spite of every effort being made to keep General Lane from moving from the mouth of the Rio Grande to Vera Cruz, General Lane, on his own initiative commandeered some boats and sailed to Vera Cruz with his brigade. In Vera Cruz, he plunged immediately into the interior of Mexico to help relieve several groups of American soldiers that were surrounded by guerrillas, and even General Scott and his army were having trouble. General Lane, through his ability and the courage and splendid bravery of his troops, fought many battles throughout central Mexico, winning them all, and clearing the country of practically every guerrilla band. He was highly commended by General Scott, and was brevetted major general. Due to his wonderful campaign in central Mexico, he was referred to as the "Marion of the Mexican War." In his brigade he had Indiana troops, Ohio troops, Texas troops, and a few regiments of Regular Army personnel. After the war was over, he was given a tremendous welcome throughout Texas, and at Cincinnati, Ohio, he was proclaimed the outstanding general of the war, and a tremendous reception was held in his honor. Indianapolis and various other Indiana towns vied with each other in entertaining and honoring him.

II

During this time, President Polk was able to come to an agreement on the boundary line between England and the United States as to the disputed Territory in the Northwest known as the Oregon Country. As soon as this was completed, the United States acquired by this treaty all of the territory from the California line to the present Canadian line, and from the crest of the Rocky Moun-

tains to the Pacific Ocean. This was known and labeled the Oregon Territory. It included all of the States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, some of Wyoming and some of western Montana. President Polk was very anxious to have the Oregon Territory set up and operating during his term of office and he immediately picked General Lane as the Territorial Governor of this Oregon Territory, and he was notified in August of 1848 of his appointment by Joseph Meek, who had been sent by President Polk to tell him and give him his commission. They left Evansville, Ind., as soon as possible, went by boat to St. Louis, where General Lane and Joe Meek were met by Joe Lane's oldest son Nathaniel, who joined the party, and they proceeded to Independence, Mo. At Independence, he contacted the commander of the Army post, and requested an escort, to make the trip to Oregon Territory. The commander informed them that due to the coming winter, they could not move out any troops until the next spring. General Lane then, using his rank as general, secured 25 mounted cavalry soldiers as an escort, and immediately set out for Santa Fe, N. Mex.

Upon this journey it was learned that gold had been discovered in California, and upon their arrival in Santa Fe this was confirmed, and after they had left there on the way to San Francisco, many of the men deserted in order to get to the gold fields. Regardless of the loss of men, they made the trip and finally arrived in San Francisco with seven men. General Lane was able to secure a boat sailing for Astoria at the mouth of the Columbia River. The party now consisted of three men, General Lane, Marshal Joe Meek, and Lieutenant Hawkins, U.S. Army. Upon their arrival at Astoria, they secured canoes to take them to the mouth of the Willamette River, and thence to Oregon City, which was to be the seat of government. During this trip, General Lane personally took his turn at pulling on the oars. They arrived there March 2, and immediately General Lane issued a proclamation and set up the Territorial government in Oregon, thus accomplishing President Polk's desire of having Oregon Territory legally set up during his administration.

President Taylor, who was a Whig, succeeded President Polk, a Democrat, and immediately, because of his jealousy and dislike of General Lane, looked around for another man as Territorial Governor. It was first offered to Abraham Lincoln, but he rejected it, and it was then offered to another man who started out on the journey but failed to complete the trip, and finally a Mr. Gaines was appointed, but, due to the delays and the long overland trip, Governor Lane was not relieved until August 1850. General Lane was then elected as Territorial Delegate to the U.S. Congress. During the time he was Governor he was also the Indian agent and was in charge of the armed troops in the Oregon Territory. He was instrumental in bringing to trial the Cayuse Indians who were accused and hanged for the massacre of Marcus Whitman, his wife, and many others. In addition to handling the Whitman massacre, he engaged in many Indian fights, and was very successful in making treaties. He became known throughout the Territory as a friend of the Indians.

Upon the election of President Pierce, General Lane was reappointed Territorial Governor. However, at this time he was deeply interested in securing statehood for the Territory of Oregon. So he resigned as Governor and recommended his friend Curry for that position, which President Pierce agreed to, and Lane ran for Territorial Delegate to Congress. He was elected and went again to Washington, D.C. There was a move on foot to divide the Oregon Territory along the line of the Columbia River from the Pacific Ocean, and the Territory of Washington took over the northern part of the

original Oregon Territory. General Lane was instrumental in having President Pierce appoint his very good friend, Isaac Stevens, as the first Territorial Governor of the Washington Territory. General Lane and Governor Stevens were both Democrats and very close friends. During his time as Territorial Delegate he was instrumental in putting through claims for the soldiers and settlers who had suffered at the hands of the Indians, as well as to protect, at the same time, the rights of the Indians in the two Territories.

III

Upon the election of James Buchanan in 1856, who was one of General Lane's admirers and supporters, he immediately commenced using every possible connection and friendship to secure statehood for Oregon. Through his efforts, in 1858, the Senate approved statehood, but the House adjourned before the bill could be acted upon. However, immediately upon Congress' meeting in January 1859 General Lane again pushed with all his influence for statehood for Oregon and was successful in getting the Congress to accept Oregon as a State, and President Buchanan made it official on February 14, 1859. General Lane then returned to Oregon and was elected one of the first Senators from the State of Oregon. Two Senators were elected, one for 6 months and the other for 2 years. General Lane secured the 2-year election.

In the presidential campaign of 1860, the Democratic Party was faced with one of the greatest splits that had ever occurred in American history. The northern Democrats, headed by Stephen Douglas of Illinois, were believers in compromise and concession to the fanatical demands of the abolitionists. The so-called border States believed in any compromise between the slave States and the free States, and was headed by Bell. But the southern Democrats, composed of the outstanding leaders of the Democratic Party, stood on the Constitution of the United States, and the rulings of the Supreme Court, which especially in the Dred-Scott decision decided that property, whether it be money, material, or slaves, was entitled to full protection in any part of the United States or its Territories, which was what the Constitution granted. This latter group picked upon Vice President John C. Breckinridge of Kentucky as their candidate for President, and Gen. Joe Lane as their Vice Presidential candidate. During this convention of the Democratic Party in 1860, Governor Stevens of Washington Territory acted as chairman and worked with General Lane in efforts to unite the party. General Lane was picked for this important nomination because of his strong stand for the Constitution, and the rights of the various States and the people of those States, as granted especially in amendments 9 and 10; which was, and is, and should always be fully protected.

Due to the three-way split in the Democratic Party in the 1860 election, Abraham Lincoln, although a minority candidate in the number of votes cast, was elected. Gen. Joe Lane accepted this defeat, and on March 2, 1861, made a masterful explanation on his stand at those troublesome and critical times in his final speech in the Senate of the United States as the Senator from the State of Oregon.

IV

He then returned to Oregon where he retired, and being 60 years of age, and his right arm because of wounds practically useless, he did not participate in the War Between the States. He was offered a brigade in the southern army, and of course still retained his commission as general in the Union Army. In addition to his age and

his disabled right arm, he could not, and would not, fire upon his relatives and close friends that were in the southern army, and he would not fire upon the flag of the United States after he had fought so gallantly and heroically for it throughout his active life. He passed away in 1881, at the age of 80 years. His tomb is located in Roseburg, Oreg., and has been restored by the organization known as the Descendants of Gen. Joe Lane.

Khrushchev's Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, Khrushchev's impending visit to this country is rightly viewed with deep concern by many thinking Americans.

On August 13, in a notable speech in the Senate, the junior Senator from Connecticut gave forceful expression to this concern.

A former member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, Senator Dobb is recognized as an outstanding authority in this field, and his views must be given serious consideration.

Since Senator Dobb's speech was not widely covered by the press, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following report as it appears in the August 24 issue of Time magazine. I commend this to the attention of those Members who may not have read the speech in full:

FOREIGN RELATIONS—MINORITY VIEW

For all the general cheering that greeted its announcement, the U.S. visit of Nikita Khrushchev is packed with political dynamite. Republican Presidential hopeful RICHARD NIXON, for example, is certain to be blamed if the Khrushchev trip turns diplomatically sour—even though it was arranged by President Eisenhower with little or no real reference to Nixon's presence in Russia. No one recognizes Nixon's problem more than New York's Governor, Nelson Rockefeller, who has himself said noncommittally: "We want to contribute to an easing of tensions, but we want it known we are not letting our guard down." On that platform, "Rocky" is in a position to jump either way, depending on how the Khrushchev visit turns out.

Many another U.S. politician has followed "Rocky's" example, either remaining quiet or simply making meaningless noises. But last week Connecticut's able freshman democratic Senator THOMAS DOBB delivered the most forceful expression so far of the opposition to a Khrushchev visit. Dobb's speech was made to a near-empty Senate and went virtually unreported by the press—but if the Eisenhower-Khrushchev exchange does turn out badly, then Dobb's words could become the battle cry in one of the decade's hottest political controversies.

"What," asked Connecticut's Dobb, "would the Senate and the country have thought if in 1939 President Roosevelt had invited Adolf Hitler to a barnstorming tour of the United States, fresh from conquest of Czechoslovakia, Austria, and Poland and in the midst of his extermination of millions

of Jews?" Extending the comparison, Dobb said: "Khrushchev rose to Communist prominence as the hangman of the Ukraine. He has maintained himself in power as the butcher of Budapest."

HOPE OF LIBERTY

Dobb's strongest point was that the very fact of the visit would enhance Khrushchev's prestige and position at home and in the Soviet satellites—even while weakening the Western alliance. Said Dobb: "We can be certain that the satellite peoples, who still cling to the hope of liberty, will be flooded with photographs of Khrushchev being wine and dined, flattered and applauded by the leaders and people of our country. Khrushchev's visit will be interpreted as a reflection of American acceptance of permanent Soviet domination of their lands."

In the free world, said Dobb, the U.S. decision to opt for Big Two talks might seem like appeasement, might have a divisive effect upon U.S. allies fearful of secret deals. U.S. allies under the guns of communism in West Berlin, Formosa, South Korea would interpret Khrushchev in the United States as a softening of our determination to resist. Said Dobb: "Those who have been soft on communism will grow softer. Those who are unconcerned about the Communist menace will become more indifferent. Those who have been sounding the alarms will find their difficulties multiplied."

TRUE PEACE

Democrat Dobb offered specific recommendations for "salvaging something from this debacle in the hope of limiting the harm wherever possible." Among them: the President should (1) mince no words with Khrushchev on the issue of Europe's captive nations; (2) insist that Khrushchev withdraw his 1958 ultimatum on Berlin before engaging in further negotiations on Germany; (3) declare null and void all the concessions the United States tentatively offered to the Russians at the Geneva Conference, e.g., decreasing Western propaganda activities; (4) emphasize to Khrushchev unmistakably the absolute U.S. determination to defend West Berlin.

In broader terms, Dobb had definite notions about how the U.S. people should greet Khrushchev, "I hope," he said, "that during Khrushchev's visit we shall hear church bells in the land, tolling their remembrance for the murdered millions behind the Iron Curtain. I hope there will be public observances of prayer. I hope there will be peaceful demonstrations of our dedication to that true peace which can only be achieved by spreading freedom and justice throughout the earth. Let there be no cheers for the Red dictator, no crowds assembled to greet him, no flattery or flowers. Let our people be civil but silent."

Housing and Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial, published in the August 18 issue of the Concord Daily Monitor, Concord, N.H., entitled "Housing and Youth."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSING AND YOUTH

In two votes last week Senators BRIDGES and CORRON not only upheld the President but again demonstrated economy is something more than the subject for a political oration.

Both Senators upheld Eisenhower's veto of the housing bill. Both opposed establishment of a Youth Corps, reminiscent of the old Civilian Conservation Corps of depression days and dedicated to much the same purpose.

It was almost a foregone conclusion the Senate would not override the housing bill veto. The Democratic leadership has gained nothing from forcing the issue to a vote. It has added to the President's unbroken record of never having his veto overridden during the six and a half years in office.

Eisenhower has made clear he is open to compromise on a housing measure and Congress has an opportunity to write a passable program that will aid many large cities.

It is in spending that the principal differences lie. It can be argued that a college building plan included in the vetoed bill more properly comes under grants to education, and that more study is needed on proposals to house elderly persons.

The Senate by a vote of 47 to 45 passed the Youth Corps bill. The basic idea is development and conservation of the country's natural resources and upkeep of recreational facilities and wildlife refuges in public parks.

Supporters claimed the proposal is an investment in conservation of youth. They said it would provide useful work for youngsters between 16 and 21 and reduce juvenile delinquency.

Opponents claimed the Youth Corps is an expensive boondoggle and a depression program in an era of prosperity. They are skeptical of its value and how attractive it will be to those it is designed to help.

Beginning with 50,000 young men and women at an estimated cost of \$125 million for the first year, participating States would be required to match Federal expenditures.

The bill now goes to the House, where its approval is seen as unlikely. In any event, it is probable that if it is passed the President will veto it.

Making jobs available to youngsters is something that appeals to politicians. However, it is questionable in these times if this should be the concern of the Federal Government.

Interest Cost of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, Paul Peters, for 40 years a collector of statistics and one who can put them together so they are understandable to the average man, has collected some interesting data on the cost of foreign aid other than the direct appropriations.

Here is a table worthy of study to those who care to understand this terrific burden of foreign aid:

Analysis of cumulative and current interest cost of moneys borrowed by the Federal Treasury to finance foreign aid programs, fiscal 1941 through fiscal 1959

Fiscal year	Net foreign aid in dollars	Interest rate	First year cost	Cumulative yearly cost	Cumulative interest
1941	\$545,418,062	\$0.02518	\$13,733,626		\$13,733,626
1942	7,745,797,011	.02285	165,953,461	\$179,727,087	193,460,713
1943	11,683,826,483	.01879	229,639,726	409,366,813	602,827,526
1944	19,753,800,439	.01929	381,050,810	790,417,623	1,303,245,132
1945	17,893,448,810	.01936	344,674,768	1,135,092,391	2,628,337,543
1946	5,783,513,843	.01966	115,039,736	1,250,132,127	3,778,469,670
1947	6,734,885,336	.02107	141,904,034	1,392,036,161	5,170,505,831
1948	5,715,000,000	.02182	124,701,306	1,516,737,467	6,687,243,292
1949	6,543,629,206	.02236	146,302,133	1,663,039,594	8,350,282,886
1950	5,842,592,000	.02200	128,337,024	1,791,576,618	10,141,859,504
1951	6,203,188,000	.02270	134,444,367	1,926,020,985	12,077,880,489
1952	4,595,477,000	.02329	107,028,659	2,033,049,644	14,120,938,133
1953	6,336,000,000	.02438	154,471,680	2,187,521,324	16,318,459,457
1954	4,855,495,000	.02380	115,800,781	2,303,322,105	18,621,781,466
1955	4,219,351,000	.02351	99,196,942	2,402,519,047	21,043,800,417
1956	4,648,000,000	.02576	119,732,480	2,522,251,527	23,575,831,616
1957	3,908,000,000	.02730	106,638,400	2,628,889,927	26,214,831,215
1958	4,661,000,000	.02638	122,956,180	2,751,846,107	28,976,187,395
1959	4,088,623,836	.02867	117,224,850	2,878,904,279	31,855,091,674

Sources: Computed annual interest rate from annual reports of the Secretary of the Treasury. Net foreign aid from reports on Foreign Transactions of the United States compiled by the Office of Clearing Information in the Department of Commerce.

NOTES

For the fiscal years 1941 through 1945 the foreign aid includes lend-lease after deducting reciprocal credits for reverse lend-lease and dollar returns.

For the postwar period 1946 through fiscal 1959 the net grants and credits extended under the so-called Marshall plan and other relief measures approved by the Congress.

Since in most of the wartime and postwar years the surpluses were not sufficient to pay the interest on the public debt and also furnish the dollars for the foreign-aid programs, in most years the Treasury had to borrow the moneys to meet the cumulative interest costs of over \$31,900,000,000.

With a deficit in fiscal 1960 probable the annual interest burden on the American taxpayers due to the foreign-aid programs will approach \$3,000,000,000 which will be a continuing burden until the Treasury is able to retire a portion of the public debt. In short the foreign aid programs cost \$3,000,000,000 in interest on top of the appropriated funds.

Grain Terminal Association Daily Radio Roundup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Grain Terminal Association Daily Radio Roundup of Friday, August 14, 1959.

There being no objection, the daily radio roundup was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP OF AUGUST 14, 1959

What's the best fed country in the world? Got any idea? No, it's not the United States. And it's not Canada, although the farmers in those two countries grow more food than farmers in most other lands.

The nation where the people eat the most, believe it or not, is Ireland. That's according to a report by the Foreign Agriculture Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Right after Ireland came Denmark, New Zealand, Switzerland, and Australia. You're down in 11th and 12th places before you run into the United States and Canada, respectively.

So the Irish eat the most, measured in calories, although not necessarily the best. You all know what's been happening in the United States as more and more people begin fighting the battle of the bulge. They shy away from fat meat and potatoes, pie and pastries. They eat more fruits and vegetables. And they can take their pick because probably no country in the world has farms that produce so much good food of all kinds at such reasonable prices. The

USDA's survey shows that Canada and the United States lead the world in dinner table bargains.

In this country, for example, food accounts for only 24 percent of family spending. It's down to 23 percent in Canada. Of the 30 countries surveyed by the USDA's Foreign Agriculture Service, the families in these two countries eat, maybe not the most, but the best for the smallest percentage of income.

It's tough going for families in South Korea and in Ghana (that's in Africa) because there it takes 57 percent of income to eat. It's 50 percent in Ceylon and Honduras, 49 percent in Ecuador, down to less than 30 percent in Australia, Belgium, and Denmark.

Of course, the people in the United States and Canada probably have more income per capita than people in most other nations. But at the same time they are getting food at bargain rates. This all adds up to a larger share of income left over for such things as automobiles, new houses, television sets, vacations, speedboats, and so forth. That's a tremendous boost for business and industry anyway you want to look at it.

That's why we've said so many times that farmers deserve a pat on the back and national recognition for the multi-billion-dollar contribution they are making to the Nation's economic stability. But pats on the back don't pay bills, and that's where the farmers are having trouble. The only thing that will pay bills is more money. And as long as farm operating costs stay skyhigh the only way that farmers can get more income is from higher prices for their products.

What about the consumers, then? Could they still get by with spending only 24 percent of income for food? The truth is that a substantial boost in farm prices would have very little effect on consumer food prices. Economists tell us that a 10-percent increase in farm prices would increase the net income of farmers by 50 percent but food prices by only 4 percent.

This is another farm report from GTA—the co-op way.

The Carey Letters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the two letters printed below were received by Members of Congress this morning.

I hope Mr. Carey is not speaking for Mr. Meany. If his position is that of the AFL-CIO, it will harm the great labor movement. Threats are not appreciated by Members of Congress or the American people. Good union members will not approve of Mr. Carey's tactics.

Letter No. 1 was sent to Members of Congress who voted against the Landrum-Griffin amendment. Letter No. 2 was sent to those voting for the amendment:

[Letter No. 1]

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ELECTRICAL,
RADIO, AND MACHINE WORKERS,
Washington, D.C., August 18, 1959.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On behalf of the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, AFL-CIO, I wish to express our deep appreciation for your vote against the Landrum-Griffin bill on August 13, 1959.

We are aware that terrific pressures were brought to bear on you to support that vindictive and oppressive measure in order to weaken and disrupt the trade union movement. Your vote was a concrete demonstration of your understanding of the basic issues involved, and of your courage in acting on your convictions in this matter.

This action, along with your continuing support of a progressive legislative program will, I am confident, assure you of support by the working men and women in your district.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES B. CAREY,
President.

[Letter No. 2]

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ELECTRICAL,
RADIO, AND MACHINE WORKERS,
Washington, D.C., August 18, 1959.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Only you know, in the privacy of your own conscience, whether you carefully considered the possible consequences of the Landrum-Griffin bill when you voted for it on August 13, 1959. If you did, and realized that it is a punitive, repressive measure intended to weaken all labor unions and thereby all working men and women, you have much to answer for. If you did not, and merely yielded to the pressures of the chamber of commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, your guilt is perhaps even greater.

You should realize now, if you did not during the heat of battle, that this vindictive assault on the labor movement will, in the long run, prove to your constituents that you are less interested in individual rights and democracy than in property rights and the concentration of power in the hands of big business.

You may believe that you are safe in such action because organized labor is relatively weak in your district, and cannot call you to account for the damage you have sought to do to it. You may be right—at the moment.

We wish to assure you, however, that we shall do all in our power to prove to the

working men and women in your district that you have cast your lot against them and they should therefore take appropriate action at the ballot box.

Very truly yours,

JAMES B. CAREY,
President.

United Jewish Welfare Fund: What It Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, my attention was called recently to a very fine address by Dr. Max William Bay, 1959 general chairman of the Los Angeles United Jewish Welfare Fund. In an appearance in May of this year at the Mormon Los Angeles Stake Center, Dr. Bay told of the meaning and objectives of Jewish philanthropy in general and the United Jewish Welfare Fund in particular. It is a stirring statement on man's obligation to his fellow man, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Bay's address be printed in the Appendix of the Record:

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

UNITED JEWISH WELFARE FUND: WHAT IT MEANS

(Address by Max William Bay, M.D., 1959 general chairman, United Jewish Welfare Fund of the Jewish Federation-Council of Greater Los Angeles, to the Los Angeles Stake of the Church of the Latter Day Saints (Mormon) on May 9, 1959)

I am deeply grateful to all of you for this privilege. It is an honor to be asked to participate in this program. I am particularly grateful to Dr. and Mrs. Sheranian and to Mrs. Rose Marie Reid for suggesting this get-together and for their inspiration and encouragement. I know that you are interested in fostering better intergroup relationships—that is best accomplished through the understanding which comes from learning all that we can about each other. We share much in common. We are full and equal citizens in a land blessed by the bounty of divine providence and basically we share a spiritual faith. Each of us is a minority in this land. We have each known the sorrow of oppression and we have wandered in search of a land where we could follow the dictates of conscience in freedom and in dignity. And yet there are dissimilarities, but these may not be great.

I am to talk to you about the United Jewish Welfare Fund. It is not my purpose to ask you for contributions. This is not a fund-raising event. I do want to consider with you the philosophic basis of our devotion to this community endeavor. What is its meaning? What is its purpose? We will talk about the spiritual foundation on which it rests and the practical matters it accomplishes. I must confess that I do not feel altogether comfortable in my present role. I am not a rabbi nor a social worker, and I prefer to leave the pulpit to the rabbis and ministers. But, in the tradition of our faith, it is the rabbi's duty to teach and it is the layman's privilege and obligation to

affirm what he has learned—and this points up another principle we share. I know of no more proper place than a synagogue, church, temple, or chapel to speak about matters which concern the welfare fund and no more appropriate person to carry the responsibility of speaking than the chairman of the campaign.

HOLINESS THROUGH SOCIAL JUSTICE

A passionate belief in and concern for justice for all men is inherent in Judaism. It stems, not alone from the immortal utterances of the Biblical prophets, but from the fundamental nature of the Jewish faith. It stems first and foremost from the Jewish concepts of God, His universe and His greatest creation, man. In our faith, we are taught that man is created in the image of God. Therefore, man is fundamentally good and he must seek for personal holiness. In some spiritual faiths, men believe that they may attain that holiness in their devotion to God and through acceptance of the sacrifice of a man who through his sacrifice cleansed them of all sin. But in our faith, man's relationship to man may even transcend in importance his relationship to God—man's transgression against his fellow man cannot be atoned by devotion to God nor by the sacrifice of another man—he must atone to the man whom he has transgressed. Man can attain the holiness he seeks only through social morality and justice. Man is privileged to take an active role in determining the direction he follows in the path of life—he may follow the path of good or of evil. He is not the victim of predetermined destiny; he does have the right to choose his course. Man seeks the better life for himself and his family—this privilege he may enjoy only so long as he accepts a responsibility, the obligation of consideration for the rights of his fellow man. This, in simple terms, is the meaning of the fundamental concepts of our spiritual faith. This, in essence, is the tradition of Judaism, and of America.

From the fundamental concepts of individual dignity and freedom, of equality, and of universal brotherhood has grown the concept of *tzedakah*, the Hebrew word which means righteousness. In classical Hebrew, there is no word meaning charity. In the Torah, our Bible, and in the Talmud, there is no reference to anything meaning charity—there is reference only to *tzedakah*, which means righteous or just giving. So we speak only of *tzedakah*, not the benevolence of the generous, nor the bounty of the arrogant, but the righteousness and moral behavior of the fortunate and the humble. What we do is not pure altruism—it is the correction of inequity—the fulfillment of justice. Man is only the custodian of his worldly goods—he has the obligation of sharing his good fortune with those who are less fortunate and even he who receives, he who may be on relief, has the obligation of sharing with him who is even less fortunate.

ABUNDANCE IMPOSES RESPONSIBILITY

Through all the years of recorded history there have been assaults on our concepts of freedom and dignity. Our spiritual forefathers understood the course of history and knew well how to teach it. They taught their children, and admonished them to teach their children in turn, and to continue to repeat the story each Passover, so that each of us would remember that we were once slaves in Egypt and the Almighty brought us forth into freedom and dignity, not alone the generations of antiquity, but even you and me in this generation. Is there any more effective way to teach us humility? Is there any more compelling reason for remaining alert and on guard against the onslaughts of those who would enslave by dictatorship, persecution, or oppression? Do we, who understand justice and mercy,

need to be reminded that we must be concerned about the poverty and disease of others, of whatever color or creed, in our own midst or in distant lands? Do we need to be reminded that we must be concerned about the economic and political enslavement of others? Should we not be concerned about the status of Jews everywhere and for their security and survival in Israel? Do we not share a spiritual heritage, a common interest, and a common destiny? Does not the security of all of us and the peace of the world depend upon these concerns? Does not our own abundance and the abundance of America impose a responsibility?

And so we are guided by the moral concepts and precepts of our spiritual faith and by the principles of American democracy; we understand our responsibilities and believe in them and we demonstrate that understanding and belief by voluntary participation in and contribution to the welfare fund. Through 166 agencies, 90 of them local and national, we heal the sick; we rehabilitate the handicapped; we feed and clothe the destitute; we promote better intergroup relations; we strengthen our spiritual faith through education; we contribute to the culture of America and promote good citizenship; and we rescue those who seek to leave the oblivion of communism. Thus we strengthen our local community, Jewish and non-Jewish; we strengthen our Nation and through protection of the civil rights and liberties of all citizens; and we contribute to world peace through an extension of foreign aid and through our support of the democracy of Israel.

COMMUNITY SERVICES MAKE FOR BETTER AMERICANS

I want to mention only briefly a few of our activities in our local community. Through our health institutions, such as the Cedars of Lebanon hospital, we provide facilities for care of physical and mental illness for those who cannot afford to pay and for those who can, for Jew and non-Jew alike. We train young physicians and we contribute to knowledge through research. Through the Bureau of Jewish Education, we subsidize many of our religious schools and thus assure our children of the knowledge, blessings and security of our spiritual faith, and through our centers we make a contribution to the culture of America, and to the understanding and maintenance of good American citizenship.

Bigotry and persecution recognize no national or State boundaries. When these go unchecked, they lead to a breakdown of law and order, and lawlessness ultimately engulfs every person and every group. Few of us are made aware of the dangers which face us constantly. The bigot and hater-monger is constantly at work and alert to opportunity. If he attacks the Negro or the Jew, thinking them most vulnerable, and if he is successful, he will attack the Catholic next, and all other groups in turn. Adolf Hitler did not stop with the Jews—in fact, he attacked the Jews because they represented the very fountainhead of the Judeo-Christian civilization which he was determined to destroy. I do not need to belabor the segregation issue in the South, nor the bombings of Jewish temples and centers—these dangers to law and order are self-evident. The issue of segregation is not a Jewish issue—it is a moral issue for all Americans. When our human relations organizations, the American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, and others, speak out on this issue, it is because we cannot remain silent—we cannot ignore our spiritual heritage. If we permit impairment of the rights and liberties of any minority, we endanger the security of all. We must keep alive the hope and dream and reality of American equality and freedom.

Now I wish to talk about our activities in the overseas area. Through the United Jewish Appeal we give aid to peoples in 25 countries outside of Israel. I visited Morocco in February. One does not begin to visualize the full meaning of squalor and filth and stench until one visits Morocco. Even a doctor can hardly appreciate the utter destructiveness of widespread communicable disease until you see the people of Morocco. One doesn't understand the degradation of abject poverty nor the hopelessness of broad ignorance until one views Morocco. The activities of our agencies which care for the health, rehabilitative, nutritional and educational needs of the destitute Jews of Morocco are truly awe-inspiring and thrilling. Only the most phlegmatic and callous could fail to be affected by the scenes I saw. Our Government considers Morocco of tremendous political and strategic importance to the free world. I have talked to American consular and embassy officials in Morocco, France and Austria on a number of occasions during the three trips I've made in the past 5 years. They regard our activities warmly and consider them an extension of the foreign aid program carried out by our own Government.

ISRAEL A BASTION OF DEMOCRACY

What does Israel mean to America and the free world? When the ancient land of Israel was laid waste and its people dispersed, barbarism struck the very cradle of Western civilization. For 19 centuries the spiritual heirs of that civilization were assaulted and bruised for no reason other than their adherence to a faith which their assailants professed but did not practice. The carnage wrought by Nazi Germany finally outraged the conscience of the civilized world. How could man be so mad? How could the civilized world stand by and remain indifferent to the slaughter of millions of innocent men, women, children and even babies? Could we ever fully atone for this transgression? The blood of Abel did indeed cry out from the ground. Justice and mercy demanded the establishment of a land where the oppressed and persecuted could be permitted to fulfill their lives in dignity and in freedom. No event in recorded history can match in magnitude and significance the prophetic reestablishment of the State of Israel. No people in history has suffered the oppression and persecution meted out to the Jews. No people in history has had the spiritual strength to withstand such abhorrent assaults and still arise from the ashes of despair.

Ours is indeed a generation of good fortune to have lived to see the day of redemption and to have had some part in its realization. Israel is a bastion of democracy in a corner of the world which has been troubled for 2,000 years. Israel is shining proof of what even a small nation may achieve under freedom. Israel lay desolate and was virtual desert 50 years ago. It had hardly begun to show much sign of development 25 years ago. Eleven years ago when the state was reestablished, it had a population of 600,000 Jews and 200,000 Arabs. Since then it has been able to develop and thrive despite two wars and despite taking in and absorbing nearly 1 million people who had no other place to go. That is, they had little choice if they wished to survive. In the past 5 months alone, it has accepted 20,000 newcomers from Eastern Europe. Comparable figures for our own country based on relative populations would mean an immigration of 1,750,000 in only 5 months. Even we in mighty America might find the absorption of such a large number in such a short period difficult.

WHAT ISRAEL MEANS TO ME

I have visited Israel twice in the past 5 years. It is a tiny land with a mighty spirit. I have seen the miracle in action.

How does one summarize Israel? Should I describe the beauty of its landscape which resembles our own familiar California—the sheer beauty of Haifa, Mount Carmel and the port which looks like San Francisco—the beauty of Lake Kinneret, known as the Sea of Galilee, which resembles Tahoe—the white sandy beaches of Tel Aviv, Herzliya, and Natanya—the lush green growth of the Jezreel Valley which is Israel's breadbasket—the heavenly majesty of Jerusalem and its hills which resemble nothing else in the world—the sheer virgin beauty of the Negev viewed from the air, mountains and rocks and desert much like our own, or the flat beach and little more than primitive port of Eilat where within 1 or 2 miles one looks at Egypt, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia as one turns in different directions?

Shall I describe the degree of industrialization which includes manufacturing or assembling all the things necessary in a modern civilization patterned on our own? Should I talk about the simple clean beauty of its homes of white, pink, or blue stucco with tiled roofs of varying colors, or the magnificent reinforced concrete apartment houses or the country club at Savoyon near Tel Aviv? Shall we talk about the farms, individual, and cooperative, and the orange groves which look and smell like ours used to before we began to subdivide them?

Shall we talk about the kibbutzim and their meaning in the development and defense of Israel? Shall we talk about the development and use of natural resources, water, mining, and oil? Shall I tell you about medicine and hospitals, homes for the aged, youth Aliyah homes and camps where thousands of homeless, displaced and orphaned children returned from Europe? Shall we talk about education—the schools and universities, the breathtaking view of the new campus of the Hebrew University at Givath Ram just outside of Jerusalem—the wonderful new campus of Technion on Mount Carmel where important research work in engineering is going on, including projects under the auspices of the U.S. Navy, or the basic scientific research, including atomic research and nuclear physics, going on at the Weizmann Institute amongst the orange groves of Rehovoth?

Shall I tell you about the culture of Tel Aviv, the theater, music, and art? Shall we talk about the democratic Government of Israel, its Parliament where Jewish and Moslem representatives sit together? Shall I try to describe the emotions felt when one views Mount Zion where the tomb of King David supposedly lies, or the distant view of Bethlehem across a green valley of Jordan, or the Dead Sea scrolls in the guarded vault of the Hebrew University, or the simple well of Abraham in Beersheba, or the drive down the Via Maris which was the ancient highway between Egypt and Mesopotamia where so many historic battles were fought, or Ashkelon where lived the Philistines, or Nazareth, Cana, and Galilee so dear to the hearts of Christians, or the Crusader towers and the Roman Aqueduct, or the fortifications of Acre which Napoleon stormed unsuccessfully, or Be'er Sheva near Haifa where the tombs of the Northern Sanhedrin have been uncovered in the past 3 years and where supposedly lie the sarcophagi of two of our great rabbis, Hillel and Judah the Prince of Safad, the medieval city to which Spanish Jews returned after the Inquisition, or the simple tomb of Maimonides in ancient Tiberias?

Shall I describe the sturdy army of young men and women, the navy in the Mediterranean and Red Sea and the air force flying in modern machines over the ancient land of the prophets? Shall we talk about the unhappiness and frustration of the 90 percent on whom is imposed the burdensome dogma of the unyielding 10 percent of orthodoxy? Shall I tell you about the

miserable slums of the maabarot, the transition camps, where 18,000 families still live, or, the squalor of the oriental Jewish squatters in the slums of Jerusalem? Israel is all of these things, but above all it is people, oriental and Western, old settlers, new immigrants and refugees. But even more, it is youth, magnificent youth, born of pioneers, dedicated to a glorious cause, people of character, bearing, courage, fearlessness, and determination. All humankind must take pride in the courage, dedication, and selfless devotion of this people. Only a mind distorted by hate and fear can fail to understand the importance of Israel in the family of free nations. Only a soul without mercy can fail to want to play a part in the rebuilding of such a nation. The United Jewish Welfare Fund is devoted to that purpose.

WE CHOOSE REDEMPTION

I wish there were time to tell you about the recent exodus of Jews from Rumania. Twenty thousand people have reached Israel in the past few months and although emigration from Rumania has temporarily ceased, we have much evidence and feel assured that possibly 100,000 may reach Israel this year. The story of this exodus is a dramatic one. The impact of this tremendous mass movement of people struck us this past January—the tremendous responsibilities for ourselves and for Israel appeared heavy indeed and it was for that reason that I visited Vienna in January so that I could see for myself just what was happening. I will not go into much detail. These people are, in the main, young and vigorous, possessing extraordinary professional and scientific skills, people who have lived under communism and have seized the opportunity to reject it.

They arrive penniless in Vienna—ours is the burden of transporting them to Israel, to feed and house them, to provide for their education in Hebrew, the language of Israel and to help Israel absorb them into the economy of the nation. The financial burden on the people of Israel is tremendous but their sacrifice is gladly given. This exodus is far from being tragic. For years we have talked about cracking the Iron Curtain, about liberating the millions of enslaved souls imprisoned behind it. In the days of Hitler, the vast majority of Jews were trapped—there was precious little that we were prepared to do for them and there was no country which would admit large numbers without restriction—6 million of them were slaughtered—since then the Communists have kept the remnants of them impounded—now there is an opening in the gate, and there is an Israel which bids them to come.

Are we now to be the ones who say to them that they cannot leave lands of oppression because we refuse to help? We do not need to reopen the ovens of Hitler to see things in clearer perspective. Our choice is clear—we choose life not death—we choose redemption not oblivion.

If my talk has seemed emotional in part, I offer no apology. I believe that a little emotion helps to clarify thinking. Human reason which is not touched by human emotion often functions like a machine which has not been lubricated. Many of us do not wish to be reminded of the sordid chapters in history. We do not wish to relieve the squalor—the filth—the stench of the concentration camps and despicable brutality of the inhuman Nazi butchers. I do not suggest that we should relieve these constantly but we are not permitted to forget entirely because our world has not yet reached the millenium—there are people living under despotism and there are people who are desperately hungry and ill and naked.

THE UNITED JEWISH WELFARE FUND: A WAY OF LIFE

I think it important from time to time to search one's mind for meaning and purpose in living. When in November 1957 my wife and I stood before the Paris memorial monument to the 6 million martyred Jews and viewed the documentary evidence of Nazi butchery, we wept, because these were our kin who were slaughtered. We would have been terribly angered if they had been Chinese, but we were both angered and anguished because these might have been our parents and they might have been us and our son. We were determined to do something to prevent this from happening again. There must be more in living than a constant feverish desire for oozing comfort and dripping prosperity. The words of Micah come to mind:

"He has told thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justice and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God?"

Can we who have so much be so unmindful of our brothers, of whatever color or creed, who need so little? We must have a sense of perspective and a balanced sense of values; we must serve our fellow men and make our contribution to the continued blessing of a world at peace. Only then can we assure these blessings for ourselves and for our children and for all others. This is not a burden—it is a responsibility. The United Jewish Welfare Fund is more than the fund-raising arm of the Jewish community. It is a great unifying force. It expresses the mind and conscience, the heart and will of the Jewish community. It serves us all, rich and poor alike. It asks of us only understanding and compassion. This we give with full sincerity. We do count our blessings. We are glad that we can help.

Traffic Safety Postage Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, for the past few years a Special Subcommittee on Traffic Safety of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has been investigating the tragic deaths on our Nation's streets and highways. These investigations have certainly proved beyond a doubt that there is an urgent need for promoting safety on the highways. No one will deny that our most precious asset is the lives of our people—yet no war or calamity has taken so many of those lives as traffic accidents.

The Safety First Club of Maryland, a nonprofit organization dedicated to traffic safety, consists of a group of citizens and officials of Maryland who are doing an excellent job of making people conscious of the need to stop the slaughter on our highways.

However, traffic safety is not just a Maryland problem. We need to make each and every automobile driver conscious of the fact that it is personal responsibility to drive safely for the protection of himself and his fellow citizens. The Traffic Safety Club of Baltimore

has adopted a resolution urging that a commemorative traffic safety stamp be issued to focus the attention of the Nation on the need for safety on our streets and highways. I heartily concur in this idea and urge that the Postmaster General give this matter serious consideration. I would like to point out that a special stamp was issued to promote wildlife conservation, and certainly human life is of even greater importance.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION FOR A COMMEMORATIVE TRAFFIC SAFETY POSTAGE STAMP ADOPTED BY SAFETY FIRST CLUB OF MARYLAND, INC.

Whereas grim statistics show that 1,081,600 people lost their lives in the United States of America between January 1, 1925, and January 1, 1958, according to the National Safety Council; and

Whereas the tragic traffic toll for 1958 comprised 36,700 fatalities, 2,825,000 injuries, with 1 out of every 61 Americans killed or injured on the highway; and

Whereas the Safety First Club of Maryland, Inc., nonprofit organization crusading for safety on our streets and highways, is campaigning that "Murder, Incorporated" of the highways must be arrested: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Safety First Club of Maryland, Inc., goes on record to urge the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp on the theme of traffic safety, in keeping with the idea originated by the Wisconsin State Legislature.

The Safety First Club of Maryland, Inc., recommends such a traffic safety stamp be issued so as to focus the attention of the American people on a great problem, and stimulate all citizens to join the crusade for safety to protect their own lives, their dear ones, their neighbors, and their fellow Americans.

Crucial Housing Problem Confronting Elderly Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an informative and effective editorial from the Oregon Journal of Portland of August 16, 1959, entitled "Housing Problem for Elderly."

This editorial effectively emphasizes the wisdom of the Senate in retaining within the new housing bill, S. 2539, the provision for a \$50 million revolving fund to provide some measure of shelter for families of low income over 62 years of age.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSING PROBLEM FOR ELDERLY

The 10 percent sample survey of housing units now occupied by the 5,000 elderly Portland residents who are dependent wholly or in part on old age assistance shows that 75 percent of them are substandard dwellings that violate one or more city codes. In large

measure these people live in housing that fails to meet ordinary Federal, State, and local regulations requiring "decent, safe and sanitary" quarters.

This shameful disclosure, made by Gene Rossman, manager of the Housing Authority of Portland, which made the survey at the request of Mayor Schunk and with the cooperation of the Portland Development Commission, indicates the need for up to 200 additional units of low-rent public housing for the elderly. With other factors, it shows the need for up to 400 units. And that is without reference to persons displaced by the new urban renewal program in southwest Portland and the new freeway program throughout the metropolitan area.

The survey shows that our elderly old age assistance recipients now occupy 107 dwelling units infested with vermin, rodents, debris, filth or garbage. It disclosed 161 cases of inadequate ventilation, 137 units with unsafe stairways, 49 with sinks not in working condition, 47 with inadequate plumbing and 168 with walls and ceilings in bad repair. More than 30 percent of all dwellings checked are in violation of three or more building code requirements.

In announcing results of the survey, Rossman also disclosed that the monthly old age assistance benefits of those checked ranges from around \$73 to \$140 with the average gross monthly family incomes of the aged old age assistance recipients running just under \$100. Thus it will be very difficult to find decent, safe, and sanitary housing within their means, unless low rent public housing is provided.

On the basis of this sample survey, it is felt by housing authority and development commission staffs that there is an actual and critical need for additional low rent housing, especially for the elderly, starting on the close-in West Side, where the largest number of old age assistance recipients is located.

Thus the housing authority is proceeding with studies of possible West Side sites, probably for multilevel structures, with the assistance of an advisory study committee made up of representatives of social agencies and community service groups.

The Journal has recognized that the housing problems of the elderly, low income group have been serious, especially since large numbers of them have been or are being displaced by the Memorial Coliseum project on the near East Side, the urban renewal project in the South Auditorium area, and the new freeway projects. But it had not realized until results of the on-the-ground survey became available that the problem already compels prompt remedial action without relation to displaced persons.

Now that we have the facts, the city, operating through Housing Authority of Portland and the development commission, should waste no time in completing its search for sites and the type of public housing that is suitable and feasible for its elderly, displaced, and needy citizens who cannot possibly find enough privately owned, decent, safe, and sanitary housing within their ability to pay.

Reappointment of Admiral Burke Is Tribute to His Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from

the San Diego Evening Tribune of August 8, 1959.

REAPPOINTMENT OF ADMIRAL BURKE IS TRIBUTE TO HIS LEADERSHIP

The reappointment of Adm. Arleigh A. Burke to an unprecedented third, 2-year term as Chief of Naval Operations is good news.

It is welcomed by all Americans who like to see top-notch talent in top-level jobs.

It is welcomed by the admiral's many friends in San Diego and around the Nation who see in the reappointment a well-deserved tribute to Burke's handling of a complex job.

He has been Chief of Naval Operations since August 17, 1955. He was reappointed in 1957, and today for a third term which will run until 1961.

These years cover a period of fantastic technological development and of swiftly changing defense concepts.

Burke, as Chief of Naval Operations, has been an effective exponent of the Navy's expanding role in the changing world of today and tomorrow.

He has always been articulate when it comes to the Navy, the Marine Corps, and national defense.

It is fortunate that his tours as Chief of Naval Operations have coincided with the rapid development and employment of missiles. He is no newcomer to this field which is assuming an ever-larger place in the Nation's overall defense concept.

And the Navy will need a knowing and effective spokesman in working out its role in the use of missiles. Already it has proposed to the Joint Chiefs of Staff the establishment of a Joint Space Command.

This proposal makes sense. It is based on the same philosophy as the Joint Chiefs, whose combined experience and specialties give this country's defense so much vitality and flexibility.

It is a means of insuring that the looming space and missile picture won't be hogged by a single service—the Air Force, to mince no words—but that all will have a part to play in the best defense of America.

We should remember that the mere conception of a space vehicle uses a "technology which is quite familiar to the Navy."

The Navy pioneered nuclear propulsion with its atomic submarines. The nuclear-powered space vehicle of the future will draw heavily on the know-how which the Navy was first to learn and use.

The suggestion by the Air Force that the Navy's Polaris fleet ballistic missile be put under its command is the tipoff on a trend that the Navy intends to reverse with its soundly conceived unified space command.

The perils to peace, the responsibilities to ourselves and to other free peoples, are too enormous to permit the Navy, or the Army, to be relegated to brushfire organizations.

The Navy can do this job, if called upon. And it is superbly prepared for the bigger roles, too, if necessary.

Admiral Burke is the right man, as Chief of Naval Operations, to see that this capability is unimpaired. And the American people can be grateful that the right man continues to head the first line of defense in trying times.

Rioting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate an editorial entitled "Law

of the Land Forbids Rioting," published in the Greenville (S.C.) News of August 15, 1959.

I think the editorial makes an excellent presentation of the general breakdown of respect for law and order in areas where integration has been forced upon people. The editorial emphasizes in a concise manner what I have been saying to the Senate for several weeks now. I sincerely regret that I have been forced to bring to the attention of the Members of the Senate various outbreaks of violations, hatred, and prejudice which have occurred in the large metropolitan areas where forced integration is practiced, but I know of no other way that I can best convince the Members of the Senate from those areas that forced integration is wrong.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News,
Aug. 15, 1959]

"LAW OF THE LAND" FORBIDS RIOTING

A large number of organizations, whose activities are coordinated in many instances, are working, so they say, for the improvement of the lot of minority groups. The best known of these are the NAACP and the Urban League.

But the great weakness of these organizations is that their efforts are devoted almost entirely to forcing Negroes into the society of whites where they are unwelcome and where the Negroes would be ill at ease at best.

They would do it despite the fact that, in the case of the schools, integration brings about a deterioration of educational standards which deprives the whites of their rights to the best possible education and helps the Negro pupils little if at all; in the case of housing, it brings only riotous protests from the whites in the invaded neighborhoods and improves the living standards of the Negroes not one bit.

These are the people who tell whites all over the country that they should integrate the races in the schools and everywhere else, wholesale and forthwith. But they heed not the fruits of integration. They have done little or nothing to prepare the people they pretend to be trying to help for social change.

They say, to the South in particular, that integration is the "law of the land" and must be obeyed.

But what say they to the repeated assaults in New York City's black Ghetto, Harlem, on police officers trying to enforce not only the law of the land but the law of the city?

Last Sunday, a mob estimated to number as many as 300 Negroes attempted to interfere with New York City police officers as they sought to arrest a Negro man and woman on whose premises they had found a large quantity of bootleg whisky. The pair, who had different names and could not have been man and wife, already were under bond for a similar charge.

Before reinforcements could be brought in, the two officers attempting to make the arrest had been manhandled, one of them was almost stabbed with a pair of shears and their clothing partly torn from their backs.

Several weeks ago, two white police officers were injured by shots from one of their own pistols as a Negro mob tried to keep them from arresting a drunken Puerto Rican woman who had gone berserk in a restaurant.

This is the kind of thing Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON of South Carolina has been

bringing to the attention of the U.S. Senate in his heated exchanges with the liberal New Yorker, Senator KEATING.

The brutal truth is that these incidents are but symptoms of restlessness and disrespect for law and order (indeed, ignorance of what constitutes law and order, is a more accurate description). New York is ripe for the worst racial strife this country has ever seen.

Integration is not the answer to these problems. Nor is public housing to replace the slum dwellings, for the record shows that transplanted slum dwellers soon turn new public housing units into slums.

These incidents and the conditions which form their backdrop constitute a challenge to those who are genuinely interested in the advancement of colored people.

If they could forget integration lawsuits for a while and channel the funds they would thus save into educational programs, the NAACP and the Urban League would begin to make real progress. They could even count on contributions for such purposes from those who are now opposing them in the courts.

They should teach their people to cooperate with law enforcement officers in the discharge of their legitimate duties. They should attack the underlying causes of the excessive rate of illegitimate births among Negroes and the crime rates which are out of all proportion to their numbers in the total population.

Had they done this from the beginning, instead of fomenting lawsuits based on false premises to force mixing of the races, they might have achieved equal rights for all without court decrees.

President Eisenhower Should Keep a Scorecard on His Sure-Fire No. 1 Issue for Winning in 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, it would be well, I think, if the President would keep a scorecard on his very own administration's record of economy which he recently described to a \$100-a-plate Republican dinner in Washington, D.C., as the most important single issue for winning the election in 1960.

Here are several items which he would certainly have to include on such a scorecard. I am, of course, very interested in economy myself, and so I am quite willing to help the President keep score. In fact, I invite all of my colleagues to help me in keeping a complete account of the President's performance in respect to the issue of economy.

It is reported that the Air Force and the Navy have decided to abandon the program for the development of a high-energy aircraft fuel. The administration, according to reports, based their decision, in part at least, on the ground that they had no further requirement for the project.

Chairman OVERTON BROOKS, of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, said the other day:

Our committee is interested in determining why it took the services 5 years and some \$200 million to determine they had no requirement for the fuel.

This is, indeed, a most interesting subject. All of us, of course, are aware that President Eisenhower told the Congress earlier this year:

Research and development in high-energy fuels for air-breathing engines continues to be a high-priority program in which NASA and other Government agencies are cooperating.

This is, indeed, a most fascinating subject. All of us, of course, received the report on the activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration which the President forwarded to the Congress earlier this year in which it was stated:

Research and development in high-energy fuels for air-breathing engines continues to be a high-priority program in which NASA and other Government agencies are cooperating.

In the planning stage is the transfer of a program for building 720 M-60 tanks from the Chrysler Delaware defense plant in Newark, Del., to Detroit.

The Defense Department pleaded for months for the Congress to authorize a spending program of nearly \$40 billion in the current budget.

Now that the Congress has authorized their budget the Defense Department is spending this money like it grew on a money bush.

The move from the Lenape ordnance plant at Newark would probably add as much as \$5 million on the order for 720 M-60's.

If the President really believes as much in economy as he says, he is going to have to do more than make speeches on the subject to \$100-a-plate rallies of the Republican Party in which he points out what a fine winning issue it is.

It is a winning issue, certainly, but if the performance rating of this administration is as low as these two items and many others we are all familiar with clearly indicate, then the President may not be on the winning team next year.

A third item which President Eisenhower should certainly look into is the recently revealed extravagance in running the White House itself. President Eisenhower spends twice as much to run this as President Truman did. During Truman's last year, his operating expenses came to \$2,467,000. This is "small potatoes" compared to the \$5,013,750 which President Eisenhower spent in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959.

Or, President Eisenhower might well investigate the fact that whereas President Truman spent only \$6,703,000 on the entire Executive Office—which includes the Budget Bureau, Office of Defense Mobilization, National Security Council, and the Council of Economic Advisers—this cost the country \$52,736,250 last year, and the President asked the Congress this year for \$91,880,000.

Another place where President Eisenhower could save money—if he really was interested in saving money and not in just trying to make a partisan issue of economy—is in the 99 limousines and

heavy sedans which have been assigned to leading officials of this administration. These are the cars they use when they come to the Congress to plead for \$40 billions for the defense budget, and for other billions.

At the present time, not only do the President, the Secretaries of the several Departments, and the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have limousines, but the Pentagon has a total of 37, of which 14 alone are assigned to various Assistant Secretaries.

If this practice were extended to the Members of Congress, and it is the Democratic Members of Congress whom the President accuses of being "spenders," then there would immediately be 436 limousines for the Members of the House of Representatives and 100 limousines for the Members of the Senate.

Senator JOHN SPARKMAN revealed recently that 20 big corporations get one-half of all defense contracts. Actually, official figures reveal that 100 firms get 74 percent of all defense contracts.

The costs of all defense contracts have skyrocketed. They have, in fact, gone higher and further than any American missile which the Defense Department has launched at Cape Canaveral, Fla.

Part of these costs, which the administration has done absolutely nothing to stop, are due to the entertainment which the companies which get these multimillion-dollar contracts lavish on high officials of this administration.

As a matter of fact, testimony was heard in Washington last week that inside influence and maneuvering by big companies was responsible for letting the Soviet Union get their sputnik missiles into the air months before we did.

It has been brought out by the investigating subcommittee headed by our colleague, Chairman HÉBERT, that the "munitions lobby," made up of over 700 high-salaried retired generals and admirals, enjoys rare and expensive privileges which are often paid for by the public.

It has been brought out that this group of high-ranking brass draws pensions as high as \$12,000 annually, to which their contributions were nil. In addition, they are permitted to hold down industrial jobs paying as much as \$75,000 annually.

But if some poor fellow drawing social security earns more than \$100 a month on the side, he is no longer entitled to social security benefits. Incidentally, he contributed to his pension.

This is class legislation of the kind we would expect to find only in the Soviet Union.

It is a matter of record that the Congress in the past 5 years has reduced President Eisenhower's budget by \$10,600 million.

The President has constantly warned about back-door financing by the Democratic Congress, but, as a matter of fact, has actually requested \$6,400 million in such funds.

This session of the Congress will soon be over, and the score will be added at that time. The Eisenhower record will

be shown to be one of free spending, rather than economy.

As a political issue in 1960 the Eisenhower economy record will not be worth a plugged nickel.

Text of Declaration of Santiago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as we know, the Organization of American States completed its conference at Santiago yesterday.

Upon adjournment, the Foreign Ministers endorsed a declaration "expressing the general aspirations of the American people to live in peace under the protection of democratic institutions, free from all interference and totalitarian influence."

Although the conference faced serious and difficult problems, I believe that, overall, it marks real progress among the nations of the Americas toward resolving differences, cementing relations and laying the groundwork for dealing with difficulties in the future.

Once again, our Secretary of State, Mr. Christian Herter, has turned in a top performance. In a brief tenure of office, the Secretary has faced most difficult problems—first at Geneva, and now at Santiago. Through these experiences—during which great responsibility rested upon his shoulders—the Secretary has demonstrated high qualities of astuteness, remarkable capability, and sound judgment. All in all, during the assumption of the position of Secretary of State under conditions which would have tried the mettle of any man, and which bore one of the great responsibilities in world diplomacy, the Secretary has continued to do honor to his high office.

The progress that was made at Santiago, I am sure, is also a tribute to the relentless efforts and dedication which he brings to his job.

We recognize, of course, that we in the Western Hemisphere still face complex problems in promoting ever-better relationships between our countries—particularly in instances where forms of government differ.

Rightly, the declaration of Santiago stressed the desirability of all governments adhering to the precept of non-interference in the affairs of other nations. Moreover, it again emphasized—as has been our own U.S. policy—that, to the greatest degree possible, the people of a nation should be allowed the greatest maximum amount of "voice in the operations of their government."

Recognizing that the conference marks one more step of progress toward resolving Western Hemisphere problems and promoting security and progress for the future, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the Declaration printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 19, 1959]

TEXT OF DECLARATION OF SANTIAGO

SANTIAGO, CHILE, August 18.—Following is the text of the Declaration of Santiago approved today at the Conference of Foreign Ministers of the American States:

The fifth meeting of consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs;

Expressing the general aspiration of the American peoples to live in peace under the protection of democratic institutions, free from all intervention and all totalitarian influence; and

Considering:

That the faith of the peoples of America in the effective exercise of representative democracy is the best vehicle for the promotion of their social and political progress (Resolution XCV of the 10th Inter-American Conference), while well-planned and intensive development of the economies of the American countries and improvement in the standard of living of their peoples represent the best and firmest foundation of which the practical exercise of democracy and the stabilization of their institutions can be established (resolutions of the special committee to study the formulation of new measures for economic cooperation);

That in Resolution XXXII, the Ninth International Conference of American States, for the purpose of safeguarding peace and maintaining mutual respect among states, among other things, resolved to reaffirm their decision to maintain and further effective social and economic policy for the purpose of raising the standard of living of their peoples, and their conviction that only under a system founded upon a guarantee of the essential freedoms and rights of the individual is it possible to attain this goal, and to condemn the methods of every system tending to suppress political and civil rights and liberties, and, in particular, the action of international communism or any other totalitarian doctrine;

That in Resolution XCV, the 10th Inter-American Conference resolved to unite the efforts of all the American States to apply, develop, and perfect the principles of the inter-American system, so that they would form the basis of firm and solidary action designed to obtain, in a short time, the effective realization of the representative democratic system, the rule of social justice and security, and the economic and cultural cooperation essential to the mutual well-being and prosperity of all the peoples of the hemisphere;

That harmony among the American Republics can be effective only insofar as human rights and fundamental freedoms and the exercise of representative democracy are a reality within every one of them, since experience has demonstrated that failure to adhere to such principles is a source of widespread disturbance and gives rise to emigration that causes frequent and grave political tensions between the state the emigres leave and the states that receive them.

That it is advisable to democratic regimes constitutes a violation of the principles on which the Organization of American States is founded, and endangers the peace and harmony of the hemisphere, and

That it is advisable to denounce, in a general way, a few principles and attributes of the democratic system in this hemisphere, so as to permit national and international public opinion to gauge the degree to which political regimes and governments conform to that system, thus helping eradicate forms of dictatorships, despotism, or tyranny, without weakening respect for the right of the peoples freely to choose their own form of government declares,

1. The principle of the rule of law should be assured by the separation of powers, and by the control of the legality of governmental acts by competent organs of the state.

2. The governments of the American Republics should be derived from free elections.

3. Perpetuation in power, or the exercise of power without fixed term and with the manifest intent of perpetuation, is incompatible with the effective exercise of democracy.

4. The governments of the American States should insure a system of freedom for the individual and social justice based on respect for fundamental human rights.

5. The human rights incorporated into the legislation of the various American States should be protected by effective judicial procedures.

6. The systematic use of political proscription is contrary to American democratic order.

7. Freedom of the press, of radio and television, and, in general, freedom of information and expression, are essential conditions for the existence of a democratic regime.

8. The American States, in order to strengthen democratic institutions, should cooperate among themselves within the limits of their resources and the framework of their laws so as to strengthen and develop their economic structure, and achieve just and humane living conditions for their peoples, and

Resolves, This declaration shall be known as the Declaration of Santiago de Chile.

Diagnostic Clinic for Aged Established in Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there was recently dedicated in my district in northeast Philadelphia the first geriatric clinic to be put into active use in the United States. In these days when the life expectancy of Americans has been increased and when we have thousands of senior citizens where formerly we had only dozens, it is of great advantage to us who must pass upon legislation bearing upon these older people to have the history of this clinic, its organization and its fine work before us. The following is the history of Philadelphia's Northeast Community Geriatric Clinic:

DIAGNOSTIC CLINIC FOR AGED ESTABLISHED IN PHILADELPHIA

A retired electrical engineer in Schenectady, N.Y., discerned when he read in the Schenectady Gazette of a community geriatric clinic begun in Philadelphia, what it was that made this clinic not only a worthwhile enterprise, but something different. In his congratulatory letter to Mrs. Dora N. Schatz, secretary of the newly established Northeast Community Geriatric Clinic as well as of the Diston Senior Citizens Club, he emphasized that too many projects are started by and operated by "well wishers" outside the "golden age" group. He is a strong believer in the older citizens doing things for themselves. He points out that the "golden age" group represents quite a large segment of our present population,

and urges them to exert what political and social strength is inherent in this situation.

And it is true that the unique diagnostic clinic set up in northeast Philadelphia is largely the result of the active concern and hard work of the oldsters themselves. Mrs. Schatz and her fellow members in the Disston Senior Citizens Club had often discussed the need for a facility where those on social security or on otherwise limited incomes could obtain a complete physical checkup. Experience had shown them that too often older persons neglect to obtain thorough checkups periodically because they simply cannot afford it; then, when serious illness strikes, they find that disease has made advanced inroads which could have been checked if discovered in time.

Active help in establishing such a facility finally came through a group of Christian laymen in the community who had organized the Northeast Council for Christian Social Action not too long before this need was presented to them. Individuals interested in the social application of the Christian Gospel in which they believed, this group represented various Protestant denominations in the community. Recognizing that a socially relevant Gospel could not be confined to one congregation, they had attempted to find a way of carrying their influence to the entire community through education and action in what ways they could. They had sponsored two successful community forums, one on the subject of juvenile delinquency and one presenting a Negro leader from Montgomery, Ala., with a message intended to emphasize the power of aggressive Christian love in overcoming even such obstacles as racial tensions.

These were well received by the community and represented a real contribution from an educational sense, but they had not been able to put the "action" part of their program into practice.

Mrs. Schatz read in a community paper a statement of the council to the effect that they aimed at acting as a live part of the conscience of the Christian Church in the community on social issues, and emphasizing their readiness to work with other groups, regardless of race or religious affiliation. She called the article to the attention of her senior citizens group, and urged that a delegation should present their need to the council for consideration. At the June 1958 meeting of the council, she spoke for her group and enlisted the interest of the council which agreed to establish a committee on problems of the aging and asked Mr. Schatz to chair it.

The committee made a study of what was being done in various parts of the country in this field and discussed it at later meetings of the council. In general, they found very much interest in government health circles. They found several States promulgating legislation particularly aimed at helps of one kind or another for the aging. When they consulted with local and State health authorities, they found that there was no present possibility of health department funds being used to operate a diagnostic clinic. Authorities agreed in general that such a facility was needed and expressed the opinion that public health funds would eventually be appropriated for such use—but the life expectancy of those in the senior citizens group did not tend to make them satisfied with a hope of help 10 or 15 years in the future.

Encouragement was obtained when Mrs. Schatz visited a free community clinic for children privately sponsored by Bethel Lutheran Church in Philadelphia. This clinic has operated successfully over a period of 12 years depending upon the generosity of local osteopathic physicians who staffed the clinic without fee, and donations from interested citizens and the church itself.

The council sent Mrs. Schatz to appear at a meeting of the local ministerium asking

the clergy of the community to consider the possibility of donating space in one of the churches. After discussing it with their official boards, three churches volunteered space. Mainly because of its proximity to the home of the senior citizens club, the council accepted the offer of Tacony Baptist Church, and started to work on real plans.

Fortunately, Mrs. Schatz' own doctor, Sidney Richman, was extremely interested in the proposed plan and extended his active help in recruiting further doctors. In addition to other osteopathic physicians who agreed to work with Dr. Richman, offers were received from a local dentist, an eye specialist, and a foot specialist.

As soon as it appeared that the oldsters' dream might become a reality, it was decided that a separate organization should be set up. In early 1959, a board of directors was formed including representatives of the Northeast Council for Christian Social Action and Disston Senior Citizens Club as the cosponsoring organizations, doctors from the volunteer staff, and the pastor of the church where the clinic was to be located. The name "Northeast Community Geriatric Clinic" was chosen. Jay B. Hurst, Jr., a member of the Christian Social Action group, was named president of the new organization, Dr. Seymour Piwoz was named medical director, and Mrs. Schatz was made secretary-treasurer. Conscious of the potential value of well-handled publicity, the group appointed one of its members (an industrial editor) to handle public relations.

Directors immediately set about soliciting funds with which to equip a small clinic. Even minimum equipment (examining tables, sterilizers, electrocardiogram, etc.) would cost a few hundred dollars. The northeast council spent what small funds it had making minor but necessary renovations in the donated space and on small equipment. The senior citizens donated their treasury of \$50. Several local churches and individuals responded with donations, so that by mid-June 1959 enough equipment was on hand to open the doors.

Local business and political leaders joined nearly 100 older citizens of the community in a dedication ceremony at which Protestant clergy and a Jewish rabbi participated.

News of the planned clinic had been carried in local community newspapers, and, the week before opening, Mrs. Schatz received a call from Harriet Smith, feature writer for the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin—one of the big-city papers—asking if she could bring a photographer and do an article on the opening session. She came and interviewed the three patients scheduled for examination the first day, talked to Mrs. Schatz, the doctors, and to Hurst, and wrote a sympathetic and very effective two column article which was carried on page 3 of the Bulletin and put on Associated Press wire service to papers throughout the country.

With this national publicity came a deluge of letters from all sections of the country. Other "golden age" groups wanted to know how it was done, schools wanted stories, an Army chaplain in Annapolis, Md., sent a donation in memory of his mother, a 70-year-old man in Florida wrote to say he was planning a trip to New York and asking if he could stop off in Philadelphia for an examination, a New Jersey man wrote claiming that doctors gave him "the brush-off" when he asked for a thorough physical examination claiming that they did not have time. He wanted to come. A heartrending letter came from an elderly widow in South Dakota who evidently understood that the clinic offered resident care and offering to contribute \$50 a month from her social security if she could come and be cared for. A generous friend of Hurst's in Chicago had sent a \$200 donation to help the clinic get started. When the publicity was released, he wrote Hurst that he had mentioned the project to his friend, Col. Jake Arvey, na-

tionally prominent political figure, and enclosed a check for an additional \$100 from Colonel Arvey.

Originally set up to interview three new patients at each weekly session, the clinic found it had a backlog of nearly 100 applicants within the first 3 weeks. More volunteer doctors were recruited and the clinic is now doubling its capacity—but this involves additional and expensive equipment too, and general expansion is planned.

Hurst comments, "The initial success of our effort has far exceeded our anticipation. When this sort of project was first suggested to our council, I must admit it was received with a jaundiced eye by some of us to whom the obstacles seemed to loom so large that they overshadowed the challenging objective. We are thankful that we accepted the challenge nevertheless, and that God has prospered us in all ways. Considering the inadequacies and limitations of many of us who have been working with this idea, accomplishment of our objective seemed humanly impossible at times. Perhaps the fact that this objective has been essentially accomplished is simply further proof that with God all things are possible."

Diagnostic service only, not treatment, is offered to women over 62 and to men over 65 regardless of ability to pay. Where possible a nominal fee of \$1 is collected. At least in the early stages of the clinic, it has not been necessary to establish any qualification except age. It is hoped that the work can be continued on that basis; however, the board recognizes that some qualification as to ability to pay may have to be established if the service is abused by those well able to pay. But they express the feeling that they will wait and see, hoping that it will not be necessary for a staff social worker to screen applicants on this basis.

In addition to general physical checkup, specialists on the staff offer gynecological examinations, cancer smear tests, and other special services. Arrangements are made for chest X-rays. Eye diseases are common among older people, and an eye specialist is on the staff. A local dentist will check on mouth or gum ailments discovered by the staff.

It is now planned for the clinic to incorporate as a nonprofit organization, and a lawyer has been the latest appointee to the board of directors, offering his services free of charge. Through incorporation, it will be possible for donations to be accepted on a tax-exempt basis, the clinic will be classified in a category enabling it to participate in Government and other help aimed to assist charitable, nonprofit organizations, and legal responsibility of the clinic and those working with it will be fixed.

All this is possible only because these doctors contribute valuable time and services without charge, because Tacony Baptist Church donated space, because many friends have cared enough to contribute toward the financial expenses involved. But, most of this became a reality because a group of older citizens acted.

World Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, August 20 marks an occasion of great significance to those of the Catholic faith and indeed the entire Christian world. This is the date of

the opening of the Quinquennial World Congress of Sodality in the archdiocese of Newark, N.J. It is only the second time in history that such a congress has been held—and for the first time outside of Rome.

I think New Jersey has been particularly honored to be selected for this second world gathering of what promises to be one of the most important and impressive gatherings of Catholic clergy and laymen in history.

More than 50,000 persons, representing 32 countries, are expected to take some part in the meetings and workshops to be held on the campus of Seton Hall University in South Orange during the 4-day conference. The deliberations will concern themselves with the role of the sodalist in a world torn by crisis and unrest.

The world will be watching these proceedings dedicated to the interest of mankind and humanity with great interest. And on behalf of all of the citizens of New Jersey I would like to extend a note of welcome and sincere good wishes for the success of this congress.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article from the Advocate of Thursday, August 13, on this subject.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Advocate, Aug. 13, 1959]

TWO CARDINALS COMING HERE FOR CONGRESS

NEWARK.—An event, historic not only for the Archdiocese of Newark, but also for the entire United States will occur here starting August 20, with the convening of the second World Congress of Sodality of Our Lady. The first congress was held in Rome in 1954.

An episcopal host to the congress to be attended by representatives of 32 nations, Archbishop Boland will be celebrant of a Solemn Pontifical Mass at 9:30 a.m., August 20, in Sacred Heart Cathedral. The sermon will be preached by Auxiliary Bishop Leo C. Byrne, of St. Louis, executive episcopal moderator of the National Federation of Sodality of the United States.

The Mass will formally open the conclave whose deliberations, including addresses by religious and lay dignitaries and panel-type workshop sessions, will take place on the Seton Hall University campus in South Orange.

The final event of the congress will be the World Congress Marian demonstration to be held August 23 at Roosevelt Stadium, Jersey City, with more than 30,000 attending. Auxiliary Bishop Fulton J. Sheen of New York will speak.

The importance given the congress is stressed by the fact that among the active participants will be 2 cardinals, 8 archbishops, and 25 bishops.

Most of the members of the hierarchy, led by Cardinal Spellman of New York, and Cardinal Cushing of Boston, will have specific assignments during the meeting. Cardinal Spellman will preside at the Marian demonstration closing the congress on August 23. Cardinal Cushing will preside at the public symposium Friday evening, August 21, at Seton Hall University.

The congress promises to be one of the most important and impressive gatherings of Catholic clergy and laymen in history. More than 50,000 persons are expected to take some part in the meetings, workshops, symposium and demonstrations during the 4 days. From 32 nations, representatives from Ceylon, India, and other Asian nations will join fellow Catholics from Africa, Europe,

North and South America to discuss and plan their respective roles in a world torn by crisis and unrest.

Following the mass August 20 the delegates will assemble at Seton Hall University. Archbishop Fernando Ruiz y Solorzano of Yucatan, Mexico, who heads a delegation of 350 Sodalists from his country, will be moderator of the opening session.

Highlight of the first session will be the broadcast of a tape-recorded message from Pope John XXIII. The opening address will be given by Archbishop Joseph Gawlina, director of the World Federation of Sodality. He will speak on the theme of the congress: "The Vocation of the Sodalist in the Crisis of the Modern World."

Both the Pope's message and Archbishop Gawlina's address, as well as all other major talks and documents of the congress, will be simultaneously translated into the five official languages of the conclave—English, French, German, Italian and Spanish.

Following the general session, delegates will break up into workshop groups to discuss various aspects of the general theme. Workshops will be held in each of the five congress languages.

In the evening, the National Federation of Sodality of the United States will be host at a reception for the foreign delegations.

Proceedings on Friday and Saturday will be similar to those on Thursday, with workshops following general sessions.

A special aspect of the theme will be examined and discussed each day.

The public symposium on Friday evening at which Cardinal Cushing will preside will be one of the highlights of the conclave. The topic will be "Sodalities in International Life." Rie Vendrik, president of the Conference of International Catholic Organizations, will be chairman, and Rosemary Goldie of Australia, secretary of the Permanent Committee of the Lay Apostolate in Rome, will be secretary.

Participants will include M. de Habicht of Hungary, secretary of the Conference of International Catholic Organizations; Martin Work, executive director of the National Council of Catholic Men; Mrs. Mark Theissen, president of the National Council of Catholic Women; and Rev. Louis Paulussen, S.J., director of the International Secretariat of Sodality in Rome.

Saturday evening will be devoted to "The Night of Nations" in which delegates from many countries of the world will demonstrate some facets of their native culture.

On Sunday delegates will meet in executive sessions before and following a Mass celebrated by Archbishop Joseph E. Ritter of St. Louis, honorary episcopal moderator of sodality of the United States. In the afternoon they will hold the final general session of the congress at which conclusions will be read and officers installed. They will then depart by bus for the closing Marian demonstration at Roosevelt Stadium, Jersey City.

Catholics and non-Catholics throughout the East are invited to the closing ceremonies at which the message of the Holy Father will be rebroadcast.

Latin American Events

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of

transmittal from Reverend Father Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs, St. Joseph's-on-Carrollton Manor, Frederick, Md., with which he forwards three articles from Latin American events of Monday, August 17, 1959. The articles are: "Reunion in Santiago"; "Secret Negotiations on a Loan to Cuba"; "News and Commentaries."

ST. JOSEPH'S-ON-CARROLLTON MANOR.

Frederick, Md., August 17, 1959.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Washington, D.C.

ILUSTRE AMIGO Y GRAN PARLAMENTARIO: Your splendid leadership, upholding freedom and decency in the domain of inter-American relations, prompts me to suggest that you consider, for possible inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the three articles I have marked in Latin American events. You are free, if you see fit, to mention that the material was brought to your attention by your undersigned friend, "the Padre."

Everything in these articles coincides with the evidence you brought to the notice of your distinguished colleagues on Thursday, August 13, 1959, by inserting the piece by Edward Tomlinson in the RECORD. I wish more U.S. leaders would become active in this cause.

In this connection, I would like to add that I have known Dr. Emilio Núñez Portuondo, former president of the Security Council of the United Nations, for many years. He is a proved friend of the United States of America and a freedom fighter of worldwide renown. No one in the U.N. worked more ardently for the brave Hungarian patriots at the time of the slaughter of people in Budapest by the Soviets.

Hoping to see you soon, I remain,

Your friend and admirer.

(El Padre) JOSEPH F. THORNING,
Associate editor of World Affairs.

[From Latin American Events, Aug. 17, 1959]

REUNION OF SANTIAGO

When in 1954, I represented Cuba in the Inter-American Conference held in the city of Caracas it became my duty to denounce before all the Americas the Communist government of Guatemala headed by Colonel Arbenz, who now directs all the conspiracies inspired by the Moscow government from Montevideo. I remember vividly that, in an animated debate with Dr. Torriello, Foreign Minister of the Red government of Guatemala, I exposed the danger that the whole continent would be subjected to by an economic-political offensive of the Soviet Union. I advocated strong measures to repress Communist infiltration in our countries.

In this Inter-American Conference the Caracas declaration was approved, by 17 votes in favor, 1 against, that of Guatemala, and 2 abstentions, that of Mexico and Argentina under Juan Domingo Perón. It was made clear in the most exact terms that the establishment of a communistic regime in the geographic boundaries of the Americas constituted a threat to its internal security. All the Latin American States were committed to comply with the obligations imposed by the passage of said declaration.

The Caracas declaration was received by international public opinion as a diplomatic triumph of the United States, who had been its most staunch supporter. I remember that I privately warned the late illustrious Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, who was attending the conference, that the main responsibility for keeping it in force fell on the United States of America for obvious reasons: because they were the ones mainly interested in preventing Communist infiltration in America and fundamentally because the United States was the only Nation with enough material and economic resources to

face the Soviet Union with any assurance of victory. In my judgment, even though we were dealing with a multilateral obligation, its chance for success or failure depended upon the vigor with which the U.S. Government would back the declaration.

The Caracas declaration went the way of all declarations among the thousands that are approved in inter-American conferences and are never applied. Since 1954 until this moment when I am writing these lines, it cannot be denied that international communism has made the most extraordinary advances in the great majority of Latin American States. To deny its existence is like trying to obliterate the sun with your finger. It is enough to cite the Communist regime now existent in Cuba, and the preponderant situation enjoyed by the Communists in Venezuela, and the advantages gained in Chile, Argentina, Uruguay, Guatemala, Panama, and Ecuador to realize that I am speaking the truth. This tragic situation does not seem to be generally known by the people or by the ruling bodies of the United States and it is essential that they realize the imminent danger that we are all undergoing.

The foreign ministers of the Americas are now in session in Santiago, Chile, in an extraordinary session in order to deal with the existent tensions in the Caribbean. We feel that if the United States does not assume the responsibility in presenting the problem in its whole magnitude, declaring in all sincerity that the tensions are primarily due to Communists and the activities of fellow-travelers who follow blindly the dictates of the government of Moscow, the conference in Santiago will fail miserably and will spread discouragement among those of us who are fighting to liberate our peoples from the totalitarian and cruel yoke. A way must be found to prevent the attention of the foreign ministers to be diverted from Communist engendered arguments; that the real cause of the problems in Latin America are primarily economic in nature when all of us know that the present situation in the Caribbean is mainly political.

With a few declarations nothing practical will be gained. We must act with vigor and insist that the declaration of Caracas must be upheld. We must do this or confess our complete failure. We must close the door to international communism in the Americas with energetic and effective measures or we will confess to the world that we are impotent to defend ourselves. If this happens and we are really incapable of stemming the Communist tide we will witness the fall of each Latin American State, one by one, under the influence of the Moscow government. Realistic and effective, we could call this form of action in order to defend ourselves. To postpone such action would be an error of incalculable consequences to the cause of democracy and liberty in this hemisphere.

SECRET NEGOTIATIONS ON A LOAN TO CUBA

Before coming to Washington just recently the Prime Minister of Cuba, Fidel Castro, assured a multitude of his followers in Havana "that he was not coming to the United States to solicit money because he did not need it, and that he would never undermine the Cuban economy with onerous obligations." These very words he repeated in Washington on many occasions.

In spite of this statement by the Prime Minister, during his stay in Washington, the Secretary of the Treasury, Rulfo Lopez Fresquet and the president of the National Bank of Cuba, Felipe Pazos, began talks with representatives of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, where they expounded on Cuba's hazardous economic situation and explored the possibility of receiving a loan. The chief difficulty in obtaining a loan is that we are dealing with a provi-

sional government, not elected by the people, without a constitution, and a regime where one man's word is law to the point where he seizes and unseats presidents at will, without regard for the Cuban public opinion. The negotiations for the loan apparently failed.

The economic situation in Cuba deteriorates more each day. The expropriations, the confiscations, the brutal laws, like the lowering of rents and the agrarian reform have produced a chaotic state and each day the government has more and more difficulties in meeting their most necessary obligations. This is well known in Cuba and the United States even though the press does not echo this situation.

Two new avenues for negotiations have been opened: Negotiations directly between the government of Cuba and Washington and in New York with private American banks. A loan of \$300 million is being sought to stabilize the Cuban peso, which, in the last 6 months has lost 30 percent of its value in relation to the dollar and also the money is being sought to speed up the agrarian reform but on a much larger scale.

It is unbelievable that these negotiations could be entertained with the U.S. Government and private American banks. You could cite more than a hundred public statements by Fidel Castro which are insulting to the Government in Washington and to the United States. In a recent radio broadcast from Cuba on the anniversary of the July 26 movement (that we personally heard) he called the North American Senators that formed part of the Subcommittee of Internal Security, "Gangsters."

The Agrarian reform law robs the citizens of the United States and many American corporations of thousands of acres of land worth millions of dollars without adequate compensation. The new tariffs place onerous taxes on North American products, such as automobiles, refrigerators and other hard goods. It would not make sense to give this loan to pay back in dollars those North Americans affected by the expropriations of the agrarian reform. They would be paying themselves with their own money.

There is adequate explanation for the aid that the United States gave Yugoslavia and Poland, because Tito defied the imperialistic designs of the Soviet Union and Gomulka removed Poland from direct influence of the Soviet Government. Fidel Castro, however, moves closer each day to the Soviet orbit. Recently the *Excelsior*, a Mexico City newspaper, said that Cuba will soon establish diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and that it has committed itself to vote favorably or to abstain on the question of the entry of Communist China into the United Nations when the General Assembly meets in September.

There would be no rhyme nor reason to the Government and peoples of Latin America, anti-Communist, and friends of the United States, for a loan negotiated without consent of the people of Cuba and given to the most pro-Communist and most anti-American country in the Americas. It would set a tragic precedent and would cost billions of dollars to the taxpayers of the United States.

NEWS AND COMMENTARIES

Guatemala: There are persistent rumors that there is a subversive movement afoot to oust President Idigoras Fuentes who has always been a strong enemy of international communism. This movement is being organized in several Latin American countries and is being directed from Montevideo by Ex-President Arbenz who aspires to take over.

The election to the mayor's office in Guatemala City of one of Arbenz's old cronies and the known, as well as underground activities of the Communists in Guatemala together with the split among the

political parties have made the sheep from Moscow think that this might be the appropriate time to undertake the coup.

Of course if the Army, as it is hoped will remain loyal to President Idigoras, this maneuver will end in a miserable failure. The experts fear, however, that the President might be too confident and that the hurricane will unleash without enough time to avoid its disastrous effects.

Venezuela: Unemployment grows in Venezuela in spite of the promises of President Romulo Betancourt. The Venezuelans complain that President Betancourt devotes more time to activities outside Venezuela than to the grave social and economic problems that are current in the land of Marshal Sucre. News of the development on a grand scale of the deposits of oil in the French Sahara and in other places, which until now have bought Venezuelan oil is disquieting to the people and businessmen of Venezuela.

Haiti: The situation in Haiti gets more complicated every day primarily because of economic reasons. With a great over population and a land which is unfertile, the truth is that poverty is extreme in the Haitian population. In order to solve this problem rapidly, international cooperation, but principally that of the United States, is needed. It is true that the Washington Government has rendered some aid to the Government of Haiti, but hunger is still prevalent in that country.

The present tensions in the Caribbean and the internal political dicotomy contribute in aggravating the situation. There are intense conspiracies against President Duvalier inside and outside Haiti. The difficult impasse between Cuba and the Dominican Republic, the latter invaded from Cuban territory without success, places Haiti in a dangerous position because it does not have sufficient military forces to defend itself. The plans to invade the Dominican Republic via Haiti have been prepared very cautiously and carefully. They have not been put into effect for reasons known to all. This was explained in a letter to President Eisenhower from President Duvalier and handed to him personally by the Haitian Ambassador in Washington.

Haiti is actually the key point in the peace in the Americas.

Chile: A distinguished politician and diplomat has just written me a very interesting letter in which he makes the following interesting observations about the forthcoming visit of Nikita Khrushchev to the United States.

"The only justification that the Government in Washington has offered, to invite Khrushchev, the most cruel tyrant and the most bloodthirsty of our era; the fearsome executioner of the peoples of the Ukraine and Hungary, was to prove to him during his visit the military might of the United States. This proof would stop him from unleashing Soviet aggression. The truth is that Khrushchev has already said to the press in Moscow that 'he would not accept any invitations to visit any military installations while in the United States.' Why the visit then which makes all the captive peoples in Europe, and Asia lose their hopes of liberty?"

PARTIAL LIST OF KNOWN COMMUNISTS OR FELLOW TRAVELERS THAT OCCUPY IMPORTANT POSITIONS IN CUBA

Positions in the military

Augusto Martinez Sanchez, Minister of Defense.

Raul Castro Ruiz, Chief of the Armed Forces.

Comandante Juan Almeida, Chief of Air Force.

Armando Acosta, Chief of Navy.

Montes de Oca, Chief of Military Intelligence.

Manuel Rodiles, Second Chief of the National Police and Chief of the Bureau of Investigations.

William Galvez, Inspector General of the Army.

Comandante Garcia Morales.

Capitan Choy, Chief of Havana Prison.

Capitan Garriga, Chief of Press and Radio of the Cuban Army.

Comandante Ernesto Che Guevara, (Argentine), Chief of the Cuban Fortress.

Teniente Lavandera (Who was in the Communist Government of Arbenz), Chief of Army Espionage.

Comandante Faure Chaumont, Chief of the Student Revolutionary Directory.

Comandante Enrique Oltuski, Minister of Communications.

Comandante Odón Alvarez de la Campa, Under Secretary of Agriculture.

Capitan Ingeniero Fresneda, Chief of the Institute of Agrarian Reform.

Comandante Antonio Nufiez Jimenez, Director of the Agrarian Law Institute.

Jose Luis Masó, Chief of Publicity of the Institute of Agrarian Reform.

Positions in the administration

Dr. Oswaldo Dorticós, Provisional President of the Republic.

Carlos Franqui, Director of the Newspaper Revolution, official organ of the Government.

Vicentina Antuña, Director of Culture of the Ministry of Education.

Eduardo Corona, Secretary of the General Accounting Office and Paymaster General.

Alfredo Guevara, President of the Institute of the Movie Industry.

José Perez Lamy, president of Indemnity Board of the Civil War.

Señora Irene Viuda de José María Perez, secretary of the Indemnity Board of the Civil War.

Celestino Fernandez, president of the retirement fund for sugar workers.

Baudillo Castellanos, magistrate in the paymaster office.

Rosa Rivero, official lawyer of the district court in Havana.

Raquel Perez, Minister of Social Welfare.

Armando Hart, Minister of Education.

Positions in the labor movement

David Salvador, secretary general of the Workers Union of Cuba. Indoctrinated in Moscow for 3 years.

Juan Armesto, secretary general of the omnibus syndicate.

José Martinez Leira, secretary general of the shoe industry.

Juan F. Esquerro, secretary general of Shoemakers Union in the Province of Havana.

Miguel Quintero, secretary general of the Club and Beach Workers Union.

Alfredo Rancano, secretary general of the Cooks, Chefs, and Food Workers Union.

Pedro Pumero, secretary general of the Construction Workers Union in Havana.

Agapito Figueroa, secretary general of the Metal Workers Union in Havana.

Francisco Lopez, secretary general of Graphic Arts Union.

Angel Espasandez, secretary general of the Public Entertainment Workers Union.

Amado Hernandez, secretary general of the Barbers, Hairdressers, and Manicurist Union in Havana.

Ricardo Rodriguez, director of the group which controls the railroad federation.

Jesus Soto, secretary general of the Textile Workers Union.

Hector Carbonell, secretary general of the Needle Workers Union in Havana.

Luis Moreno, secretary general of the Tobacco Workers Union.

Monroney Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the unusually able junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has made a fine contribution. It was from Senator MONRONEY that the idea came of using our accumulating piles of foreign currencies for international development. The Eisenhower administration has now endorsed his plan, and proposed it to other countries.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial, published in the Baltimore (Md.) Sun on August 17, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Aug. 17, 1959]

NEW DEVELOPMENT TOOL

After a slow start Senator MONRONEY seems now to have lined some of the right people up behind his plan for a new world bank to make local currency loans. Local currency is a polite way of describing the money of countries which can't readily convert it into other moneys. It stands to reason that such money doesn't make very good lending material for an international bank. The reason is that a country with nonconvertible money is likely to have little to sell and so little to offer in the way of capital materials.

But while a country with nonconvertible money may not be able to provide steel and tractors, nuclear reactors and hydroelectric equipment, it may well have other goods, even if in limited supply, which would help its friends in a development program. If it had a rice surplus, say, it might provide rice for a developing neighbor country and enable that country to turn some of its manpower from food production to more direct development employment. The new kind of bank Mr. MONRONEY has in mind would mobilize such secondary development resources. At first savored rather coolly by the international development people, the plan is now being taken up by the bankers and by the U.S. Treasury itself.

The proposed local currency bank would be set up in affiliation with the World Bank. This institution now makes strictly hard money loans on bankable terms payable in hard money in the classic business tradition. But the possibility is now seen of what you might call blended advances, with hard money from the World Bank to supply the capital equipment available only in such countries as the United States, Britain, West Germany, and local currency through the new local currency bank for such goods as were available in the more modest countries. In this way every last potential and degree of development capital would be mobilized for effective use. Were Congress, after appropriate study, to authorize American collaboration in such a plan the overall cause of world development would undoubtedly be helped.

Labor Reform a Necessity

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8342) to provide for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, it is imperative that this Congress pass a strong and effective labor reform bill. The American people are rightfully demanding an end to the disgusting tactics of racketeers such as Dave Beck and Jimmy Hoffa.

We all know that the overwhelming majority of our labor leaders and union members are honest, loyal Americans. But a small element in the labor-management field have fallen into the use of corrupt and strongarm tactics that are a disgrace to our free enterprise system.

Actually, the rotten apple in the labor barrel should have been removed long ago. The Congress was given a chance to take a long stride in that direction a year ago when the Kennedy-Ives anti-racketeering bill passed the Senate with only one dissenting vote but was choked off in the House by a cross-fire of propaganda from extremists on both sides of the issue—those who wanted no reform at all and those who wanted to use Dave Beck as an excuse to put a legislative shackle on the entire labor movement.

I believed last year, as I do now, that the overwhelming majority of the American people want legislation that is strong enough to put hoodlums like Hoffa out of business. On the other hand, the same Americans would be just as strongly opposed to the schemes of labor haters to destroy honest labor organizations. That is why as a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor last year, I did my best to secure passage of the moderate Kennedy-Ives bill.

Although I transferred from the Education and Labor Committee to the Committee on Agriculture this year, I have not lost my interest in effective labor reform legislation. Neither have I changed my belief that the public interest lies between the two extremes of either doing nothing or passing a bill designed to punish all labor, honest and dishonest alike.

For this reason, I again supported the position of moderation represented by legislation reported out of the House Committee on Education and Labor and sponsored by my respected colleague and friend, Congressman ELLIOTT, of Ala-

bama. To the left of this bill was a second bill backed by the AFL-CIO and introduced by Congressman SHELLEY, of California. On the right is the third bill now before us, backed by the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, introduced by Congressman LANDRUM, of Georgia, and GRIFFIN, of Michigan.

All of the men who have introduced these bills are respected, highly competent Congressmen who act in good faith. Actually, the Shelley bill and the Landrum bill are patterned after the Elliott committee bill in most of their provisions. All of the bills contain tough, effective machinery for cleaning out corruption, rigged elections and racketeering. The differences come on matters relating to the scope of the National Labor Relations Board, picketing, boycotts, and the "hot cargo" practice. Although the Landrum bill is virtually a copy of the committee bill in more than 80 percent of its language, it contains highly restrictive language and heavy penalties which many labor lawyers and Members of Congress sincerely believe would jeopardize legitimate collective bargaining. Robert Kennedy, the McClellan committee's able legal counsel has strongly backed the moderate Elliott committee bill as the most practical of the three bills.

Our distinguished and beloved Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN, who supports the committee's middle-of-the-road bill, put it this way:

To cut out the cancer of corruption, we used a surgeon's scalpel instead of a butcher's cleaver.

Those of us who are doing our best to resist pressure from both sides and take a moderate position in support of the committee bill have been hit from both left and right. Quoting further from Speaker RAYBURN:

Every time that Congress takes up the subject of labor-management relations, powerful interests move in and try to twist the legislation to give them an undue and unfair advantage in the age-old struggle between management and labor. Each side tries to shape the laws so that the Federal Government's great power will be put to work on its behalf in this continuing struggle for economic power. This is not right, for the Federal Government should serve as an impartial umpire between these great economic forces, seeking to maintain fair and free competition.

The man who has served as Speaker of the House longer than any other man in American history, speaking for those of us who support the committee bill, added:

This middle road, the road of reason and fair play, is a hard one to walk, but more often than not it is the path of common sense and justice. When a bill is being fought by both Jimmy Hoffa and the labor haters, that, in itself, is a pretty good recommendation. * * * Let us reform without punishing. Let us cure without crushing.

Although I have preferred the committee bill, now that the Landrum-Griffin bill has been substituted, I am voting for this substitute measure on final passage.

It is essential that labor reform legislation be passed by the House. If there are errors in the legislation, let us hope that they can be corrected in the conference between the House and Senate versions of labor reform bills.

The important task for us to accomplish before the adjournment of this Congress is the passage of legislation that will set the power of the Federal Government against the racketeers without crushing legitimate collective bargaining and the rights of our working men and women.

While I have disagreed with some of my constituents who have written me on both sides of the labor reform issue, I believe these good people know that I am as sincere in my convictions as they are in theirs. I believe they know, too, that I will do the best I know how to cast my vote on the side of fair play for both management and labor and for the American people as a whole. I am most grateful for the fact that I have enjoyed the support of both labor and business, as well as the great farm population of South Dakota. I see no conflict between the best interests of all three of these basic elements of our economy, and I trust that my public record will be fair to each of them.

Trees Can Help Control Smog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, almost everybody likes trees. And I am sure that everyone who lives in or near any of our large metropolitan centers hates smog. Yet it is possible, according to a novel scientific theory which has come to my attention, that by planting more trees and foliage we can reduce air pollution. The authority for this statement is Dr. Chauncey D. Leake, dean of the college of medicine of Ohio State University, who is the new president-elect of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Maybe that is one reason why we have a great deal less smog in Washington, D.C., than we do in Los Angeles. Both cities have great numbers of motor vehicles discharging large volumes of carbon dioxide and other contaminants into the atmosphere. Both cities have a share of foggy mornings. But humid Washington has a great many more trees and natural foliage than arid Los Angeles. You may recall that the mild smog spell we had here in the District in early June was dispelled before noon. If Dr. Leake's theory is proven correct by further scientific study, it could mean a great deal to many smog-plagued metropolitan areas which are virtually devoid of trees.

Dr. Leake gave a scholarly address

on certain social aspects of air pollution at the national conference held in Washington last November. He recently has extended his point of view with the suggestion regarding the use of trees in fighting air pollution. An interesting article on the subject was published in the Oregon Statesman of Salem, Oreg. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S KEEP OUR BALANCE

(Chauncey D. Leake, Dean, College of Medicine, the Ohio State University)

Every great application of science carries its cost. Take the matter of transportation: Look how we have advanced from weary leg plodding, through oxcart and horse and buggy, to steam carriage and automobile, now to diesel engine, airplane, and jets. This tremendous advance has occurred within the last 50 years. It has revolutionized the world. But at a price.

The millions of automobiles, trucks, and airplanes, which we now have running all over the earth, burn up oxygen. This is a great danger. Oxygen has accumulated on the earth as a result of the photosynthesis of plants. In this process the carbon dioxide which accumulated during the days when volcanoes blew off all over the earth was converted by sunlight to sugar and oxygen. It is this oxygen that makes possible the land animals such as ourselves. We cannot live without oxygen, and we get in trouble if we produce too much carbon dioxide.

All modern transportation moves on combustion; that is, the burning of fuel with oxygen to produce carbon dioxide. Incidentally, a lot of other poisonous materials are produced also, but let's just stick to the carbon dioxide picture.

For millions of years the earth has been in a wholesome balance between oxygen and carbon dioxide. The plants use up the carbon dioxide that comes into the air from burning, or from the breathing of animals, and produce sugars and oxygen, so that animals can live. This is a very delicate balance. It is involved in maintaining the stability of weather. It is important in keeping just the right balance for heat capture from the sun and for the preservation of a balance in our water distribution, between the icecaps on the poles and the water vapor in the air. If this exquisite balance is disturbed, things can go bad.

We are disturbing this balance in a sudden and startling way. We are dumping tons of carbon dioxide, along with a lot of other poisonous material, into the air from the engines that run our automobiles, trucks, and airplanes. Meanwhile, we are also cutting down our trees, destroying our forest lands, and making deserts in our cities. We are in a fair way to get badly out of balance before we know it.

Carbon dioxide helps to build heat. With only a slight increase in the overall carbon dioxide of our atmosphere, we might add just that bit more heat that could upset our weather balance. Think what might happen if the polar icecaps were really to melt away.

Before it's too late, let's start planting trees. Certainly for every automobile we produce, we should have at least a dozen trees planted to take care of the carbon dioxide that we produce and to put back the oxygen that we need. For every truck, we need probably a hundred or more trees to keep the balance. For every airplane, and now for jets, we probably need several hun-

dred more trees. Let's start planting them; let's keep our balance.

Meanwhile, our cities are becoming more ugly, our landscapes are becoming more barren, our whole civilization is losing the natural beauty that belongs to all of us in the good regions of the earth. Let's get the trees back to preserve our watersheds, to give us the oxygen we need to breathe, to remove the carbon dioxide, dusts, and other poisonous material from the air, and let's get trees back into our cities to hide the ugliness of our buildings.

H. L. Mencken, that sharp-tongued Baltimore wit, wrote once, "On certain levels of the American race there seems to be a positive libido for the ugly . . . Here is something that the psychologists have so far neglected: The love of ugliness for its own sake, the lust to make the world intolerable." One has only to take a little stroll about any one of our big cities to see the ugliness we tolerate. Maybe our libido for ugliness is unconscious, but it certainly is there, or else we would try to bring some beauty into our cities.

This can best be done by trees. Trees can be planted and maintained along our main streets, in our business areas, in our commercial and industrial areas, as well as in our residential sections. We need lots more trees, green places and parks in our cities.

Even Vitruvius, the great architect under Augustus Caesar in ancient Rome, realized the value of trees. He indicated that they help to keep the air clean and fresh, and are more needed in the cities than they are in the country.

Trees would help enormously in our motor age. Planted along our highways they would relieve monotony and lessen fatigue; they restore natural beauty; and help maintain the roadside, particularly in the prevention of erosion and they are thus economical; they reduce noise, dust, and take out carbon dioxide from the air; they can effectively screen off the ugliness of industrial areas, and they can afford rest places for safety and recreation.

More importantly are trees needed in the cities. Here they can help in reducing noise and dust, in providing cool shade in the summer, and in hiding the ugliness of our buildings both in summer and winter. They give a refreshing look to our streets, and they can provide a lot of employment in connection with their care and maintenance.

Certainly if we are to preserve our balance in connection with our wasteful use of oxygen from the air, and with our appalling increase in the amount of carbon dioxide we are dumping into it, it can best be done by planting trees; at least 10 trees for every automobile, at least a hundred trees for every truck, and at least a couple of hundred trees for every airplane. This would promote beauty, stabilize our weather pattern, and help maintain our land in the beautiful natural way that we all enjoy.

Mrs. Helen Fleming Czachorski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride and inspiration that I call to the attention of the Members of Congress the achievements of a distinguished woman attorney in my district, Mrs. Helen Fleming Czachorski. Mrs. Czachorski is a unique and out-

standing woman and I wish to take this opportunity to acquaint you with her background and qualifications.

Helen Fleming Czachorski was born April 27, 1928, in Buffalo, N.Y., the second of five children of Mr. and Mrs. Teofil Fleming. She was educated at Masten Park High School, Buffalo, and then entered Buffalo University, from whence she received her LL.B., the first female graduate of that university's college of law, in June of 1908. She was admitted to practice November 16, 1909, before the Supreme Court of the State of New York. Her first position was as an associate of Samuel Harris, later to become a judge of the Supreme Court of New York.

In 1914, she married Dr. John A. Czachorski of Chicago, Ill., and was admitted to legal practice in Illinois. In the same year she was elected attorney of the Polish Women's Alliance and remained general counsel of that national organization until 1936.

In 1941, Mrs. Czachorski was elected national president of the Polish Bar Association, being the first woman to hold said position. She was the founder of this association. She was also one of the founders of the Chicago Advocates Society, a local branch of the national group.

Mrs. Czachorski is unique in that she is believed to be the first woman of Polish extraction to be admitted to the practice of law anywhere in the world. It is also believed that she is the only mother associated in a law partnership with her sons. She and her sons, Eugene and John, have their law firm at 100 North La Salle Street, Chicago. Previous to this association, she was engaged in the practice of law with her brother, Edward E. Fleming. She was attorney for the Hegewisch Federal Savings & Loan Association, Hegewisch, Ill., for many years.

This most distinguished woman has been active in many civic, charitable, and professional organizations throughout the years. She is a member of Women's Bar Association, South Chicago Bar Association, Polish Women's Alliance of America, Polish Roman Catholic Union, Polish Welfare Association, Women's Auxiliary of Chicago Polish Medical Society, attorney for Polish Women's Alliance of America for 21 years.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Helen Fleming Czachorski is certainly a rare and outstanding professional woman and is truly deserving of all the civic as well as personal tributes that she will receive on her 50th anniversary of legal practice.

Hawaii Day in New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, Governor Meyner, our distinguished Governor of New Jersey, has proclaimed today Hawaii Day in New Jersey. I

would like to join in the celebrations and extend a most joyous welcome to our new State.

I had the memorable pleasure and honor to participate in the vote for statehood for Hawaii in March. This was a living demonstration of democracy in action. It is proof of the vitality of the United States. It is the fulfillment of hope that we have long held out to the loyal people of Hawaii. The vote for statehood demonstrates that the United States offers more than the hope of freedom to the world. It is proof that the United States of America is synonymous with the word "freedom."

To my colleagues from our new State, I extend a most sincere welcome. May he find it as rewarding an experience as I have.

The Impact of Science on Our Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include an address which I delivered at the 96th commencement of Bryant College on July 31, 1959. The address is entitled "The Impact of Science on Our Society":

THE IMPACT OF SCIENCE ON OUR SOCIETY

(Address of the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, Member of Congress from the Second District of Rhode Island, Veterans Memorial Auditorium, Providence, R.I., at the 96th commencement of Bryant College)

Gathered here this morning are several hundreds of young men and women who have successfully met another in the long series of challenges by which each human being is measured, from his first learned response to his last influence before or after his death.

Gathered here, too, are several thousands of men, women, and children for whom this commencement also signifies the successful meeting of a challenge. For the award of a diploma to an individual is not just tangible recognition of that individual's academic accomplishments; it is also, symbolically, recognition of the accomplishment of parents and loved ones who have given much of themselves in order that a new and potentially valuable member may be added to the family of man.

Bryant College has witnessed many occasions such as this. Thousands of students have studied here and, enlightened and enriched by the experience, gone on to productive, rewarding careers. For nearly a century, the college has been a source of pride to the community it serves by blending specialized education in business techniques and administration with the more general education required for useful citizenship in our complex and dynamic society. It has had the vision and courage to pioneer in educational methods and curriculum. Yet it has never lost sight of its primary mission: To educate the individual.

The educated individual is the key factor governing the strength and effectiveness of our democracy. The incredibly rapid sweep of events in the 20th century places a special responsibility on all of us, not only to keep abreast of our times, but in a sense to keep ahead of our times.

This is nowhere more evident than in the field of science. That is why I have chosen to share with you today some thoughts on science and its impact on society.

What image do you have in your mind when you think of the term "science"? Is it the picture of nuclear power for instruments of peace and weapons of destruction? Is it manned missiles encircling the earth or exploring the surfaces of the moon? Is it probing the depths of the ocean, the molecular structure of metals, the chemistry of the cells of the human body?

This is the kind of image most people have when they think of science. They endow science with qualities that tend to remove it from the society it serves—to set it apart as something mysterious and almost frightening in its potential for engendering sudden and unpredictable change in our way of life. In the same vein, scientists are commonly viewed as obsessively motivated, highly intellectual, socially naive individuals who spend their lives satisfying their intense curiosity to understand the phenomena of the world and the universe about them.

Such images tend to create barriers to public understanding of science, and public understanding is essential if science is to be an even more effective force for the achievement of goals that are set by society.

Textbooks tell us that the essence of science is the facts or principles or rules which are used to explain or hold together what man knows, and to help him discover what he still does not know. The abstract sciences deal with things that cannot be touched, like numbers or thoughts; the natural sciences deal with things in nature, such as men and stones and stars; and the human or social sciences deal with the way we think and act, alone or together. No matter how it is classified, however, science is characterized by what is known as the scientific method. And the application of the scientific method to the study of man and his universe has been a primary force directing and conditioning the growth of civilization as we know it.

It is easy for us today to look back over those relatively few years in which man on this planet has recorded his history and see how primitive science has evolved into modern science. The use of metals—the control of fire, the domestication of animals, the planting and harvesting of crops, the discovery of the wheel, the invention of written language—these were scientific accomplishments which had a marked effect on the subsequent history of mankind.

In the forward movement of science through the intervening centuries—movement associated with such names as Aristotle, Archimedes, Copernicus, Galileo, Kepler, Newton—there is evidence of a characteristic of science that must be understood by all of us who live today in a world that is rapidly becoming a scientific world. This characteristic is, if you will, the fallibility of science. It is the only source of knowledge whose truth can be tested by experiment. Its methods and results must be reliable or they are discarded. But what is called scientific truth is not, and must not be thought to be, always absolute and final. Often the information on which scientific conclusions are based is incomplete. Thus scientific knowledge is continually growing and continuously being revised. Science cannot answer, and it is not the answer to, all of the questions of society. It cannot tell all about man, where he came from or where he is going. It cannot tell all about the universe. And while we build and strengthen science because we expect it to build and strengthen our society, it is important that we recognize both the limitations of science and the dangers it brings along with its many blessings.

I shall not try to summarize the ways science affects our daily life. Directly and indirectly, it has made us richer—not only in material and technological miracles that are accepted as commonplace, but in leisure time, tools for study, and opportunity to create things of beauty. The tempo of scientific discovery in the 20th century has been incredibly rapid. All sciences have moved forward and literally hundreds of new sciences have been generated. Terms like supersonics, thermodynamics, plastics, biochemistry, nuclear physics and astronautics become meaningful parts of our vocabulary. And we invest heavily in programs seeking greater control of power, new forms of matter, freedom from hunger and disease. Yes, science is a dominant force in our society. Its evidences are everywhere—in our homes, in our industrial and agricultural economy, in our transportation and communications systems, in our communities, in our places of work and of learning. One has only to think of the ways science and scientific advances have influenced your own chosen field of business administration and practices to realize the extent to which science is interwoven into the total fabric of our society.

We tend to think of the product and influence of science in positive terms. But just as in the scientific process each major advance highlights other scientific problems that require solution, so the total forward movement of our scientifically oriented society is threatened by dangers which must be recognized and met.

Can we, for example, find ways to use for human betterment the powers that science has given us for weapons of destruction?

Can we use our advanced communications systems to achieve the kind of understanding that will lead to peace among the peoples of the earth?

Is there a solution for the situation which finds some nations producing in excess of their nutritional needs while other nations are starving?

Although science can make nearly everything necessary for life out of certain raw materials, not all nations have a supply of these raw materials. Can we learn to share them so that no nation will have to go to war to win its share of needed substances? Moreover, there are just so many raw materials in the earth and no more. Can science find substitutes for old sources of energy before the earth's resources are depleted?

Can we find certain ways to protect ourselves against the environmental hazards and stresses that we ourselves have created?

Can we eliminate or bring under control the diseases that cause crippling and premature death?

Is there a way for society to manage its affairs so that everybody has an equal chance? Can economic and social and political forces learn how to avoid peaks and depressions in a total economy?

These are the kinds of challenges we face. Under a broad and comprehensive definition of science, they are scientific challenges—or, more precisely, challenges in the ultimate application of the scientific method.

Whether the challenges will be met is dependent upon man himself. Man lifted himself above the level of animals because he alone, of all the forms of life on earth, was able, by thought and work, to gain control over the forces of nature. He lifted himself from savagery and barbarism to civilization. This has not been a steady gradual process. Social organization and moral ideals have lagged behind the control over nature. We must use all of our talents and capacities to bridge the great gap that exists between the scientific accomplishments of man and his much less advanced social thinking and action.

This is one of the reasons why the individual and his education are of such critical importance today. For each individual member of our society is a precious resource, to be nurtured, challenged, and given every opportunity to make a contribution to the solution of the great and small problems that beset society as it moves ahead to meet—as I know it will meet—the challenges that lie ahead.

There are many ways in which the functions of an elected representative of the people to the Federal Government permit him to contribute to the achievement of the goals we all share. I, for example, have served the people of the Second District of Rhode Island for nearly two decades in the House of Representatives. There are three general ways in which that responsibility is reflected in my actions.

First, it is my responsibility to act for and on behalf of the people of my district. This means I must know them, their views, and their wishes, and faithfully reflect them on all matters of interest to my constituency.

Second, it is my responsibility to take an active and informed part in all matters of national and international consequence. In this sense, each elected representative serves the people of the Nation as a whole, as well as his own constituents.

Finally, it is my special responsibility to review and recommend appropriations for the activities of two departments of the executive branch—the Department of Labor, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This committee assignment gives me an opportunity to study in depth the work of many Federal agencies that have a direct and personal effect on the lives of all of us. Out of the complex of activities in these Departments, I have chosen to mention here today two that bear on my topic "The Impact of Science on Society."

Within the U.S. Office of Education, there has recently come into being a program which loans funds to brilliant young students in order to help them acquire higher education in the physical sciences. Called the National Defense Education Act and now in its second year, this program will help recruit and train a number of young people for careers in one segment of our Nation's total scientific endeavor.

While I gave my support to this program, and would do so again under the present circumstances, I know I will not be misunderstood if I say I wish it had not been necessary for this legislation to be enacted.

In the first place, such emergency programs are always less efficient and effective than the orderly and sustained growth in depth and in strength of the total educational system. A nation such as ours should be well able to afford a system of elementary, secondary, and higher education which would have the capacity routinely to meet our national needs; more than this, we cannot afford not to have such a system. But there are grave present inadequacies in our educational system—inadequacies which threaten to become critical deficits in the years ahead. Our educational facilities are being outdistanced by population growth and change. The salaries and other compensations for teachers are not commensurate with their services, and the teacher shortage becomes increasingly acute. And higher education is fast becoming out of reach for too many of our young men and women who should have an opportunity for such education.

The crisis in education is a local, State, and national problem. The public has a right to expect vigorous, enlightened leadership from Washington so that our full resources can be directed to its solution. I regret to say that such leadership has not been forthcoming. The administration has toyed

with the problem but has backed away from any affirmative action. As a result, little bits of the problem—like the special impetus to science education to which I just referred—have been touched. But the heart of the problem remains, and will remain until the people of the United States decide how much importance they attach to sound education and make their views known to their representatives in government at all levels.

A second scientific activity of the Federal Government with which I am closely associated is medical research. In this activity, I am happy to be able to report that the public interest is being well served. During the past 15 years, there has been gratifying and sustained growth in the Nation's investment in medical research, with about equal support from Federal and non-Federal sources. What began in 1946 as a spotty, uncertain program has emerged into a comprehensive, stable, productive effort of which every citizen can be proud. We are now able to provide for the needs of most of the competent scientists who have sound research ideas and work in an established research environment. At the same time, recognizing that investments in science are long-term investments, we have an active program for the advanced training of medical research scientists and another to assist in the construction of medical research facilities.

I am proud to say that my name is closely linked with that part of this effort which has Federal origin, particularly the National Institutes of Health, a bureau of the U.S. Public Health Service in Bethesda, Md. I have supported this program because of my deeply rooted conviction that the health of our people has a direct correlation with the strength, well-being, and productivity of our Nation—a conviction that has been borne out by the progress that has been made since we embarked on a renewed medical research activity after World War II.

There are all sorts of objective measures of the advances which have occurred when knowledge derived from medical research has been applied in medical and public health practice. There are increases in life expectancy. There are diseases that can be prevented, conditions that can be ameliorated or cured, lives that can be saved. In the health sciences as in the other sciences, an endless succession of ever more complex problems stretches out ahead. But we can be glad that we have taken and are taking and will take the necessary steps to assure that one by one, as scientific knowledge permits, the major health issues of today will crumble before the diversified and brilliant attack of our medical research workers. Perhaps not in my lifetime, but almost certainly in yours, we will see better ways to prevent or cure cancer, better ways to control heart disease, better ways to protect against and treat certain of the mental illnesses.

It is this thought—this awareness of the intimate relationship between medical research and the people's health, and between science and the fulfillment of man's total aspirations—that I would leave with you today.

You who are being honored here for the completion of your work at Bryant College have essential roles in our complex world of tomorrow. Science has made all of us world citizens. It has enlarged our spheres of activity so that neither we, our community, nor our Nation can be in fact separate or independent. This places a high premium on the responsibility of society to provide an opportunity for each of its individual members to reach his full potential. And it emphasizes the responsibility of the individual to use his full potential for the

betterment of the society of which he is a part.

To you who are graduating from this fine institution—best wishes in whatever you do in the years ahead. You have been well educated here. Use your education.

To your parents and friends who have come here this morning because they love you, are proud of your accomplishment, and would not willingly be anywhere else when you are being singled out for recognition—to them, congratulations for a different kind of accomplishment, a kind you will understand better when it is your sons and daughters who are graduating from college.

To those who administer and instruct at Bryant College—a special word of gratitude. There is no finer contribution that an individual can make than to educate.

And to all of you—students, parents, staff, and friends—may I convey the abiding respect and confidence that is shared by all who have reason to know Bryant College and its graduates. The people of Providence and of Rhode Island are proud of Bryant's long and distinguished service and are proud, too, that it is numbered among this little State's large family of educational institutions.

I am sure that those who are graduating today will do honor to Bryant College as, in their work and in their daily lives, they reflect what they have learned here.

Plaudits to Bob Murphy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Pittsburgh Press of Sunday, August 16, 1959:

PLAUDITS TO BOB MURPHY

Robert D. Murphy has been sworn in as Undersecretary of State for political affairs—making him No. 3 man in the Department, after Secretaries Christian Herter and Douglas Dillon.

This is belated recognition of an extraordinarily competent diplomat who has been a career officer for 39 years. Bob Murphy has been aptly called Uncle Sam's favorite troubleshooter.

Warships and tough infantry regiments have a tradition of inscribing on their quarter decks or battle flags the names of all engagements in which they have participated. If Bob Murphy were to attempt such a roster, it would be longer than both his arms, North Africa, Trieste, Tokyo, Lebanon—to name just a few—and everywhere he has been sent he has left a good measure of tranquility wreathed in his broad Irish smile.

When Mr. Murphy won this year's Notre Dame Laetare Medal for achievement he was accorded the usual privilege of selecting a Latin epigram for inscription on the medal. Characteristically, he chose Martial's "Ride, at sapis"—"Laugh if you are wise."

Wise, good humor has been his redeeming safeguard in the countless crises and emergencies of foreign affairs he has faced. He is not likely to relinquish his motto now in his higher post and it will stand him in good stead.

Full Steam Ahead on the Arkansas River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, this week the Congress sent to the President the public works appropriation bill for the 1960 fiscal year, following adoption of the conference report by the House last Friday and by the Senate on Monday. This action is another momentous and historic milestone in the development of the Arkansas River Basin program of navigation and flood control—for appropriations in excess of \$45 million are included for this great program for the last major undeveloped river in the United States.

Under this bill, construction funds are provided of \$13.4 million for the Eufaula Dam on the Canadian River in McIntosh County, Okla.; \$12.5 million for the Oologah Dam on the Verdigris River in Rogers County, Okla.; \$10 million for the Keystone Dam on the main stem of the Arkansas River near Tulsa, Okla.; \$3.4 million for the Dardanelle Dam in Pope and Yell Counties, Ark.; and \$5 million for Arkansas River bank stabilization work in Arkansas and Oklahoma. The John Redmond—Strawn—Dam on the Grand—Neosho—River in Coffey County, Kans., will receive \$1.3 million in construction funds. Also included in the bill is \$2.5 million for recreational facilities at completed Corps of Engineers projects in the United States, and it is expected that more than \$150,000 of these funds will be spent for recreational facilities at completed projects in the Arkansas Basin during the coming year.

In addition, the sum of \$900,000 is provided for general engineering studies by the Corps of the Arkansas River and its tributaries—something of basic importance to the entire program.

In this connection, one of the finest and most thought-provoking speeches I have ever read concerning the Arkansas Basin program was made by Brig. Gen. William Whipple, Southwestern Division Engineer of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, when he spoke to the Rotary Club at Pine Bluff, Ark., on August 4, 1959.

Mr. Speaker, since General Whipple's speech was a most excellent and detailed analysis and report on the progress of the Arkansas Basin program and since it should be of great interest to every American who is deeply interested in the development of our national water resources, I should like to insert this most informative speech in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM WHIPPLE, DIVISION ENGINEER, U.S. ARMY ENGINEER DIVISION, SOUTHWESTERN, DALLAS, TEX., TO THE ROTARY CLUB, PINE BLUFF, ARK., AUGUST 4, 1959

It is a pleasure to be with you in Pine Bluff. You already have a fine city here and the Arkansas River program should give you

an even better outlook for the future. Mr. Sanders has long been a prime mover in this undertaking and other citizens have joined with those up and down the valley to present a solid front on this far-reaching improvement. Senator McCLELLAN, with the great respect accorded him across the Nation, continues to maintain the development of the Arkansas River as a prime objective and, rather than letting the increasing scope of his responsibilities dim his enthusiasm for this program, he applies his enormous prestige to bring progress to this basin.

We have well qualified district engineers in Colonel Jacoby at Little Rock, Colonel Walsh at Vicksburg, and Colonel Penney at Tulsa, along with experienced staffs, to carry on this challenging task. As you know, General Carter, with offices in Vicksburg, has responsibilities for the Arkansas from this point downstream. I feel most fortunate in having a man of his capabilities and an old friend and classmate besides as a teammate on this important work.

Reviewed in its simplest terms this entire project will provide barge navigation from the Mississippi River to Tulsa, a considerable degree of flood control, hydroelectric power, channel improvements, bank stabilization, improved low flows, reduction of sediment in the river, recreation opportunities and the general advantages of a controlled and developed river basin.

This will be brought about by three major storage reservoirs in the upper reaches of the integrated system, a series of navigation dams, on the main stem, cut-offs, dredging and other channel work, dikes and revetments.

The Keystone Reservoir, on the main stem above Tulsa, and the Eufaula Reservoir, on the Canadian River near its confluence with the Arkansas in eastern Oklahoma, are critically important to the whole system. These reservoirs, although they only control one-third of the stream flow above Dardanelle, control three-quarters of the sediment. It is necessary to cut off this source of sediment before we could close the downstream dams and initiate the final adjustment of the river. Closure of the Dardanelle project is not to be made until after closure on Eufaula and Keystone, in 1964, which is phased in with the overall completion date of 1972 which we use for planning purposes.

The Keystone Reservoir is reaching the point where progress will begin to show. Relocation of highways, railroads and utilities, which will constitute more than half of the \$135 million cost of this project, are well underway, as is the construction of the first stage cofferdam. In all, almost \$5 million in construction contracts are in effect, in addition to the work already accomplished on access roads, project buildings, land acquisition and much time-consuming planning and engineering. However, best of all, we are now in a position to advertise the first of next month for a major contract for the main dam itself, a contract of the order of \$25 million.

The Eufaula Reservoir is similar to Keystone, except that it will have an initial power installation, and as yet has less construction under contract. It will cost \$153 million. Bids for the three generators will be opened August 13. We expect to advertise a principal dam contract about November of this year. Completion of this project, as well as Keystone, is scheduled for 1965.

The Oologah Reservoir, a \$35,100,000 project in northern Oklahoma, is further advanced, with a completion date of 1962. It will regulate flows on the Verdigris River which the navigation channel will follow from Muskogee to the vicinity of Tulsa.

The Dardanelle Dam, with which you are probably more familiar, will function for navigation and hydroelectric power and is necessarily scheduled for completion later than the storage projects upstream. Except

for this lock the project will be completed in 1966; the lock will be completed in 1970. Its total estimated cost is \$94,600,000. On my way to Pine Bluff this morning, I inspected the work under the \$3 million contract which got underway in May. This contract is for the first stage of diversion of the river and the initial construction on the lock and dam proper. Because there was a considerable period of uncertainty in the early stages of this program, I know that many of the proponents were greatly encouraged by the fact that this contract included part of the navigation lock as well as the left bank portion of the dam. This was interpreted as conclusive evidence of the inclusion of navigation in the program under construction. There is in my own mind no doubt that navigation and all the other functions of the multipurpose program have been directed and confirmed by the Congress, and will be completed successfully at an early date.

Some indication of the growing impetus of the program is given by the appropriations being considered this year. Based on the House version of the bill, \$44,200,000 will be included for the various elements of the work. Last year \$30,230,000 was allotted and the year before \$13,950,000. Even if the House versions are adopted, it will make a total of \$124,300,000 which has been provided for this program. While the entire improvement will cost about \$1.2 billion, the funds appropriated and in prospect for this year leave no doubt in our minds that this is a going program, and our only thought is to prosecute the work with all vigor. This is an answer to those who thought that Congress might never appropriate funds to complete this work.

The breakdown of the House figure for this year is \$900,000 for general studies, \$3,400,000 for Dardanelle, \$13,400,000 for Eufaula, \$10 million for Keystone, \$12,500,000 for Oologah, and \$4 million for bank stabilization. By districts the bank stabilization funds are \$1 million for Vicksburg, \$1,300,000 for Little Rock, and \$1,700,000 for Tulsa. However, the Senate figures are \$8 million for bank stabilization, which we can very well use.

I consider it good fortune to have been assigned to the southwestern division last year, at the time when some of the most interesting engineering questions in water resources development history were coming up for solution. There is a tendency to think of imposing structures as the most challenging for the engineer. The Arkansas River program includes the Eufaula Dam, which will produce hydroelectric power and form a very large reservoir, but the structural problems of this and other individual structures are routine compared with the interrelated complex of channel problems. I will say without qualification that the problem of how to develop the Arkansas River mainstem has been the outstanding engineering question in the entire southwestern division for some time past. One of the first things I did as coordinator for this multipurpose Arkansas project was to set up a sediment board, made up by three distinguished engineers, Dr. L. C. Straub, of the University of Minnesota; Dr. H. A. Einstein, of the University of California; and Mr. D. C. Bondurant, of the Missouri River Division of the Corps of Engineers. As an indication of the importance which I attach to this matter, I participate personally in all meetings of the board. The studies of the board are coordinated with studies in the district and division offices and with model studies at hydraulic laboratories.

Nature sets up a delicate balance in the regimen of a stream. Many forces are joined together to establish the pattern and changes in the various forces alter the pattern. Be-

cause there are so many factors involved and there are possibilities for so wide a range of change in each, it is difficult to talk about the subject without getting into technical terms. Yet, because it is such an interesting subject and means many millions of dollars in this program, I will discuss it with you today. Since your interest is in the essentials rather than in technical analysis, I will resort to oversimplification to some degree.

There will be basic changes in the regimen of the river in any event. After the multipurpose reservoirs are in operation, there will be less severe and less frequent flooding and there will be better sustained low flows. The reduced sediment loads will be carried more uniformly rather than being scooped up in great quantities by quick rises and dumped in bars by rapidly falling stages. While changes in the channel characteristics of the Arkansas are inevitable, their nature and the amount of time required to complete them are subject to some degree of control. The objective is to, balance out the most economical combination of final river and structural characteristics.

If the bed of the river were to remain unchanged, the problem would simply be one of spacing the dams close enough to build up navigable depths throughout each navigation pool. These dams must not be built high enough to inundate appreciable amounts of productive land, so that the top evaluations of the dams are relatively fixed and any flexibility must come in spacing the dams and in changing the bottom elevation of the channel. We know that the regulated flows with greatly reduced sediment load will cause eventually considerable degradation in the streambeds. This natural effect, called degradation, could attack the banks and undermine our structures if not controlled; our problem is to make it work for us instead of against us.

If the new regimen of the Arkansas can be made to dig a deeper channel and keep it relatively clean, the necessary depths for navigation can be created with dams spaced further apart. This would result in fewer dams, fewer lockages for navigation and less operating cost.

The best way to make the river work for us is a two phase program. As a first phase, starting now, we will expedite the bank stabilization and contraction works which have already been advanced some way under emergency authorities. I testified to the congressional committee this spring, and I repeat to you now, that there are sound engineering reasons to get on with this work. By contracting and realigning the channel now we have exactly 5 years, and that is none too much, prior to closure of Dardanelle, to complete the major portion of the work with the full natural supply of sediment, which helps us close the old chutes and meanders. After closure of Dardanelle and the upstream reservoirs, the regulated stream will rapidly scour itself deeper. In the first 2 years' time, with average stream flow, the changed river will scour out and remove from 40 to 50 million tons of sand; and if we have done our work well, a large part of this scour will be in the parts of the river where we want it to be removed.

We can then move to the second phase of the work. We will excavate, by dredging, the remaining sand in the upper depths of the pools, anticipating the further scouring of the bed which would take years if we had to wait for it. This will mean many millions of cubic yards of dredging, in fact a really major dredging program, but its cost will be much less than that of the dams which it will make unnecessary.

How can we know that the excavated channel will not fill up again after passage of the first flood?

The answer is that it would do just exactly that except for one thing—we will plan the final stabilization works so as to increase the degree of contraction in the upper ends of the pools. With a relatively slight degree of contraction, and some special features at the river crossings, the contracted channel will increase the velocity enough to hold the new condition with reasonable maintenance. It appears that, compared with previous tentative plans, we may be able to reduce the number of navigation dams between here and Dardanelle from seven to five and possibly one less above Dardanelle. The Tulsa district has already planned to reduce two dams in Oklahoma. Also General Carter is considering the possibility of eliminating one downstream from here in his reanalysis of that section of the river. These various possibilities could have considerable effect on overall costs. Just because we will be spending more than a billion dollars on this program, we have not become unmindful of economy. There is the possibility of saving many millions of dollars and producing a superior system.

I have talked primarily about channel slopes, but there are important and related questions with regard to the trace of the channel. We are studying certain new forms of channel contraction especially for the crossings. I will not go into these today other than to say that contraction works and all other means of controlling the river must result in economical improvement of the resource before we are willing to adopt them.

We have had constructed at Vicksburg a new movable bed model reproducing 11 miles of river between here and Little Rock, and we will test in this channel in the next few months all the new plans for channel improvement which I have been talking about.

In this rosy picture of future progress there are still three big question marks. The first is the question as to whether we will satisfactorily complete the general engineering studies for which we were given \$900,000 last year and again this year. This is a large amount of money; but the problems to be solved were many and complex. I believe we will complete these studies satisfactorily and on time, and produce the necessary complete solutions, including those of which I have today suggested as scheduled, of the first low-head navigation locks and dams.

The second big question is money. The appropriation indicated for this year is the largest so far and will allow fine progress. Up to now we could not have used larger appropriations except for limited features of the work. However, beginning next year and for some years thereafter, very much larger appropriations will be required if the program as a whole is to be completed as scheduled. Appropriations at the next session of Congress will therefore be of critical importance in indicating whether the work will continue with maximum economic speed for completion in 1972 or will taper off to slower progress.

The third big question mark, and I know how keenly you are interested in it, is the decision as to whether we should follow the river route or the North Bank Canal route between Pine Bluff and Arkansas Post.

As you know, a complete restudy of this entire problem has been made. I told the congressional committee this spring that I expected this question to be resolved before next year's hearings. While this matter has to be referred to the Chief of Engineers personally, I believe we will have an answer this fall.

While the corps has been concentrating on the engineering problems, we remain acutely aware that the end objective of all

this work is to make the resources of the Arkansas Valley more useful to its people and the Nation. In the broader objective there is much to be done beyond the construction of river control works. Every element of Government, every unofficial organization concerned with economic advancement, and every individual with an interest in a more abundant way of life—all of us throughout the basin in each of our capacities have a stake and a responsibility in this great undertaking.

The controlled river will give you new advantages on a year-to-year basis within the present economic structure of the region. However, if this improvement is to be put to full use, you must visualize in full your new opportunities. Recreational possibilities seem more significant when considered in the light of the great national wave of interest in outdoor life. The level pools of the new dams will provide excellent water for boats. The fish and wildlife aspects of the river will be enhanced by the reduced sediment content of the water. The system will add a useful increment of hydroelectric power to the systems serving the region. The additional flood control will give new security to both urban and rural areas. The bank stabilization program will not only protect the navigation channel but will eliminate an imminent threat to many thousands of fertile acres up and down the valley, and make the protected banks more attractive as potential sites for industry. The improved low flows will offer more dilution for the urban and industrial wastes that offer a serious problem in many rapidly growing areas. The reduction in sediment will facilitate potential use of the water of the Arkansas for many purposes. Without looking too far into the future, the Arkansas Valley has a great deal to offer to new industries which must have water and waterway facilities.

Two-thirds of the benefits of the Arkansas River program are estimated to come from navigation. Water transportation can be a magnet with an active force to attract a new pattern of expansion. Barge transportation is making a phenomenal gain; in the 5 years ending with 1957 there was an increase of 22 percent in tonnage on the inland waterways of the United States. The Arkansas ties directly into the Mississippi River system, which almost doubled the national increase during the same period. I cannot say right now just how Pine Bluff will profit from this navigation; but I urge that you gentlemen get to work to evaluate the business opportunities that may appear.

This is an impressive package of new opportunities coming your way. Let me urge that you examine them and plan your course to take the best advantage of them. I would not suggest that you expect the basin to be suddenly transformed overnight, but neither would I suggest that you prepare to preserve the status quo. I have every confidence that you will pursue a sound course to a greater era in the Arkansas Valley. With you, as with us, it's full steam ahead on the Arkansas.

The Khrushchev Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, we are soon to be visited by one of the most

powerful men in modern history—Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev. It is of the utmost importance that while we are greeting Khrushchev, we also maintain our perspective on world affairs.

The hard job of building the peace of the world will still be ahead of us, regardless of Mr. Khrushchev's recent smiles.

I agree with President Eisenhower that Khrushchev should be treated courteously, but I know the President does not want us to close our eyes to the menacing threat of communism. Certainly, our international problems will not disappear overnight simply because Khrushchev has decided to visit us.

Mr. Khrushchev is the same ruthless dictator who ordered Russian tanks to smash the Hungarian freedom movement. He is the same tyrant who presides over a godless tyranny that no true American can ever tolerate.

While we have enough faith in our democracy to be courteous even to those whose doctrines we despise, we want to make it clear that beneath our courtesy our sense of justice cries out against the evils of Communist tyranny.

It is far better that we talk to Khrushchev than get into a nuclear war with him, but peace cannot be built simply on well-publicized trips between Moscow and Washington.

It will take all the patience, courage, and imagination that we can muster for decades to lay the basis for a durable peace.

Modern Army Readiness Through Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Research and Development of the U.S. Army, delivered such a striking and timely address to the annual meeting of the Association of the United States Army on August 4, 1959, at the Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., that I am extending this address into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. General Trudeau, in statements that permit him to use vision and foresight, outlines the developments of the future U.S. Army in an age of scientific progress and space development. In such an address oftentimes scientific developments seem weird and chimerical, but in the light of progress, what may be exotic today is commonplace and ordinary tomorrow.

The address of General Trudeau is a challenge to the forward-looking personnel in the U.S. Army and certainly is worthy of our most careful study. It is as follows:

MODERN ARMY READINESS THROUGH RESEARCH
(Remarks by Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Research and Development, Department of the Army, annual meeting of the Association of the United States Army, Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., August 4, 1959)

Members of the Association of the United States Army, ladies and gentlemen, the Research and Development Panel is delighted to be your host this morning to discuss with you the contribution of research to the modern Army. This is a most challenging subject at a time when science and engineering are striving to fashion new advances in power, electronics, and space while the sinister shadow of a godless, powerful opponent reaches across the oceans and the continents.

Since all of the panel members may not be familiar to you, I would like to introduce Dr. James McRae, Chairman of the Army Scientific Advisory Panel and vice president of A.T. & T.; Maj. Gen. August Schornburg, Deputy Chief of Ordnance; Mr. Tom Morrow, group vice president, Chrysler Corp.; Col. Robert Partridge, Headquarters, CONARC; and Sfc. Joseph Conroy, Headquarters, CONARC.

Our program today consists of my brief report to you on the overall Army research and development program and then answers by the panel to questions from me and from you, the audience.

Army research and development has the objective of providing effective weapons and equipment for the future Army organizations and requirements.

This objective is accomplished first by designing future weapon systems and materiel in support of our concept of new organizations and tactics, from known enemy capabilities and from our own scientific breakthroughs and technological progress or "state of the art." Then we must be able to integrate the weapons, organizations, and missions to test and insure their effectiveness for predicted combat missions. The result is a continuing effective force to meet any future enemy threat.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that we must know the enemy. We must know what he is developing in weapons and equipment and exactly what his military capabilities are. We cannot risk basing our national defenses on his supposed intentions.

We must not forget why our strength must be maintained in the free world today. The Communist threat has increased immeasurably since World War II. They have conducted a relentless campaign to nibble the peaceful countries of the world to death—piecemeal.

Their intention is to dominate all the nations of the earth and they are coming close to having the means to accomplish their objective. Where once only America possessed the power of massive deterrence, today America and the Soviet Union share this mutual massive capability. Either side can well nigh destroy the other. With this situation in effect, Soviet air and naval capabilities coupled with the superiority of the Soviet bloc's military land forces over ours are a matter of grave concern and Soviet control of space would make this power overwhelming.

Within the framework of this Communist threat, the Army must develop the weapons and equipment to win in battle—the means to move, shoot, communicate, and defend ourselves regardless of enemy aircraft or missiles; to close with enemy ground forces and destroy them if forced into war and then to occupy the enemy homeland pending the establishment of a free government, and thus to control the land. Despite conflicting theories of strategy, I know of none brash enough to maintain that hostile or contested territory can be controlled in absence.

Let us turn from the threat, to the Army research and development program which is my special responsibility on the Army General Staff. The scope of this research and development mission covers an extremely wide spectrum of developments and we feel our responsibility very keenly whether we are seeking better mobility, communications, firepower or logistical support. Let me review a few points:

Why is research and development important? Because it determines the future weapons and equipment that soldiers will use in combat. I have mentioned the type of threat that we can continue to expect and I would now like to describe the rest of the environment that determines the direction of our developments.

The battlefield of the next decade will be much larger than ever before and with even less clear-cut boundaries between units. Real mobility will be the key to success and combat units will move fast, concentrate to destroy the enemy, and then disperse rapidly. Soldiers will move in aerial vehicles just above the "nap" of the earth and carry with them new types of lightweight but potent weapons using not only conventional ammunition but also atomic rounds. Communications will be increased by new radios and relay systems using the latest techniques of earth satellite transmission and of bouncing signals off the moon.

Science and technology are other prominent factors in the research and development equation. Our basic research program continues to investigate the latest discoveries and inventions so that they can be integrated into the development part of the program which results in the hardware that rolls off the assembly lines of industry. We contract basic research out to industry and some 181 colleges and universities. Ten major fields and 74 subfields are covered from mathematics, human factors and medical projects to polar and arctic research. We will continue to stress this type of work because without it there would be little future development. As a matter of fact, our technological progress today is the chief determinant of the state of the weapon art during the next decade and beyond. We need to expand our basic research in the present technological race with the Communists.

What are some of the more promising results of this program that we can expect to see incorporated into future equipment? New metals with amazing characteristics have been created under extremes of temperatures and pressures. They promise to open a whole unexplored field of alloys that will be stronger, more heat resistant and lighter than anything else that we know of today. Missiles, space vehicles, and even tanks will benefit from such advances. Electronics is another field that has seen a quantum jump in the last 10 years and can be expected to surge beyond the boundaries of our imagination in the next 2 years. Electronic parts have been reduced in size through micromodularization so that instead of 7,000 parts per cubic foot we can put 700,000 parts in the same space. Applications of solid state physics have resulted in radios and electronic computers of miniature size that can perform all manner of operations to enable information to be gathered more quickly and accurately in combat.

The next step in the cycle is what we call applied research and development. The results of basic research are incorporated into weapons or equipment designed by the industrial engineer guided by the requirements of the military. This has resulted in a large spectrum of developments in the fields of mobility, communications, firepower, space and those designed to support the individual soldier.

We have some interesting vehicles under development to give us the mobility that we require for the future battlefield. On the ground we look to the "Goer" type of equip-

ment used in the construction industry, where large wheels and tires give true, off-road mobility. New tanks and armored personnel carriers are to be operational soon to back up the striking power of powerful new weapon systems.

In the air we are looking for the type of vehicle that gives us the takeoff and landing characteristics of the helicopter and the advantages of the fixed-wing aircraft in forward flight. You have probably seen pictures of some of our flying test beds that look like disks or platforms propelled by unusual powerplants. These are the vehicles that will give us the answer to flying low and slow and quietly just above the battlefield.

Communications and electronics have enabled the Army to increase its command and control capabilities to the degree required by mobility and dispersion. Included in this area, also are the surveillance drones that will penetrate enemy lines to send or bring back information recorded by radar, infrared, photographic and TV equipment. This information will then be sorted and evaluated by automatic data processing systems to give the commander the facts needed for a decision.

Firepower is always a critical part of our programs. We have improved rifles and other small arms soon to be operational that outperform anything we have now and still better ones are in the offing. Many types of guided missiles are under development to supplement or replace those that we have now. For instance, Sergeant will replace Corporal and Pershing will replace the workhorse of our missile arsenal, Redstone. In addition, Lacrosse units now being organized will back up frontline infantrymen. These are all surface-to-surface weapons fired at ground targets.

The Army has an important mission in the air defense field, as you undoubtedly know. We have under development a shoulder-fired missile, called Redeye, for the soldier to use against attacking aircraft along with the field mobile Hawk missile to be employed against low flying aerial targets. Probably our most important contribution in the future will be Nike-Zeus, the only weapons system presently designed to attack incoming ballistic missiles. We have just successfully fired the sustainer rocket motor for this missile and are now approaching the testing stage of the complete system. In the near future we hope to fire it against our own IRBM's and ICBM's to establish its effectiveness for the air defense of our country. There is an urgent requirement for such a weapon while we are faced with the ballistic missile blackmail of the Communists. We are confident that Nike-Zeus can do this job in the 1960's.

Another thought-provoking addition to our arsenal is in the chemical field. If the Communists ever use chemicals with which they are equipped against us, we must be prepared to meet such an attack. On the other hand, recent tests with nonlethal gases have shown the really humane nature of such a weapon that incapacitates without killing, even leaving no harmful aftereffects on humans or the works of man. This is certainly an advantageous way to capture an objective without destroying needed buildings, bridges and other manmade structures.

The Army's contributions to the national space program have been substantial and we have enjoyed a good share of success in our projects for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Advanced Research Projects Agency. Probably the most noteworthy of these were the space probe last March, still orbiting the sun as I stand here now, and the recent flight of the monkeys in a Jupiter missile. We look forward to participating in the Mercury astronauts' trips in space and to launching more satellites and other experiments in the future.

There is one other area that I assure you we are most concerned with. And that is with the most important factor of any battlefield at any future time—the soldier. We firmly believe that the man on the ground, well trained and well led is the key to success and still is the most necessary and most fundamental part of our national military posture. He is the man for whom we hope to develop new methods of preserving foods by radiation, requiring no refrigeration; for whom the Medical Corps has developed a "bone glue" that will enable a soldier with a broken leg to walk out of the hospital in 48 hours; and to whom we are constantly striving to give every possible advantage in future combat so that he can perform his vital missions.

I have covered the research and development program in view of the Army staff responsibility and by describing some of the more promising results. At the same time I have deliberately omitted parts of the complete cycle which goes from the concept of the idea to production of the proven, finished hardware. The role of science, of the technical services, of industry and of the using troops is an interrelated one and essential to the accomplishment of the research and development objectives.

At this time I would like to begin the panel discussion with a series of questions intended to amplify the complete research and development cycle. After my question to each panel member, I will open the discussion to the floor before we move on to the next member. After the entire panel has had a chance to discuss their areas of interest and experience, general questions of a pertinent nature may be directed at any of us. Remember that anything that is said by the panel this morning will be on an unclassified basis, and we would appreciate that your questions be asked along those lines.

DAV Service in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that an organization in the State of Washington has furnished service to thousands of citizens without any charge for such service. This service is of a humanitarian nature and not always sufficiently appreciated by those who have benefited thereby, either directly, or indirectly. This organization is a congressionally chartered veteran organization which has a State department and local chapters in Washington. This organization is the Disabled American Veterans. The Disabled American Veterans is the only such organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States or of some country allied with it during time of war.

The Disabled American Veterans was formed in 1920, under the leadership of Judge Robert S. Marx; DAV legislative

activities have benefited every compensated disabled veteran. Its present national commander is another judge, David B. Williams, of Concord, Mass. Its national adjutant is John E. Feighner, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Its national legislative director is Elmer N. Freudenberger; its national director of claims, Cicero F. Hogan; and its national director of employment relations, John W. Burris—all located at its national service headquarters at 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Inasmuch as less than 10 percent of our country's war veterans are receiving monthly disability compensation payments for service-connected disabilities, some 2 million, the DAV can never aspire to become the largest of the several veteran organizations. Nevertheless, since shortly after its formation in 1920, the DAV national headquarters, located in Cincinnati, Ohio, has maintained the largest staff, of any veteran organization, of full-time trained national service officers, 138 of them, who are located in the 63 regional and 3 district offices of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, and in its central office in Washington, D.C. They have ready access to the official claim records of those claimants who have given them their powers of attorney. All of them being war-handicapped veterans themselves, these service officers are sympathetic and alert as to the problems of other less well-informed claimants.

The three DAV national service offices in the State of Washington are Perry E. Dye, David H. Kays, and David W. Lloyd, located at 803 Shafer Building, 523 Pine Street, Seattle. The department commander is Harold Yager, 5606 44th Avenue SW., Seattle, Wash.; the department adjutant is Merle Dihel, 3235 62d Avenue SW., Seattle, Wash.

The 5 hospitals in Washington are a 904-bed neuropsychiatric hospital at American Lake; a 320-bed general medical hospital at Seattle; a 501-bed general medical hospital at Vancouver; a 200-bed general medical hospital at Spokane; and a 407-bed tuberculosis hospital at Walla Walla. DAV representatives are: American Lake, Homer L. McLaughlin; Seattle, A. R. Thompson; Spokane, James W. Reed; Vancouver, Otto Weise; Walla Walla, Harvey Knifong.

During the last fiscal year, the VA paid out \$85,488,000 for its veteran program in Washington, including \$22,557,003 disability compensation to its 28,906 service-disability veterans. These Federal expenditures in Washington furnish substantial purchasing power in all communities. Only about 12 percent—3,312—are members of the 29 DAV chapters in Washington. This 12 percent record is strange, in view of the very outstanding record of personalized service activities and accomplishments of the DAV national service officers in behalf of Washington veterans and dependents during the last 10 fiscal years, as revealed by the following statistics:

Claimants contacted (estimated).....	54,090
Claims folders reviewed.....	45,075
Appearances before rating boards.....	26,452
Compensation increases obtained.....	4,118
Service connections obtained.....	2,039
Nonservice pensions.....	1,936
Death benefits obtained.....	599
Total monetary benefits obtained.....	\$2,686,638.05

These above figures do not include the accomplishments of other national service officers on duty in the central office of the Veterans' Administration, handling appeals and reviews, or in its three district offices, handling death and insurance cases. Over the last 10 years, they reported 83,611 claims handled in such district offices, resulting in monetary benefits of \$20,850,335.32, and in the central office, they handled 58,282 reviews and appeals, resulting in monetary benefits of \$5,337,389.05. Proportionate additional benefits were thereby obtained for Washington veterans, their dependents and their survivors.

These figures fail properly to paint the picture of the extent and value of the individualized advice, counsel and assistance extended to all of the claimants who have contacted DAV service officers in person, by telephone, and by letter.

Pertinent advice was furnished to all disabled veterans—only about 10 percent of whom were DAV members—their dependents, and others in response to their varied claims for service connection, disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, insurance, death compensation or pension, VA guarantee loans for homes, farms and businesses, and so forth. Helpful advice was also given as to counseling and placement into suitable useful employment—to utilize their remaining abilities—civil service examinations, appointments, retentions, retirement benefits, and multifarious other problems.

Every claim presents different problems. Too few Americans fully realize that governmental benefits are not automatically awarded to disabled veterans—not given on a silver platter. Frequently, because of lack of official records, death, or disappearance of former buddies and associates, lapse of memory with the passage of time, lack of information and experience, proof of the legal service-connection of a disability becomes extremely difficult—too many times impossible. A claims and rating board can obviously not grant favorable action merely based on the opinions, impressions, or conclusions of persons who submit notarized affidavits. Specific, detailed, pertinent facts are essential.

The VA, which acts as judge and jury, cannot properly prosecute claims against itself. As the defendant, in effect, the U.S. Veterans' Administration must award the benefits provided under the laws administered by it, only under certain conditions.

A DAV national service officer can and does advise a claimant precisely why his claim may previously have been denied and then specifies what additional evidence is essential. The claimant must necessarily bear the burden of obtaining such fact-giving affidavit evidence. The experienced national service officer will, of course, advise him as to its possible improvement, before presenting same to the adjudication agency, in the light of all of the circumstances and facts, and of the pertinent laws, precedents, regulations, and schedule of disability ratings. No DAV national service officer, I feel certain, ever uses his skill, except in behalf of worthy claimants, with justifiable claims.

The VA has denied more claims than it has allowed—because most claims are not properly prepared. It is very significant, as pointed out by the DAV acting national director of claims, Chester A. Cash, that a much higher percentage of those claims, which have been prepared and presented with the aid of a DAV national service officer, are eventually favorably acted upon, than is the case as to those claimants who have not given their power of attorney to any such special advocate.

Another fact not generally known is that, under the overall review of claims inaugurated by the VA some 4 years ago, the disability compensation payments of about 37,200 veterans have been discontinued, and reduced as to about 27,300 others at an aggregate loss to them of more than \$28 million per year. About 0.014 percent of such discontinuances and reductions have probably occurred as to disabled veterans in Washington, with a consequent loss of about \$392,000 per year.

Most of these unfortunate claimants were not represented by the DAV or by any other organization. Judging by the past, such unfavorable adjudications will occur as to an additional equal number or more during the next 3 years, before such review is completed. I urge every disabled veteran in Washington to give his power of attorney to the national service officer of the DAV, or of some other veteran organization, or of the American Red Cross, just as a protective measure.

The average claimant who receives helpful advice probably does not realize the background of training and experience of a competent expert national service officer.

Measured by the DAV's overall costs of about \$12,197,600 during a 10-year period, one would find that it has expended about \$3.50 for each claim folder reviewed, or about \$8.80 for each rating board appearance, or, again, about \$22.70 for each favorable award obtained, or about \$123 for each service connection obtained, or about \$54 for each compensation increase obtained, and has obtained about \$14.10 of direct monetary benefits for claimants for each dollar expended by the DAV for its national service officer setup. Moreover, such benefits will generally continue for many years.

Evidently, most claimants are not aware of the fact that the DAV receives

no Government subsidy whatsoever. The DAV is enabled to maintain its nationwide staff of expert national service officers primarily because of income from membership dues collected by its local chapters and from the net income on its Identito-Tag—miniature automobile license tags—project, owned by the DAV and operated by its employees, most of whom are disabled veterans, their wives, or their widows, or other handicapped Americans—a rehabilitation project in thus furnishing them with useful employment. Incidentally, without checking as to whether they had previously sent in a donation, more than 1,400,000 owners of sets of lost keys have received them back from the DAV's Identito-Tag department, 4,871 of whom during the last 8 years, were Washington residents.

Every eligible veteran, by becoming a DAV member, and by explaining these factors to fellow citizens, can help the DAV to procure such much-needed public support as will enable it to maintain its invaluable nationwide service setup on a more adequate basis. So much more could be accomplished for distressed disabled veterans, if the DAV could be enabled, financially, to maintain an expert service officer in every one of the 173 VA hospitals.

During the last 10 years, the DAV has also relied on appropriations from its separately incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, aggregating \$3,300,000 exclusively for salaries to its national service officers. Its reserves having been thus nearly exhausted, the DAV Service Foundation is therefore very much in need of the generous support of all serviced claimants, DAV members and other social-minded Americans—by direct donations, by designations in insurance policies, by bequests in wills, by assignments of stocks and bonds and by establishing special types of trust funds.

A special type of memorial trust fund originated about 3 years ago with concerned disabled veteran members of the DAV chapter in Butte, Mont., which established the first perpetual rehabilitation fund of \$1,000 with the DAV Service Foundation. Recently it added another \$100 thereto. Since then, every DAV unit in that State has established such a special memorial trust fund, ranging from \$100 to \$1,100 equivalent to about \$5 per DAV member.

Each claimant who has received any such rehabilitation service can help to make it possible for the DAV to continue such excellent rehabilitation services in Washington by sending in donations to the DAV Service Foundation, 631 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. Every such serviced claimant who is eligible can and should also become a DAV member, preferably a life member, for which the total fee is \$100—\$50 to those born before January 1, 1902, or World War I veterans payable in installments within 2 full fiscal year periods.

Every American can help to make our Government more representative by being a supporting member of at least one organization which reflects his interests and viewpoints—labor unions, trade associations and various religious, fraternal and civic associations. All of Amer-

ica's veterans ought to be members of one or more of the patriotic, service-giving veteran organizations. All of America's disabled defenders, who are receiving disability compensation, have greatly benefited by their own official voice—the DAV.

The Constitution: More Than a Legal Document

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, a young man from Arlington, Va., in my congressional district, has written the winning speech in the department of Virginia division of the 22d annual national high school oratorical contest sponsored by the American Legion National Headquarters.

The rules of this contest, in which an estimated 350,000 high school students throughout the Nation competed, required that the speeches be the original efforts of each contestant and limited them to approximately 10 minutes in length. The assigned subject was a phase of the Constitution of the United States which gives emphasis to the attendant duties and obligations of a citizen to our Government.

Richard John Shaker, the author of the winning speech, is an honor graduate of Washington-Lee High School in Arlington. He was valedictorian of his graduating class this June, winner of four awards, including two for the highest overall marks in English and mathematics, and has been honored by several northern Virginia organizations as one of the outstanding students of the year. As a recipient of a scholarship, he will attend the University of Chicago this fall, and I anticipate a bright future for him in any of his endeavors.

I know the membership of this body will join me in congratulating young Mr. Shaker on this speech, and that they will profit, as will all who read it in the RECORD, from the thoughts and convictions of this representative of truly outstanding American youth:

THE CONSTITUTION: MORE THAN A LEGAL DOCUMENT

There is, at the present time, prevalent throughout this Nation, a false belief—a dangerous myth, one that could have, as its final result, the complete and utter destruction of every ideal for which the U.S. Constitution has become a symbol. This belief manifests itself in the feelings of many individuals across the country, who hold that the Constitution is simply a legal document and thus is subject to legal evasion.

It is true that the Constitution is and represents the supreme law of the land. This the document states itself, in its sixth article. If the citizens of America are not willing to accept this statement as fact, then they cannot, in good faith, accept any of the balance of the document. But while

expressing belief in the national supremacy clause, the people of this Nation must not and cannot afford to lose sight of the basic moral principles that resulted in the drafting of this document.

It is true that the Constitution represents the culmination of 700 years of British legal tradition. It is more important, however, that it represents the first powerful government to depend upon the consent of the governed for its sovereignty.

The basis of the Constitution did not originate in stuffy courtrooms. It was born in the minds of those visionary thinkers, who first realized that a government of, for and by the people was not only a plausibility, but a necessity, if the dignity of free men was to survive.

The Constitution provides for a working system of government based on this ideal of the complete sovereignty of the people. It is not a perfect system. It is not 100 percent efficient. It may be evaded through various ingenious schemes. Possession of the Constitution within our boundaries does not guarantee that democracy will flourish throughout this Nation.

But more important than its legal shortcomings is the fact that the Constitution has become a symbol to millions of people in all parts of the world. It is the final answer to all those who held that the mob was not fit to rule. It is the vindication of the dreams of the earliest proponents of democracy, as represented by such men as Locke and Rousseau.

If then, you ask, the Constitution is all this, why cannot it in itself act to safeguard our liberties? The answer is simple. Political opportunists are willing and eager to twist the words of this document for their own personal benefit. These selfish men ignore the adverse effects their actions have on the security and well-being of this Nation.

No individual has the right to subordinate the U.S. Constitution to his own personal gain. Too many men have sacrificed their lives, their fortunes, their sacred honor for one man to nullify its purpose.

The Revolutionary patriot did not hold his position on Bunker Hill so that a voter could offer his ballot to the highest bidder.

The young militiaman did not set up a barricade of cotton bales at New Orleans so that two legal theorists could argue over whether Congress has the right to pass laws which are proper but not necessary.

The war-weary Kentucky veteran did not take up arms against his brothers so that a rebellious legislature could attempt to seize full control of governmental functions by impeaching the chief executive.

The tired doughboy did not march into the Belleau Wood so that a group of vocal solons could take advantage of legislative tactics to forestall the will of a majority.

The wounded marine sergeant did not raise Old Glory over Mount Suribachi on Iwo Jima so that a corrupt judge could interpret the Constitution according to the political pressures and influences exerted upon him.

The GI did not charge up Porkchop Hill so that State officials and individuals could openly defy sections of the Constitution that had no ready means for enforcement.

What were these men fighting for? Certainly not for a mere scrap of paper encased in helium. No, these men were fighting for something more than a mere scrap of paper. They were fighting for something more than a mere collection of laws.

On the other hand, the voter, the lawyers, the Congressmen, the Senators, the judge, the State officials, and the individuals whom I have mentioned were providing their country a great disservice. Their selfishness clouded their vision. When they gazed upon the Constitution, they saw not the great collection of American liberties but instead visualized a mass of legal details. They saw

means by which they could evade these details, in a legal way of course, and thus felt that what they were doing was right. These selfish men ignore the first 10 Commandments and instead substitute an 11th one, do anything you can legally get away with. In so doing, they jeopardize the security and well-being of this Nation, for by concentrating on words they lose sight of the basic moral principles that it is the duty of every American to defend.

If these people ever become a majority; if the voters of this Nation, as they have done in the past, place these people in positions of high trust; if these people are allowed to guide this Nation's destiny; then those who lived, fought, and died in defense of the Constitution will have lived, fought, and died in vain. The paper will remain, but the true Constitution will have died.

This Nation is presently locked in a life-and-death struggle with a country whose social, religious, political, and economic ideology is in direct opposition to those principles brought forth in the Constitution. It is a battle between religion and atheism, between capitalism and communism, between democracy and totalitarianism.

But yet, the conflict between freedom on the one hand and tyranny on the other cannot be resolved through a mere comparison of the two constitutions, for the differences are not there to be found. The millions of people behind the Iron Curtain live in a police state because they have been unable to maintain the ideals they first proclaimed when they overthrew their foreign and domestic oppressors. How can we preserve our ideals?

The annual assemblage of a Congress will not necessarily safeguard our liberties. The Politburo convenes annually in the Soviet Union.

The presence of a judicial system will not necessarily safeguard our liberties. A "supreme court" is an integral part of the theoretical Russian governmental setup.

The existence of a Bill of Rights will not necessarily safeguard our liberties. The Soviet Constitution of 1936 contains such an appendage.

And finally, as I have stated before, the mere presence of a Constitution within our boundaries cannot in itself safeguard our liberties. The Soviet counterpart is as idealistic as our own. But, a conscientious legislature, representative of an appreciative and interested populace, can act as a tremendous deterrent against the rise of totalitarianism.

A militant judiciary, willing, and eager to defend the rights of those who have been infringed upon in a lawless manner, can see to it that all Americans, regardless of racial, social, political, or economic status, receive "equal justice under law."

The Bill of Rights, upheld by the combined powers of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of Government, can nip in the bud any attempt by a would-be dictator to seize control over individual liberty.

But it is the Constitution which still stands as our first line of defense against tyranny. However, before the Constitution can act as a shield, it must be revitalized.

After all, it was written and ratified some 170 years ago. It may or it may not still be representative of the thoughts and ideals of Americans. Whether it is or isn't can only be demonstrated by the action taken by Americans of today in defense of it.

Therefore, it is the duty of every American to recognize that his Nation and his way of life are presently being challenged as they have never been challenged before.

It is the duty of every American to help prepare to meet this challenge by studying his Constitution, paying attention not so much to specific details as to those basic

moral principles that have resulted in the Constitution becoming a beacon of freedom throughout the world.

It is the duty of every American to transform his faith in the democratic system into action to help preserve it.

It is the duty of every American to defy and oppose unconstitutional statutes.

Finally, and perhaps most important of all, it is the duty of every American to help dispel the myth that this Nation can afford to let selfish individuals work in direct opposition to those principles brought forth in the Constitution and still maintain national security.

For only when the myth is dispelled, only if the myth is dispelled, can the Constitution, the true U.S. Constitution, survive.

The Death of Admiral Halsey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the death of Adm. William F. Halsey has ended the illustrious career of one of the Navy's most colorful and inspiring leaders in World War II.

His loss will be deeply felt, not only by his family whose grief all those who knew him will share, but by many others throughout the country. For "Bull" Halsey did not let retirement dull the edge of his forceful, generous personality. His fight to preserve his old flag-ship, the gallant carrier U.S.S. *Enterprise*, will not be forgotten. As one who joined in this effort, I know it was worthy of this great seaman and good man.

The memory of Admiral Halsey will be especially cherished, however, by those of us who take pride in thinking of ourselves as his fellow townsmen, residents of his home town, Elizabeth, N.J., and his neighbors throughout Union County.

Speaking for the people of Elizabeth, and in words of fitting eloquence, the *Elizabeth Daily Journal*—"Bull" Halsey's hometown newspaper—has engraved this fighting man's memory in an editorial that deserves the widest circulation.

The *Journal* said of the admiral, in part:

Always there were those home ties, the ties of family, of the native heath remaining strong and calling him back no matter where duty sent him and regardless of honors. One of the touching human-interest stories of the Second World War was the meeting far out on a Pacific island between Admiral Halsey and Pfc. Christy DeMaio, the stout boy from Peterstown, fondly remembered by prewar boxing fans as the "Pants House Kid." But let Christy tell it again.

"I'm standing by the side of the road and I give the thumb to a car coming straight at me. Then I'd like to die. It stopped and who looked out at me, but the big boy from Elizabeth himself—Admiral Halsey. So, he said, 'All right, Soldier, get in.' And when he found out that I was from Elizabeth too, boy, did we cut it up for 25 miles. Real pals, we were. No brass. What a guy he is!"

And "What a guy" he was," the *Journal* editorialist echoed, as he recited the

story of Elizabeth "bursting with pride" on that memorable November 7, 1945 when Admiral Halsey returned to his own.

Continuing, the editorial commented:

We are bursting with pride now, even as we grieve, while newspaper headlines the world over tell the story of the Elizabeth boy who led naval forces in exploits President Eisenhower has termed "a brilliant part of American military history"—of whom Adm. Chester Nimitz has said "he has left for all of us a shining example of courage and service."

The same spirit of pride motivated editorials in other newspapers in the Union County area.

The Plainfield Courier-News, for instance, had the following to say:

Union County residents were particularly proud of Admiral Halsey and his brave exploits because he was a native son of Elizabeth. True, he lived there only until about 11 years old, but nevertheless, he was a local boy who made good in the minds of Elizabethians and Union County citizens as well. As a result, he was honored on several occasions for his enviable record as the man who chased the Japanese Navy all over—and off—the Pacific.

Admiral Halsey's record should be an inspiration not only to our younger men who follow that branch of the military service but to all Americans who place loyalty to their country above all.

And the Newark Evening News concluded its editorial this way:

Admiral Halsey, who was born in Elizabeth, was a legend years before his death at 76. His passing ends a colorful career, but the legend will live as long as fighting men roam the seas in defense of liberty.

Centennial Year Sightseeing in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include a most interesting article by Paul Laartz which appeared in the August 9, 1959, issue of the Oregonian. Mr. Laartz points out the many scenic attractions of Klamath County in my congressional district. The historical data included in his article is especially interesting and I hope it will encourage my colleagues to visit Oregon during our centennial year observance.

CENTENNIAL YEAR SIGHTSEEING IN OREGON—
KLAMATH COUNTY SCENIC LURES COUNT
CRATER LAKE

(By Paul Laartz)

Klamath and Lake Counties are among Oregon's southern gateways, and through them have been pouring thousands of visitors—many more than in years past—to share in the State's centennial year.

Though similar in general characteristics, the two counties are distinctive in the tourist and scenic features they have to offer.

Klamath County, the first treated in this two-part series, is well known, of course, for its lumbering and business—as a leader in these fields in southern Oregon.

But it's rightfully proud of its beautiful lakes and scenic attractions.

CRATER LAKE FAMED

Topping the list is its world-renowned Crater Lake, a national park since 1902. However, along the broad back of the Cascades are also scores of other lakes, notably Diamond, Crescent, Odell, Lake of the Woods, and in the center, of course, Klamath Lake.

These lakes, along with fine fishing streams, are favorites of sportsmen, as well as the growing numbers of out-State visitors.

Another major tourist attraction in the general area, across the border in northern California, is the famed Lava Beds National Monument—scene of a crucial Indian battle that figured in early-day Oregon history.

TOURIST GAIN NOTED

All of these scenic spots are not far distant from Klamath Falls, key city of the area, and thousands of tourists are pouring northward into Oregon to view them and continue on northward and eastward to other scenic Oregon spots.

The Oregonian-Oregon State Motor Association white motorlog car found solid evidence of this tourist gain at Crater Lake. There a park ranger noted that visitors to this famed spot are up 45 to 50 percent over last year.

And the big gain, he added, is "all due to the Oregon centennial celebration."

Though all these lakes are gems in their own category, the best known of these jewels is unbelievably blue Crater Lake, the deepest lake in North America.

LAKE FORMED IN CALDERA

It's only 56 miles north of Klamath Falls, via the lush Wood River Valley—which some term one of the richest cattle-feeding areas in the world—past historic Fort Klamath and Klamath Agency, and up on the spine of the Cascades.

Crater Lake was created several thousand years ago when mighty Mount Mazama, a 12,000-foot volcano, discharged a tremendous quantity of ash and lava. The mountain top collapsed, creating a caldera which contains today's Crater Lake.

The awesome lake is about 6 miles wide, 20 square miles in area and has about 20 miles of shoreline. The uneven crater rim—about 7,000 feet elevation—towers as much as 2,000 feet above the lake.

MANY STATES REPRESENTED

Increasing thousands visit this creation of nature annually. On any day, one can see auto licenses from Virginia, Kansas, Texas, Alaska with California and Oregon predominant.

Included, too, among the visitors are many who speak accented English, here from Europe and Asia to view this internationally known spectacle of nature.

In the days before the white man, Indians regarded it as the battleground of the gods and visited it rarely, then only with awe.

It was discovered June 12, 1853, by John Wesley Hillman, a young prospector, who on his return to the early-day mining camp of Jacksonville in the Rogue River Valley, named it Deep Blue Lake.

Other discoverers later named it Blue Lake and Lake Majesty, but in 1869 the name was changed to Crater Lake by visitors from Jacksonville.

At Crater Lake, or Rim Village, there are accommodations at the lodge, dining room, campground, store, cabins, picnic area and all the necessities for the tourist. Launches and rowboats are available on the lake. Private boats are not permitted on the lake.

To the north, some 20 miles, is Diamond Lake, another beauty in the chain of lakes up and down the backbone of Oregon's Cascades, and a mecca for fishermen. Rainbow and Kamloops trout are plentiful. There are lodge, restaurant, camping and like facilities.

LAKE OF WOODS POPULAR

A longtime favorite among southern Oregonians and northern Californians is Lake of the Woods, some 35 miles west of Klamath Falls.

It's beloved for its water sports, camping, family outings.

However, one of the most amazing stops on this Oregon State Motor Association Oregonian Motorlog was a visit to the Lava Beds National Monument, 41 miles south of Klamath Falls and near Tule Lake, Calif.

Not only does it show off nature's flaming wrath of centuries ago, when volcanoes in what is now northeastern California spewed forth great masses of molten lava, which in cooling left weird and rugged masses of rock.

NATURAL FORTRESS USED

But it incorporates what might well be described as an infantry soldier's nightmare. It was in these twisted, misshapen lava belches—in 1872-73—that one of the Pacific coast's last and most famous Indian wars was fought. It was also one of the most costly Indian campaigns engaged in by the United States.

Into these lava masses, which had formed natural trenches and strongholds in solid rock, some 71 fighting Modoc Indians, under a leader known best as Captain Jack, fought off a U.S. cavalry unit 15 times their number.

The Modoc war started in 1872 when a small band of Modoc Indians, angered at having to share a reservation with their hereditary enemies, the Klamaths, clashed with U.S. troops near Lost River, in Oregon, near the Oregon-California border.

INDIANS WIN BATTLES

After raiding adjoining settlements, Captain Jack's crew retreated to the natural lava bed fortresses and, safe in the rock-ribbed trenches and caves, withstood all attempts of the whites to dig them out.

The Indians, in the process, won two battles. In one, two-thirds of the white command was killed or wounded.

Gen. E. R. S. Canby was killed during a parley with Indian leaders under a flag of truce. The Canby Cross was later erected there to his memory.

VISITOR HAS TO WALK

It was only when the white men were able to cut off the Indians' water supply that they won the final battle. The Modocs got their water from Dry Lake, since pumped dry by the white man's Bureau of Reclamation.

A few weeks later, Captain Jack was captured. In the fall of 1873, he and three other leaders of the band were hanged at Fort Klamath.

These Modocs were unlike the usual Indian bands of early western history. They eschewed the red man's beaded buckskins and instead, wore white men's clothing, spoke the white man's tongue, and used his ways.

Only on foot can today's tourist see these fortresses—a hearty walk. But it's well worth the climb up and down through these jagged lava trenches and caves.

An infantry soldier would understand clearly how the Modocs, though obliged to care for their women and children and live off the country, kept an army of regular soldiers and volunteers 15 times their number at bay for months.

The battlegrounds are said to be practically the same today as they were in 1873. Rock forts used by the Indians and white men alike still mark the struggle.

Nearby are pictographs of two types. One type of Indian symbolic writing includes paintings of red, yellow, and green mineral pigments on the walls and caves and sides of natural bridges. The other includes carvings (petroglyphs) which are confined entirely to the rocky bluffs in the Tule Lake Peninsula.

Hon. James G. Polk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein letters and eulogies sent to the widow and family of our late beloved colleague the Honorable James Polk, who so ably represented the Sixth District of Ohio for a great many years.

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, D.C., April 29, 1959.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. POLK: Mrs. Nixon and I were very saddened to learn of your husband's passing and this note brings with it our deepest sympathy.

I realize that words mean very little at times such as this, but I did want you to know our thoughts and prayers are with you in the days ahead.

With kind regards,
Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

THE STATE OF OHIO,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Columbus, April 29, 1959.

DEAR MRS. POLK: Jim's loss will be felt by all of us, but of course not in the same way or degree as you will miss him. He was without question one of my favorite people. Kind, generous, cooperative, and extremely able. I hope that your sense of loss will be minimized in some measure by the knowledge of the great contribution he made to public service. If I can be of help to you in any way please let me know.

Sincerely,

MIKE,
Michael V. DiSalle.

JOHN W. DONAHEY,
Columbus, Ohio, May 1, 1959.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Rural Route 1,
Highland, Ohio.

DEAR MRS. POLK: Mrs. Donahey and I were in Washington last Monday and stopped by Congressman Polk's office. We were so sorry to hear that his illness was of such a serious nature.

Then, of course, we were deeply saddened when we learned of his death. You and the family have our deepest sympathy.

I know that Congressman Polk's services in Washington will certainly be missed. He had the home-spun qualities that made everyone like and respect him. These qualities are rare in political circles today.

If there is anything we can do to ease your burden, Mrs. Polk, please don't hesitate to ask.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. DONAHEY,
Lieutenant Governor.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., April 30, 1959.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Rural Free Delivery 1,
Highland, Ohio.

DEAR MRS. POLK: I was indeed saddened to read about Jim's untimely passing, and want you to know how awfully sorry I am.

We served together in the House, and I considered him among my good friends. He

was an able legislator and will be greatly missed by his many colleagues in Congress. Nancy joins me in deep and heartfelt sympathy.

Most sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., May 14, 1959.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. POLK: Your husband was an esteemed friend of mine and I share your great sorrow. You and all of his loved ones can well be proud of the life he lived and the record he made. As you know, Jim and I served as members of the House Committee on Agriculture for many long years. At all times he was courteous, gracious, and kind and yet with foresight and vision he represented the people of his district. We, of course, knew of his long suffering, but the last sad news came as a great shock.

Enclosed is a copy of a resolution adopted by the members of Jim's committee. Madeline joins me in extending to you and your loved ones our very warm and sincere sympathy.

Cordially yours,

HAROLD D. COOLEY.

JAMES G. POLK

Whereas James G. Polk, for 21 years representative of the Sixth District of Ohio in the Congress devoted the full measure of his talents and his energy to the improvement of agriculture, especially for the betterment of the living standards of the farm families of America;

Whereas the ultimate achievement of a parity position of agriculture, with the other great segments of the Nation's economy and society, will be a monument to his memory; and

Whereas, serving with the House Committee on Agriculture and having progressed to a high rank and position, he won respect for his ability and was held in esteem by his colleagues: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the committee has learned with profound sorrow and a sense of deep loss of the untimely death of James G. Polk; and be it further

Resolved, That the committee express its very sincere sympathy to members of his family; and be it further

Resolved, That the committee clerk communicate this resolution to the family of the deceased.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 30, 1959.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Highland, Ohio.

DEAR MRS. POLK: I have been immeasurably saddened by the untimely passing of your distinguished husband who was my good and respected friend.

In the years in which I have been privileged to serve with him on the House Committee on Agriculture I have come to prize his friendship and to respect him for his outstanding contribution to the public welfare.

I know that the solicitude of even his closest friends cannot lessen the sorrow which is now yours and I can only commend you to an abiding faith in the divine assurance that we shall some day be reunited with those whom we have lost for awhile.

Mrs. Dague joins me in this word of sympathy and it is our prayerful hope that you will be given the courage and strength that will be so sorely needed as you face this grievous loss.

Sincerely,

PAUL DAGUE.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Highland, Ohio.

DEAR MRS. POLK: I was terribly sorry to learn of Jim's passing for he was my good friend for many years. I hasten to extend to you and to your family my deep and heartfelt expression of sympathy on what I know is a very great loss for you all.

With kind regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

GENE KEOGH.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 29, 1959.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. POLK: It was with much sorrow that I learned the sadness of your husband's death. He was a very near friend of mine and I share your grief in his passing.

Jim had rare qualities of character such as modesty, friendliness, and a devotion to duty which will make him long remembered among his friends and colleagues.

Mrs. Rhodes joins me in extending deepest sympathy to you and other members of the family.

Sincerely,

GEORGE M. RHODES.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 1, 1959.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. POLK: One of the best friends I had in the Congress was taken when Jim died. I am grieved and saddened. However, my loss cannot compare with that of you and the children.

Each of you has the satisfaction of knowing that Jim lived a fine and useful life, and that the world is better by his having lived in it.

I wanted you and the children to know that you are in my thoughts and in my prayers in this, your hour of great sorrow. May He who loves and cares for all of us hold you and each of your loved ones always safely in the hollow of His divine hand.

Sincerely,

JIM TRIMBLE.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Highland, Ohio.

On behalf of the U.S. Air Force as well as Mrs. Douglas and myself I extend deepest sympathy to you on the passing of your husband.

JAMES H. DOUGLAS,
Secretary of the Air Force, Office Secretary of the Air Force.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Highland, Ohio.

I am greatly saddened to learn of the passing of your husband on behalf of the officers and airmen of the U.S. Air Force, I extend to you our deepest sympathy.

THOMAS D. WHITE,
Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, April 30, 1959.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Highland, Ohio.

DEAR MRS. POLK: Mrs. Fisher and I have learned with sadness of the death of your husband. While there is little one can say or do in times like these to ease your feeling of sorrow, we should like you to know that you have our profound sympathy.

Sincerely yours,

W. P. FISHER,
Major General, U.S. Air Force, Director,
Legislative Liaison.

APRIL 29, 1959.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MRS. POLK: Permit me to express my deepest regret to you on the passing of your husband, the Honorable James G. Polk.

As Secretary of the Army, it was my privilege to observe the patriotic devotion to duty and the sincere concern for his fellow man that motivated your husband. His passing is indeed a great loss to our country.

I wish to extend my heartfelt sympathy to you in this time of bereavement and hope that this may in some small way serve to assuage your grief.

Sincerely,

WILBER M. BRUCKER,
Secretary of the Army.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., April 29, 1959.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. POLK: It is with profound regret that I have learned of the passing of your husband, the Honorable James G. Polk. May I extend my deepest sympathy to you in your bereavement.

Sincerely,

J. H. MICHAELIS,
Major General, GS, Chief of Legislative Liaison.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. POLK: I was saddened to learn of the passing of your beloved husband, and you have my heartfelt sympathy in your great loss. While I realize that words are most inadequate at a time like this, I hope you will gain some comfort from knowing that your many friends are sharing in your sorrow. If there is anything at all we can do to be of assistance, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

J. EDGAR HOOVER.

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C., April 29, 1959.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. POLK: Our deepest sympathy to you in your great loss and my personal condolences at this time of great sadness. Congressman Polk will be sorely missed by our party and our country for his dedicated efforts on behalf of the people.

Sincerely,

PAUL M. BUTLER.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
R.F.D. 1, Highland, Ohio.

DEAR MRS. POLK: I was very sorry to note in Wednesday's New York Times the account of the death of your distinguished husband.

I knew him very well and our paths crossed frequently when I served in Washington as Postmaster General. He was a fine public servant and a fine gentleman and highly respected by all with whom he came in contact.

I know words are meaningless at a time like this but I do want you to know that you have my deepest sympathy.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES A. FARLEY.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
JAMES DICKEY POST No. 23,
Portsmouth, Ohio, April 28, 1959.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Highland, Ohio.

DEAR MRS. POLK: It is indeed with a sense of deep shock that I read in the Portsmouth

(Ohio) Times, the report of the death of your husband, James G. Polk.

I have known Mr. Polk for a good many years and have had the pleasure of having voted for him each time he ran for Congress, and knew him personally, not alone in politics, but very closely in matters pertaining to veterans' benefits.

Mr. Polk and myself have corresponded quite frequently through the years, to and from his Washington office, in matters pertaining to individual veterans and their claims for benefits, and never once have I ever known Mr. Polk to fail to do all in his power in each case I brought to his attention.

So from a personal standpoint, I too feel that I have lost a very great and good friend, for not only myself but for the veterans on whose claims we have worked jointly, to attain the benefits desired.

Please accept my deepest sympathy in your bereavement, and you can feel assured that God will make a place in Heaven for a man so conscientious and clean living and honest as was Mr. Polk.

I will remember Mr. Polk in my prayers.

Yours very sincerely,

LOUIS T. KRICKER,
Service Officer.

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF JAMES G. POLK

Ever since I first became acquainted with Congressman Polk, in 1932, he has been my warm, personal friend even though we were in different political camps, so to speak. He was a likeable person, a type all his own—one whom we could and did call "Jim" because of his outstanding democratic manner—never aristocratic.

After his first election and departure for Washington, I was his successor as teacher of the adult Bible class in Highland Methodist Church which I then attended, being a resident of Highland at that time.

James G. Polk, our good neighbor, will be more than missed by his many friends and by his constituents whom he has so ably served in Congress so long. His repeated reelections testify to the high esteem in which he was held by people regardless of political faith. James G. Polk was an American before he was a partisan and the effects of his good works will long follow him and be remembered.

LEESBURG, OHIO, April 30, 1959.

S. A. RINGER.

NICHOLS, SPEIDEL & NICHOLS,
Attorneys at Law,
Batavia, Ohio, May 2, 1959.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Highland, Ohio.

DEAR MRS. POLK: I hoped that I might be able to attend the funeral services for Mr. Polk today but circumstances will prevent me from doing so, and I felt that I must express to you my deep appreciation for the life and services which Jim has rendered to the people of this district and my sympathy to you and your family for this untimely death.

He has been my good friend over many years, and if my personal experience means anything, he certainly has been the most thoughtful, helpful, and devoted public servant this district has ever had in Washington.

With kindest regards, I am,

Yours sincerely,

RUSSELL F. SPEIDEL.

WOOSTER, OHIO, April 29, 1959.

DEAR MRS. POLK: My wife and I learned with sincere sadness of the death of your husband. We served many terms together in the Congress. There was no more modest or hard-working member than he was. The farmers had in Jim a true and a reliable

friend. He might not always agree with the members of the various farm organizations but these farmers learned that Jim had a reason based upon his long experience and knowledge and soon learned to rely upon him.

He clearly and patiently presented farm bills upon the floor of the House. With confidence I always voted with him. He will be terribly missed both for his personality as well as for his great contribution to the legislative program.

Bob Jameson—a former pupil of mine in Wooster High School told me today that he coached the teams at Hillsboro High School while Jim was either principal or superintendent. Bob told me how wonderfully kind he was and how easy it was to work with him. All of his friends will have something good to tell you about him and I am sure this will make you proud and less sad.

I am sorry that we could not join with his many friends in paying tribute to him at his funeral. Axl joins me in this our very deep expressions of sympathy and in hoping that you will have good health and many years in which to enjoy the memory of a fine American, your husband Jim.

Most sincerely,

JOHN MCSWEENEY.

THE PENN MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO.

Philadelphia, Pa., April 29, 1959.

DEAR MRS. POLK: I'd like to express to you and your family my deep regrets over the death of Jim. He was a fine husband, father, educator, legislator, and one of my earliest and best friends.

How happy I was to have him as my principal for 2 years in Hillsboro High School, 1927-29.

I visited him in his office in Washington a few times and he was a statesman and a real American and an excellent farmer.

Most sincerely,

R. B. JAMESON.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORP.,

Washington, April 29, 1959.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. POLK: It was a great shock to learn of the passing of your distinguished husband, Congressman Polk. We served together for many years, having both been elected in 1930. He was a devoted public servant and served his district and the country well. He will be greatly missed and his place will be hard to fill.

We realize the futility of words in such an overwhelming loss, but we want you to know that you are in our thoughts and prayers in these dark hours. We know that a word of comfort strengthens our faith in the rightness of the divine plan, and helps us to carry on in these difficult times.

Grace and I wish to extend to you and your fine family our sincere sympathy.

Sincerely,

JESSE P. WOLCOTT.

SPRINGFIELD, OHIO.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Highland, Ohio.

Fifty thousand members of the United Automobile Workers of Region 2-A extend our deepest sympathy. We shall always cherish the memory of the Congressman who gave his all for all of the citizens of these United States.

EDWARD B. HELLKAMP,
Assistant Director, Region 2-A, UAW.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

Mrs. JAMES POLK,
Highland, Ohio.

We extend our sincere sympathy to you in your hour of bereavement. America and its

people also lost a dear friend when your beloved husband passed away.

GEORGE FECTEAU, President,
ANGELO G. GEORGIAN,
Secretary-Treasurer, General Executive
Board, United Shoe Workers of
America, AFL-CIO.

[From the Evening Star, Apr. 28, 1950]

JAMES G. POLK DIES; OHIO REPRESENTATIVE

Representative James G. Polk, 62, Democrat, of Ohio, who was as proud of being a farmer as he was of being a lawmaker, died today at Walter Reed Hospital of cancer. He has been ill several months.

Mr. Polk listed himself in the Congressional Directory as one of the few legislators whose sole occupation was farming. A member of the House Agriculture Committee, he served for 20 years in Congress in two tours of duty.

He was first elected in 1930, the first Democrat to be sent to the House from Ohio's present Sixth District. He served five successive terms. He did not seek reelection in 1940.

From 1942 to 1946, Mr. Polk was a special assistant in the Agriculture Department. He went back to farming fulltime before running again for Congress, in 1948. He was elected, and had served ever since.

Born on a farm in Penn Township, Highland County, Ohio, Mr. Polk attended the village school in Highland and went to high school at nearby New Vienna. He graduated from the Agricultural College of Ohio State University in 1919.

After college, he became principal of the New Vienna High School in 1919, and later was superintendent of schools there until 1922.

Following a period in farming near Highland, he returned to his studies, receiving a master of arts degree from Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio, in 1923.

For 5 years after graduation from Wittenberg, Mr. Polk was principal of Hillsboro (Ohio) High School, serving until 1928. Two years later he ran for Congress.

He was a member of Kappa Phi Kappa, a national education fraternity, the Masons, the Elks, and the Methodist Church.

Speaker of the House RAYBURN today called Mr. Polk "a fine Member of Congress; a gentleman all around." He announced the House would adjourn out of respect to the Ohioan after eulogies.

[From the Washington Post and Times
Herald, Apr. 29, 1950]

REPRESENTATIVE POLK DIES; 20 YEARS ON HILL

Representative James G. Polk, Democrat, of Ohio, a veteran of 20 years in Congress who prided himself on being "one of the few members whose sole occupation is farming," died of cancer yesterday at Walter Reed Hospital.

The Congressman, who was 62, had been ailing for more than a year and had been a patient at Walter Reed since March 21.

Agriculture was the Ohioan's chief interest in Congress where his only current assignment was on the House Agriculture Committee.

Representative Polk, the first Democrat elected from the present sixth Ohio district, divided his congressional service in two tours. First elected in 1930, he served from the 72d through the 76th Congresses. He did not seek reelection in 1940 in order to return to fulltime farming near Highland, Ohio.

Two years later, he was named a special assistant to the Agriculture Department and held the job until 1946. He returned to the "Hill" for the 81st Congress and had served there since.

The Congressman was born on a farm in Penn Township, Ohio, and graduated from the Agriculture College of Ohio State Uni-

versity and from Wittenberg College, with a master's degree, in Springfield, Ohio.

Dividing his time between farming and teaching in the 1920's, he served as principal of the New Vienna (Ohio) High School, superintendent of schools in New Vienna and principal of the Hillsboro (Ohio) High School.

He is survived by his wife, Mary Polk; a son, William A., and three daughters, Martha Wilhite, Helen Vara, and Lois Taylor, all of Washington.

Services will be held Saturday at the Highland Methodist Church in Highland, Ohio.

Putting aside scheduled business, dozens of House Members paid tribute to the veteran lawmaker. Speaker SAM RAYBURN described him as "a fine Member of Congress; a gentleman all around." Agriculture Committee Chairman HAROLD D. COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, read into the RECORD a special committee resolution, especially praising Representative Polk's efforts to raise living standards for farmers.

[From the Portsmouth (Ohio) Times, Apr. 28, 1950]

OFFICIALS, FRIENDS JOIN IN MOURNING POLK
DEATH

State and district officials joined congressional leaders and local friends of James G. Polk today in mourning the veteran Congressman's death.

They praised Mr. Polk's long service as Representative from Ohio's Sixth District and expressed a feeling of personal loss at his passing.

Democrat leaders said his knowledge and experience in legislative matters will make him difficult to replace.

House Speaker SAM RAYBURN (Democrat, of Texas), announced in Washington that the House will adjourn out of respect to Mr. Polk. The Speaker called Representative Polk "a fine Member of Congress, a gentleman all around."

Gov. Michael V. DiSalle, informed of the Representative's death, issued this statement in Columbus:

"The people of the Sixth District have suffered a great loss. Ohio and the Nation share in this deep feeling.

"Jim Polk was a kindly, able and sincere public official. He worked hard for the people of his District and he was devoted to his obligation to the national interest.

"While I was in Washington, he was serving as a member of the House Agriculture Committee. His sense of fair play was so evident that I became a great admirer and a close personal friend."

George D. Nye, of Waverly, State Democratic Committeeman from the Sixth District said he was shocked and saddened by Representative Polk's death.

Mr. Nye said, "The Sixth District has lost one of its very finest citizens. Jim Polk was a representative of all the people. He was always trying to help our county and your county and the entire area, both industrially and economically."

Arrie N. Barker, Scioto County Democrat chairman, said, "Mr. Polk certainly did his job the way it should have been done. Those who knew him well will consider his death as very much of a personal loss."

Robert R. Leedom, county commissioner, called Mr. Polk "a very good representative of the people."

"He knew what the people wanted and he always kept that in mind," Mr. Leedom said. "He will be hard to replace with his knowledge and closeness to the people."

Attorney John Alden Staker, Democrat member of the county election board, remembers Mr. Polk's first campaign visit to Scioto County in 1930.

"He never dreamed then that he had any chance of winning," Mr. Staker recalled. "He has been an able and conscientious of-

ficial and has enjoyed great popularity throughout the Sixth District."

William Staiger, president of Local 2116 of United Steelworkers and president of Shawnee District, AFL-CIO: "The death of Representative James Polk comes as a shock and a feeling of deep regret to our officers and members. Representative Polk has been a true friend and excellent Representative of all people in this district.

"His always friendly approach and intelligent devotion to duty marked him as a fine example of public servants dedicated to perpetuate the American form of government. Although others will take up his work and carry on, the passing of Representative Polk leaves a void in our hearts that can never be filled."

Attorney Laurence Kimble, county Democratic leader and long-time friend of Representative Polk, said, "Mr. Polk was a great friend and advocate for the development of Scioto County and southern Ohio.

"He is irreplaceable. Personally, I feel keenly the loss of a dear friend."

Republican Municipal Judge Lowell Thompson said, "Everyone regrets the death of Congressman Polk after his many years of faithful service to the Sixth Congressional District."

REPRESENTATIVE JIM POLK DIES—SERVED FOR
20 YEARS

WASHINGTON.—Representative James G. Polk, 62, Democrat, Ohio, died of cancer today at Walter Reed Army Medical Center. Polk had been ill for several months.

He had served in Congress for 20 years, in two tours.

First elected in 1931, he served five terms, then was out during the 77th through 80th Congresses.

Polk, whose home was in Highland, 10 miles north of Hillsboro, served the nine-county Sixth Congressional District of southwestern Ohio.

The counties in the district are Adams, Brown, Clermont, Fayette, Highland, Pickaway, Pike, Ross, and Scioto.

He listed himself in the Congressional Directory as one of the few legislators whose sole occupation was farming.

Polk was the third Member to die since the House was elected last November. The other were Daniel Reed, Republican, New York, and George Christopher, Democrat, Missouri.

Polk's death left the House membership at 282 Democrats and 152 Republicans, with 2 vacancies. Christopher's successor was chosen in a special election.

Under Ohio law, no replacement will be named for Polk until the next regular election.

House Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Democrat, Texas, announced the House would adjourn out of respect to Polk, following the usual eulogies. RAYBURN described Polk as "a fine Member of Congress; a gentleman all around."

Colleagues said Polk had been in and out of hospitals for the past 2 years and that he entered Walter Reed for the last time 2 weeks ago.

Polk divided his time between farming and school teaching after his graduation from Ohio State University's College of Agriculture in 1919.

He served briefly as a high-school principal at New Vienna, Ohio, and later was superintendent of schools in the same city; from 1923 to 1928 he was a high-school principal at Hillsboro, Ohio.

Polk didn't seek reelection to Congress in 1940 so he could return to farming. Two years later he was named a special assistant in the Agriculture Department, a job he held until 1946. He was reelected to Congress in 1948.

Representative Polk, who was a lifelong resident of Highland County, was the first Democrat ever to be elected to Congress from his district. He never was beaten in either a primary or general election.

Although he formerly was a school principal and superintendent his only business activity since 1928 had been operation of his farm near Hillsboro.

The Representative was a descendant of Robert Bruce Polk who came to Maryland from Ireland in 1672. His grandfather moved to Highland County in 1826 and his father, William A. Polk, was a banker and conducted a cattle feeding operation near Hillsboro.

Survivors are the widow, Mrs. Mary Polk; a son, William A. Polk of Washington; three daughters, Mrs. Martha Wilhite of Washington, Mrs. Helen Vera of Highland, and Mrs. Lois Taylor of Silver Spring, Md.; a half brother, Robert T. Polk, and a half sister, Miss Fannie Polk, both of Carreysville, Ohio.

Funeral services will be held in the Highland Methodist Church at 2 p.m., Saturday. Burial also will be at Highland. The body will be at the Patterson Funeral Home in Leesburg after noon Friday.

Unlike the case of a U.S. Senator, Governor DiSalle has no powers to appoint an interim Representative. He is empowered to call an election to fill the vacancy, at his discretion. A special primary could be held in the Sixth District any time so long as it is 15 days before a general election. Thus, it would be possible for a new Representative to be elected in the November election.

In Columbus, Gov. Michael V. DiSalle, informed of the Representative's death, issued this statement:

"The people of the Sixth District have suffered a great loss. Ohio and the Nation share in this deep feeling.

"Jim Polk was a kindly, able, and sincere public official. He worked hard for the people of his district and he was devoted to his obligation to the national interest.

"While I was in Washington, he was serving as a Member of the House Agriculture Committee. His sense of fair play was so evident that I became a great admirer and a close personal friend."

[From the Portsmouth (Ohio) Times, Apr. 29, 1959]

CONGRESSMEN PAY TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE POLK—FUNERAL SATURDAY AT HIGHLAND; SPECIAL ELECTION LIKELY

Funeral services for Representative James G. Polk, 62, Democrat, of Highland, will be held at 2 p.m. Saturday in the Highland Methodist Church. Burial will be in Highland.

Mr. Polk's body will lie in state in the Patterson Funeral Home in Leesburg after Friday noon until noon Saturday.

Masonic services will be held at the funeral home at 8 p.m. Friday.

Representative Polk died Tuesday in Walter Reed Army Medical Center at Washington, D.C., of cancer.

The House of Representatives was adjourned Tuesday afternoon out of respect for Mr. Polk. About 25 Members of the House, including most of the Ohio delegation, eulogized Mr. Polk. Speaker SAM RAYBURN adjourned the House after the eulogies.

Gov. Michael V. DiSalle probably will call for a special election to name a successor to Mr. Polk.

Political observers said the Governor may call for the primary election to be held in October at which time the parties will select a candidate for the general election.

The special election for Congress would be held November 3, concurrent with the general 1959 elections. The successful candidate could take office a few days after the election.

Governor DiSalle said he will sound out sentiment for a special election in the nine-county district, in light of the election expenses involved. However, he said, "it probably would not be good for the district to have no representation in Congress all through the 1960 session."

The law provides that the Governor may call for a special election, the primary of which could not be held within 15 days of the general election.

Since the party is at the height of its State and local power, Democratic leaders are expected to insist upon a special election, feeling they can elect a Democrat this year.

An incumbent has an edge on the officeballot, hence the winner of a special election would have a better opportunity to capture the full term in the 1960 election.

Frank E. Smith, former postmaster and veteran Democratic leader, is considered a top choice of many Democrats. He is widely known throughout the district, having campaigned for himself and the party in all the counties.

Since the GOP debacle in the sixth district last November no outstanding candidate for the party nomination has emerged.

It is not considered likely that Elmer Barrett of Chillicothe, the 1958 candidate would be interested, observers said.

Mr. Barrett is now president of Photographic, Inc., an internationally known highway engineering firm founded by Everett S. Preston, now State highway director.

Mr. Polk had been in ill health in the last 2 years. He was critical in the summer and early fall of 1958 following a major operation.

He rallied, campaigned a little and appeared on the road to recovery. In January he suffered a relapse and was hospitalized for examination.

He improved and resumed his duties. March 14 he entered the medical center for examination and treatment and carried on his office duties from his hospital room.

Mr. Polk first was elected to Congress in 1930 and served until 1940 when he decided not to seek reelection. He became a candidate again in 1948 and subsequently was reelected, winning his 11th term in 1958. He was serving his 21st year in Congress.

Mr. Polk is survived by his wife, Mrs. Mary A. Polk; a son, William Polk of Washington; three daughters, Mrs. Martha Wilhite of Washington, Mrs. Helen Vera of Highland, and Mrs. Lois Taylor of Silver Springs, Md., and a half-brother, Robert T. Polk, and a half-sister, Miss Fannie Polk, both of Careytown, Ohio.

[From the Portsmouth (Ohio) Times, Apr. 29, 1959]

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES G. POLK

Somewhere along the line in the last quarter century James G. Polk became known as the "people's representative."

He was proud of the designation and in a nutshell it sums up why the Highland County Democrat was unbeatable in Ohio's Sixth Congressional District.

He threw his hat into the political ring in 1930 as an unknown in a district that until then had been represented in Congress only by Republicans.

He astounded even his own supporters by unseating the veteran incumbent and becoming the first Democrat elected from this district. From that time to his last campaign last fall Representative Polk never lost an election.

The key to his political success was his representation of the people. Never spectacular, always in the shadow of more colorful contemporaries, Representative Polk kept in close touch with his constituents, regardless of political affiliation.

His conservative stand in the 1930's won for him Republican support which never was shaken.

He won and retained support of business and industrial leaders. He was solid with and was supported by organized labor and the farm vote.

Among the farm folk Representative Polk was synonymous with agriculture. It was his chief congressional interest and he served on the House committee in that field.

His retirement from politics in 1940 was to enable him to return to farming. And he was one of the few legislators who listed his sole occupation as farming.

Locally, Representative Polk worked quietly but efficiently to help obtain the Portsmouth Area A-plant, the city's flood defenses, the Scioto County Airport, aid for schools, surplus commodities and improvements through WPA and PWA work.

Representative Polk had been in failing health for some months, but he remained on the job in Washington representing the people who elected him.

James G. Polk had the respect of his friends and foes alike. House Speaker SAM RAYBURN calls him "a fine Member of Congress; a gentleman all around."

That is exactly how his constituents thought of him.

[From the Greenfield Daily Times, May 4, 1959]

POLK EULOGIZED FOR "LIFE OF SERVICE"

Seven Members and two officials of the U.S. House of Representatives comprised the congressional delegation to last rites for Representative James G. Polk held Saturday in Highland Methodist Church.

Mr. Polk died April 28 in Washington.

Rev. C. S. Thompson, minister of the church, in his sermon eulogized Mr. Polk as a plain, righteous, and humble man who devoted his life to the service of others.

Revs. Jack Ellsberry and C. A. Arthur offered the prayer and scripture reading. Mrs. Leroy Larrick, Sr., was at the piano.

The large congregation was accommodated by placing extra chairs in the church and on the front lawn.

Burial was made in the family lot in the churchyard cemetery. Pallbearers were James Rhodes, Charles Blackburn, Carl Fetters, Vannie Fry, Tom McFadden and Heber King.

The congressional delegation included Representatives William E. Hess, Wayne L. Hays, Gordon H. Scherer, Thomas L. Ashley, Charles A. Vanik, Robert E. Cook, and Samuel L. Devine; and Zeke W. Johnson, Jr., Sergeant at Arms, and Kenneth R. Harding, Deputy Sergeant at Arms. They were appointed by Speaker SAM RAYBURN.

Highland and Leesburg police officers and State highway patrolmen directed traffic.

Several hundred persons paid their respects during visitation at the Patterson funeral home in Leesburg.

Following the service, Patterson's sent many of the floral pieces to the VA Hospital at Chillicothe, and to the Greenfield, Washington C.H., and Hillsboro hospitals.

[From the Manchester Signal, Apr. 30, 1959]

CONGRESSMAN JAMES G. POLK, VETERAN LEGISLATOR DIES TUESDAY IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

Death wrote finish to a long and active political career Tuesday morning at 10:48 a.m., when Representative James G. Polk died of cancer in Walter Reed Medical Center, Washington, D.C.

The Highland County Democrat, representative of Ohio's Sixth Congressional District, was 62 years of age.

He had been in poor health for quite some time, having entered the hospital March 21. After examination, it was an-

nounced he was suffering from lymphoma, an inflammation of the lymph node.

Polk, after being seriously ill in the fall of 1958, recuperated in time to make a successful campaign for reelection.

His home was in Highland, 10 miles north of Hillsboro. His Sixth District is comprised of Adams, Brown, Clermont, Fayette, Highland, Pickaway, Pike, Ross and Scioto Counties.

The veteran campaigner had served 20 years in Congress. First elected in 1931, he served five terms and retired in 1940. After sitting out the 77th through 80th Congresses, he came back in the 81st and had been in the House since.

Political observers feel Gov. Michael V. DiSalle probably will call for a special election to name Mr. Polk's successor. If he does, the primary will probably take place in October to give parties an opportunity to select a candidate for the November finals. The special election for Congress would then be held November 3, with the general 1959 elections. The successful candidate would take his seat in Congress a few days after the November election.

Mr. Polk was a "people's representative." He watched over his constituents in the district with constant attention, and no matter what political affiliation a voter in his district professed, he always received the same courteous, prompt reply to a problem from Mr. Polk's office.

Survivors include his wife, Mrs. Mary Polk of Washington, D.C.; a son, William A. Polk; three daughters, Mrs. Martha Willhide, Mrs. Helen Vara, and Mrs. Lois Taylor; half-brother, Robert T. Polk and a half-sister, Miss Fannie Polk.

Funeral services will be held in Highland Saturday.

[From the Hillsboro (Ohio) Press Gazette May 1, 1959]

rites Planned for Saturday—Served 20 Years as Representative

James Gould Polk, 63, of Highland, who had served 20 years as Sixth Ohio District Congressman, died of cancer about 10 a.m. Tuesday in Walter Reed Army Hospital, in Washington, D.C.

Funeral services will be held Saturday at 2 p.m., at the Highland Methodist Church, with the Reverend C. S. Thompson and the Reverend C. A. Arthur officiating. Burial will be made in Highland Cemetery under the direction of Patterson Funeral Home of Leesburg. Friends may call at the funeral home after noon, Friday.

The Representative had been in failing health for some time. He first entered the hospital last January 16, for examination and reentered the hospital on March 21 for treatment. Relatives said that he was believed to have had cancer for several years but periodic checkups failed to reveal it until a few weeks ago. He was born on Oct. 6, 1895, a son of William Alexander and Isophena Ockerman Polk. He was a veteran of World War I.

He made his home at Highland when Congress was not in session and engaged in farming. He was the owner of a 285-acre farm and took an active interest in its operation.

In Columbus, Gov. Michael V. DiSalle, informed of the representative's death, issued this statement:

"The people of the Sixth District have suffered a great loss. Ohio and the Nation share in this deep feeling.

"Jim Polk was a kindly, able, and sincere public official. He worked hard for the people of his district and he was devoted to his obligation to the national interest.

"While I was in Washington, he was serving as a member of the House Agriculture Committee. His sense of fair play was so

evident that I became a great admirer and a close personal friend."

Tuesday in Washington, 25 Members of the House of Representatives, including most of the Ohio delegation, Democrats and Republicans alike, eulogized him on the Chamber floor before Speaker SAM RAYBURN called for adjournment out of respect for the gentle, soft-spoken Ohioan. "He was a fine Member of Congress, a gentleman all around," RAYBURN said. Several Senators, Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, Democrat, Ohio, among them, spoke of his passing. Flags on all Government buildings in Washington were at half mast.

He was born on a farm near Careytown in Penn Township of Highland County. His parents and three of his grandparents were born in the same county. The Congressman was a direct descendant of Robert Bruce Polk, who emigrated from Scotland to Ireland, where he married and later came to the Eastern Shore of Maryland, in 1672.

Joshua Polk, the Congressman's great-grandfather, came to Highland County from Maryland in 1826 and bought a 330-acre farm in Penn and Fairfield Townships.

His ancestors were pioneer residents of Highland County. Their principal occupations were farming, teaching, and preaching. Three of his mother's cousins were ministers of the Church of the Brethren and one of his father's brothers was a minister of the Universalist Church.

The Congressman's late father, William Polk, was for many years one of the most extensive cattle feeders in Highland County and president of the New Vienna Bank.

[From the Bethel (Ohio) Journal, May 7, 1959]

JAMES G. POLK

In the death of Representative James G. Polk, the Sixth Ohio District has lost a devoted public servant. He was held in high esteem by members of both political parties.

First elected in 1930, he served for five successive terms. A humble man, his biography in the Congressional Directory refers to him as being "one of the few Members of Congress whose sole occupation is farming." He was deeply interested in and concerned about farm problems. For a time he was a special assistant to Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan.

After laying politics aside for 10 years, in 1948 he again ran for Congress, won back his congressional seat and, never being defeated, he continued in office until his death.

In the passing of James G. Polk, the Sixth District has lost a capable, honest public servant who was completely dedicated to the duties of his office and to the service of his constituency.

[From the People's Defender, West Union, Ohio, May 7, 1959]

THE LOSS OF CONGRESSMAN POLK

The death of Congressman James G. Polk, of the Sixth Ohio District, which came as a shock last week, is one of the greatest losses this section of Ohio had in many years.

Congressman Polk was an outstanding and well liked representative with a record in Congress that will stand for many years to come. His knowledge of the Sixth District was one that was thorough and he understood the needs of each county he represented.

As a member of the agriculture committee, he did not hesitate in asking information from his voters of the district before he came to casting his ballot on each particular issue. His interest in the burley allotment program was something that will remain in the minds of the growers forever.

His colleagues in Congress paid the highest tribute to him and said he was "kind, able and a Christian man." He had won

the respect of both the Democrat and Republican members of the body.

It will be many years in the future before the Sixth Ohio District will again have such representation in Congress.

[From the Portsmouth (Ohio) Times, May 4, 1959]

THREE PASTORS PAY FINAL TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE POLK—FRIENDS OVERFLOW CHURCH AT RITES FOR CONGRESSMAN

HIGHLAND, OHIO.—U.S. Representative James G. Polk, (Democrat, Highland), was laid to rest here Saturday afternoon on the family plot in Highland Cemetery.

The career of the 62-year-old Democratic Representative came to an end last Tuesday in Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, D.C.

Final services were conducted at the local Methodist Church where Representative Polk and his family worshiped when he was at home here.

The church was filled with flowers and people and many other persons were seated on chairs which had been placed on the lawn outside the edifice. A public address system was used to carry the funeral services given by three ministers who had served the Polk family.

Rev. C. S. Thompson, current pastor of the church, used the 17th psalm, 15th verse . . . "I will behold thy face in righteousness: I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with thy likeness."

SERVED OTHERS

Reverend Thompson said Representative Polk's aim was "to always serve his fellow man well. He always thought first of others, himself last."

In his tribute of the legislator, Reverend Thompson cited his service in Congress and also to the church, such as when he taught Sunday school here.

Reverend Thompson was assisted by Revs. C. A. Arthur and Jack Elsberry.

The body of the Congressman arrived at Patterson Funeral Home in Leesburg Friday morning and from noon that day until the time it was moved to the church a steady stream of persons paid respects.

Present for the funeral were six Members of the House of Representatives, the Sergeant at Arms and the Deputy Sergeant at Arms.

The Representatives—WILLIAM E. HESS, WAYNE L. HAYS, GORDON SCHERER, THOMAS L. ASHLEY, CHARLES A. VANIK, and SAMUEL L. DEVINE—acted as honorary pallbearers.

LOCAL FRIENDS PALLBEARERS

The pallbearers were friends of the Polk family. They were James Roads, Carl Feters, Charles Blackburn, Heber King, Tom McFadden, and Vannie Frye.

Letters, cards, and flowers were sent to the family from members of both political parties throughout the Sixth District, the State, and Nation.

"He was an American before he was a partisan," said one of his political opponents. Similar eulogies came from his associates in Congress as they filled some seven pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last week.

The nearly 100 baskets of flowers sent were given to area hospitals and to the Veterans Hospital at Chillicothe.

Masonic services were held at the funeral home in Leesburg Friday night. He also was a member of the Elks, the Grange, the Farm Bureau, and the Farmers Union.

Farming was closest to his heart as he served on the House Agricultural Committee and owned two farms locally.

Representative Polk divided his time between farming and school teaching after his graduation from Ohio State University's College of Agriculture in 1919. He earned his master's degree at Wittenberg College in Springfield. He was graduated from there in 1923.

HEADED SCHOOLS

He served briefly as a high school principal at New Vienna and later was superintendent of schools.

From 1923 to 1928 he was high school principal at Hillsboro.

Representative Polk was born at Careytown, about 3 miles west of here, October 6, 1896, a son of William A. and Amy Isyphenia Ockerman Polk.

Surviving are his wife, 3 daughters, a son, a half-brother, a half-sister, and 11 grandchildren.

Those from Scioto County attending the funeral were:

Vernal Riffe, Jr., Arlie N. Barker, Everett Wilkerson, J. Alden Staker, Hymie Canter, Frank Smith, Russ Burns, Cleo Wiltshire, Mr. and Mrs. O. Carson Barklow, Mr. and Mrs. William Burch, and Mr. and Mrs. Oscar Peterson. Mr. and Mrs. Oscar Pyle, formerly of Portsmouth and now living in Oak Ridge, Tenn., also were present. Mr. Pyle was Representative Polk's secretary during the first 10 years of his career in Washington.

RESOLUTION BY UNION PRAISES POLK

The following is a resolution passed by the members of the Highland County Farmers Union:

Whereas Congressman James G. Polk was an active member of the Highland County Farmers Union, and a wholehearted supporter of Farmers Union policies, and

Whereas, as a member of this organization, as a farmer, as a Member of the Congress of the United States for 20 years, and as a member of the Agriculture Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives, he rendered distinguished service to agriculture, and

Whereas he regarded agriculture as a way of life, and was always a champion of legislation which would preserve and strengthen the family farm as a fundamental unit in rural life, and

Whereas his personality was a combination of those qualities of courage, kindness, friendliness, and humility which caused him to be respected and admired by all who knew him: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Highland County Farmers Union deplore the loss of the Honorable James G. Polk, and that this resolution be adopted in tribute to him, and that a copy be spread upon the minutes; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the Highland County Farmers Union send a copy of this resolution to Mrs. Mary Polk, his widow, to the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to the press.

[From the Miami Valley News, May 7, 1959]

POLK BURIED AT HOME IN HIGHLAND

The body of Congressman James G. Polk was brought from Washington to the Patterson Funeral Home at Leesburg where it lay in state last Friday afternoon and evening and Saturday morning.

Final services were conducted at the Methodist Church in Highland, the Congressman's home town two miles west of Leesburg, at 2 p.m. Saturday.

Surviving are the widow, Mary Smith Polk; a son, William Polk, Washington; three daughters, Mrs. Martha Wilhite and Mrs. Lois Taylor, Washington, and Mrs. Helen Vara, who has just returned to Ohio from Germany where her husband is serving with the Army; a brother, Robert, and a sister, Fannie Polk, both of Highland.

JAMES G. POLK DIES; OHIO REPRESENTATIVE

Representative James G. Polk, 62, Democrat, of Ohio, who was as proud of being a farmer as he was of being a lawmaker, died today at Walter Reed Hospital of cancer. He had been ill several months.

Mr. Polk listed himself in the Congressional Directory as one of the few legislators whose sole occupation was farming. A member of the House Agriculture Committee, he served for 20 years in Congress in two tours of duty.

He was first elected in 1930, the first Democrat to be sent to the House from Ohio's present Sixth District. He served five successive terms. He did not seek reelection in 1940.

From 1942 to 1946, Mr. Polk was a special assistant in the Agriculture Department. He went back to farming full time before running again for Congress, in 1948. He was elected, and had served ever since.

Born on a farm in Penn Township, Highland County, Ohio, Mr. Polk attended the village school in Highland and went to high school at nearby New Vienna. He graduated from the Agricultural College of Ohio State University in 1919.

After college, he became principal of the New Vienna High School in 1919, and later was superintendent of schools there until 1922.

Following a period in farming near Highland, he returned to his studies, receiving a master of arts degree from Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio, in 1923.

For 5 years after graduation from Wittenberg, Mr. Polk was principal of Hillsboro (Ohio) High School, serving until 1928. Two years later he ran for Congress.

He was a member of Kappa Phi Kappa, a national education fraternity, the Masons, the Elks, and the Methodist Church.

Speaker of the House RAYBURN today called Mr. Polk "a fine Member of Congress; a gentleman all around." He announced the House would adjourn out of respect to the Ohioan after eulogies.

[From the Hillsboro (Ohio) Press Gazette, May 5, 1959]

TRIBUTES PAID TO REPRESENTATIVE POLK—
SOLONS JOIN IN HONORING COUNTIAN

When James Gould Polk, 63, who represented Ohio's Sixth District in the U.S. House of Representatives for 21 years, died April 28, many of his colleagues paid him tribute both in the House and the Senate.

Ohio Senators FRANK J. LAUSCHE and STEPHEN M. YOUNG headed the list of those who spoke in glowing terms of their association and knowledge of Polk's service and ability.

LAUSCHE introduced a resolution memorializing Polk in the Senate and similar resolutions were adopted in the House, all unanimously.

LAUSCHE described Polk, a Democrat from Highland, as a "humble, unostentatious person . . . devoted to the people he represented. He was beloved, not only by those who believed in his philosophy but also by those who disagreed with him."

Said YOUNG, "He was a gentleman of the sweetest character. He had represented his constituency with fidelity and zeal."

Senate majority leader LYNDON JOHNSON said that Polk was "one of the good and great men I have known."

KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, New York, who had served with Polk in the House, said, "I found him one of the soundest and most helpful Members in that body. He wore no man's colors."

Many more tributes were added by House Members, both Ohioans and those from other States.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN of Ohio's 19th District, announced Polk's death to House Members and said:

"The people of the Sixth Ohio District loved and trusted Jim Polk, and held him in the highest esteem. He never raised his voice in anger and distinguished himself as an

able, conscientious representative of his people. They understood and respected him."

Other tributes from Ohio Representatives included:

CLARENCE J. BROWN, Seventh District: "He was a true gentleman, a man of great character and ability. Jim was a kindly man; a Christian gentleman, if ever there was a Christian gentleman on this earth of ours."

WAYNE L. HAYS, 18th District: "I have never known a person more kindly than Jim Polk. He was the kind of a man that I think all of us would like to be."

THOMAS L. ASHLEY, Ninth District: "It has been said that Jim was a kind, gentle man. And, indeed, these were his virtues. But he was endowed, too, with a rare courage. . . . There will be few who will be remembered with greater love than Jim Polk for the wisdom and for all that he gave."

DELBERT LATTI, Fifth District, who, as a Member of the House, served with Polk on the Committee on Agriculture: "Jim Polk's many years of experience in the field of agriculture would have been invaluable to me. His wise counsel in this field will surely be missed by the entire Congress."

House Speaker SAM RAYBURN and Democratic whip JOHN MCCORMACK also paid tribute. Said RAYBURN:

"He served his district and his country well . . . was a fine man, of splendid ability, of the highest character."

Added MCCORMACK:

He exercised a "powerful influence in the House . . . as a result of the recognition of his unusual ability, his logical mind, and his sound advice."

RESOLUTION EULOGIZES CONGRESSMAN POLK

The following resolution eulogizing the late James G. Polk, Congressman from the Sixth Ohio District, submitted jointly by Representatives James W. (Bill) Collins, of Highland, and Jackson, Kruse, Shoemaker, Riffe, Gaines, Leist, Hook, and Wallace, was adopted by the Ohio House of Representatives, Monday, May 4, and entered in the journal of the House:

RESOLUTION

Relative to the death of the Honorable James G. Polk, Congressman from the Sixth Ohio District.

Whereas the members of the House of Representatives of the 103d General Assembly have learned with deep regret of the passing of a long distinguished Member of the U.S. House of Representatives; and

Whereas Mr. Polk was elected to Congress in 1930 and served five consecutive terms (1931-41), when he voluntarily retired to become associated with the U.S. Department of Agriculture in Washington, D.C., during the World War II period, only to be elected once again to Congress in 1948 where he served for five more consecutive terms, including the current 1959-60 term; and

Whereas Mr. Polk was graduated from the College of Agriculture, Ohio State University, and from Wittenberg College, served his country during World War I, and taught school before entering Congress; and

Whereas his public career has been marked by conscientious application to duty, sincere dedication to the service of his fellow man, and a devotion to public service of such superior quality as to demand the respect and esteem of all those who were so fortunate to come in contact with him, including fellow servants in Government and the many others in various walks of life and fields of endeavor: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the House of Representatives, with the sorrow and grief that inevitably follows the deplorable loss of a remarkable man, pay tribute to the

Honorable James G. Polk, and that this resolution be adopted by a rising vote and a copy thereof be spread upon the Journal; and be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives transmit an authenticated copy of this resolution to Mrs. Mary Smith Polk, his widow.

LAST RITES HELD FOR CONGRESSMAN

Congressman James Gould Polk, who served the Sixth Ohio District for nearly 21 years in Congress, was eulogized in brief, simple rites Saturday at 2 p.m., the Highland Methodist Church.

Officiating at the last rites were the church pastor, the Reverend C. S. Thompson, the Reverend C. A. Arthur of Leesburg, and the Reverend Jack Ellsberry, former pastor of the church. Burial was in the church cemetery.

Masonic services for the late Congressman were held Friday night at the Patterson funeral home in Leesburg. Hillsboro members conducted the service.

An estimated 500 persons attended the services for the Congressman, who had served 11 terms in Congress, 1931-40, and 1949-59.

In addition to many county, district, and State officials, friends and relatives, a delegation of Ohio Congressmen was in attendance.

These included WILLIAM E. HESS, WAYNE L. HAYS, GORDON H. SCHERER, THOMAS L. ASHLEY, CHARLES A. VANIK, ROBERT E. COOK, and SAMUEL L. DEVINE. Zeke W. Johnson, Jr., sergeant at arms of the House of Representatives, and Kenneth R. Harding, deputy sergeant of arms, were also in attendance.

Pallbearers included Carl Feters, Jim Roads, Charles Blackburn, Heber King, Vannie Fry and Tom McFadden.

Special music during the service was provided by Mrs. Leroy Larrick, Sr.

[From the Portsmouth (Ohio) Times,
June 23, 1959]

CORN TO PROVIDE CHURCH ORGAN AS POLK MEMORIAL

HIGHLAND, OHIO.—A memorial to the late James G. Polk, Congressman from the Sixth Ohio District, will be purchased from funds obtained in a community project.

The project is the raising of corn on the Polk land at the family home here. Fertilizer and seed corn has been donated by various citizens while others have prepared the fields and planted.

Mrs. James Roads, a member of the finance committee, said that half of the money raised from the project will be used to purchase an organ for the Methodist Church in memory of Mr. Polk. She said he was a strong supporter of the church and worshipped there when he was home.

Mrs. Roads said that 46 acres have been planted.

COMMUNITY PROJECT IN HIGHLAND FOR MEMORIAL TO LATE CONGRESSMAN POLK

A part of the money from a community project in Highland for the Methodist Church will be used as a memorial to the late James G. Polk, Congressman from the Sixth Ohio District.

The project, raising corn on the Polk land at the family home in Highland, is one in which the labor and materials are donated.

Mrs. James Roads, a member of the church's finance committee, said 46 acres have been planted, or will be by the end of this week.

She said half of the money will go to the church fund and half will be used to purchase an organ for the church in memory of Mr. Polk. He was a strong supporter of the

church and worshipped there when he was home.

Mrs. Roads said the plowing, disking, planting, etc., has been handled by Don Ingersoll, Jim Roads, Bob and Bill Manuel, LeLarrick, Jr., George Roads, John Adams, Heber King and Tom McFadden, who also has donated some fertilizer to the project.

She said others can help by donating money to buy fertilizer.

The seed corn was donated by Tom Miller, Mr. Ingersoll and Winter's Service Station.

[From the Manchester (Ohio) Signal,
June 11, 1959]

CHURCH MEMORIAL TO HONOR POLK

HIGHLAND.—Part of the money from a community project in Highland for the Methodist Church there will be used as a memorial to the late James G. Polk, Congressman from the Sixth Ohio District.

The project, raising corn on the Polk land at the family home near Highland, is one in which labor and materials are donated.

Mrs. James Roads, a member of the church's finance committee said 46 acres have been planted.

She said half of the money will go to the church fund and half will be used to purchase an organ for the church in memory of the late Congressman. He was a strong supporter of the church and worshipped there when he was home.

[From the Chillicothe (Ohio) Gazette,
May 11, 1959]

SENATOR FRANK E. MOSS OF UTAH LAUDS POLK AT DEMOCRATIC RALLY HERE

Utah's Senator FRANK E. MOSS spoke with admiration for the late Congressman Polk. "Though Jim Polk and Harry Truman were cast from different molds, they fought with equal effectiveness for the same principles," he said.

"* * * Polk was a quiet, reserved man, but a thorough, balanced, and fearless legislator. I want you people of the Sixth District to know I share your grief in his passing and I can wish you no greater blessing than the nomination and election of a Democratic successor who is even half as dedicated and effective as Jim Polk."

Municipal Court Judge William B. Brown delivered a "memorial" to the late Congressman Polk.

"Those who didn't know James G. Polk wondered why he was such a success—that quiet, unassuming, friendly man. Those who did business with him became quickly aware that outward appearances are disarming and deceiving. Those of us who knew him were devoted to him, elected him and reelected him, for, as our Representative * * * he truly labored in the vineyard."

WITTENBERG COLLEGE,
Springfield, Ohio.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Highland, Ohio

DEAR MRS. POLK: For the college and its alumni I extend sincere sympathy in the loss of your husband. His death was a great loss also to our Nation which he had served so faithfully for many years.

We at Wittenberg appreciated the generous support he gave to the college year after year, and the ready manner in which he responded to various calls for help. I can recall no time when he failed to do his full share on any task we placed before him.

We were always especially proud of his honest, forthright stand on matters of principle. Our Nation, we are sure, would be stronger were it fortunate enough to have more men like him in the Congress and other positions of great responsibility.

Mr. Polk's greatest monument will be his record of loyalty, honesty and devotion to duty as he saw it.

Sincerely yours,

W. EMERSON RECK,
Vice President.

PRAYER AT FUNERAL SERVICE FOR MR. POLK

Almighty God, our Father, from whom we come, and unto whom our spirits return; Thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations. Thou art our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. Grant us Thy blessing in this hour, and enable us so to put our trust in Thee that our spirits may grow calm and our hearts be comforted. Lift our eyes beyond the shadows of earth, and help us to see the light of eternity. So may we find grace and strength for this and every time of need; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name; Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory forever. Amen.

MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR MR. POLK IN THE HIGHLAND METHODIST CHURCH, REV. JACK ELLS-BERRY READING THE SCRIPTURES

Jesus said, I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die.

The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms.

The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear? The Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid?

The righteous live forever, and the care of them is with the most High; with His right hand He shall cover them, and with His arm shall He shield them.

For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, and house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.

THE 23D PSALM

The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures; He leadeth me beside the still waters.

He restoreth my soul; He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for His name's sake.

Yea, though I walk through the Valley of the Shadow of Death, I will fear no evil; for Thou art with me; Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me.

Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies; Thou anointest my head with oil; my cup runneth over.

Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life; and I will dwell in the House of the Lord forever.

A PORTION OF THE 90TH PSALM

Lord, Thou has been our dwelling place in all generations.

Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God.

For a thousand years in Thy sight are but as yesterday when it is past, and as a watch in the night.

Thou carriest them away as with a flood; they are as a sleep; in the morning they are like grass which groweth up.

In the morning it flourisheth, and groweth up; in the evening it is cut down and withereth.

So teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom.

High Hope for the Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, passage of the Tennessee Valley Authority self-financing bill, and the approval by President Eisenhower with assurance of a clarifying amendment, was hailed by millions of citizens in my home State and throughout the TVA area, along with champions of public power throughout the United States.

As an indication of the importance of the self-financing bill to the valley area, I cite two of many editorials which appeared in Tennessee newspapers immediately after the measure was signed by the President.

One article, entitled "High Hope for the Valley," appeared in the Chattanooga Times on August 7. The second excellent editorial was printed in the Memphis Commercial Appeal on the same day. I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Chattanooga Times, Aug. 7, 1959]
1959]

HIGH HOPE FOR THE VALLEY

Presidential approval of the TVA self-financing bill, which has had a fantastic journey through Congress to the White House, has many facets of meaning. But surely the broadest, the one which means more to most people, is that the valley can now look forward to an adequate supply of electric power to serve an expanding economy.

A tremendous program of construction by the Authority itself is in the cards, given impetus by the right to issue up to \$750 million in revenue bonds. It will be needed, and quickly, to pull the area from beneath the shadow of a potential power shortage in the next few years.

This is the threat with which the valley has lived for too long. It has been imposed by hostility and misunderstanding, inside Congress and out, which denied TVA the funds and the flexibility necessary to meet the rising power demands of its service area.

Happily, those binding restrictions have been removed in the measure which President Eisenhower signed despite reservations, and in the amendment which congressional leaders have promised him to remove the cause of those reservations.

The whole affair is an unusual demonstration of good faith and cooperation between the executive and legislative branches. For the valley, it couldn't have come at a better time.

Mr. Eisenhower objected to provisions which required him to transmit TVA's construction program plans to Congress without change. Congress could modify them if it chose. The President saw in this a threat to the balance of power between the executive and legislative branches, and gave notice of his intent to veto the bill for that reason.

An amendment freeing TVA from control of its construction program by either branch was proposed and found favor, but there was no feasible way to get it to the President within the time he had to act on the bill.

Agreement was reached for him to sign the bill anyway while Congress rushed consideration of the amendment.

We are convinced the President was mistaken in his original distaste for the bill, and find it somewhat surprising that he agreed to a solution which relaxed congressional control without strengthening the executive reins. But we'll not quarrel over that.

The end result will be to give TVA greater freedom of action than it has ever proposed. In that sense, it imposes a new and heavier burden of responsibility upon the board of directors, one which we are confident they will discharge with integrity of purpose and efficiency of operation.

Actually, TVA is, and will remain, under the ultimate control of Washington. It is a creature of Congress with directors who are appointees of the President and responsible of him. All the Authority or its friends have ever asked was that degree of independence and flexibility vital to the successful operation of a sole supplier of power to a growing, expanding region.

This is what the law of 1959, when it is finally on the books, will give TVA.

The region will be the immediate beneficiary, to be sure, but the Nation will feel the effects and reap the rewards of the sound growth prompted by this legislative turn.

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal,
Aug. 7, 1959]

TVA COMES OF AGE

With a stroke of his pen yesterday President Eisenhower gave the Tennessee Valley Authority freedom and self-determination.

In short: TVA has come of age. It is a tremendous economic victory for our area. It is a personal triumph for our own Representative Davis and all the other Congressmen from the Midsouth who backed the bill to permit TVA to do its own financing—the bill the President signed.

Although nothing can be completely divorced from politics, the bill takes TVA close to that, closer than anyone thought possible 4 years ago when CLIFF DAVIS first tackled the job getting it through the Congress.

That is not to detract from the steering it got from Senator ALBERT GORE in the Senate, or from the other sympathetic solons from Southern States. The House was the arena of doubt this time and it took expert handling to get it by in the form agreeable to the administration.

And at long last the President fulfilled his original promise, made in 1952, that he would not knowingly do TVA harm. His action yesterday permits TVA to proceed in its endeavor to serve the region for which it was intended without further encroachment on private utilities' territory. It answers the accusations of tax free rides. It stands on its own two feet.

Indeed, TVA has come of age. And the South beams with the fondness of parenthood.

Dancey Returns From Russia—Wants Khrushchev To Visit Peoria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial by George E. Sokolsky appearing in the August 20, 1959,

issue of the Washington Post. Mr. Sokolsky refers to the fact that Charles L. Dancey, editor of the Peoria Journal Star, has returned from Russia and would like Mr. Khrushchev to visit Peoria, Ill. In so doing, Mr. Sokolsky points out, that Mr. Khrushchev would, on his trip through the Midwest, see the greatest industrial complex in the world. The editorial follows:

HOW TO SEE AMERICA

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Usually when guests of the Nation come to this country, the State Department works out an itinerary which often includes the big and spectacular cities and such places as are of special interest to the visitor. There are dinners and luncheons, and speeches are delivered. Obviously, the man who is guarded by secret police and FBI agents and the local police and who moves through the country in a storm of confetti learns very little about the American people, what they think, how they live, and what they really believe to be true. The mass demonstration for Vice President RICHARD NIXON in Warsaw gave evidence of a spontaneous friendliness to an American, but neither Nixon nor anyone in his entourage sat down to a glass of tea with a few simple proletarian families, just as Khrushchev will not have occasion to do anything like that in this country.

Charles L. Dancey, editor of the Peoria Journal Star, has made an interesting suggestion for Khrushchev's visit. He, of course, wants to have Khrushchev brought to Peoria. What, at least, could be done is to fly the Russian low from Pittsburgh to Cincinnati where he can see the greatest industrial complex in the world. He could be put down in the smaller cities of this area; it should be possible for him to visit homes. He might pick and choose so that he could not suspect that the show was set up for him.

He would find many Russian and Polish-speaking people in these areas who could tell him of their lives in this country. He would find many whose ancestors were Ukrainians. He would discover how descendants of a great many races and nationalities manage to live and work together, retaining some of their inherited customs; but in the third generation, he will find that a new breed is emerging, an American breed, somewhat different from their sires but also different from what he might see in New York or Washington, in New Orleans or Chicago, in San Francisco or Los Angeles. The Middle West like New England is the America he ought to see, in many respects more surprising than the larger cities.

There is no American type as there is no Russian type. Certainly a Kalmuck is different from a Georgian, as a Ukrainian is different from a Uzbek.

In the United States, these differences are more pronounced because here for about 300 years, races of man have been mixing in a veritable melting pot. In some areas, the basic stock was Anglo-Saxon; in others, it was French or Spanish.

There was no time, from the earliest settlements until today, when there was not an influx of Germanic peoples into this country. It is difficult to trace this kind of statistics, but there have been as many German, Dutch, and Scandinavian migrants into the United States as Anglo-Saxon. It is estimated that there are about 12 million descendants of Italians.

The Jews first arrived in 1653 and there have been Jewish immigrants ever since; also, Jews have since the earliest days been assimilated into the general population and have disappeared as Jews. That trend is impossible to study thoroughly because of

intermarriages and the Anglicization of names, but in certain areas, it must have been notably active.

All Russians have been led to believe that the Negroes are a brutally treated minority nationality without rights, practically enslaved. And if Khrushchev is taken to Harlem in New York City, he will be in the ugliest ghetto in the world where Negroes live in crowded tenements and are usually exploited by Negro and white politicians. However, there are cities in the South and in the West where Negroes live comfortably and even advantageously because they are Negroes. It would be an act of patriotism for Negro labor leaders to establish to Khrushchev the fact of the equality of pay for identical work in cities like Detroit and Pittsburgh. He should be taken to universities where he can see Negro boys and girls preparing for national leadership. The lies that have been told in Russia by American Communists need to be exploded. Perhaps Khrushchev can still learn something about the United States and the American people.

If we want to show off, this is the kind of showing off we need to do. If this visit is not for showing off purposes, what is it for? We need to establish the fact that here live some 50 races and nationalities of man in mutual interest without accentuation of differences, but with freedom to pursue their differences if they so desire. We need to show him that in our freely demonstrated differences lie our strength.

Discrimination and Mutual Security Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, some time ago I announced in the Senate that when the mutual security appropriation bill reached the floor of the Senate I would offer again the amendment which I offered at the time the mutual security authorization bill was before the Senate, which sought to place the Senate on record as being opposed to entering into mutual security foreign-aid agreements with countries such as Saudi Arabia, which follow a policy of discrimination against American citizens because of their religious faith.

At that time my proposed amendment lost by a vote of 47 to 43, but I was satisfied at the time that a considerable number of votes against the amendment were cast by those Senators who had not been present on the floor of the Senate during the debate and who were not fully aware of the import of the amendment. Several Senators who voted against my amendment at that time have come to me since and said that is exactly what happened; that they voted without fully understanding the significance of the amendment I offered.

I shall offer the amendment again, Mr. President, when the mutual security appropriation bill reaches the floor of the Senate.

In support of that amendment, Mr. President, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America in their 64th annual national convention assembled in New York City, August 5 to 9, 1959, passed a resolution. I am pleased to have the support of this resolution, which I shall refer to again in the course of the debate at the appropriate time.

I now ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the resolution be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DISCRIMINATION AND MUTUAL SECURITY LEGISLATION

Whereas it is our understanding that certain foreign nations, some of them beneficiaries of our country's mutual security assistance, exercise discrimination against U.S. citizens, based upon race or creed, which inhibit or nullify rights of personal, commercial, diplomatic or military access to these countries, rights which are, according to our fundamental American concepts, due to all U.S. citizens without distinction; and

Whereas remarks made on the floor of the U.S. Senate as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 8, 1959, indicate such restrictions specifically obtain in Iceland, which discriminates against Negroes; Norway, which discriminates against certain Catholic clergymen; and Saudi Arabia, which discriminates against Jews; and

Whereas these discriminations are repugnant to the principles of American democracy, the Constitution of the United States of America, and are derogatory to the rights of American citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America in 64th annual national convention assembled in New York City, August 5-9, 1959, That we urge the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation pertaining to the mutual security appropriations bill which would prohibit disbursing any appropriated funds to any countries which practice such discrimination; and be it further

Resolved, We urge that in no instance should these practices or prejudices, with their evil consequences be permitted to become a part of the practice of any of the agencies of our Government.

Statement by David J. McDonald, President, United Steelworkers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, we recently were favored by receiving a report on the facts in the steel strike as the Secretary of Labor saw them.

I ask now that the House be given a chance to read President David J. McDonald's, of the United Steelworkers of America, statement on the same subject:

STATEMENT BY DAVID J. McDONALD, PRESIDENT, UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA

The steel mills of the nation have been idle for 2 weeks because the steel companies

have refused to discuss the needs of their employees until they "generate economic progress" for the companies. People who are not familiar with the astounding profit record of these companies have been given the impression that the steel industry has been suffering from a lack of economic progress. United States Steel Corp., the Nation's leading steel company, has now reported its 1959 profits. The facts disclosed by the report serve to demolish all of the claims made of inadequate progress by the steel corporation.

United States Steel Corp. reported net profits, after taxes, of over \$254,900,000 in just the first half of the year, a new, all-time record high. These profits were almost 88 percent greater than a year ago and were \$23½ million higher than the previous record for a 6-month period. For the first time in history the corporation succeeded in pushing its profits before taxes over the half-billion-dollar mark in half a year. And this was accomplished despite the use of several "extra charges" against profits, such as almost \$16 million charged off against profits in the second quarter alone for "accelerated" depreciation not deductible for tax purposes under the law.

The criticism by the corporation of its employees' supposed lack of efficiency is best evaluated in the light of the spectacular growth of the corporation's profits on the work of each employee. Last year, the corporation's profits amounted to \$2,625 per employee. In the prior record profit year of 1957, profits were \$3,045 per employee. This year, in 1959, United States Steel's profits are equal to an annual rate of \$4,345 per employee, an increase in profit per employee of \$1,300 a year over the best previous record in 1957.

The corporation's current profits on an hourly basis are even more revealing of the hoax which United States Steel is attempting to perpetrate. The corporation tells the American people that its profit margin does not permit an increase in the hourly wage rates of its employees. But, whereas last year its profits were equal to \$1.47 for every hour worked by each of its employees, and in the prior record profit year of 1957 its profits were \$1.61 per man-hour, the corporation's 1959 profits are over \$2.28 per man-hour. In other words, the profit margin is now over 67 cents per man-hour above the prior all-time record of just 2 years ago. This profit growth of 67 cents per hour in 2 years stands in sharp contrast to the corporation's claims of inefficiency and lack of economic progress by the corporation.

In reporting on its earnings and operations in the most recent 3-month period United States Steel understandably neglected to comment on the fact that record production was achieved with fewer employees than in any year since 1939, except for recession 1958. This is understandable because the corporation's own report gives the lie to its vicious attack on the performance of its own workers. In the most recent 3-month period in 1959, the corporation shipped steel products at a record annual rate of 30.9 million tons with 250,310 employees. As recently as 1953, a good production and profit year, the corporation employed 301,560 workers and shipped 25.1 million tons, a record up to that time. In the space of 6 years, employment has been reduced by more than 51,000 and steel shipments increased by 5.8 million tons a year—an increase in steel shipments per employee of 48 percent in 6 years. In the last 2 years alone, since the prior record profit year of 1957, employment has been reduced by about 21,000 and steel shipments have risen by more than 32 percent. It is indeed shock-

ing that the corporation spreads propaganda of inefficiency and lack of corporate economic progress when its own reports disclose a record of relentless reduction of jobs, increased production and soaring profits.

Year after year the corporation has pocketed the lion's share of tremendously increased productivity and, on top of that, has piled one unjustified price increase after another (23 of them since World War II) on helpless steel consumers. The proof of this unprincipled behavior is found in the corporation's own financial reports. Although protesting that price increases have been required to meet added costs, the corporation's profit margin on each dollar sales has grown relentlessly, accompanying a fantastic growth in total sales. With total sales running at the rate of over \$5 billion a year, the corporation is making a profit on each dollar of sales which is more than double the rate of profit earned on each dollar of sales when total sales were less than \$1 billion a year, as in 1939. Further evidence of United States Steel's enrichment at the expense of the consumer is found in the record profit on each ton of steel shipped. If, as the corporation claims, price increases were required to meet added costs, the record would not show an ever-increasing profit per ton of steel. But the record shows precisely this fact—a profit per ton of steel shipped in the first half of 1959 which has increased by more than \$3.50 a ton since the prior record profit year of 1957, by about \$10 a ton since 1955, by over \$17 a ton since 1953, and by almost \$27 a ton since 1947. This profit record has brought the corporation's return on net worth up to the present level of 15.7 percent—a rate of return which is more than five times greater than 20 years ago.

Because of evident embarrassment at being required to disclose its phenomenal profits at a time when it is posing as the Nation's savior by forcing on its workers the hardships of a strike, United States Steel is attempting to pass off its profits as a temporary phenomenon brought on by unusual demand for steel in the first half of this year. Again the corporation's own report demonstrates that this is not true. The corporation's amazingly high profits in the first half of 1959 were achieved with about 12 to 13 percent of its capacity lying idle. United States Steel operated at between 87 and 88 percent of capacity in the first half of 1959, a rate of operations which was exceeded in 1947, 1948, 1950, 1951, 1953, and 1955. In addition, its rate of operations in 1952, 1956 and 1957 was only fractionally under its 1959 rate. Thus in 9 out of the last 12 years, the corporation's rate of operations was only fractionally under, or was in excess of its 1959 rate. Clearly this does not support the corporation's claim of an unusually high rate of operations in 1959.

The corporation's spokesman here made much of an alleged wage-cost push in their attempts to explain their opposition to sharing any part of their tremendous gains with their workers. Therefore it is not surprising that United States Steel did not comment in its report on the reduction in its employment costs in 1959. In the prior record profit year of 1957, the corporation's total employment costs amounted to 42.2 cents per dollar of sales. In the first half of 1959, this was reduced to 39.8 cents and in the most recent 3 months these costs were only 37.1 cents. This decline in employment costs in relation to sales, of course, reflects the consistent trend of reduced employment and increased production. As the reports of the American Iron and Steel Institute reveal, fewer and fewer man-hours

are employed to produce a ton of steel. In the prior record profit year of 1957, a total of 16.1 man-hours were employed for each ton of steel shipped. In the most recent month for which figures are available, May 1959, only 13.3 hours were required. As a result of this constant trend, total payroll costs per ton of steel shipped are \$3 a ton less than in the prior record profit year of 1957. It is pertinent to note that, despite the reduction in total payroll costs, the price of steel today is more than \$7 a ton higher than it was in 1957.

What is indicated by these facts is not only the tremendous profitability of selling steel at current prices, but also the certainty of a growing profit margin as technology and efficiency steadily reduce the cost of producing each ton of steel. Accordingly, the statement of United States Steel's chairman of the board that he does not intend to raise the general level of steel prices this year is not quite the hold-the-line position that he pretends. This is so because, first of all, sharply rising productivity reduces the cost of producing steel month by month and, therefore, even a fixed steel price will result in a constantly increasing profit margin since the corporation never shares this growth with steel consumers. Secondly, it is not a hold-the-line position because steel dividends are at a new all-time high and are about to be raised still further; the compensation of supervisory employees (management incentive plan) in the steel mills is rising month after month as the result of bonuses gained as a reward for adding additional steelworkers to the ranks of the unemployed; and the compensation of steel executives, because of stock options, grows by leaps and bounds every day that the market price of steel equities rises.

As the market price of United States Steel stock rose from about \$90 to \$105 in the last few months, for example, the chairman of the board of United States Steel with stock options of 32,000 shares has gained about \$480,000. For each 1-point rise in the price of United States Steel stock, his options increase in value by about \$32,000. If he can succeed in holding the line on wages, he must be comforted by the thought that profits and stock equities will rise even further. Consequently, a successful hold-the-line policy on wages guarantees the opposite result for the chairman of the board—an increase in income from stock options, half of which is tax free. Finally, steel consumers can find little comfort in a statement that the general level of steel prices will be held this year because United States Steel is an old and practiced hand at obtaining sizable price increases without ever raising the general level of steel prices. By raising the charges for what are known as extras, the corporation has succeeded in the past in raising the average price of steel by as much as \$5 a ton without ever putting into effect a general price increase.

Only those facts contained in the financial reports of United States Steel and the lesser steel corporations and in the reports of the industry's own American Iron and Steel Institute are necessary to establish that the crisis in steel has been created, for reasons known to the steel corporations, in complete disregard of those facts and of the welfare of the entire Nation. The entire position of the steel corporations in this crisis having been refuted by their own reports, it is no surprise that the steel industry shuns fact-finding and public disclosure of its sham like the plague. Sometimes truth takes time. But the union is confident that the truth will prevail.

The Atlantic Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the July issue of the NATO Letter, official publication of the Information Service of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, states that the meeting of the Atlantic Congress held last June in London and attended by delegates from this body shows that NATO is growing into a community of peoples sharing common ideals, policies, interest, and activities.

"This development, as the Congress also showed, is coming about in the sturdy and healthy way that is possible among democratic people," the letter states.

Mr. President, I believe the letter is important in pointing up, as it does, the real spirit of the Congress, which drew representative peoples from all the NATO nations together, to consider their common aims and aspirations. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the publication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ATLANTIC CONGRESS

The really important feature of the 5-day Atlantic Congress, which was opened by Queen Elizabeth II in Westminster Hall on June 5, was that it was a conference not of allied governments but of allied peoples from the countries composing the North Atlantic Alliance. It showed that the alliance between countries in Western Europe and North America which started 10 years ago as a defense against Soviet military and political encroachment in Europe, is growing into a community of peoples sharing common ideals, policies, interests, and activities.

This development, as the Congress also showed, is coming about in the sturdy and healthy way that is possible among democratic people. It is taking place, not under orders from governments and governmental officials, but through the initiative and hard work of individual citizens of the NATO countries who believe that an Atlantic Community is both natural and necessary. As the Queen said in her opening speech: "The Atlantic Community is the first real effort to give practical form to a growing desire of the peoples of this part of the world to work more closely together for their mutual security and benefit." Her Majesty went on to say that the Congress began its work "with two great advantages, for the Atlantic Community shares a common interest in security and progress, and a common European heritage. The many elements which make up this heritage are too complex to describe and too subtle to define. We cannot list them, but we know them when we meet them. However, there are two which have long been the main principles of enlightened European thought and action: respect for the freedom of the individual, for the dignity of human nature and a simple faith in God. These two principles show more clearly than anything else that the things which divide

us are very small and unimportant compared with the things which unite us. These two principles also demonstrate to our fellow members of the Commonwealth and to all our friends throughout the world that the Atlantic Community is not an exclusive club, but itself belongs to that wider brotherhood which comprises all men of good will."

The idea of holding the Congress derived from a resolution in 1957 of the annual conference of Members of Parliament from NATO countries—a nongovernmental body founded in 1955 to foster the political and economic development of the Atlantic Alliance. The preparatory work was carried out under the direction of a small international committee of Members of Parliament and other prominent people. Similarly constituted committees were responsible for national planning in the member countries of NATO.

The 640 members of the Congress came not as delegates of their governments or parties, but in a private capacity, speaking only for themselves. About one-third were Members of Parliament, others were prominent in the fields of science, technology, education, culture, religion, labor, industry and finance.

They set themselves to consider, from the experience of the first 10 years of the Atlantic Alliance, the ways in which it might develop toward a community over the next decade. They discussed the future course of relations between the NATO countries themselves, they paid even more attention to the relations of the alliance as a whole with the rest of the world. Convinced that the alliance has a positive role to play in the world, they were especially concerned in its future relationship with underdeveloped countries, particularly the newly independent states of Asia and Africa.

One of the early speakers was a distinguished Negro from the United States, the President of Howard University in Washington, Dr. Mordecai Johnson. Speaking as the child of a slave, he appealed for much greater economic aid for the peoples of Africa and Asia; aid on a scale sufficient to free them from the struggle for existence.

Dancey in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the 25th, 26th, and 27th of a series by Editor Charles L. Dancey appearing in the August 13, 14, and 15 issues of the Peoria Journal Star respectively:

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Aug. 13, 1959]

WORD "SIBERIA" STUNS CROWD

(By Charles L. Dancey)

Tbilisi.—There was some kind of an East German delegation in Tbilisi while I was there—also, of course, located at the Intourist hotel.

One of them in particular, a short, square, middle-aged man with thin straight hair latched on to me, eager to talk. (Mostly German, which is surprisingly easy to understand when spoken slowly. Or maybe it isn't so surprising for one raised in Pekin?)

He kept asking, every few minutes: "Are you sure you are an American?"

I would reply: "Peoria is about as American as anyone can get."

Finally, he grabbed me by the arm, leaned over, and said slowly: "East Germans are no different than West Germans—except that the way things are we have to be smarter." And then words, unmistakably in German and in intensity of manner, "Don't worry. Our day will come."

If he thought he was reassuring me, I must confess that it did not have that effect. At one point, he referred to the Russians as "those animals." This much intensity of hate, which can't be conveyed in mere words, is as disconcerting as an occasional example of unbelievable continuing fear.

Also in Tbilisi I attended a modern Russian play, in Russian, for an audience made up largely of local Russians, apparently. This time there was no special propaganda—it was a kind of romantic comedy.

At one point when two women were wrangling over the hero, one of them told the other sharply: "If you want a man why don't you go to India and marry an Indian."

For some reason, this made the audience almost hysterical. It was apparently the funniest line in the show—the idea of this good-looking blond Russian girl marrying an Indian.

This reaction hardly jibes with the government policy and propaganda line about the Russian people's true attitude toward orientals and other races.

With all the guff I'd taken from Professor Rai of India I could not help but maliciously wish he could have been there to hear what these great humanitarians really think of him.

On the other hand, I should have been very embarrassed if an Indian gentleman named Suomi, and a fine fellow, had been there.

Also in this play, home living was pretty realistically shown so far as my own limited experience and conversations indicated.

The setting was a home—i.e., a room, and there the actors, male and female, entertained, ate their meals, did their homework, and also slept (two on cots that were part of the furniture, one on a folding cot). And they were not supposed to be poor.

The third very revealing part of the play came when the hero, who was dodging marriage every which way, finally told his sweetheart that the truth was he had a job in Siberia.

Now, the move to Siberia is propagandized as a great patriotic effort in which the people are joining and volunteering with great enthusiasm.

But when the word "Sever" (Siberia) was finally spoken on stage—although not dramatized in the stage action—the hush that fell over the audience was like a heavy curtain falling over the theater, and then a woman in front of me began sobbing.

There is more than one way to find out what feelings and emotions stir a strange, isolated people like the Soviets. I think this play was one of the most effective and revealing.

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Aug. 14, 1959]

NIGHT FLIGHT HIDES RED MISSILE BASES

(By Charles L. Dancey)

TASHKENT.—I flew from Tbilisi to Tashkent in Russia's famous TU-104 jet, but this time we took off after sundown and landed before dawn, going the whole way in darkness.

One of the stewardesses, betraying the usual giggling curiosity about Americans, sat down with me after we were airborne and began asking questions. The plane was almost empty.

When she had been quizzing me for a while, I asked a few questions myself—per-

sonal questions such as what connection did the plane make at Tashkent, and therefore, where did she fly from there, and where did she live, etc.

From this, it was revealed that this is in fact a shuttle flight between Tbilisi and Tashkent. It doesn't go anywhere else. It doesn't connect with anything else. Yet it is scheduled all at night.

Why?

(When I returned to the United States I learned—it is no great secret that we can track them—that this Caspian Sea area is where the Soviet rocket missile range and launching area is located).

The landing in Tashkent was again on a lone paved strip, and again I saw about 50 Mig fighter planes parked on the ground as well as many commercial planes.

I was met by another Intourist guide, this one named Lida, who couldn't find much to show me in this central Asian city in the center of the Soviet cotton and textile area.

There is some new construction underway here, but very little, and hardly any completed. Lida explained that Stalingrad and the other cities that were destroyed in the war had to be rebuilt and this delayed housing projects in Tashkent which was unharmed in the war.

We drove through miles and miles of low, flat, mud huts, which looked like Pueblo Indian villages that were started but never got beyond the first or second story. Rarely does one see a window, and then it is just an open space in the wall with a number of sticks propped in it.

Most of the roofs are flat, and apparently earthen, too, and covered with heavy, brownish, tough-looking grass or weeds.

Lida says that when these were built the Moslems who built them and lived in them did not believe in having any windows facing outward.

She says this is a city of 1 million people of whom 60 percent are tilt-eyed oriental-Arabic Uzbeks, 15 percent Russian, and the rest Tartar, Tadjek, Armenian, and Kurd and others including various Afghan tribes.

She says there are 9 million people in Uzbekistan, and 90 percent are Uzbeks.

There are no screens here either—and plenty of flies. The central square, however is beautiful, with a fantastic hotel fronted by many statues and blue glazed tile designs. It is new. It faces a park-like square, with a big fountain in the center, and on the other side is another very impressive new building—the Government building.

This and a few adjoining blocks, however, are a modern Russia island in a sea of mud hut Moslem homes—which Lida blithely says will all be torn down and replaced.

When, I wonder? Not in 7 years.

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Aug. 15, 1959]

GONE IS WEALTH OF SAMARKAND

(By Charles L. Dancey)

SAMARKAND.—A short hop from Tashkent lands you at Samarkand, the fly-bitten, sun-baked, God-forsaken end of the world which once was famous from Greece to Cathay for its riches and its beautiful blonde women.

Here Alexander the Great reached the borders of his conquests when he rode his horse into the river and turned back. Here he became so enamored of Asian luxury (and married Roxanne of Samarkand) that he abandoned Greek customs and habits—and murdered his best friend and general for protesting.

Where that great walled city stood, however, is still barren and sun-baked hills today. For Genghis Kahn laid siege to it and was bitterly resisted. The final insult came when the Sultan of Samarkand with 1,000 picked horsemen sallied out one of the old city's many gates, surprised the Golden Horde, cut his way through and escaped.

The great Khan leveled the city stone by stone, slaughtered its inhabitants and plowed the earth where it had stood.

Beside these barren hills, however, rose a new city, now numbering 200,000—a city which a century after the Mongols razed it became the capital of a fabulous empire that included most of what is now Russia, Turkey, all the Arabic countries, North Africa, Persia, Afghanistan, and most of India. The empire of the dreaded Tamerlane.

Tamerlane still lies buried here. In a crumbling tomb, across a barren courtyard, under a blue-tiled dome with grass growing out between the tiles stands a solid block of gleaming black nephrite—the biggest single hunk of this precious stone in the world—marking the place where Tamerlane lies.

On this is written: "Were I alive today, the world would tremble!"

The world isn't paying much attention, except that a few years back the Russians took out Tamerlane's skeletal, mummified remains, found his thick red hair and beard still preserved, checked his crippled bones (from which he got his name) and stuck him back in the crypt.

Around this crumbling tomb are the familiar cluster of mud huts with narrow baked-clay street, ditched in the middle, chattering half-naked Uzbek children, and shrouded Moslem women.

This was the Red Square of another day—only more so. Today it is a curiosity to a visiting American, but not much else to anyone.

My guide in Samarkand is Udol, a big, strapping handsome Tartar boy whose grandfather was a mullah of Islam.

Besides the tomb of Tamerlane, he showed me the Moslem "holy place" second only to Mecca, where three pilgrimages "purify" the believer, and a cluster of the tombs of great men when Samarkand was the world center of Moslem culture.

Many of these mosques and tombs, all in ruins or half-ruins, were built by slave labor and by architects whom Tamerlane spared from the city populations he slaughtered across half the world.

In one such great tomb built for the purpose of gaining special favor with Allah according to Moslem law, the slave workers or architect had managed to blend into the shadow effects of the fabulous tile designs—the shadows of animals at each of the four corners. This, to a Moslem (had they known the animal pictures were there), turned the tomb from a holy place into an accursed place.

In others, clever architects had worked their own names in Arabic into the complicated tile designs—thus desecrating those shrines even as they were newly built.

Udol got a great kick out of telling me how these slaves of the dreaded Tamerlane had betrayed him and fooled him.

Castro Kills While United States Keels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it will be recalled that immediately following the Castro revolution in Cuba, which brought Fidel Castro into power, the senior Senator from Oregon was the first in the Senate of the United States to take the floor and protest the blood bath which Castro was inflicting at that time

upon Cuba, as a result of violating all the rules of morality with respect to the treatment of war prisoners. The senior Senator from Oregon was roundly criticized for characterizing the unconscionable conduct of Mr. Castro as a blood bath. However as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations which deals with Latin American affairs, I was briefed frequently as to what was happening in Cuba, and I knew whereof I spoke.

I was soon joined by other colleagues in the Senate whose support I deeply appreciate.

From time to time, Mr. President, I have pointed out that Cuba has had visited upon it an exchange of dictators, an exchange of government heads who adopt police state methods. I think the RECORD now amply supports the forewarnings of the senior Senator from Oregon, made during those early days of the Castro regime. One does not have to have very much evidence to judge the character of a man. When it became evident that the new leader of Cuba was one who would give no heed to those principles of morality set forth in the Geneva Convention with respect to providing fair trials, I then knew that no democrat had taken over the administration of Cuba.

There has been more and more recognition of that point of view, Mr. President, in the periodicals and in the press of this country. I have noted a recent column in the Valley Times of Monday, August 17, 1959, George Todt's Opinion, entitled "Castro Kills While United States Keels."

I appreciate very much the references in the column to the early position which I took in regard to the conduct of Mr. Castro. I wish to say that I think this column is one of about four or five Mr. Todt has written in recent weeks bringing attention to the course of action which is being followed in Cuba, a course of action which certainly has not been in the interests of the United States or in the interests of the cause of freedom in Latin America.

Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that George Todt's column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASTRO KILLS WHILE UNITED STATES KEELS

(By George Todt)

"Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." (Genesis 9: 6.)

Will there be another bloodbath in Castro's Cuba?

Is there to be more slaughter of human beings by drumhead courts-martial and trials which reek with lack of elementary justice for the rights of the accused?

Are we to see once more the inhumanity of man to man as expounded by Fidel Castro and his strange band of Reds and near-Reds in the wake of the recent Cuban uprisings?

It will be something in the nature of a miracle if the Caribbean would-be dictator—he even sports the fanatical mysticism of a Hitler albeit he is admittedly of pint-size proportions—doesn't go overboard again where his passions are concerned and provide the world with another modern Roman circus with all its innate cruelty.

It is too bad for that part of humanity which still remains decent in this rapidly decaying world, where morality continues to count for less and less with the passage of time, that the Cuban revolution against Castro didn't succeed. This Communist stooge is playing it right down the middle for the Kremlin and when Nikky Khrushchev visits our man after his American tour of triumph—well, more puerile doubts should become erased from the blank looks of the lunatic fringe who are unable to spot the nose on a Commie face at 10 paces.

What is the matter with us, anyway? We are the most powerful Nation on earth and still we permit punks like Castro to expropriate illegitimately and without payment the property of our nationals—and even entertain the crumbly notion to give him the money from the American taxpayers to pay off other American taxpayers in the future.

Have we lost our marbles? Why doesn't anyone speak out against such outrages?

Are we so afraid of the ants that we have become pacifists in the world jungle we are living in today?

Forbearance to use overwhelming power is to be admired, cowardice is not. Sometimes there is only a very fine line, in appearance, between the two. Let us make sure our Nation is not accused, with reason, of the latter. It could be fatal to our role as leader of the free nations on the world stage at this point of history.

With regards to the pipsqueak, Castro, one U.S. Senator is continuing to look better with the passage of time. And that is Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, Oregon, who was one of the first to raise his voice in public doubt about the controversial figure.

Last January 20, and again on January 27, Senator MORSE arose in the Senate to put the finger on the Castro brand of firing-squad justice then being imposed on the defeated of the fallen regime and their friends. He was the original solon to do so, although others are fast joining the chorus.

We may be sure that more would have done so by now except for their very healthy respect of the incredible—and extremely powerful—coalition of misguided Americans who aided Castro to power.

All of which ought to be properly investigated by the Senate's Internal Security Subcommittee before too much grass grows underfoot.

Be that as it may, we are indebted in large part to the Oregon Senator for turning the spotlight of disapproval and condemnation on Castro's methods of applying justice in Cuba.

"Those of us who rejoiced at the political demise of General Batista have, for the most part, been appalled in turn by the terror turned loose by Castro," he told his Oregon audience in a January 27 radio broadcast. "Within hours after Batista fled the country, the firing squads of the rebels were lining up dozens of members of the police and the army who had been accused of crimes by the local population."

"These men had no trials whatsoever; in less than 3 weeks, Castro's execution squads killed 250 persons in what amounted to a horrible blood bath. When many of us protested against this drumhead justice, we were told, in effect, by the spokesmen for the rebels that everyone in the community knew of the guilt of these men—and so it was perfectly fair that they should be executed at once."

Senator MORSE made it abundantly clear in his earlier speech before the Senate that any military-type trial is simply a mockery of justice unless it guarantees to a prisoner four items: (1) qualified counsel, (2) right to call witnesses, (3) use of an interpreter wherever necessary, and (4) defense counsel to have at least 2 weeks to prepare the case for the accused and be furnished the necessary facilities for this purpose.

This is included, incidentally, in the Geneva Convention under articles 105 and 106.

While it is true that the Cuban rebellion was not a war between nations, and the Geneva Convention did not therefore technically apply, we might say that it reflects the moral law in this case.

But what cares the bearded one for morality, comrades?

Just a reactionary bourgeois expression, Nyet?

So-Called Fair Housing Legislation—The Rhode Island Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the National Economic Council, Inc., with headquarters in New York City, issues at regular intervals its Economic Council Letter. The Economic Council Letter No. 460, dated August 1, 1959, is devoted entirely to so-called fair housing legislation. It gives the facts regarding the Rhode Island story, and the action in Rhode Island regarding this misnamed "fair housing bill." The story is written by Mr. Robert B. Dresser, of Providence, R.I., who is a nationally known lawyer.

The foreword to this Rhode Island story gives the background of the activity in the State of Rhode Island. It is a part of Economic Council Letter No. 460, and I have included it as a part of the insertion.

Under unanimous consent previously granted I insert the entire contents of Economic Council Letter No. 460 herewith as a part of these remarks:

SO-CALLED FAIR HOUSING LEGISLATION—THE RHODE ISLAND STORY

(By Robert B. Dresser)

Early last January leaders of both political parties in the Rhode Island Legislature introduced in both branches a so-called fair housing bill prohibiting discrimination because of race, color, religion or national origin in the sale or rental of housing accommodations or land, or in making loans with respect to such property.

Under the bill an owner is forbidden (1) to make any written or oral inquiry concerning the race, color, religion or national origin of a prospective purchaser or tenant, (2) to refuse to sell or rent his property for any such reason, or (3) to discriminate against an individual on any such ground in the terms of sale or lease. There are similar provisions regarding loans. Enforcement of the act is placed in the hands of the commission against discrimination, which is empowered to act on its own initiative or on complaint of an aggrieved individual or an organization chartered for the purpose of combating discrimination or racism, or of safeguarding civil liberties. Failure to obey a decree of the Court entered to enforce an order the commission is punishable by "fine or imprisonment, or both."

In short, the bill deprives a property owner of the right to enjoy the benefits of property ownership, and the right to choose for himself the persons with whom he associates in connection with his own property—both of them basic rights in any free society.

The bill was sponsored and promoted by an organization called Citizens United for a Fair Housing Law in Rhode Island, of which Irving Jay Fain is the chairman. Members of the organization include the leaders of both political parties, prominent bankers, educators, and many of the clergy of all faiths.

A substantial number of the members have since resigned.

The bill has had the vigorous support of Rhode Island's leading newspaper, the Providence Journal, which has by far the largest circulation of any paper in the State.

During the legislative session editorials supporting the bill were published by the Providence Journal, as well as a considerable number of news articles declaring the need of better housing facilities for Negroes and calling for an end of discrimination in the sale or renting of houses because of race, color, religion or national origin and for the passage of the so-called fair housing bill.

Also, numerous letters were written to the editors of the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin regarding the bill. A majority of them supported the bill, doubtless because the proponents were well organized and had the support of many of the clergy of all faiths.

The movement is nationwide. A bill of this character has been introduced in some 13 or more States. It indicates a trend toward the ultimate abolition of the right of private property, which is the aim of socialism.

While it has been made to appear by the proponents of the measure that the controversy is purely a Negro question, this is not the fact. The bill applies to all races, and they are forbidden to discriminate against one another under penalty of fine or imprisonment.

The opponents of the measure take the position that if any race wishes to live together in a house or community, whether they are English, Irish, Italian, Jewish, Yankee, Negro, or any other race, they should be permitted to do so. They likewise hold that if individuals prefer living in mixed racial households or communities they should be allowed to do so. The rule, they say, should work both ways. It is government compulsion to which they object.

The opponents of the measure say that if a person is to be deprived by Government order of the right to choose his own associates and to have full enjoyment of his own property it is entirely logical to expect that he may eventually be deprived of freedom of speech and other rights which he now enjoys on the plea that the exercise of these rights is against the public interest. They ask, "Where is the line to be drawn?" In their view the issue is much broader than that of housing. It is whether the American people shall have liberty or eventual serfdom imposed by Government dictatorship.

The first opposition to the bill appeared in a letter written by me to the editor of the Providence Journal, which was published on January 11, 1959, from which the following is quoted:

"This, I submit, is an outrageous and unconstitutional interference with the right of private property and personal freedom. These rights, guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, constitute the basic difference between a free society and a socialist or communistic society in which the government dictates and the people obey."

"If a law of this sort can be passed, it is but a short step to extend it to owners who rent rooms or take in boarders. Or does the bill apply to those who rent rooms? (This paragraph was stricken from the letter as published by the Journal.)"

"Is there no longer any respect for the Constitution or for the concept of private property and personal freedom?"

"Have we at last reached a stage in our country's history when a person is no longer allowed to choose his own associates—no longer master of his own house and undisputed owner of his own property?"

"If so, a major step has been taken toward the destruction of the great American experiment in individual liberty."

"The issue is not whether any racial or religious group is superior or inferior to another. The issue is whether a person, regardless of his race or religion, is to be free to exercise certain fundamental rights guaranteed by the Constitution. On this there should be no difference of opinion."

This was followed by a series of articles which I had published as advertisements in the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin, from certain of which I quote as follows:

1. Advertisement dated January 26, 1959, and published February 3 and 8:

"The so-called fair housing bill is based upon the premise that there are many people in Rhode Island who are living under depressed or substandard housing conditions, and that this situation can and should be cured by prohibiting discrimination because of race, color, religion, or national origin in the sale or rental of housing accommodations or land, or the taking of mortgages on such property."

"The only offense committed by the unfortunate owner is the exercise of what has heretofore been regarded as inviolable personal rights, namely (1) the right to choose one's own associates and (2) the right to enjoy the benefits of property ownership."

"If these are not rights protected by the Constitution of the United States, I am certain that it is a very different Constitution from what its authors intended and students of the Constitution have for generations supposed. It is not surprising that in the words of the Providence Journal, 'No other State in the Union has such a law.'"

"And let there be no mistake, if this breach in the wall of constitutional protection is permitted, it will be only a beginning. It would be but a short step to extend the law to owners who rent rooms in their own homes or take in boarders. The history of legislation of this character is that it seldom ends with the original act. This is but a beginning."

"The restrictions upon the use of private property cited by the proponents of the bill, such as zoning legislation and the forbidding of nuisances, are obviously of a very different character."

"Who would have thought that in this land of much-vaunted freedom serious consideration would ever be given to a proposal to deprive a person of the right to sell or rent his house, or an apartment in his house, to a respectable, law-abiding citizen of his own choice, and to put him in jail if he did so? And yet this is precisely what this bill does."

"I wonder if all those who have endorsed the bill have fully understood its provisions and its possible consequences. Have they by any chance felt that they were not in a position, or not likely to be in a position, where the law would affect them?"

2. Advertisement dated February 23, 1959, and published February 25 and 26:

"Efforts are still being made to confuse the real issue involved in the controversy over the so-called fair housing bill."

"In an editorial published in the Providence Sunday Journal for February 22 under the heading 'Lippitt Hill Challenges Opponents of the Housing Bill,' it is stated that 'finding housing for 450 Negro families displaced by the Lippitt Hill redevelopment project will not be an easy job.'"

"After observing that it is unlikely that the fair housing bill will be passed in time

to meet the emergency, the editorial continues: 'This fact provides an excellent opportunity for opponents of the bill to prove by their own action their thesis that the Negro housing problem can be licked without a law.'

"What an amazing statement.

"The great mass of opponents of the bill are people of modest means—the owners and occupants of small homes, many of them two and three family houses. A goodly portion of these people have invested their life savings in these houses, and are dependent upon the rents for their support. These are the people who the Journal says must provide the housing for the displaced Negroes, and not the supporters of the bill whose names appear in the literature of the Citizens United for a Fair Housing Law as the members or supporters of that organization. These include some of our leading citizens—persons of substantial means with large single homes, who no doubt feel certain that the bill will not affect them. I wonder how many of them have read the bill.

"I wonder too if they were not induced to join the organization by its appealing title 'Citizens United for a Fair Housing Law,' without realizing what they were getting into. Who could be so depraved as not to be in favor of fair housing? It is, of course, always open to a person to resign from such an organization if he feels he has made a mistake.

"It is about time that this bill be called by its right name 'A bill to destroy individual liberty and create disunity in the United States of America.'

"As I have again and again pointed out, the issue is not whether relief should be afforded the unfortunate people who need it. Of course it should be provided—but by the usual government and charitable channels, and not by the people who own houses.

"The issue, and the only issue, is whether the individual should be deprived of rights which are essential to his freedom, the loss of which would constitute a major step toward the establishment of a full Socialist state.

"If an owner, regardless of his wishes, must under penalty of fine and imprisonment accept as a purchaser or tenant a person he does not want, how can it be said that such a person is free? This is the one and only issue, and people should not be misled by all the propaganda to the contrary."

3. Advertisement dated March 17, 1959, and published March 22:

"Letters to the editor continue to be published urging the passage of the so-called Fair Housing bill and denouncing its opponents. These letters persist in ignoring the real issue, which is the right of private property and individual freedom. They continue to harp on the plight of the Negroes and the need of providing better housing conditions for them, which is not the issue at all. They further insist on integration in housing which means forcing people to live together whether they want to or not. If people wish to live together, they should be permitted to do so, but they should not be forced to do so against their will.

"The same old line that human rights are more sacred than property rights is continually stressed, although a moment's thought would reveal the utter absurdity of such a distinction.

"The Housing bill strikes at the right of private property which is the keystone of our economic system of private enterprise and of our system of constitutional government. Destroy that right and we descend to the degradation and despair of the despotic Socialist state.

"Don't think that this is just a figment of my imagination. A very competent judge of such matters in our Nation's Capital, com-

menting upon the Rhode Island bill, recently wrote as follows:

"I had heard that similar legislation was pending in several of the States. It is, of course, completely destructive of the right of property and is a form of nationalization of private property.

"This assault upon the right of property in this country has prevailed in some areas and I predict that it will be quickly followed by other efforts which can but eventuate in a nationalization of property and a dictatorship akin to that which prevails in Soviet Russia."

"The issue involved in the present controversy is far greater than the impact of this legislation upon the people of Rhode Island. As a countrywide movement it constitutes a serious threat to our entire economic system and our system of constitutional government under which the United States has become the richest and most prosperous country in the world with the widest distribution of wealth among its people that the world has ever known.

"Are we going to scrap this system or preserve it? Those who believe it should be preserved will oppose the housing bill, in any form whatsoever, no matter how 'watered down' it may be.

"It is unthinkable that any legislature composed of conscientious, patriotic Americans would ever pass the housing bill, whether in its present form or any other form. Even though 'watered down,' it would constitute but a beginning and the pressure would be continually renewed in the future to extend it to the utmost limits."

4. Advertisement dated April 2, 1959, and published April 5:

"An article in the Providence Sunday Journal for March 15 states:

"Rhode Island, which is considering fair housing legislation, is only 1 of 13 States in which similar legislation is pending."

"And the States are named.

"It is significant that in Colorado and Massachusetts, two States in which legislative action has been taken, there was little or no opposition. The reason undoubtedly was that the real purpose and effect of the measure were not understood and that the legislation was slipped through without the people or the members of the legislature being aware of its true character. There is grave danger that this will happen in other States."

5. Advertisement dated April 27, 1959, and published April 29 and May 3:

"MASSACHUSETTS BILL"

"In articles published in the Providence Evening Bulletin on April 23 and 24, the story is told of how the bill was passed by the Massachusetts Legislature on a voice vote without debate, with no recorded opposition and with little or no public opposition. The strategy used by the proponents, the Massachusetts Committee for Fair Housing Practices Legislation, was similar to that used by its counterpart in Rhode Island. The passage of the bill in Massachusetts is hailed by the proponents of the Rhode Island bill as a great victory and as establishing a precedent that should be followed here.

"Of course, the bill passed, and the reason was that the Massachusetts public did not understand its real nature and its consequences. Had they understood, the bill never would have been enacted.

"The Bulletin articles commend the clever way in which the matter was handled by the proponents. Credit for the success is attributed in large measure to the quiet gradualist approach. By 'quiet' is meant, I suppose, that as little publicity as possible was given to the matter. By 'gradualist approach' is meant the acceptance of a less drastic bill than desired as a beginning with the expectation of more later. As I have

pointed out in earlier articles, this is the usual course of legislation of this sort—a small beginning with further expansion from time to time until the ultimate objective is fully achieved. Such legislation must be stopped at the beginning. It must not be accepted in any form, however harmless it may appear.

"All that is required to prevent the enactment of such legislation is for the people to understand its nature and effect. What has happened in Massachusetts and earlier in Colorado could not, I am convinced, happen here, for the reason that the public of this State are aware of the evil nature and consequences of the proposed legislation and are overwhelmingly opposed to its passage in any form.

"Incidentally, it should be noted that similar legislation failed to pass in New York this year.

"INTEGRATION IN HOUSING"

"The proponents' continued insistence on forced integration in housing displays a callous disregard for individual freedom. To force people to live together against their wishes is a gross violation of a basic right without which a person cannot be said to be free.

"LOSS OF FREEDOM"

"For some years we have seen the rights of the individual in this country being steadily whittled away and the powers of government increased. And now we have this major assault on the right of private property. Unless this trend is promptly checked, the inevitable outcome will be the abolition of the right of private property, loss of the people's liberty and the establishment of a fully socialized state with its autocratic government.

"What an end this would be to the greatest experiment in individual liberty ever tried by man.

"Seven and a half centuries ago, the barons at Runnymede wrung from King John the Magna Carta, regarded as the beginning of individual liberty among the English-speaking people. During the centuries following, a continual struggle was waged to free the individual from the domination of the state and make the people, not the government, the master.

"Our Declaration of Independence was a demand for less governmental interference in the lives of the citizens, and the Revolutionary War was fought for the purpose of enforcing this demand.

"But now in the last several decades we have witnessed the amazing and distressing spectacle of a trend back toward autocratic government advocated and promoted by persons who call themselves liberals and who denounce their opponents as reactionaries. Had anyone prior to this recent period suggested that King John was a liberal and that the barons at Runnymede and those who have since carried on the struggle to limit the power of the state were reactionaries, he would have been regarded as a fit subject for an insane asylum. How easily are the people fooled by mere titles.

"Socialism has never worked. It will ruin any nation that adopts it.

"Freedom, the antithesis of socialism, has been well defined as 'the right of the individual to work out his destiny, with whatever capacities he possesses, without interference from government beyond that necessary to prevent him from interfering with the freedom of others.' ('The Freeman,' September 1954.)

"Americans will not vote themselves out of freedom with their eyes open. But with their eyes half open they can be fooled and bit by bit the right of private ownership can be pulled gently away from them." (Dr. George S. Benson, president of Harding College.)

"This must not be allowed to happen here."

6. Advertisement dated May 7, 1959, and published May 10:

"NATURE OF OPPOSITION"

"There appears to be a misunderstanding on the part of some of our citizens as to the nature of the opposition to the so-called fair housing bill. It is not in any sense a matter of emotion that will disappear with the passage of time.

"The opposition is based upon a firm conviction that the real issue is the preservation of individual liberty. This was the issue that prompted the Declaration of Independence. It was the cause for which the Revolutionary War was fought.

"That people should be indignant at an assault upon their freedom should cause no surprise. A burglar who tries to break into a house will be resisted by any red-blooded owner with all the power at his command. Further attempts will be met with like resistance. It is not a matter of emotion, but a matter of self-defense.

"MISLEADING TITLE OF HOUSING BILL"

"In these days when there are so many important and complicated issues before the country, it is understandable that persons, misled by the appealing title of a proposal, such as 'fair housing,' should endorse it without a full examination of its terms. It is to be hoped, however, that all such persons, when they have become fully aware of the facts, will withdraw their endorsement, as many have already done.

"PROPERTY RIGHTS VERSUS HUMAN RIGHTS"

"The proponents of the housing bill still continue to declare that human rights are more sacred than property rights, despite the absurdity of the distinction. Property itself has neither rights nor value, save only as human interests are involved. There are no rights but human rights, and what are spoken of as property rights are only the human rights of individuals to property.

"The ownership of property is the right for which, above all others, the common man has struggled in his slow ascent from serfdom.

"A man without property rights—without the right to the product of his own labor—is not a free man. He can exist only through the generosity or forbearance of others." (Essay by Paul L. Polrot, of the Foundation for Economic Education.)

"PERMANENT ORGANIZATION"

"Many have expressed a desire to form a permanent organization to safeguard individual liberty and to oppose the passage of legislation designed to destroy or restrict that liberty. The housing bill in its present or any other form is a measure of this character.

"Such an organization should be formed. It would, I am confident, attract the support of thousands of our citizens who would on all occasions and without regard to political affiliations make the preservation of individual liberty paramount to all other issues.

"It is my intention to submit for consideration a plan for such an organization."

During the legislative session a petition opposing passage of the so-called fair housing bill in any form whatsoever was circulated, and coupons were attached to newspaper advertisements expressing the individual's opposition to the bill and his desire to join in the petition against it. By means of the petitions and coupons over 5,400 signatures were secured. Mimeographed copies of the petition with the signatures obtained from time to time were sent to the Governor of the State, to the members of the general assembly, and to certain other individuals. In all, seven batches of signatures were mailed to this list.

Also, an excellent pamphlet containing a list of questions and answers on the so-called fair housing bill was prepared for the Rhode Island State Association of Real Estate Boards and the Home Builders Association of Rhode Island by John V. Kean, a law partner of mine. This was published as an advertisement during March, and was also widely distributed.

On May 26, 1959, the general assembly ended its session without the bill being reported out of either the senate or house committee to which it had been referred.

The proponents, however, have publicly stated that they "are more determined than ever" to push for its passage next year.

During the legislative session the proponents were given two hearings before the house judiciary committee.

The opponents were given a hearing before that committee on February 20. It was an evening hearing, held in the house chamber, and was attended by more than 500 persons, the largest number ever to attend a legislative committee hearing in the State of Rhode Island. Twenty persons spoke against the measure.

On February 10 the Pawtucket Real Estate Board voted 26 to 2 to oppose the bill. Frank A. Martin, Jr., the president, and Charles H. Lawton, Jr., a prominent member, with a number of other associates, became greatly interested, and with John V. Kean played a prominent part in defeating the legislation. One of the highlights of the campaign was a mass meeting at the Tolman High School in Pawtucket on the evening of March 25, arranged by them, which was attended by about 500 persons.

Throughout the controversy very effective work against the bill was done by Edwin T. Scallion, of Providence.

The proponents of this legislation are well organized, apparently well financed, and determined to secure the enactment of this legislation throughout the country.

An organization called National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing, located at 35 West 32d Street, New York City, appears to be taking a leading part in the movement.

The following is quoted from a letter sent out by that organization under date of May 26, 1959, signed by Eleanor Roosevelt and Jackie Robinson:

"DEAR FRIEND: Have you heard the good news? Colorado, Massachusetts, Oregon, and Connecticut have just joined New York City and Pittsburgh in passing State laws barring discrimination in private housing. Ten years ago even the most starry-eyed would not have predicted this.

"Today communities across the Nation are stirring, neighbors are organizing, articles are appearing in national magazines. There is a coast to coast movement to break down the barriers.

"The National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing has for 10 years played a key roll in alerting, educating, informing, and stimulating communities over the Nation to combat residential segregation.

"We believe the NCHD program is basic to the whole civil rights challenge."

On the reverse side of this letter appears the following list of the committee's member organizations:

"Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL-CIO; American Civil Liberties Union; American Council on Human Rights; American Ethical Union; American Friends Service Committee; American Jewish Committee; American Jewish Congress; American Newspaper Guild, AFL-CIO; American Veterans Committee; Americans for Democratic Action; Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith; Congregational Christian Churches, Council of Social Action and Race Relations Department, Board of Home Missions; Cooperative League of the USA;

Friendship House; International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, AFL-CIO; International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, AFL-CIO; Jewish Labor Committee; League for Industrial Democracy; The Methodist Church, Woman's Division of Christian Service; Migration Division, Puerto Rican Department of Labor; National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; National Association of Intergroup Relations Officials; National Council of Negro Women; National Council of Churches of Christ, Race Relations Department; National Urban League; Presbyterian Church, USA, Department of Social Education and Action; United Auto Workers of America, AFL-CIO; United Steel Workers of America, AFL-CIO.

This legislation is also supported by the National Lawyers Guild, as appears from the spring 1958 edition of its publication, the Lawyers Guild Review, "Special Issue on Integration in Housing."

An organization called the Committee for Individual Liberty has just been formed in Rhode Island, having as its initial objective "to prevent the passage of any measure prohibiting discrimination because of race, color, religion, or national origin in the sale or renting of housing accommodations or land, or in making loans with respect to such property."

The issue is one of the most important before the country today. It involves no less than the preservation of individual liberty.

This legislation can be defeated if a sufficient effort to inform and arouse the people is promptly made. Otherwise, its passage is inevitable.

Certainly there must be enough people in the various States to provide the leadership and organization necessary to check this movement.

A Report to President Dwight D. Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, in a speech delivered earlier this year I talked about the importation of Japanese stainless flatware and the destructive effect of unfair competition on American industry and American jobs.

Recently, the flatware producers of America addressed an open report to the President.

If any Member of Congress doubted my figures or questioned my conclusions, I would suggest reading the attached statement by these American industrial representatives:

A REPORT TO PRESIDENT DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

On January 10, 1958, the U.S. Tariff Commission was unanimous in finding serious injury had been caused the domestic flatware industry, by imports of stainless steel flatware and made certain recommendations for relief.

On March 7, 1958, you wrote the Tariff Commission stating you thought it inadvisable to take action on the Commission's recommendations at that time. You further stated:

"I request the Commission, however, to keep this matter under review and to report to me as soon as practicable after December

31 with particular reference to the experience of the domestic industry in 1958 during which the Japanese limitations on exports to the United States will have been in effect."

Tariff Commission report of July 1959 proves:

1. The Japanese 1958 voluntary quota was a failure: Quota, 5,500,000 dozens; receipts, 8,760,874 dozens.

2. Japanese stainless flatware took a greater share of U.S. market in 1958 than in 1956.

3. The domestic industry's position deteriorated still further between 1956 and 1958.

We first formally asked the U.S. Government for relief from the serious injury caused by excessive imports of stainless steel flatware on July 18, 1956. It is now August 10, 1959. Three years have passed during which time the U.S. Government has failed to take any action to remedy this serious injury. Instead the injury has increased year after year. An expensive, disillusioning, and disheartening experience for this U.S. industry and its employees.

The Japanese poured 2,739,442 more dozen of stainless steel flatware into the United States in 1957 than they did in 1956, reaching the fantastic total of 10,200,000 dozens in 1 year.

The bulk of the extra 2,739,442 dozen was shipped after the escape clause hearing on July 16, 1957 and during the time the Japanese Government was negotiating a voluntary quota for 1958.

The Tariff Commission, on January 10, 1958, basing its decision on the record through 1956 when Japanese imports totaled 7,460,558 dozen, was unanimous in finding the domestic industry seriously injured by imports of stainless steel flatware.

At the Tariff Commission second hearing April 21, 1959, citing the drop in receipts of

Japanese stainless flatware in 1958 from 1957, the Japanese claimed the "voluntary restraint was and continues to be effective."

This in spite of:

1. The deliberate buildup of shipments in 1957.

2. The fact that receipts in 1958 were 1,300,316 dozen in excess of 1956 imports on which the Tariff Commission declared the U.S. industry to be seriously injured.

3. The fact that receipts in 1958 were 3,260,874 dozen in excess of the 5,500,000 dozen quota which they themselves proposed.

Mr. President, on January 10, 1958, the U.S. Tariff Commission unanimously found the U.S. flatware industry to be seriously injured by imports. This decision was based on the record through 1956. In July 1959 the Tariff Commission stated:

"The most important factor tending to increase losses and reduce profits from (U.S.) stainless steel table flatware production in 1957 and 1958 was competition from imported Japanese flatware."

We believe there is no justification for prolonging further the well-established injury to the U.S. flatware industry. We believe the facts prove this industry is justly and legally entitled to immediate and effective relief. We ask you to provide such relief in the only form it can be truly effective, by proclaiming a global quota of 4 million dozen annually on all imports of stainless flatware having a foreign value up to and including \$3.50 per dozen.

Very respectfully,

U.S. STAINLESS STEEL FLATWARE
MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION.

The following table tells a graphic story of the disaster that must obtain to an American union if this impracticable and utterly simple misconception of reciprocal trade continues:

Stainless steel and silver plated flatware serve the same market—U.S. consumers buy one or the other—Japanese stainless steel flatware rapidly absorbing total U.S. market

	Total U.S. consumption, stainless steel flatware	Percent Japanese of total U.S. stainless consumption	Percent Japanese to U.S. manufacturers' sales	Total U.S. consumption, stainless steel and silver-plated flatware	Percent Japanese of total U.S. stainless and plated flatware consumption
	Dozens	Percent	Percent	Dozens	Percent
1951	11,625,000	3.3	3.3	27,389,000	1.4
1952	9,474,000	2.9	2.9	21,208,000	1.2
1953	11,553,000	6.5	7.0	24,820,000	3.1
1954	12,650,000	9.1	10.2	24,334,000	4.5
1955	18,081,000	17.3	21.4	29,027,000	10.7
1956	22,309,000	33.4	51.8	31,856,000	23.4
1957	23,725,000	43.0	77.2	30,473,000	33.5
1958	22,775,000	38.5	58.8	29,253,000	30.0

Japanese stainless flatware took an even greater share of U.S. market in 1958 than in 1956. Japanese 1958 percent of total U.S. stainless consumption was 5.1 percent more than in 1956. Japanese 1958 percent to U.S. manufacturers stainless sales was 7 percent more than in 1956. Japanese 1958 percent of total U.S. stainless and plated flatware consumption was 6.6 percent more than in 1956. The situation in stainless flatware is not unique nor isolated. This is becoming the "story of our tradition and life" in this country.

Very respectfully,
U.S. STAINLESS STEEL FLATWARE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION.

Medical Societies Versus Polio Vaccine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, in the Drew Pearson column, was an account of a very serious situation

which has developed with respect to the dissemination of Salk vaccine. It will be recalled when the Salk vaccine, the wonderful discovery of Dr. Salk, was first made available to the American people, the senior Senator from Oregon proposed on the floor of the Senate that we set up a Government program of distributing it and making it available, in the interests of the general health of the American people, under a Government distribution system. The Senator from Oregon was roundly criticized because he was seeking to interfere with the rights of the private practice of medicine.

The Senator from Oregon said then, Mr. President, that the public interest was so great that the medical profession should be told, and told very clearly, the public interest should come ahead of the financial interests of the medical profession. I predicted then, Mr. President, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show, that we would have difficulties with regard to this program, unless a course of action such as I proposed at that time was followed.

I read Mr. Pearson's column with a great deal of interest, Mr. President, because it bears out a good many of the things which I forewarned of at the time. I ask unanimous consent that the portion of Mr. Pearson's column dealing with the Salk vaccine problem be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDICAL SOCIETIES VERSUS POLIO VACCINE

(By Drew Pearson)

The American public isn't being told the whole story about the shocking rise of polio which caught the Nation with a Salk vaccine shortage in many areas.

Officially the U.S. Public Health Service explains the situation by saying that community inoculation drives, spurred by the rising incidence of polio, have drained off vaccine supplies.

However, what the people aren't being told is that the alarming increase of the crippling disease, plus the vaccine shortage, might have been avoided, or at least lessened, if many local medical societies had not blocked mass Salk vaccine immunization.

One of the worst outbreaks of polio this year occurred in Des Moines, Iowa, where 2 years ago the Iowa State Medical Society went on record against mass immunization without (doctor) fees for administration.

In other words, the Iowa Medical Society wanted Iowans to go to the office of each individual doctor and pay a \$4 or \$5 fee for each Salk vaccine shot, rather than have the shots administered on a mass, cut-rate basis by nurses under the supervision of a doctor.

It is a well-known fact that many people, especially lower-bracket families, will not go to a doctor's office to be inoculated against polio or any other disease.

A similar situation occurred in Washington, D.C., in 1957, when the District of Columbia Medical Society balked at supplying

medical supervision for the antipolio inoculation of 1,600 Capitol employees. They claimed it was socialized medicine. The Navy Department finally had to provide an attending physician.

Dr. Leroy Burney, Director of the U.S. Public Health Service, when interviewed last week on NBC, did not reveal that the opposition of medical groups to mass Salk vaccine immunization—so-called socialized medicine—was the chief reason for the current polio epidemic. And NBC did not press him. In fact, commentator Morgan Beatty stated that Salk vaccine shots have been free—which was anything but the case in most cities until the present emergency.

However, public health doctors working under Burney are less discreet. They are emphatic that had the medical societies of all States cooperated in mass inoculation programs, instead of crying about "socialized medicine," there would be no polio epidemic today. Also, with planned mass inoculations, the supply of Salk vaccine would be more closely stabilized to demand, since manufacturers can then gauge the market.

(NOTE.—Not all doctors oppose mass vaccinations. In some States, notably North Carolina, local medical groups enthusiastically endorsed the idea.)

Pittsburgh Press Favors Kennedy-Ervin Bill Provisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

NO MAN'S LAND

Practically everyone, including the AFL-CIO, seems to agree that Congress has to do something about the no-man's land of labor relations. Several plans have been suggested. The one most likely to work is in the Kennedy-Ervin bill, passed by the Senate.

There are literally thousands of labor disputes which the National Labor Relations Board declines to handle because they are too small or have too small an effect upon interstate commerce. The States are forbidden to intervene under a Supreme Court decision. This leaves both employees and employers without orderly, legal recourse in case of differences. It encourages strikes and protects racketeers.

The House committee bill would meet this situation by adding two members to its regional directors and requiring it to handle all cases over which it has jurisdiction. Provisions of the Shelley bill, which was rejected by the House yesterday, were similar.

While this might be an improvement, it has two main flaws: (1) It would enlarge an already unwieldy Federal bureaucracy, and (2) there would be question of its jurisdiction over cases obviously not involving interstate commerce.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill and the Landrum-Griffin bill are a lot alike, differing in one important respect. The Landrum-Griffin bill would permit State agencies to handle all cases refused by the NLRB, under State laws and with appeal to State courts. The Kennedy-Ervin bill would require the State agencies to operate under Federal labor law, with appeal through the Federal courts.

Either system could be made to work. The Kennedy-Ervin plan seems preferable because it would establish a uniform system for

handling all disputes. Under the Landrum-Griffin plan there would be two sets of regulations in each locality, possibly leading to confusion and a sense of injustice. It would mean, in effect, one set of laws for the big companies and another set for the little ones.

Indians Angered by Prime Minister Nehru's Appeasement of Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story written in India by the correspondent of the Manchester Guardian. Many in India apparently are learning the hard way what it took so long for others also to learn; namely, that attempts to please or appease Communists leads to more trouble with them, not less.

The article follows:

INDIANS WEARY OF NEHRU'S WISDOM, ANGERED BY APPEASEMENT OF CHINA

(By Taya Zinkin)

BOMBAY.—For the first time since 1937, when Jawaharlal Nehru became India's expert on foreign affairs, Indian opinion has affirmed itself instead of waiting to hear what Nehru wants India to do. It is not a case of the chick teaching its mother to suck eggs but a measure of the extent to which Indians are fed up with China and weary of Nehru's wisdom.

The issue are twofold: the admission of China to the United Nations and India's policy toward China on the one hand, and developments in Laos on the other.

On Laos the Times of India is categorical. "Mediation is no more to the point than in Tibet," it says, going on to prove that the Pathet Lao crisis is entirely China's and North Vietnam's making and that there is "nothing to justify exaggerated references to Laos as an American base."

The paper concludes by warning the Indian Government, which is keen to negotiate and resuscitate the International Control Commission, that "a commission of sorts might have its uses in certain conditions, but as things are it is surely advisable to avoid any course that imparts even by implication a definite status to the Pathet Lao insurrectionaries."

Distaste for China has gone deep. The Indian Express, in a leading article on India and China, launches a direct attack on Nehru's foreign policy over the years and accuses him of making India the laughing-stock of the world by meekly turning a new cheek to every Chinese slap. It says:

"The Prime Minister confessed in Parliament that China has dealt most perfunctorily with our protests against Peiping's treatment of our nationals in Tibet. What else did we expect after our humble gestures in the tradition of appeasement which Mr. Nehru so roundly condemned two decades ago."

The Times of India lists step by step India's appeasement of China over Tibet, from the recognition of suzerainty and preventing United Nations discussion by an assurance of the restoration of peace, to believing the assurance from Chou En-lai about Tibetan autonomy. It adds:

"Experience, they say, is the name men give to their mistakes, but experience seems

to have taught our rulers nothing. Now, with Indian currency declared illegal in Tibet, with Indians being bundled out of the country and Indian traders harassed, New Delhi has thought fit to sponsor Peiping's admission to the United Nations. Why? Is there no limit to the humiliations, we are prepared to accept at China's hands?"

In the Hindustan Times the news that the Chinese want to liberate Sikkim is prominently displayed. The paper's special correspondent states that, according to reports reaching Delhi, the Chinese have begun a propaganda war for the absorption of Sikkim, Bhutan, and Ladakh, and that Chinese troops have been massed along the border of Sikkim and Bhutan, which are both Indian protectorates.

The correspondent does not say that Delhi has been trying to suppress the news that the Chinese have built a road in Ladakh and occupied a chunk of Ladakhi territory.

Dancey in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the 28th, 29th, and 30th—the last—of a series of articles by Editor Charles L. Dancey on his 30-day tour of the Soviet Union appearing in the August 16, 17, and 18 issues of the Peoria Journal Star, respectively:

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Aug. 16, 1959]

DRUNKS FOUL STREETS TAMERLANE RODE IN GLORY

(By Charles L. Dancey)

SAMARKAND.—At Samarkand, my Tartar guide, Udol, showed me besides the Moslem shrine and the tomb of Tamerlane, all that is left of the ancient observatory of one Uleg Bek.

Uleg Bek, at this place, charted the stars in the sky, cataloging accurately more of them than Isaac Newton of western fame cataloged when he launched modern science—and Uleg Bek lived 500 years before Newton.

Udol said that legend tells us that the Moslem priests murdered Uleg Bek, chopped off his head, and tore down his observatory—all but the great underground arched sextant that he used. This they simply buried.

It has been dug out again—and the arch of this sextant is 150 feet long, carefully notched and marked with accurate figures, with a double track in the stone for carrying the instrument along its curved length.

In charting the courses of earth and sun, Uleg Bek calculated the actual length of the solar year to within 1 minute of the exact length only accurately figured in recent years.

When the great tombs hereby were exhumed a few years back (the same time Tamerlane was taken out and restored), the tomb of Uleg Bek was opened. Sure enough, the skeleton revealed a sharply cleaved neck bone—the skull was beside the body instead of at its top—and the body was clad in silk, not linen wrappings, in short—he was not only murdered but buried as an unbeliever, not as a Moslem.

The Soviets, of course, are interested in making a hero of him, and of attacking the

Moslem religion as in conflict with science and as brutally stamping out true knowledge.

Only now is an archeological effort beginning here, plus the rebuilding of some of these buildings apparently as tourist attractions eventually—and antireligious propaganda opportunities.

These efforts a few weeks hence turned up ancient ivory chessmen dating back to 500 years before Christ but the Soviets were really excited over one glass chess knight of the same vintage because this indicates that at that ancient date not only rich nobles played chess, but also there were cheap chess sets.

What of modern Samarkand?

Like Tashkent only more so. A small modern area, with a rather nice park, no nice buildings—a miserable, dirty, fly-infested hotel (a plywood public toilet was all that was available in filthy condition with torn-up newspapers as the only towels or tissue provided).

The rest—the same endless mud huts crawling with people. Many, many people here wear either Uzbek national dress or Moslem white headpieces.

I saw a great many crippled men, arms or legs cut off, four men so drunk they were lying helplessly on the sidewalk mumbling, others staggering about, and several beggars.

Here were fewer police than anywhere.

But the Tartar guide, Udol, was good-looking, clean, young, smart and eager for knowledge, like most of the young folks I met.

People with his drive and desire could work great changes in the years ahead—but I wonder how many like him there are in this miserable place.

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Aug. 17, 1959]

WEATHER IN MOSCOW SEEN AS COVERUP (By Charles L. Dancy)

Moscow.—The flight from Tashkent to Moscow took 8 hours even in the TU-104 jetliner, but they went hundreds and hundreds of miles out of the way to land at Sverdlovsk in the Ural Mountains.

There's something peculiar about that. We landed and a woman boarded the plane, came to me and escorted me out while everyone else waited. I was told the stop would take 40 minutes.

My occupation there was a good deal different than Vice President Nixon's recently. I was taken into the airport, through the lobby, up a stairs, through two sets of doors, through another door that had to be unlocked, and advised that I should wait there, "it would be cooler."

There was an iron grille design on a sort of inside window where I could sit and watch the activities in the lobby, which I did for 40 minutes. Then the lady returned, led me back through the empty rooms, down the steps, through the lobby and back aboard the plane. The rest of the passengers then boarded. It was exactly the same group as before.

And off we went to Moscow.

Landing at Moscow, a little girl aboard, about 2 years old, began to cry and hold her ears. They fussed around for a while, and she kept crying and holding her ears. Finally, I went up and gave her a piece of gum and told her to chew with big bites.

She chewed with wide, wet eyes fixed on me, quit crying, and everybody relaxed. When we had landed, this curly-haired tot walked off waving a tiny hand and saying, "Dos v dahnne" (goodbye).

Everyone smiled and nodded.

At the Ukraine hotel in Moscow, I ran into Mr. Peoples whom I had last seen at Sochi. I asked if he had made it to Tashkent, as he had also planned. He said he had.

In the ensuing conversation, he remarked on the way back to Moscow on the jet from

Tashkent, they had word of "weather" in Moscow, and detoured to make a 40 minute stop at Sverdlovsk.

This was about a week before we had the same kind of weather for exactly the same amount of time on my trip.

Only 2 days remained before my visa would expire, and checking in at this last stop I am finally completely stripped of my trip documents. They have taken my passport, the last of my papers relating to the paid contract for meals and hotel space, and even my foreign plane tickets home.

Actually, except for my tickets on the U.S. airline, they've done this every place, but by this time one becomes a bit fed up with the repeated propaganda themes plus this bland way of stripping you of your credentials, any evidence of your status, and even your means of assuring transportation back to the United States.

After almost a month here, it doesn't worry me but it annoys me—and it is a practice that sets many tourists on their ear completely.

It just caused me to be a little nasty to the poor little girl who was my guide in Moscow.

For example: She took me inside the Kremlin walls, through the fantastic museum there, and the great cathedrals.

In the cathedrals with their rich and costly icons, she gave me the tired old standard pitch about how silly, wasteful, and worse it was to spend the people's money on this fancy stuff.

When we left there and got on the subway, she proudly showed me the marble subway or Metro station with its mosaic pictures over the long row of arched openings to the cars—and asked me what I thought of it. These all showed Communist themes.

"I think you people still like icons," I said.

It was not a popular remark.

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Aug. 18, 1959]

SOVIETS CAN TEACH LESSONS IN WASTE (By Charles L. Dancy)

Moscow.—My harassed Moscow guide took me to the big Soviet trade exhibit where thousands of people poured through to see the wonders that are someday to be theirs in the workers paradise.

My disposition was still not as good as it had been through most of the trip, and when the guide pointed out to me the wonders of synthetic materials in one exhibit—the new wash and wear—I agreed with her that this was wonderful stuff and remarked that both the slacks and shirt I was wearing were made of such material.

It didn't help that this exhibition was in the outskirts of the city and our car didn't arrive for 4 hours from when I was scheduled. We called the Intourist office and all they could do was insist that it had left on time. After a few hours they might have suspected something had gone wrong, but there is no two-way shortwave radio system in the Intourist or any other taxi setup in Moscow.

We took the Metro finally.

Again, another fantastically ornate station. Now the Metro is a remarkable achievement with tremendous 150-foot-long escalators sliding underground at a steep angle and great speed. The trains run like clockwork with great efficiency. However, the stations are ornate to the point of the ridiculous.

Like their river canals, like the Black Sea resorts, like the sanitariums, they put out a great deal of material, time, and skill into making monuments out of these useful projects. The piles of statuary, and other ornate decorations lauding the regime for these great accomplishments are especially irksome when one sees that there is so much

that needs to be done for these people—and ought to come before fancy decorations.

So, when my guide asked if we have anything like this in the United States I said that if any government built anything this ornate there would be a scandal and they'd be drummed out of office for wasting the people's money on show.

(I forgot about the new Senate Office Building.)

I got a surprise. Instead of being insulted again, she replied: "Khrushchev is ending the waste in building. There will be no more 'sky-buildings' for example. Too much is wasted on fancy construction."

(Moscow University, and the Ukraine hotel where I stayed, are two of Moscow's six sky-buildings.)

This last evening in Russia, I took a stroll in the hotel area, and a young man with horn-rimmed glasses fell in step.

"You're an American," he said.

"Yes."

"I can always tell. European coats have no split in the bottom at all. The English have two. The American ones split in the middle."

Then he tried to persuade me to sell him American dollars offering me 20 rubles for the dollar.

When I turned this down, he asked if I had any extra clothes to sell.

When I said "No," he asked if I had any books in English to sell.

Then, he suggested again the dollar-ruble deal saying I could buy fine old silver with the rubles and sell it at good prices in the United States.

I asked him what use he could make of dollars in this country.

He said: "I've a friend who's leaving the country."

Me, too.

Red China Unfit for Membership in United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star of August 19, 1959. It is the best brief statement I have seen of the reasons why Red China must be kept out of the United Nations because of its own lawless behavior:

UNFIT FOR MEMBERSHIP

By a vote of 368 to 2, the House has once again placed itself on record as opposed to Red China's admission to the United Nations. In and of itself, this carries no legal weight internationally, but it does reaffirm with great and significant vigor a sentiment which Congress as a whole has repeatedly expressed in the past. And it is a sentiment shared by both the executive branch of our Government and the overwhelming majority of the American people—a fact that cannot be shrugged off elsewhere in the world, on either side of the Iron Curtain.

The reasons for the House action are not hard to find. They are as obvious as they are compelling. To begin with, as our State Department has made clear on numerous occasions, the Communist regime in Peking has yet to meet the primary qualifications for U.N. membership—namely, that the applicant must be peace loving. The Chinese Reds simply do not measure up on that

basis. On the contrary—wholly apart from their unpurged crime of aggression in Korea and their continuing threatfulness in the Formosa area—their recent brutalities in Tibet and their current pressures on Laos leave no room for doubt that they are still bent upon becoming masters of all Asia through a policy of subversion and naked armed force.

In such circumstances, the United States cannot possibly acquiesce in having Communist China become a U.N. member unless or until the Peiping Government changes markedly for the better—a prospect that seems remote in the extreme right now. Accordingly, when the General Assembly convenes in New York next month, and when the issue is revived again by broad-mission countries like India, our American representatives will have to do everything they can—including possibly even a resort to the veto—to prevent favorable action. This is the more true because such action, almost as much as if America were to extend diplomatic recognition to the Chinese Reds, would have a profoundly demoralizing psychological effect throughout Asia.

This is indisputable. For any such recognition would so enhance Peiping's prestige that the Chiang Nationalist Government on Formosa would suffer a mortal blow, and nearly all the free nations on Red China's perimeter would experience a terrible new sense of abandonment and desperation. More than that, the so-called oversea Chinese in the affected area would feel impelled to shift their allegiance to Mao. These are basic realities. They explain why it is imperative for our Government to act in keeping with the resolution just enacted by the House.

Jefferson Through the Fog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following letter of transmittal from Mr. Julian P. Boyd of Princeton University, enclosing a copy of the address delivered by Mr. James Russell Wiggins, publisher of the Washington Post, at Monticello on April 13, 1959, on the anniversary of Thomas Jefferson's birth. Mr. Boyd is a member of the Board of Directors of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation.

THE PAPERS OF THOMAS JEFFERSON,
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY,
Princeton, N.J., August 13, 1959.
The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I am most grateful for your kindness in making an inquiry of Colonel Poutre at Tobyhanna Signal Depot, and for letting me know.

The enclosed address by Mr. James Russell Wiggins of the Washington Post, delivered at Monticello last April on the anniversary of Thomas Jefferson's birth, may be of interest to you.

With much gratitude for your thoughtfulness, and with all good wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

JULIAN P. BOYD.

JEFFERSON THROUGH THE FOG
(An address delivered at Monticello, April 13, 1959, by James Russell Wiggins)

Of this spot, Richard Rush in 1816, in the letter only recently come into the possession of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, wrote. "The fog . . . never rises to the level of his mountain."

It is a pleasure and a delight to stand here on a day, and in a time, when the fog upon lower elevations is especially impenetrable. This eminence in such times is seen through the mists that shroud its approaches with new advantage. No one could hope to bring to an audience that would gather here on this day anything new about Thomas Jefferson or any hitherto undiscovered thing that he said.

Our annual reexamination of Jefferson will divulge to us nothing changed or new in him. Still, each day in our round of years brings us to a new perspective from which to look toward that elevated place in our history which he continues to occupy; just as when we traverse the plain below this mountain, and see from time to time, through valley mists and spring foliage, a hitherto unperceived delight in the architecture of Monticello.

This is what brings us back, again and again, to read the same Jeffersonian documents. So frequently, the weeks and months and years since last we read them give them a new application and meaning, so at variance with earlier understanding and appreciation that, although well aware of having previously perused the same texts, we read again as in a fresh discovery.

It may be said of Jefferson as Sir John Myres said of Homer; "It is we, and our tools and methods that change, not the genius of Homer."

When we repair to the genius of Jefferson for advice and counsel in the causes of our day, we need to be warned that a man out of his generation may be as misleading as a paragraph out of context. And those who quote such scriptures to their own purposes run the double risk of lifting wisdom out of its time and out of its place.

So much depends upon time and place and context that the application of Jeffersonian truths to contemporary problems leaves the individual latitude enough so that each of us, in a sense, can have his own Jefferson. I apply to the fogs of our day, I warn you, my own Jefferson; and if you do not like him, I cheerfully give you leave to summon to your own examination of contemporary problems, your own Jefferson.

In the State of Virginia, on April 13, 1959, it would be to deny the universality of Jefferson, if one did not repair to what he said and did for illumination upon the issue that has produced, in the last few years, more agitation than any other. That issue, however it might distress him, in a curious way would gratify him. He surely would not be dismayed to discover that Virginians are spending a great deal of their time in arguments about education. They could argue about things of less consequence. It is some consolation that they think it important enough to argue about, and I believe Jefferson would be wryly pleased about that.

The common impulse of so many Virginians, of all shades of belief, to preserve the educational institutions of this State, in spite of all hazard, surely must have arisen in part from the foundations that Thomas Jefferson laid. The Virginians who labored so long and so hard to salvage the educational system struggled in a cause that Jefferson commenced in 1776. Neither Virginia, nor any other State, has yet caught up with the ideas that Jefferson put into his "Bill for the More General Diffusion of Knowledge." As everyone knows, he thought this the most important of all the revisal

and put upon it a higher estimate than he placed upon his bill for religious freedom.

In the difficult months through which Virginia has just passed, many of her citizens must have repaired to the Jefferson papers to read the admonition he voiced to his friend George Wythe in 1786, in a letter in which he said:

"Preach, my dear sir, a crusade against ignorance; establish and improve the law for educating the common people. Let our countrymen know that the people alone can protect us against these evils and that the tax which will be paid for this purpose is not more than the thousandth part of what will be paid to kings, priests, and nobles who will rise up among us if we leave the people in ignorance."¹

In his emphasis on education, he never wavered. In his second administration as President, he recommended that the accumulating Federal surplus be spent for a system of education (even though he had some doubts on constitutional grounds). We are still trying to catch up with him, in this area. Recent events in Virginia and the Nation, indicate, however, that his beliefs have widely pervaded the thinking of our own generation and his admonitions and injunctions have not been wasted.

Partisans in contemporary political disputes always mine the papers of Thomas Jefferson at their own peril because his mind was not fixed in its outlook or inflexible in its commitment, but open to the persuasion of discovery, invention, imagination, information, and fresh argument.

At first, he thought America's role in the world should be that of a primary producer, and its polity that of a rural society of independent husbandmen, free of the complications of urban masses. His hostility toward manufactures subsequently was overcome and in the years preceding the War of 1812 he took delight in the country's industrial growth. Antipathy toward Great Britain was a Jeffersonian constant from revolutionary days until long after he left the White House; but when the proposals of Canning were laid before Monroe, he became an advocate of the Monroe Doctrine. Once he rejoiced in the country's isolation from the broils of Europe, but he foresaw a future time when this policy might change, and he did not hesitate in the midst of his philosophical infatuation with isolation, to advocate an 18th century sort of NATO to cope with the pirates of north Africa.

His views on racial problems greatly changed, over the years. He incorporated into his revision of the laws of Virginia the most inhumane features of the colonial slave code. He did so because he thought there were real distinctions which nature has made between the races. While making allowances for differences of condition and education, he felt the Negroes were an inferior race. He was for the gradual extinction of slavery, but wished to settle the freed slaves abroad because he pessimistically thought that 10,000 recollections by blacks of injuries they have sustained would make it impossible for the races to live together under the same government. The editors of "The Papers of Thomas Jefferson" note that though Thomas Jefferson endeavored to view this problem with the reasoned humanity that characterized his liberal thought in almost all other realms, he was, on this issue, inflexible in opinion and conservative in legislation.

Many of his contemporaries found him conservative in these matters. David Ramsay, on May 3, 1786, wrote him:

"I admire your generous indignation at slavery; but think you have depressed the

¹Papers of Thomas Jefferson, vol. 10, p. 245.

Negroes too low. I believe all mankind to be originally the same and only diversified by accidental circumstances."²

As early as 1785, evidences of a slightly changing view began to appear. In a letter of Chastellux, written on June 7, 1785, he declares:

"I believe the Indian then to be in body and mind equal to the white man. I have supposed the black man, in his present state, might not be so. But it would be hazardous to affirm that, equally cultivated for a few generations, he would not become so."³

By 1788, he was making a very remarkable proposal to Edward Bancroft. Bancroft had written Jefferson to confirm a conversation about some reportedly unsuccessful experiments in manumission in Virginia. In his reply, written January 26, 1788, Jefferson said:

"Notwithstanding the discouraging result of these experiments, I am decided on my final return to America to try this one. I shall endeavor to import as many Germans as I have grown slaves. I will settle them and my slaves, on farms of 50 acres each, intermingled, and place all on the footing of the Metayers of Europe. Their children shall be brought up, as others are, in habits of property and foresight and I have no doubt but that they will be good citizens."

Some of his letters indicate his delight at the discovery of evidence that his earlier apprehensions as to the innate racial inferiority of the Negro were mistaken. To the Marquis de Condorcet, he wrote on August 30, 1791:

"I am happy to be able to inform you that we have now in the United States a Negro, the son of a black man born in Africa, and a black woman born in the United States, who is a very respectable mathematician. I procured him to be employed under one of our chief directors in laying out the new Federal city on the Patowmac, and in the intervals of his leisure, while on that work, he made an almanac for the next year, which he sent me in his own handwriting and which I enclose to you. I have seen very elegant solutions of geometrical problems by him. Add to this that he is a very worthy and respectable member of society. He is a free man. I shall be delighted to see these instances of moral eminence so multiplied as to prove that the want of talents observed in them is merely the effect of their degraded condition, and not proceeding from any difference in the structure of the parts on which intellect depends."

He traveled quite a distance from 1776 to 1791 and his intellectual journey was accomplished in a society that changed its deeply held views in these fields even more slowly than such views are changed in our own time. I own to the relatively optimistic view that, in spite of all the trying difficulties of which we know, these problems will be solved. I am more worried about another race—the race to which all of us belong—the human race.

Does it stand upon the edge of extinction? Has its scientific and mechanical ingenuity outrun its political invention so far that its destruction awaits nothing but a mishap or a maniac? Have we stumbled upon forces so far beyond control that a mere miscalculation might alter our planetary environment in such a way as to make it unfit for human habitation? These are questions that must plague any thoughtful and reflective citizen. And the more he is plagued by them, the more he must wish that we could have Jefferson at hand in the 20th instead of, or as well as in the 18th century.

We have often comforted ourselves by the reflection that Providence has seemed to produce for this country, in each of its crises, men fitted by nature and experience to deal with each of them.

The right man has appeared at the right place in the right time, generation after generation. But when we look at the combination of difficulties that now confront us, it must be borne in upon us that what we really need is Jefferson. Of all the men who occupied the White House, he was the foremost in his knowledge of science. Of all the men who led the Nation in a crisis, he was certainly among the first in his diplomatic experience and facility. Of all our national leaders, surely he was unrivaled in his ability to articulate the political aspirations of free people. What we have now is a crisis compounded of dangerous international political rivalry, diplomatic difficulty, and scientific challenge.

Now that all the living Democrats—or nearly all of them—have been nominated for the Presidency—I trust it will not be offensive if we proceed to some no longer living. But, of course, we cannot do that. We cannot trade Thomas Jefferson's 18th century political career for a new one in the 20th century. And we cannot have him in both centuries. We cannot nominate him to lead us in a time, the perils of which seem curiously devised to call forth precisely those gifts of leadership in which he excelled.

Were he available, I think we could clinch his nomination—and election—with a single letter—that which he wrote on June 18, 1799, to William Munford. In it speaks the scientist, the sociologist, the politician, and the patriot—in a combination the like of which I cannot discover in the current political lists. He wrote:

"I have to acknowledge the receipt of your favor of May 14, in which you mention that you have finished the 6 first books of Euclid, plane trigonometry, surveying, and algebra, and ask whether I think a further pursuit of that branch of science would be useful to you. There are some propositions in the latter books of Euclid, and some of Archimedes, which are useful, and I have no doubt you have been made acquainted with them. Trigonometry, so far as this, is most valuable to every man, there is scarcely a day in which he will not resort to it for some of the purposes of common life. The science of calculation also is indispensable as far as the extraction of the square and cube roots; algebra as far as the quadratic equation and the use of logarithms are often of value in ordinary cases. * * * There are other branches of science, however, worth the attention of every man: astronomy, botany, chemistry, natural philosophy, natural history, anatomy. Not indeed to be proficient in them; but to possess their general principles and outlines, so as that we may be able to amuse and inform ourselves further in any of them as we proceed through life and have occasion for them. * * * I am among those who think well of the human character generally. I consider man as formed for society, and endowed by nature with those dispositions which fit him for society. I believe * * * that his mind is perfectible to a degree of which we cannot as yet form any conception. It is impossible for a man who takes a survey of what is already known, not to see what an immensity in every branch of science yet remains to be discovered, and that, too, of articles to which your faculties seem adequate. * * * While the art of printing is left to us, science can never be retrograde; what is once acquired of real knowledge can never be lost. To preserve the freedom of the human mind, then, and freedom of the press, every spirit should be ready

to devote itself to martyrdom; for as long as we may think as we will, and speak as we think, the condition of man will proceed in improvement."⁴

When we find utterance such as this commonplace among the public men of our 20th century, we can have more confidence in our ability to surmount our problems. Perhaps it is true that not since the 18th century has there been a time when a single man could hope to get a glimpse of the sum total of human knowledge, and acquire, as did Jefferson and Franklin, a speaking acquaintance with all that was best in art, literature, science, and philosophy. The ideal of the complete man of the 20th century indeed may be unattainable. I sometimes think I would settle for the complete man of the 18th century. I am not sure that he would not tower like a giant upon the public stage.

Are our public men diminished by the awful dimensions of the problems of the nuclear age so that they seem less than they are against the vastness of the challenges that confront them? Perhaps.

Still, it is not possible to prowl the papers of Jefferson and his colleagues without sensations of disquiet. One must make allowances for the greater distractions of modern life—but can you avoid wondering if Americans today think as hard, work as hard and worry as much on public problems as did the Americans of the 18th century.

There are plenty of public officials today who are wearing themselves out in the country's business, but I am not talking only of the transactions of public office during intervals of public employment. To Thomas Jefferson and literally hundreds of his colleagues, life, from beginning to end, was a process of learning and studying, of thinking, and reflecting on the affairs of society. From earliest youth onward, an astonishing proportion of waking time was spent in the contemplation of the country's welfare. The consideration of public affairs occupied hours of rest, recreation, and leisure. Conversation centered upon the business of the State and the Nation, wherever citizens were drawn together.

Not the least of the things that made Thomas Jefferson's contribution so great was the sheer habit of industry—from earliest youth until declining age. Native wit, genius, and perception he owed to fate—but the discipline which made his waking hours productive for himself and for society was his own.

These habits continued into his declining years and a letter he wrote in 1810 discloses how he identified even his "repose" with a level of usefulness few men could maintain now in the prime of life. I would like to quote a little from this letter:

"I am retired to Monticello, where, in the bosom of my family, and surrounded by my books, I enjoy a repose to which I have been long a stranger. My mornings are devoted to correspondence. From breakfast to dinner, I am in my shops, my garden, or on horseback among my farms; from dinner to dark, I give to society and recreation with my neighbors and friends; and from candle light to early bedtime I read. My health is perfect; and my strength considerably reinforced by the activity of the course I pursue; perhaps it is as great as usually falls to the lot of near 67 years of age. I talk of ploughs and harrows, of seeding and harvesting with my neighbors, and of politics too, if they choose, with as little reserve as the rest of my fellow citizens, and feel, at length, the blessing of being free to say and do what I please, without being responsible for it to any mortal. A part of my occupa-

² Papers of Thomas Jefferson, vol. 9, p. 440.

³ Papers of Thomas Jefferson, vol. 8, p. 186.

⁴ Original in Teachers College Library, Columbia University.

tion, and by no means the least pleasing, is the direction of the studies of such young men as ask it. They place themselves in the neighboring village, and have the use of my library and counsel, and make a part of my society. In advising the course of their reading, I endeavor to keep their attention fixed on the main objects of all science, the freedom and happiness of men. So that coming to bear a share in the councils and government of their country, they will keep ever in view the sole objects of all legitimate government."

Well, we cannot nominate either Jefferson or any of his colleagues for 20th century roles. The best we can do is to repair to their accumulated wisdom, and there discover if we can the secrets of their greatness. What we cannot nominate, we can imitate. Thanks to the endeavors of historians who are now at work upon the orderly presentation of the papers of our 18th century intellectual and political giants, we can put before us a fairer and a clearer model of Jefferson and his contemporaries.

Thanks to the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation and the University of Virginia, young men, now as in 1810, in the words of Jefferson "place themselves in the neighboring village" of Charlottesville to profit by his instruction. The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Professorship, now held by Dumas Malone, is giving to several Thomas Jefferson fellows, our generation's closest possible approximation of the 1810 opportunity to share in Jefferson's counsel and to become a part of his society.

May they keep their attention fixed, as did the young men who studied with Jefferson himself, upon the "main objects of all science, the freedom and happiness of man."

How appropriate it is for Monticello to sustain a teacher and to bring young students of history and politics from all parts of the country to sit under him. This is the kind of memorial Jefferson himself would have most esteemed. It is the kind of memorial that is especially fitting for a man who among all his distinctions was first of all a great teacher.

It is through our historians and teachers that we can avail ourselves of the 18th century's Thomas Jefferson in this our own 20th century.

We cannot place him at the conference tables where the fate of mankind upon this planet may be at stake; but we can place his philosophy there.

The power of that philosophy to influence the hearts and minds of men is undiminished by either the passage of time or the progress of science and may yet make a contribution to our survival more profound than all the material resources that the inexhaustible wealth of a continent can amass.

Against Seating of Communist China in the U.N.

SPEECH
OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the only reason I take this time is because I think there ought to be in the Record a more accurate statement of what the position of the United States on Red China is, and why.

To begin with, it is the same under this administration as it was under the

previous administration. When the Communist attacks on Quemoy began a year ago, the former President of the United States, Mr. Truman, was among the first to identify himself with the policy of the present President on this issue.

Those favoring membership for Communist China in the United Nations generally give about three major reasons. Two of them have been mentioned today. One is the realism argument. Red China is there, it exists, it is a fact; therefore we should admit it to the United Nations to represent the Chinese people in that organization. It is said that not to do so is unrealistic; we are hiding our heads in the sand; or, as the gentleman from Vermont has put it, we are trying to deny its existence. Now nobody denies the existence of Communist China. We are very acutely aware of its existence and its danger. That is precisely why we do not want to build it up. We recognize it for what it is—a dedicated enemy of the United States. Every instinct of self-preservation—that is, realism—requires that we not do anything to make it stronger or give it greater stature, influence, power—as acceptance into the U.N. would certainly do.

Gangsters are a fact in some of our own cities. Should we, therefore, take them into the FBI, the agency charged with maintaining law and order against the gangsters? Does anyone ask, How can the FBI plan its operations against the gangsters unless it has the gangsters in it to help it plan and carry out its operations against the gangsters? Of all courses, that would be the most unrealistic.

No one in this Government denies the existence of Red China. On the contrary, we have been dealing with it officially for years. We have had 87 official negotiations with its representatives in the last 4 years, at Geneva and at Warsaw. We have negotiated with it on two main issues, and only two. First, we have been trying to get the Chinese Reds to release American prisoners of war captured in Korea, or to account for them. We have tried to get them to do that in accordance with their pledges at Panmunjon, for two reasons. One, we care about our boys. Two, we would like to find out if, just once, they will keep their word. We accepted a military draw in Korea, the first time in our history that we ever took less than a victory. Part of the reason was in order to get back thousands of American boys who were in their cruel hands. Everybody remembers Little Switch and later Big Switch. But they held back on some 900 men. Little by little word has come through that at least half of those are dead. But there are still 450 who we know were in their hands at one time, and alive. They spoke over the Communist radio from Peiping in their own voices, and their folks here heard them. They sent postal cards home at Christmastime in their own handwriting. When John Jones was released he said that Bob Smith was in the bunk next to his, but Smith could not be exchanged because his leg had

just been cut off. And so on. We know they had them. Why will they not release them? Maybe they are all dead now. But their mothers will not believe that. Why will not the Reds account for them?

Mr. Speaker, we paid a great price in exchange for those promises. We have been trying to get them to keep the promises. If just once they would do that, then the question asked by the gentlewoman from Oregon about changing our policy would be more pertinent. There might be some sense then in going on to a next step.

The other issue on which we have been negotiating with them is the issue of conquest by the use of force. We have tried to get them to agree to refrain from using war as an instrument of national policy in the Taiwan Straits and in Asia, without prejudice to their positions on the various disputes there. They have adamantly refused to renounce force as the way to get what they want, and yet they demand membership in the United Nations.

That brings up the second argument, namely that the United Nations is a universal organization and therefore all existing governments should be members. Of course the United Nations was never intended to be a universal organization. That idea was debated and rejected at San Francisco. It was to be a union of peace-loving nations which would accept certain obligations. They are very plain; you can read them.

Article IV reads:

Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving nations which accept the obligation contained in the present charter and, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations.

What is the first obligation?

All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means.

And—

All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat of use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state.

We have been trying to get them to agree to accept those obligations. They would then be eligible for membership.

The United States is not stubbornly, capriciously, arbitrarily keeping Communist China out of the United Nations as you are told by some. It keeps itself out. It simply will not qualify. Whenever Red China is willing to qualify by accepting the obligations of the charter and will demonstrate in a dependable way that it is able and willing to carry out its international obligations under the charter, it will unquestionably be admitted at the next session of the U.N. General Assembly.

You may argue if you wish that the United Nations ought to be a universal organization. Then you should work to amend the charter and make it that. But please don't nullify the charter and make a mockery of it. Do not drag the United Nations down to the level of the lawless, but call upon the lawless to bring their conduct up to the standards of the charter, if they want the benefits of membership.

Somebody will raise the objection, "If you are not going to let Red China in, why do you not kick out the Soviet Union?" That is a fair question; but it is a useless question. Because you cannot kick the Soviet Union out. She can veto her own expulsion. So there is no use arguing about what cannot be done.

When the Soviet Union was admitted at the formation of the U.N., she was pretending to be democratic and peace loving. She agreed to accept and carry out the obligations of the charter. Her breaches of faith came after her admission. It is bad enough to have been fooled by Russia then. What excuse is there for taking in Red China now, when we know before admission that she had no intention of keeping the obligations of the charter? At the negotiations last year at the time of the Quemoy aggression, she insisted on four goals: Quemoy, Matsu, Formosa, and expulsion of the United States from the Western Pacific.

No one can appease Red China by giving it Quemoy, or even Formosa. It is destruction of our position in the Western Pacific that it is after, in order then to take over the rest of Asia, easily.

Mr. Speaker, ours is not an arbitrary action of prejudice or stubbornness. It is, first of all, hardheaded concern for the security of the United States.

It is said that since the Chinese are the most numerous people on the globe, they are entitled and ought to have representation in the U.N. Certainly, but the Peiping government does not represent the Chinese people. It is not working for their well-being. It is making war on them and on everything they hold dear, on order to use them for its world objectives. When a person becomes a Communist, he ceases to be a Chinese patriot, or a French patriot, or an American patriot. He is a world revolutionist. A Communist government does not operate in terms of national interests; it operates in terms of an international conspiracy.

Whenever the Reds will let the Chinese people choose their own representatives in free elections, these representatives will promptly be admitted to the U.N.

Let me ask three questions.

First. Would admission of Communist China to the U.N. make that regime weaker or stronger? The answer is obvious. Why would every Red sympathizer in the world be moving heaven and earth all these years to get Red China admitted if such admission would weaken the Communists?

Second. Would admission decrease or increase Red China's prestige, power, and influence with its neighbors in Asia—Japan, the Philippines, southeast Asia, India—and the neutrals everywhere? The answer again is obvious.

Third. Would admission make Red China a lesser or a greater danger to ourselves and to genuine peace in the world? Once more the answer is obvious.

To build up an avowed enemy, as admission to the U.N. would undeniably do, could only be described as an act of folly. The future of our Nation and the cause of free men everywhere require

that this not happen, unless or until the Communist government in China is willing to qualify for admission by meeting the requirements for admission, particularly the requirement of "refraining from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state."

It is not a blind and stubborn United States that is blocking admission; it is Red China's stubborn refusal to change her lawless international conduct.

Let me sum up the reasons why the United States resolutely opposes admission of Communist China to the United Nations. They are not founded on emotional prejudice. They arise from the true character of the Chinese Communist regime.

First. Such admission would destroy the United Nations as an effective instrument for justice and freedom and peace in the world. It would make a mockery of both the letter and spirit of the charter.

Almost all Americans want to see the United Nations succeed as an instrument to insure justice, and security, and peace in the world. To convert it from a union of peace-loving nations into a league with lawless gangsters could only destroy it.

Second. Admission of Communist China would weaken our own security and that of the free world. The Communist world conspiracy is openly dedicated to our destruction. We are at war with it in every sense except open hostilities. If we are not at war with it, then why are we straining ourselves so dangerously to help about 60 other countries in the world build up their strength and maintain their security against its pressures and threats? If we are at war with it, then how can anybody justify our taking an action that would greatly strengthen it?

Admission to the United Nations would give the Communist dictatorship in China legitimacy, respectability, enormously increased prestige, and influence, and power. It would lead to recognition by most, probably all, other governments and thus enable Peiping to turn every Chinese embassy and consulate in the world into a center of espionage, sabotage, and conspiracy against the governments and peoples still free and independent.

Third. Admission of Communist China to the United Nations would represent the abandonment to Communist enslavement of almost one-fourth of all the human beings on this planet. That we are not willing to do.

We cared enough about freedom of choice for Communist prisoners of war to delay the Korean truce for months, sacrificing thousands of American lives in the process. How can we accept for 600 million Chinese people the enslavement we rejected for 15,000 Chinese prisoners of war in Korea?

Such a course would be not only morally wrong, it would be shortsighted and a foolish abandonment of the national character that has given us greatness and the terrible responsibility of world leadership.

Century 21 Exposition Waste of Taxpayers Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Congress voted on a bill, H.R. 8374, which would authorize the expenditure of over \$12.5 million for participation of the Federal Government in the Century 21 Exposition to be held in Seattle, Wash., beginning in 1961.

I feel that this is a waste of the taxpayers money. The project is not one which has particular merit and has little, if any, international significance.

I would have voted against this bill if a rollcall would have been taken on it. I am a bit dismayed that a rollcall was not taken on this bill which will cost the American taxpayers over \$12.5 million for what amounts to little more than a State fair.

I believe that the Federal Government should participate in all activities which promote cultural and scientific understanding between nations of the world. This necessarily includes participation in activities such as international expositions, cultural and scientific exchanges.

However, I do not believe that the Federal Government should participate in programs, such as the exposition contemplated in this case, which are not, in fact, a part of the fiscal year budget of the Federal Government.

If the Department of Commerce was seriously interested in this project it would have made the request as part of its yearly budget. Indeed, it is very unusual that a department would send a bill down to the Congress asking for an authorization of money (in this case \$12.5 million) without including that amount in its yearly budgetary request in view of the fact that the Bureau was aware of this item when planning the budget.

Certainly no one will argue that this is must legislation in the sense that school construction is must legislation, or housing development is must legislation, or road construction is must legislation, or economic foreign aid is must legislation, or urban renewal and slum clearance is must legislation.

Yet the Congress is placed in a position where it is supposed to support a project which is clearly not a necessity, and its national or international significance is dubious on its face. Under the terms of this authorization, \$7.5 million would be used directly for the construction and supplying of scientific exhibitions whereas \$5 million would be used for building an exposition building.

I have been informed that public buildings already exist which could be used for such scientific exposition on the proposed grounds. Hence, I must question the need for building another such building. Furthermore, upon comple-

tion of this exposition in 1962, it is unclear as to what the status of that building would be. Under the present arrangements it may well be necessary for the Federal Government to buy the land from the city of Seattle if it is to protect its \$5 million investment in the building. If proper safeguards are not taken, it can be safely predicted that the building will be sold at a great loss by the Federal Government at the close of the exposition.

Therefore, I submit that an expenditure of money such as is contemplated in this bill is a questionable use of the taxpayer's money when we are trying so hard to balance the budget. There is no need to build a \$5 million building for this exposition; and any \$7.5 million administration request for authorization of a scientific exhibition such as the one contemplated here should appear in the President's budget.

Supposedly Smart and Hardheaded American Businessmen Continue To Be the Easiest Pushovers for the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following disturbing article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

ON WORLD AFFAIRS—COMMUNIST, AMERICAN
BUSINESS "DEAL" SEEN

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

If as an American citizen you have been perplexed by the cordial, even enthusiastic welcome shown to Bolsheviks Mikoyan and Kozlov by part of the American business community and are sadly wondering just why the President of a business administration in Washington should be turning out the red carpet for a sworn enemy of the United States, I call your attention to a remarkable document which has just come to my desk.

It is a market letter dated August 4 by Shields and Co. of the New York Stock Exchange, penned by one Walter K. Gutman. This presumably routine letter reveals, it seems to me, not only what is behind the perverse pro-Soviet attitude of the Canadian-American tycoon, Cyrus Eaton, but the kind of thinking that is inspiring the relaxed attitude toward the Soviet danger by the businessmen who horsed about with Mikoyan and Kozlov—and will, if given a chance, do the same with the bloody handed Khrushchev.

Here are excerpts from Mr. Gutman's analysis of the situation:

"Vice President Nixon's trip revealed that East and West don't want to fight. Just as the Communist people have revealed to us their true feelings and these feelings seem to have a depth which cannot be ignored by their leaders, so Nixon has revealed to them our true feelings which have greater depth than we have been aware of.

"NONEMOTIONAL

"What Nixon revealed was that the new leaders of American politics do not have the

same emotional dislike of communism that the old leaders had. The new leaders don't approve of communism and will resist its spread insofar as it threatens us, but they don't have the emotional feeling of the old generation that it must be excoriated.

"To the new leaders communism is just a practical thing. The old leaders felt communism was unethical—they felt it was evil not just because it suppressed individual liberties—after all some of our best allies have demonstrated a remarkable ability in this respect—but because it challenged our teleology. Over the years just what this was has gotten lost.

"Both sides now agree, although they may not be entirely aware of it, that material success . . . cannot be a total solution. However material success . . . is a good thing. What has happened is that the competition between communism and capitalism has been reduced to a sporting event. It is a tremendous sporting event—greater even than the America's cup—and we might get mad enough to fight—but after Nixon's visit it does not look that way.

"If this analysis of what Nixon's trip revealed is correct . . . there will be a growing willingness to acknowledge Russia's pre-eminent interest in certain geographic areas. This will depend upon Russia's tact in asserting these interests. However, if Russia can develop the same sort of tact which we have developed in Latin America, we will withdraw not only from Berlin but from the eastern Mediterranean.

"We are still strong enough to force Russia to stop where she is if she plans to take over the Near East militantly but we don't have the will to contest the issue if it is done in a sporting manner and if our purely commercial interests are not jeopardized. It is obvious that if such a spirit of practicality develops, armament expenditures will be cut back."

This, I repeat, is the prediction of things to come made by a Wall Street forecaster. Obviously, he has no feeling of the enormity of what he describes as a spirit of practicality. For he does not appear to grasp that such a division of the world is what the U.S.S.R. has planned since World War II; that it would gradually cost us all our Allies beginning with Greece and Turkey and force us back upon Fortress America, that the present Communist bloc plus West Europe is far stronger than the Western Hemisphere can become in any foreseeable period, and that after we had retreated "in a sporting manner," Moscow's monstrous empire could compel us to fight or submit to Communist tyranny.

Nor is it (yet) true that our leaders foresee any such retreat. Certainly the Pentagon does not, the State Department does not, and I cannot believe that the President does.

What seems more likely is that a portion of the American business community—the same that applauded Mikoyan and Kozlov and will be charming to Khrushchev—hopes for such a development and that by describing their hope as the wave of the future, Mr. Gutman is helping make it come true.

KEY PHRASE

I fear the key to this aspiration lies in the phrase "if our purely commercial interests are not jeopardized." Well, that is the spirit in which fat merchants brought Carthage to ruin. That is the spirit which Lenin tipped off the comrades they could always take advantage of. That is the spirit which the wily Khrushchev hopes further to promote during his visit.

It is the spirit with which some American businessmen welcomed the advent of Adolf Hitler in 1933—"good for Germany and a stabilizing influence on Europe."

It is the spirit which led short-sighted British business circles to blunder into World War II. It has regularly led to dis-

aster, yet here it bobs up again in the United States.

One can therefore be thankful to Mr. Gutman for bringing it into the open where the still sound part of American business may recognize it as defeatism and move to counter it in time.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed bill on State taxation of interstate commerce, adopted resolution on FNMA mortgage exchanges, and took up military construction appropriations.

House passed bill extending the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 15083-15090

Bills Introduced: Five bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 2570-2574; and S. Res. 168.

Pages 15084-15085

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 2500, authorizing the reappointment of Elwood R. Quesada, former lieutenant general, USAF, retired, to the grade of major general, and to retire him in the grade of lieutenant general, with amendment (S. Rept. 748);

S. 1712, to extend the application of the Motorboat Act of 1940 to certain possessions of the U.S. (S. Rept. 749);

H.R. 5067, to repeal section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, relating to international freight forwarders (S. Rept. 750);

H.R. 7948, to declare nonnavigable a part of the west arm of the South Fork of the South Branch of the Chicago River (S. Rept. 751);

H.R. 8575, fiscal 1960 appropriations for military construction, with amendments (S. Rept. 752);

S. 2390, to authorize exchange of lands in or near Everglades City, Fla., for use of Everglades National Park, with amendments (S. Rept. 753); and

S. 2181, proposed Mineral Leasing Act Amendments of 1959, with amendments (S. Rept. 754).

Page 15084

Bill Referred: One House-passed bill was referred to appropriate committee.

Page 15083

Bill Placed on Calendar: H.R. 4576, suspend import duties on book bindings and covers, was ordered to be placed on calendar.

Page 15083

Social Security: Senate insisted on its amendments to H.R. 213, providing additional time for certain State agreements under section 218 of Social Security Act to be modified to secure coverage for nonprofessional school district employees. Senate then agreed to hold conference requested by House, and appointed as con-

ferees Senators Byrd (Virginia), Kerr, Frear, Williams (Delaware), and Carlson.

Page 15097

National Order of Science: H.R. 6288, to establish a National Order of Science to provide recognition for individuals who make outstanding contributions in science and engineering, was taken from desk, passed without amendments, and cleared for President.

Page 15090

Senators From Hawaii: Majority leader announced that the newly elected Senators from Hawaii will be sworn in next Monday, August 24.

Pages 15090-15091

State Taxation of Interstate Commerce: Senate passed (motion to reconsider tabled) S. 2524, to prevent, under certain conditions, States or political subdivisions from imposing a net income tax on income derived from interstate commerce, after taking the following actions on additional motions and amendments:

Adopted: Kerr amendment to exempt sales offices within the State, the "sole" purpose of which (as distinguished from "primary" purpose as bill is worded) is to serve representatives of company engaged in solicitation of orders within the State for tangible personal property by 65 yeas to 29 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Talmadge amendment (motion to reconsider tabled), to eliminate language that would deny to the States the right to tax nonresident corporations which maintain offices and do business within the States; and

Rejected: By 31 yeas to 62 nays, McCarthy amendment to eliminate all language of the bill except that providing for committee study of the problem of State taxation of interstate commerce; by 37 yeas to 56 nays, Sparkman amendment to limit duration of bill to taxable years which begin before July 1, 1962; Long amendment to confine bill to relatively small concerns and setting up a formula based on volume of business as test; and by 36 yeas to 62 nays, Carroll motion to postpone further action on the bill until March 1, 1960.

Pages 15091, 15097-15107, 15108-15136

Appendix

Higher Export Subsidies No Panacea for Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a very penetrating and significant piece of writing on this country's agricultural difficulties, particularly with regard to cotton, appeared in the *Corpus Christi (Tex.) Caller* of August 14, 1959. This editorial, entitled "Higher Export Subsidies No Panacea for Cotton," demonstrates effectively that our farm program must be geared to face economic and political realities, international as well as national.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HIGHER EXPORT SUBSIDIES NO PANACEA FOR COTTON

Another exercise in the treatment of the symptom rather than the disease that afflicts the economy of King Cotton began this month. It is designed to recapture at least part of our sadly dwindling export market, but it appears to have no greater prospect of success than have other experiments in the field.

On August 1 the Department of Agriculture began offering an export subsidy of approximately \$40 a bale for American cotton. The experience of the past in this connection has been a melancholy one.

Approximately 2,800,000 bales of cotton were exported last year when a subsidy of approximately \$32.50 a bale was offered. In the same previous period ending July 31, 1958, 5,700,000 bales were sold abroad, and in the same period ending July 31, 1957, 7,600,000 bales went to foreign buyers.

The source of the difficulties being experienced by American cotton producers in finding a market—other than Government warehouses—for their cotton is simple to define. It arises from the Government price-support program which consistently kept the price of American cotton above the world market price. This has brought a twofold reaction: (1) It has speeded the development and use of synthetic fibers, and (2) it has brought competition for markets, through increased acreage, from new and old producers of cotton in many parts of the world.

The agricultural economy of south Texas is inevitably involved in this and any new approach to the problem of growing cotton surpluses. Obviously if the United States is to protect its domestic producers of oil, machinery and minerals, to name but three, it cannot escape granting its cotton producers a measure of protection. The vital question relates to the nature and extent of that protection.

Increasing restiveness on the part of Congressmen representing urban areas is a warning sign that few farm leaders have ignored. The danger increases that the whole farm price-support program will collapse of its own weight, bringing a grave crisis to agriculture throughout the Nation. A workable farm program addressed to economic and political realities rather than to blind politics is urgently needed. Even the bare outlines of that program appear remote at this time.

Basic Elements of Land Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the Record an open form letter published in the August 9, 1959, issue of the *Des Moines (Iowa) Sunday Register* written by the Right Reverend Monsignor L. G. Ligutti.

Monsignor Ligutti, the executive director of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference with headquarters in Des Moines, and the permanent observer for the Vatican with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, is known and respected throughout the world.

His letter follows:

One of the most widespread topics for discussion in the American press has been the Cuban land reform law enacted by Castro and now, supposedly, becoming operative. The Cuban law is of greater interest to us because of our closeness to Cuba and because of the financial implications involved in land ownership and sugar production. However, Cuba is but one Latin American country where land reform is the big political and economic question of the day.

Victor Gymenez, Minister of Agriculture in Venezuela, has just presented the draft for an agrarian reform law in behalf of the Betancourt Government. Senor Pedro Beltram, Peru's new Prime Minister will be considering the report of the commission just back from Italy where they studied the Ente Maremma reclamation and colonization projects.

In Colombia, a committee of Catholic bishops is calling a meeting to study the land reform proposals in the light of Christianity and the national welfare. Mexico's Ejido system is now old enough to be studied for results and implications. Jose Figueres of Costa Rica is being looked upon as a leader in Central America's agrarian legislation. Peron's downfall was in great part due to his pressure on the big ranchers. Guatemala and Bolivia are still suffering from ill-planned reforms.

CONTRAST AND PROBLEM IN BRAZIL

Brazil's vast resources present a contrast and a problem: terribly overcrowded in some parts where, for the sake of a few square meters of inheritance, fratricide is committed; while, not too far away, millions of acres of productive land can be had for the asking.

But, of course, this is only history repeating itself. Have we not right here in the United States our own agrarian problems: surplus production, soil bank, parity payments, meat grading, braceros, sharecroppers, vertical integration, etc. "Nothing new under the sun" runs an old adage. It's as old as the hills.

FOUR REQUISITES FOR SUCCESS

Because of our closeness to South America and our interest in its general economic and social conditions, it would be well for us to consider the basic philosophy, economics, and social implications that must underlie and permeate real land reform schemes.

Having studied the history of land reform and having visited personally almost every general type of land use practiced in the world, may I outline what I believe to be the four basic and essential elements for the success of land reform any place and under any circumstances?

1. Agrarian reform must be economically sound: Land distribution is but a step, not necessarily the first or even the most important. Proper use of land, availability of capital, and marketing facilities are of the essence. What may be sound in one place might probably prove a failure elsewhere under different material and cultural conditions.

2. Agrarian reform must be morally just: Two wrongs never make a right. However, a situation is not morally just because it happens to exist here and now. Neither is it right to eliminate one moral evil by creating another evil. No matter how good the intentions, stealing is wrong, even by Robin Hood who would comfort all in distress.

No antiquated, unjust system of land tenure and use should be continued, but neither should a complete upset be attempted. National and international rights must be respected. To stall a needed reform is wrong and to rush into it without moral considerations is equally wrong. A middle course is the safest and, in the long run, the most effective.

3. Agrarian reform must be socially democratic: It cannot be based upon decrees and unlikes from on high. Man must first be reconstructed from within. He must develop his God-given personality and become conscious of his social responsibilities. It's a slow process, one filled with pitfalls and disappointment, but it's the only sure and lasting way.

4. Land reform must be for today and not for yesteryear: That implies the application of up-to-date physical as well as social sciences. It means the possession of imagination and vision coupled with good horse-sense.

If the four standards briefly outlined above are used as a measuring stick and guide for land reform, no matter where or by whom, society cannot go far wrong even though the process may be slow.

Americans Need To Crystallize "Image" of Our Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me relating to interchanges between the United States and the Soviet Union.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We recall that during the recent trip of Vice President Nixon to Moscow Premier Khrushchev challenged the United States to a battle of ideas.

Frankly, I think we should take them on. I am confident we will be the victors.

However, I believe the American people today face a real challenge in the need to reevaluate, sharpen up, and crystallize their image of our way of life.

Unfortunately, the benefits of our system are, all too often, taken for granted and thus are hazy in the minds of the American people.

In a peaceful world, this kind of lackadaisical attitude might get by. Today, however, in a world in which communism is challenging our system on practically every front—military, scientific, economic, political, cultural, educational, and others—the time has come to sharpen up our thinking and prepare to defend ourselves in the battle of ideas; or better, to take the offensive in proving the superiority of our system for providing a better life for our people.

INCREASED UNITED STATES-SOVIET TOURIST TRAVEL

The Eisenhower-Khrushchev exchange visits—subsequent to the Nixon trip to Russia—may well be followed by increasing exchanges on a people-to-people, as well as on the government-officials level. As a matter of fact, the flow of persons is stepping up.

During 1958, for example, an estimated 6,000 U.S. citizens traveled to the Soviet Union. By contrast, in the first half of 1959, more than 8,000 Americans have already visited the U.S.S.R.—a rate of more than twice the previous year.

At the same time, the flow of Soviet tourists to the United States is expected to increase. Although only 66 Soviet tourists came to the United States in 1958, it is anticipated that this peaceful invasion is likely to number several hundreds this year.

The Communists—including Mr. Khrushchev and his proteges—can be expected to be well-schooled on their own system as well as knowledgeable of our weak spots.

Consequently, it will be increasingly important that we sharpen up our image of the United States in the minds of our people. We must ask ourselves: "What does our way of life really mean to us? About which of its aspects should be best informed?"

HIGHLIGHTS OF OUR WAY OF LIFE

Among the highlights, I believe, should be included:

A thorough knowledge of our governmental system.

A picture of benefits which the average citizen and his family enjoy; including living standards, wages, ownership of such items as homes, automobiles, television sets.

Opportunity for each person, regardless of place or station of birth to seek and obtain

in accordance with his capabilities, the goals he seeks in life—including a vacation of his own choice.

A system of laws that not only aims at maintaining peace and order, but also recognizes and respects individual dignity, rights, and privileges—as opposed to the Communist system which subjugates all rights and personal interests of people to the dictatorship of the State.

Recognition of freedom of thought, including self-selected religious, philosophical, political, or other ideas—so long as adherence to such does not jeopardize, or interfere with, similar privileges of other citizens.

Economic security within our system, including such programs as retirement benefits, unemployment compensation, job opportunities, and others.

Respect for maintaining traditional family relationships—the foundation of our way of life—often either strained or destroyed under communism.

Ability to defend our foreign policy; and also to explain such domestic policies as conflict with the Communist ideas.

Reaffirm the peaceful intentions of our leaders, unity of our people behind our leadership, and to correct the misconceptions of our way of life which have been presented to the Russian people.

Above all, I believe it is important to stress that we are dedicated to attempting to live in peace and harmony with other nations; that we are willing to contribute ideas—yes, even a "helping hand" materially—toward assisting lesser developed nations to resolving economic, social, security, or other problems; but that we do not seek to impose our way of life on any country, but rather, strive for a world in which peoples can, by self-determination, select their own systems of government.

Fortunately, the Russian people—as I'm sure is true of all people—demonstrated, during Vice President Nixon's tour that—despite years of false propaganda by the Communist machine—they gratifyingly remembered the "helping hand" given Russia—both in terms of military and nonmilitary aid, including food—prior to, and during, World War II.

In countering the Communist ideological offensive, I believe, too, that we must learn more of the Soviet system. By so doing, we will be able to hold up to the light of logic and reason and Communist political, economic, social, and other ideas and reveal their weaknesses and inadequacies.

TRAVELERS TO THE SOVIET UNION

A United States traveler to the Soviet Union—as an ambassador of our country—bears a particularly heavy responsibility.

The reports of visitors within the Soviet Union as—well as the experiences of our U.S. guides at the exhibit in Moscow—confirm the fact that the Americans in the Soviet Union will be the target for a wide variety of questions by the Russian man-on-the-street, as well as the "planted" Soviet inquisitor.

To the degree possible, therefore, the U.S. traveler should be fortified with intimate knowledge and information of our way of life. In addition, he should know something, if possible, of the Soviet system, so as to be able to present his ideas in terms the Soviet people can understand.

In view of the importance of getting our story across—now that we are finally penetrating the Iron Curtain—we might well examine the possibility of providing U.S. travelers to the Soviet Union with either briefings, or at least access to utilizable information, prior to journeying to the Soviet Union.

CONCLUSION

With the opening of what may well be a new era of increasing interchanges between the United States and the Soviet Union, it

is especially important that we crystallize our image of the United States and be well prepared to meet the Communist challenge of a battle of ideas.

I am confident that we have the system, reservoir of ideas and ideals, record of accomplishments, and real prospects for an ever-better life that will come out on top in a freedom versus communism conflict.

Hanson W. Baldwin Cites Injustices to Retired Officers of Army, Navy, and Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, many of us have been disturbed over the injustice to retired officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force in the military pay bill enacted in 1958.

In an article in the Saturday Evening Post for August 8, 1959, the noted military editor of the New York Times, Hanson W. Baldwin, has written an article entitled "Our Fighting Men Have Gone Soft." While I cannot evaluate the basic theme of Mr. Baldwin's article, I think there should be called to the attention of the Senate two or three paragraphs from his very challenging presentation which emphasizes the injustice done by Congress and the President to retired military officers.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that these paragraphs from the article in the Saturday Evening Post by Hanson W. Baldwin, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Even more important is the feeling in the Armed Forces of discrimination by Government at the expense of the services. Pay rates have been raised, and various benefits authorized; but nearly always grudgingly, never without major effort, and usually far less percentage-wise than the raises the unions have succeeded in imposing in civilian life, or the increases and privileges which Congress has voted itself. One of the worst blunders the administration and Congress have made was the passage of a clause in the 1958 service-pay act, which has been widely interpreted by many officers as a breach of faith on the part of Government. In the past, service retirement pay always has been keyed to active-duty pay on a fixed percentage basis; if the pay of active officers was increased, the pay of all retired officers and enlisted men was increased by the same percentage formula. But the 1958 pay act violated this principle—which had always been one of the inducements to a service career—and provided only a nominal cost-of-living increase to all retired personnel who took off their uniforms prior to its passage. But those who retired after it was passed received the full benefits, thus creating two groups of retired officers—one of them "second-class citizens" economically. In some cases the monetary difference amounted to \$157 a month between retired officers of the same rank and same length of service.

West Berliners Placid in Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Edward J. Milne, Washington correspondent for the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin of Providence, R.I., has returned recently from a tour of the NATO countries. In reporting on his trip, Mr. Milne has captured a vivid impression of the hopes and fears, the potentials and the role of these our allies. He brings an objective eye to that which we have established as our first line of defense and depicts a very real picture of what this country is doing as a member of that organization.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the first of a series of articles which appeared in the Providence Sunday Journal of June 28, 1959, entitled "West Berliners Placid in Crisis":

WEST BERLINERS PLACID IN CRISIS—MINISTER SAYS PEOPLE DOUBTED MOSCOW WOULD START SHOOTING; SEES DANGER OF WEST TIRING OF PROBLEM CITY

(By Edward J. Milne)

BERLIN.—In the midst of crisis, Berlin seems a city of almost unbelievable calm.

How can that be?

Joachim Lipschitz, who lost an arm on the Russian front in World War II and is now West Berlin's Senator (Minister) for the Interior, has some ideas.

"In the awful days of last November," he says, "no Berliner believed a world war would be started over Berlin. Lots of Berliners polled on May 27 had absolutely forgotten it was the day for which the end of the world had been forecast. They had forgotten because in their hearts they had never believed disaster would come."

On November 27, 1958, the Soviets demanded that the Western powers pull their troops out of Berlin at the end of 6 months.

It is true, Senator Lipschitz acknowledges, that the balance of power, nuclear power, has shifted since West Berlin withstood its last great ordeal in 1948, when the United States and allied airlift broke the Berlin blockade. But talk of Berlin and nuclear power in the same breath does not impress him.

QUOTES AMERICAN

"I might quote an American officer," he says, "who told me the Russians had so many nuclear weapons as to destroy the world three times over and the United States so many as to destroy it five times over. I was interested to know that the earth can be destroyed eight times over, although in my opinion once would be quite enough. Why on earth should we in Berlin fear this awful thing any more than the people in Washington or London—or Moscow?"

When the Soviet ultimatum came out of the blue last November, the United States, Britain, and France repeated the Berlin guarantees of 1952 and 1954 to treat any attack on Berlin as an attack upon themselves.

"And now since Geneva," Senator Lipschitz says, "we know all the more that the West is adamant on not giving up its position in Berlin."

Another reason for the apparent serenity of the west sector of this great green city of gardens and parks and woodlands is psychological, Senator Lipschitz suggests.

COOK WITH WATER

"This is not the first time we have been exposed to Soviet attacks," he reminded visiting American reporters. "They attacked us before the blockade, during it, and after it. We are beginning to believe, as you say it, that the bark is worse than the bite. The Russians also cook with water."

A danger facing Berlin today, he believes, and this is not such a one as to create panic but only to demand a sensible response, is that the Federal Republic is compelled to say no to practically every suggestion the Soviets make.

"The rest of the West could come to regard us as 'cold warriors,'" he says, "and tend to get sick of this troublesome city."

Therein lies a reason that there does not seem to be in West Berlin an optimism matching its calm.

Several West Berlin editors told the reporters they did not expect Germany or Berlin to be reunited in their lifetime.

It is true that many of the ingredients of optimism abound in West Berlin today. There is freedom of speech, press, assembly, and religion. The occupiers are not oppressors. And all one has heard about the contrast between the West and East sectors of the sprawling metropolis—it is almost 20 times the area of Providence—is as true physically as politically and spiritually.

RUINS LIE TO EAST

On the west side of Brandenburg Gate, one of the border check points between what the Communists call the "democratic" and the "capitalistic" sectors, much of the physical evidence of war has been removed. Great and splendid new buildings are rising. But pass through the gate into Unter den Linden and turn into the Wilhelmstrasse, the old center of government, and the war might have ended last night—acres and acres of huge broken hulks of the stately old buildings, wild flowers growing on the site of Hitler's chancellery, only Goering's air ministry ironically standing untouched while the shattered remains of the German and French cathedrals, for example, and the national theater lie in fields of ruins.

But all that is an oft-told story. What matters today is the outlook for the divided city. It is the fashion in the West to call West Berlin an island of freedom in a sea of totalitarianism, and like names. Yet the freedom leaves much wanting.

In place, Senator Lipschitz says, of the West Germans' maximum demands for a reunited Berlin as the capital of a united Germany, "we are putting forward minimum demands to get out of this mess which has been thrust upon us by the Soviet authorities."

The first of these is that none of the means of access to the city from the west—four highways, three railroads, three air corridors, and two waterways—be denied.

WORKERS CROSS LINE

The second, looking to improvement rather than maintenance of the status quo, is an arrangement for better west and east sectors. Thirty thousand Berliners live in the east sector and work in the west; 17,000 live in the west and work in the east. Ninety-eight streets cross the border. Fifty-seven of them may be used by vehicles, all by pedestrians.

Municipally, three agencies move back and forth—the subway system, the interurban elevated, and the sewage system. But there are separate heat, light, gas, bus, street car, police, fire, and telephone systems. West Berliners are warned not to use the elevated, however, because at points it leaves the east sector of the city and passes into the Russian zone outside the city, and the careless rider could find himself under arrest for traveling without authority. And they do not have to be warned about the hazards of automobile travel. Were one to get a flat

tire in East Berlin, he would have to telephone his garage in West Berlin by a long-distance call via Leipzig and Frankfurt.

"CITY IN COUNTRY"

West Berlin has some 7 square miles of parks, 30 square miles of forest or woodland, 12 square miles of lakes and other water surface. It has been called the "City in the Country." It might seem small hardship that the city's 2,100,000 inhabitants are denied by the Soviets access to the beautiful areas beyond the city limits.

But Senator Lipschitz, a Socialist, says that one of the most inhuman measures the Russians have taken has been the denial of kitchen gardens beyond the city limits to some 40,000 workers' families. These modest vegetable plots used to be a prime source of sustenance to the workers' families.

"That is what the 'state of workers,' as they call themselves, has done to the workers on this side," he says.

Last Speech in the House of Representatives of Hon. John A. Burns, of Hawaii

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN A. BURNS

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as one of the members of the opposition who met in the inner sanctum so often, let me say I formed during that proceeding the very highest admiration for the distinguished Delegate from Hawaii. Not only that, I can truthfully say that it was because of this admiration for you and the love you had for Hawaii that final passage of Hawaiian statehood was obtained. Many people from my area of the country supported statehood for Hawaii. I can say that it was the gentleman's leadership, his sagacity, his ability to look ahead, more than any other factor that led to the overwhelming victory for statehood for Hawaii.

Delegate BURNS, I want you to know when you visited in my home last year you formed a great friendship there among the press and among the people of my district and the deep Southland that will go with you and your great State as long as you live. I feel sure that those people, those friends whom you met, are with you here tonight, and in speaking for them, I wish you well in any undertaking you might pursue, and hope you will some day represent the great State of Hawaii in the Senate of the United States.

Let me say further that Mrs. Dorn joins me in wishing for you and Mrs. Burns the very best.

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina, and may I make this observation to him. I do not know of any people in America who are not fair and just. I do not know of any part of the United States that was actually opposed to the admission of Hawaii into statehood. Maybe some of

them did not understand the facts as well as others did, but no one was opposed. There was no ill will from anybody in the United States toward the people of Hawaii. As for southern support for statehood, I point out that the Honorable James T. Morgan, of Alabama, did everything possible to make a Hawaii a State instead of a Territory in 1900. The Honorable Henry Larcade, of Louisiana, was the chairman of the committee making the first favorable report on statehood.

The gracious hospitality of the people of your district, Mrs. Dorn, and yourself, and the genuineness of your friendship will always be remembered by my assistant, Dan Aoki, and myself.

West Berlin Sustained by Hope of Becoming Capital of Reich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include the second in a series of articles by Mr. Edward J. Milne, Washington correspondent for the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin of Providence, R.I., concerning his recent tour of the NATO countries. This article appeared in the Providence Evening Bulletin, of July 1, 1959, and is entitled "West Berlin Sustained by Hope of Becoming Capital of Reich":

WEST BERLIN SUSTAINED BY HOPE OF BECOMING CAPITAL OF REICH

(By Edward J. Milne)

BERLIN.—All that keeps West Berlin going, Western observers here believe, is the distant prospect of becoming once again the capital of a reunified Germany.

This frail hope is sustained not only by the security guarantees of the Western Powers but by the political and economic policies of West Germany.

Although it is isolated in East Germany and not a geographical part of the Federal Republic, it has been declared a state of the Republic, and its capital. The last West German presidential election was held here in 1954 and now, despite growls out of East Berlin and Moscow, Parliament has convoked the electoral college to elect the next President here Wednesday as a major gesture of loyalty to the city.

Economically, the city is propped up at every point by the actions and policies of the Federal Republic. While West Berlin is West Germany's biggest industrial city, it constitutes only about 3½ percent of West Germany's industrial capacity. At the end of World War II its manufacturing capacity had shrunk to 15 percent of prewar levels, recovery did not get fairly underway until 1950, and the city remains a drain on the economy of West Germany.

West Berlin's trade is chiefly with West Germany, from which it imports about 5 billion marks (\$1.19 billion) worth of goods annually and to which it exports only about 4 million marks (\$952 million) worth. A billion-mark deficit in the city government is made up by direct grants by the Federal Government, and that has the effect of fi-

nancing the city's deficit in the balance of payments.

(Maybe the Federal Republic ought to do more. On the lawn outside the tax office in one of the boroughs here is a statue of two pelicans—"greedy birds," Berliners explain. And their nickname for a heroic statue of a nude athlete is "The Last Taxpayer." "You see," they say, "he has lost everything.")

American occupation authorities feared in November last year that the Soviet ultimatum would have a dampening effect on West Berlin's economy. But the Federal Republic stepped in in December with tax concessions to stimulate commercial construction and industrial plant and equipment outlays, and West German businessmen put on a special campaign to increase purchases from West Berlin factories.

As a result, unemployment has continued to drop—it is now between 6 and 7 percent of the labor force—and new orders are up between 10 and 16 percent over a year ago. American economists are a little nervous, however, because savings deposits, up steadily from 1950 through the fall of 1958, leveled off in November and have drifted down since then. The drop is not significant statistically, they say, but the fact that the upward trend has stopped may be.

The East Germans have been threatening a new blockade of West Berlin to show their displeasure over a new presidential election here. Almost everything the city eats, wears, and otherwise uses must be brought in—about one-third of it by 10,000 trucks a month, one-third by about 400 freight trains, one-third by about 600 barges.

The estimate here is that the city could survive a new blockade 6 months to a year without an airlift, but the emphasis is on "survive." Industrial and export activity, which hardly existed in 1948, could be ruined.

Since American high policy is to assert the West's right of land access to West Berlin, U.S. officials here talk only guardedly and reluctantly about the possibility of sustaining the city's economy through a new airlift.

"Can you keep the economy going through an airlift?" one was asked recently.

"If you had a big enough airlift," he replied.

But the fact is that a big enough airlift is probably impossible. In 1948, when it was only a question of keeping the city from being starved out, the U.S. Air Force controlled Tempelhof Airdrome, Hitler's masterpiece in the center of the city, handled about two-thirds of the traffic. Its facilities were saturated by the job, and so were those of the airports in the French and British sectors. Airport capacity has not been increased since, and so the turnaround and reloading problem implicit in trying to keep an export-by-air trade alive seems insoluble.

Meantime, Berliners graze sheep and mow hay on the grasslands between Tempelhof's landing strips and hope the problem won't come up.

Meantime, too, a flame burns in Bismarck Square in commemoration of the East German uprising of June 17, 1953, and the victims of the Russian tanks that crushed it. It is to burn until the day of German unity arrives.

"We hope the gas lasts," West Berliners say wryly.

Diplomats are divided on whether concessions offered to the Soviets by the West at Geneva represented a retreat from the steadfast position on Berlin assumed last November or a shrewd maneuver to prove to the world that the allies are fairminded and conciliatory.

West Berliners are happy that no reduction of the Western Powers' 11,000-man garrison force was proposed. Any considerable reduction might be disastrous to civilian morale, they feel, on the ground that it would be considered the first step on the West's way out of Berlin.

If the allies' offer to limit the garrison to its present size is renewed when the foreign ministers reconvene, West Berliners feel the allies should be careful to avoid a rigid ceiling that would let the Russians demand, say, that two lieutenants go home for every two that come in. That would give the Russians a veto over the allies' clear rights of occupation, West Berliners feel, and set a precedent for Soviet control of the free city in other respects.

One of the allies' proposals at Geneva was for a limitation on propaganda and subversion. Here again the West Berliners sound a warning signal. The West's most powerful voice in eastern Europe today is a 300,000-watt radio station, six times more powerful than any in the United States, which the U.S. Information Service operates out of West Berlin. Known as Radio in American Sector (RIAS), it is largely operated "by Germans for Germans." For West Berliners it is a local radio station. For East Germans it is a strong link with the free world.

The Russians and the East German Communists keep up incessant attacks upon it, coupling it with agents provocateurs and bridge blowers. American officials of RIAS contend that nothing proposed at Geneva would mute this voice. But West Berlin officials say that RIAS would be the first on the Russians' list of what must go if any limitation on propaganda were not drawn specifically to protect it.

West Berliners believe careful conditions would have to be set on the proposal to transfer control of access to West Berlin from the Russians to the East German People's Police. They don't care whether Russians or East Germans man the check points as long as it is clearly stipulated that responsibility for access without let or hindrance remains with the Russians.

Motorists' Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a thoughtful and valuable suggestion for promoting highway-safety practices comes to us from England by way of the Tyler (Tex.) Morning Telegraph. On August 15, 1959, that newspaper printed an editorial entitled "Motorists' Prayer," regarding a suggestion by the Reverend Vyvyan Watts-Jones, of Staffordshire, England, for a motorists' prayer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOTORISTS' PRAYER

Much has been said and written on the subject of "practical religion," meaning putting faith into practice in everyday life as well as within the sanctuary and on other ceremonial occasions.

Such a consideration probably caused an English minister to suggest that prayer might be the answer to the problem of keeping safety on the highways these days.

The Reverend Vyvyan Watts-Jones, of Staffordshire, wants every driver, before he starts his car engine, to spend 10 seconds in prayer.

He has devised the following prayer, which he asks motorists to copy and paste on the dashboard:

"Help me, O God, as I drive, to love my neighbor as myself, that I may do nothing to hurt or endanger any of your children. Give to my eyes clear vision, and skill to my hands and feet. Make me tranquil in mind and relaxed in body. Deliver me from the spirit of rivalry, and from all resentment at the actions of others, and bring me to my journey's end."

McGraw-Edison Sets Example of Civic Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, one matter about which I think we all agree is the importance of Americans keeping themselves well informed about vital issues and taking an active part in their Government. This is not a new problem, but something new has happened in recent months in the way of a remedial approach to this situation which deserves laudatory comment.

Businessmen, who once placed a "hands off" label on politics, because of its controversial aspects are now actively encouraging participation in civic affairs. A leader in this field is the McGraw-Edison Co., of New York, spearheaded by the former New Jersey Governor, Charles Edison, chairman of the board of directors.

Mr. President, the example set by this company was the topic of a recent editorial which was published in the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader. I ask unanimous consent that this fine editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

McGraw-Edison Shows the Way

A sterling example of civic responsibility has been set for all American businessmen by the McGraw-Edison Co., of New York. This newspaper frankly believes the company, through action of its board of directors, led by former New Jersey Gov. Charles Edison, has provided the answer to that perennial question one hears from the lips of countless American businessmen—"But what can I do to effectively combat communism?"

One answer, we feel, is to follow the fine example set by McGraw-Edison: Appoint a committee on public affairs and authorize that committee to take effective action to inform executives and employees of the company on current events and movements which may be either helpful or detrimental to that society which permits these same business organizations to survive and prosper.

Here is how McGraw-Edison accomplished

that task. On August 21, 1958, the board of directors adopted this resolution:

"Resolved, That the president be authorized to appoint a committee of not less than three or more than five members to be known as the Committee for Public Affairs; that the function of this committee shall be (a) to keep the company informed as to governmental or pressure group actions inimical to the preservation of our form of government as set forth in the Constitution (b) or to the preservation of the concept of private property, and free competitive enterprise or (c) that are hostile to the best interests of the company and its stockholders. Further, that the committee may cooperate with, or take an active part in, activities designed to safeguard the matters referred to, with due regard to legal restriction on company activities in this field."

The committee has operated with great effectiveness, publishing a monthly confidential newsletter describing movements detrimental to company interests; a monthly bulletin devoted exclusively to State and Federal legislative matters; and sending sample copies of Human Events, National Review, American Opinion, the Freeman, and other such periodicals to interested parties. The committee also advises its constituents of books it feels are especially pertinent; recommends activities to be carried out within the community by its constituency, and in general serves as an information center for company employees.

This newspaper has examined copies of the McGraw-Edison newsletter and bulletin and we frankly believe they are the finest of their type we have seen. We feel certain that local firms desiring to put this program into effect in our community will find the McGraw-Edison Co. eager to lend a helping hand.

Duluth Befriends British Seaman—Even in Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, every once in a while something happens which makes one realize how much genuine goodness there is in this world. All too often these acts of mercy, kindness, and compassion go unnoticed. Fortunately, the editors of the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune did notice an act of friendship and kindness which took place in Duluth, Minn.

I am sure that Duluth is all the better because of the good deeds of some of its citizens. There is nothing which makes a day brighter or a life more meaningful than an act of kindness. Indeed by helping others we help ourselves.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Duluth Befriends British Seaman—Even in Death" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune, Aug. 16, 1959]

DULUTH BEFRIENDS BRITISH SEAMAN—EVEN IN DEATH

DULUTH.—"We are only a small dot on a very large-scale map," read the letter from

Middleton-on-the-Wolds, Driffield, Yorkshire, England. "To us, Duluth, then, was another dot on a big map of the world. Now we regard it as part of us—with our son, Peter, there among so many friends."

Peter Dixon, 21, was a Britisher, the second son in a family of five who grew up among the rolling hills of Yorkshire. He was determined to go to sea. At home, his mother kept marking the map where his freighter, the *Deerpool*, was due. The last marking on the map will forever be Duluth.

In the warmth of a mid-June day, the young sailor went for a swim in the Duluth-Superior Harbor. He dived in, and never came up. His three companions swam deep, trying to find him. Harbor authorities were called.

For days, the area was dragged. The master of the *Deerpool* delayed his sailing date. Finally, the freighter could wait no longer. Next day, Peter Dixon's body was recovered from Superior Harbor.

That much was a news item, brief, and saddening. But the understanding hearts of Duluth people who never knew Peter Dixon wrote another chapter.

The shipping line's agent in Duluth called the New York office of the company. Soon, from London, came a phone call to Mrs. Dorothy Dixon, the young sailor's mother.

In an hour, Middleton heard that Peter had drowned in some far-away place called Duluth. Only 300 people live in that Yorkshire village. Everyone knew the boy and his family.

The shipping line had offered to fly Peter's body to New York, where the *Deerpool* could then take it home. The Dixons talked into the night about that. Why not give the lad peace?

"Could you please find an Anglican church and have services for our boy there?" Mrs. Dixon asked. "It seems right to us."

The Reverend John Hildebrand, rector of St. Paul's Episcopal church in Duluth, was called. Would he conduct the services at Crawford chapel for this boy? There were no relatives, no friends of the sailor.

"Perhaps some of you would care to attend the services tomorrow," Rector Hildebrand told his congregation the next Sunday. "We hope you will."

Over that weekend, Jim Crawford, at the mortuary, received several phone calls from Great Lakes seamen.

"Are they going to take care of this fellow right?" asked one. "We'll get together and do what we can. We didn't know him, but we figure what it would be like if this happened to us in some foreign port. A guy would need friends."

Next afternoon, Peter Dixon had more than 100 friends.

"If I died right now, I wouldn't have such people," Jim told me. "There were men and women from every section here. Some of the old families were represented. Three British girls who became GI brides were here. Parents of boys who were killed in Britain, or in flying from British bases in World War II came by."

The front of the chapel was banked with flowers from strangers. The mourners heard the words of Mr. Hildebrand. Then the procession of cars moved to Forest Hill Cemetery. Jim Crawford's staffmen were pallbearers.

"Some 75 people came out to the graveside," Crawford remembers. "It was a moving thing. We see many funerals, but this was unique. You'd think all those people had known young Dixon."

With the group was a woman who phoned her florist later that day.

"I want to be sure there will be flowers to mark that boy's grave," she said. "Will you see to it, please? The friendship I've seen today is something that ought to stay

green. Keep a plant, or flowers, on that grave from now on."

The next day, in that tiny Yorkshire village, memorial services were held for Peter Dixon.

"Everybody knows everybody and our little church was packed," Peter Dixon's mother wrote.

Winging across the Atlantic, at that moment, were letters from the strangers who had attended the young sailor's funeral and burial. A packet of pictures, taken by Jean Basgen, Duluth photographer, showed the Dixon family what had happened. Here were the faces of unknown friends, come to give friendship to the boy they never knew.

Every one of those letters is bringing an answer from Mrs. Dixon. To Mr. Hildebrand she wrote:

"My husband and I wish to thank you for writing so quickly and sympathetically. All we ever expected was official information of Peter's burial. Instead we have been overwhelmed with kind letters from you and American and English residents of Duluth. They have helped lighten our load.

"Peter was our second son. We have been very proud of our fine healthy family.

"We always knew before where Peter would travel. I followed his movements from maps."

That distant dot on the very large map, the city at the head of the seaway, is far, far more than that to everyone in Middleton-on-the-Wolds.

It is a wonderful place where understanding people befriend a stranger—even in death.

Hon. John A. Burns, of Hawaii

SPEECH

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I just want to add to the words already spoken in tribute to the statesmanship of the gentleman who has so ably represented Hawaii during his period of service here. I think the tribute which has been paid already is one that could be echoed many times over on this floor, without disagreement by anyone.

I would like to add one word of personal appreciation of JOHN BURNS, not so much as a statesman or legislator, but as a man. In service with him on the committee and in friendly visits outside the committee room I have been deeply and profoundly impressed by the qualities of the man, by his breadth of vision, by his simple and kindly humility, and humanity, by his gentleness and sweetness of character and by the very manly way in which he has accepted a tough setback in a truly impressive career and has with very good grace, I think, confronted the situation. JOHN BURNS continues to speak with genuine friendship of the people of Hawaii, as well as of the colleagues he served with here in the House.

I know that what has happened is merely an interruption, and we hope of very brief duration, in a distinguished

public career. I hope and trust that the gentleman will once again return to Washington to serve his Nation ably in the future as he has in the past.

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. I thank the gentleman.

"Howdy, Hawaii"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, at 4 p.m. today, Hawaii will join this indissoluble Union of indestructible States. Speaking for the Lone Star State, I would like to extend a warm welcome.

This new State has a long tradition of Democratic self-government and will be a valuable member of the United States, leading our growth in new areas and directions. I was privileged to be a co-sponsor of the bill which admitted it to the Union.

In the language of the islands, "Aloha, Hawaii," or, in the language of my State of Texas, "Howdy, Hawaii."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Times for Wednesday, August 19, 1959, entitled "Hawaii Will Join the Union Friday," and an article by Elsie Carper from the Washington Post and Times Herald for Wednesday, August 19, 1959, entitled "Ceremony at White House at 4 p.m.—Hawaii Becomes 50th State Friday When President Signs Proclamation."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, August 19, 1959]
HAWAII WILL JOIN THE UNION FRIDAY—PRESIDENT TO PROCLAIM ENTRY OF 50TH STATE AND SHOW DESIGN OF NEW FLAG

WASHINGTON, August 18.—Hawaii will be the Union's 50th State at 4 p.m., Friday.

At that time President Eisenhower will sign the official proclamation. His press secretary, James C. Hagerty, announced today that the President would fly back from his farm in Gettysburg for the ceremony.

Mr. Hagerty said that the President would also disclose on Friday afternoon the design of the new 50-star flag of the United States. It will not be flown officially, however, until next July 4.

The proclamation will clear the way for the new State's two Senators and one Representative to take their seats in Congress. But formalities may delay that step a few days.

Under the rules, no Member can be seated unless he shows a certificate of election. The new State government of Hawaii cannot issue the certificate until it comes into existence formally on Friday.

A cable from the Hawaii government to Congress might serve as a temporary substitute for the certificates, allowing the three new Members to be sworn in Friday. But no one at the Capitol today was sure they would be here by then.

INVITED TO WHITE HOUSE

The Senators elected in Hawaii last month were HIRAM L. FONG, Republican, and OREN

L. LONG, Democrat. DANIEL K. INOUE, a Democrat was elected to the House.

Mr. Hagerty said today that all three would be invited to the White House on Friday.

Hawaii will have its own ceremony at the same hour—10 a.m. Hawaiian time. Presiding there will be William F. Quinn, the Republican who won an upset victory for Governor.

The three Hawaiian Members of Congress will take office just in time to take part in what seems likely to be a sharp battle over civil rights near the end of the session. In both the Senate and the House civil rights advocates are pressing for action before adjournment.

The new Senators from Hawaii, with its mixture of oriental and western racial strains, will unquestionably add a little weight for civil rights legislation and against any southern delaying tactics. This has been one factor in the general southern opposition to Hawaiian statehood in past years.

The lineup in the Senate after the new Members are seated will be 65 Democrats and 35 Republicans. In the House, it will be 283 Democrats, 153 Republicans and 1 vacancy.

Permanent law fixes the number of seats in the House at 435, but the acts admitting Alaska and Hawaii gave them one Representative each beyond that total.

After the next census, unless the law is changed in the meantime, the number of House seats will drop to 435 again and others will have to lose seats to make way for Hawaii and Alaska. Hawaii's population will probably entitle it to two seats.

Alaska was admitted by Presidential proclamation last January 3.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Aug. 19, 1959]

CEREMONY AT WHITE HOUSE AT 4 P.M.—HAWAII BECOMES 50TH STATE FRIDAY WHEN PRESIDENT SIGNS PROCLAMATION

(By Elsie Carper)

President Eisenhower formally will proclaim Hawaii the Nation's 50th State in ceremonies at the White House on Friday.

Press Secretary James C. Hagerty said yesterday the President will return to Washington from his farm at Gettysburg to sign the proclamation at 4 p.m.

At the same time he will issue an order designating a new 50-star flag.

Hagerty said the ceremony will be similar to the one held January 3 when the President signed the proclamation admitting Alaska. He helped unfurl a flag with 49 stars at the conclusion of that ceremony.

The new 50-star flag will not become official until next July 4, the 184th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence.

Officials invited to witness the historic ceremony will include the two Senators and one Representative elected by Hawaii to represent the islands in Congress.

Hawaii sent HIRAM L. FONG, a Republican, and OREN L. LONG, a Democrat, to the Senate, and DAN K. INOUE, a Democrat, to the House.

They will be able to take their seats after the Governor of the new State is sworn in and certifies their election.

The Eisenhower-appointed Governor, William F. Quinn, a Republican, was elected to retain that office. He will remain in Hawaii and preside at a celebration to be held at 10 a.m. Friday, Hawaiian time, to coincide with the ceremonies at the White House.

Signing of the proclamation on Friday will permit the State legislature to convene in special session a week from Monday, 10 days after Hawaii officially enters the Union.

A commemorative 7-cent airmail stamp also is to be issued on Friday, the Post Office

announced. The stamp, printed in red ink, shows a Hawaiian warrior extending a lei of welcome to the star of statehood.

Tribute to Michael Shimkin, Government Cancer Fighter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is always gratifying when a leading newspaper takes notice of the outstanding work of one of our Government's civil servants.

In a recent issue of the New York Post an article by Barbara Yuncker about Dr. Michael Shimkin tells the story of this remarkable man.

It was my privilege to travel with Dr. Shimkin this past year during our visit to the Scandinavian countries and the Soviet Union. Dr. Shimkin is a highly respected scientist and doctor. His work in the field of cancer research has earned for him a fine reputation. I know Dr. Shimkin not only as an outstanding scientist, but also as a good friend and neighbor. I was delighted to see the article in the New York Post. It tells of Dr. Shimkin's background and of his tremendous contribution to the field of medical research, particularly in the field of cancer.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MICHAEL SHIMKIN, GOVERNMENT CANCER FIGHTER

(By Barbara Yuncker)

"The thing we Americans have got to learn is that the Russians aren't 9 feet tall. But they're not 3 feet tall, either. They're just our size."

That's Michael Boris Shimkin, M.D., cancer specialist, expert on Russia, enthusiast for international medicine, talking about sputnik and about Soviet medicine.

The tart and voluble Dr. Shimkin epitomizes a species of bureaucrat new to our age of science, the specialist little known to the public whose expertise lies behind the official pronouncements.

Shimkin was adviser-interpreter to HUBERT HUMPHREY a few months ago when the Senator proposed an International Health Year to Nikita Khrushchev.

When the Senate Government Operations Subcommittee called recently for a worldwide campaign against cancer, it was the National Cancer Institute's Biometrics Branch, of which Shimkin is chief, that supplied the data. (Biometrics applies the tools of statistics to the problems of biological sciences.)

If the currently stymied bill for international medical research, within the National Institutes of Health, gets pried loose and passes the House (it has Senate approval under the shepherding of Alabama's LISTER HILL), the zeal of public servants like Shimkin will rate a large vote of thanks.

What kind of man is this scientific civil servant? For one thing, he gives the lie-direct to the clichés about Government time-servers and patterned thinkers. His opinions fairly crackle, with no apparent awareness of sacred cows.

On catching up with the Russians, for example: "The trouble is our Government wants instant science. And science to them is hardware, military hardware. They think by pouring out money they'll get results, like pouring hot water on instant coffee. They're just not oriented to human values yet."

On an International Health Year: "It's a great idea, a wonderful thing. But don't be under any illusions. Some nations will oppose it because it is against their leader's self-interest to have a healthy educated people. Not everybody buys our happy doctrine."

On the level of Soviet science: "They're ahead on rockets, generally a bit behind in medicine, perhaps a dozen years. We've made such tremendous strides in financing research." He stresses the word "financing."

On our posture before the world: "We've let the Russians steal our revolution. If we finally lose, that may be why."

On smoking and lung cancer: "They keep saying it hasn't been proved and talking about all those smoking mice which didn't get lung cancer. Well, maybe mice just don't know how to smoke too well; maybe it's the puff that does it. If the mice had got cancer the tobacco industry would have said it only proved mice shouldn't smoke."

"They threw a lipstick off the market because it produced lesions on the backs of mice. Mice don't use lipstick but most of us accept the fact that if it irritates mouse skin, it's an irritant. You can go around the circle both ways."

Shimkin completes this comment with a cross between a chuckle and a snort. He smoked heavily for 25 years, gave it up 5 years ago when the statistical reports started coming in.

Shimkin, a round-faced jovial man of 48, was born in Tomsk, Siberia, and became an adopted California at 11, having spent the intervening years mainly in Java. He has kept his Russian but his once-fluent Dutch got lost in the middle of his efforts to learn English and German. His English is excellent and totally unaccented.

Despite his exotic background and the international ramifications of his professional life, he describes his Chevy Chase, Md., home life with his schoolteacher wife, Mary, in slick magazine terms.

His hobbies, he says, are "chauffeur-ing the kids around and mowing the grass. A suburban husband is a yardman with sex privileges."

The "kids" are 19-year-old Peter, a premed student at Brown; Ann, going on 16 and a high school senior, and Philip, 7, a pencil-and-crayon artist whose interest in illustrating has just shifted from cats to the Civil War. His creations decorate his father's office walls in Silver Spring, Md.

Amid Shimkin's concern with particular bits of research (he has nearly 150 published scientific papers in his bibliography), the NCI official pursues two giant goals: the war on cancer and the fight for international understanding.

"I like what I am doing," he says. "Anybody who has any part in fighting cancer has a job as great as landing on the moon."

"But important as cancer may be and as important as landing on the moon may be, the most important thing is how human beings get along with human beings. Mankind can live with cancer—though we hope some day he won't have to—but he can no longer live with international war."

NATO's Specialists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include the third in a series of articles by Mr. Edward J. Milne, Washington correspondent for the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin of Providence, R.I., concerning his recent tour of the NATO countries. This article appeared in the Providence Journal of July 8, 1959, and is entitled "NATO's Specialists":

NATO'S SPECIALISTS

(By Edward J. Milne)

VERONA.—Both north and south of the Alps, the U.S. Army in Europe has highly specialized forces ready for action if NATO finds itself in the war-by-miscalculation that is the only kind of war our commanders seem to expect.

GUERRILLA WARFARE

Not far from Munich, for example, is the otherwise unidentified headquarters of a tough bunch of paratroopers newly trained in guerilla warfare with the mission of aiding and abetting revolt in the satellites. The guerillas are part of the U.S. 7th Army, the Nation's major contribution to NATO land forces. Headquartered at Heidelberg, the 7th claims to keep 50 percent of its men combat-ready in 30 minutes, 35 percent ready in 2 hours, and only 15 percent on leave or on pass.

Again, this ancient northern Italian city is the headquarters of the U.S. Army in Europe's Southern European Task Force. A short helicopter hop away across the hilly vineyards that lie between the Alps and the Po, the Army's first overseas missile command, the task force's fighting arm, is in readiness at Vicenza to give atomic fire support to the Italian Army. It has formed the U.S. Army's first "sky cavalry" and has just completed, in June, the training of two Italian battalions in the use of Honest John rockets that also can carry atomic warheads.

ITALIAN MISSILEMEN

Col. Melville B. Coburn, boss of the missile command, tells the story of the creation of the Italian units. It goes back, he says, to 1954, when U.S. military advisory groups throughout the NATO area and the Pentagon in Washington were studying the possibilities of the forces of other nations taking over some of the Americans' commitments.

Political questions had to be answered first. Would the U.S. State Department agree? Would the Italian Government agree? It was not until the summer of 1958 that all agreements had been reached, for the Italians had to wrestle with tooth-and-nail opposition from the Communists to a United States-Italian collaboration in the atomic weapons field.

Once the agreements were reached, Colonel Coburn says, "the Italians did a magnificent job." They "practically drained their artillery of men who could get security clearance and do the mathematics. They finally assembled a training cadre, some of whose men had learned their English in prison camp in the last war."

The training began in January of this year, was completed in June, and the Italian units

are now "operational in the Italian Army," with "probable" commitment to NATO if war comes.

MATTER OF MOTIVES

With the formation of the Italian battalions, the 1st U.S. Army Missile Command lost its own two Honest John battalions. The United States controls the atomic warheads, the Italians now having only the conventional ones.

Maj. Gen. John P. Daley, commander of the task force, is a little impatient with questions about the Italians' fighting qualities. He has studied Italian military history, he says, and he points out that before the Italians broke at Caporetto in World War I they "fought 12 great battles and lost a million men." That they later reformed on the Piave was "almost a miracle," he says, and goes on:

"I've served with French, Dutch, Korean, British, and others. I'm convinced that men will fight as long as they have something to fight for. In World War II, the Italians weren't fighting for anything. I don't think their hearts were in it. Now they have got something to fight for. And every time they turn out another Fiat they've got something to fight for."

The Honest John rocket, with a range of 15 miles, is a modern fire support weapon described as "amazingly accurate within a few hundred yards." Retained by the 1st U.S. Army Missile Command are two battalions of Corporal guided missiles. Colonel Coburn says it would be a waste of time to train the Italians in the use of those more sophisticated 75-mile-range weapons.

In the first place, it has taxed the Italian resources of the modern manpower to form the Honest John units. In the second, and more important place, the Corporal, he says, "is obsolescent if not obsolete. The Corporal is like a woman driver. It either goes all out or slams to a dead stop. It will either be right back on the target or 100 miles off in the wrong direction. It was formerly called the WAC Corporal."

Colonel Coburn would like to have his battalions armed with the newer, lighter, more accurate, and less expensive Sergeant missiles of the same range, but General Daley says that the arrival of the Sergeant on the Italian front "if not in the dim future, is not tomorrow, either." He says this would be "a lovely place," too, for Pershing 500-mile missiles but knows of no plans to place them here.

Besides its Corporal units and their security forces—one U.S. Infantry company and one company of crack Italian Alpine troops—the 1st U.S. Army Missile Command has a company of engineers and its unique sky cavalry company. Budget cuts have recently whittled down both outfits.

DEMOLITION EXPERTS

The engineers are trained in atomic demolition. Their wartime job, with Italian acquiescence, would be to blow up mountain pass invasion routes.

The sky cavalry is a target-finding unit equipped with planes, helicopters, radar, and other modern means of telling the rocket and missile groups what to shoot at, and where. Teams of 6 to 12 men can be flown in low behind enemy lines by helicopter or dropped by parachute, to radio back target information.

Are not these men expendable?

"We hope to recover them," Colonel Coburn says, "either by helicopter or by having them work their way back across the mountains. They're good, and they're tough. In training, they've worked their way back past screens of Italian police and Italian troops, and they've all got back undetected after many days in the cold."

There are many other examples of cooperation between U.S. and Italian forces here. But General Daley observes:

"I am completely conscious that we could have the best military command in the world and still be worthless if we did not get along with the Italian people. I think we are accepted and generally well liked. We certainly work at the job. We try to be part of their community family and help them all we can. The headquarters company here has in effect adopted an orphanage. Our worst headache is automobile accidents. If you kill somebody in one, you've lost friends."

SYMBOL OF POWER

Colonel Coburn has a complimentary observation about the presence here of the Southern European Task Force.

"Hardly a day goes by," he says, "that SETAF doesn't appear in the Italian papers. There is hardly a person north of Rome that doesn't hold SETAF symbolic of U.S. atomic power and Italian national security. The 6th Fleet's planes may have 100 times the atomic power of our missiles and rockets, but up here they don't see the 6th Fleet. The 6th roves the Mediterranean."

If the time comes, he says, when it seems advisable to put U.S. intermediate range ballistic missiles into Italy, the Italians will have their answer to protesting Communists.

"They will say," he says, "that SETAF already has atomic missiles, so why the fuss? It makes no practical difference whether those missiles are 75 miles or 1,500 miles."

A good deal of what one hears at task force headquarters sounds as if the preparation is all for a bigger, fiercer version of the ground campaigns of World Wars I and II. Colonel Coburn promptly concedes it.

"None of this is applicable," he says, "to all-out nuclear war. But life would be academic then, anyway."

The article is from the Washington Post and Times Herald of Saturday, August 15. It reads as follows:

MORTON SUGGESTS FEDERAL INSTALLATION CLEARINGHOUSE

Senator THURSTON B. MORTON, chairman of the Republican National Committee, sees a need in the Eisenhower administration for a clearinghouse to review proposed closing of Federal installations.

He said yesterday the party is trying to "get a setup, I don't know whether it will be in the White House, or not, where if any installation has to be closed they will let somebody with political savvy look at it."

"If the action can just as well wait until after an election, let us do that," he proposed.

But MORTON urgently felt the need for such a clearinghouse Thursday. He said he was trying to persuade two Members of the House, both from labor districts, to support the administration's labor bill. One declined flatly, claiming it would be "political suicide." The other reluctantly agreed.

Before the day was over, MORTON related, an announcement was made that a Federal installation would be closed in the district of the Member who was supporting the bill and that a new installation would be opened in the other Member's district.

"We got to that one just in time and got it straightened out," he added.

National Farm Safety Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under approval granted by the House I am including a timely statement delivered by Mr. Maynard Coe, director of farm safety, National Safety Council, at a meeting of this organization held in Washington in July. Mr. Coe is a director of education for the prevention of accidents on the farms of our country. He is an authority on this subject matter. Mr. Coe is known for his leadership in the farm safety movement. His contribution to the cause of the prevention of accidents is immeasurable. His statement follows:

Education in the principles of accident prevention for agricultural leaders and through them for the 20 million farm residents is the essence of the work of the farm division of the National Safety Council. Farm safety is the responsibility of all agricultural agencies and leaders. The job to be done is so enormous that no organization, no matter how large, can do the job by itself. However, with all agencies and leaders that influence farm life, working together in behalf of accident prevention real results can and are being accomplished.

Many agricultural organizations and agencies are cooperating. Each organization attacks problems or makes contributions it is best equipped to make, while the council provides the machinery for cooperation and coordination. Thus, the farm division collects information from statistical bureaus on one hand and distributes it to engineers and educational agencies on the other. The farm division enlists the support of farm-equip-

GOP Pressures for Punitive Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal said in the press and on the House floor regarding alleged improper lobbying by representatives of labor. That there has been such lobbying there can be no question. Yesterday's letter by Mr. James B. Carey of the AFL-CIO has been greeted everywhere by loud and indignant shouts of outrage.

But there is another side to this coin. Mr. Speaker, I want to describe, not in my own words, but in the words of the chairman of the Republican National Committee, some of the highly improper pressures that were brought by the administration and the Republican Party to defeat fair and effective legislation and insure the adoption of punitive legislation in its place.

It is not my desire to make unfounded allegations. I am merely going to place in the RECORD a newspaper interview with the chairman of the GOP National Committee. Chairman Morton's disarming frankness about administration manipulation has the undimmed virtue of complete frankness. At least there should be no doubt left about the type of lobbying which resulted in the vote of August 13.

ment manufacturers in providing educational films and materials and in turn distributes such films and materials to other agencies and organizations. The farm division seeks out successful activities and disseminates information on the methods employed.

Cooperators in farm safety includes the Farm Bureau, the Grange, and other farmers' organizations, the American Society of Agricultural Engineers, the farm-equipment industry, the 4-H Clubs, the Future Farmers of America, State agricultural colleges, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, many commercial organizations closely related to agriculture, and other groups who desire to have a part in this important program that is basic to the welfare of agriculture.

There are more than 500,000 4-H clubs in America, 10,000 FFA chapters, more than 300,000 farm women's groups are organized throughout the United States. There are 200,000 rural schools and there are approximately 75,000 other rural organizations. To facilitate the cooperation of all these groups the farm division of the National Safety Council assists in the formation of State and local farm safety committees. Thus far 43 States have established State farm safety committees, and in Kansas, Minnesota, Ohio, and a few other States, reductions in accidents have occurred annually since the formation of these committees. Thus the pattern for making definite reductions in accidents is being established.

The farm division recognizes that an adequate farm safety program must include the development of safety techniques for the major jobs in farming. Farm equipment manufacturers are doing splendid work in safeguarding farm equipment. As practical methods are developed additional safeguards will be adopted and the farm division will assist in the stimulation of farm people to make maximum use of all safety devices and equipment. Demonstrations and exhibits are required also and the farm division assists in the preparation of such exhibits and other materials.

A bimonthly publication, the Farm Safety Review, is published to inform and aid agricultural leaders. Special publications such as program manuals and discussion outlines are produced, fortnightly releases to agricultural colleges and others are provided, regular news releases to newspapers, feature articles for magazines, and periodic mailings of radio material are prepared and distributed by the farm division.

National Farm Safety Week (July 20-26) is a publicity springboard which mobilized to an unusual degree the public educational facilities of the Nation in behalf of farm safety.

The farm division recognizes that farming is a family proposition and that it is imperative therefore that all members of the farm family be made safety conscious. This includes recognition of the danger spots around the farm, what constitutes major hazards, what are the dangerous practices in the handling of machinery and livestock, how children can be safeguarded, what are the risks in the use of electricity, efficiency in fire prevention, up-to-date knowledge of first aid, and a host of other items. The farm division maintains intensive efforts with Federal, State, and local extension organizations and individuals and with vocational agricultural and home economic schools as well as with the 4-H Clubs and farm women's groups. It promotes farm safety contests for youth groups, for farm publications, for radio stations to stimulate more and better work against accidents. It provides awards and recognitions for those doing the best job.

The farm division is constantly adding to the materials that are available. These are not only instructional, but includes also inspirational materials to assist in the carry-

ing out of farm safety programs by organizations and others.

Cooperation is extended toward the farm safety specialists who are leaders of farm safety in their respective States. Assistance to agricultural colleges also constitutes an important phase of the work of the farm division. Other work includes the setting up of more unified plans for safety in various agricultural contests, the development and stimulation of research in farm safety, adequate testing and proving grounds for safety devices.

The farm division is alert to the ever present need of expanding the program to include needs as they develop, thus giving leadership and coordination to the entire movement. Through its leadership the farm safety movement is making its contribution to the permanent progress and welfare of agriculture.

Discussion of Dangers to Mankind of Biological and Chemical Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my attention has been called to a press release issued today, relating to an exceedingly important conference of scientists at Pugwash, Nova Scotia. The release reads as follows:

PUGWASH, NOVA SCOTIA, August 21, 1959.—Twenty-five of the world's leading scientists will gather in this simple seaside community next week to discuss the dangers to mankind of biological and chemical warfare. Sponsor of this nongovernmental meeting, the fifth in a series initiated in 1957, will again be Pugwash-born American industrialist, Cyrus Eaton. The four earlier scientific sessions, which were concerned with the perils of nuclear war, have been credited with laying the groundwork for last summer's first official Geneva understandings.

The Pugwash Conference of International Scientists on Biological and Chemical Warfare, as the new private meeting is designated, runs from August 24 to 30 and includes participants from both sides of the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. Represented will be approximately 60 percent of the world's population.

Purpose of the latest conference, as planned by the Pugwash continuing committee under the chairmanship of Lord Bertrand Russell, is to "examine the potentialities of biological and chemical warfare, both as weapons of mass destruction and as factors in increasing international tensions through the possibility of smaller countries producing such weapons."

Members of the committee, in addition to Nobel Laureate Russell, include top scientific minds from the United States of America, United Kingdom, and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, prominently identified with such noted institutions as Great Britain's Cambridge University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Johns Hopkins University, University of Illinois, and the Soviet Academy of Sciences.

Topics to be discussed by the Pugwash participants range from use of communicable diseases as biological warfare to theoretical possibilities of disease agents produced through guided mutations, and potentialities of chemical weapons such as internal and external viscants, incendiary substances, and physiological poisons.

Conferees will meet in the paradoxically ultra modern new Pugwash District High School, while being housed in Eaton's centuries' old family home, now familiarly known as Thinkers Lodge, as well as in comfortable ancient neighboring homes of the quiet community's leading citizens. The Pugwash population of 500 will be increased at least 10 percent by members of the conference and associates.

Pugwash's original scientific meeting took place in July 1957 at the combined instance of Eaton and Lord Russell, the renowned British mathematician and philosopher. The two started laying plans for such a conference with the late world famous physicist, Albert Einstein, shortly before his death. Subsequent symposia have been held under the Pugwash name at Lac Beauport, Quebec, and in Austria. In turning from nuclear perils to the threat of biological and chemical warfare, Lord Russell's continuing committee stated, "Some scientists believe the destructive potentialities of biological and chemical warfare are now even greater than those of nuclear warfare. Others disagree. Whatever the true position, an authoritative statement on this subject is certainly of the utmost importance particularly in view of the tight secrecy which it is surrounded by the governments concerned. Biological warfare, even if not so dangerous as nuclear warfare, could be of great nuisance value in wars between small nations. In the present state of the world, this might easily lead to global conflict."

The statement points out that "the Pugwash movement deals with all consequences of science that may affect the fate of man. It is quite possible that the potentialities of biological warfare may radically alter the conditions necessary for the establishment of stable peace."

Mr. President, we shall be watching for the observations made and the conclusions reached by these 25 scientists on this general subject, which is of such vital importance to the future welfare of mankind—namely, biological and chemical warfare and what we can do to bring reason to bear, before it is too late, by bringing to an end the danger that any such war would ever be started.

Mr. President, I ask that the release which I have read and these remarks be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

Mediterranean Patrol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the fourth in a series of articles by Mr. Edward J. Milne, Washington correspondent for the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin of Providence, R.I., concerning his recent tour of the NATO countries. This article appeared in the Providence Journal of July 10, 1959, and is entitled "Mediterranean Patrol":

MEDITERRANEAN PATROL

(By Edward J. Milne)

ABOARD U.S.S. "INTREPID."—Give a map of Europe a quarter turn clockwise and the continent's peninsula character becomes

strikingly plain—along, in the Navy's opinion, with the necessity of controlling the waters around it.

A big part of the job of controlling the Mediterranean's 2,000-mile sea flank of Europe has been assigned to the U.S. 6th Fleet. A big part of the 6th Fleet's job is done by its Attack Carrier Striking Force, consisting of 2 large carriers, 2 to 3 cruisers, and 20 destroyers.

One of the carriers at present is U.S.S. *Intrepid*, which—according to one's point of view—is either a miracle of modern sea warfare or a beat-up old tub.

At any rate, she's a gallant veteran of the Pacific in World War II, when she took both torpedo and kamikaze hits. She went into mothballs in 1946, came out in 1954 fitted with steam catapults to allow her to launch the ever bigger and heavier planes; 2 years later, she was fitted with an angled deck to increase her plane recovery capacity. Now she can launch and take back all but the biggest of the Navy's retaliatory strike atomic bombers, and some of those she does handle can carry any weapon we have.

Her air group today varies all the way from the fighter bombers, jet and prop, to all-weather supersonic fighters firing guns or missiles to helicopters for sea rescue duty that can pull a ditched pilot out of the water and put him on deck in 5 minutes.

While it ceaselessly prowls the Mediterranean, the 6th Fleet is based on the east coast of the United States—Newport, Norfolk, and so on. It has no major dependence on southern European ports, although its ships constantly visit them on good-will missions, because it is supplied by the oilers, refrigerator ships, and other supply vessels of its own service force.

Depending on whether her planes are nuclear-loaded or conventionally armed, the 6th is ready for all-out war, if that is what comes, or brush-fire war. The fleet has received an estimate from the British, old tenants of the Mediterranean, that from 750 to 1,000 merchant ships a day, not counting countless fishermen, ply the Mediterranean. Every one of these shows a return on radar, and that, the Navy thinks, would give the Russians one devil of a job trying to identify the 6th's widely dispersed units.

"The memory of Pearl Harbor," says the 6th Fleet, "is still with us," and that, plus training needs, is the reason the fleet is constantly churning the Mediterranean's blue waters at 600 to 700 miles a day and its carriers' planes are so much aloft. On June 29, for example, *Intrepid* shot 61 planes into the skies in day and night exercises, setting a new monthly record of 1,504 sorties and bringing the total of sorties since conversion to angled deck to 35,891.

Officers of *Intrepid* and the 6th Fleet have been briefing newspapermen on the missions, capabilities, and problems of the fleet. The missions are plain enough and agreed upon—to join the U.S. Strategic Air Command and United States and other NATO tactical air units in Europe if the Supreme Allied Commander Europe calls for a counterstrike against hundreds of Russian targets; to wage conventional warfare in support of national policy; i.e., handle localized outbreaks; and bolster the confidence of Turkey, Greece, and Italy, the alliance's southern anchor.

But capabilities and problems are something else again.

There's the problem, being fought at higher levels in Washington, of new carriers for the Navy.

"Why do we need new carriers?" one briefing officer asked. "Because the majority we have now are of World War II vintage. Their hulls are fast approaching the point of overage. Maintenance costs are approaching operating costs. In addition, as aircraft increase in speed and size, we need larger launching and recovery areas. The Russians

don't use second-line aircraft, and we can't afford to."

Intrepid's engineering officer, a hard-bitten, zealous and obviously sincere commander, said 80 percent of the equipment below decks should be replaced or renewed. *Intrepid* will be going into the yards soon, he said, but a lot of what needs doing to her won't be done because of shortage of both money and skilled personnel.

"I am convinced," he said, "that a Navy board will find the ship is in no fit condition to go to war. It's true of 95 percent of our ships. Should the showdown come today, I wonder if we could count on all our carriers."

Briefed, in turn, on this briefing, neither *Intrepid's* skipper, Capt. Paul Masterton, nor Vice Adm. Clarence E. Ekstrom, commander of the 6th Fleet, endorsed it enthusiastically. Said Captain Masterton:

"I am sorry he made that remark. He is not competent to comment on the fleet or even on the combat capabilities of this ship. The record shows that we have made all our commitments."

Admiral Ekstrom responded in more general terms.

"It is true," he said, "that we have lost ground in modernizing the fleet in the last few years. Korea was an extra charge, and because of it most of the destroyers, of World War II vintage, suffered maintenance-wise. But we are in good shape and ready to go."

"We would like to have new and better ships, radar, sonar, and so on. But it cannot all be done at once. The French air force in 1935-36 was the most modern in the world, but they had committed so much to it that by the time World War II started it was reaching obsolescence."

Besides ships, a Navy has sailors, and here there are problems, too. Cmdr. Malcolm W. Cagle, *Intrepid's* Washington executive officer, undoubtedly knows that the Navy has a little publication, "Facts About the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean," which lists, among others, the fact that "Duty with the 6th Fleet is widely regarded as the best in the seagoing Navy."

"Our enlistment rate," Commander Cagle said frankly, "is not good. We have only 13 re-enlistments on board." (*Intrepid* has a ship's company of almost 3,000.) "These kids can't take it, and you can't blame them. When we go to sea, they sometimes have to go for days without baths. They sleep in those old-fashioned tiered bunks. The heat down there is intense. There's almost no place for them to sit down to have a game of cards."

Yet, there are things that make him proud of his boys. The Navy indoctrinates them with the idea that they are their country's ambassadors in port and urges them to behave themselves ashore. They seem to be doing so.

So far this year, Commander Cagle said, 30,302 sailors have been ashore in Mediterranean ports, and there have been only 19 shore patrol reports—"and 15 of the 19 were for fights at the fleet landing. The kids work like animals and live like animals, and we expect them to go ashore and behave like Little Lord Fauntleroy."

But life aboard is no bed of roses, either, for *Intrepid's* officers. Sixteen- and 18-hour days, even longer, are common. There are times when Captain Masterton, no youngster any longer, is lucky to be able to nap 10 minutes at a stretch in any 24-hour period.

And, at fleet level, Admiral Ekstrom would be a lot easier in mind if he had his hunter-killer task force aboard at all times. Part of the Atlantic fleet, the hunter-killer force, consisting of a carrier, specialized air, and destroyers, is the 6th's antisubmarine screen. Russian submarines and manned aircraft are deemed the greatest threat to the 6th Fleet's striking forces.

"If things got warm it would take the hunter-killer group 7 to 8 days to get here from the east coast," Admiral Ekstrom's staff says. "We feel much better when it's here."

Progress in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, few nations have had to struggle against such odds as has the Republic of Korea. Since its formation in 1948 that country has faced staggering economic problems, a bitter war, and the continued threat of annihilation from enemies to the north.

When one considers the great burdens borne by the Republic of Korea, it is a wonder that it has been able to survive. But the amazing fact is that the Republic has not only survived, but it has been making significant progress.

In the August 3 issue of Newsweek the noted foreign policy analyst, Ernest K. Lindley, reports on the encouraging developments taking place in that country and on the strength and spirit of its people. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article entitled "Korean Comeback" be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

I have spoken out on certain actions in the Republic of Korea which were not compatible with a free society. Evidence of strong-arm tactics by the majority party cannot be excused or ignored.

Yet despite such shortcomings, we must remember that the Republic of Korea has attempted to work within the framework of the 1948 Constitution, which is patterned in large measure after our own form of government. It maintains a popularly elected assembly, its President and Vice President are elected by the people each 4 years, and its judiciary is an independent branch of the Government.

The Republic of Korea strongly favors unification of Korea. It cherishes the hope that some day the whole of Korea will be united under a republican form of government. This is a hope which is shared by the people of all the free nations of the world. Communist-controlled North Korea stands as a threat to the freedom and independence of the Republic of Korea. It stands also as a symbol of the ruthless aggression and terrorist methods of the Communists.

The Korean comeback, as reported by Ernest K. Lindley, involves much more than the struggle for achievement of the brave people of this tiny country; it involves also the worldwide struggle between the free world and the Communist bloc. The Republic of Korea is in the front line trenches, both literally and figuratively speaking, in this common struggle.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Newsweek, Aug. 3, 1959]

KOREAN COMEBACK

(By Ernest K. Lindley)

SEOUL.—If all free Asians were as sturdy as the Koreans, the Communist offensive would be at a dead end. Not only naked force, but intimidation, beguilement, economic penetration, diplomatic trickery—all the devices in the arsenal of Red expansionism—would be obviously futile.

Almost every able-bodied ROK youth does 3 years of military service, for less than cigarette money. The truce line is defended by 18 ROK divisions and 2 American (containing many Koreans), half on the front, half in reserve. Behind this line, the Republic of Korea has risen from the debris of war and is making significant economic gains. Most of the damage to Seoul has been repaired. Industrial production has risen 70 percent in 4 years. Farm output has risen much less but has enjoyed two successive good crops. Per capita income is estimated at roughly U.S.\$100, medium for free Asia. The standard of living is probably well above North Korea's, although the latter, with more resources and fewer people, is making industrial gains.

Since mid-1957, inflation has been substantially checked. Bank deposits have soared. So have tax revenues—they are nine times what they were in 1953, when the truce was signed. Good progress appears to have been made in curbing corruption and misuse of American goods. Lt. Gen. Song Yo Chan, ROK Army Chief of Staff, has cracked down hard on thefts of military supplies. Pressure toward petty corruption was relieved last October by doubling Government salaries, both military and civilian.

GOOD MANAGEMENT

As long as it has a heavy military burden, the Republic of Korea must have large-scale aid. However, a ROK soldier costs only one-tenth as much to maintain as an American. In administering our general aid two special devices are used to good effect. One is the Combined (American-Korean) Economic Board, which allots funds and verifies their end use. The other is the aid control law, with prison penalties for misuse of aid money. Relations between key Koreans and Americans, both civilian and military, are excellent. "We are like brothers," one Korean minister said to me. Men such as Song In Sang, Minister of Finance, and Kim Chong Yol, Minister of Defense, are highly esteemed by our representatives.

The apparently everlasting President Syngman Rhee (now 84) remains impatient to unite his country, by force if necessary—although he knows the United States will not permit the ROK to take any military initiative. He also remains implacably hostile to Japan. Japan has been sticky in its dealings with Korea and blundered in proposing to send to North Korea some of the Koreans now in Japan. But Rhee's unwillingness to forget the old Japanese tyranny impedes a rapprochement that would serve the interests of both nations.

BETTER PLANNING

Internally, there is discontent with Rhee and his Liberal Party, and this is probably augmented by their tendency to use strong-arm tactics on their opponents. Next in line to Rhee as Vice President is a member of the opposing Democratic Party, John M. Chang, who lives in semiseclusion because of attempts on his life. Rhee's own chances of winning the national election next year are rated better than his party's, if the choice is completely free. Democrats complain of all sorts of discrimination, including press curbs. They favor unification of Korea by peaceful means only and differ with the Liberals on certain constitutional questions. But they seem to be no less friendly to the United States.

Korea still has unemployment and underemployment. It needs a well-coordinated economic program and more money for education. Our 1-year-at-a-time system of dishing out aid handicaps orderly development. A 5-year commitment would help Korea more and probably save money for us. Experienced Americans say that Koreans, given a chance, learn new skills as quickly as the Japanese.

These are an intrepid people. Their severe war losses, in life and property, appear to have stiffened their spirit even more. They have both the will to fight if necessary and the ability, with our aid, to make their country a telling frontline illustration of the superiority of the free way of life.

Thors for Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the fifth in a series of articles by Mr. Edward J. Milne, Washington correspondent for the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin of Providence, R.I., concerning his recent tour of the NATO countries. This article appeared in the Providence Journal of July 14, 1959, and is entitled "Thors for Britain":

THORS FOR BRITAIN

(By Edward J. Milne)

LONDON.—Come all-out war, a United States-British team could blast back at Russia today with atomic ballistic missiles.

Both U.S. Air Force Strategic Bomber Command and British Royal Air Force Bomber Command spokesmen say that on an emergency basis the Thor intermediate range ballistic missile, American-made and British-operated, is ready to be "fired in anger" if need be.

Four widely dispersed bases from East Anglia north almost to Scotland are nearing completion as Thor launching sites, and the British are expected to announce within a week or two just when they will be fully operational. In the meantime, SAC says its training role should be completed, and the British ready to take over lock, stock, and barrel, by next spring. The United States will retain control of the warheads.

Thor is not an intercontinental missile in the commonly accepted sense, in America, of a 5,000-mile vehicle. But it becomes intercontinental, for all practical U.S. purposes, when shot from these islands.

President Eisenhower and Harold Macmillan, the British Prime Minister, agreed in March 1957 that until Britain could produce her own, U.S.-built ballistic missiles should be stationed here in the heart of the second most formidable NATO power. The British, overcoming strong antinuclear feeling, have pressed ahead with the job of base construction and missile squadron training.

The Thor-for-Britain program is probably unique in world political and military history. For the first time the United States has supplied a friendly power with a major weapon before putting it to work in its own Armed Forces. For the first time, too, the United States is sharing operational control, and that at an eventual minimum, with another power.

"Mr. Thor" in England, is Maj. Gen. W. H. Blanchard, SAC's 7th Air Division Commander and principal American adviser to the RAF on the missile program.

Scattered over the four Thor bases, he says, are 20 dispersed launching sites with three of the big "birds" on each.

"So we are completely dispersed," he says. "One bird on each location would be the optimum dispersal. But there never was any weapon system in the free world as completely dispersed. If you put in 60 more birds there wouldn't be much of England left."

Since ground was broken for the Thor program last year, construction of two of the four bases has been completed. In one of the two, the missiles have been installed and checked out; in the other, the installation and checkout phase is about to be completed. In both of these, RAF crews got their individual technical training in the States and are now completing their training as crews here in England.

To speed the process, while the third and fourth squadrons' base construction is being completed and the installation and checkout phase is underway, all individual and crew training is being given in the States so that the squadrons will be ready to take over operationally as soon as construction and installation are complete.

There is no room in these tight little islands for test firings of the Thor, and the first two RAF squadrons will be back in the States for that job in a few weeks. The two others will not be far behind.

If the British made a big political decision to go ahead with the Thor program, the Americans made a tremendous financial and physical effort to carry it out. Dollar figures are not available, but they can be sensed from a mere mention of SAC's Ballistic Missile European Task Organization: a force of 1,000 people, military and civilian, moving up and down the English countryside in trailers, managing construction and supervising installation. The British met the cost of the launching pads and accessory construction.

The Thor is roughly in the 1,500-mile range class. The British are working on their own IREB, the Blue Streak, which will have a greater range than Thor—"2,000 miles would be a serious underestimate," they say—and could be fired from underground. They regard Thor as an addition to, not a substitute for, their retaliatory bombing planes. They offer no date on when their own Blue Streak may become operational, but when it does, they expect it to replace, not supplement, some of their manned aircraft.

Duncan Sandys, the British Minister of Defense, and other military people here agree with the American estimate that in the next 12 months, "provided we maintain the unity and strength of NATO," there is "no likelihood of war at all."

But in any event, he says, "not at any time since the end of the war has the partnership of Britain and the United States in the military field been more intimate and effective than it is today."

General Blanchard has been in the atomic game since before the first bomb was dropped over Hiroshima. He says that by "scrambling everything we have," meaning RAF, USAF, and technical representatives of the American manufacturers of Thor, Feltwell, the most advanced of the four bases in the English lowlands, has had the capacity since last December 31 to fire Thors should they have been needed as part of the first wave of all-out retaliation. Today, he says, there is "reasonable emergency capability in any of these locations," although the operation would "not be as fast and smooth as later on."

Each of the 4 Thor bases carries 15 of the missiles, and these in turn are scattered,

3 to a site, among the main base and satellite bases. Seventh Air Division training forces are fast disappearing from the scene at Feltwell, as they will be doing soon at the three other bases, and when the British are ready to take over, only skeleton U.S. crews will remain to maintain the warheads.

These, under U.S. law, must remain in U.S. Air Force custody until the President releases them. General Blanchard says no one knows just when he might do so. In a period of acute tension, when all the political signs pointed to the possibility of a major Russian thrust, he might do so well in advance of actual attack alerts, General Blanchard says—2 or 3 days, perhaps, or a week.

But even then, U.S. control would be complete up to the moment of decision to fire. The "two key" system makes this possible. The British have the key that starts the 15-minute countdown for launching a Thor. But sometime within the first 12 minutes of the countdown, a U.S. "authentication officer" would have to turn the second key or there would be no lift.

This two-key system is the ultimate satisfaction of American atomic energy law requiring U.S. control over its nuclear weapons. In a nation with an atomic capability of its own, such as Great Britain has, the arrangement has suffered some unpopularity politically.

But as a practical military matter, RAF Bomber Command people treat it lightly. They can hardly conceive of a situation in which the British would want to unleash a nuclear counterattack and the Americans would not, or vice versa.

In any event, what is important to them, however, is the mere existence of these sleek, powerful birds roosting in eastern England. For the British, like the Americans, believe that the more symbols the West displays of instant and overwhelming retaliatory power, the less likely are the Russians to risk challenging it.

A Legislature for American Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, students from 390 member schools of the United States National Student Association will meet from August 24 to September 3 at the University of Illinois. Their National Student Congress will mark the 12th anniversary of the United States National Student Association; the congress will also be a clear-cut demonstration of student responsiveness to challenges.

The congress, called the Nation's most significant student meeting, will offer workshops on issues ranging from "International Awareness on the Campus" to "Higher Education and the Federal Government." The students will try to predict "The Goals and Directions of Higher Education." Their legislative committees will examine issues which show the wide range of United States National Student Association interests: First, The Student and the Educational Process; second, Human Rights and Academic Freedom; third, Student Self-Government; fourth, The Campus and

the Greater Community; fifth, International Student Relations.

The association president Robert R. Kiley, of the University of Notre Dame, put the purposes of the Congress succinctly in his letter of greetings to delegates: "By acting as a legislature for American students on all United States National Student Association campuses, congress delegates also have constructed a basis for the development of national programs of lasting importance, while functioning as the only unified voice for the American student community."

Mr. President, the voice of our students is an important one, particularly at a time when we are asking our educators whether we can meet the challenge of future competition with nations that do not educate as we educate, that do not permit the freedom of thought which we permit.

An answer to those who ask that question is provided in part by this Congress and by the activities of the USNSA within the past year.

In the 12 months since the last National Student Congress the USNSA has completed these programs:

Campus consultations. USNSA staff members have traveled to over 150 member and nonmember campuses, providing local student leaders with help in evaluating their own performances and in improving their liaison with their counterparts in other areas of the country.

Completion of the first year of the student responsibility project, a major innovation in educational programming financed by a \$25,000 Ford Foundation grant, and involving experimental programs on 15 pilot campuses and in 2 pilot regions. The responsibility project stressed three areas: student responsibility in college teacher recruitment, student responsibility in counseling and tutoring, and better utilization of existing educational resources.

A series of four summary publications are now in preparation.

A southwide student conference on human relations, which brought together 150 southern student leaders from November 28 through 30 at Pfeiffer College in Meisenheimer, N.C. A result of suggestions from the area's student leaders, the meeting was designed as an open conference stressing discussion and solution of problems.

A student editors' conference on international news coverage, cosponsored with the Overseas Press Club of America. Approximately 120 student editors and 60 club members met at the club headquarters in New York City on March 13, 14, and 15.

The association has recognized the importance of understanding among nations. Among their 1958-59 international programs were these:

Participation in the International Student Conference, held in February in Lima, Peru. As a member of the International Student Conference, USNSA was one of 66 national unions of students represented.

A long-term academic exchange agreement negotiated by representatives of USNSA and the Polish National Union of

Students. Two American students now are enrolled in Polish universities under the terms of this exchange, with one Polish student attending the University of Michigan and one more scheduled to arrive in September.

Contributions for academic scholarships for 12 Algerian refugee student leaders have been secured, with the program now in operation.

USNSA's foreign student leadership project entered its fourth year of operation, with special scholarships provided for 16 foreign student leaders from underdeveloped areas. The students spent a full academic year on selected American campuses with reduced study loads, in order to study the structures and operation of American campus organizations.

The seventh International Student Relations Seminar. Fifteen outstanding student leaders have been selected from member school applicants for an intensive 9-week seminar in international student relations, now in progress at USNSA's international commission office in Cambridge, Mass.

The students elected as officers for the 1958-59 year are individuals who apparently have a deep awareness of individual responsibility. These officers are:

Robert R. Kiley, 23, president. He served as student government vice president in 1957-58, after graduating with honors from the University of Notre Dame where he was named outstanding student.

Diane Hatch, 20, executive vice president, will be a senior at Brigham Young University in 1959-60. At Brigham Young, she was a student government officer for 3 years while taking a pre-medical course. She also served as chairman of USNSA's Utah region for 1 year.

Willard Johnson, 23, international affairs vice president. He served as 1957-58 educational affairs vice president, the position he won at the 10th National Student Congress after serving as UCLA's student body president.

Reginald H. Green, 23, educational affairs vice president, is a former Whitman College newspaper editor and is now a graduate student on leave from Harvard University.

Fred Werner, 22, student government vice president, is a graduate of Trinity College where he was campus newspaper editor.

James J. Harrington, 20, student affairs vice president, graduated in June 1959 from St. John's University in Brooklyn, where he was student body president.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record messages of encouragement received at the August 1958 congress from government and leaders. To give further indication of the importance of this confederation of student government of colleges, I ask, too, for unanimous consent to have printed the names of member schools and members of the National Advisory Council of the U.S. National Student Association.

There being no objection, the messages and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MESSAGES RECEIVED IN AUGUST 1958

Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States:

"To all attending the 11th National Student Congress, I send greetings. The young men and women now studying in American colleges and universities are sharing in a great democratic heritage. With renewed dedication to the principles of free inquiry and the discipline of truth, I am confident that your deliberations will add to both the vitality and the stature of American higher education.

"Best wishes for a memorable congress."

RICHARD NIXON, Vice President of the United States:

"It is a pleasure to extend greetings to the delegates and guests attending the 11th National Student Congress.

"During this past academic year the attention of the Nation has been fixed as never before on the subject of education not only in the public schools but also in our colleges and universities. More than ever we realize that education determines our social, cultural, moral, and economic progress and may even decide whether this land shall remain free.

"The National Student Association and its members have willingly entered into efforts to improve the quality of our schools and colleges and have also carried the story of the importance of education throughout the land. By its serious purpose and dedication to the ideals of democracy it has served a real function in our society.

"With every good wish for a most successful convention."

RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Senator, Texas:

"Texas is proud of the part her students have played in the founding and continued growth of the National Student Congress. Believing that an educated citizenry is the only true safeguard of a democracy, I have coauthored the National Education Act of 1958. Having implicit confidence in the youth of America I extend my warmest congratulations to the congress and urge you to push your leadership of American college students to the end that our people will be the most enlightened in the world. Give to student bodies a tone of nobility and dedication to the great challenge which encompasses us on every side. God be with you."

Robert B. Meyner, Governor, New Jersey:

"My best wishes to the officers and delegates of the U.S. National Student Association on the occasion of your 11th congress. Discussion about our schools cannot be carried on as if education is unrelated to the kind of society we have created on this continent and which we want to cherish and improve. In the worldwide conflict which we have come to describe as the cold war, the moral armor of a people dedicated to freedom, individual liberty and self-government, may in the long run prove to be the most important strength in our national arsenal.

"Our reach sometimes exceeds our grasp. Too often, perhaps, we fail to measure up to the best that is in us. Nevertheless, as a people, we do stretch out our hands to raise our practice to our precept. We believe everyone deserves an equal chance. Furthermore, we believe that people deserve more than one chance. A single failure is never final. Our concern is with the person on whom we place the ultimate value. We encourage truth to compete with error in the market place of debate and discussion, confident that a free people enlightened by education can tell the difference between the real and the counterfeit, between good and evil. The record of American students acting through USNSA over the past decade

indicates that our faith has not been misplaced.

"May your discussions and resolutions of this next week be fruitful to yourselves and your colleges and instructive to us, your fellow citizens."

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL OF THE U.S. NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION

Wallace M. Alston, president, Agnes Scott College.

Ralph J. Bunche, Under Secretary, United Nations.

John Ciardi, poetry editor, Saturday Review.

John Cogley, staff administrator, the Fund for the Republic.

Christine Y. Conaway, dean of women, Ohio State University.

James M. Debbs, president, Southern Regional Council, Inc.

Rev. T. M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president, University of Notre Dame.

Russell Kirk, editor, Modern Age.

Robert H. Shaffer, dean of students, Indiana University.

George N. Shuster, president, Hunter College.

Harold E. Stassen.

Howard E. Wilson, dean of the School of Education, University of California at Los Angeles.

O. Meredith Wilson, president, University of Oregon.

NATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD OF THE U.S. NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION

Mr. Charles W. McCracken, dean of student personnel services, Trenton State College.

Mr. Paul McMinn, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. Phil Berry.

Mr. Phillip H. DesMarais, executive vice president, St. Mary's Dominican College.

Prof. Warren Ashby, Woman's College of the University of North Carolina.

Dr. Gordon Klopff, visiting professor of education, Columbia University.

Mr. James Lewis, vice president, University of Michigan.

Carl M. Grip, dean of men, Temple University.

Kathryn L. Hopwood, dean of students, Hunter College.

Dr. Charles Gadaire, dean of students, American International College.

Three hundred and ninety colleges and universities, with a total enrollment exceeding 1,300,000 students, constitute the U.S. National Student Association.

UNITED STATES NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION MEMBERSHIP, AUGUST 1959

California-Nevada-Hawaii: Immaculate Heart College; Los Angeles State College; Mount St. Mary's College; University of California, Berkeley; University of California, Los Angeles; University of Hawaii; University of Southern California; Whittier College; Church College of Hawaii; Chaminade College.

Carollinas-Virginia: Atlantic Christian College; Averett Junior College; Belmont-Abbey College; Bennett College; Bridgewater College; Claflin College; Clemson Agricultural College; Columbia College; Converse College; Davidson College; Duke University; Women's Student Government, Men's Student Government; Fayetteville State Teachers College; Furman University; Greensboro College; Hampton Institute; Hollins College; Lenoir Rhyne College; Lynchburg College; Mary Baldwin College; Mary Washington College; North Carolina College; North Carolina College of Agriculture and Engineering; Queen's College; Randolph-Macon Women's College; Flora McDonald College; South Carolina State College; Salem College; Sweet Briar College; University of North Carolina;

University of South Carolina; Winthrop College; Wofford College; Women's College; University of North Carolina; Limestone College.

Great Northwest: Cascade College; Central Washington College of Education; Eastern Washington College of Education; Maryhurst College; Reed College; University of Alaska; University of Portland; University of Washington; Washington State College.

Great Southeast: Agnes Scott College; Barry College; Clark College; Morehouse College; Morris-Brown College; Savannah State College; Shorter College; Spring Hill College; University of Miami; Florida A. & M.

Great Southwest: Arkansas A. & N.; Arkansas A&M; Dillard University; Houston-Tillotson College; Oklahoma City University; Our Lady of the Lake College; Phillips University; Southern University; Southwest Texas State Teachers College; Southwestern University; St. Mary's of the Dominican; University of Oklahoma; University of Texas; Xavier University; Wayland Baptist College.

Illinois-Wisconsin: Illinois State Normal College; Augustana College; Barat College of the Sacred Heart; George Williams College; Lakeland College; Milwaukee-Downer College; Mt. Mary College; Mundelein College; National College of Education; North Park College; Northwestern University; Rockford College; Roosevelt University; Rosary College; Southern Illinois University; University of Chicago; University of Illinois; University of Wisconsin-Madison; University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee; Wright College; Shimer College.

Iowa-Nebraska: Briar Cliff College; Central College; Iowa State College; Simpson College; State University of Iowa; University of Dubuque; Wartburg College; Nebraska Wesleyan College; Westmar College.

Kentucky-Tennessee: Berea College; Bellarmine College; Carson-Newman College; Centre College of Kentucky; Fisk University; George Peabody College; Georgetown College; Kentucky State College; King College; LeMoine College; Maryville College; Nazareth College; Siena College; Southwestern at Memphis; Transylvania College; University of Louisville; Vanderbilt University; Pikeville College; Tennessee Wesleyan College.

Mason Dixon: Catholic University of America; College of Notre Dame of Maryland; Coppin State Teachers College; Dumbarton College of the Holy Cross; Howard University; Maryland State Teachers College, Frostburg; Maryland State Teachers College, Towson; Morgan State Teachers College; Trinity College; University of Baltimore; Washington College; Wesley College.

Metropolitan New York: Brooklyn College; Barnard College; CCNY, Baruch Day; CCNY, Baruch Evening; College of New Rochelle; Columbia College, Columbia University; Fordham School of Education; Good Counsel College; Hunter College, Bronx; Hunter College, Park Avenue; Long Island University, C. W. Post; Manhattan College; Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart; Marymount College, New York City; Marymount College, Tarrytown; New York University (Heights); Notre Dame College of Staten Island; Queens University, Long Island; St. John's University, Long Island; St. John's University College; St. Joseph's College; Sarah Lawrence College; Yeshiva College; Long Island University, Brooklyn; Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn.

Michigan: Kalamazoo College; Bay City Junior College; Central Michigan College; Flint Junior College; Ferris Institute; Hope College; Marygrove College; Mercy College; Michigan State University; Michigan College of Mining and Technology; University of Michigan; Wayne State University; Alma College.

Minnesota-Dakotas: Augsburg College; Bethel College and Seminary; Carleton Col-

legs; College of St. Benedict; College of St. Catherine; College of St. Teresa; College of St. Thomas; Concordia College; Dickinson State Teachers College; Gustavus Adolphus College; Hamline University; Huron College; Hibbing Junior College; Macalester College; North Dakota Agricultural College; Southern State Teachers College; St. John's University; St. Mary's College; University of Minnesota; Duluth; University of Minnesota; Minneapolis; Yankton College.

Missouri-Kansas: Bethany College; Central Missouri State College; Cottey College; College of Emporia; Harris Teachers College; Kansas State Teachers College; Pittsburg; Lincoln University; Marymount College; Maryville College; Mount St. Scholastica College; St. Benedict's College; University of Kansas; University of Kansas City; University of Missouri; Webster College; William Jewell College.

New England: Albertus Magnus College; American International College; Amherst College; Babson Institute of Business & Administration; Bennington College; Bradford Junior College; Brandeis University; Colby College; Colby Junior College; College of Our Lady of the Elms; Dartmouth College; Eastern Nazarene College; Northeastern University; Boston; Bates College; Emmanuel College; Fisher Junior College; Garland Junior College; Harvard-Radcliffe Graduate Council; Hillyer College; Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Mitchell College; Mount Holyoke College; Mount St. Mary's College; Newton College of the Sacred Heart; Pembroke College; Quinnipiac College-Radcliffe College; St. Joseph's College; Regis; Simmons College; Skidmore College; Smith College; Springfield College; State Teachers College, Framingham; State Teachers College, Bridgewater; State Teachers College, Castleton; State Teachers College, Keene; State Teachers College, Salem; State Teachers College, Westfield; Trinity College; University of Bridgeport; University of Maine; University of Rhode Island; Wellesley College; Wheaton College; Wheelock College; Worcester Junior College; Yale College; University of New Hampshire.

New Jersey: College of St. Elizabeth; Douglass University; Drew University; Fairleigh-Dickinson College; Jersey City Junior College; Jersey City State College; Monmouth College; Rutgers University; Rutgers Graduate Council; Rutgers South Jersey; Montclair State College; Trenton State College; Seton Hall University; St. Peter's College; Newark State College; Upsala College; Newark College of Engineering.

New York State: Alfred Agricultural & Technical Institute (of State University); Alfred University; Bard College; Canisius College; Clarkson Institute; College of St. Rose; Cornell University; D'Youville College; Erie County Technical Institute; Harpur College; Hartwick College; LeMoyne College; Niagara University; Oneonta State Teachers College; Orange County Community College; Rochester Institute of Technology; Rosary Hill College; State Teachers College, Buffalo; State Teachers College, Cortland; State Teachers College, Fredonia; State Teachers College, New Paltz; State Teachers College, Plattsburgh; State Teachers College, Potsdam; Union College; University of Buffalo; University of Rochester; University of Rochester, School of Nursing; Vassar College; Ithaca College.

Ohio-Indiana: Antioch College; Ashland College; College of Wooster; Defiance College; Denison University; DePauw University; Penn College; Penn College, evening session; Indiana University; John Carroll University; Muskingum College; Oberlin College; Ohio State University; Otterbein College; St. Mary's College; Taylor University; University of Notre Dame; Ursuline College; Western College for Women; Wilberforce University; Wilmington College; Youngstown University.

Pennsylvania-West Virginia: Alderson-Broadus College; Allegheny College; Alliance College; Beaver College; Bethany College; Bryn Mawr College; Cedar Crest College; Chatham College; Chestnut Hill College; Dickinson College; Drexel Institute of Technology; Gannon College; Grove City College; Hershey Junior College; Immaculata College; Juniata College; Lincoln University; Lycoming College; Mercyhurst College; Mount Mercy College; Philadelphia Textile Institute; Rosemont College; St. Francis College; Seton Hill College; Sheppard College; Swarthmore College; Temple University; University of Pennsylvania; Woman's Student Government; West Virginia University; West Virginia Wesleyan College; Villa Maria College; Harcum Junior College; Waynesburg College; St. Joseph's College; Moravian College; Muhlenberg College.

Rocky Mountain: Colorado State College (of Education); Colorado Women's College; Loretto Heights College; Regis College; University of Colorado; University of New Mexico.

Utah: Brigham Young University; College of Southern Utah (of Utah State University); University of Utah; Utah State University; Weber College.

Un-American Attempt To Intimidate the Congress of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, much has been written and said during the last few weeks about labor reform legislation, especially the Landrum-Griffin bill. I have received hundreds of letters, telegrams, and postcards on this subject from all parts of the Nation. None of these contained a threatening tenor, except for the form letter I received this morning from James B. Carey, president of the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers. His threatening communication is a reflection on the citizens of the United States and an un-American attempt to intimidate the Congress of the United States.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include at this point in the RECORD my reply to Mr. Carey:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 21, 1959.

Mr. JAMES B. CAREY,
President, International Union of Electrical,
Radio, and Machine Workers, Wash-
ington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CAREY: I have received your form letter of August 18 endeavoring to intimidate me because of my favorable vote on August 13, 1959, in support of the Landrum-Griffin bill, which also was supported by President Eisenhower as well as by 303 of my colleagues out of the total membership of 436 in the House of Representatives.

It is interesting to note that you have described this legislation as "a punitive and repressive measure." This phrase characterizes the tenor of your letter. In my judgment your action constitutes a grave and intemperate misuse of the money of the rank-and-file of labor union members. By your ill-considered threat you are exposing the labor boss practice of the denial of the

basic rights and democratic processes of your union members. A threat from you is no more terrifying to me than would be a threat from Mr. Hoffa, although I believe even he would be inclined to use better judgment than you have demonstrated.

By your act you have caused me to realize more than ever that I was correct in voting for the Landrum-Griffin bill. I am sure my voting record has proven to my constituency that I am interested in individual rights and democracy more than in the concentration of power in the hands of big business, regardless of whether that big business be the management boss or the labor boss.

The people of the 11th Congressional District of Michigan will not yield to the unthinking dudgeon of any labor leader when they are exercising the right to mark their ballot in secret for the candidates of their choice. Similarly, I would not, and did not, yield to any pressures from the National Association of Manufacturers and the Chamber of Commerce, as you allege, when I cast my vote for the Landrum-Griffin bill.

I have always supported legislation that would protect the rights of labor union members and would rid the unions of the practices of corruption, breach of trust, gangsterism, violence, and abuses of power. The political hoodlumism that you imply will be brought to bear against me does not dismay me, and I am sure it will not be persuasive with the thinking people of my congressional district.

In order that my constituency may be aware of your activities I am sending a copy of your letter and my reply to all individuals on my mailing list. I respect the intelligence of the people whom I have the honor to represent, and know that they too will realize more than ever the real need for the enactment of the provisions of the Landrum-Griffin bill.

Yours truly,

VICTOR A. KNOX,
Member of Congress.

United States Loses, Other Nations Win With Export Credit Guarantees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, a number of Members have expressed concern about declines in U.S. export trade. I have been particularly interested in the recent decline in U.S. trade with Asian countries. During 1958, U.S. exports to the Far East and south Asia dropped 24 percent below the previous year—imports dropped 4 percent. We have grown so accustomed to having export surpluses it is unusual, to say the least, to see our exports and imports approaching a balance. In context, this recent decline follows an increase in exports to Asia of some 25 percent between the end of the Korean war and 1957. To some extent, the decline in exports to Asia since 1957 may be attributed to the cut-back in the volume of aid goods to such recipients as South Korea, Formosa, and South Vietnam. Another more recent factor is the increased energy with which other countries are developing Asian markets.

Mr. President, it is not my purpose today to discuss the many complex factors affecting U.S. trade with Asia. I would, however, like to invite the attention of the Senate to one aspect of the competition. A number of west coast exporters have expressed concern over the fact that foreign competitors are able to make the sale, often for the reason that the competitor is able to offer more attractive credit, both in terms of interest rates and period of repayment. He can offer these attractive terms of credit for the sole reason that many foreign governments guarantee or insure a wide variety of export risks, including export credit. The U.S. investment guarantee program covers some risks. The Development Loan Fund provides reasonable interest rates and terms of payment for transactions through the Fund. The Export-Import Bank satisfies the needs of still another type of transaction. There is a large gap, however, placing many American exporters at a disadvantage. In this connection, I call attention to an editorial in the July 31 edition of *Business International*. The editorial describes in some detail this disadvantage to American exporters. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES LOSES, OTHERS WIN WITH EXPORT CREDIT GUARANTEES

Are foreign competitors offering more attractive terms to overseas buyers than U.S. manufacturers are able to offer? This is not a new question. But the continuing deficit in U.S. international payments (suffered in every year since 1950, except 1957) and the recent, serious drain on U.S. gold reserves make it imperative for the answer to be found now—and a course of action agreed upon.

It is oversimplification to assert that the United States is pricing itself out of world markets. In many cases, in terms of quality, design, performance, appearance, and service, this is just not so. But there is a great deal of evidence that overseas buyers are swayed by foreign competitive credit terms which the U.S. manufacturer cannot match. In many cases the buyer must have credit—or not buy at all. In some countries the government will grant foreign exchange only if the foreign seller offers credit.

Many foreign governments provide export credit insurance policies against a wide variety of both business and political risks. They include the risks of inconvertibility, insolvency, protracted default, promotional losses suffered by the exporter, preshipment losses (if political events prevent shipment, for example), catastrophe and other risks. These guarantees generally apply both to consumer goods and capital goods—and to short-term as well as long-term credits. And they make possible the lending of money by private banks.

Private banks provide most of the export credit for U.S. manufacturers, although normally this is done with recourse to the U.S. supplier. But obviously U.S. banks cannot match the terms offered by foreign banks which enjoy government-backed guarantees. While the Export-Import Bank actually lends money for export credit without recourse to the supplier, its loans (except for cotton) are confined to capital goods. Credits to individual U.S. manufacturers are not offered by Eximbank to countries in balance-of-payments difficulties.

EXIM HELP OF LIMITED VALUE

Most of Eximbank's money has been used for developmental loans in countries suffering balance-of-payments troubles—Indonesia, Argentina, Brazil and India, for example. And these developmental loans have been enormously helpful to U.S. capital goods manufacturers who otherwise would not be able to sell to these countries. But this does not mean that any U.S. capital goods manufacturer can get export credit to accommodate a customer in Indonesia. Far from it. It merely means that those U.S. manufacturers making certain specified goods for the special project in Indonesia which the Eximbank is financing may compete for the order, and if successful, get the credit. All others are frozen out.

The Export-Import Bank has been holding conversations with private banks about offering limited guarantees against political risks in certain countries. But no program has yet been announced that would enable U.S. manufacturers to meet foreign competition on even terms.

Some bankers and manufacturers argue that the whole idea is unsound—that such guarantees underwrite financial mismanagement by foreign governments, or, more brutally, that they finance the balance-of-payments deficits of other countries. In response, proponents of export guarantees argue that no one can foresee the future, and that it could just as easily be said that life insurance companies underwrite unhealthy living.

Whatever one's philosophy in this matter, the grim fact is that foreign manufacturers (including U.S. firms with plants overseas) and their private bankers are protected against more risks, in more countries, and on more goods than are U.S. manufacturers. Here is a summary of export credit facilities and insurance schemes now operated by six foreign governments.

The United Kingdom's Export Credit Guarantee Department (ECGD) of the British Board of Trade offers the world's most complete coverage of capital and consumer goods against all risks except loss from exchange fluctuation. Coverage is for up to 85 percent of loss when due to insolvency or protracted default and up to 95 percent in all other cases. Terms are up to 3 years for consumer goods, 5 for capital goods, and 7 for aircraft. As a further aid, the ECGD offers exporters to the dollar area the opportunity to recoup a portion of their expenditures for market research and promotion in those countries.

The Japanese Government is giving considerable encouragement to exporters, both through credits and insurance from the Japanese Eximbank and by granting tax relief up to 80 percent on export earnings from new markets or in lagging industries. The bank's insurance agency will guarantee up to 80 percent on all losses (including exchange fluctuations) for both capital and consumer goods, and it will also cover any promotional loss suffered by an independent export drive anywhere. Premiums range from 0.48 to 1 percent. Unlike Britain's ECGD, Japan's Eximbank also provides direct export credit, at rates of 4.5-6.5 percent. Additional export incentives include preferential Government treatment of exporters' requests for information, licenses, etc., and permission to exporters to retain 3 percent of their foreign exchange earnings.

In France and territories of the French Community, the semipublic French Export Insurance Company (COFACE) provides coverage (usually 80 percent) against all risks for up to 6 months on consumer goods, 5 years on capital goods. Premiums range from 0.4 percent upward. In addition, COFACE will cover 50 percent of promotional losses incurred by an exporter expanding or seeking new overseas markets. The French Government also usually exempts

exporters when special credit restrictions are introduced, permits accelerated depreciation rates, and allows retention of foreign exchange (12 percent of sales to the dollar area, 8 percent for other exports). Special exporter cards are issued by the Government to companies which export 20 percent or more of their production. Card holders receive privileged treatment by Government agencies and are allowed to retain an extra 3 percent of foreign earnings.

West German Government guarantees are given through Hermes Kreditversicherung, and sureties covering sales to foreign governments are given through a special agency. Both groups cover all risks except default and, with few exceptions, exchange loss. Guarantee extends to 80 percent for political risk (which may soon be hiked to 95 percent for special cases), 70 to 75 percent on other risks. Freshment coverage is available for capital goods. Insurance premiums average about 1 percent for both capital and consumer goods. Other public banks purchase exporters' bills and provide long-term (8-year) financing. In addition, the Government grants turnover tax rebates ranging from a minimum 0.5 to maximum 3 percent.

In Belgium, L'Office National Dueroire, a Government bank, offers risk coverage up to 90 percent for consumer and capital goods produced in Belgium or the Congo. Insurance against political risks costs from 2 to 10 percent and other risks from 3 to 5 percent. The Banque Nationale de Belgique also offers special visas to exporters enabling them to receive favorable discount rates from private banks to finance export operations.

In Italy, the National Insurance Institute (INA) guarantees or insures credits to exporters of capital equipment and some high-value consumer goods against political disturbances, catastrophe, cancellation, and transfer risks, but not default unless the debtor is a foreign government. Insurance coverage runs for up to 5 years on amounts not exceeding 85 percent of value. Rates vary from 0.2 to 2.5 percent. Although more limited than those of the UK, Germany, and France, the Italian export credit insurance system is developing. The ceiling on guarantees granted by INA was just raised from \$160 to \$240 million. A bill now before the Parliament would extend coverage to all Italian exports. The Central Institute for Medium-Term Credit (Mediocredito) grants 4- to 5-year credit, covering up to 83.75 percent of the export value for a rate of 3 percent. In addition, the Foreign Affairs Ministry provides special export services to spur export of capital goods. The Government also waives turnover taxes on many exports.

Miss Elizabeth Allen Smart

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I am including herewith a statement by Charles X. Hutchinson, Jr., president, National Temperance and Prohibition Council, concerning the career of Elizabeth A. Smart, who passed from this life on August 16 in Washington, D.C.:

The notable career of Elizabeth Allen Smart came to a quiet end on August 16 at the Washington Sanitarium. The victim of cancer, she had battled for almost a year to win her fight with the disease. Im-

mediately following the 1958 convention of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union held in Washington, she entered the hospital with no idea of her precarious condition. She lingered between life and death for several weeks, and with great courage and infinite patience won her way back to partial health. Returning to her apartment, she took up her work with surprising energy in spite of her apparent weakness. After a period of weeks, she recognized that her condition was deteriorating, and made her plans to return to the hospital. She did not go until Bishop Hamaker had gone to his summer home and Mrs. Hutchinson and I had sailed for Europe. She did not want to give us any uneasiness. We found a beautiful bouquet from her in our stateroom when we boarded the *Queen Elizabeth*, and did not know that she had reentered the hospital on that very day. On our return, there was only time for a few precious conversations with her at her bedside. Her strength was gone and she spoke in a whisper. She awaited in faith her blessed release.

Elizabeth Smart was the daughter of the parsonage. Her father, the Reverend John Gardner Smart, was a minister of the Dutch Reformed Church in Schoharie, N.Y., when she was born. She attended Smith College, graduated cum laude, and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa. She decided to enter the law and matriculated in the New York University Law School. She was admitted to the New York State bar in 1915 and was a practicing attorney in that State. Her special interest at that time was "business law" which was the title of a book of which she was coauthor. She became interested in journalism as the medium through which public opinion is shaped and motivated and launched a career as editor and publisher, and later owner, of the oldest weekly in New York State, the *Washington County Post*, of Cambridge, N.Y. In law and in journalism her concern was the direction in which our society was drifting, and she supported every movement for moral and social betterment. It was during that period that the conviction crystallized that beverage alcohol was at the root of most of our social ills, and from that time Elizabeth Smart's name became synonymous with temperance reform.

In 1940, Elizabeth Smart came to Capitol Hill as the director of legislation for the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union. Her legal and journalistic background had prepared her for her public relations task as she made her approaches to the Members of the Congress in behalf of pending moral and social, particularly temperance, legislation. She looked upon herself as the voice of the thousands of women in her organization. She had a sense of "calling" that few, if any, lobbyists have ever had. Her penetrating mind and judicious temper won the respect and confidence of congressional leaders. She was far removed from the doctrinaire reformer. She had an understanding of the difficulties of the legislative process in a democracy. She used her power of persuasion in urging the Members of Congress to move in the direction she was convinced we had to go for the sake of the moral health of the Nation. She kept her constituents informed as to what was happening in Congress through her *Washington Letter* in every issue of the *Union Signal*, the national journal of the W.C.T.U. She never wearied. She was always patient. She took her defeats in her stride as temporary setbacks. She lived and died in the faith that her cause would ultimately triumph because it is right.

Elizabeth Smart was related to many organizations including the League of Women Voters, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the American Bar Association, the National League of American Pen Women, and the American Academy of Political and Social Science. Her most active interest was

given to the National Temperance and Prohibition Council which includes 23 organizations working in the field of temperance reform. She was the secretary for many years, and was chairman of the legislative committee at the time of her passing. She has been the key person in the organization for so long that her death is almost an irreparable loss.

Above all, Elizabeth Smart was a good woman. No finer or truer thing could be said. During the years we worked together, my regard for a gallant lady grew, and my affection deepened. For she was great as a person. We shall miss her sadly, but we shall carry on in her faith that—

"Though the wrong seem oft so strong,
God is the Ruler yet."

U.S. Guides at Moscow Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, some of our most able representatives abroad now are the 75 guides at the Moscow Fair.

These young men and women are engaged in hand to hand combat in the war of ideas. They symbolize our way of life to hundreds of thousands of Russians who, until now, have been deprived of personal contact with Americans.

I am proud that one of these guides is from my home State, John D. Levan, Jr., of Springfield, Mo.

In two recent articles, the *New York Times* reported on the fine work being done by these young Americans.

I ask unanimous consent that these two articles from the *New York Times* be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

The constructive work these young people are doing is but another argument in favor of the establishment of a Foreign Service Academy which would train thousands of people in language skills and other knowledge so essential for those who would act as effective American ambassadors of peace.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. GUIDES STAR AT MOSCOW FAIR—RUSSIANS FIND TALK IS MORE REWARDING THAN EXHIBITS

(By Max Frankel)

Moscow, August 14.—The full burden of describing, explaining, defending and selling the United States and its ways at the American National Exhibition here has fallen on the shoulders of 75 young guides.

Chosen carefully from 19 States and the District of Columbia for their knowledge of Russian and familiarity with the American scene, the guides have needed both—and their wits—more than anyone had foreseen. Less than halfway through the show, most are weary but unbowed.

The guides, 27 of whom are women, were to have been adjuncts of the exhibition, to translate for exhibitors and to provide answers to questions not covered on hundreds of explanatory placards.

But in fact the young Americans with large red, white, and blue buttons bearing the word "GID" have become the show.

When they can, they make use of the millions of dollars' worth of props around them, or direct visitors to written explanations. But they are never quite successful in diverting attention from their extensive, often good-humored, and endless talk about how Americans live, work, play and think.

"A hundred times a day I ask the crowds whether they didn't really want to move on, to see other exhibits," says Alexander Kuchero of Washington, D.C., who normally works at the paperback book rack. "Invariably the answer is, 'No, we want to talk to Americans.' And who can deny such a request?"

Richard Leed, of Lititz, Pa., and Titiana Akhoni, of Washington try to explain the features of a model house but end up discussing social security and the cost of groceries with pressing knots of Russians.

Mrs. Natasha Carlton, of 749 West End Avenue, New York, stands behind a freezer and before rows of canned goods in a section of supermarket. She is discussing overseas bases and the chances of war.

Curtis Kamman, of Tucson, Ariz., stands in the living room of a model apartment, microphone in hand, with 500 Russians looking in from two floors. He is explaining why there are so few Negro millionaires in the United States.

On the edge of a large turntable bearing a Thunderbird car stands George Feller of 175 Claremont Avenue, New York, also with microphone, before 300 persons. He gets five questions about his family budget for every one about the car's horsepower.

AN INTERNATIONAL PRINCIPLE

"And if you don't have all that money to buy a Thunderbird?" asks a young Russian into the extended microphone.

"If you don't have the money and don't want to buy on installment, you don't buy," the guide replies. Seeing a few smiles, he adds: "I think this is an international principle."

Now there is widespread laughter, and the guide decides to make a further, unsolicited point:

"I own a Ford, a simple Ford, like the one over there without a crowd around it," he says. "And I can buy used cars for half the original cost, and less."

Invariably, the guides have found, when crowds gather and the banter and give-and-take becomes particularly good-natured and informative, there appears from somewhere someone determined to show up the American.

"And do the Negroes in slums own such cars?" the man asks. Or: "Why don't you tell us about the soup lines?"

Normally, the guide tries to answer and to carry on. Usually, the man persists in the same spirit.

"I answered the same question for you 2 hours ago," the guide will say, when pertinent. Or, if really antagonized: "For someone who has never been to the United States and who cannot get our newspapers and magazines, you seem to know much about us."

HECKLERS MEET REBUKES

Often the man comes with five or six friends and then there are not only sharp, aggressive questions but derision and scorn for the answers.

"Why do you persist in asking if you don't believe me?" the guide will remark. And frequently others in the crowd will begin to shout for recognition, openly demanding to hear the American instead of the things they always hear.

"The other day I spoke for 2 hours about everything under the sun," Mrs. Carlton recalled. "When I just couldn't go on without getting hoarse, a few in the crowd who

hadn't budged since I started thanked me and told me to rest. And suddenly, for the first time since we opened, there was a burst of applause. You can't imagine what it meant. It just made everything worthwhile, even the bouts with the hecklers and the terrible mob scenes."

The guides have found that virtually every day brings something unexpected, even though the bulk of the questions from Russians are amazingly repetitious. But there is nothing like the monolithic reaction or response they had expected, nor is the full range or depth of the Russians' curiosity to be foreseen:

"Do you jam foreign radio broadcasts?" "Are Marx and Engels banned or published only with critical annotations?"

"Is abstract art really taken seriously or is it just meant for fun?" "What does that statute mean?"

"Are there many Russians in the United States?" "Are they being detained against their will?"

"What are slums?" "Are they all underground?"

"Is it true you publish 'Anna Karenina' in 12 pages?" "Are all paperback books comics?"

"What is the tallest building in the United States?" "Do most Americans live in skyscrapers?"

"What is the purpose of the 'Family of Man' exhibit?"

"Did you not bring heavy machinery because you were afraid we would copy it?"

A QUIZZICAL REACTION

The guides say there is no telling how much of their answers is believed. Most difficult, they find, are explanations of the diversity of opinion, of prices, or products and of ways of doing things in the United States.

They find that most Russians are not starry eyed over the wealth of consumer goods on display. Many a Russian remarks that those things don't count for much.

On the other hand, as Alton S. Donnelly of Berkeley, Calif., explains, "Many are attracted to our ways, but they also seem genuinely afraid of what they have heard about unemployment, high medical bills, and rents."

A good number of the guides are surprised at the freedom with which some Russians have expressed frank opinions, especially when conversing in small groups. They have heard unexpected words of admiration for the exhibition and of grumbling about life here. The guides are surprised, too, by the frequent approaches for private conversations, at their hotels or elsewhere off the grounds.

Thousands of the Russian visitors appear willing to stand and hear the same questions answered over and over again, by guide after guide. Often the guides have the feeling that the words of one are measured against the words of others.

ANSWERS KEPT AD LIB

But the guides deliberately resist standard, rehearsed answers and generally give freely of their own views and experiences. They tell about the lives of their friends and neighbors. Or they say they themselves don't really like abstract art.

Such divergence of view, they say, especially in a foreign country and at a propaganda show is the most effective demonstration of the freedom they are trying to suggest.

No question is too personal for the Russians. Most find out soon after they reach the exhibit that the guides earn \$16 a day, and most are impressed with this. They know also that the guides work 6 days a week, from 11 a.m. to 10 p.m. and from 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. on alternate days.

The guides have been given wardrobes—suits, shirts, sweaters, dresses, shoes, and accessories—that enable them to wear differ-

ent clothes each day, but all dress alike on any given day.

They pay about \$3 a day for rooms at a hotel on the outskirts of town and pay for their own food and expenses. As promised, they find the wage covers them, but little more.

A HASTY LOOK AT RUSSIA

The guides range in age from 20 to 35. Most are college and postgraduate students. Many have never before been in the Soviet Union, and they dash in their few free hours to museums and theaters. Some have been to Leningrad for a weekend. Others are planning trips after the exhibition closes September 4.

Whatever they learn on their own, however, they seem to agree that nothing will ever quite match the grueling but rewarding holding forth at the exhibit. And most agree that they have learned two very important things about themselves.

"You learn quickly," one of them remarked, "that when that smile disappears and your sense of humor with it, you are no good to anyone, least of all yourself and your country."

"And, you know," said another, "the average American, until tested under fire, is not really accustomed to articulate America."

RUSSIANS REPEAT QUESTIONS AT FAIR—U.S. GUIDES IN MOSCOW LIST TEN QUERIES PUT TO THEM MOST FREQUENTLY

Moscow, August 14.—Soviet visitors, eager to know more about the United States, have been addressing a great variety of questions to the guides at the American National Exhibition here.

Many of the questions recur frequently. In general terms, following are the 10 questions the guides feel are asked most often and the answers given to these questions:

"Question. What does the average U.S. worker earn?"

"Answer. About \$90 a week. A family often earns more if there is more than one member working."

"Question. How do your unemployed live?"

"Answer. Most guides explain the temporary nature of unemployment, averaging about 3 months. They cite unemployment benefits available in different States. They also try to explain other benefits, varying with union contracts. They stress assistance available in finding work. Sometimes, too, they are called upon to explain why there are periods of relatively high unemployment. They point to the problems of an interdependent but not centrally controlled economy."

LIVING COSTS EXPLAINED

"Question. What do you pay for rent?"

"Answer. The guides describe their own living quarters and rents. They generalize by saying most Americans figure they can spend up to one-fourth of their income on rent and another fourth on food. At various displays, the guides also offer explanations of public housing, cooperative housing and private home ownership and mortgage financing."

"Question. What does education cost?"

"Answer. The guides explain public and private elementary and secondary schooling available in the United States and describe State and private colleges, varying tuitions, availability of scholarships and jobs for students to supplement their budgets. Most also cite their own experiences."

"Question. Why are Negroes discriminated against?"

"Answer. The guides describe the extent of segregation and discrimination and their history in the North and South. They cite progress in various fields and problems remaining, describe antidiscrimination laws of different States, the Supreme Court decision outlawing segregation in schools, and the problems of enforcing this ruling and the

reluctance of the United States to force social changes violently. Several of the guides are Negroes."

FREE PRESS IS A TOPIC

"Question. Are Americans free to read Soviet publications?"

"Answer. The guides explain that Soviet newspapers and magazines can be bought openly in most big cities and that they are available in most university libraries and major public libraries. They also describe English-language publications that carry translations from the Soviet press and the extensive reprints of Soviet speeches and documents in American newspapers."

"Question. Are Americans free to travel out of their country, and is it true they carry no internal passports and need not register with the police when moving into a city?"

"Answer. The guides explain the absence of passports and registration except for criminals on parole, the procedure followed for obtaining a passport to travel abroad, the freedom to move from city to city and from job to job."

U.S. BASES QUESTIONED

"Question. Why has the United States surrounded the Soviet Union with bases?"

"Answer. The guides say this is a political question, which they are not expected to discuss. However, if pressed, they try to answer briefly by citing fears of Americans that they will be attacked and that they could not effectively retaliate from their own territory."

"Question. How does the average worker live, what vacation does he get, what does he spend for medical care, what pension does he get, and how much tax does he pay?"

"Answer. The guides usually relate the life of a family they know to be living within a budget of \$5,000 to \$6,000. They explain medical insurance plans, social security, union and company benefits, housing, resorts, and other details."

"Question. Where did you learn Russian, what work do you do, how much do you earn, how do you live, do you have a car?"

"Answer. There are 75 answers available at the exhibition to these questions, as many as there are guides. All of the answers are honest and they are usually related with humor and a wealth of corroborative detail."

NATO Dig-in Plan Seen as a Gigantic Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include the sixth in a series of articles by Mr. Edward J. Milne, Washington correspondent for the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin, of Providence, R.I., concerning his recent tour of the NATO countries. This article appeared in the Evening Bulletin of July 15, 1959, and is entitled "NATO Dig-In Plan Seen as a Gigantic Job":

NATO Dig-in Plan Seen as a Gigantic Job

(By Edward J. Milne)

NAPLES.—United States and allied North Atlantic Treaty Organization forces in Europe appear to be digging in for a gigantic holding operation.

A tour of NATO defenses in Germany and Italy leaves the impression that there is

no end in sight to the grim and expensive business of building an atomic retaliatory capacity designed to discourage the Russians from making military inroads to the West.

At Ramstein Air Base in west central Germany, two important air headquarters are centered. One is that of the Fourth Allied Tactical Air Force, a NATO command with French, Canadian and U.S. components. The other is the combat headquarters of the U.S. Air Forces, Europe. For all practical purposes the two are the same, with the same American general in charge.

At the NATO command they say: "Our aim is an atomic delivery capability which will allow us to deliver the Sunday punch."

At the U.S. command, they say: "We are SACEUR's private air force." SACEUR is military for Supreme Commander, Europe—once Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower and now U.S. Air Force Gen. Lauris Norstad.

U.S. Maj. Gen. Gabriel P. Disosway is the deputy commander of both USAFE, the U.S. actual operational air force in Europe, and 4ATAF, the NATO force that will go into action if the bell rings.

"Our first and foremost task," he says very simply, "is to execute an atomic strike. SACEUR has placed the highest priority on this."

General Disosway and his superiors on up to General Norstad are not without their problems, including finding new bases in Germany or the United Kingdom if the French rule atomic bombs out of France. But despite the political uncertainties, he says:

"We have a sizable force, entirely atomic-capable, able to deliver a retaliatory strike."

In south central Germany, the U.S. Army, Europe, built around the billion-dollar-a-year 7th Army and its tough armored cavalrymen and even tougher paratroop guerrillas, is headquartered at Heidelberg. While the Air Force cons the skies to the east with radar, the 7th Army's mounted cavalry patrols the East German and Czechoslovakian borders with tanks, jeeps and helicopters.

The 7th Army is equipped, too, with Redstone and Corporal missiles, both atomic-capable, and with what it still thinks of as "the ultimate weapon—the man on the ground," the infantryman.

But it sees no early use for its missiles, its foot soldiers, its guerrillas.

"Soviet strategy," says Maj. Gen. Ralph M. Osborne, its intelligence chief, "has been based on the estimate that Russia would either lose a general war or suffer too much to make such a war worthwhile."

The U.S. Army in Europe, he says, thinks Russia will not attempt even limited hostilities in Europe because the chances the conflict would become general are too great.

The Army's estimate of Soviet short-of-war aims, he says, is this:

1. To force, by threat of military might, Western acceptance of continued division of Germany.

2. To weaken NATO solidarity, likewise by threat of military might.

3. To keep the West back on its heels so that any eventual negotiation of a permanent European security arrangement will be most favorable to Russia.

"We believe," a spokesman says, "that no war in Europe can now be controlled as a limited war. As soon as the Russians who have great numerical superiority, try to overrun our NATO forces on the ground, we'll be in a major war. If they make any kind of move that can be construed as an attack on Europe, it will be by miscalculation. It is our judgment, and we think theirs, that any war in Europe would become an all-out war in which the Russian motherland would be decimated."

A natural enough question from a layman is why, if the Russians fear a war by mis-

calculation, they don't pull back and make sure it won't happen.

The Army's answer is that if the Russians turn around and walk away they will suffer a loss of prestige that will defeat the political aims enumerated above.

Cross the Alps and come down here into southern Italy, where NATO's main concern is protecting Turkey, Greece, Italy, and the Mediterranean lifeline, and the thinking is much the same.

The NATO boss here is U.S. Adm. C. R. "Cat" Brown, recently commander of the U.S. 6th Fleet. His NATO command consists of ground, air, and sea forces from six countries—the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Italy, Greece, and Turkey—whose chief difficulties are linguistic.

This Mediterranean theater is one in which the assumption must be made that any part of it could be hit today by Russian intermediate ballistic missiles. Admiral Brown's people profess not to know whether the Russians have that capacity actually or only theoretically.

But whether by bomber, missile, or land movement, any attack on the Mediterranean flanks of NATO could not be confined to a limited war, Admiral Brown thinks.

"Anything that strikes any NATO country would develop into a general war in a hurry," he says.

"Don't forget, the basic NATO concept is that an attack on one is an attack on all. I don't mean some irresponsible border skirmish. I mean a move to take or subdue territory."

It is Admiral Brown's view that for the Russians to start a war in his sector, just as in Germany, "would be an act of insanity." But here, as along the front to the north, the Allies cannot afford to let down their guard "and invite the Russians to walk in."

A Forward-Looking Community Establishes a Nursing School at Dumas, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 21, 1959

MR. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the most acute personnel shortages in this country today is in the field of trained nurses. They are vitally needed to help maintain the good health of our people.

At Dumas, in Moore County, Tex., a new school has been established to train vocational nurses. This new school, set up at the county-owned Memorial Hospital is another step in the progress of the area's forward-looking citizens. As one writer put it, the hospital itself is "not yet in its teens." Now it is doing something many larger and older hospitals have not done.

Mr. President, as a salute to these civic-minded people and their newest step forward, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from The Moore County News for Sunday, August 16, 1959, entitled "Memorial Hospital Plans To Open Nursing School—Registration To Begin September 1," and an editorial from the same publication entitled "A Do-It-Yourself Plan."

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORIAL HOSPITAL PLANS TO OPEN NURSING SCHOOL—REGISTRATION TO BEGIN SEPTEMBER 1

A state-approved program for training vocational nurse candidates has been established at Memorial Hospital in Dumas, according to its manager, Frank Cheevers.

In making the announcement Cheevers said this is the first year the county-owned hospital has been able to extend its operations into the broad field of vocational nurse training.

A minimum of 1 year study is required in the course, which includes approximately 600 hours of actual classroom (at the hospital) study, completing a well-rounded week of from 40 to 42 hours of combined study and nursing.

Because of limited facilities for training, only 12 or 15 trainees will be accepted in the initial year, Cheevers said. Applicants from this immediate area will be given first consideration, the manager added.

Upon successful completion of the course, and after passing the required examination given by the State Board of Vocational Nursing in Austin, trainees will be issued their LVN license (licensed vocational nurse) by the State.

This program, Cheevers said, should not be confused with other types of nursing now practiced in Dumas and in other towns. Other nurse units at Memorial include those of young nurses' aids, usually high school girls employed in training through the school-State ICT program; and the ranks of the RN (registered nurse) staff, a license held only by those who have completed an extensive 3-year course of study.

Requirements for entrance in the nurse training program include age of between 18 and 50; good health; a high school graduate; and possess such personal traits as may be desired by the screening board. Selection of candidates will be made by a board consisting of two doctors, the director of nursing service, the director of nursing education, and Frank Cheevers, all associated at Memorial.

"The training program is twofold," Cheevers said. "It will give us (Memorial Hospital) an opportunity to train nurses within our own organization, providing adequate personnel for the future from a field of trained nurses in whom we have confidence; and, the new service of actual nurse training will benefit the community and help meet the growing demands for trained nurses all over the country."

Cheevers said the present nurses staff at Memorial consists of 14 full-time RN's, 4 vocational nurses, and 6 nurses aids.

Training under the newly formed program locally will be supervised by current ranking nurse personnel at Memorial.

Trainees will receive slight payment as they take their study. A typical study day during the first 30 days, Cheevers said, will include at least 7 hours in class and lecture sessions. Modified facilities at the hospital will be used for classroom area. During the next 30 days the classroom work will be cut to about 4 hours and more time will be given to nursing duties. After the first 60 days, 2 hours of class study will be given daily, and the remainder of the time will be devoted to practical training.

A tuition fee of \$35 per student will be charged applicants. "We estimate that each nurse trainee completing the course will receive a training schedule costing a minimum of \$100. With books and uniform fees, she should pay only about \$75 for the year of study," Cheevers added.

Applicants may inquire about the new program at Memorial Hospital. Deadline for applying is September 1, and classes will begin on September 8.

A DO-IT-YOURSELF PLAN

We congratulate Moore County's Memorial Hospital, and its planning board, for what we think is a progressive step, sparked by vision.

At a time when the declining ranks of qualified, well-trained vocational nurses appear to pose a threat to efficient hospital operations everywhere, those persons directing policy of our hospital decided to do something about it.

Starting in September, Memorial Hospital in Dumas will to several nurse candidates become a virtual back-to-school miniature medical college.

Using only what facilities are presently available at the hospital, and these are adequate, the first class of would-be vocational nurses will be given a thorough, 1-year education in nursing which is a compact, accelerated study course containing more than 600 hours of actual classroom study in addition to practical nursing duties.

The fact is fairly common that Memorial Hospital, not yet in its teens, is one of the State's few in-the-black hospitals which are county owned. This commendable record has been achieved despite a constant program of expansion and construction of new facilities to keep pace with the growing demands of our area.

We think a large amount of credit for this status is due to the efficient management of Frank Cheevers who, having been handed the task of maintaining hospital policy, has executed the planning by the county hospital board.

Because of faith in this community, and because of future needs seen years ago, Moore County now enjoys one of the finest hospital facilities in the Southwest. The beautiful, modern, and well-equipped facilities at Memorial are second in value only to a full staff of the outstanding caliber of registered nurses and doctors which make our hospital the envy of other towns.

Dumas and Moore County are growing. Memorial Hospital has kept the pace and now it has stepped out front by meeting challenges of the future.

It is large enough, and select enough, to train its own licensed vocational nurses. The people of Moore County can be proud of their hospital.

Planes Switch Serious for NATO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the seventh in a series of articles by Mr. Edward J. Milne, Washington correspondent for the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin of Providence, R.I., concerning his recent tour of the NATO countries. This article appeared in the Providence Sunday Journal of July 19, 1959, and is entitled "Planes Switch Serious for NATO":

PLANES SWITCH SERIOUS FOR NATO—ACTION DICTATED BY DE GAULLE'S DECISION PRESENTS BOTH MILITARY AND POLITICAL PROBLEMS FOR PLANNING AGENCIES

(By Edward J. Milne)

PARIS.—No attempt is made here to gloss over the serious implications, military and political, of the decision to move 200 American fighter-bombers from bases in France to Britain and West Germany.

U.S. Air Force General Lauris Norstad, the North Atlantic Alliance's Supreme Commander in Europe, made the decision in response to French President Charles de Gaulle's refusal to allow the planes' nuclear bombs to be stockpiled in this country.

It is NATO doctrine that reaction to an all-out attack from the East must be immediate, swift, and, if possible, decisive. The planes involved would be part of the first retaliatory wave. General Norstad felt he could not afford to have the planes separated from their weapons.

Seven of the nine squadrons involved will be shifted to Britain and two to West Germany. That means the front over which they should be dispersed to reduce their vulnerability as targets will be substantially reduced.

In addition, there will be "some loss," the degree not indicated, of offensive effectiveness because the NATO command will have less flexibility in stationing its "sword forces," which are principally the planes and missiles of the U.S. Air Force and the Royal Air Force.

SMALL LIKELIHOOD OF SOLUTION SEEN

Those are both apparent permanent losses—short of some political solution of which no one seems to see an immediate likelihood. There will be, in addition, at least temporary difficulties. Planes, weapons, and personnel will have to be reshuffled on a large scale, with probably some shifting of units between Britain and West Germany as well as from France to those two countries.

Both the British Isles and West Germany are relatively small and densely populated. German Air Force officials told reporters while the move was under consideration at the political level that the difficulty of acquiring new bases is among the chief problems of their fledgling force. The deputy commander of U.S. Air Forces, Europe, said flatly the transfer would mean "an overcrowding of bases" in Germany because "there are no bases in Germany underutilized now."

Base development has been a large problem for U.S. airmen in England, too. British law makes it much more difficult for the government there to acquire land from reluctant farmers, and instances were cited of its taking as much as 18 months to put together land for a 1,000-foot runway extension.

PERSONNEL TRANSFERS WILL TAKE 6 MONTHS

Some 6,000 U.S. officers and airmen and a like number of dependents are involved in the transfers, which are expected to start, substantially, about September 1 and require some 6 months to complete. The move admittedly will be costly, but not to the point of having to ask Congress for more money to foot the bill.

To keep the temporary disruption of combat effectiveness at a minimum, the moves probably will be staged squadron by squadron, so that eight of the nine will be at the ready all of the time.

It is difficult here to get a firm opinion on just why the French have forced this expensive and militarily distasteful move on the biggest and strongest partner in the alliance. A French Air Force general told reporters recently that he would be satisfied if the American nuclear bombs were stockpiled at the French bases under the same terms that American bombs are stockpiled at the British bases.

Under the U.S.-British agreement, the consent of both governments is required before the U.S. planes can be "down in anger," nuclear bomb-loaded. A similar agreement governs the firing of the 1,500-mile Thor nuclear missiles, 60 of which the United States is supplying to British squadrons now reaching a state of operational readiness.

FRENCH GET OFFER BRITISH ACCEPTED

It has been widely printed that the United States has declined to give President de

Gaulle the same veto power over use of the bomb that the British enjoy. But it is flatly said here that such statements are incorrect, that the French received precisely the same offer that the British accepted.

If that is so, it can only be assumed that the de Gaulle government has insisted on the greater U.S. concessions that he has been reported seeking since the almost daily discussions began last January. These appear to include the unrestricted sharing of atomic weapons and secrets with France, against which Congress has balked because it does not want to expand the family of nuclear nations.

The British, of course, have their own nuclear capability. One of their top diplomats suggested a possible key to the French feeling recently when he discussed Great Britain's own case.

The sole reason the British want nuclear strength of their own, he said, is that if there should be any serious deterioration of Anglo-American relations, Russia could dictate at will to a Britain without nuclear arms. By themselves, he acknowledged, the British would not have the strength to deliver a knockout blow at Russia, but they would have at least enough to make the Russians think twice about starting any rough stuff. Even a little nuclear deterrence can go a long way in this age.

FRENCH AIRMAN MAKES HIS POINT

The French airman, who holds an important NATO command, arrived at much the same point, albeit by a somewhat different route.

"You are refusing to us things that are well known to the Russians," he said. "You are refusing to give to your friends what your enemies have. You are our allies, and we trust our allies. But situations can always arise where judgments differ."

He pointed out that the French, unlike the British, made no attempt from 1946 to 1957 to develop nuclear weapons. That was because of a basic decision not to disturb the peace, he said. But the French view now, he said, is that the nation's self-interest demands full great-power status in the nuclear age. Even if there should one day be an East-West agreement on nuclear test suspension, he said, France in its present mood might well go ahead on her own with tests in the Sahara.

It would be a mistake to leave any impression that NATO's military and political problems are regarded as insoluble. There is always the hope, for one thing, that President Eisenhower and President de Gaulle may still work out an agreement for NATO-committed nuclear muscle for France. And while the strength of NATO's "shield forces" in Europe, the ground divisions may leave much to be desired, there is growing satisfaction with the "sword" or strike forces despite the French base problem.

ROLE OF SHIELD FORCE MAY BE PSYCHOLOGICAL

One gets the impression that the importance of the shield forces may well be greater politically or psychologically than militarily. Great stress is placed on showing the world that NATO is a truly defensive alliance, without aggressive intent. That means the ability to display ground forces able to respond to aggression with something less than all-out nuclear retaliation—not only an ability but a desire.

But all the way up the line to the military peak at NATO is the repeatedly stated belief that no limited war is really possible in the hot area of Europe. NATO military leaders are determined to use all the weapons available to them in any mission of defense that calls for them, whether the other side uses them first or not.

This determination would be applied with equal force in a serious situation involving West Berlin. There is a feeling here that there are extremely dangerous possibilities in the Berlin situation. There is profound

hope, with the Big Four foreign ministers' conference now resumed at Geneva, that the diplomats can find some formula for a peaceful solution.

Twice, the United States, the United Kingdom, and France have asserted their responsibility for the welfare and security of the people of West Berlin, and twice NATO has associated itself with the tri-partite declarations. Any attack on West Berlin is to be regarded as an attack on the Western Powers' occupation forces there, and any attack on the Western forces is to be regarded as an attack on NATO.

And it goes almost without saying that the response to such an attack would not be, because it could not successfully be, on the ground.

Proposed Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Gainesville Daily Sun of August 16, which deals with proposed labor legislation.

I think this is a fair and perceptive, although brief, analysis of the proposed labor legislation and I know it is thoroughly representative of the thinking of the people of Florida with respect to the need for labor legislation.

This editorial was written by Mr. William M. Pepper III, one of the State's most vigorous, articulate, and sensible editors. I commend it to the attention of all.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOPES HIGH FOR GOOD LABOR LAW

Passage of the Landrum-Griffin bill by the House of Representatives is a sign that the pendulum which has swung so wide and handsome in favor of labor union excesses is about to be checked. For the first time in many a Congress, the gullies of the powerful labor union lobbies backed up by threats of political extinction from the union bosses failed to check strong and realistic legislation in the labor relations area.

Popular sentiment for such legislation was at a peak as our own Congressman D. R. (Billy) MATTHEWS, in the forefront of Landrum-Griffin proponents, will testify. Cards, letters, telegrams, and communications poured in to Congressmen from tens of thousands of citizens sick and fed up with corruption, racketeering, denial of individual rights, secondary boycotts, blackmail picketing, and other high-handed abuses. The response of the House last week was a tremendous endorsement of the wisdom of our democratic government.

It is imperative that every grateful citizen remember for a long time those Representatives who responded to the call for sound labor legislation. Now is the time for tens of thousands more communications to the Florida congressional delegation showing support for the action of the House.

It is to be hoped, of course, that the salient points of the Landrum-Griffin bill will not be watered down in Monday's conference between House and Senate. We believe the Senate will vote for the Landrum-

Griffin bill. After all, the same Senate voted for the McClellan amendments to the Kennedy bill, reversing itself only after certain civil rights provisions in the amendments became onerous to the southern solons. In fact, the Kennedy bill with the McClellan amendments was, in many respects, as strong legislation as the Landrum-Griffin bill. It is essential that those citizens who are in favor of enforceable rights for rank and file union members, against racketeering and for the rights of those millions of workers who have chosen not to join unions communicate their feelings to Senators HOLLAND and SMATHERS.

Shift in Emphasis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the second report of the President's Cabinet Committee on Price Stability has puzzled many observers who remember the first Cabinet committee report. The first report emphasized the perils of inflation; the second report would like us to forget, for the moment, what the first report emphasized so vigorously.

Senator KEFAUVER analyzed the situation well earlier this week and reminded us that the consumer may still be concerned by rising prices despite White House "deemphasis."

An editorial which appeared in the Newark News on August 18 also asks questions about the second report. An article in the Christian Science Monitor of August 17 joins the questioning and suggests a few answers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the editorial from the Newark Evening News of August 18 and the article from The Christian Science Monitor of August 17.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Newark Evening News, of Aug. 18, 1959]

SHIFT IN EMPHASIS

The Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth set up by President Eisenhower to educate the public on the nature and dangers of inflation apparently is no longer worried about inflation. Its latest report indicates the committee has shifted its emphasis to economic growth.

In fact, the committee, which is headed by Vice President Nixon, doesn't even mention the word "inflation." Instead, it uses the phrase "rises in general price level" on the theory that the public is a little confused about the meaning of inflation.

The public may be a bit further confused when it recalls that only 7 short weeks ago the committee was greatly disturbed by the threat of inflation. In an interim report sent to Mr. Eisenhower on June 28, the eve of the steel strike, the committee warned of the dangers of a settlement that would mean higher wages and prices.

In any case, price stability has now been placed at the bottom of a three-point program offered by the Nixon Committee. In

first place is a large and expanding output of goods and services. Next is maximum employment opportunities, meaning not only a chance to work, but a chance to hold the kind of job that suits you best.

Curiously enough, that is approximately the idea advanced by the liberal Democrats in Congress. But the Nixon committee's switch may have a basis much simpler than any political considerations. The steel strike is entering its sixth week today and the economy is beginning to feel the pinch. The Federal Reserve Board reports that its index of industrial output in July fell 2 points to 153 and attributes the decline to the strike's impact. If the strike continues much longer, we'll all be worrying about economic growth, not inflation.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 17, 1959]

UNITED STATES SHIFTS ECONOMIC TARGET

(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—Economic growth now has become the major economic aim and interest of the Eisenhower administration.

This represents a sharp and dramatic change in administration thinking from 2 months ago, when the same Cabinet Committee which is reporting this week warned repeatedly against spiraling inflation.

This Cabinet Committee, headed by Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON and set up last February by the President, in this, its second report appeared relatively optimistic about price-stability prospects.

Rather than steps to halt inflation, its second report said: "What we want and need is sound sustainable economic growth."

There are several explanations for this change in the administration's attitudes toward the national economy.

One is that it feels that the battle against inflation is being won and that therefore attention can be directed to other problems.

INFLATION BRAKED

This explanation is supported by the figures making up the united consumer price index trend (the criterion of inflation). These show a rise of only slightly more than one-half of 1 percent in the last year.

However, this does not explain why only 7 weeks ago the committee reported that the nation's economy was "at a critical juncture" and that the Nation was confronted "with overwhelming evidence" that prices might start spiraling upward.

Another explanation is that the administration, feeling that it now would get much of what the President wanted from Congress, was downgrading the threat of inflation. Congress, for example, seems certain to give him an increase in interest on Federal bonds and an increase in the gasoline tax—both anti-inflationary measures.

COMMITTEE CRITICIZED

A third reason relates to the criticism from Democratic liberal economists who followed the committee's June 28 report. They had accused the committee of ignoring the importance of economic growth in its concern over inflation.

And a fourth explanation relates to growing evidence that the Soviet Union's rate of economic growth is double or triple that of the United States and that while the level of U.S. production is still ahead of that of the U.S.S.R., the Soviets in time will catch up with and surpass the United States unless the United States steps up its rate of economic growth.

THREE GOALS LISTED

According to the Nixon committee report there should be three economic goals for the country:

1. Economic growth—through a large and expanding output of goods and services. It sees this being achieved only through im-

provements in health, education, and skills; the development of natural resources; expansion of natural science and technology; and improved equipment and organization.

2. Maximum employment opportunities—meaning not only a chance to work but a chance to hold the kind of job that suits one best.

The committee avers that maximum employment opportunity is a more appropriate goal than simply maximum employment because people should be free to choose for themselves among a variety of occupations.

3. Price stability—referring rather to the general level of prices instead of specific prices.

PRICE FREEDOM BACKED

Actually, the committee said, the freedom of individual prices to change is essential to economic efficiency, for prices are messages to producers and sellers telling them what things should be made in greater or smaller quantities.

This 1,600-word statement from the committee is the second, but not the last, that it will put out. The next one, it is expected, will deal with this matter of economic growth in some detail.

This 8-man cabinet committee includes, beside the Vice President: Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson; Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson; Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell; Secretary of Commerce Frederick H. Mueller; Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield; and Raymond J. Saulnier, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. W. Allen Wallis is executive vice chairman of the committee, a special assistant to the President, on leave from his post as dean of the University of Chicago's School of Business.

Cross Country With the On-to-Oregon Cavalcade—XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. PORTER, Mr. Speaker, the On-to-Oregon Cavalcade has successfully completed its remarkable 20th century trip from Independence, Mo., to Independence, Oreg.

From time to time I have inserted in the Appendix of the Record a daily account of that trek which has been written by Rudy Roudebaugh, driver of the Drain covered wagon. The record is a bit behind the actual trek, but the accounts today will bring us more up to date. I hope to conclude this fine record by Mr. Roudebaugh soon. Many people have learned about Oregon and our centennial through the efforts of the sturdy 20th century pioneers who were members of the cavalcade. I salute the caravan members and all of the men and women who made this historic venture a reality.

Mr. Roudebaugh's account follows:

[From the Drain (Oreg.) Enterprise, July 23, 1959]

RUDY TELLS OF SAGEBRUSH, HEAT, DUST, AND WARRANTS

(By R. "Rudy" Roudebaugh, driver of Drain covered wagon, now on his final leg in the 2,000-mile trek from Independence, Mo., to Independence, Oreg.)

The Twin Falls sheriff's posse escorted us through Twin Falls. Gail Hopkins and his

friends put out Drain letters for me on their bicycles on both sides of the street. There were more people on the trail than any other day yet. Sunday Jan got three new shoes; two in front, one on the right rear. The peas and beans that are grown around here are used for seed.

(Notes that were left out last week.)

July 13: 6:06, we are on Highway 30 going northwest. 6:26, Janell and her girl friend have gone back to bed. Ki is on cook shift. 7:07, the sun is out bright and hot. 7:22, crossed deep creek. 8:35, Janell and Claudia have got up. We are going through hills and sagebrush on both sides of the road, very little farmland here. 8:47, starting down Hagerman Valley and crossing Salmon Fall Creek. 9:16, going along the Snake River with rock walls on each side. 9:40, stopped to water at the 1,000 Spring resort.

Jan and Doc each drank 2 pails of water. The spring water here is supposed to be from some hidden body of water. It has been tested and is the same as water from the Arctic. Last week I wrote that the Pendleton Indians gave us safe passage, but that's wrong—they gave us just the opposite passage. 9:58, rolling again. 10:38, leaving Twin Falls County crossing over the Snake River entering Gooding County. 10:44, big boulders cropping out of the ground all over the fields on both sides of the road. 11:32, entering Hagerman, population 520. 11:46, camped at the city park and rodeo grounds and ball park.

Tim Miller and family from Yoncalla were here to visit us this evening. The mayor broiled steaks for us last night and the drugstore donated ice cream yesterday. It was 105 in the shade. Made 21 miles today.

July 14: 5:55, same story—waiting for Roy again. 6:03, heading northwest. 6:24, crossed Billingsly Creek. This is a pretty little valley with popular trees 125 feet tall. The valley is about 1/2 mile wide. 6:53, Malad River. The ground is rocky on both sides and we're going up out of the Hagerman Valley. 7:31, we are on top, sagebrush and rock on both sides of us. Weather is cooler with the sun out bright. 8:12, entering Bliss, population 126. 8:44, going into the desert. 9:04, Janell is just getting up. She has a rope burn on her neck from playing cowboy. Ki is still on cook shift. 9:31, stopped to water. Doc and Jan each drank a pail of water. 10:39, entering Elmore County, leaving Gooding County. 11:40, going by the 101 ranch. It produces rodeo stock. 12:22, camped at Graham general store and trailer court about one-half mile from Kings Hill. Ki and I are doing our laundry here at the store and also had a nice tub bath.

Grandma (the one who is walking to Independence, Oreg.) stayed at this place Saturday night. The people of Kings Hill are going to give us a chicken dinner tonight. Mr. Graham has loaned his station wagon to the wagon train bunch to go back and forth to town in. Made 24 miles today.

July 15: 6:00, just sitting here waiting for Roy. I wish he'd hurry the nats are bothering Doc and Jan. (Editor's note: guess an old logger like Rudy is too tough for the nats to gnaw on.) Jan got one new shoe on left rear foot. 6:12, going west and the weather is cloudy and hot. 6:17, entering Kings Hill (unincorporated). It lays in a narrow valley with the Snake River and UP railroad on the south side. There are very few farms around here. Hay is about all they raise. 7:05, Ki just got out of bed. Janell got up early this morning and is riding in the Carnegie wagon or Roseburg wagon. 7:49, we are going a quarter of a mile from Glenn's Ferry. Now 130 miles from Oregon border. 7:56, crossing Little Canyon Creek. 8:00, leaving Highway 30 going on a rock road. 8:42, sagebrush and hills on both sides of us. You can see the Three Island crossing of the old Oregon Trail where they rafted across

the Snake River. 9:53, stopped to water. Each mule drank a pail of water. 10:11, on our way again. My tire on the left rear wheel is getting loose.

A big horse fly just bit Jan and she raised cane. I got off and killed it. 12:05, stopped for the day at the Jack Hendly ranch. The people at Glen's Ferry took up a collection and gave us a roast beef dinner. By some misunderstanding we almost had to leave our campsite. They even contacted the sheriff, but we are still here so I guess all is well.

July 16: 6:02, all hooked up. 6:10, westward again. Nothing but sagebrush. 6:30, on oil again. Thank gosh. The dust was pretty bad. 8:10, here is a policeman with a summons for us. Don't know for sure what it's all about. I suppose over our campsite. Tell you later. 8:45, stopped to have pictures taken for the Oregon Journal. Also the State police are here teasing us about our trouble. 9:00, I guess they're through with us for a while as we are on our way again. 9:20, here comes Mount Home Rough Riders and also 4-H Club riders to meet us and escort us to Mount Home. 10:05, stopped to water at Mount Home sale barn. Doc and Jan were pretty dry. 10:23, heading west and entering Mount Home. It lays in a small valley. Hay and grain is about all that is grown here. I think the whole town is out to see us. 10:32, on highway 30. 10:31, leaving highway 30 and going on an old highway.

We've had State police escort all morning. Here comes a pickup with a loud speaker from Nyssa, Oreg., to welcome us to Oregon. They are going to have an all-girls rodeo for us at Nyssa. 12:51, entering camp at the Crater station. Made 23 miles today. Our trouble earlier didn't amount to much. By noon everything was taken care of by the wagonmaster, Tex Serpa. Our lunch today was furnished by the people of Mount Home, population 4,552.

July 17: 5:58, ready to go but looks like we are going to be held up. 7:59, finally got started. As I said, "People that came West years ago had their ups and downs and we sure had ours this morning, but all seems well again." It's sure sultry out. We were 2 hours late getting started this morning. It is going to be a long, hot day. 8:20, on gravel. 8:44, crossed over onto the brand new highway, three lanes in each direction. 9:05, we now have a police escort. 8:24, crossing Samar Creek. 9:56, stopped to water. Doc drank one pail and Jan guzzled two.

Our lunch was passed out because we'll be late getting to camp. 10:14, we're still on the fertile desert; in the near future this land will all be under cultivation. 11:44, entered Ada County. Stopped to water for the second time today. Doc and Jan drank two pails apiece. 1:02, rolling again. 1:16, back on Highway 30 about one-half mile. 1:24, on the old highway and Janell is feeling lonesome for Christine Stolz. Janell was looking out the wagons and two girls in long centennial dresses were waving at her. They were Kathy and Sharon Lupher, also John and Mrs. Lupher and Cub's sister, Henry. The two girls rode into camp with Janell and I. Ki rode with Virginia and John. 2:52, arrived at the Lloyd Hanson ranch. Army helicopter dropped bread, pop, milk, cottage cheese to us. They also brought the mayor. We went to the Y for showers. Janell and I went to the Snake River Stampede at Nampa. Ki was the only woman that stayed at camp. She gave out about 500 letters. The six women on the trail received gifts from the Welcome Wagon club.

July 18: Here is Cathy, Sharon, and John to ride with us. 5:58, all hooked up. But we are waiting again. 6:20, rolling northwest again. 8:06, a sign says "Welcome Wagon City." 8:46, crossed over the New York canal. The reason I have mentioned these canals is they are responsible for the development of this country. 8:55, met by

the Ada County Sheriff Possee as we entered Boise, population 34,392. It is the largest city in the world without the main line of a railroad. 8:59, crossed the Rideabough Canal. 9:54, arrived at the capitol to meet some old pioneers. Kl has gone with Virginia to wash and iron at Cub's sisters. Thanks to her we have clean clothes again and we had a very nice visit with them. They brought us a huge bunch of fruit and we sure enjoyed it. 10:24, leaving the capital. 10:04, crossed back across the river. 10:44, stopped to water at the Beaten Plumbing Co. in Boise. 11:01, westward again. 11:12, entering Garden City, population 1,459. We stopped and had cold drinks and the chief of police shook hands with us and welcomed us to the town. 12:14, turned off the highway. Weather is windy and hot. 12:24, arrived at camp at the A. Coffey ranch. Mrs. C. G. Estell was at the wagon when it stopped at Capital (she is Mrs. Bill Gasser's sister). We went out to the Mission Inn for dinner celebrating our 3 months on the road. We passed out about 3,000 letters yesterday. Janell went to the jalopy races at Meridan last night.

This account in the July 30, 1959, Drain Enterprise starts with July 20, a Monday. The next day the sturdy modern-day pioneers arrived back in Oregon.

As Rudy Roudebaugh observes in his diary:

July 21: 6, all hooked up, but as usual waiting. 6:26, here we go. We'll soon be in dear old Oregon.

And it has been a long trip since the train left Independence, Mo., April 19. President Harry Truman was on hand to start the train. Another former President, Herbert Hoover, was invited to greet the cavalcade at journey's end in Independence, Oreg., but he was unable to attend.

Mr. Roudebaugh's account for July 20 through July 25 follows:

[From the Drain (Oreg.) Enterprise, July 30, 1959]

WAGON TRAIN ENDURES 121° HEAT WAVE TRAVELING THROUGH IDAHO

(By R. R. Roudebaugh)

July 20: 6:07 a.m., waiting again, 6:16, rolling west. 6:31 hit Highway 20. 6:59, going by the Joplin Cemetery, which is very old. 7:15, here is the 7 Mile store and inn. 8:21, there is a whole field of seagulls come in from Drain to greet us. 9:20, crossed the Phillip Canal. 9:14, leaving Ada County and entering Canyon County. Being met by the sheriff's posse to escort us. 9:44, stopped to water at the Botts service station. Doc and Jan drank very little water. Kl just got out of bed. Jerry Carnine is riding with us today. We met Mrs. Jim Whipple's brother and sister-in-law at Boise, Mr. and Mrs. Bob Wilcox. 10:04, have left our watering spot. 10:14, crossing the Highline Canal. 10:20, crossed 10 Mile Creek.

10:46, going past the spot where the Ward Massacre occurred. Out of a party of 20 only 2 small boys survived. 11:30, crossing and recrossing the Notus Canal. 11:34, entering Caldwell, population 10,487. 12:00, entering Memorial Park where we are making camp. The mules are staying at the rodeo barns. This park is beautiful, but my mules like dust to roll in. As I recall an old saying that a mule is worth \$100 everytimes it rolls over, Doc rolled over four times and Jan three. That makes them worth \$700 today. This part of the country is good for dairy farming. Also a lot of corn is grown for ensilage for silos.

We had dinner this evening with Mr. and Mrs. Ben Rohnert and family. I graduated from high school with Mrs. Rohnert.

Kl met a nice woman in Boise who presented us a scrapbook filled with news stories of the wagon train. She and her husband are going to come to Drain to see us.

July 21: 6:00, all hooked up, but as usual waiting. 6:26, here we go. We'll soon be in dear old Oregon. 6:40, pulling onto Highway 20. 6:50, crossing Riverside Canal. 6:54, crossing the Boise River. 6:59, crossing Farmers Coop Canal. 7:20, as we are going close by the railroad tracks Kl counted 125 cars going by.

The most asked question is: How are you going back to Missouri? We have to explain we're all Oregon residents and that we'd only started from Missouri for this trip.

Caldwell was really seeking keepsakes from us. More than any place we've been so far. They were raiding our wagon and even cut a piece of tarp from one of the wagons. 7:27 entering Notus, population 313. 9:21, crossing Sand Hollow Creek. South of us looks like wild hay or pasture. North of us is mostly sugar beets and a little corn. I gave away about 2,000 letters yesterday. Kl is supposed to be on cook shift, but all meals today are being served to us. There is more beets grown around here than any other part of Idaho we've been. 10:07, here is the Canyon County Sheriff's Posse to escort us to Parma. 10:30, stopped to meet Mayor Jim Watson. We picked up a little boy named Harley Noe. His father is riding with the Posse and is a good friend of Gail Carline. 10:35, entering Parma, population 1,525.

A boy on the street called to me, "Pull off that fake beard!"

I believe the whole town is out. 10:56, stopped and watered the livestock. We were served pie, ice cream, lemonade and iced tea. 12:13, leaving Parma. There is hundreds of cars and people here to see us at the bridge bidding farewell to Idaho and hello to Oregon as we cross the Snake River bridge. 1:27, in Malheur County. While we were on the bridge, John Wilder from Pleasant Hill was there to meet us. We arrived in camp at 1:49 at the Nyssa high school. It was 111°. The horses and mules were taken about a mile from camp to the rodeo grounds. They were right out in the sun—what a day.

This evening, Mr. and Mrs. Rufus Hickethier and Mrs. Shaw and son and Mrs. Irvin Freeze and daughter and son came to visit the wagon train. We were pleased to see them.

July 22: Up at 3:30 to go to rodeo grounds to take care of my mules. Kl is on cook shift so I lit the stoves for her. 6, after I was hooked up we were called together to have a talk with Howard Appling Jr., secretary of state for Oregon, and Dick Smith, president of the On-to-Oregon Cavalcade. 6:25, ready to take off and roll for home. We are going to have National Guard escort the rest of the way home. 7:14, going through the country here reminds me of Idaho. 8:35, hitting the first Oregon desert and its like Hades. 10:10, cold drinks and cookies were given to us by Mr. Spaulding, county road superintendent. 10:31, rolling again. 10:56, stopped to water, but the water truck never showed up. 11, here comes the Malheur County sheriff's posse to escort us in. 11:59, we stopped at the grave of John D. Henderson for a small prayer given by Rev. Vincent Egar the only cowboy priest. He is the only known priest to get permission from the Pope to wear cowboy boots. 12:10, forded the Malheur River. We made out just fine. The water came up to the mule's stomach. This was an original trail. Then we circled through Vale and back to the city park at 12:39. Dinner was given us by the American Legion, Lions, Women's Club and Rebeccas.

I took a hot steam bath at Dr. Dale N. Scheer's Therapy Springs. He is one of Forrest Johnson's friends. Many other friends of the Johnsons send their regards.

July 23: 5:38, all hooked up and ready to leave, but waiting on the Roseburg wagon and Tex. Our breakfast was served to us by the Vale C of C. 6:08, here we are starting out and heading across Oregon Highway 26. We have a young photographer, Norris Niccum, riding with us a couple of days. He works for United Press International Newspictures.

The weather is just plain hot. I guess I forgot to mention before, but right out of Boise it was 121°. And we were right out where the sagebrush was short—no shade. We all had our tongues hanging out.

9:16, here comes the 4-H riding club to escort us into Jamison. We are also entering Willow Creek (just post office, general store, tavern). We have been going through a valley about 3 miles wide. 9:25, crossing Willow Creek.

Here is a combine at work. The first one we've seen since we have been gone. They are harvesting wheat and barley. 10:04, stopped to water. The mules were really ready for water. They each drank two pails. The drivers were in luck today. They each got an orange. 10:02, about 7 more miles to camp. It's 100 today. 11:20, went through Jameson and hit gravel road. 11:41, going along the foothills. 11:54, we have made camp for today at the Floyd McBride Farm. Mrs. McBride came and took our laundry home to clean for us.

We just found out that no one has been buried in the old pioneer cemetery out of Vale since 1930.

July 24: 6, ready but waiting on Dave. His horse is lame this morning.

As I was talking to the people visiting the wagon train last night, I looked up and here comes Janell riding a cow right out of a barn. I don't know what I'm going to do with her. Kl is riding on the water truck today. I guess she was scared to cross the mountains in the wagon.

Doc got one new shoe on his right front foot. Jan got one on her left rear foot last night. 6:15, rolling northeast through sagebrush and up a canyon. 7:40, stopped to rest the mules for 10 minutes. 8:24, the hills are brown with beef cattle grazing on them. 9:36, we are locking our wheels to go down this steep hill. Moving across Burnt Creek and by old ranchhouse. 9:55, stopped to water. Dwight Lockett and Ellis Allen are guides that came to the wagon train last night to take us on our trip for today. 10:14, rolling northeast again. 10:46, Jan threw her left front shoe. 11:26, we have stopped to rest on a hill as we have been on dirt road all morning. We stopped and rested 10 minutes three different times coming up this hill. 11:40, going out on a hogback and down the longest hill on this trip to far. 12, we are at the bottom of the hill waiting on Roy Brabham.

We have entered Huntington. The wagons went through main part of town and back to the high school where were making camp at 12:19, potluck lunch was brought in by the whole town. They put on a small program and we were introduced to all the oldtimers of Huntington and Baker County it seemed.

July 25: Up at 5:30. Went to Howell Cafe for breakfast. 5:57, ready to roll. 6:05, rolling out of Huntington and through Oregon on Highway 30, the Oregon Trail. We have the State police, National Guard, and Baker County sheriff's posse all escorting us today. 6:31, crossing the Burnt River. The weather is windy and cooler this morning. The oil is slippery for the mules today. Jan got one new shoe on her left front foot. She rolled into the fence yesterday and tore the shoe off. 7:28, at Lime, where Portland

Cement Co. has a manufacturing plant. 7:40, going through Dixie, just a wide place in the road. 8:32, passing Weatherby, old pony express station. 8:51, crossed Burnt River again for the last time. Our route previously crossed this river at least 20 times.

A group of 4-H youths on horseback have joined us to ride to Durkee. 9:14, stopped to water at Rattlesnake Springs, one of Oregon's rest areas. 9:54, picked up JoAnne, 6, and Suzanne, 8, daughters of Mr. and Mrs. Lowell Anderson of Yoncalla. They will ride to camp with me. The wind has went down and getting hot. 10:52, arrived in Durkee, which has only a few stores. The town lies in a pretty valley 1 mile wide and 10 miles long. 10:06, crossed Pritchard Creek. 11:24, arrived at camp at Vincent Kirby Ranch, where they had moved in feed bunks filled with hay. This is the first place we have found feed waiting for our livestock when we arrived at camp. Durkee grange is providing us oats, dinner, and entertainment. We are also provided transportation into Baker, 22 miles away, for showers, shopping, public dance at community center, and rodeo tonight.

Besides Mr. and Mrs. Lowell Anderson, of Yoncalla, other north Douglas County visitors at the wagon train encampment at Durkee, Saturday, were Mr. and Mrs. Rufus Pfister and Mr. and Mrs. Arlo Thomas, of Drain, who arrived about 5:30 p.m.

Housing Act Would Meet Many Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, as we await final decisions on the compromise Housing bill of 1959, it might be well to explore some of the bill's provisions which have not received as much attention as the urban renewal and other widely publicized programs.

An article from the Plainfield (N.J.) Courier-News of August 14 discusses the housing shortage which exists at Rutgers—the State university. One of the Housing Act provisions is intended to help colleges deal with such conditions. Rutgers officials have, in correspondence to me, clearly indicated the need for housing bill provisions which would deal with this and other college needs.

The other article, from the Camden Courier-Post of August 17, describes how one relatively small program of the housing bill has been discontinued, for all practical purposes, until a final word on a veto is given. Good municipal planning, of course, is essential in these years of growth in the suburbs. It is unfortunate that there should be any slowdown of planning activity, particularly at a time when many municipal officials have worked for years to effect just such planning.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record, the article from the Courier-News, Plainfield, N.J., of August 14 and the article from the Camden Courier-Post of August 17, 1959.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Courier-News, Plainfield, N.J., Aug. 14, 1959]

ROOM FOR STUDENTS SOUGHT BY RUTGERS

NEW BRUNSWICK.—Rutgers' housing officials today appealed for help from New Brunswick area householders in finding rental rooms for some 275 students presently on the waiting list for dormitory places.

Housing Director Joseph F. Nolan said that as of August 6, 112 freshmen and 128 upper-classmen at the colleges for men remain on the waiting list, along with 17 graduate women students and about the same number of graduate men.

Nolan said that the waiting list remains after the conversion of the basements of three dormitories to sleeping quarters (which will be rented at half price) the pre-emption of all study rooms in the three big canal bank dormitories for use as sleeping rooms, and the addition of 55 units to be vacated this month when the college infirmary moves from the "Quad" dormitories to the new student health center.

TEMPORARY USE

The lounge room on each floor of the six-story canal bank dorms will be temporarily used in September as emergency sleeping quarters, but will be vacated as soon as other rooms can be found.

The university's own facilities at the men's colleges will house 1,835 men this fall, with some 700 more living in fraternity houses. Upward of 800, it is estimated, will be commuting to New Brunswick daily from homes in a radius of 25 miles or more.

Douglass College, which this fall will put in use a new dormitory for 240 girls, will have all its quarters at capacity.

Students now pay \$300 per year in dormitory rentals and Nolan said rooms in local homes renting at about that level would be ideal for student use.

"Overcrowding is no longer a hypothetical problem," Nolan emphasized, "the rush of students has hit us with a crash and far sooner than we had expected."

ESTIMATES INACCURATE

He explained that last spring's best estimates of this fall's campus population indicated that the addition of space in dormitory basements, the freed infirmary space and the conversion of study rooms would amply meet the needs of informing and returning students.

Rooms in homes within 5 miles of the campus are suitable for students, Nolan said, particularly if bus service is conveniently available.

Nolan said local residents may write or telephone him at Voorhees Hall on the men's college campus to list accommodations and that students would then be given copies of the lists of available rooms. His office, he pointed out, serves only as a referral point for nonuniversity housing.

[From the Camden (N.J.) Courier-Post, Aug. 17, 1959]

HOUSING VETO STALLS STATE PLANNING AID

TRENTON, August 17.—Local planning assistance applications from 30 municipalities are being held by the New Jersey Department of Conservation and Economic Development until sufficient Federal funds are made available.

Conservation Commissioner Salvatore A. Bontempo said today, "In light of the recent Presidential veto of the 1959 omnibus housing bill, it has been necessary to notify local administrators that processing of 701 applications will be delayed until authorized funds are appropriated. The limited funds remaining from last year's authorization may

permit four New Jersey applications currently pending Federal approval to be authorized. However, lack of funds makes it necessary to hold all current requests."

Aided by the enabling 1954 national housing legislation, New Jersey has conducted the largest local planning assistance program in the United States. Planning personnel of the New Jersey Department of Conservation and Economic Development have and are acting as consultants in the preparation of 17 of the 116 municipal master plans included in the program.

The \$20 million authorization contained in the vetoed housing bill for the urban planning assistance program would have enabled the State to continue its local planning assistance program at its current pace. Commissioner Bontempo said, "The Department's Bureau of Planning is geared to continue providing proper planning guides and recommendations for the physical development of our many communities. The enabling legislation would permit us to offer our services to approximately 300 more municipalities if the program is continued."

The vetoed legislation, amending the 1954 act, also provided Federal funds for local planning assistance for communities whose population was 50,000 or less in the 1950 census. The existing legislation limits applications to municipalities whose population is 25,000 or less. B. Budd Chavoshian, chief of the bureau of planning of the New Jersey Department of Conservation and Economic Development, said, "The omnibus housing bill would enable 21 more communities to be included in the State's program. Thus, all but 13 of New Jersey's 567 municipalities would then be eligible for local planning assistance."

The communities affected are Teaneck, Garfield, Hackensack, Vineland, Belleville, Bloomfield, Maplewood, Montclair, Nutley, Orange, West Orange, West New York, Kearny, Plainfield, Linden, Woodbridge, New Brunswick, Perth Amboy, Hamilton Township, North Bergen, and Union.

NATO Leaders Put Trust in German Ex-Enemies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include the eighth of a series of articles by Mr. Edward J. Milne, Washington correspondent for the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin, of Providence, R.I., concerning his recent tour of the NATO countries. This article appeared in the Providence Journal of July 24, 1959, and is entitled "NATO Leaders Put Trust in German Ex-Enemies":

NATO LEADERS PUT TRUST IN GERMAN EX-ENEMIES

(By Edward J. Milne)

WASHINGTON.—Mixed emotions pursue the observer on an inspection trip through the NATO countries across the ocean and remain upon his return to the States.

If, for example, there is a tendency to look upon all the planes and tanks and men and regret the tax dollars that are required to keep them in the field, it is quickly swallowed in the realization of the tremendous strides that have been taken towards build-

ing the security the dollars are designed to provide.

Again, one reads of a recent public opinion poll in France indicating that while some 70 percent of the French are for more economic and political unity with the Germans, 70 percent likewise still fear or are uneasy over the Germans.

This recalls a visit to a bustling base of the new German Air Force in upper Bavaria and the questions that flash through the mind upon seeing American-made jet fighter-bombers squatting there with Maltese crosses proclaiming the rebirth of German airpower on a field that was put out of action by allied bombers in World War II.

WORLD WAR II ACE

One of the builders of the German's new Air Group South at Erding, a few miles northeast of Munich, is Brig. Gen. Johannes Steinhoff. Now 48, he was a World War II ace with more than 100 planes reported to his credit, but when he is asked how many, he replies:

"I prefer not to remember. I think you will understand."

General Steinhoff's face was badly burned in a wartime crash. He wears dark glasses that serve to hide any emotion his eyes might otherwise reveal as he insists that the new German Air Force is entirely tactical and defensive, with neither strategic capability nor strategic plans.

As Gen. Lauris Norstad, NATO's commander in chief for Europe has pointed out, the nuclear bomb has virtually wiped out the distinction between tactical and strategic aircraft, but the Americans who work so closely with the Germans at Erding and other NATO bases seem largely willing to accept the West Germans' disclaimer of any but defensive intent.

HOPE FOR ALLIES

American airmen have a standing joke that they never meet a German who fought anywhere but on the Russian front in World War II. Yet they seem in general to have a hope, amounting almost to a firm belief, that the Germans will prove as staunch allies as they once were implacable foes.

At its peak in World War II the Luftwaffe had some 7,000 to 8,000 pilots. There were about 6,000 surviving pilots when the war ended. Only about 60 of them are flying in the new German Air Force, reborn in 1955. About 200 of them are in the new force as instructors and administrators.

The new air force has two wings operational today and expects to have six operational by the end of the year—four fighter-bomber, one fighter, and one support. It has about 40,000 officers and men, including about 1,000 pilots and 350 combat planes. Its goal is 100,000 officers and men, 3,000 pilots, and 1,000 combat planes by 1964.

Starting from scratch in 1956, the Germans had a target, permitted by treaty, of 1,364 combat planes by 1962. Several factors account for the cutback in size and the setback in time. One of the main difficulties has been a lack of experienced instructors and maintenance and other technical personnel. The United States is still supplying much of such skill, and the Germans expect to have to rely upon such assistance well into the 1960's.

EXPECT NIKE MISSILE

The Germans see little net loss in the reduction from almost 1,400 to 1,000 combat planes. They are expecting Nike missiles to replace some of the fighter planes, and they are expecting faster, longer range, and more powerful fighter-bombers than envisioned in 1956.

With an assist on parts from the United States they hope to produce in their own plants by 1962 most of the ultramodern fighter-bombers for their force, to acquire others here.

General Steinhoff says the new Luftwaffe had recruiting difficulties at first because of widespread reluctance in West Germany to rearming. But volunteers are now sufficient, he says. Pilot trainees must sign on for 6 years.

There is scattered opinion among the allies that the Germans should be pressing forward faster than their present timetable and have their full force combat-ready earlier than 1964. The rebuttal argument is that the more deliberate pace means a succession of better-trained airmen coming into service with more up-to-date planes each year between now and the completion of the buildup.

Competent American opinion seems to agree with the soundness of the West Germans' position. It is reasoned that no one is in a position to realize more than the Germans the need for speed in forging the NATO sword and that what they are giving up is not speed but haste.

Perhaps underneath the American attitude is the deep satisfaction U.S. and NATO officials feel with one other aspect of the cooperation with the West Germans. That is the no-strings-attached arrangement under which NATO nuclear air might be stationed at German bases, ready for instant retaliation if Russia starts the big one.

The issue of trust in the new German allies was put to President Eisenhower at his press conference Wednesday. A reporter asked what assurance we have that "a rearmed and restored Germany" will "not turn against the West as it has twice in a generation?"

What this country must do, the President said, is "decide where your greatest danger is" and give that "your attention at the moment."

"Now this doesn't mean," he said, "that you shouldn't have your eye on future potentialities, but particularly when those potentialities look as low in the—as I think they are along the line that you were suggesting about a hostile Germany, and rearmed, I would say I would rather have Germany strong and my friend today."

The Metropolitan City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we already have heard much about metropolitan problems throughout the United States. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Metropolitan Problems is now under study by the Government Operations Committee.

In press and magazines we read daily about the troubles caused by the amazing growth of our suburbs. One medical author even wrote recently that our insistence on shifting to mortgaged homes outside our cities has caused an alarming increase in physical and mental ailments. In Life magazine last week an author paid much attention to methods which may be needed to preserve open land in the relatively rural areas near our cities.

All of these developments are, I think, indicative of the need for a Federal Commission which will study our metropolitan areas.

Another good argument for the Commission is an address given by Frederick G. Gardiner, Q.C., chairman of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto. Mr. Gardiner spoke on June 16 in Plainfield, N.J., before a meeting of the Metropolitan Regional Council. He described how the municipality of Toronto has applied regional government to that area. To the Metropolitan Regional Council, this was particularly significant, because this informal group of elected officials from cities and counties in or near New York City is seeking some form of regional government cooperation for their own 22-county area.

Mr. Gardiner did not mention the proposed Federal Commission on Metropolitan Problems, but he very clearly described a situation which causes a need for clear-cut answers to vital problems. The closing paragraphs give a very pertinent warning about the need for some kind of action. Mr. Gardner warns:

In these days, emergencies in both domestic and foreign affairs develop with startling rapidity. There is seldom time for an exhaustive examination of all possible solutions in the hope that you can discover the perfect answer.

I think we should pay heed to this warning at a national level and at State, county, and municipal levels. Mr. Gardiner is the first to say that the Toronto experiment may not offer the precise pattern which will fit all metropolitan areas, but his understanding of the overall urban area problem is one which, I believe, is worthy of some study.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the closing paragraphs of Mr. Gardiner's address. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record two editorials which discuss the Metropolitan Commission introduced by the distinguished and knowledgeable Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. CLARK.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Perhaps you are saying to yourself: "It's all very well to come down here and talk as though you came from Texas but what have you learned from your experience that might be useful to us?" Ladies and gentlemen, we have learned quite a bit. May I make it perfectly clear that I am not here to suggest that a metropolitan system such as ours is the solution to the problems of all metropolitan areas. What may be the answer in one area may not be the answer in another. The probability is that the solution in each case must be designed to suit the particular situation which exists and varying conditions are not likely to lend themselves to any simple or standard formula. We have found that you have to be a large shareholder in a company known as "Patience and Persistence Incorporated"; that you have to take a step at a time; that there are many obstacles to be overcome; and that it is just as bad to try to do too much too soon as it is to do too little too late.

We have found that you can line your shelves with reports, plans and models but eventually you must choose those projects which commonsense tells you are most important, give them the necessary priorities and, as Robert Moses would say, put in the steam shovels and the bulldozers. Then

and then only will you know that your project is on its way.

Perhaps our most important accomplishment is that the metropolitan council has adopted the metropolitan concept. Subject to human nature being what it is, and neither you nor I will ever change that, members of council consider projects in relation to their value to the whole area rather than in relation to the advantage they might have upon their respective individual municipalities.

We found that we must spend many millions of dollars to provide the area with the services it needs. We recognize that such expenditures are investments in the plant and equipment which our rapidly expanding metropolitan area must have if it is to remain attractive to industrial and commercial development without which it cannot hope to exist.

One comment which I think is appropriate is that there is probably a more urgent need for action than is generally appreciated. In these days emergencies in both domestic and foreign affairs develop with startling rapidity. There is seldom time for an exhaustive examination of all possible solutions in the hope that you can discover the perfect answer. In our case we had arrived at a stage where our three rapidly expanding residential municipalities were finding it difficult to finance their requirements. When you can't sell your bonds you do not have the time and the composure to undertake an academic discussion into what is the perfect solution.

Under such circumstances the time required for extensive investigations of the problems which have arisen and the solutions which have been adopted in other areas might better be devoted to securing an accurate and comprehensive knowledge of the facts of your own situation. This should be followed by a careful description of the general scheme and its fundamental principles in the simplest possible language so that it may be understood by the general public.

As to any plan which may be proposed it should be based upon two fundamental principles. The first is a realization of the vital interdependence which exists between the local units comprising any metropolitan area. No one local municipality in a metropolitan area can be sufficient unto itself. Secondly the history of both our countries has taught us that local responsibility in local affairs is a vital element in our democratic system of government.

In our case the necessity for certain services required by the whole area became more and more pressing. We discovered that it was not difficult to determine what should be done. You could find a common denominator with respect to what was needed but we found it to be impossible upon a voluntary basis to establish a common denominator as to how the things that should be done would be paid for.

There are many, and I confess to having been one, who thought the problem could only be solved by complete amalgamation of all of our constituent municipalities into one big city. I expounded the arguments of overlapping jurisdiction, and the administrative efficiency and economy that would result from large-scale production, but I have learned from experience that there were those who understood the fundamental issues better than I did and who presented a better solution than complete amalgamation. I cannot say that there is not some duplication of administrative staffs and services nor can I say that dollarwise there may not be some increased costs but I can say that if there is some overlapping and duplication it is minor in degree and if the costs are greater that they are only slightly higher and that the accomplishments are worth many times the increased cost.

In our case the vigorous opposition of 11 out of the 12 suburbs to the city's application for amalgamation surprised the ardent and highly vocal advocates of outright consolidation. Amalgamation seemed like a simple and logical solution of our problem. Like many simple answers, it was deceptive. It would have tended to destroy true local government rather than to improve it.

One recommendation I would make is that you should not wait until you have convinced everybody that you have the perfect solution. No one has ever achieved the acme of perfection. Make a start. Many of the matters which you are apprehensive about will never occur and if they do they will not have the cataclysmic effect you think and time and experience will be your best teacher.

In closing may I say that in the course of our experiments we receive many criticisms and many complaints, but that we are proceeding in accordance with the advice inherent in Abraham Lincoln's words which I paraphrase as follows:

"If I were to attempt to read let alone answer all the criticisms and complaints I receive I would have no time for any other business. From day to day I do the best I can and will continue to do so to the end. If in the end I come out all right then the complaints and criticisms will make no difference, but if the end brings me out wrong, then 10 angels coming down from heaven to swear that I was right would still make no difference."

[From the Providence (R.I.) Evening Bulletin, Aug. 3, 1959]

A HOPEFUL NEW APPROACH TO METROPOLITAN PROBLEMS

A bill to set up a U.S. Commission on Metropolitan Problems is before the Senate, and there is gathering interest in its passage. The proposal was introduced by Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, a former mayor of Philadelphia, who won the respect of many municipal executives for the imagination and vigor he brought to bear on city problems.

Senator CLARK wants an 18-member commission, named by the President and by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate. The legislation would guarantee representation by the minority party in both branches of Congress by Governors with major urbanization problems and by mayors of American cities.

The job of the commission would be manifold. It would review present and prospective needs of metropolitan areas for public service; it would study the capabilities of the different levels of government to meet these needs; it would pinpoint the extent of existing Federal support in satisfying those needs.

But its most useful job, it seems to us, would be the review of means for improving coordination of Federal, State, and local policies and programs that affect metropolitan areas. In effect, the commission would be able to put together a blueprint indicating avenues of approach to the solution of metropolitan problems.

Metropolitanization has been a matter of discussion and concern for several years, and the first successful attempt at metropolitanization in Dade County, Miami, has attracted continuing attention. That area had to hurdle early opposition to metropolitanization and a later attempt to hobble metropolitanization severely.

But a major trouble in getting started in any one area on the job of solving metropolitan problems is the lack of experience in the field. The problems are so large and involve so many layers of government that it is difficult to lay hold of a method to untangle the snarl of rights, duties, powers, and authorities.

If the commission did no more than outline a new and effective pattern of inter-

related Federal, State, and local policies and programs for handling of metropolitan problems, it would earn the gratitude of many a governor and mayor, as well as the citizens of the crowded, fast-growing metropolitan centers of the nation.

The commission would have no power to impose a thing on Congress or a State and its subsidiary governments. It would be asked to make recommendations to the President and Congress by February 1, 1961, and it would be clothed with enough authority and given enough money to do a meaningful job for the Nation.

We hope Congress approves Senator CLARK's bill. The opportunities for the commission are tremendous in just the one field, for instance, of urban renewal. It could start from the firm basis of the Hoover Commission findings on governmental relations, and it could pioneer with recommendations of great value to the cities of America.

[From the Erie (Pa.) Times-News, Aug. 2, 1959]

CABINET HELP FOR CITIES PROPOSED

New York's Senator KENNETH KEATING, Republican, is the latest to propose a Cabinet-level department at Washington catering to an urban clientele. No figure of speech is intended; the Department of Urban Affairs—the name suggested several years ago by Representative J. ARTHUR YOUNGER, Republican, of California—is frankly conceived as a counterweight to the Department of Agriculture, whose name it imitates, and to such other client agencies as Labor and Commerce.

Despite fine theories to the contrary, political scientists generally regard Government agencies as spokesmen more or less for the groups they oversee. The "more or less" may cover an enormous range and leave room, let's say, for a Secretary Benson as well as a Secretary Brannan, but in general Agriculture Secretaries are expected to expound the farmer's viewpoint and Commerce Secretaries the businessman's.

City spokesmen have long complained that nobody understands their viewpoint—at least nobody high enough to matter. Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, in support of his own bill to establish a Department of Urban Affairs, told the American Municipal Association last December that its job would be "to listen to representatives of groups like this one, understand their problems and reflect that understanding in the policy forming processes within the executive branch."

Recently, urban strategists have been soft-pedaling demands for a separate Federal department. Instead they are concentrating their energies behind proposals for a Hoover-type study of metropolitan problems. Senator CLARK is himself following this course (with public encouragement from Senate Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON), and the U.S. Conference of Mayors at its mid-July convention skipped over its earlier endorsement of a Cabinet post in favor of the study plan.

The big point is, however, that the plight of the established cities finally has been recognized and something is going to be done.

Statewide Poll on 45 Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, last month I sent out a questionnaire to con-

stituents in my State. Forty-five questions of national interest were asked. Replies came back in great numbers. As a matter of fact, a total of 1,581 questionnaires were filled out and mailed back to me. They came from every part

of the State and from every walk of life, on a fairly proportionate basis. In my opinion, these 1,581 answers to each of the 45 questions present a representative cross section of public opinion.

The results, which have been tabulated and reduced to percentages, are

informative and interesting to study. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have the results of the poll printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Percent]

	Yes	No	No answer		Yes	No	No answer
1. Do you favor integration in schools?	51.6	43.4	5.0	25. In the program of "matching funds" for the aged, blind, and disabled, do you favor the Federal share being increased?	37.3	45.9	16.8
2. Do you favor integration in housing?	30.2	59.4	10.4	26. Do you think that unemployment benefits are too extensive?	51.0	36.9	12.1
3. Do you agree with the scientists who say that the danger from nuclear explosion fallout is negligible?	41.7	36.4	21.9	27. Do you favor TVA and other public power projects?	31.1	52.4	16.5
4. Do you favor changing the law which requires that "equal time" on radio and TV be given to opposing candidates?	52.6	36.9	10.5	28. Are you in favor of more "socialism" or government paternalism than we have at present?	6.2	80.7	13.1
5. Would you have voted to confirm Admiral Strauss' nomination?	67.3	17.9	14.8	29. Would you support the President's efforts to keep spending in line with the budget?	84.6	9.5	5.9
6. Would you vote for the measure which would provide that a Federal law does not strike down a State law unless Congress specifically says so?	60.1	26.3	13.6	30. Do you think that heavy Government spending, without regard to the budget, helps our national economy more than it hurts it?	16.3	66.0	17.7
7. Do you favor legislation or constitutional amendment to curb the Supreme Court's power?	40.3	50.9	8.8	31. To pay for the highway program, would you favor boosting the gasoline tax rather than boosting other taxes?	68.1	22.5	9.4
8. Would you favor giving the residents of the District of Columbia full voting rights permitting complete home rule?	65.8	26.5	7.7	32. Would you favor raising taxes to pay for a bigger housing program?	12.0	76.9	11.1
9. Do you favor the 8-year limit on a President's tenure of office?	68.7	25.2	6.1	33. Would you favor a tax increase to offset a deficit resulting from increased Federal expenditures?	27.1	60.5	12.4
10. Are you in favor of equal-rights-for-women legislation?	70.6	17.9	11.5	34. Do you favor indefinite extension of sales, or excise, taxes?	24.0	64.5	11.5
11. Do you favor liberalizing our immigration restrictions?	31.3	58.2	10.5	35. Do you think the Geneva talks, now in recess, are likely to solve anything basic?	10.7	76.2	13.1
12. Do you favor all possible speed in our space program?	62.9	21.5	15.6	36. Do you favor a "summit" conference if the Geneva Conference fails?	30.8	55.4	13.8
13. Do you think that high tariff is better than low tariff for our national economy?	37.4	43.7	18.9	37. Would you favor our withdrawing from West Berlin?	5.5	83.5	11.0
14. Would you favor a program designed to return the farmers to the "law of supply and demand" which would embody the stopping of price supports and the lifting of acreage and production limitations?	84.1	9.8	6.1	38. Should we place restriction on the activities of Soviet officials in this country, 80 percent of whom are engaged in spying, according to FBI Chief Hoover?	80.8	9.7	9.5
15. Do you favor labor legislation to restrict activities of labor officials?	90.8	3.9	5.3	39. Would you favor the admission of Red China to the Olympic games?	26.0	61.8	12.2
16. Do you favor continuing the McClellan hearings?	70.7	7.8	15.5	40. Are you in favor of granting passports to known American Reds?	15.4	71.4	13.2
17. Do you favor the "open shop"?	71.9	12.9	15.2	41. Do you favor our dropping the traditional rule that in war the United States "never strikes first"?	44.4	39.6	16.0
18. Are you in favor of raising the minimum wage to \$1.25?	35.4	52.8	11.8	42. Do you think we should stop all nuclear tests regardless of what Russia may do or "promise"?	9.9	79.9	10.2
19. Do you believe that raising the minimum wage would be inflationary?	55.7	35.2	9.1	43. Would you favor making France an equal partner, as is Great Britain, in nuclear information and facilities?	37.7	42.7	19.6
20. Are you in favor of a pay boost for steelworkers?	8.1	81.1	10.8	44. Do you favor foreign aid?	56.1	28.5	15.4
21. Do you favor Federal aid for school construction?	42.2	46.3	11.5	45. Do you think our mutual security program is paying off?	45.4	25.6	29.0
22. Would you support the use of Federal funds for paying teachers' salaries?	21.3	69.8	8.9				
23. Would you favor increased retirement benefits under social security?	51.3	39.1	9.6				
24. Do you favor further extension of veterans' benefits?	22.4	64.5	13.1				

Miss Elizabeth A. Smart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time to announce the passing of Miss Elizabeth A. Smart who died in a hospital in Washington, D.C., last Sunday, August 16.

Miss Smart was well known to Members of the House and Senate, as well as others on Capitol Hill. They knew her especially because of her championing the cause of temperance. She represented the Woman's Christian Temperance Union in Washington. No one, to my knowledge, was more diligent and more effective in opposition to the sale and distribution of intoxicating liquors.

She was highly respected by everyone who knew her, even those who disagreed with her views. She was deeply religious, she was sincere, she was a great Christian character.

Even though Miss Smart has passed from this life, her influence and her effectiveness will live on in the years to come. The great organization she represented and the country have suffered a distinct loss of a great American.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The Preservation of Freedom in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Minister Pyo Wook Han of the Korean Embassy before the Kiwanis Club of Richmond, Va., June 8, 1959. At a time when we hear so many criticisms of the newly independent countries of Asia as they struggle against almost insuperable odds, it is important to look at some of the truly remarkable achievements. Korea is a brilliant example because the gains have been made while a state of war still exists, under an uneasy armistice.

The address of Minister Han is also notable for the fine tribute he pays to Walter S. Robertson of Richmond who was recently forced to retire because of health reasons, after more than 6 years of extraordinarily brilliant service as Assistant Secretary of State for the Far East. The valiantly struggling new government of old peoples in Asia understand even better than we just how great have been the contributions made by Mr. Robertson to the freedom, stability and progress accomplished in the Far East, with great benefits to their countries and to our own.

The address follows:

THE PRESERVATION OF FREEDOM

It is a great personal privilege—perhaps more than you realize—for me to have this opportunity to speak here in Richmond, especially at this time. Richmond is, of course, one of the most interesting and attractive cities of the world; and in this season of the year it is surely one of the most beautiful. Also it is a city which has always taken a lead in its opposition to communism and in its defense of world democracy.

But I have an even more immediate and pressing reason why I am more than delighted to be here with you today.

One of your greatest sons—the Honorable Walter Robertson—is retiring at the end of this month from his position as Assistant Secretary of State for the Far East. I myself came to the Korean Embassy in Washington a few years before he assumed his high duties in this most important office. It has been one of the delights and rewards of my life to enjoy his friendship, just as it is now a great privilege to pay tribute to the dedicated and high service which he has rendered, at great cost to himself, to the freedom and democracy of Asia, to my own country particularly, and to the security and ideals of the United States.

The responsibilities of the office of Assistant Secretary of State for the Far East are vast. It is his responsibility to deal with the destinies of fully half of the human race. He has had to guide the relations of

your great Nation with more than a score of Asian nations, many of which have just recently emerged or re-emerged into freedom. He has had to lead the battle against Communist aggression on its most vital battlefield—for it has long been Communist dogma that the conquest of the Far East is the essential road to the eventual conquest of the world.

I think few diplomats have ever had to confront more difficult or delicate problems than those which circumstance have imposed upon Walter Robertson. To his eternal honor, he has acquitted himself superbly well.

Mr. Robertson learned about Communist intrigue and ruthlessness the hard way, when he was attached to General Marshall's mission in China in 1947. He learned then that the Communists simply will not negotiate in good faith—and that they make promises only to break them. He learned that their policy is guided by only one aim—the destruction of freedom everywhere.

To this knowledge he has added the great attributes of personal courage and clear wisdom. He has never faltered in his fight against admitting the Chinese Communist regime into the United Nations—for he knows that to do so would be to strike a mortal blow against the whole cause of democratic liberties in the entire Far East.

When Quemoy and Matsu were under attack, and when the resolution of free peoples around the world wavered, Walter Robertson was a tower of strength. He knew that the only way to combat Communist terrorism is to stand firm—and his position has been vindicated.

During and following the war in my own country, Mr. Robertson has always been a friend upon whom we could solidly depend. We always and forever have found him to be a gentleman of the highest standards of personal honor and integrity. Through him our own small country has been able to deal with the great and powerful United States in a spirit of mutual respect and regard which has well served the common cause of freedom.

His greatest memorial is the high regard in which he is held by the vast majority of the more than a billion human beings with whom it has been his responsibility to deal for these past years.

I am happy to attest, too, that I know the man who has been named as his successor; and I am glad, as I know Mr. Robertson is, to feel assured that the wise policy of firmness and justice which Walter Robertson did so much to shape and maintain will continue to be upheld.

For the problems that afflict our part of the world are far from being solved. Perhaps they never will be solved in our lifetime—for the problems of humanity, especially in this era when totalitarian dictatorship is rampant, are numerous and continuous.

In Korea the fighting was ended with an unjust armistice—an armistice that was violated by the Communists as soon as it was signed—but there is no peace. Our nation is still half occupied by foreign aggressors. A military force of awesome proportions has been built up against us in the northern half of our own country, and we are constantly threatened by infiltration and subversion.

Seoul is a city of more than a million and a half inhabitants—and every one of them lives under daily threat from the jet war-

planes that are based just less than 100 miles away. The defense of our security is our very first responsibility—a responsibility that imposes itself upon every aspect of our personal and national life.

Every Korean youth is inducted into the armed forces when he reaches the age of 20 to serve for 3 years of active training, and then to be transferred into the active reserves.

Despite the enormous needs for rehabilitation and development, our principal efforts must all be directed into defense. For the freedom and independence—the democracy and progressive development—to which our government is pledged all depend first of all upon preserving our security against the constant Communist threat.

In many ways the pressure of the Communist will to conquest imposes itself into our national life. Scores of Communist agents have been arrested in our territory—armed with large sums of Korean and American currency and supplied with detailed instructions concerning the subversion of our newspapers and other agents of public information.

It is naive of those who appear to think that the Communists fight only with guns, or with threats of attack. Actually a very large part of their program of world conquest consists of propaganda and infiltration. Their agents are carefully trained to make instant and loud appeal to the very laws that are designed to protect democratic freedom. In this way they hope to win regardless of what happens. In some instances their subversive tactics may succeed. In other instances their agents may be apprehended and found guilty of subversion—but when this happens there are always misty-eyed and innocent idealists who will cry out that freedom is being violated when these agents—who, of course, pretend to be sincere critics—are arrested.

Your own country suffers and has suffered to some extent from these tactics. Our nation, which lies divided right across the world's major battlefield, is much more vulnerable. We are vulnerable to Communist infiltration—and we also are vulnerable to the slashing criticism of some so-called liberals in the West who denounce any action we take for internal self-protection.

Because of these criticisms against the necessary defensive operations of our own government, I want to read to you an official and most careful assessment of the progress of genuine democracy in my country—a statement which I quote from the latest report of the United Nations Commission on the Rehabilitation and Reconstruction of Korea. After 10 years of continuous observation of democratic processes in southern Korea, this is what the Commission says:

"The Republic of Korea was established in 1948 and, in the Commission's view, the foundations of democracy have been progressively strengthened during the past 10 years, despite the difficulties encountered, including the division of the country, the destruction of war and the problem of rehabilitation and reconstruction."

We are especially proud of the democratic developments in our own country because of some of the things we have been able to accomplish—despite all the enormous handicaps. And I am particularly happy to

enumerate some of them to you—for they are your achievements, too. Nothing that we have done would have been possible without the generous aid program of your country. What has been accomplished is, I feel, a proof positive that our kind of international cooperation truly works.

Here, then, in brief summation, is a part of the record:

1. When the Japanese were defeated, after 40 years of unjust colonial rule of Korea, some 80 percent of all our people were illiterate. Today the illiteracy has been reduced to about 6 percent. Of the children aged 6 to 11, 96 percent are now in school. And we have no fewer than 90,000 students in our 78 colleges and universities. This is, I believe, one of the most far-reaching and successful educational revolutions in all history.

2. When the Japanese grip was pried loose from Korea, some 54 percent of all our farmers were tenant farmers, and another 25 percent were partial tenants. One of the first acts of our new Government was to end this system of farm tenancy. We devised a system whereby every tenant farmer became the independent owner of the land he cultivates—with payment made over a 10-year period from the products of his fields and labor.

3. When our Government reverted to our own hands, we devised a constitutional democracy that insures absolute political equality to women and to every adult above the age of 21. This democracy really means something to our people—as is shown by the fact that on the average in all our elections the turnout of eligible voters is 84 percent.

4. In 1948 when our Republic was inaugurated, we had no real political party system. Today we have two major political parties, with the balance of political power fairly divided between them. Our Liberal Party controls the presidency; our Democratic Party the vice presidency. Some 60 percent of the National Assembly is composed of Liberals, some 35 percent of Democrats—the rest being Independents.

5. In 1948 our nation was the victim of a near runaway inflation—a condition rendered far worse by the war. For some 12 years after the Japanese defeat in 1945, our annual rate of currency inflation amounted to more than 220 percent. This means, in your terms, that a bottle of milk that cost 20 cents on January 1 would cost some 45 cents by December 31. Obviously this was a factor of ruination that struck a deadly blow at the welfare of every family in our country. Now I am happy to say that for the past 3 years the inflationary spiral has been cut back to a mere 4 to 6 percent increase a year—a figure somewhat comparable to that in your own and in European nations.

All these factors—plus improvements in the welfare of our agricultural and fisheries population, and the great expansion of our wholesome diplomatic relations, constitute a very substantial gain for Korean and world democracy. We are proud of them, and we look to the future with hope.

But there is another side of the picture that must not be overlooked. Much has been accomplished—but a vast amount yet remains to be done.

The other day, a distinguished American said that in his judgment the most fateful fact in the world today is the great disparity in living standards between the West and the Orient. I can highlight this for you by saying that, in American terms, the average per capita income in southern Korea is now about \$105 annually—whereas, in the United States it is over \$2,000. These figures mean just what they say—that on the average Americans live perhaps 20 times better than do our people in Korea.

Here is the great challenge of the future—of the immediate future—of today and of all the upcoming tomorrows. This is a problem that can only be dealt with through a combination of American resources, financial and technical, and our own Korean determination. We are willing and eager to make every sacrifice and every effort. But we must move ahead into the benefits of the 20th century. There is no other way.

This is the way we shall defeat communism. This is the avenue to a richer and better life—for us, for you, and for all the world.

Review of Record of 1st Session of 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during the weekend, I was pleased to comment over Wisconsin radio stations on the record of the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

Naturally, it is possible in a broadcast to touch only the highlights of the manifold, complex legislative actions in Congress.

Generally, however, I feel that—when Congress winds up—the record of accomplishments will be moderately good, particularly in two major fields of which have been required bipartisan cooperation:

First, keeping the peace; and

Second, successfully recovering from our economic setback.

I was privileged, also, to review the tasks still ahead of us upon which constructive action is needed prior to adjournment.

And finally, the broadcast covers problems that—as we all recognize will remain unresolved in a number of fields.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the broadcast printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the text of the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY SAYS KEEPING PEACE AND RECOVERING FROM RECESSION ARE TWO MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF NATION—EVALUATES RECORD OF 86TH CONGRESS MODERATELY GOOD

(Address by Senator WILEY over Wisconsin radio stations.)

Friends, I welcome the opportunity to be with you.

As you know, the adjournment of Congress is not far away.

In reviewing our progress in Congress, and as a nation, it is important to take a look at the record.

Insofar as it reflects bipartisan accomplishments, I believe the record is moderately good.

With adjournment there will, of course, be efforts—often “colored” in a partisan manner—to evaluate its record by either attempting to take credit for the accomplishments, or, conversely attempting to blame the other party for failures.

Without engaging in such partisanship, however, I would like to review the record briefly, including achievements we have made as a nation.

Question. Senator WILEY, what are the major marks of progress?

Answer. Although there have been advancements in a great many fields, I believe that two major accomplishments stand above the rest in the record. These include: keeping the peace; and successfully recovering from the economic recession.

PREVENTING WORLD WAR III

First of all, we have supported policies and programs that have helped to keep the peace; for the most part, this means preventing the cold war from degenerating into a hot war.

By and large, our foreign policy has had bipartisan support. Naturally, honest men may differ on national policy.

Overall, however, I believe the Nation can be gratified that the majority of its leaders—both Republican and Democrat—have been big enough to rise above lesser considerations and work for what is best for the country.

We are aware, of course, that keeping the peace and promoting greater security is not something that can be achieved—then forgotten. Rather, this is a continuous task.

Although there has been a superficial “thaw” in the East-West relations, we must remain alert and keep our powder dry.

Around the globe, the Communists are continuing their efforts at penetration of more areas and seeking control of more people.

Consequently, we must not be deceived by the words of peace of Khrushchev or any other Communist; rather, it will be necessary to keep up our guard—until words of peace are backed up with actual deeds.

Among the steps that Congress still must take is the approval of an adequate mutual security program—to further strengthen the alliance of free nations.

UNITED STATES MAKES ECONOMIC COMEBACK

Question. What is the second major accomplishment, Senator WILEY?

Answer. I believe the fact that we have successfully recovered from the economic recession is a real victory for the country.

Contrary to predictions of the prophets of gloom and doom, the Nation—despite an economic setback—did not succumb to a major depression. Instead, the Congress, administration leadership, and, most important, the confident outlook of Mr. and Mrs. Average Citizen, demonstrated the spirit and zeal necessary to prevent what might have been a serious depression, with ultimately disastrous international results.

Again, it is gratifying to acknowledge that—though there were differences of views at times—the leadership of both parties again rose to the challenge.

Now, it is true—that, economically speaking, inflation still plagues us—the cost of living is high—and there are still a number of unemployed. However, there also is a number of factors that brighten the outlook.

Question. What are these, Senator WILEY?

Answer. Today, the Nation is experiencing new highs in the economic field. These include the gross national product—that is, the value of all goods and services—amounts to about \$485 billion; and national income is at a record high of \$374 billion; civilian employment is at a peak of over 67 million.

In Wisconsin, too, the outlook is brightening.

According to a recent survey, the State hit record high levels in a great many facets of the economy.

Employment has hit a high level of 1,582,300—although this still leaves about 2.5 percent of the labor force unemployed (as compared, however, to 5.4 percent this time last year).

Average weekly earnings for production workers in our manufacturing industries are earning an average of \$94.57 weekly—an increase of 7.1 percent over last June.

The trend in homebuilding is up over last year;

Sales of cars and trucks are well above comparable 1958 levels;

Department stores sales gained 12 percent in the 5-month period beginning in January;

Business and corporations have set a new record—up nearly 50 percent over last year.

We recognize, of course, that we still have economic problems—including the need for action to reach an early settlement of the steel strike. Based on the record, however, I believe we can continue to deal with these successfully.

There has, of course, been real progress, also, in a great many other fields.

Question. Senator WILEY, we appreciate a quick look at the record of major accomplishments. Now, looking ahead, what are the jobs that must still be completed by the 86th Congress prior to the adjournment of its 1st session?

JOBS STILL TO BE ACCOMPLISHED BY 86TH CONGRESS

Answer. There are, of course, a number of major tasks ahead of us. These include:

Providing financing for the highway program;

Enacting an effective labor reform law; Strengthening our civil rights status;

Enactment of a good housing program;

Approval of funds to strengthen our mutual security alliance.

In addition, there are a substantial number of other bills still pending on the calendars in both the Senate and House of Representatives that deserve the consideration of Congress.

WHAT CONGRESS—OR THE COUNTRY—FAILED TO ACCOMPLISH

Question. Are there any fields in which it looks like Congress—and the country—still must face serious challenges in the future?

Answer. Yes. Unfortunately, solutions have not yet been found for a number of problems. These include:

First, the farm problem. Despite high costs, the economic outlook for the American farmer has not been substantially improved, nor have surpluses been reduced;

Second, we need tax reform, along the lines recommended in the Wiley bill, S. 1885, to establish a Hoover-type Tax Commission to make an overhaul of the overall tax system.

Third, the economy has not succeeded in mustering forces to block inflation. Regrettably, this economic hazard is still reducing the buying power of dollars, diminishing value of savings, investments in bonds, and life insurance; making it extremely difficult for folks on modest retirement incomes to meet the high costs of living and otherwise plaguing the economy.

Unfortunately, this general but brief review does not provide an opportunity to touch upon activities in a great many other important fields. These include: conservation, veterans' programs, education, programs for the aging, brightening the outlook for youth, and a great many others.

COMPLETION OF THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Prior to closing, I would like to mention one more significant major mark of progress; that is, the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway. Dedicated in June of this year, there has been a tremendous increase in the first-season traffic through the improved, deepened, and modernized waterway.

As a sponsor of the seaway law, I am particularly happy that the completed project promises fulfillment of the great expectations which we envisioned in enacting legis-

lation for U.S. work on the St. Lawrence program.

STOPPING THE "CHICAGO WATER STEAL"

Question. Senator WILEY, now turning to a closely related subject, we recall that the bill, H.R. 1, proposing to divert more water from Lake Michigan, was favorably reported out of the Public Works Committee this week.

Answer. Yes; unfortunately, the measure is now before the Senate. As things look now, it may come up for consideration next week.

Question. What is your strategy, Senator WILEY?

Answer. Naturally, I shall fight the bill. Among other things, I shall attempt to have the measure recommitted to committee; this time to the Foreign Relations Committee, where it rightfully belongs.

Question. Why do you say that, Senator?

Answer. In the U.S. Senate, legislation affecting our relations with other countries, and relating to treaties with other nations, should be handled by the Foreign Relations Committee.

The dangerous water diversion bill touches upon both these criteria in these areas of activity.

First, it threatens to jeopardize our relations with our good neighbor, Canada, by diverting waters of the Great Lakes in which Canada has a vital interest; and secondly, the unilateral action to divert dangerously large volumes of water threatens to violate our treaty with Canada relating to the utilization of common waters between the two countries.

Time after time, the Canadian Government has resoundingly voiced its strong opposition—and wisely, I believe—to the proposed water steal legislation.

The Congress of the United States, I believe, ought not to let go unnoticed the voice of a friendly government in such a critical matter.

There are, of course, sufficient reasons at home why the bill should not be enacted. If this is done, it will seriously jeopardize safe shipping, reduced tonnage carried on the lakes, damage lakeshore property, and impair dock facilities and port and harbor development projects. In addition, it would endanger the St. Lawrence Seaway and threaten to damage beaches and resorts.

CONCLUSION

Question. Thank you, Senator WILEY, for this preadjournment review of the record of the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

Answer. I have been happy, once again, to have the opportunity to discuss with you a variety of programs, issues, and challenges.

Now, this is your senior Senator, ALEXANDER WILEY, saying "Thanks for listening."

Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to present for the RECORD a resolution recently adopted at the 41st Annual Convention of the American Legion, Department of West Virginia, held in Parkersburg, W. Va., in which the department unalterably opposed H.R. 7650, recently passed by the Congress.

I respectfully invite my colleagues to take a few minutes to read this resolution:

RESOLUTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF WEST VIRGINIA

The following resolution was adopted at 41st annual department convention of the American Legion, Department of West Virginia, held July 24-26, 1959, in Parkersburg, W. Va.:

"Whereas H.R. 7650, the new proposed pension bill has been passed by the House of Representatives, and is now under consideration by the Senate Finance Committee; and

"Whereas the national organization of the American Legion has advocated enactment of this legislation; and

"Whereas contrary to the position taken by the national organization, the Department of West Virginia is unalterably opposed to the pension bill H.R. 7650 in its present form for the following reasons: (1) The bill under consideration is an abrupt change from the historical concept of veterans pensions, and places the recipient of such benefits on the basis of public dole rather than honorable assistance in time of need; (2) it creates more inequities than it proposes to eliminate; (3) this proposed legislation would after July 1, 1960, have two rates of payment for veterans who are identical in service, age, income, and need. This difference caused only by the time the pension was granted: And, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the American Legion, Department of West Virginia, assembled in convention in Parkersburg, W. Va., this 24th, 25th, and 26th of July 1959, urge that the senatorial delegation of the State of West Virginia expend every effort to defeat H.R. 7650, now pending in the Finance Committee of the U.S. Senate; and be it further

"Resolved, That copy of this resolution, as adopted, be forwarded to Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, Members of the House of Representatives of West Virginia, and to the national commander, Preston J. Moore."

I, Tommy E. Jones, do hereby certify that I am the duly elected, qualified, and acting adjutant of the American Legion, Department of West Virginia, and that the above is a true and correct copy of the resolution adopted at the 41st annual department convention of the American Legion, Department of West Virginia, on Saturday, July 25, 1959, in Parkersburg, W. Va.

Given under my hand this 12th day of August 1959, at Charleston, W. Va.

[SEAL]

TOMMY E. JONES,
Department Adjutant.

Where the Public Good Goes It Steps on Toes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, recently the Waco, Texas, News-Tribune published a thoughtful editorial on the subject of the public good in conflict with personal property rights.

This intelligent editorial echoes the utilitarian writings of Jeremy Bentham, the 19th century philosopher, who held that the "greatest good for the greatest number" should be the aim of just and fair legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial entitled, "Where the Public Good Goes It Steps on Toes," from the Waco News-Tribune of August 19, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE THE PUBLIC GOOD GOES IT STEPS ON TOES

No matter what the project may be—as long as the ultimate goal is for community betterment—we must face the fact that personal property rights in some cases must give way to the greatest public good, yet with fair and reasonable reimbursement for those rights.

As a case in point, hardly a week goes by that we do not hear some rumor about Lake Waco property-owners having a hassle with the Corps of Army Engineers about the value of lands that the new reservoir will inundate. So far as we're able to learn, the only serious rumors are traceable to the curbstone gang, none of whom owns as much as a square foot of lake property—they just like to talk about it.

Certainly, there may be some disagreement as to value, for there are some owners who would like to get more for their holdings. (And who wouldn't?) But, for the most part, those who have completed their negotiations are agreed that the settlement prices have been fair.

Whether it's a flood-control measure, the construction of a new highway system, urban renewal or whatever, no project of any such magnitude can be completed without stepping on a few toes. Somehow, progress has a way of avoiding "no-man's land," and it's probably a good thing—no man would benefit thereby.

Address of the Honorable Alf M. Landon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the following is an address delivered by the Honorable Alf M. Landon to the AFL-CIO Second Annual Kansas State Convention on July 16, 1959 at Topeka, Kans. After reading Mr. Landon's remarks, I am convinced every Member of Congress will find such of interest:

ADDRESS BY HON. ALF M. LANDON TO AFL-CIO SECOND ANNUAL STATE CONVENTION, TOPEKA, KANS., JULY 16, 1959

I deeply appreciate your invitation to address the duly elected representatives of 150,000 fellow Kansas citizens.

I am going to discuss this morning not only some of labor's problems from your point of view but also from the public's point of view—which I do not believe are well understood.

Revolutionary changes have taken place in industrial conditions and labor organizations in my lifetime that affect every American.

I can remember when the standard work week was 72 hours and father and mother discussing the reduction of the 12-hour day to the 10-hour day—6 days a week. I can remember talking to a superintendent of a steel plant in 1922 when President Harding

had persuaded the steel industry to adopt the 8-hour day in place of the 12-hour day. He said it might work in other industries but it would never work in the steel industry. A year later, talking to the same superintendent, he said he wouldn't go back to the 12-hour day if he could.

When I was a student in the University of Kansas—some 50-odd years ago—the fight in the Congress and State legislatures was to abolish child labor in industry and for protective legislation for women in industry. That fight was led by the American Federation of Labor. The argument against that legislation was that it was unconstitutional—that women and little children had a right to work—if they wanted to. At that time there was no limit to the hours that a train crew had to work. That was corrected by legislation led by the late Senator Robert La Follette, Sr., and the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen to the benefit of not only labor but for the safety of the passengers as well as the equipment—because the physical reactions of a man who had worked 18 or 20 hours or longer were not adequate to the demands of his job.

That's when I became a believer in the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively. And I have never seen any reason to change my mind.

That does not mean that I believe labor organizations—their leadership and their policies—have always been right or above public concern.

I believe strong labor organization supplements a sound capitalistic economy. In the beginning—labor was organized along craft lines exclusively. Then came the unique American development of massed production. That brought about the massed unionism of today. The growth of single companies spread from one plant to first—scattered nationwide plants. Many of these branch plants are larger today than the original factory. Second—in the last few years many American corporations have branch factories located all over the world and in different nations.

As American corporations have grown in size—so has the AFL-CIO and United Mine Workers.

I believe it can be argued with validity that the natural evolution of massed unionism to meet massed production provides a needed check and balance on economic power in our Nation's life. Without that we would have a chaotic condition similar to other countries in the world today.

Look at the two extremes—from Russia where labor is not free—to England where it is a major political party and as such is involved in a conflict of interests. Right now England's labor party is split wide open on its H-bomb policy in the coming campaign. Faced with the responsibility of government it must take a position on that question of national security that does not involve primary labor economic and social policies.

I do not think a labor political party will ever be successful in America because of our 50 States. And I do not think labor unions will ever take over either one of our political parties for the same reason. They may—in effect—take over some political party temporarily—in one State or another—because of the ineptness of the leadership of the other major party in failing to develop a political philosophy adequate to meet the problems of today.

But that is not a new development in the political life of our great country.

In the nineties we had the Populist and the Farmers Alliance that temporarily dominated several State governments and elected Members of the Congress.

It is significant that most of the policies of that agrarian movement—that scared the pants off a lot of people at that time—have long been written into State and National

legislation. What was socialism and revolutionary then is ultraconservative now.

There was one fundamental difference between the political activity of that old agrarian political bloc and Labor's Committee on Political Education. The farmers did not have the cash available for campaign funds that the labor organizations have. What money there was in the country in the eighties and nineties available for campaign purposes—was all on one side. Now there is a balance.

We have not developed a practical and successful way to check the unhealthy growth of campaign funds because the Congress and State legislatures have refused to enact legislation providing for accurate and complete public reporting of political campaign contributions—both by parties and candidates.

There is much to be said about that. I do not believe campaign funds are being used to buy votes as they were only a comparatively few years ago in too many cities. Today the rising expenditure of political campaigns is the increased costs of television—radio and printing.

And there is nothing new in our history about the charges of pressure groups like those made against the political activities of the AFL-CIO and the United Mine Workers.

There have always been pressure groups in our history.

In our early history it was charters for toll roads, canals, and land grants. Then came railroad charters, defense contracts, power projects—not to mention such perennial standbys as tariff and river and harbor legislation, known as the pork barrel bills.

Again—when I was a student at the University of Kansas—the battle in the legislature was for an antipass bill—primary and popular election of U.S. Senators to curtail the political influence of the railroads and to establish the Interstate Commerce Commission and State Corporation Commission.

Whatever influence the labor leaders have used has not been confined entirely to the problems of their organizations.

I have been familiar with the work of Kansas Legislatures for 40 years. And in all that time I have never known of more public spirited lobbyists than the representatives of labor.

They have always been for better education, better roads, and streets, better conservation and flood control, improved recreational facilities and better sanitation and safety measures.

All of which today are highly important factors in securing industrial plant locations.

The farmers of the State would not have the REA facilities they do today without the vigorous support from start to finish of that legislation by the labor organizations.

Today the struggling labor unions of my youth have grown in strength and most of them in responsibility.

Because of their size their leaders live in a goldfish bowl just as all public and big business figures. Their character and activities are of public concern.

Arguments as to who has the greatest economic power are fruitless. A strike to settle that by two powerful giants like steel unions and corporations has appalling consequences on all America. If it lasts long enough—more union workers will be laid off in other industries—than are on a strike in steel. Our national defense program is threatened.

Yet not one official word of the final points in dispute has been made public. Why the mystery?

The public ought to know and has a right to know what it is all about.

There are published stories and comments on the points at issue but no official statements by the men who did the talking.

Why not? What were the problems and the needs of both sides as stated to each other and what are the facts to back them up as claimed by both sides?

I believe that both Union President David McDonald and R. Conrad Cooper—spokesman for the steel industry—should sign a joint statement for the public on the points of difference.

Can there be any doubt that the pattern of the negotiations between big steel and big union is as important as any debate on the floor of the Congress?

Therefore, can there be any doubt as to the obligation of both union and management to make public their demands?

It became necessary for Government—to protect the public as well as investors against the frenzied finance—insurance scandals of past years—inside deals by management—and unconscionable contracts between corporations with interlocking directors.

Big business resisted that kind of legislation as labor leadership is resisting it today for labor organizations.

But there is one very fundamental difference between the two. Big business made little effort to clean its own house. The AFL-CIO under the wise leadership of President George Meany is making a vigorous attempt to do just that and is entitled to receive wholehearted support from public officials, management, and the public that he is asking for.

If your leadership does not succeed in that and unless better labor management relations are established by sincere objective and factual recognition of each other's problems and needs, Government is bound to step in sooner or later, just as it did with big business by increased regulatory powers over both unions and management. That means creating new Government bureaus and endowing Government with new powers.

In this complex industrial life of ours I recognize the necessity of regulatory legislation covering big labor just as I believe that is necessary to cover big business. But I believe such legislation should be held to the minimum essential to public protection—else we will have a cumbersome Government bureaucracy that entangles both labor and management in endless redtape and confusion of administrative laws.

I also recognize that the administration of that regulatory legislation with equity and justice is all important.

But I am opposed to any legislation aimed at weakening the principle and structure of collective bargaining through strong and responsible labor unions.

Now may I speak of the responsibilities confronting you and ahead of you—outside of your organization's problems and policies.

The greatest contribution labor organizations have made to the general welfare—not only to all freedom loving Americans, but to freedom in the world—is their stance and unrelenting opposition to communism. The future historian, writing of this period, will give more credit to men like George Meany and John L. Lewis for the defeat of the Imperial Soviet's plans for world conquest by the sword, slave camp, assassination, and subtle subversion, than they will to any other American civilian.

There is no stronger civilian bulwark anywhere in the world against the Soviet tyranny and slave camps, than the AFL-CIO and United Mine Workers. Massed unionism is democracy's negative answer to the Lenin-Trotsky-Stalin expectation of a proletarian revolution.

I am sure I do not need to warn you patriotic and devoted Americans that the fight will go on probably beyond the lifetime of

the youngest delegate present. Either that or civilization will be "booped," like a quail on a rail, in hunting season.

Nowhere in the world is there a Communist government resting on popular support.

Every Communist government in the world rests on bullets instead of ballots and with no choice or freedom of action on the part of the individual.

We must be prepared at all times to offer either the hand of equity and justice to the Soviet, that makes for an orderly and peaceful world, or the mailed fist.

We must be willing and able to give them their choice, without threats or without fear.

The appalling and tragic confusion in the Pentagon, between the heads of our armed services, that has existed under both Democrat and Republican administrations, is a national scandal and menace.

On several occasions our President promised to bring order out of chaos in the so-called General Staff. He has failed to do so.

If he does not—the Congress can and should. There is a vital need for a thorough objective reappraisal of our overall defensive strength. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor—retiring Chief of Staff—says he has tried to get that done since 1953.

Inflation is as great a threat to our national security as the intolerable and unsatisfactory conduct of our defense affairs. Inflation is the greatest boon to communism and it's a politician's paradise when they do not have to levy taxes to meet public spending.

Inflation by government is like a thief in the night robbing you—while you are asleep—of your earnings—your savings and your pensions.

Up until 1933—except in war—it was unknown legislative procedure to appropriate funds without accompanying revenue measures.

Both major parties—in recent national platforms have pledged expanded Government services—lower taxes and a balanced budget.

Well, I won't go so far as to say that both Democrat and Republican platforms were fooling the citizens. Because a rigid application of the pruning knife on our over-stuffed bureaucracy—a rigid and sound decision of what should have priority as between what was desirable and what was necessary—could accomplish wonders in reducing the cost of our National Government. But that was too much in the nature of a miracle to occur.

The fight I had with the resolutions committee at the 1936 Republican Convention for sound money was with the so-called conservatives. They were all for a little snack of inflation then. But there isn't any such a thing. Planned inflation by deliberate Government policy has never worked because the controls never work. Since 1933 we have been steadily debasing the value of the American dollar by our Government's financial policies.

The place to stop the incipient flight from the dollar is in our Government's fiscal policies—either by reducing spending or increasing taxes until the twain do meet. That must be done one way or the other if we are to avoid the destruction of our money and credit.

The solution of the financial mess some 29 States are in—and countless municipalities—is just that simple.

The hope for America is that labor will wake up to the fact that it has more at stake in sound money than capital. The owner of a patch of land or some good common stock or merchandise—has some hedge against soft money. But those who have neither are like ducks on a pond.

Capital is fluid. It can shift around all over the free world and some of the Commu-

nist colonies as well. Labor cannot. The nimble speculator can always take care of himself. And that's going on right now.

As other countries of the free world have got on their feet—by America's aid—the American dollar is weakening in foreign exchange. That is partly due to fear of the stability of the American dollar and partly due to trade conditions and also the availability now of other countries for investments—whose governments have sounder fiscal policies.

Another illustration of the effect of our unsound fiscal policies is the invasion of our domestic market by foreign products. As you well know, taxes are a major factor in the cost of every product.

German casing and tubing—made according to the American Petroleum Institute specifications—can be bought in Kansas for \$30 a ton less than American tubular pipe. German structural steel is being laid down in Kansas City for \$40 a ton less than American steel. With the enlarging of the St. Lawrence Seaway the lower transportation costs will probably be reflected in lower prices. Belgian barbed wire is selling in Kansas for approximately \$1.75 a spool less than American barbed wire and it is just as good. Recently our American Navy bought some steel plates from Japan \$4 per ton less than American quotations. But on checking it was found that our U.S. Government lost about \$6 a ton in taxes. So Uncle Sam was \$2 a ton net the loser. American textiles are facing increasing competition from foreign textiles. You all know how foreign automobiles are taking the market away from American cars.

The completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway—lowering transportation costs to the seaboard—makes all of Kansas—with its great natural resources—educational and recreational facilities—more advantageous for industrial development.

I realize our foreign policies—our military disorganization and our imbecile fiscal policies are not on this convention's program. But they are of vital concern to every American. I mention them because they are policies that we all should be thinking about and talking about.

I have discussed with you this morning not only some of the issues in labor-management areas—but also the wider field of public policies.

It is obvious that big business and big unions are here to stay. Therefore, we must seek methods to adjust that development—to our American way of life.

Surely the America that developed new political—social and humanitarian values and principles that revolutionized the governments of the world—and the America that developed new methods of massed production that revolutionized industry all over the world—surely that America is capable of realistically facing and solving the complex problems of our industrial structure.

The American people must never forget the fact that our great Republic was founded on the concept that the average man and woman develops under responsibility and education.

I would like to see Labor's Committee on Political Education do more in the way of public relations such as the luncheon for representatives of statewide organizations and management arranged by Vice President James Yount last year on the educational problems of our great State.

I would like to see labor and management meet occasionally under different circumstances than strictly bargaining—based on who has the biggest club.

Several years ago your secretary—Floyd Black—issued invitations in Topeka for a joint meeting of labor-management and the press for an objective discussion of the problems affecting the growth and development of a better community to live in and do business in.

The relaxing visits during the social time of those meetings provided even a better opportunity for free and frank exchange of views.

I believe the pattern of those meetings is worthwhile for other communities and the State. Eventually regular meetings of that kind will contribute to the education of all the parties concerned. I mean not only labor and management—but the public as well.

It is evident that a better understanding of our existing mutuality of interest and interdependence would be a great asset for all Americans and the free world as well.

We must build our new industrial society on the capacity and the desire of the average man and woman to do what's right.

We must never lose confidence in each other or in the political capacity of each other.

Unless that be true—I mean, unless the mass is capable of exercising responsibility—there is no breath in popular government.

Our perceptions may be imperfect—but there must be and is—more good than bad in our combined intelligence.

The Eyes of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, all of us know the exciting, heroic story of how the United States got its National Anthem, "The Star-Spangled Banner." But I do not believe many people are aware of the colorful history of the song, "The Eyes of Texas," which, although not the official State song of Texas, is the best known ode to the Lone Star State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "The Eyes of Texas," from the magazine article, Texas Parade, of August 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Texas Parade, August 1959]

THE EYES OF TEXAS—MUCH BETTER KNOWN THAN "TEXAS, MY TEXAS," THE OFFICIAL STATE SONG

(By Joe Tucker)

One moonlit night some 50 years ago, a young student slowly walked across the University of Texas campus to B Hall dormitory, climbed two flights of stairs to his small corner room, and on the back of a piece of laundry wrapping paper scribbled what are probably the most famous words ever written by a Texan.

Those penciled phrases are now sung as lyrics to one of the most typical and well-known college songs of America—"The Eyes of Texas." Written as a joke for a minstrel show, almost entangled in a legal battle involving a U.S. Senator, translated into 10 languages, "The Eyes of Texas" mirrors a unique rags-to-riches success story.

Although "The Eyes of Texas" certainly is not the national anthem—nor even the State song—many Texans jump to their feet when they hear it. It is the school song of the University of Texas and radio station KVER in Austin signs off at midnight with it instead of "The Star-Spangled Banner." The

song is played before the beginning of all athletic contests of the University and is the theme for many welcoming committees in the East.

The song has been sung at many a hard-fought football game, by servicemen on lonely Pacific Isles, and even by German infantrymen during World War II. An American medical officer in Tunis watched in amazement as German PW's of Hitler's defeated Afrika Korps filed down a dusty road singing "all the livelong day."

Many words have been exchanged and humorous situations arisen over the similarity between the song "I've Been Working On The Railroad" and the more recent "The Eyes of Texas."

Years ago when the University of Texas Longhorn Band appeared in the East, a radio announcer said: "Here comes the University of Texas band dressed in its white and orange uniforms playing 'I've Been Working On The Railroad.'" The following week, the station was flooded with letters pointing out the error.

On November 22, 1948, at 6:45 p.m., over radio station WFAA in Dallas, the following news broadcast was heard:

"There was another slap taken at Texas today—and by a foreigner no less. It came from a gentleman—so-called—by the name of Harmon Nichols, who does some writing for the United Press up in Washington. Nichols sat himself down in front of his typewriter to do a piece on the fact that there aren't very many original tunes kicking around anymore. And the very first thing he took a swipe at was 'The Eyes of Texas'—suh. Rather than get involved we're going to quote this man Nichols directly. He writes: 'The Eyes of Texas'—anthem of the proud Lone Star State—is billed as original: PFFFFT. That's PFFF. It's a theft from 'I've Been Working On The Railroad,' which in turn is a theft from 'I've Been Working On The Levee.'"

An immediate defense of the song came from a loyal and indignant ex-student of the University of Texas, Ed Nunnally, of San Angelo, Tex. "Hah," said Nunnally, "as for the 'Levee Song' or the 'Railroad Song,' those tunes were hardly known until John Lang Sinclair, the beloved author of 'The Eyes of Texas,' wrote his immortal words."

However, Nunnally admitted the copyright governed only the words. "But," he said, "without them you'd only have just another tune, or a folk song, if you like."

The battle for the song's copyright made interesting reading in newspapers around the country in 1936.

In the fall of 1935 Nunnally led a movement to have the song copyrighted, but an investigation led to the discovery that a former director of the University of Texas Glee Club, J. Oscar Fox, and a Boston publishing company had already secured a copyright. A major battle followed. The Texas attorney general and Senator Tom Connally came to the rescue of the State university.

Fox defended his copyright, saying, "It's simply like finding a steer that has gone unbranded for years." However, Fox relinquished his rights to the university, after it threatened suit, and Nunnally received a letter in March 1936 from the Director of Copyright Division of the Library of Congress successfully ending the 4-month contest.

The copyright protects the song on two counts:

1. Whenever the song and the "Texas" words are used in movies, plays, on records, radio, or television it will be played only to reflect credit to the university and command the respect of the audience.

2. Money collected in royalties and movie rights will go into a fund, half of which will go to the University Students' Association and half into a John Lang Sinclair Eyes of Texas Scholarship Fund.

Despite the fact that the song officially became the property of the University of Texas, the copyright was not enforced. In 1951 the song was used in the MGM movie "Go for Broke," a story of the 36th Infantry Division. The committee wrote MGM asking where they obtained permission to use the song. They answered they had obtained the right from Broadcast Music, Inc., who in turn stated they had received the right from a deceased Boston music publisher. In 1952 a contract was negotiated between the copyright committee of the University Student Government and BMI.

As a result of the new arrangement, a \$675 check was obtained for rights to "Night Train to Galveston"—a Columbia Pictures western production. A grand total of \$1,600, minus BMI's cut, was subsequently received for "Go for Broke" rights. In 1951 the song brought in \$2,400 on the copyright with several suits pending against firms who had violated the copyright. Dick Powell of movie, radio, and television fame made a record of it in swing time.

In 1964 the copyright will run out. It may then be renewed again for 28 years. In 1992, 89 years after its composition, the most popular song a Texan ever produced will cease legally to be the property of the University of Texas where it was born.

But despite its widespread popularity through the years, love for "The Eyes of Texas" has not always been equally shared by everyone. Several years ago, a newspaper reporter interviewed Frederick Jagel, Metropolitan Opera star, who at that time was raising eyebrows around the country by declaring "The Star-Spangled Banner" was no good as a national anthem. He was asked: "Mr. Jagel, how do you like 'The Eyes of Texas'?"

"The eyes of what?" the singer replied. "Why 'The Eyes of Texas,'" the reporter returned. "You know, the college song."

"I don't believe I know how it goes," came the reply.

The reporter sang a few phrases before Jagel came to his defense.

"Yes, of course, I do remember it," he said. "No," he said kindly, "that's not the proper kind of rhythm for a national anthem. It has qualities for getting crowds together but would never be inspiring enough to arouse enthusiasm. Noooo, I don't think it would do. But, it's a fine song—just a little lame."

In spite of its wide acclaim and universal popularity, the song's father, John Lang Sinclair, a red-faced, blue-eyed gentleman with quizzical eyebrows, pooh-poohed the idea he had written "The Eyes of Texas" for a college hymn.

"It was just something dashed off for diversion," he said. In New York City he was considered an authority on stocks, bonds, and income taxes. His interest before his death in 1947 was primarily statistical—not musical.

However, Sinclair's lyrics were not conceived by accident.

"In 1903," Sinclair said, "I was closely connected with the musical organizations at the University of Texas, being a member of the band and glee club. Some of the boys got up a show—University Minstrels—and asked the glee club for a selection. We didn't have anything new or good and we were in a pretty bad fix up to the last minute. A classmate, Lewis Johnson (a retired Jacksboro, Tex., rancher before his fairly recent death) said I would have to make up a song of some kind, so it was a case of do or die. I was very fond of that old son 'I've Been Working on the Railroad' so I decided to write new words."

The lyrics actually sprang up from a campus joke of the time. Referring to criticism leveled at the University of Texas, Col. William L. Prather, university president, in

a speech to a group of students that year, said:

"Young ladies and young gentlemen, the eyes of Texas are upon you." The statement might have been forgotten had not the colonel picked up the same phrase in subsequent talks. Soon the phrase "eyes of Texas" became a campus jest leveled at the president. In thinking up words for his new song, Sinclair decided on "Eyes of Texas."

Instead of being peeved by the song, Prather took it as a considerable honor and laughed with great glee. It touched a tender spot in his heart to his dying day.

In one of his customary addresses delivered at the June 1905 commencement, the Colonel gave his usual fatherly advice and as he closed an otherwise serious speech, the characteristic twinkle came into his eyes and he brought forth a thunderous applause by saying, "and in the words of one of our own poets, remember young men and women, the eyes of Texas are upon you, till Gabriel blows his horn."

Four weeks later Colonel Prather died.

When planning the funeral, those in charge asked that the song might be used in the services. The family answered they thought it appropriate, reverent, and considerate, knowing as they did, how dear to his heart the song's sentiments were.

And from that day, "The Eyes of Texas" changed from a campus joke to a revered college hymn.

Footnote on Western Capitalists Trying To Do Business With Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following illuminating news item from the report of the company meeting of Paton & Baldwin, Ltd., as it appears in the London Economist of August 1, 1959. It illustrates vividly the folly of imagining it is possible to do business with Communists except on their terms and insofar as it helps them prepare for final liquidation of the West. Lenin said that capitalists would cooperate in their own destruction. Some in America, also, seem to want to prove him right.

[From the Economist, Aug. 1, 1959]

SHANGHAI

Developments over the year have made it plain that continued operation of the company's factory in Shanghai, China, is a fruitless if not impossible task. There is no true modus vivendi between Communist and Capitalist regimes, at least not within the borders of the totalitarian state, and with the growth of China's own productive resources the need for continued toleration of foreign-owned enterprise within China has become less and less. The Chinese authorities were, therefore, approached with a view to the company being relieved of further responsibilities for running and maintaining our plant and personnel and in the hope of obtaining proper compensation for the surrender of our assets.

An agreement has been come to in recent weeks which will not be fully implemented

until the end of 1959. Another announcement will be made to stockholders as soon as is appropriate in the circumstances, but I can say now that it would be unrealistic to expect that the settlement of affairs will bring much material benefit to the company.

Resolution Adopted by Aviation Post No. 651 of the Illinois American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Aviation Post No. 651 of the American Legion for the State of Illinois.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF AVIATION POST NO. 651, AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF ILLINOIS

Whereas Aviation Post No. 651, the American Legion, Department of Illinois, has in the past, been the recipient of the good graces of the Rt. Reverend Bishop Ezekiel of the Greek Archdiocese of North and South America, and who is presently the Archbishop of Australia and New Zealand; and

Whereas the late and venerable Archbishop Michael has been called to eternal rest, and has been succeeded by his Eminence, Archbishop Iakovis, whose wisdom and zeal is known throughout the Christian World; and

Whereas for the last 6 years, our post has been favored with a representative of the Greek Orthodox faith, to give the invocation and convocation at every large public function, commencing with your past President, John Manos, and thereafter by the personal and most gracious participation of His Grace Bishop Ezekiel; and

Whereas because of the close collaboration with this dearly beloved, cultured, compassionate, and truly great divine leader, Aviation Post, has through its Public Relations counsel, been most articulate and outspoken in its denunciation and condemnation of the forces of evil that have plagued our Greek brethren in Turkey, Cyprus, and other parts of the world, resulting in action by the President of the U.S. State Department, United Nations and other governmental agencies, and bringing great Americans, Governors of many States, generals and admirals of our Armed Forces to participate together with outstanding representatives of Greek organizations; and

Whereas the Greek American Progressive Association is recognized as a great, compelling force for good, that has supported many educational, philanthropic and worthwhile undertakings, and has done all in its power to preserve the traditions of its great Hellenic heritage, and has contributed to the education of American-born young men, to finance their schooling in theology in Greece until the establishment of the present seminary, and has further succeeded in integrating and preserving the ancient and modern Hellenic philosophy which makes them better Americans and better men and women; and

Whereas, in addition thereto, the Greek Americans Progressive Association have

have pledged \$100,000 to the Greek Archdiocese Foundation, for the building and establishing of a much needed Home for the Aged, which was the dream and hope of His Eminence Archbishop Ezekiel, and those stalwart individuals, whose sincere contributions in time, effort and devotion, are bringing this dream into reality; and

Whereas the Honorable Andrew Fasseas, Director of Revenue, has embarked upon a "Road Building Machinery for Greece Program," and, which Aviation Post feels is one of the most needed enterprises to help our great ally in every war since the First World War: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That Aviation Post No. 651, the American Legion, Department of Illinois, hereby pledge our unqualified support, first, to bring to the attention of our Government, through the Congress of the United States of America, by resolution and personal effort, such aid and assistance as is necessary on matters of legislation, in the purchase of surplus property, such as farm implements, machinery, tools, surplus vehicles and parts, to follow the peaceful pursuits for farmers, artisans and others, needing such assistance; and be it further

Resolved, That we herewith pledge to maintain a helpful attitude in furnishing speakers on Americanism and citizenship as related to the ancient Hellenic philosophy, and to render such services to the Greek American Progressive Association as is humanly possible and in keeping with the principles of the American Legion, free from partisan politics; be it further

Resolved, That we extend our felicitations and good wishes for a long, useful, successful and healthy life to his Eminence Archbishop "Iakovis" of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, and much success to all of the officers and members of Greek Americans Progressive Association, and the future Bishop of the Greek Orthodox Diocese of Chicago, Ill.

Dated at Chicago, Ill., this 21st day of July A.D. 1959.

A. HENRY GOLDSTEIN,
Public Relations Counsel,
Odd Meyer,

Commander Aviation Post No. 651,
the American Legion.

NATO's Nuclear Power Grows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include the ninth and final in a series of articles by Mr. Edward J. Milne, Washington correspondent for the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin of Providence, R.I., concerning his recent tour of the NATO countries. This article appeared in the Providence Sunday Journal of August 9, 1959, and is entitled "NATO's Nuclear Power Grows":

NATO's NUCLEAR POWER GROWS

(By Edward J. Milne)

WASHINGTON.—The North Atlantic Alliance passes a new milestone tomorrow in the development, always slow, frequently frustrating, but on the whole steady, of its sword forces, or nuclear strike capacity.

On that day, August 10, there becomes effective the last of new agreements with

four of this country's NATO allies designed to allow them to sharpen the sword by achieving the capability of turning today's terrible weapons against a common aggressor.

The agreements are among six which President Eisenhower proposed to Congress this year as the result of the lowering of some—but by no means all—of the barriers to exchange of atomic information during last year's session. Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, chairman of the committee which handles international agreements in the atomic energy field, steered them through Congress under a ground rule which permits them to become operative if Congress does not adopt a resolution rejecting them.

The agreement which becomes effective tomorrow is that with Greece. Late last month, agreements became effective with Turkey, which forms with Greece the southeastern anchor of the alliance, and with West Germany and the Netherlands, key nations to the West and North.

MANY HANDS NEEDED

To see British speeding smartly through "dry runs" of launching Thor intermediate range ballistic missiles is to understand two things: That with NATO, the United States is far from alone in building the defense of the West; but that to reach optimum effectiveness, the alliance must be sure that as many as possible of the partners have the modern modern deterrent weapons.

Despite years of angry warnings from the Kremlin, the NATO heads of government accepted the principle of nuclear armament in December 1957. Congress relaxed the strict law on sharing of atomic secrets a few months later, accepting, with no substantial resistance, the argument that this country could not expect NATO to remain a going concern, politically or militarily, if our allies were required to remain in a condition of inferiority.

Our secret-sharing is not extended to all the allies on the same basis. We are much more open-handed with the United Kingdom than with any other for the simple reason that she already had such knowledge in the nuclear-weapons development field that we were not making it possible for her to become an atomic power, but simply easier, cheaper, and quicker for her to do so.

FRANCE LIMITED

An agreement with France was among those becoming effective this year, but it is far more limited than any of the others. Unlike the United Kingdom, France does not have the ability to design, develop, and build nuclear weapons.

On the other hand, unlike others of the allies, she thinks we should help her acquire that ability, and she thinks, too, that she should have a say in the use of such weapons by this country. Last year's changes in the law were carefully tailored to prevent our telling France how to make the weapons. With so many high United States-French political problems unresolved, the new agreement with France provides only for a sale to her of nuclear fuel for use in a prototype submarine reactor.

But Greece, Turkey, West Germany, and the Netherlands for all practical purposes don't care whether they are told how to make nuclear weapons as long as they learn how to use them. As the law stands, and as the agreements provide, they would never be able to use them without the specific authority of the President of the United States.

EXCLUSIONS CITED

Here is what the four agreements do not provide: They do not involve the transfer of atomic weapons, the nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons, nuclear materials, or information on the design, development, and fabrication of such weapons.

Here is what they do provide: The exchange of information necessary to the development of defense plans; to the training of personnel in the use of and defense against atomic weapons; to the evaluation of the nuclear capabilities of potential enemies; and to the development of delivery systems capable of carrying atomic weapons (i.e., planes and missiles). Finally, the agreements allow the transfer from the United States to each country of nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons systems.

The information which may be passed on to the four nations is strictly limited to that necessary to enable their military forces to use the weapons, not to design or build them. As someone has pointed out, an artilleryman doesn't have to know the formula for gunpowder or how to make it in order to use a shell effectively. But he does need to know how to load and fire a shell and what it will do when it explodes on target.

DEFINING NONNUCLEAR

The nonnuclear parts of weapons systems do not include any part of the atomic warhead. Rather, they are such things as lugs, pylons, and other devices for attaching the missile or bomb to its launcher or carrier, other accessories for handling the weapons, and control systems for checking out bombs or warheads to make certain they are safe and in operating condition.

Training in the elaborate launching and electronic checkout procedures would be accomplished with dummy weapons.

On the whole, the path of the four agreements through the Congress was a smooth one, but the administration and Senator PASTORE had to meet a number of objections during the hearings. Chairman ANDERSON, Democrat of New Mexico, of the Senate-House Atomic Energy Committee was one of the doubters.

He was disturbed lest the extension of U.S. atomic capabilities to new NATO allies would be countered by transfer of nuclear weapons by Russia to its satellites. Senator PASTORE's rebuttal: That what the Russians do about arming the satellites doesn't depend "for a minute" on what we do.

Senator ANDERSON was worried, too, about the "stability" of some of our own allies. "This is like a Paul Jones dance, you don't know who you will be dancing with when the music stops," he said.

"God help us," Senator PASTORE retorted, "if that is the situation in NATO."

Thrift and Rates of Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Blow Against Thrift," published in the Hartford Courant of August 23, 1959, and also an article entitled "Tight Money Likely To Get Tighter," written by Harold B. Dorsey, and published in the Washington Post of August 24, 1959. These two items deal with the subject of thrift and rates of interest.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant, Aug. 23, 1959]

BLOW AGAINST THRIFT

Early last week a duly constituted committee of Congress decided to disdain the repeated pleas of the administration for permission to raise the ceiling on interest rates for Government bonds. Whether or not this was the final word of the 86th Congress on this subject, it was a serious economic mistake. Of greater interest to most Congressmen, probably, is the fact that it eventually may prove a political boner as well.

The decision to cling to an outgrown ceiling affected, in the first place, all new issues of marketable bonds of more than 5 years maturity—those intended for such institutions as banks and insurance companies and for big individual investors. By refusing to lift the top rate beyond 4½ percent, Congress has greatly handicapped Secretary Robert Anderson in managing the ever-growing public debt with the least possible stimulus to inflation.

But that is not the whole story. More significant to the average citizen is the fact that the resounding congressional "No" will prevent the Treasury from raising the long-outdated interest rate on E and H saving bonds. And these are securities that one administration after another has been persistently trying to sell to the American public for some 18 years.

In the past the Treasury has succeeded in winning from Congress occasional modest increases in the interest it can pay on savings bonds, to keep the return roughly commensurate with that available from other conservative investments. On E bonds held to maturity, for example, the yield has inched up over the years from 2.9 percent to 3.26 percent. Meanwhile however, the rate paid by commercial banks has risen as high as 3 percent. Savings banks have gone to 3½ percent and within a few months some will step up again to 3¾ percent. Some savings and loan association, for their part, are paying 4 percent.

Yet the U.S. Government, by decree of Congress, is unable to keep pace. The inevitable result has been a steady cashing in of savings bonds by their holders. The Treasury has just disclosed that cash-ins of E and H bonds had outrun sales for 12 successive months through July. For the first 7 months of this year, redemptions outstripped sales by \$613 million. Furthermore, Treasury officials said that unless the arbitrary ceiling is lifted, the whole savings bond program is "in danger of collapse."

It could be. Most Americans bought these bonds in the first place out of patriotic zeal, and a desire to back the boys on the firing line in every way possible. When the guns fell silent, many persons continued to buy them, as a form of regular savings, for their safety and perhaps even for their steady if unspectacular yield. But with the continued march of inflation all that has changed. Few savers are going to put money into government bonds that pay a scant 3¼ (and that only if held to maturity), when other institutions offer higher rates along with a government guarantee of the principal. Under today's circumstances, moreover, saving in any form has become a dubious procedure. Hence the popularity of the high-flying stock market, as a possible, if risky, hedge against the rising cost of living.

If it is to halt the ravages of inflation, Washington must act forcefully on several fronts. But it surely will not succeed if it persists in penalizing the saver. That is exactly what Congress is doing by clinging to an interest rate that was adequate 10 years ago, but is clearly inadequate now.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 24, 1959]

TIGHT MONEY LIKELY TO GET TIGHTER

(By Harold B. Dorsey)

Now that the House Ways and Means Committee has pigeonholed for the balance of this session legislation permitting the Treasury Department to issue Government bonds with an interest coupon higher than 4½ percent, business analysts are trying to figure the consequent effects on business activity and the credit market.

Their analysis must start out with the fact that short-term credit is very tight. Small business borrowers are beginning to complain that their bankers are "pretty well loaded up," meaning a bank's ratio of loans to deposits is just about as high as the banker wants to see it go. And, as a generality, it may be noted that this ratio for the total of all of the commercial banks at the end of July was at a high level.

It is against this current status of the banking system that business analysts have to project conditions, which must include a normal seasonal increase in the demand for bank credit between now and the end of the year, to finance harvests, Christmas inventories, and the higher rate of business activity that usually develops in the fall and winter.

On top of the already tight situation, plus the rising seasonal needs for short-term credit, we now have to superimpose the credit needs of the Federal Government. The latter is being forced to borrow in competition with business for the available supply of credit in the short-term and intermediate-term markets. Thus simple arithmetic strongly suggests that the present tight credit situation threatens to become extremely tight over the next several months.

The failure of Congress to give the Treasury Department more flexibility in solving its financing and refinancing problems is going to place a considerable penalty on legitimate business borrowers, large and small—but, as usual, more severely on the small rather than the large.

All of which presents some very difficult problems for the monetary authorities at the Federal Reserve. One of their primary responsibilities is to exercise credit controls in a fashion that will prevent an inflationary abuse of credit. In the past year they have been discharging that responsibility with excellent results and without retarding sound business expansion.

That reminds us that another primary function of the monetary authorities is to provide the economy with a bank credit base that will be sufficient to permit sound economic expansion. There probably is no group of men in the country that is more anxious to see a rising trend of business activity, providing, of course, that the prosperity does not contain those excesses which cause a boom-and-bust pattern.

It appears that the monetary authorities in the next several months must try to find a very delicate solution for a set of unusually rough problems. It would seem that they will have to ease credit policies to a sufficient extent to prevent the extreme tightness now indicated for the fourth quarter of the year, or else the soundly expanding economy might be threatened by a deficient supply of credit. Simultaneously, the Treasury Department's demands for credit will have to be handled in such a fashion as to prevent an inflationary expansion of money supply, or we will be threatened with the development of a boom-and-bust pattern.

From a security market viewpoint, when credit is this tight it certainly is not bullish, and usually it is the reverse. The condition means: (1) That there are less funds readily available for buying securities, (2) it leads toward an increase in the relative yield attraction of bonds over stocks, and

(3) it could have a dampening effect on business activity. In most earlier cycles, this combination has frequently led to downswings in both the trend of business and the trend of stock prices.

But in none of those earlier instances were the nonfinancial economic forces operating as strongly in the direction of sustained business activity as they are now. In those earlier instances, the tightness of the credit situation reflected the presence of an over-expanded economy and an abusive use of credit. The nonfinancial economic factors were set for a downswing to a much greater extent than they are now. Present indications suggest quite strongly that there will be a good snapback of business activity when present work stoppages are terminated. As a corollary, fourth-quarter earnings of a great many companies promise to be excellent.

In brief, the money situation is bearish, so far as common stocks are concerned, and the business situation is bullish. It was because the money situation had been bullish in the presence of a fairly severe inflation scare that high price/earnings ratios and low yields have been recorded in the stock market, especially for "quality" stocks and some of the extremely speculative issues. It is because the business and earnings situation for numerous cyclical groups of companies had been bearish that some of the stocks in this category do not appear to be high in relation to the earnings and dividend improvement now indicated by business prospects.

Shutdown in Steel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I thought the statement made by the AFL-CIO executive council on August 17, 1959, concerning the shutdown in steel, would be of interest to the Members:

SHUTDOWN IN STEEL

(Statement by the AFL-CIO executive council)

The shutdown in steel is now in its fifth week. This is no ordinary strike. On the surface the issues may appear to concern wages, fringe benefits, work rules, and similar issues. But, as Roger Blough, chairman of the board of the United States Steel Corp. has said, this strike involves more than those issues. It represents the focal point of an effort by corporate management of this country to reverse the whole pattern of labor relations in industrial America by converting unions into subservient tools of management.

The crisis in steel is but the latest in a series of events which illustrates the determination of corporate management in this country to achieve this result. The position taken by the automobile companies in negotiations with the United Automobile Workers in 1958, the position of the manufacturers of electrical appliances in response to the legitimate requests for employment security programs in that industry, were forerunners of the frontal assault upon cooperative labor management relationship which is now taking place in the basic steel industry.

The story in steel began in April of this

year. At that time the steel companies proposed to the United Steelworkers of America that they agree to a 1-year freeze on wages and other benefits. This meant giving up both the cost of living protection which was contained in the Steelworkers' agreements and giving up the annual improvements which were contained in the existing labor agreements.

The supposed basis for this proposal was the necessity of preventing inflation. That this was not the real basis was immediately demonstrated when the Steelworkers Union proposed an agreement that there should be no increase in steel prices but such improvements in wages and other benefits be negotiated as could be justified by the industry's increased profits and the increased productivity of the workers in the industry. The industry rejected this proposal out of hand.

The more than 2 months of negotiations which followed were completely fruitless. Despite their own knowledge that their profits were increasing at an exorbitant rate, the representatives of the steel industries refused to abandon their preconceived position that those increases and the increases in worker productivity must be reserved solely for the companies.

The steel industry knew full well that neither the United Steelworkers of America nor any other self-respecting union could accept its proposition. They knew full well that by their adamant insistence upon that position they would create a crisis in steel.

But to make assurance doubly sure, they injected into the negotiations during their closing weeks still another issue, the union must agree, they said, to the abolition of clauses in the agreements protecting individual working conditions and must give management a full rein to take any action at whatever cost to the individuals, if such action would result in an increase in profits.

The result was the result which the industry anticipated. Although the union, in a final effort to avoid a test of strength, agreed to a 2-week extension of the expiring contracts, the companies still maintained their position, and the strike began on July 14.

That the inflation issue which the companies had posed was a false issue became obvious when the companies reported publicly, as they are required to do, their profits for the first half of 1959. Without exception those reports showed that the industry could not possibly claim that any reasonable increase in steel wages or other benefits would provide the basis for increase in prices and thus further inflation. The reports demonstrated equally the falsity of the companies' claim that existing agreements prevented increases in efficiency.

Thus, for example, United States Steel showed a profit after all costs were paid, before taxes, of more than \$2.28 for each man-hour worked in the first 6 months of 1959, as compared to the prior record profit year of 1957 when its profits before taxes per man-hour were \$1.61. Profits for each hour worked had grown by 67 cents an hour, despite the wage increases which were placed in effect in 1958, despite the cost of living increases which had been placed in effect in that period and despite the fact that the operating rate had actually dropped. Profits per man-hour, after taxes, for the first half of 1959 are \$1.11.

There was also given the lie to the industry's position by the phenomenal increase in worker productivity shown by the 1959 reports. In the last 3 months in which work was performed in 1959, United States Steel shipped steel products at a rate almost 6 million tons greater than in 1953 but with 51,000 less employees. Nor was this phenomenal increase in profits and productivity necessary to bring steel up to general levels in profits. United States

Steel earned a return on net worth after taxes of 15 percent in the first 6 months of 1959 and a return on sales, after taxes of 10.1 percent.

These figures make it perfectly plain that the steelworkers' case for an increase in wages and other benefits without a price increase in steel is an overwhelming one. But the figures do more than that. They make it plain, because they are so overwhelming, that there can be no reasonable dispute concerning the ability of the steel companies to absorb reasonable increases. They make it plain, therefore, that the struggle in steel is not solely, or even primarily, a question of economics.

The issue in steel is one which involves all of American labor. The corporations of America have determined that this is the time to attack the American labor movement. Utilizing the genuine concern about inflation which is existing in America, and what they think is the attitude of the public generated by the exposition of the sins of a small minority of labor leaders, the companies have decided that this is the time to weaken, if not to destroy, the organizations which have compelled them to give up some portion of their unlimited prerogatives in dictating the terms and conditions of employment. And the steel industry, because it is an industry which has just emerged from a period of heavy unemployment, but one in which the companies continued to enjoy profits, was the place to have that fight.

The steel companies have found that the workers in the steel industry, despite their recent unemployment, are nevertheless determined not to yield their hard won union protections. American industry should understand that the labor movement of the United States is fully cognizant of the fundamental nature of the issues involved in this strike and they will rally wholeheartedly to support the Steelworkers' Union.

The executive council of the AFL-CIO understands the nature of the issues in steel. The executive council of the AFL-CIO recognizes that at issue in this strike are not only differences over wages, fringe benefits, work rules and similar issues but the whole course which labor-management relations will take in major industries in this country in the future. For this reason, the executive council of the AFL-CIO on behalf of all of the unions represented in the AFL-CIO pledges to the United Steelworkers of America not only its full moral support but also every assistance that can possibly be rendered to that union in its struggle with the basic steel industry.

I Did My Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that, from time to time, it is desirable to pause in our busy cycle of day-to-day activities—to reevaluate our progress—to gain new perspective—perhaps just to be inspired by the words or deeds of those who, having attained notable planes of accomplishment in their fields, have crystallized ideas worthy to be considered by their fellowmen.

I am aware, of course, that there are those who feel that the consideration of philosophical concepts is not the mission of political bodies. Yet, the actions of each of us—and the caliber of the jobs we perform—are determined, to a significant degree, by the ideas and concepts in which we believe.

Consequently, I feel that a new look at those philosophical ideas which underlie our actions, as well as new thoughts, can well be beneficial.

Yesterday, This Week magazine published brief excerpts from a speech by the Honorable Learned Hand, a notable, respected, and revered jurist, who has carved a unique role in his field. Under the title, "I Did My Best," his eloquent words—excerpted from a collection entitled, "Spirit of Liberty"—convey a thoughtful philosophy which, if more broadly applied, may well help men and women to better travel their respective roads through life.

I ask unanimous consent to have the excerpts printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I Did My Best

(By Judge Learned Hand)

Man is a projector, a designer, a builder, a craftsman. His reward is not so much in the work as in its making; not so much in the prize as in the race. We may win when we lose, if we have done what we can; for by so doing we have made real at least some part of that finished product in whose fabrication we are most concerned: ourselves.

And if at the end some friendly critic shall pass by and say: "My friend, how good a job do you think you have made of it all?" we can answer: "I know as well as you that it is not of high quality; but I did put into it whatever I had, and that was the game I started out to play."

How To Go Places by Team Tactics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Malvina Lindsay's column in the August 21, 1959, issue of the Washington Post which is not only a humorous, but rather factual description of how to rise to the top in Washington.

How To Go Places by Team Tactics

(By Malvina Lindsay)

I had long worried over my inability to go everywhere and at the same time to do my work. People who amounted to anything, it seemed, missed nothing in the way of mass gatherings.

What was more puzzling—especially from my taxpaying point of view—was how high public officials with supposedly demanding jobs could be regulars on the party circuit, the television screen, and at all public affairs.

I had a feeling I was off the main current of American life. Hence I sought the ad-

vice of my public relations counsel, Dr. Gulliver Shrug, operator of Shrug's Specter and Spy Service, and top ghostwriter for both sides in all major controversies of the last 25 years.

Things were humming at Dr. Shrug's office. "It's the chance of a lifetime, this Khrushchev visit," he exclaimed. "Anybody can get his name in the papers—with comment supplied by us. Members of Congress can keep in the spotlight after they go home. Besides, I have a new gimmick in campaign training."

I broke in to tell of my own problem. Dr. Shrug looked at me severely. "You probably have the obsolete idea that a person should do his own work."

"But who else—?"

He waved me to silence. "You probably even stay home at times with a good book."

"I would like some time," I admitted, quoting Yeats, "to sup at journey's end with Landor or with Donne." But I never get around to it."

"It might be a little more excusable if you had said with Jack Kerouac or James Jones. However, even that sort of thing is out of date, as even you should know. My office can supply you with authoritative cocktail-party comment on any best seller—"

"But how do I get to the cocktail party?"

"The way most big shots do—by having others do your work. Now, if you expect to get anywhere in this town, you must begin to organize your team."

"My team?"

"Yes. Your secretary, researcher, speechwriter, magazine writer, bookwriter, scriptwriter, television coach, 'think' man, or woman, promotion director—"

"Wait. How do I pay these people?"

"You work up to that. Perhaps your first investment should be in a promoter. If you are sufficiently promoted, you'll get a salary raise or a better job. Then you start hiring your team to do your work. You begin to go places, to be seen more publicly. People will think you important. You will make advantageous friends, make more money, hire more teamworkers."

"I draw the line at hiring a thinker."

"Why? Greater figures than yourself have had their names attached to other people's ideas. It's been a practice since the Monroe Doctrine, and no doubt long before that. Most historic Government programs that bear the names of prominent men have been created or thought out by obscure persons."

"I still say it's dishonest not to try to do your own thinking—"

"There isn't time any more. Your smartness now is gaged by your ability to assemble a capable unobtrusive team. All public men who go places are adept at this."

"Then we should not judge a presidential candidate on whether he's wise or has the capacity for greatness."

"Those things don't hurt. But what counts is what kind of a team does he have? Who, above all, are his 'think' men? You don't elect a man any more; you elect a team. That system is reaching down through business and social life. You start with the promoter—"

"And you end with an animated facade, shopworn from public exposure."

"You end with an efficient front man—one who knows how to select good thinkers, writers, etc., how to use them effectively, how to put their products across with the public. That's why I'm starting a new course for political candidates in front-man techniques." He handed me a leaflet. "It can also help anyone go places professionally or socially."

"I don't have the aptitudes, or the energy," I sighed. "It's easier to go back to my office and tackle that piled-up desk."

Invite Mr. Khrushchev to the TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, as I have already stated, I am glad that Premier Khrushchev is coming to this country. I do not expect his visit to end the cold war, or even substantially to melt it. And I recognize, as have others, the inherent risks of such a tour. But I nevertheless believe that the advantages outweigh the disadvantages, and that therefore the President was wise in extending his invitation.

Perhaps the most fruitful result of Mr. Khrushchev's stay will be his increased awareness of American strength and increased understanding of American life. Many suggestions have been offered for the Russian leader's itinerary. I know of no better illustration of America's strength than the humming complex of dams and plants and rivers and mountains in the Tennessee Valley region. And I know of no better example of America's life than the strong, freedom-loving inhabitants of the valley.

An excellent editorial appeared in the Knoxville Sentinel of August 5, 1959. Entitled "Sure, Expose Mr. K. to Valley People," it forcefully expresses two of my own views. It compellingly states the benefits of a visit by Mr. Khrushchev to TVA, and it reminds him, and us, that the most important knowledge to be gained from the forthcoming visit is not about the power of our industry, military and technology. It is about the power of the American people, which the Tennesseans in the valley so well represent.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SURE, EXPOSE MR. K. TO VALLEY PEOPLE

A good idea, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER has, in urging President Eisenhower to suggest that Russia's Khrushchev be taken on a tour of TVA installations when he comes over here.

If the main purpose of inviting the top man in the Communist hierarchy to America is to expose him to this Nation's strength, technological skills, industrial wealth, tenacity to the principles of freedom, and love for peace, we don't know of any better place for the exposure.

We say let Mr. K. take a long look at the TVA hydro and steam plants, the natural resource conservation program covering the whole valley; let him visit some farmers, factory workers, and industrialists.

Take him right into the top-secret areas at Oak Ridge (as a nonscientist he couldn't steal any secrets); let him see the Air Force's wind tunnel at Tullahoma, the fertilizer pilot plants at Muscle Shoals. Show him through a typical all-electric home of a modestly paid white-collar worker.

Here in the Tennessee Valley, where there are those who trace their ancestors to soldiers in the Battle of Kings Mountain,

Mr. K. would come face to face with the real American.

The people of this valley are a cantankerous, argumentative, and sometimes ill-tempered breed. Some of them are tight-fisted; others profess to hanker after so-called mountain ballads sung in a high nasal monotone. Some vote "dry," go to church on Sunday and drink a beverage distilled from corn mash that looks, smells, and tastes like bad vodka. (Mr. K. might go for it.)

But by golly, there's one thing Mr. K. will find that is a great common denominator in this magnificent land of lakes, mountains and lush valleys.

It is a fierce and unwavering defense of liberty, fairplay, and love of this country.

Mr. K. couldn't help from being impressed. Send him in, we say.

Those of us who have been traveling about this country recently, on business or vacation, return to our desks tremendously impressed with this land and its people—its wealth and richness, its strength and vitality, its growth and change.

This is reflected in myriad ways—by the great superhighway developments, by the mushrooming of huge suburban shopping areas, by the number of new schools, churches, and other public buildings—not to mention uncountable new factories and residences.

Seeing them will help Khrushchev estimate how quickly he can match and surpass the Americans.

Health Coverage Needed for Retired Career Federal Civilian Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to provide voluntary health benefits coverage for retired career civilian employees of the Government. I do so in recognition of my responsibility as chairman of the Civil Service Subcommittee of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

My bill is a companion bill to the bill introduced Friday in the Senate by Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, who has rendered such an outstanding service to the Government and Federal civilian employees in developing the legislation which became S. 2162, providing a comprehensive governmentwide health benefits program for 2 million active Federal civilian employees.

My bill provides health coverage for career retired civil employees on the same basis that active employees and those who will retire after June 30, 1960, are covered in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, which passed the Senate on July 16 by a vote of 81 to 4 and early this week was unanimously reported by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

ANNUITANTS AND GOVERNMENT SHARE COSTS

This bill would provide health benefits coverage for approximately 260,000 retired Federal employees, Federal em-

ployees disabled while in service for the Government, and their spouses and minor children. The premiums under this bill are the same as provided for under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, and are not to exceed \$3.80 per month for an annuitant who enrolls for himself only, and \$9.20 for an annuitant who enrolls for himself and members of his family. These premiums would be matched equally, on a 50-50 basis, by the Federal Government. The retired annuitant may have a free choice of plans: a service benefit plan, such as offered by Blue Cross-Blue Shield; an indemnity plan, such as offered by the insurance industry; a group practice prepayment plan, such as offered by the Kaiser Foundation on the west coast and Group Health Association here in Washington, D.C.; and an employee organization plan, such as offered by national employee organizations.

CONTRACTS, COVERAGE, ANNUITY DEDUCTIONS

Specific health benefits would be negotiated by the U.S. Civil Service Commission, as the administering agency, with the various carriers. Annuitants would have 90 days after July 1, 1960, to elect coverage, and those who had not elected coverage within this period would lose the opportunity to do so. The annuitant's contribution, which would equal one-half of the cost, would be withheld by the Civil Service Commission from the annuity check.

COSTS

Reliable figures as to the family composition of the presently retired annuitants of our Government are not readily available and, of course, the cost of such a program could not be ascertained until this information is studied by the Civil Service Commission. Another factor in determining costs would be the number of annuitants who might elect coverage under this voluntary health plan. However, reliable estimates place the first year's cost of health coverage for retired Federal civil employees at around \$40 million, which cost will be shared equally by the Federal Government and by the annuitant. The first year's cost will be the greatest since the presently retired and those who retired prior to July 1, 1960, is a group which inexorably will decline in size.

PRIVATE INDUSTRY PROTECTS RETIRED EMPLOYEES

The Federal Government cannot ignore the progressive examples of many large private employers who sponsor health benefits programs and have included in these programs persons already retired. These number, for example, the Arkansas Power & Light Co., B. F. Goodrich Co., Eastman Kodak Co., Goodyear Tire Co., Firestone Tire Co., Gilmore Belt & Rubber Co., American Sugar Refining Co., Swift & Co., Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co., and the First National Bank of Oregon.

If present retirees are not included in health benefits legislation on the same basis as future retirees will be included under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, large groups of retired employees may be penalized be-

cause they may lose such health insurance as they now have, or if they do not lose it, the premiums for continuing the insurance may be so greatly increased and become so high that it will be difficult for them to continue it. The reason for this is that many retirees are now insured in small local groups or under the plan established by the National Association for Retired Civil Employees—NARCE—or other plans composed of active employees which allow them to continue such coverage after retirement. When the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 becomes effective on July 1, 1960, the presently active employees may promptly abandon these policies and seek coverage under the favorable terms of the new act. Without an influx of new members and newly retired members, the rates for these policies would become prohibitive, since the group would continue with only the presently retired, who, of course, become older each year.

It is my opinion that the need of older people in our area for voluntary health coverage has long been neglected. Providing health coverage for presently retired Federal employees would prove an important step forward in meeting the health needs of our older people. It is well known that the need for health services is extremely critical in older groups. We must not shut our eyes to this urgent need.

CHAIRMAN OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
RECOGNIZES NEED

Chairman Roger W. Jones of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, in a letter to Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER dated May 18, 1959, stated:

Anyone who expressed indifference to the plight of our already retired employees in being unable to obtain adequate health insurance at a price they can afford to pay would be callous indeed. . . . To require retirees to assume all or a major portion of the cost would put the insurance out of their financial reach. The only possibility which suggests itself would be to consider already retired employees as a separate group from active employees and try to work out separate legislation for them.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
FAVORS

The report of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on S. 2162 contains the following statement:

In making this recommendation, we have not overlooked the fact that the bill does not address itself to the problem of health insurance for those who are already retired, a fact that has given us much concern. We consider it essential that legislation for active employees and future retirees be supplemented in the near future by providing similar protection for those already retired. While we recognize the complexity of the problems involved in providing effective health benefit coverage to those already on annuities, the pressing health insurance needs of retired Federal employees suggest the importance of an early formulation of ways and means to meet their problems. . . . The Bureau of the Budget advises that it perceives no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

NEW YORK PROVIDES HEALTH COVERAGE FOR ITS
RETIRED STATE EMPLOYEES

The State of New York has wisely made health benefits coverage available

to its retired State employees as of June 1, 1958, with the State paying 50 percent of the cost of the coverage for the retired employees. I am pleased also to report that our northern good neighbor, the Dominion of Canada, has adopted a national hospitalization program which includes its already retired senior citizens.

Health coverage for retired employees on a voluntary basis also has been endorsed by the insurance industry and the Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans. I am also pleased to report that the Government Employees' Council of the AFL-CIO, representing over 600,000 Federal employees who are members of the AFL-CIO affiliated unions, have endorsed coverage for retired Federal civil employees.

As chairman of the Civil Service Subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, it is my hope that health coverage for presently retired Federal civil employees and those who retire prior to July 1, 1960, will take effect on July 1, 1960, the same date when coverage begins for active and future retirees.

Legislation to provide voluntary health coverage to our career retired Federal civil employees is of vital importance and our Government, the Nation's largest employer will be following in a pattern already established by progressive private industry and our most populous State, the State of New York.

Credit Union Movement in America
Celebrates 50th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the year 1959 marks the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the first credit union in the United States, and the 25th anniversary of the Federal Credit Union Act.

Today there are some 20,000 credit unions in this country with a total membership of about 11 million persons. Their assets total \$4.4 billion.

In my own State of Oregon, the Oregon Credit Union League represents 188 credit unions with 91,000 credit union members.

America's credit unions have performed a highly beneficial service over the past 50 years in making available credit to persons of limited financial resources.

Last week the Senate Banking and Currency Committee ordered reported legislation to modernize the Federal Credit Union Act. I hope such a bill will come to the floor soon. The value of the credit union program has been proven. Congress should give every assistance to insuring its effective operation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the August 17, 1959, issue of the Mail Tribune of Medford, Oreg., by United Press writer Elmer C. Walzer, discussing the growth of credit unions in the United States be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GROWTH OF CREDIT UNIONS REACH ABOUT
20,000 IN THE UNITED STATES

(By Elmer C. Walzer)

NEW YORK.—Credit unions, according to Alexander Hamilton Institute, are growing at a faster rate than any other financial institution in the Nation.

These do-it-yourself institutions might be compared to banking somewhat as investment clubs are to the stock market. There is one difference. Bankers aren't too fond of them. The stock market loves the investment clubs.

Credit unions take business away from banks. Investment clubs brings business.

The two groups are thrift institutions and each is growing rapidly in scope and in the money invested.

ELEVEN MILLION CUSTOMERS

There are some 20,000 credit unions in the Nation with a membership aggregating 11 million persons. Their assets total \$4.4 billion. They have \$3.1 billion of loans outstanding. Membership averages 550 persons.

These unions pay 4 percent interest on deposits and charge 1 percent per month on the unpaid balance on loans.

A credit union is described as a group of people organized into a sort of bank to save their money together and make loans to each other at low interest rates. Loans include those for auto purchases, home modernization, and the like.

The unions are subject to regulations and must maintain reserves. In their formation they must obtain charters. They maintain their own insurance for members—mutual insurance society—which has \$4.2 billion of insurance in force.

The Alexander Hamilton Institute made a study of these unions. It found their history dates back to 1849 when they were first organized in Germany.

The institute found that a French-Canadian legislative reporter, Alphonse Despardin, became interested in the European experiment and after a long period organized the first credit union in North America at Levis, Quebec, in 1900. In 1906, the Quebec legislature passed the first credit union law in the Western Hemisphere.

Despardin helped to form the first credit union in the United States in Manchester, N. H., in 1909.

Meantime, Edward A. Filene, Boston department store owner and philanthropist, came into contact with credit unions in India. He gave around a million dollars to further the idea in the United States.

The U.S. Federal Credit Union Act was passed in 1934. By that time legislative approval of credit unions had been attained in 39 States.

Today, the Alexander Hamilton Institute estimates, the 20,000 credit unions serve better than 6 percent of the U.S. population. Of the total number of unions, almost a third have been organized by employees of manufacturing companies, independent of labor affiliations.

Government employees have organized 19 percent of the total and another 10 percent has been formed by employees in transportation or utility services. Church groups, teachers, and school maintenance employees, labor union locals, and employees of wholesale and retail establishments complete the membership picture.

Three Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of Founding of Santa Fe, N. Mex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the capital of New Mexico, Santa Fe, celebrates next year the 350th anniversary of its founding. It is the oldest seat of government within the United States. Santa Fe was the capital of a farflung empire—and had been so for a decade—before the Pilgrims arrived at Plymouth Rock. For generations it was the object of overland travelers, fur trappers, traders, and emigrants.

Therefore, Mr. President, it was with some astonishment and dismay that the residents of the State, the Southwest and the Rocky Mountain regions—not to mention students of history in the South and East—learned of the Post Office Department's recent refusal to issue a special stamp commemorating this anniversary on grounds that it is only of regional interest.

Such a statement is ridiculous, especially when weighed against some of the stamps which have been issued for other reasons. To date, editorials replying to this Post Office Department decision from four great newspapers have come to my attention. They are from the Santa Fe New Mexican, the Denver Post, the Dallas Morning News, and the Shreveport (La.) Times. Others, in the United States and abroad, have noted the occasion and deplored the Post Office reaction.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have editorials on this subject from the New Mexican, and the Shreveport Times printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Santa Fe, New Mexican, Aug. 17, 1959]

DON'T THESE GUYS READ HISTORY?

Santa Fe's request for a special stamp to commemorate its 350th anniversary has been turned down by the Post Office Department screening committee on grounds that the event is of only regional interest.

Evidence to the contrary is beginning to build up. In Sunday's edition, we reprinted an editorial from the Dallas Morning News—one of the biggest and most influential newspapers in Texas—which reflected the interest of our big neighbor to the southeast concerning the committee's ruling.

Below you'll find the opinion of our big neighbor to the north—an editorial entitled "Don't These Guys Read History?" from the Denver Post.

"A citizens committee which makes recommendations to the Postmaster General regarding the issuance of commemorative postage stamps has—believe it or not—turned thumbs down on a request that a special stamp be issued next year in honor of the 350th anniversary of the founding of Santa Fe, N. Mex.

"The reason given for the committee's action was that it is contrary to established policy to issue stamps in celebration of events which are of only local or regional interest.

"Do tell.

"Isn't it a matter of national interest that Santa Fe is the oldest seat of any government in the area now comprising the United States?

"We believe it is—except, perhaps, to a few provincial easterners who think of the Alleghenies as the western border of civilization.

"Isn't it a matter of national interest that Santa Fe has the oldest public building in the United States—the Palace of Governors, built in 1610, which housed public offices under Spanish, Mexican, Confederate and U.S. jurisdictions?

"We believe it is.

"Isn't it a matter of national interest that Santa Fe was the terminus of the oldest before the Pilgrims arrived at Plymouth Rock?

"We think so.

"Isn't it a matter of national interest that Santa Fe was the terminus of the oldest highway in North America—the Turquoise Trail, the original trade route between Mexico City and New Mexico?

"Of course it is.

"Among special stamps issued by the Post Office Department recently were those commemorating the completion of Mackinac Bridge in Michigan, the 200th anniversary of the establishment of Fort Duquesne, and the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Missouri University School of Journalism.

"We have no quarrel with any of these issues but we can't understand why those events should be worthy of special stamps if the founding of Santa Fe is to be brushed off as a local event of no national significance.

"We understand Mayor Leo T. Murphy of Santa Fe is protesting the decision of the Citizens Stamp Committee to Postmaster General Summerfield, who has authority to overrule the committee. He should do so."

[From the Shreveport Times, Aug. 17, 1959]

THE POST OFFICE PEOPLE SHOULD STUDY HISTORY

The Post Office Department has turned down the plea of the city of Santa Fe, N. Mex., for a special postage stamp commemorating the 350th anniversary of the founding of that metropolis. The reason given by the Post Office Department is that "It is contrary to established policy to issue stamps in celebration of events which are of only local or regional interest."

Well, whatta yuh know?

Perhaps the gentlemen in the Post Office Department, where commemorative stamps have been issued for such things as the opening of a bridge in Michigan, the establishment of an anti-Indian fort, and the 50th anniversary of a school of journalism, should read a bit of history. The way we got it from our books, Santa Fe is:

1. The oldest seat of any government in the area now comprising the United States (a claim sometimes questioned by hinterlanders who think of the Alleghenies as the western border of civilization).

2. The present site of the oldest public building in the United States—the Palace of Governors, which has housed public offices under Spanish, Indian, Mexican, Confederate and U.S. jurisdictions, and was built in 1610.

3. The only existing city which was established as a capital before the Pilgrims arrived at Plymouth Rock.

4. The terminus of the oldest highway in North America—the old Turquoise Trail, the first trade route between the nation of Mexico and what now is New Mexico.

The Post Office Department nonchalantly bypasses such history as this, yet it probably would rush into print with a new commemorative stamp if someone should come up with a chicken that walked backward.

Moscow Discloses the Fakery of Its New Peace Disguise by Blaming United States and Laos for the Disturbances There Directed by Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the New York Times. Moscow, as was to be expected, interprets as weakness our desire for a civilized settlement of world issues, and rewards our efforts by blatant charges that we are responsible for the troubles in Laos which it and its minions there have organized and are directing:

MOSCOW'S HAND IN LAOS

State Department suspicions that the Soviets, under cover of Premier Khrushchev's projected visit to the United States, are helping to stir up new trouble in Southeast Asia involving this country are confirmed by an official statement broadcast by Moscow.

The statement, issued by the Soviet Foreign Ministry, not only supports the Communist attack on Laos but, with typical Communist effrontery, presumes to make the victim the guilty party. It accuses the Laotian Government of violating the neutrality provisions of the Geneva truce agreement of 1954 by admitting American military personnel and bases and thereby risking a "civil war" that could shatter the peace of all Southeast Asia. More bluntly Soviet propaganda accuses the Laotian Government of seeking to suppress a "democratic," meaning a Communist, movement, and Communist North Vietnam boasts that the Communists have already "liberated" vast areas in Laos.

The facts are, of course, otherwise, and back the assumption that the Soviets and their Communist allies are trying to use the apparent easing of world tensions due to the Soviet-American exchange of visits for a breakthrough in Southeast Asia as they used the "Geneva spirit" of 1955 for their breakthrough into the Middle East. Neither Laos nor the United States has broken the Geneva agreement; there are no American military bases in Laos and the American supply of arms and a few instructors in their use is wholly in keeping with that agreement.

It is the Communists who have violated all agreements. They have staged a revolt against the 1957 agreement between the Royal Laotian Government and the Pathet Lao integrating the Communist-dominated provinces and forces with those of the rest of the country. And they have backed this revolt with men and arms from North Vietnam. The 1957 agreement supplanted the Geneva agreement and the truce commission it created, and the Soviet demand for reactivation of this commission is merely an attempt to nullify the 1957 agreement and to repartition Laos as a step toward a Communist conquest of it. Neither the United

States, a member of the Southeast Asian collective defense treaty that protects Laos, nor the United Nations can permit this to happen.

Hays Says TVA Has Made United States \$12 Billion Richer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article containing several statements by the Honorable Brooks Hays, who is now a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which appeared in the Chattanooga Times of August 15.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAYS SAYS TVA HAS MADE UNITED STATES \$12 BILLION RICHER

(By Fred Hixson)

The U.S. Treasury is some \$12 billion richer and the people of the Tennessee Valley have been saved many millions of dollars in flood damage and in costs for electric service because of the work of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Brooks Hays, junior member of the TVA Board of Directors, said Friday.

The former Arkansas Congressman, who took his seat on the TVA board July 1, was here "for a family gathering" with key members of the agency's Chattanooga division. He had luncheon with the TVA Friday Luncheon Club on his first official visit here since he took office.

Hays explained to newsmen at a conference before the meeting that "I'm new on this job—I don't feel sure of myself on a lot of questions." However, he sallied into the questions shot at him and showed that he apparently had learned much about TVA while a member of the House of Representatives, where he was considered a staunch congressional supporter of the agency.

Hays' reference to the \$12 billion supplement to Federal income came when he was asked to comment on the current advertising campaign of private utilities against public power. The ads are appearing in a number of national periodicals.

Hays referred to these advertisements as "Madison Avenue superficialities" and charged that they ignore the pertinent facts about the "real benefits TVA has brought during the 26 years of its existence." He added that the benefits are too numerous to cover in a single interview and emphasized that "they cover many, many fields."

Hays was accompanied here from Knoxville by TVA General Manager A. J. Wagner and Information Director Paul Evans. He was joined here by G. O. Wessener, manager of the power division; C. E. Wilkerson, TVA coal procurement officer, and Louis Marks, reports officer.

Wagner, Evans, and Wessener helped Hays with statistical information. He explained they were more familiar with detailed information of that kind than he, since he has been a Director for less than 2 months. He sidestepped questions about his future, declaring:

"I am enjoying a vacation from politics." He added that "I am devoted to the non-partisan and nonpolitical character of TVA."

Asked if he would be willing to continue as TVA Director "as long as the President and Senate want you to serve," Hays answered:

"It would be presumptuous for me to assume they will want me to serve when my 11 months are up." He is serving the unexpired term of Dr. Frank J. Welch, dean of the College of Agriculture of the University of Kentucky, which will expire May 18, 1960.

Later, in answer to a question, Hays said he still maintains his legal home in Arkansas.

He sidestepped questions about the possibility of his becoming a candidate for Governor of his native State in 1960, emphasizing that "I have no political plans whatsoever."

The \$12 billion Treasury supplement he referred to, Hays said, resulted from improved economic conditions in the seven-State area served by the Tennessee Valley Authority. During the 26 years the TVA has been in existence, great economic gains came to this area, resulting in heavy increases in Federal tax collections from the area, he said.

Hays said the TVA has served "all elements of life in the valley well." Even the "private utility companies which seem anxious to destroy it have materially benefited by TVA operation," he continued.

"Let the record speak," Hays continued. "The average common-stock earnings of private electric utility companies all over the United States have increased three times what they were in 1937 when the TVA started its power operations."

"The average common-stock earnings of private companies serving areas surrounding the TVA territory have increased eight times what they were in 1937."

"Now with respect to rates. The record shows that the private companies having the lowest rates also had the highest earnings on their common stock. Of course, this applies to private companies operating in territory surrounding the TVA territory."

"In 1932, the year before TVA was created, residential electric rates in Tennessee and surrounding areas were among the highest in the United States. In 1959 residential rates were lowest in the TVA area in the east, and in the Bonneville Dam area in the west. Rates become progressively higher as distance from the TVA area increases, and by the same token, earnings on common stock of these companies decrease with distance from the TVA area."

Hays also challenged the contentions made in advertisements that TVA is being subsidized by taxpayers over the Nation.

"The TVA is paying its way, liquidating the Federal investment in power facilities and earning an average of 4 percent on that investment," Hays declared.

He said it would cost the American taxpayers \$50 million a year to "adjust upward, by 1 mill per kilowatt-hour, the Federal Government's bill for electricity to operate its atomic energy program."

SAYS FACTS IGNORED

"Consider, for instance, how much the TVA has saved the people of Louisiana by controlling flood waters in the Tennessee basin and keeping them off of the low lands of that State," Hays continued. "It is easy to distort facts, such as is being done by the advertisements being publicized about public power these days."

"After all," Hays said further, "the people who are paying rates to the companies which are doing this advertising, are actually paying for this propaganda. I don't believe the officers of the companies are passing the hat among themselves to pay the advertising bills. They are charging it against rates."

"The TVA has never engaged in that sort of a thing. Why should the ratepayers of the private companies have to bear the expense of this advertising campaign?"

Leyden, Mass., Celebrates Its 150th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the township of Leyden, Mass., is celebrating its 150th anniversary. Last weekend a special celebration, including a parade and a special service at the Methodist Church, were held in Leyden to mark this historic occasion. And next month a monumental history of the town, written by W. T. and Masha Arms of Leyden, is scheduled to be printed.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article from the Greenfield (Mass.) Recorder-Gazette describing this important event in the history of Leyden, a town which I am honored to represent in the Congress:

LEYDEN HISTORY, WRITTEN BY ARMS, LABOR OF LOVE SPANNING 3 YEARS

(By Ken Walker)

Distilling old memories, combing facts from legend and resurrecting the long-dead infancy, youth, and manhood of an old Franklin County town—this has been the labor of love spanning more than 3 years for W. T. and Masha Arms of Leyden.

The Arms project is "History of Leyden," to be published late next month in a 224-page clothbound book by Carl P. Bradbury of the Orange Enterprise and Journal.

Leyden's chroniclers conceived the idea of a town history a decade ago after investigating the life of Leyden native H. K. Brown, who died in 1896, after painting Arms' grandfather's portrait.

Most of the research and writing going into the history has been done over the past 3 years, approximating 5 man-hours daily, 6 days a week, for a total of more than 6,000 hours, including initial historical research in Boston and Cambridge in 1955.

Mr. and Mrs. Arms credit Leyden townsmen with a share of the success of the venture, furnishing the links of history from family memory, letters, diaries, and old photographs and maps. Particularly helpful were Harold V. Campbell and Edith M. Howes.

Included in the history are three specific re-creations of the township, showing all roads, boundaries, and public buildings as of 1794, 1830, and 1871. Also between the orange covers will be 11 other halftone illustrations and linecuts.

Every man, woman, and child who lived in Leyden in 1781 and the location of their residences will be included as well as a listing of all individuals now residing there. Peak population in the 1880's was about 1,100 compared to 350 now.

Stamped on the book's cover in gold foil will be the town seal. The covers will be orange, Arms explained, because the town was named for Leiden, Holland, which at one time was international headquarters for the House of Orange.

In addition to digging into dusty records in Leyden and Bernardston, the Greenfield courthouse, and Boston, Mr. and Mrs. Arms have hunted old cellar holes to place accurately former structures. They have found many, including the site of the old Dorril place.

The Dorrilites were a religious sect which flourished briefly in Leyden under tutelage of William Dorril, former British soldier under General Burgoyne.

"The Indians didn't live here too extensively," Arms related. "They lived in lower elevations and hunted through this area each fall. We've found several Indian artifacts, including the remains of a campfire."

The geographic history of the white man's Leyden starts in 1734, according to Arms, when "Fall Town" was included in a land grant. This was composed of the present Bernardston and East Leyden.

An additional grant was made in 1743, including West Leyden and East Colrain. East Colrain was made part of Colrain in 1779. Leyden was named in 1741, became an official district in 1784, and became a township in 1809.

The latter date determines the sesquicentennial date of Leyden, to be celebrated Saturday and Sunday. Sesquicentennial events will include recording of excerpts from the history and placing a historical marker at the former site of the Dorril place.

The Armses came to Leyden from Greenfield 14 years ago to make their home on Eden Trail Road in the eastern part of town. The history has not been writer Arms' only project during these past few months. Although weakened by illness and confined to his home, he has assisted Mrs. Arms in planning this weekend's celebration.

With the exception of this story and two others on this page by Dorothy Howes, Arms wrote every word in today's Leyden anniversary supplement of the Recorder-Gazette. He has also turned out countless news stories to publicize both the history and the celebration.

One might think he has been so busy the new beard he sports on his lower jaw was the result of being too busy. But not so. This is Bill Arms' way of joining in the fun of the town's birth.

Indiana Dunes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald this morning be printed in the Appendix of the Record. The letter is from Freeman E. Morgan, Jr., whose family once owned most of the Indiana dunes. It is a plea that the dunes be saved from being taken over by steel mills, and made into a national park.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STORY OF THE DUNES

I have watched with interest and some alarm the struggle to save the Indiana dunes for the people waged by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS and other friends of nature. Interest, because I have known and loved the dunes since I first saw them in 1917.

Alarm, because of the general apathy I find on the issue which must be changed if we are to overcome the selfish forces of political power and big industry.

A century ago the dunes belonged to my family. My great-grandfather, Lansing Morgan, cut millions of feet of pine there that was used to build Chicago into the great city that it is. With the timber gone for a while, the lumber industry moved on and most of the 8-mile Morgan tract reverted to the State. One mile was saved for future development and soon after the turn of the century it began to flourish as a recreation center for people from Fort Wayne to Chicago.

Cottages were built by the hundreds and picnickers swarmed to Waverly Beach (as the Morgan estate was then known) by the thousands. In the middle 1920's the property was purchased by a syndicate of public-spirited millionaires to form the nucleus of a State park. The Chicago Prairie Club property and another mile of undeveloped property were added to the Morgan estate to create the Indiana Dunes State Park.

In the early days of the park, the Governor of Indiana had a summer capital there. A beach hotel was erected to accommodate weekend visitors. Several acres were developed as a second-to-none swimming beach and the rest retained in its natural setting.

The sand is cleaner than on any other public beach I have ever seen. The water is clean with a sand bottom. From Memorial Day to Labor Day, the temperature of the water is ideal for swimming.

Most of the time the dunes are quiet and tranquil, offering the nature lover a relaxed respite from the cares of the world. But I love it best when the Lake Michigan storms whip up 25-foot waves that come crashing far up the beach and the wind whistles through the trees with a mournful tune. Then it is that we see nature's triumph over man, glorified and majestic.

We have camped in parks from Florida to Ontario and from Connecticut to Minnesota, but my family prefers the dunes to any other campsite. The new turnpikes have made the dunes available to travelers from all over. For a half century it was the playground of a relatively limited area. Now it is only 10 minutes off the main route for any Indiana Turnpike tourist. It is a wonderful place to rest and relax.

Let your Congressman know that you would rather visit a dunes park on your next trip west than another steel mill.

FREEMAN E. MORGAN, JR.

TAKOMA PARK, MD.

White Fleet Supported

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, just a month ago the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] and I introduced in the House, and Senators HUBERT HUMPHREY and GEORGE Aiken introduced in the Senate, concurrent resolutions calling for the establishment of a Great White Fleet of mercy ships to carry American surplus foods, medical aid, and supplies to disaster and distress areas throughout the world.

On August 4, under extension of remarks, I described in some detail the

moving response of the American people to this bright new concept for peace, which is the idea of an Oklahoma naval officer, Comdr. Frank A. Manson, of Tahlequah. Life magazine, in its July 27 issue, threw its full support behind the Manson plan for a Great White Fleet as a "bold proposal for peace" and devoted its cover to a striking picture of the proposed fleet and also devoted its lead story to the proposal and endorsed it in an editorial. Since that time Life magazine has followed up on this story, and favorable comment has come from almost every corner of the land.

Massive mail has been received urging establishment of the Great White Fleet by every sponsor of these concurrent resolutions, and I have received in my office alone more than 1,470 communications from every State in the Union, including Alaska and Hawaii, favoring the proposal. Less than 1 percent of the mail I have received has been unfavorable to the Manson plan.

I am informed that at the present time 47 Members of the House have sponsored concurrent resolutions calling for the establishment of the fleet, and that 35 Members of the other body are cosponsoring the Senate concurrent resolution calling for the establishment of the Great White Fleet.

Since my report to you on August 4 I have received many other communications of strong support and offers of help, financial, technical, or personal, in the activation of the Great White Fleet.

Mr. Speaker, as an example of the type of endorsement and support which has been forthcoming in connection with this plan, I should like to insert in the Record at this point an editorial by Mr. Bruce Palmer, news director of television station KWTV in Oklahoma, which was broadcast over that station on August 18, and also to salute Mr. Palmer for giving this fine message, in the form of an editorial, to his many listeners.

Last evening we observed that the United States has just begun to smarten up in terms of international propaganda. We are learning how to give a somewhat better account of ourselves in the word war between the free world and the Communist world. But we need new devices to make our propaganda messages more effective.

Within the last month, an imaginative project to focus world attention on the United States as a friend to all mankind has been suggested by a native Oklahoman. Comdr. Frank Manson of the U.S. Navy, who hails from Tahlequah, proposes to form up a new Great White Fleet, reminiscent of the one President Theodore Roosevelt sent around the world in 1907.

But where the Great White Fleet of 52 years ago had the mission of impressing the world with American naval power, Commander Manson's ships would carry hope and help to areas of the world struck with poverty, disease, or starvation. They would carry supplies and equipment necessary to bring relief to people of all nations in times of emergency or disaster.

The ships would come from Uncle Sam's mothball fleet, their crews from the Navy or the merchant marine, and the food, medicines, and other relief items from America's great store of all those items.

Commander Manson offers a bold approach to our national problem of making and keeping friends around the globe. The

Great White Fleet could quickly become an international symbol of American concern for the destitute everywhere. It could carry medicines to India to combat the annual onslaught of dysentery, or to Indonesia, where malaria is frequently epidemic. Its helicopters could rescue thousands from flooded areas, as the Navy's choppers did in 1957 when the cruiser *Princeton* was dispatched to the inundated island of Ceylon. Its supply ships could carry wheat and other foods to lands where crop failures threaten mass starvation, as was the case in India in 1951. Its potential for extending a helping hand is enormous.

As Commander Manson says, a new White Fleet would not bring peace to the world in one sweeping movement. Progress toward peace will come only a bit at a time. America may never be able to bring peace to the world by herself, but American leadership can prevent the people of the world from losing hope.

As the good idea of an Oklahoman, Commander Manson's proposal deserves Oklahoma's support. If you think that some of America's fighting ships might well be transformed into ships of peace and assistance to make the benefits of the free enterprise system available to the entire human race, here again is an opportunity to let your Congressman know about it. A new Great White Fleet could give the United States a tremendous victory in that propaganda war.

Approval of Senate Resolution 21

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recall that on August 21 the Senate approved Senate Resolution 21, expressing the sense of the Senate relating to making of loans by the REA.

As we know, Senate Resolution 21 states that it is the sense of the Senate that the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, continue to be interpreted to authorize the making of loans for the construction of facilities to, first, bring electric service to persons in those areas defined in the act as rural areas if such persons are in fact not receiving central station service, and, second, continue to serve those who are presently being served with the aid of funds loaned under the act.

Today I received a resolution from the Rural Electric Cooperative of Columbus, Wis., expressing approval of the resolution and thus, in effect, endorsing the Senate action.

I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE COLUMBUS RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, COLUMBUS, WIS.

"Whereas the Comptroller General a year ago on July 21, 1958, issued a ruling imposing an unprecedented restriction on the Rural Electrification Administration's loan-making authority, and completely reversing

congressional intent as set forth in the 1936 law, and ignoring a historic precedent of 23 years' standing; and

"Whereas this ruling, in the opinion of the Department of Agriculture General Counsel and other lawyers conversant with the REA program, would, if enforced, destroy the REA loan program and jeopardize hundreds of loans previously made; and

"Whereas protests registered by the Department of Agriculture, Members of Congress, rural electric cooperatives, and the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association have caused the Comptroller to make no fundamental change in his original disruptive and destructive ruling; and

"Whereas Senator Aiken and 13 of his colleagues in the Senate have recognized this as a potential dagger pointing at the heart of REA and have therefore introduced Senate Resolution 21 designed to reaffirm the original congressional intent with respect to REA loans; and

"Whereas prompt and favorable action on Senate Resolution 21 will contribute measurably to the strength and stability of the rural electrification program: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the board of directors of the Columbus Rural Electric Cooperative here assembled do urge our own Senator A. WILEY to actively support and promote Senate approval of the Aiken resolution (S. Res. 21)."

This is to certify that the foregoing resolution was unanimously approved by the board of directors of the Columbus Rural Electric Cooperative at its regular monthly board meeting on August 12, 1959.

LESTER WELCH,
Secretary.

A Proud Record for Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, every man has an intense pride in his home State and this is intensified when as a Member of Congress his whole effort is devoted to serving a part of that State. My own pride in Indiana is one which words cannot adequately express, but among the many attributes which contribute to that pride is the great industrial potential which exists in this State which has come to be known as the crossroads of America.

This feeling of satisfaction which I have is shared by my constituency and is forcefully expressed in the following editorial recently published in the *Marion Chronicle*, one of the outstanding newspapers of my district.

A PROUD RECORD FOR INDIANA

Indiana has just outdistanced 48 other States in an important popularity contest.

Mill & Factory, a trade magazine, recently conducted a national survey asking industrial firms of all types and sizes which State they would choose for the location of a new plant.

We finished second, 1 percentage point behind Illinois.

Of the 133 firms participating in the survey 9 percent picked Illinois and 8 percent chose Indiana. Ohio was third choice.

The industrialists were also asked: Which States do you think are doing the most to attract new industry?

Indiana tied for third place on this point with Ohio and Florida. Pennsylvania was first with Georgia second.

It is interesting to note that 15 percent of the firms said they plan to move plants in the near future.

What does industry look for in new locations?

The survey produced these significant answers:

1. Favorable labor climate.
2. Favorable tax policies.
3. Nearness to market.
4. Adequate transportation.
5. Nearness of raw materials.
6. Adequate water and power supply.

Another question asked: Which States do you think are doing the most to discourage new industry? The replies listed Michigan, New York and Massachusetts in that order.

Indiana can be proud of finishing second in choice for new plant locations and tying for third in doing the most to attract new firms.

But Indiana must keep its industrial climate favorable. Industry—as the poll shows—is on the move.

If Indiana retains its sensible, fair, and independent outlook on State government and if our cities maintain their aggressive efforts to attract new plants perhaps we'll even pass Illinois.

Texas Loses Dr. James I. McCord to Princeton University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this fall Dr. James I. McCord will take another step in his distinguished career of education, theology, and service. He will become president of the Princeton Seminary.

Dr. McCord, dean of the Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary and who has been associated with the University of Texas in some capacity since 1939, has an outstanding record on which is based the admiring respect accorded him by all who know him. He served as an instructor in philosophy at the University of Texas and has served as dean of the Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary since he was 24. In addition, he assisted with the Presbyterian Bible chair at the University of Texas; has served as temporary pastor for The University Presbyterian Church in Austin and is a member of the executive committee for the Presbyterian World Alliance.

This man's example of religious leadership, moral example for students, and working citizenship has helped many students find a pattern for their lives. His leadership in the fields of education and theology is widely recognized. I have been stimulated by his comments and intellectual boldness as a member of Austin Town and Gown.

Princeton made an excellent selection for its seminary president. Texas' loss is Princeton's gain.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Richard M. Morehead, an able Texas writer, which was published in the *Alcalde*, the University of Texas alumni magazine, for May 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the *Alcalde*, May 1959]

DR. JAMES I. McCORD

(By Richard M. Morehead)

The new president of Princeton Theological Seminary is going to miss seeing the Longhorns gallop across the turf of Memorial Stadium next fall.

Dr. James I. McCord will leave Austin with a deep sense of regret. But he is stepping into the presidency of the largest Presbyterian seminary in the land and one of the greatest of the Protestant world.

When he wasn't tripping to Europe or other distant spots doing the Lord's work, Jim McCord was usually on hand to watch the Texas football team play.

While noted most for his keen intellect, the churchman-teacher keeps tab on sports, politics, and other worldly affairs.

Take, for example, the time when Malcolm Kutner, Texas' All-American end of the early 1940's, was a student in a philosophy class which McCord taught at the University of Texas.

"Kutner met his wife in my class," McCord recalls with pleasure. "The girl, Marilyn Tillery of Beaumont, was a Presbyterian. He was a Baptist from Dallas. Now he's an officer in the Presbyterian Church at Lubbock."

Jim McCord came to the university as a graduate student in philosophy in 1939-42, holding one degree from Austin College at Sherman. He received his master's degree here in 1942. He served as an instructor in philosophy and a Charles Oldwight Fellow for 2 years, 1941 and 1942, and remembers well that his class included part of the great Texas football teams of those years.

But McCord's admiration for the University of Texas is based upon deeper things.

"This university has in Logan Wilson one of the outstanding educators in the country," McCord commented. "He has brought to Texas more vision than any educator I know—and I think education in Texas is developing in every way in recent years."

The churchman believes that the state university has a duty of leadership in the whole educational structure.

"And the most powerful force for lifting the educational standards of Texas is the alumni of the University of Texas," he continued. "It ought to be the main objective of every ex-student to interpret the University of Texas' program to the people of the State."

McCord's words take added meaning because he has been a student, faculty member, and an observer of the university at close range for 19 years. Yet he can take the impartial view, for his career has been largely in church-sponsored education.

"It is impossible to carry on theological education without a great university," said McCord. The Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary, where McCord became dean at 24 and served until called to Princeton, sends its students to the University of Texas for nontheological courses.

McCord also taught hundreds of Texas students while assisting the late Reverend Samuel Joekel in occupying the Presbyterian Bible chair. Every major denomination maintains off-campus facilities where students can take specified Bible courses for university credit.

This frank and keen-minded minister-educator once made a speech that could well be repeated to those who look upon The University of Texas as a Godless place.

"As an alumnus of this University and as one who has been privileged to have a connection with it for years, I do not subscribe to the oft-repeated charge that godlessness and irreligion characterize a great State institution," McCord said during a Religious Emphasis Week address on the campus.

"I want to acknowledge publicly my debt to the spiritual inspiration I have received from my association with students, faculty and administration. From you I have learned lessons in discipline, openmindedness, and dedication to purpose."

McCord also disputes the idea that religion and the natural sciences conflict.

"While they may represent different ways of looking at the same reality, there is no necessity in opposing these two ways," he said. "It has been especially from men in natural sciences, like Dr. Roger Williams, that I have learned most and in them I have seen most clearly the ideals of scholarship coupled with singleness of purpose and devotion to truth."

The man tapped to head Princeton's training school for ministers has touched many lives, from Austin to Central Europe.

Twice he served as temporary pastor of the University Presbyterian Church in Austin. As such, he was pastor to the largest congregation of Presbyterian students in the Southern Church which ordained him. No other Presbyterian Church in the South serves so many students as the one situated one block west of the university campus.

On the larger front, he is a member of the executive committee for the Presbyterian World Alliance, which represents 47 million members of the church.

The seminary which he will head at Princeton has approximately 500 students from many nations. McCord believes it can and must serve to promote church union as well as to train young ministers. Many Protestant faiths are represented at the Princeton Seminary.

"I hope at Princeton to help serve as a bridge between northern and southern Presbyterians," McCord told a questioner. "I have always favored church union."

Princeton is operated by the recently merged Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. and the United Presbyterians. The new name is the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. The Presbyterian Church, U.S. (southern church), remains separate.

People at Princeton will come in for a real treat from their new theologian.

He speaks with a voice of authority. His positive manner prompts some Presbyterians to refer jokingly to McCord as "the Bishop"—although his church does not have bishops.

McCord is a strapping 6 feet 2, weighing 204 pounds. He keeps the weight distributed by brisk walking, often 5 miles a day. This posed a problem in Geneva, he added, "because it's hard to walk 5 miles in Geneva without crossing into France."

McCord is a lover of serious music, preferring Berlioz. His wife is an accomplished musician. They have three children.

Montana a week ago is impossible to portray in words.

A destructive slide and great physical damage resulted from the earthquake in a part of Montana separated by but a few miles from my own State. Many citizens of my State own summer homes and cabins on the portion of the Hebgen Dam Lake and in the canyon below it. It has been a wonderful recreation area. One of my friends in Idaho, who owns such a home, has written to me a letter giving his personal experience in the earthquake.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from this letter, which so vividly tells the reactions of one family to the violent natural forces that struck in the fateful night of August 17.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO,
August 20, 1959.

HON. FRANK CHURCH,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: My wife and I went to our cabin on Hebgen Lake on June 12 this year and have been there ever since until day before yesterday. It literally took an earthquake to convince us we should return to Idaho Falls.

We were right at the focal point of the quake, and it was an experience neither of us wish to repeat. We were asleep when the quake struck, and awakened to find ourselves being tossed around the bedroom like a chip on the ocean, our bed sliding from one wall to the other and back again. There was a terrific rumbling noise, then crashes and a high moaning sound. My first coherent thought was that we had been struck by a tornado and the cabin had been deposited out in the middle of the lake and we were tossing around on the waves. As soon as the first shock passed we jumped out of bed, I turned on the light and started out into the living room, but stopped abruptly and stared at the havoc. Our fireplace was down in a heap on the living room floor and there was a great hole in the wall where it had stood, and it appeared that not one brick was in place on top of another. The room was a shambles with broken glass, crockery, pictures, and furniture strewn all over the floor. The kitchen and dining room floors were 6 inches deep in broken dishes, broken catsup bottles, jam, jelly, and supplies, the fixtures in the bathroom had torn loose from the walls and water was streaming out of broken pipes. I never saw such a terrible mess.

We ran out of the cabin in our night clothes, barefooted, and then the second shock took the ground out from under us and we sat down and held on till it passed. The big pine trees were swaying and groaning, the water in the lake was churning and rushing by like a mill race. It was bright moonlight and the eerie feeling was increased by the roaring sound, like water going over a high falls. Boats, trees, and debris of all kinds went sailing by in the lake at a good 10 to 15 miles an hour and the water was dropping out of the lake so fast that it appeared it would be dry in an hour or so. Our boat stayed tied to the dock and was up high and dry in just a few minutes.

As soon as we could collect our senses we went back in the cabin, dressed and started out to see if any of the other summer residents were hurt or needed help. Your wife's cousin, Harold Holden was in a trailer at Aunt Mercedes' Cabin just east of us, with his wife and family. You probably know that he is a judge of the superior court in

Recent Earthquake in Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the catastrophic force of nature which was centered in the west Yellowstone area of

California. We talked with all of them a while and then went on up the shore line and looked at the rest of the cabins. All fireplaces were down, anything made of brick, stone, or concrete blocks, was shaken to pieces, but the cabins themselves withstood the shocks quite well. My cabin was moved off of its foundation about a foot, and twisted toward the east, but believe it or not, as Ripley says, not a window was broken. Some of the other cabins did not fare quite so well in this regard. No one was hurt in our section and another miracle—not a single fire started. It is almost unbelievable with all the fireplaces down, kitchen stoves torn loose, etc. If a fire had started, the whole forest would probably have gone up in flames, as dry as everything was.

I was proud of everyone, there were no women screaming, no children crying, and while everyone, including myself, was scared and frightened beyond words, we all took it calmly, at least outwardly, and decided to remain right where we were until we could learn of a safer place to go. We turned on the radio to try and learn how extensive the damage was, but there was nothing until nearly 5 o'clock the next morning, and then only sketchy reports. We worked like beavers all through the night trying to clean up the worst of the mess, although continuous tremors occurred at from 1 to 3 minute intervals, some of them quite sharp.

The next morning, after the sun came up, Harold and I took pictures of most of the cabins, and then after the roads were cleared we piled in our cars and started for home. I was about the last one to leave at about 11 that morning.

Am sorry this letter turned into such a long epistle, but thought you might like to have an eyewitness report on just what happened. The newspapers have given a very good factual account, but it is almost impossible, even for one who was right there, to describe the catastrophe so that others can understand the confused and jumbled feelings of fear, awe, and yes—panic, that swept over all of us.

With kindest regards to yourself and wife, I remain, your loyal and admiringly grateful constituent,

ED HOLDEN.

Appraisal of Khrushchev's Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two pertinent questions submitted to the column of Edgar Ausel Mowren, and his very cogent answers—what we should not do in dealing with Khrushchev, and what we should do.

"Don't you think showing Khrushchev the reality of American power will cause him to call off his ambitious imperialism?" (J.S., Monterey, Calif.)

No, it may cause him to substitute honeyed lies for threats and promises. But as a Soviet realist, he knows that more important than military and economic power is the will to use it in time.

Unless the President and other American contacts convince Mr. K. that we shall stand no more nonsense from him, he may go home convinced that by small agree-

sions he can not only secure what he wants in Berlin but gradually disintegrate NATO and force the U.S. forces out of Europe. Any way you look at it, the invitation to Mr. K. was a desperate gamble.

"Since you don't seem to fancy negotiation with Khrushchev, just what would you do?" (A.L., Provo, Utah.)

Accept the cold war, study the blatant weaknesses of the adversary and use the weapon of nationalism to break up the Soviet empire, as it uses this force to break up the empires of our allies.

Sewage-Disposal Problems of Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as we all know, the Senate will shortly have to pass upon H.R. 1, the O'Brien bill, providing for a 3-year study of sewage-disposal problems of Chicago.

It is also known that most of the Lake States are insisting that Chicago should not return its sewage into Lake Michigan, where it would contaminate the drinking water and close the bathing beaches.

In view of these arguments, I think it is appropriate that various articles and editorials from newspapers indicating that this same practice, pursued by other cities on the Great Lakes, is resulting in the pollution of the waters of the lake and the closing of bathing beaches, be printed in the RECORD. Among those cities are Milwaukee; Green Bay, Wis.; Toronto, Canada; and sundry other cities as well.

I ask unanimous consent that these articles and editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily News, Aug. 18, 1959]
SANITARY DISTRICT CHIEF HAILS OK OF DIVERSION IN SENATE

The president of the sanitary district Tuesday hailed the approval by a Senate committee of a bill to permit Chicago to take more water from Lake Michigan for sewage disposal.

"The favorable action by the Senate Public Works Committee Monday on lake diversion is another step toward victory in this long-drawn battle," said Frank W. Chesrow. The bill will permit Chicago to experiment with taking more water from the lake for additional sewage disposal problems.

Chesrow said that the study of lake currents and the operations of the sanitary district proposed in the bill will do much "to remove the hysteria and fear which have surrounded this subject in the minds of our neighbors on the Great Lakes and in Canada."

The bill has been hotly opposed by six Great Lakes States and Canada who have expressed the fear that it would lower the lake level.

Meanwhile, the Chicago-Milwaukee feud over lake pollution continued.

Chesrow ordered sanitary district engineers to make a study of currents along the

lake to see if they could carry pollution from Milwaukee to Chicago.

Milwaukee withdraws water from the lake for sewage disposal and then returns the water to the lake. The city recently had to close seven beaches because of pollution.

Milwaukee's Mayor Frank Zeidler said Chicago has nothing to fear because studies show that lake currents near Milwaukee don't come near Chicago.

The Army Corps of Engineers said that two surveys made shortly after World War II show that certain currents do bring sand and silt from upper regions of the lake and deposit them along the Chicago shoreline.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Aug. 18, 1959]
GREAT LAKES CITIES DIRTY OWN WATER, BUT FIGHT CHICAGO—DAILY NEWS CHECK BARES SHOCKING LEVEL OF FILTH

(By Nicholas Shuman)

MILWAUKEE.—"No swimming" is an increasing sign of the times northward from Chicago on Lakes Michigan and Superior.

At the metropolitan centers, the Great Lakes are becoming choked with filth-sewage, industrial waste and ship pollution.

Bacteria counts in "the land of sky blue waters" are soaring to levels that Chicago medical experts consider shocking.

All this was revealed in an on-the-spot inspection by the Daily News of lake cities in Wisconsin and Minnesota.

These are two of the six States that are demanding in a Supreme Court suit that Chicago dump its treated sewage in the lakes—as their cities do, treated or raw.

Milwaukee, though the most recently publicized, is by no means the only afflicted city. Serious problems also were found in Duluth, Minn., and Superior and Green Bay, Wis.

In all these cities—once blessed with miles of sparkling clear waterfront for the recreation of the masses—beaches have been closed.

And the unlucky burghers are being forced to pay for new pools or take their families on voyages to inland lakes.

"Considering all the water we have, bathing beaches here are very poor—there's no question about it," said Dr. Mario Fischer, Duluth's commissioner of health.

His city has only one authorized beach on 25 miles of waterfront.

In Superior, E. W. Berg, director of public works, said, "The only place my kids go swimming is out at the cottage, and that's the way it is with most people here."

Superior has one authorized beach, and it is often closed because of pollution. The city began treating its sewage only last year. Until then it had gone into Superior Bay—which opens on the lake—raw.

In Green Bay, Karl A. Mohr, deputy health commissioner, said:

"Bay Beach—our only beach—was at one time a beautiful place, but it has been closed since 1942. And as far as fish are concerned, there just aren't any for 22 miles up the bay."

For its drinking water, Green Bay must go 29 miles by land across Door County to the open lake.

But in terms of population, Milwaukee is in the worst shape for bathing facilities.

There, four city beaches and three others in the county were closed recently on the recommendation of Dr. E. R. Krumbiegel, health commissioner.

Two of the beaches—South Shore and Bay View—have been barred to the public permanently. They catch the heaviest load of raw and treated sewage washed out at the Milwaukee River's mouth on south-flowing currents.

Krumbiegel said dourly, "I can't see anything that will cause the quality of our water to improve. It's going to deteriorate."

He is recommending that the city build swimming pools on the lake shore—a bitter irony.

The health commissioner acted after the coliform bacteria count at South Shore Beach on July 27 hit 110,000 per 100 cubic centimeters of water (about 3.3 ounces).

The coli are bacteria that exist in the colon. They indicate the presence of human or animal waste. Swallowing water containing them can cause diseases such as typhoid and dysentery.

And Krumbiegel pointed out that it's usually child bathers who swallow water.

The Illinois health department specifies that a coliform count of 500 is safe and anything over 10,000 is definite evidence of sewage pollution.

Shock at Milwaukee's 110,000 figure was expressed by Dr. Gerald Atlas, Chicago Park District health director.

"When we get a count of 240 at the beaches on the far north side, we consider that high," he said.

A high count at Calumet Beach—which gets its pollution from outside the city limits—is 1,100.

Krumbiegel said ship traffic and a rising number of pleasure craft are responsible for Milwaukee's woes.

But he said "the biggest single factor in producing beach contamination is the overflow of raw sewage from the city's combined sanitary-storm sewers and treatment plant during storms."

Chicago has this problem, too, but its sewers have a larger capacity, carry a higher volume of water before overflowing.

Krumbiegel noted that sewage in the water is retained at the city's shoreline by breakwaters that form the harbor.

Ray D. Leary, general manager of the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage Commission, was bitter about the health commissioner. He said that his own coliform counts—taken farther out in the water—showed no change.

"Krumbiegel is trying to get you your increased diversion," Leary said, adding that this remark was facetious.

The reference was to the Chicago Sanitary District's frustrated efforts to get more Lake Michigan water to purify its treated sewage—which is washed into the Illinois waterway and not the Great Lakes.

Milwaukee is fighting Chicago on the issue in Congress.

But Leary tacitly admitted that something could be done about his own problem. He said a plan is in the talking stage to pipe his plant's effluent (treated sewage) from the shoreline, where it is now dumped, out beyond the breaker.

In the meantime, on a hot August day at beautiful South Beach, not a single care-free foot splashed in the lake's water.

It was a sickly gray, and it coated the stones with a green slime.

[From the Chicago American, Aug. 19, 1959]

NOW GET THE FACTS

The Senate Public Works Committee's decision to send the Lake Michigan water diversion bill to the Senate floor opens the way for a vote on the measure, and it seems likely that it will pass. Both Senator LYNN JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, the Senate leader, and Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, the Republican leader, favor it.

The vote is expected to come next week, and we hope it will. A vote on last year's diversion bill was delayed until the closing days of the session. The shortness of time made it possible for Senator PROXMIER, Democrat, of Wisconsin, to kill the measure with a filibuster, and no doubt he would be happy to try it again if the vote were delayed long enough.

PROXMIER, who has been demanding that Chicago be required to follow Milwaukee's system of sewage disposal, does not seem to have been subdued by the fact that Milwaukee has had to close its Lake Michigan beaches to prevent epidemics of typhoid fever and amebic dysentery. PROXMIER is opposing Chicago's diversion measure as noisily and as illogically as ever.

Wisconsin, five other lake States and the Canadian Government have been protesting that it would cripple lake shipping and reduce the Canadian production of electric current at Niagara Falls if an additional 1,000 cubic feet of water a second were taken out of Lake Michigan at Chicago. The U.S. Army Engineers say it wouldn't have any effect either on navigation or electric power production.

The argument has been going on for years with no result except to generate bad feeling. This year's diversion bill is designed to settle it. It provides for increasing the withdrawal of water into the Illinois Waterway from 1,500 cubic-feet per second to 2,500 for a 1-year period and then conducting a 2-year study to determine exactly what effects the increase has, if any.

We hope the Senate, understanding that this is the only possible way to get at the facts, will quickly pass the bill, as the House already has done. And we hope President Eisenhower, who has vetoed two other diversion bills because Canada did not like them, will sign this one if it comes to him. The health of the millions of Americans who live in Chicago and along the Illinois Waterway is more important than the preferences of the Canadian power interests.

The chief reason why Chicago and Illinois need a little more Lake Michigan water is that Chicago's sewage disposal system, although it is the finest in America, cannot get quite all the impurities out of the sewage it treats. No disposal system can. So more fresh water is needed to dilute and purify the effluent discharged into the Illinois Waterway from the disposal plants.

More water is needed also to keep enough water in the Illinois Waterway, which is indispensable to the whole Nation, so that it can always be navigated safely and without delay.

Those are real and legitimate needs, and they should not be denied because of the insincere and unreasoning opposition offered by other lake States and Canada.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Aug. 19, 1959]
WASTE IN RIVER GIVES GREEN BAY ODOR ALL ITS OWN—YET WISCONSIN SENATORS HIT CHICAGO'S FIGHT ON POLLUTION

(By Nicholas Shuman)

GREEN BAY, Wis.—Citizens of this northlands city are literally choking on their own industrial wastes.

Ask anyone who has to cross the nauseous East River downtown as it makes its junction with the bay-bound Fox River.

On a summer's day the rotten-egg odor of hydrogen sulfide gas rises from the charcoal-brown surface of the water, which bubbles from the decomposition of organic matter below.

Green Bay has a problem. But it is not alone.

An one-the-spot inspection to the Daily News revealed that metropolitan centers on the lakes are having sewage problems all the way up the Wisconsin coast and to Duluth, Minn.

Oddly, Wisconsin's two Senators have been among the most outspoken critics of Chicago's sewage system in that city's fight for increased Lake Michigan water to purge Illinois Waterway of pollution.

Both Senator PROXMIER, Democrat, and Senator WILEY, Republican, argue that Chicago shouldn't be allowed another drop be-

cause its sanitary district is doing a poor job of treating sewage.

The fact is that virtually every city on the Great Lakes except Chicago—pick your State or county—dumps its sewage into the lake, whether treated or plain, raw muck.

And the fact is that none of them has a sewage disposal system that does a better job of treatment than the sanitary district.

This is shown by the standard sanitation yardstick—BOD, or biochemical demand—which measures the organic matter in water.

Last year the sanitary district removed 90 percent of the BOD in Chicago's sewage before dumping the remaining effluent into the waterway. Here are the corresponding figures elsewhere.

Duluth, 36 percent; Racine, Wis., 38 percent; Superior, Wis., 40 percent at best (no average because the plant is new); Green Bay, 70 percent, and Sheboygan, Wis., 84.8 percent.

Percentagewise, only Milwaukee topped Chicago, with a reading of 94 to 95. But on the basis of actual waste remaining in the treatment effluent, Milwaukee's record is poorer.

The BOD of its effluent is 18 parts per million, against only 10 in Chicago.

The reason for this is that Chicago's sewage is diluted in the sewers before treatment by a much higher water content, thus only about half as much pollution remains in it after treatment.

Green Bay's 70-percent BOD reduction looks fairly good.

But Karl A. Mohr, deputy commissioner of health, pointed out that all of the industrial waste from three downtown pulp mills is pumped directly into the rivers.

The sewage plant is bypassed "because of high volume and the difficulty of treating pulp mill chemicals."

Mohr said that the three mills empty 45 million gallons of waste water a day into the river, and this represents "sulfites with a terrific BOD."

By contrast, the average daily flow of domestic sewage and other industrial waste is only 11 million gallons.

According to Mohr, the biggest of these mills, the Marathon division of American Can Co., is about to undertake a million-dollar cleanup project.

Basins and pumps are to be erected to settle out its waste and dump the effluent into the already filthy bay instead of the river.

The treatment plant stands on the bay, within a mile of what once was the town's only waterfront swimming area, Bay Beach Park.

The plant was opened in 1935—and the beach was closed forever in 1942.

There, in comparative isolation on a hot day, children frolicked in a small wading pool. For adults there was nothing but a scum-coated shoreline overgrown with weeds.

The twin ports of Duluth and Superior are gunky with their own waste, that of other towns up the St. Louis River and the pollution of ships in the world's second busiest harbor.

But its own industrial pollution is substantial.

For example, Dr. Mario Fischer, Duluth commissioner of health, said that the American Steel & Wire division of United States Steel Corp. "uses more water than the whole city combined and washes it all back in the river with its chemical byproducts."

"Minnesota has a State water pollution commission," Dr. Fischer said, "but they haven't done anything about the St. Louis River."

Carl Lund, assistant director of the city's sewage department, said his system's sewers serve a connected population of 90,000.

But the sewage of another 20,000 persons—including whole suburbs, goes into the bay raw, and thence into Lake Superior.

Duluth is now building three new sewage plants at a cost of \$500,000. Nobody in town mentioned this, but across the river in Superior, a city official said: "They had to do something, because sewage was getting into their water supply."

Henry Wick, operator of Duluth's sewage treatment plant, was asked if he didn't think 36 percent BOD reduction was pretty low—even for that part of the sewage that was treated.

His answer—and the philosophy of officials all up and down the deteriorating lakes—was:

"Any more treatment would be unnecessary. We are fortunate in having a large body of water to dump into."

Superior has a year-old treatment plant. Before it was constructed, the city dumped its sewage raw into Superior Bay, which also flows into Lake Superior.

E. W. Berg, director of public works, said: "The bay is unfit. We've been dumping sewage there for 60 years, and we're not going to clean it up overnight."

According to A. W. Ecklund, head of the health department laboratory, the city's one authorized beach—Billings—is closed because of pollution toward the end of nearly every other season, "but the kids swim there anyway."

What if they don't want to take a chance on catching a disease?

"Fattison State Park is only 10 or 12 miles south of town, and the swimming there is fine," said Joseph T. Leszczynski, Superior's beach-poor director of parks.

Racine and Sheboygan so far are blessed with clean bathing waters, though both have cloudy rivers.

According to Thomas F. Hay, superintendent of the Racine sewage plant, he's treating "16 million gallons of sewage a day, though the plant was designed to handle only 12 million."

Obviously, the efficiency of the treatment suffers, though not to a critical degree here. Sheboygan is seeing better days. Like Manitowoc, it was pressured into adding secondary treatment to its primary works recently by the State board of health.

But all these plants, whether their treatment is good or bad, are dumping the sewage that remains after treatment into the Great Lakes.

Only Chicago can say that it doesn't.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 20, 1959]
SEWAGE BACKS UP, TORONTO BEACH UNSAFE—
SHIFTING CURRENTS OF LAKE BLAMED
(By Eugene Griffin)

TORONTO, ONTARIO, August 19.—Toronto's entire waterfront on Lake Ontario has been polluted by wastes from the city's sewers.

All beaches have been posted as dangerous to the health of swimmers.

Donald P. Scott, Toronto deputy works commissioner, said the biggest cause of the current pollution is that a shift in lake currents has carried Toronto's sewage back inshore to the waterfront, instead of out into the lake.

Dr. A. J. Boyd, health officer for Metropolitan Toronto, who ordered the beaches declared unsafe, said the lake water was filthy and highly dangerous.

Signs warn swimmers that they enter the water at their own risk. Few have taken the chance to step into the lake, even during sweltering heat waves in recent days.

Untreated sewage emptied into the lake by Toronto has been found on half a dozen beaches in the city, and in suburban Scarborough and Mimico, by health inspectors. Some beaches on Toronto Island, a summer resort in the harbor also have been polluted.

NINTH CLOSING SINCE 1945

Toronto's sewage treatment plants are not efficient enough for their job. The largest plant gives only primary treatment to sewage, removing only some of the solids. When lake water is warm, the germs multiply rapidly as the Toronto sewage is pumped into it.

This is the ninth time since 1945 that Toronto beaches have been closed because of pollution in the lake. The colon bacilli count, considered dangerous at 2,400 for 100 cubic centimeters of water, reached 380,000 in 1952.

Toronto has 30 miles of lakefront, and the sewage is a health hazard for 50 miles down the lakeshore to Hamilton.

"Untreated and partly treated sewage has turned one of the world's great fresh-water bodies into a health menace," the Toronto Globe and Mail said in an editorial.

FIND DEAD CATS

Even dead cats have been washed ashore. Dysentery, infantile paralysis, and all manner of stomach ailments may be caught from the germs in the water, health authorities have warned.

Miss Jean Newman, member of the Toronto City Council, who visited some of the beaches, said they "smell like an open sewer."

Toronto plans to expand its sewage treatment system, at a cost of several million dollars, but the expansion is not expected to be completed for another 2 or 3 years.

The city is a center of Canadian opposition to Chicago's attempts to divert more water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway.

Public officials and newspapers agree here that the answer to Toronto's sewage problem must be more efficient treatment before the sewage is emptied into the lake. More or less water in the lake here will not affect the situation.

If Toronto, or other Ontario lakefront cities, wanted higher lake levels, they could get it by allowing the power dam in the St. Lawrence Seaway near Cornwall, Ontario, to store more water upstream.

At present, this dam lets 10,000 cubic feet of water a second run off as waste, in excess of the water needed by the power generators. Chicago wants to divert only another 1,000 cubic feet a second from Lake Michigan.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Aug. 18, 1959]
CLOSE WILMETTE BEACHES—LAKE BLUFF AREAS
CHECKED

Bathing beaches at Wilmette and Lake Bluff were closed Tuesday because of pollution.

The beach at Lake Bluff was later reopened, but a special laboratory report was ordered.

Other suburbs along the North Shore and the Lake County (Ill.) Health Department were keeping a sharp eye on bacteria count in water off their beaches.

The Wilmette beaches were ordered closed when the bacteria count was found to be more than four times above the permissible level, Frank Le Jeune, beach director, said.

Under study was the possibility that sewage from Milwaukee, where all beaches have been closed because of pollution, had floated southward.

The chief sanitary officer of the Lake County health department, John Morris, said bacteria counts go up when the wind blows steadily from the north.

"However, I don't think we can say that it is necessarily attributed to Milwaukee," he added.

Chicago health authorities reported meanwhile that beaches here were not in danger of pollution.

Drinking water was also ruled out of danger by health officers in the entire North Shore area.

Ye Jeune said the Wilmette pollution was discovered in a routine check by the village water department late Monday. Another report was expected late Tuesday.

The beaches would remain closed until the pollution had cleared, he added.

The permitted level of coliform organisms varies among health departments, Morris explained.

His office doesn't consider a beach polluted until the level has reached 3,000 organisms per 100 milliliters. A milliliter is a tiny measure, less than an ounce.

In Wilmette the permitted level is 1,100. The count was 4,630.

[From the Toronto Globe and Mail]

MORE DISEASED BEACHES

There must be an immediate and exhaustive investigation into the conditions which necessitated the closing of the eastern beaches yesterday. It is disgusting that pollution has again been permitted to deprive Toronto citizens of the pleasures of this city's greatest natural asset, Lake Ontario.

Pollution on the eastern lakefront would be bad enough as an isolated incident, but it is shocking when viewed in conjunction with what has been happening all along the shore from here to Hamilton. Untreated and partly treated sewage have turned one of the world's greatest freshwater bodies into a health menace. There is now no beach left within the city where swimming can be officially and safely tolerated—and this at one of the hottest periods of an unusually hot summer.

Many millions of dollars were spent to make the eastern beaches safe by expanding the nearby Ashbridge's Bay sewage treatment plant, which had been shamefully overloaded. The recurrence of pollution there justifies the most drastic action to fix responsibility and take whatever remedial action is required to make the beaches safe again.

Extension and Amendment of Public Law

480

SPEECH
OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill H.R. 8809, which would amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480) as amended, by extending the authorities of titles I and II, and adding the program of disposals through barter, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, is one of the most helpful and far-reaching pieces of legislation in behalf of agriculture that has been passed by the Congress in over a quarter of a century.

This is the only legislation on agriculture which has become famous and well known outside the continental limits of the United States. This is true because this law provides for disposal abroad of U.S. agricultural surpluses other than those that are sold for cash dollars.

I consider my efforts in the enactment of this law in 1954 to have been thus far the best legislative contribution I have made since I have been in the Congress. Because of the impact of this law upon agriculture, I have traveled in its behalf in some 27 countries and in excess of 35,000 miles. I believe I understand not only what the law has meant to agriculture in the United States, but also its effect upon needy and hungry people in every part of the world.

We have sold in excess of \$8 billion in American agricultural surpluses in the 5 years the program has been in operation. These sales have been made in 28 countries, from Japan to Spain and from Iceland to Argentina.

The act now consists of three titles. Title I authorizes the sale of surplus agricultural commodities overseas for local currency of the purchasing country. By the end of this year we will have sold \$6,250 million in surplus produce overseas under this title.

Title II of the act authorizes donations of surplus agricultural commodities "on behalf of the people of the United States to friendly peoples in meeting famine or other urgent or extraordinary relief requirements." Under this title the United States will have contributed over \$800 million in surplus commodities through the year ending December 31, 1959. Some of these donations have met the needs of countries where conditions near famine have existed. No greater act of mercy has been shown in history than in some of the donations made under this title.

Title III authorizes principally the barter of surplus agricultural commodities for strategic and other materials of value to the United States. We have disposed of approximately \$1,165 million in surplus under this program. Of special significance at this time are the records which show first that the materials acquired under barter are worth more today than the price the United States paid for them in surplus commodities and second that the annual cost of storing these materials is \$105 million less than the annual cost of storing the surpluses given in exchange.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL FOR 1959

Under the 1959 extension now under consideration by the House, we hope to sell in the coming year \$1,150 million worth of surplus agricultural produce outside the continental limits of the United States. This is an ambitious program but one which can be achieved.

LONG-TERM SUPPLY CONTRACTS

For several years after the enactment of the law in 1954, I appeared regularly to testify before the House Committee on Agriculture for authorization in this bill to include long-term supply contracts. I am happy to see a provision for long-term supply contracts contained in the 1959 bill for the first time. I consider this provision to be the major step in the last 5 years in improvement of Public Law 480.

Under the provision of this new title which would be added to Public Law 480, the President would be authorized to make agreements with foreign nations

under which the United States would undertake to finance the export of surplus commodities over periods of up to 10 years and to accept from the country payment in dollars over periods of up to 20 years at an interest equivalent to the cost of money to the U.S. Treasury. I believe that such a program will fill a major gap in our existing export operations and result in a substantial increase in our agricultural exports.

It has been my observation in studying Public Law 480 operations and agricultural exports in many parts of the world that as a nation concentrates its efforts on industrial and economic development, its demands for food and agricultural products almost always overload the ability of its domestic agriculture to produce. This is for two major reasons: First, increased individual purchasing power from commercial and industrial development creates a greater demand for food and agricultural products and, second, capital, labor, and management are drawn from agriculture into industry and commerce, and in many instances agricultural production actually declines, at least for a temporary period.

In numerous instances, officials of countries which are experiencing these "growing pains" of economic and industrial development have expressed their urgent need for some long-term assurance of adequate agricultural supplies during their development period. These nations expect to be able to pay for these commodities, and they are willing to pay in dollars, but they need all their existing resources, and particularly their foreign exchange, to carry out the industrial and commercial development programs they have planned. It is with this type of situation particularly in mind that the Committee has included the provisions for long-term supply contracts in this bill.

In addition, this new program will open up markets that are not now available on other than a strictly cash basis. I feel sure many nations which are now buying surplus commodities under title I would prefer to take advantage of the extended dollar credit authorized in the new long-term supply contract provision.

A new section 8 has been proposed by the Department of Agriculture and adopted by the committee. It will authorize inclusion of agreements for a relatively small stockpile of surplus commodities to be established in recipient countries, under the ownership and control of the recipient country, to be later used for emergency relief donations or for sale under the regular provisions of Public Law 480. Definite language was added to make it clear that full responsibility for the condition of the commodities and for handling and storage charges shall be assumed by the recipient country upon transfer of title and the placing of the commodities in storage.

Two points I would like to make fully clear. First, we make no claim to perfection in this program. We have done and will continue to do our best to reduce a large portion of the accumulated

surplus of farm products by disposal overseas. Second, the U.S. surplus disposal program is not entirely altruistic. We believe it to be just as much in the interest of the American farmer to reduce accumulated stocks. In this we hope to improve the economic position of the American farmers. I realize full well that an economically strong and progressive agriculture is vital to the United States. This program is strengthening agriculture and providing a market beyond our borders for the food surpluses of this country. It is a practical program geared to 1959. It is a program that deserves not only the commendation of the farmers of this country but the approval of every Member of this House who is genuinely interested in the future of American agriculture.

Wilderness and Wildlife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the June issue of Montana Wildlife, the official publication of the Montana Fish and Game Department contains an excellent editorial supporting the need for wilderness areas. Because the wilderness bill, now being considered by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee is one of the more important pieces of legislation we have before us this Congress, I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILDERNESS AND WILDLIFE

We are becoming increasingly aware of the important part wilderness is playing in our wildlife program in general and specifically in the preservation of several important game and fish species.

Big game hunting is earning an important place in Montana's outdoor recreational program. Much of the high-quality aspect of this sport, particularly in regard to hunting the rarer species, is due to the remote regions in which these animals are found. A great deal of the finest sport hunting in the State today lies within the boundaries of designated wilderness and wild areas.

In regard to specific species, the grizzly bear population has reached a critical low in the United States. Total elimination has taken place throughout the greater part of its former range. It has been found that the grizzly shuns areas dominated by man's activities. The chief hope, therefore, for the survival of this highly prized game species lies in the preservation of a reasonable amount of wilderness range.

The native black-spotted cutthroat trout is in jeopardy in Montana. The disappearance of this valuable game fish is directly attributable to habitat destruction as well as the introduction of nonnative fishes. Only a few waters, and they mostly in remote areas, still have pure strains of the original cutthroat.

It is an important and practical consideration of fish management that these rare strains be preserved. They will be needed for introduction into waters that are presently barren and will be the raw material for creating improved strains as needs arise. Then, too, cutthroat are important for the particularly rewarding type fishing they provide.

The salvation of these native strains of cutthroat lies in the more remote inaccessible waters and, in particular—wilderness areas. Here the habitat will be preserved and incompatible exotic fish excluded. It is very evident that those who seek native cutthroat will not hesitate to expend the necessary energy to reach these more remote regions. This is clearly testified by the resident and nonresident fishermen enjoying this sport in wilderness areas.

A further value of wilderness has often been realized. This is the importance of having undisturbed plant and animal communities available for scientific studies. It is felt that only with such controls can the effects of man's many modifications be properly judged, and unwise practices avoided.

In summary, we feel that we are obligated to furnish the highest quality hunting and fishing possible. This is becoming an increasingly difficult task in the face of rapidly mounting hunting and fishing pressures and the continual shrinkage of the more desirable areas in which these activities may be enjoyed.

We look, therefore, to a planned wilderness preservation system as insurance that we may continue to provide outstanding recreational opportunities, so important to Montana and the entire nation. We agree with principles expressed in the proposed wilderness legislation. We believe that this program may be accomplished without jeopardizing other important uses of public lands. We sincerely hope that national wilderness preservation may soon become a definite policy of Congress.

Annual Training of Reservists and Citizen Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, after Congress adjourned for the week, I had the opportunity to visit Camp Meade, Md., at Odenton, Md., for an afternoon and evening. The occasion for my visit was the fact that a group of citizen soldiers from my area, together with the contingent from the State of Kentucky, are on active duty for annual training in compliance with LTR O T 6-952 XXI USACR, IGMR, Pa., dated June 23, 1959.

A great number of us are too prone to take for granted the value of our so-called reservists and citizen soldiers who leave their homes and occupations to go back into an intensive 2-week training period in order that they may keep abreast of the latest developments in our national defense.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of Congress that this is not mere play-acting but downright serious business. These men, most of whom are family men, are dead serious and in earnest about the training they receive.

In talking to them, from private on up to our own Maj. William Wolinsky

from Greensburg, Pa., who in private life is the chief of police of that city, and his officers under him, Louis P. Antolini, Jeannette, Pa.; Frank O. Baydek, Latrobe, Pa.; George J. Caperelli, Greensburg, Pa.; Russell H. Ault, State College, Pa.; Cleo M. Wildasin, Hanover, Pa.; Jean T. Fuqua, Mayfield, Ky.; and Malcolm R. Boaz, Mayfield, Ky. Not forgetting, of course, Captain McKetta from New Kensington, Pa., who is one of our very capable officers in our State police force in Pennsylvania.

I learned that these civilian soldiers are very proud and doing their very best to fulfill their obligations to our country by better preparing themselves for any eventuality. I was particularly struck with the serious manner in which they go about their duties and their apparent desire to strive for perfection. I was happy to greet many of the men whom I have known for years and I admit frankly, that as a Member of Con-

gress, I was not aware of the very important role they play in our overall picture of defending this country. They are entitled to a special commendation because no matter how you look at it, this tour of duty is, in most instances, a personal sacrifice, and one which they willingly make without complaint. I believe that they are all entitled to a special note of thanks from this Congress because it could very well be that devotion to this duty carries out the admonition of Thomas Jefferson when he said: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." They rate a special salute, and in passing, I would like to name the citizen soldiers of these two great States and to thank them for receiving a Member of Congress with the spirit and with the understanding that we too are part of the defense of this Nation. The following is a list of assigned enlisted personnel of the 394th Military Censorship Detachment:

Assigned enlisted personnel

Grade	Name and home address	Service No.	Branch	Security clearance	TPA auth.
Sfc (E-7)	Rager, Robert D., 32 Maple Ave., Blairsville, Pa.	ER33017107	AI	Secret	Yes.
S. Sgt (E-6)	Creighton, Donald K., 802 Ash St., Irwin, Pa.	ER13403980	Arty	do	No.
S. Sgt (E-6)	Seranko, Robert J., R.D. No. 2, Latrobe, Pa.	ER52250966	MPO	do	No.
Sfc (E-6)	Petroy, Anthony J., 1520 Poplar St., Greensburg, Pa.	ER13473394	AI	do	Yes.
S. Sgt (E-6)	Howard, Donald E., R.D. No. 1, Greensburg, Pa.	ER13492586	QMC	do	Yes.
Sgt (E-5)	Derubis, Gilbert, 184 East Market St., Blairsville, Pa.	ER13540761	Inf	do	No.
Sp5 (E-5)	Baughman, Ronald C., 47 Lincoln Way East, Jeannette, Pa.	ER13541503	AI	do	No.
Sp5 (E-5)	Cherubini, James A., 1424 Poplar St., Greensburg, Pa.	ER13541492	AMed	do	No.
Sp5 (E-5)	Peters, Wayne C., R.D. No. 1, Jeannette, Pa.	ER52324668	MPO	do	No.
Sp5 (E-5)	Tamewitz, William E., Box 195, Oak St., Westmoreland City, Pa.	FR13522728	AI	do	Yes.
Sp5 (E-5)	Williams, Gerald I., 24 St., Westmoreland City, Pa.	FR13573538	AI	do	No.
Cpl (E-4)	Ziglar, Ronald L., 2354 Locust St., Greensburg, Pa.	ER2377412	Inf	do	No.
Sp4 (E-4)	Baughman, Robert C., III, 317 Vernon Dr., West Newton, Pa.	ER52325922	FI	do	No.
Sp4 (E-4)	Gidlick, Gary L., Box 88, Suttersville, Pa.	ER52324667	MPO	do	No.
Sp4 (E-4)	Conrad, William R., 332 Concord Ave., Greensburg, Pa.	BR13601692	AI	do	No.
Sp4 (E-4)	Erny, Thomas C., 1701 Dalley Ave., Latrobe, Pa.	BR13601696	AMedS	do	No.
Sp4 (E-4)	Fontana, Vincent F., 544 George St., Greensburg, Pa.	ER52325919	Arty	do	No.
Sp4 (E-4)	Johnson, John A., 423 East Pittsburgh St., Greensburg, Pa.	ER52325912	Arty	do	No.
Sp4 (E-4)	Kipp, Donald C., R.D. No. 1, Jeannette, Pa.	ER52327700	CE	do	No.
Sp4 (E-4)	Musick, Merle L., R.D. No. 1, Latrobe, Pa.	BR13612590	AMedS	do	Yes.
Sp4 (E-4)	Pallitta, Joseph A., 218 Offutt Ave., Greensburg, Pa.	ER13578001	AI	do	No.
Sp4 (E-4)	Remaley, Clarence R., 605 East Pittsburgh St., Greensburg, Pa.	BR13612600	AI	do	No.
Sp4 (E-4)	Myers, Leroy B., Jr., 337 Depot St., Latrobe, Pa.	BR13601695	AMedS	do	No.
Pfc. (E-3)	Caperelli, John M., 1431 Elm St., Greensburg, Pa.	FR13611975	AI	do	No.
Pfc. (E-3)	Caruso, Angelo, 226 Irving Ave., Latrobe, Pa.	ER52325920	Arty	do	No.
Pfc. (E-3)	Hooza, Robert R., R.D. No. 3, Mount Pleasant, Pa.	ER52325925	Arty	do	No.
Pfc. (E-3)	Lash, Wayne R., R.D. No. 1, West Newton, Pa.	BR13612605	AI	do	No.
Pfc. (E-3)	Mickins, Michael W., 221 John St., Latrobe, Pa.	BR13612591	AMedS	do	No.
Pfc. (E-3)	O'Malley, John P., 15-2 North Braddock Heights, North Braddock, Pa.	BR13613592	CE	do	No.
Pfc. (E-3)	Peer, Donald R., 225 Brinker St., Latrobe, Pa.	ER52324670	MPO	do	No.
Pfc. (E-3)	Pollicastro, Joseph E., 60 South Hamilton St., Greensburg, Pa.	BR13619172	AI	do	No.
Pfc. (E-3)	Snell, Earl E., R.D. No. 3, Irwin, Pa.	BR13619173	AI	do	No.
Pfc. (E-3)	Vallozzi, James A., 918 St. Clair Way, Greensburg, Pa.	BR13612602	AI	do	No.

1 Ordered active duty for tng as Adv Det, 12-29 Aug 59, per 1st Ind, 394th Mil Cen Det, to LO#6-952 (ANADUTRA XXI USACR dtd 23 Jun 59).

I would also like to pay my compliments to the 321st Military Censorship Detachment, Mayfield, Ky.:

Assigned enlisted personnel

Grade	Name and home address	Service No.	Branch	Security clearance	TPA authorization
SSG-6	Royd, Byron P., Jr.	ER15565165	AR	Secret applied for	Present
Fgt-5	Tucker, Donald R.	ER52388687	MD	do	Do.
Sgt-5	Wilson, Jerry L.	ER52388699	AI	do	Do.
Sp5-5	Price, James S.	FR15552306	MP	do	Do.
Sp4-4	Billington, Daniel	BR15555880	MP	do	Do.
Sp4-4	Billington, James M.	BR15555884	MP	do	Do.
Sp4-4	Billington, Mason G.	BR15555882	MP	do	Do.
Sp4-4	Mathis, Walter C.	ER2435273	Inf	do	Do.
Sp4-4	Windsor, James E.	ER25267507	EN	do	Do.
Pfc-3	Bell, Jimmy D.	BR15575559	In	do	Do.
Pfc-3	Gossum, Richard F.	BR15575880	In	do	Do.

JEAN T. FUQUA, Major, QMC, USAR, Commanding.

Nixon Journeys Contrasted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Mr. George Todt, noted west coast columnist and commentator, whose column originates on the editorial page of the Valley Times which covers the San Fernando Valley out in California, has come up with some highly interesting observations growing out of Vice President Nixon's visits to Russia and Poland.

I think many Americans will share Mr. Todt's conviction that the existence of the Iron Curtain is not so much to keep news, and facts and people from getting behind the Iron Curtain as it is to prevent people unhappy with communism from fleeing their homelands.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NIXON JOURNEYS CONTRASTED

(By George Todt)

What may very well have been the most significant feature of Vice President RICHARD NIXON's recent trip to Moscow and Warsaw seems to have been lost on many writers and observers who covered this event.

For the warm reception he received behind the Iron Curtain indicated pretty conclusively that those who know communism best receive most affectionately those who fight against it the hardest.

Conversely, Nixon's trip to South America a little more than a year ago—where and when he was stoned and spat upon—shows us the other side of the coin: Those who know communism the least are, at the same time, also the most antagonistic to those who oppose its expansion at the expense of free nations around the world.

There is a lot of difference between those who can afford to seat themselves on the sidelines and preach theoretical communism as an attractive ideology for their fellows—and others who are forced to live under its godless tenets as a working formula.

Let's think this one over for ourselves, shall we?

Speaking along such lines as we have been discussing here, Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican of South Dakota, one of the wisest and most solid of the solons on Capitol Hill, recently had this to say:

"I believe that several lessons can well be learned from the short interval of history which took the Vice President of the United States on the big jump from rocks in Venezuela to roses in Warsaw, on his good will mission for the people of the United States."

"I think the first lesson is clearly this: Communism has its greatest appeal to the people who live farthest from it.

"The second lesson is that to people living under communism, but once enjoyed freedom—as is true in the case of the people of Poland—the existence of freedom and its demonstration anywhere in the world, as exemplified by Vice President Nixon's visit to Warsaw and to Russia, is a cause of great rejoicing.

"The third lesson is, I believe, that the more one knows about communism, or the closer he lives to it and the more intimate

his connections with it become, the more he detests and abominates it—both as a philosophy and a way of life."

As so often is the case, the well thought out words of Senator MUNDT add up to commonsense and reason. The difference in the receptions afforded the Vice President at Caracas and Warsaw amply illustrate the point he has made for us.

The inhabitants of the first city, in Venezuela, are happily not infested, infected or otherwise inflicted with the plague known as Marxist communism: How easy for them to sit around and prate of what an excellent system of government it might be.

But the more practical denizens of the capital of Poland, which is Warsaw, are not the unrealistic theorists of the South American variety who, to put it in the words of the overrun Poles, may be said to have "never had it so good."

The liberty-loving people of Poland have had the Red colossus on their backs since the end of the Second World War. Although the cream of the Polish patriots and democratic elements of the stricken country have long since been liquidated by the Communists—first notable instance of Marxist mass murder there was the Katyn Forest massacre of 14,000 army officers while the late war was still in progress—those who yet remain have forgotten neither their former freedom nor hatred for the Communists who took it away from them.

The real reason for the Iron Curtain today, as it has been in the past, is not so much to keep us out—as it is to keep the poor, miserable wretches on the other side from running away.

Do we need look any further than West Berlin to see that this is so? Actually, several millions of grateful East Germans have succeeded in gaining freedom for themselves via this escape route.

But how many West Germans—or how few—have gone the other way?

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the newsletter of August 22, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

AUGUST 22, 1959.

The first session of the 86th Congress is struggling to a close, many Members think, although in the next breath some concede the possibility of endless debate ahead. Here's a roundup.

Controversial issues to be carried over include minimum wage, aid to education, aid to depressed areas, Federal unemployment compensation, Federal health insurance, social security expansion, interest rate ceiling removal (and others?).

Controversial issues considered earlier and scheduled for further action include labor reform, housing, and the farm program. New items for House debate include Public Law 480, (surplus food disposal), civil rights, highways and gasoline tax increase, and foreign investment tax incentive (H.R. 5).

Controversial clashes of viewpoint continue and include the political front, for example,

who's for big spending, and the balanced budget; our international policy embodied in foreign aid (including food surplus disposal) and the Khrushchev visit.

Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade and Assistance Act of 1954, to dispose of surplus commodities, with amendments, was the week's big floor debate, centered around a barter provision. The big question—should the United States dispose of our surplus food products in exchange for strategic materials for our national stockpile rather than sell for foreign currency, which currency may or may not be of any use to the United States. If not, then the food in effect becomes a gift. The complicated, confusing, and at times self-defeating nature of this program led me to observe in debate that the problems confronting us arise because of a very basic problem, quite overlooked; namely, that the Federal Government is not set up nor intended constitutionally to be in the distribution of food, clothing or other necessities, neither at home nor abroad. The original emergency nature of disposal of farm surpluses has now, in my view, been distorted so that surpluses are encouraged. Government regulation fostered, and the free market destroyed in the United States and throughout the world. The fact is, our surpluses endanger the economies of other nations, too. This basic fault of the program itself was not debated. Government has been accepted as a food distributor at the taxpayers' expense. All I can hope to do is to keep the criticism alive, until the people demand an accounting. This I have done and shall so continue.

Civil rights, already through the Senate, will probably be before the House soon. The Democrat leadership is committed to advance in this field. The questions to be resolved: (1) A tough bill or a relatively innocuous one? (2) This year, or next (election) year? Odds are, in my opinion, an innocuous bill this year, because: (1) Few can show any real need (other than political in some districts) for further legislation; and (2) many Republicans may feel constrained to cooperate with those Southern Democrats who helped in enacting a legitimate labor reform act. I expect a bill to extend the Civil Rights Commission and give the Justice Department a little greater authority to investigate local election practices. The gasoline tax increase may take time, now that the Ways and Means Committee has voted out a 1-cent increase for 22 months and a later 5-percent excise tax allocation to highways. I am among those opposing a tax increase. (See newsletters of July 25 and August 1). Highways can be built without more tax, I believe.

Earlier controversial issues yet to be resolved are headed by labor reform, which is now in conference between the House and Senate. Housing could continue as a tremendous struggle in view of the veto, the Senate's attempt to override (both Texas Senators so voted), and the legitimate needs embodied in the earlier outrageous bill, that require that a bill be passed. The present suggested compromise is only a lesser degree of the faults of the vetoed bill, including more public housing direct loans for college classrooms (backdoor Treasury financing beyond Congress' control), urban renewal (though reduced), and others. As before, this bill probably will be held until the last minute and then railroaded through. As for agriculture, the general recommendations of the President for reduced price support levels and eased acreage requirements will get little if any attention, I believe, even though the President may urgently so request of Congress.

The interest rate ceiling's removal (see newsletters of June 13, 27, and July 11) so urgently requested by Treasury Secretary Anderson to reduce the cost of Government

financing has become a political football. By a party line vote (Democrats for, Republicans against), the Committee on Ways and Means voted to shelve such needed action until next year. The Government thus is forced to continue to compete with families and small business men for the available money in the short-term loan market. As I see it, it is wrong for Congress after spending the money to tie the hands of the Secretary in financing the Government debt.

So Congress struggles on, not all good, not all bad, but just like people. Congress will improve only as the people force improvement by demanding right action. Adjournment date is anyone's guess.

The Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I insert in the RECORD a recent article written by George E. Sokolsky on "The Captive Nations":

When Nixon and Khrushchev held their now famous debate in the American-style kitchen at the American Fair in Moscow, the cause for Khrushchev's unruly anger was that Congress had passed a joint resolution on July 17 providing for a Captive Nations Week. The President approved the resolution the same day. Several times, during Nixon's visits with Khrushchev, the latter referred to the "captive"—his captives. After his anger, it struck him as funny. It is not so funny for millions of human beings.

The nations referred to in the resolution are as follows: Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others.

This is a long list of areas conquered by Soviet Russia, mainly during World War II and after. Some of them have been incorporated within the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics; others are so-called people's republics. It is a record of imperialistic success of the Kremlin. The resolution further states:

"These submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, and other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties."

This resolution seems to have bothered Khrushchev more than any criticism that has been made of his brutality or rudeness because it is a wholly true statement of fact. Following the theories of Treitschke, Stalin set out to establish a number of satellite countries that would take the first brunt of war.

To Soviet Russia, the captive nations represent a Chinese Wall against the West. However, that wall is realistically rubble now that war must be conducted by airborne bombs, rockets, and missiles. Nevertheless, it has been characteristic of Russian history that what the Russians take, they never give up willingly. Russia has been like a rolling snowball, gathering size as it rolled on and on.

Men's memories are short. We, in America, forget, for instance, that the United States brought into existence the most progressive Slavic state, Czechoslovakia. It was the great friendship of three men, Woodrow Wilson, Prof. Thomas G. Masaryk, and Charles R. Crane that carved out this nation, liberated it from the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and obtained its independence at the Paris Conference after World War I. Czechoslovakia became a democratic republic with Prof. Thomas G. Masaryk as President and Dr. Eduard Benes as Prime Minister. Hitler seized this country on the ground that the Sudeten Germans (Bohemia) were ethnically Germans and therefore belonged to him. The Kremlin succeeded to Hitler's ownership. Czechoslovakia is now practically an integral part of Russia with no life of its own.

Americans were excited when Hitler marched into this peace-loving country of hardworking, energetic people. We are not excited today when Czechoslovakia is, for all practical purposes, a province of Soviet Russia.

In fact, it has become fashionable to go to Russia. Those who do not go there are not "in." I cannot imagine what they are "in" or not "in" but they all went to Russia this summer like bees swarming together. This winter, we shall be hearing all about Russia from 10-day experts who saw the Red Square in Moscow, the Nevsky in Leningrad, and whatever it is they can see in Kiev—possibly the ancient cathedral. They will all tell of the wonders of the one big department store in Moscow—something like Gimbel's basement. They will say that all Russians smile when they see Americans. It looks more like a belly laugh watching the fools part with their money.

Controversy Still Waxes Warm Over Khrushchev's Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in the past few days, I have made several comments to express just how I feel about the prospect of Premier Khrushchev's visit to America. I have tried to emphasize that I, for one, do not wish to extend any festive welcome and great show of comradeship for this international tyrant.

As a sort of footnote to my previous remarks, and to illustrate that quite a number of other Americans feel as I do in this respect, I would like to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a group of letters to the editor which were published in the August 17 issue of the Washington Evening Star. I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTROVERSY STILL WAXES WARM OVER KHRUSHCHEV'S VISIT

It is surprising that few people question the assumption that Khrushchev is in many ways ignorant of conditions in the United States. Harriman returned from Russia stating that he found the Soviet leader badly informed; Nixon took up the same line; then

the President said he would like to show Levittown to Khrushchev so he can see that the U.S. housing exhibit in Moscow is typical. A little thought ought to convince Americans that Khrushchev cannot be so uninformed. Consider the size of the Soviet Embassy staff in Washington; consider the mass of reports that are surely being sent to Moscow; consider the ease with which information of such a nature can be obtained in the United States from personal inspection, newspapers, official sources. Khrushchev's purpose is quite transparent. He wants to minimize the effect of the housing exhibit on the Soviet people, make them think Americans are not as far ahead of them as is actually the case. How Khrushchev must chuckle when he sees how this simple ruse has pulled the wool over some eyes.

H. C. NEAL.

Khrushchev is coming. Where are the Paul Reveres? One if by land, and two if by sea, and three—the manifesto calls for us to be brought down as a free nation.

With some, I think of the peoples of the world who will see pictures of the hammer and sickle flying over our land. Why don't we keep the flags after Khrushchev leaves so as to have them ready when he comes again as victor instead of as visitor?

I am one citizen of this country who does not wish to see diplomatic courtesy extended to this man who has bragged of our forthcoming demise.

BETTY M. BONNETT.

Premier Khrushchev's visit and President Eisenhower's return visit should not be considered as "missions of peace," but merely as opportunities to examine more thoroughly and closely conflicting world policies.

To interpret these informal talks as gestures of good will would be a misconception. However, it is hoped that Americans will pledge their full-fledged support to the President and demonstrate to Premier Khrushchev that we are peace-loving people, educated, informed, and enlightened as to the international variances at stake.

SUZANNE R. STALLING.

All the way from Union Station
And along the city's parks
The crowds sing their hosannas
For the salesman of Karl Marx.

The day is warm and sunny
And brimming with good will
But in J. Edgar's dwelling
There's an autumnal chill.

He looks out of his window
And he views with jaundiced eye
The hammer and the sickle
Beneath the summer sky.

But then, let's all be jolly
And let no one frown
For Khrushchev's in the White House
And the Reds are on the town.

HYMEN R. KAPLAN.

We see that for Premier Khrushchev's first American visit it is planned to fly the hammer and sickle flag from Washington lampposts. In his plan to bury us, we can only assume that he will hang statesmen, Congressmen, and reporters from lampposts on his second visit to Washington.

JURI BARTHOLO.

It was a shock to me, and I believe it was to the average citizen, when our President gave out the news that he had invited a criminal like Khrushchev to become a guest of the United States. How low have we sunk when our Chief Executive can shake hands with and entertain a man who has murdered thousands of people and has boasted that he will bury us?

Why should the taxpayers and decent citizens of this country have to put up the money to entertain and actually protect the life of this murderer?

LINDA McCLURE WOODS.

It is too late now to consider the wisdom of extending to Khrushchev an invitation to visit our country, but we can do certain things when he comes. We can, and should, treat him with punctilious courtesy because he is an invited guest. Since few people in the United States, however, wish to consort with a murderer, a liar, and a thief, it follows that we should not honor him further than has already been done by asking him here as a guest. It is unthinkable to me that he should be the guest of honor at functions not strictly and solely official, such as are being proposed by businessmen and others throughout the Nation.

I would like to see Khrushchev confronted with a wall of complete indifference, except for reporting the actual facts of his visit. There should be neither praise nor censure, and everything possible should be done to prevent him from making his visit a basis for his well-known propaganda, of which he is a master. Because we are a reasonably honest and fair-minded people we cannot excel or even match him in the field of propaganda and, at all costs, we should avoid being taken in by any of his proposals until they have resulted in positive, clear-cut action; for the man is a consummate liar and from all indications has no comprehension of what we mean by honesty.

E. R. BALLINGER.

It is regrettable that when Khrushchev arrives in Washington in his official capacity as Prime Minister of the U.S.S.R., Congress may no longer be in session. However, this unfortunate situation may very well be remedied by inviting Mr. Khrushchev to appear before one of the congressional committees, thus keeping him in the limelight.

The Committee on Internal Security would be the most appropriate one to extend the invitation. Mr. Khrushchev, as chairman of the central committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and boss of the world Communist movement, could perform a signal service to the cause of peace and friendship by supplying many a missing link in the investigations of the committee which has amassed evidence on incidents of Communist subversion, sedition, spying, arousing of interracial hatred, etc. in this and other countries. An additional point: As a foreigner, Mr. Khrushchev could not claim the privileges of the fifth amendment.

CHARLES COLLINS.

The President pulled the biggest blooper of the century by inviting Khrushchev here, thereby skyrocketing his waning prestige at the expense of the oppressed, enslaved peoples of Europe and Asia.

Of all the naive reasons for having the Russian dictator here, that of visiting strategic air bases is the most insane. Naturally, Khrushchev rejected Secretary McElroy's invitation, for the Soviet leader doubtlessly has seen them in pictures and movies brought to him by his diplomatic couriers. Then, too, he doesn't want Eisenhower looking at his.

As for seeing how the West lives, don't you suppose Khrushchev knows? On his visit there several years ago, Khrushchev saw England's cottages, manors, industrial complexes, and cities similar to those in America. Angry sullen crowds greeted him and he returned to the Kremlin in disgust. Yes, he knows how the west lives. And he knows too, he must bury it if communism is to survive.

CHARLES P. BEAZLEY.

It came as a great shock to read that the President is extending to Dictator Khrushchev a courtesy he has chosen to withhold from some of our friends—that of meeting him at the airport. If, in the general interest, this persons must be permitted to enter our country, it seems to me our conduct should be no more than formally courteous, considering the numerous outrages committed not only with his consent but at his order.

Our sudden switch in policy resembles the switches called by Khrushchev himself, which switches have always brought from us comments of amusement or contempt. It seems that we are not only doing business with the devil—we are doing it on his terms.

DORIS STIVERSON.

The Speaker's Rebuke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from Business Week for August 1, 1959.

This editorial relates to a statement made recently by our distinguished Speaker, and I feel that it is most appropriate that it be put into the RECORD so that those in the executive branch who take the time to read of our activities and statements here will realize the necessity for thinking before they start talking. I believe our distinguished Speaker gave a needed rebuke to some spokesmen for the Federal Reserve Board.

The editorial follows:

THE SPEAKER'S REBUKE

Speaker SAM RAYBURN has a sharp tongue, but there was considerable justice as well as sharpness in the rebuke he administered last week to some of the more vocal supporters of the Federal Reserve Board.

"I have been forced to the conclusion," RAYBURN declared, "that the Federal Reserve authorities have reached a point in their thinking where they consider themselves immune to any direction or suggestion by the Congress, let alone a simple expression of the sense of Congress."

Speaker RAYBURN's voice is a powerful one in Washington, and when he says something like this, it is worth listening to. In fairness, though, his rebuke should apply not to the Fed itself but to some of its more ardent champions who have rushed to attack the proposed "sense of Congress" amendment to the bill raising the ceiling on the interest rate the Federal Government can pay.

The merits of the amendment itself may be arguable—though it can be remarked in passing that the language is moderate and the principle has been supported by some highly qualified students of central banking.

But whether the amendment is wise or foolish, the right of Congress to give these or any other instructions to the Fed should be beyond question. The Fed itself has always acknowledged this. But some of its partisans with their charges of a "political foray" seem to have forgotten it.

It is a basic principle of our Government—and an excellent principle—that the expert administrator operates not by divine authority but by virtue of his ability to persuade duly elected representatives of the laity that he knows what he is doing.

Regardless of what happens to the "sense of Congress" amendment, it will be a sad day for the country—and for the Federal Reserve System—if we ever try to operate on any other basis.

The Senate's Responsibility for Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I think Members of Congress and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, generally, will be interested in reading the August 10 lead editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, of St. Louis, Mo. It places upon the U.S. Senate the direct responsibility for enacting effective labor reform legislation in this session of Congress and it supports the point of view which I presented in the more than 2-hour debate on this subject on Monday, August 17. In other words, the Post-Dispatch urges the Senate to follow the constructive action of the House by enacting the Landrum-Griffin bill.

Mr. President, if the conference committee can agree upon a better and more effective piece of labor reform legislation than the Landrum-Griffin bill, let it bring such legislation to the floor of the Senate. If it cannot agree, let it act in conformity with the commitments made on the Senate floor last Monday and give the Senate itself the opportunity to vote to instruct its conferees to carry out its wishes and desires.

The conferees have now had this legislation before them for a week. We are 1 week closer to adjournment. Time is marching on. I hope that within the next few days the Senate will be given an opportunity to register its views on effective labor reform legislation, either by adopting a conference report containing such provisions—or by voting to instruct the conferees of the Senate to conform with the House provisions on the areas of disagreement.

Mr. President, this Post-Dispatch editorial merits careful reading on this issue.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Aug. 10-16, 1959]

THE SENATE'S RESPONSIBILITY

Enactment of strong labor reform legislation at this session of Congress now is up to the Senate. The House of Representatives acted Thursday with commendable speed and statesmanship in voting 229 to 201 to approve the Landrum-Griffin bill, which carried administration endorsement. There is no question of a veto if the Senate goes along with the House, and Senators should examine carefully the meaning of Thursday's rollcall and insist that their conferees conform to it.

It is fair to say that in this crucial vote the House succumbed to pressure, but it was the

pressure of public opinion and not of a special interest. In following the wishes of the people the House repudiated the most severe and potentially the most politically damaging pressure from organized labor that has been brought to bear in the present Congress. Those Members who stood against it are entitled to a vote of thanks.

The House opened debate with three bills before it. One was the Landrum-Griffin bill, given final approval Friday 303 to 125 after passage was assured in the key vote the day before. At the opposite extreme was the measure backed by organized labor. In the middle was a version of the Senate-approved Kennedy-Ervin bill, which emerged from a House committee and which had the support of the Democratic leadership. Thus the House rejected the alternatives and chose the toughest of the lot, and did so by a comfortable margin despite the last minute efforts of AFL-CIO lobbyists to hold down the winning vote as a lever for use in the expected Senate-House conference. A close tally would have provided argument for a weakened compromise.

Each of the three measures before the House had its topflight supporter; each advocate took his case to the country by radio. President Eisenhower put his prestige behind the Landrum-Griffin bill; AFL-CIO President George Meany appealed for the labor bill; House Speaker SAM RAYBURN asked support for the committee bill. What happened to RAYBURN was surprising and significant. When the venerable MISTER SAM resorts to the unusual step of arguing publicly for a piece of legislation, his colleagues in the House pay careful attention. But in this case he lost control even of his own Texas delegation; of 21 Democrats, 16 voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill.

It was to be expected that Mr. Meany would denounce the House action. "A victory for antilabor forces," he called it. The same comment was made by labor leaders at the time of the Taft-Hartley battles in the forties. John L. Lewis termed Taft-Hartley a "slave labor act." Yet anyone who thinks Taft-Hartley damaged the labor movement is sadly out of touch with the times. The Landrum-Griffin bill, which in many ways merely tries to end the abuses of Taft-Hartley, would not hurt honest unions or legitimate organizing practices.

There is one aspect of the House vote that Senator KENNEDY, the presidential aspirant, and other influential Senators would do well to ponder. It is this: Something has happened since last April when the Senate passed the mild Kennedy-Ervin bill 88 to 1. Certainly organized labor went all-out in its effort to defeat the Landrum-Griffin bill. It failed. Does that mean that labor's actual political power is a great deal less than it appeared only a week ago? Or does it mean the public is insistent on a good reform measure? Both elements figured in the House vote, and should make it easier for the Senate to concur.

There is little room for compromise between the Senate and the House bills. The compromises have already been made. The only course for the Senate to follow is to accept the Landrum-Griffin bill.

Mission With Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George W. Healy, the editor of the New

Orleans Times-Picayune, accompanied Vice President Nixon on his recent trip behind the Iron Curtain. He has now completed a very penetrating series of articles about that journey. I commend the series to all the Members of the House and the Senate.

The series is written in an informative and lucid style. The articles are most timely in light of the approaching visit of Mr. Khrushchev.

Mr. Healy is a distinguished journalist and is the recent past president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. During World War II he had an outstanding record as director of all domestic activities of the Office of War Information.

The first of the series follows:

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune, Aug. 9, 1959]

NEW YORK-MOSCOW FLIGHT LIKE NEW ORLEANS-SAN FRANCISCO TRIP—CROSSING SO RAPID IT'S HARD TO BELIEVE

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

Moscow.—What's it like to fly the 4,800-plus miles from New York to Moscow in a record 8 hours 53 minutes?

It feels about like flying from New Orleans to San Francisco—only you don't stop at Dallas, and the plane is almost twice as big and climbs twice as high as the largest airliner now in regular service in Louisiana. It's quieter, too, and the seats are almost as wide as a divan.

This 707-321 intercontinental jet transport carrying its first payload for Pan American World Airways, "raced" an older, smaller 707-121 plane flown by the Military Air Transport Service (U.S., that is) from the Atlantic coast to Moscow.

NIXON OFF FIRST

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON and part of his official party left Friendship Airport, Baltimore, July 22 about 9 p.m. aboard the MATS plane. Those of us assigned to the newer 707-321 took off from Idlewild Airport, New York, about 10:30 p.m.

Less than 9 hours later were were on the ground in Moscow, waiting for the Vice President's plane, which had refueled in Iceland, to come in for a landing. Just ahead of us had been a Russian jet, returning Nikita S. Khrushchev from Poland.

Every plane in the air near Moscow was "stacked" until Khrushchev, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, was on the runway. A commercial jet, coming in from Copenhagen, with William R. Hearst, Jr., and Frank Conniff, the editorial director of Hearst newspapers, among its passengers, was held up an hour to permit the Khrushchev plane and the two Nixon party planes to get on the ground.

CROSSING SEEMS FAST

The Atlantic Ocean, Norway, Sweden, Latvia and a sizable part of Russia are crossed quickly when friends are with you aboard a roomy plane and you can spend about 5 hours in sleep.

So rapid is the crossing that it's hard to believe that it has been accomplished.

Before takeoff Juan Trippe, president of Pan American, and Alfred F. "Mike" Flynn of Pan American entertained at Idlewild's new International Hotel.

When the plane got in the air old friends had held reunions, and strangers had been introduced. Fortunately, many of the 73 official party members and press, television and radio correspondents in the cabin were old friends.

Ruth Montgomery of Hearst headline service and Bob Considine, columnist, talked about Ruth's recent series about Gov. Earl K. Long when I stopped at their seats. West-

brook Pegler reminisced about a "Roman holiday" party given in Washington at the peak of World War II. "Peg" was in the hotel where the party was given, but didn't attend. He wanted to give the party a working over in his column—and did.

Jinx Falkenburg, the model and actress, was aboard in a new role—as correspondent for Newsday, Alicia Patterson's Long Island tabloid. She wondered out loud what the Moscow streets might do to her new shoes.

Demaree Bess of the Saturday Evening Post asked about Charley Nutter of International House, with whom he worked in Russia 20 years ago.

John Charles Daly strolled the aisle—looking for a candidate for "mystery guest."

Most representatives of the press, television and radio who planned to file "spot" copy wondered about how long it would take to pass their stories and pictures through the Iron Curtain. They soon found out: about 8 hours for stories and longer for pictures.

I wondered how much time my duties as a member of the official party and of the President's advisory committee for the U.S. exhibition in Moscow would permit me to write and to file copy. I found that out, too; very little; and when I waited 6 hours for a long-distance telephone call to go through to New Orleans and it never went through, I resolved to file little but write much—for use on return.

The country around Moscow looked just about like the rolling land around Alexandria or Jackson, Miss., as we made a steep bank and sharp turn while coming in for our landing. Farmhouses, though, were in clusters—not widely separated.

From the air the Moskva River, winding through the city, seemed slightly wider than the Red or the Pearl, but not as muddy as either. Its banks are reveted with concrete, like the Works Progress Administration reveted the banks of Bayou St. John.

WELCOME CORDIAL

Our welcoming crowd was neither as large nor as enthusiastic as the one that receives the Zulu King on Mardi Gras. The official hosts, it seemed to me, were formally cordial.

The drive from the airport to the Ukraina Hotel started on a black-topped road like the old Chief Menteur Highway. About every 70 yards was a policeman in a white coat, and in between were groups of Russian men in boots and trousers and jackets resembling army fatigues and women in coveralls.

Occasionally we saw a woman in the field, cutting grass with a scythe.

As we came closer to the city our procession of automobiles moved faster—with pedestrians scurrying to the sidewalks at every intersection. Every principal street in Moscow apparently is as wide or wider than South Clairborne Avenue. None that I've seen has a neutral ground or winky lights. Autos, most of them owned by Intourist, the official travel agency of the Soviet Union, run through red lights faster than through the green.

Russians may work together and play together, but on the streets it's every man for himself.

Wide Honor for Benson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the South Bend Tribune recently had an editorial entitled "Wide Honor for Benson." Be-

cause I think it contains much food for thought, I include it herewith:

WIDE HONOR FOR BENSON

The "prophet without honor in his own land" axiom comes to mind as a set of guiding principles drafted by farm economists representing 25 nations comes into the news. These economists are working under the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization.

When the full membership of the FAO meets later this year, these guiding principles may be presented to it for consideration as farm price policy in the 76-member nations. If so, it will mean that things for which Secretary of Agriculture Benson has been berated in the United States will be recommended for adoption in those 76 nations.

The FAO agricultural economists don't mention Secretary Benson in their declaration of principles. But, obviously, they are impressed by his farm price support reform program.

They advocate price supports below levels that tend to encourage surplus production. That is a Benson objective. They state that price supports should not be based on farm prices and costs in a remote reference period. Secretary Benson recommends abandonment of the 1910-14 "reference period" in the U.S. support system.

In some other respects also the FAO economists rule out things that Secretary Benson has refused to endorse.

Of course, our Secretary of Agriculture isn't entirely without honor at home. But where propaganda and practical politics are concerned, he has been given the worst of it for a long time.

It is highly significant that international endorsement of his farm price support principles is developing.

Courage and Heroism of Dr. Thomas A. Dooley, M.D., Medical Missionary in the Jungles of Laos and Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I have spoken before in the Senate of the humanitarian dedication of Dr. Thomas A. Dooley, the American doctor who has devoted his career to caring for natives in the jungles of Laos and Vietnam. I have written in magazines of Dr. Dooley's courage, skill, and tender care. And I have said that this man is the type of ambassador whom our country needs—indeed, whom humanity needs.

Dr. Thomas A. Dooley also emphasizes the wisdom of the proposal by a number of us in the Senate, and by the editors of Life magazine, to send a Great White Fleet of hospital ships across the seven seas bearing American doctors, nurses, and medicines. If one man in the steaming jungles can accomplish what Dr. Dooley has accomplished, then think of the horizons of mercy and healing open to an entire flotilla of Dr. Thomas A. Dooleys.

But now Dr. Thomas A. Dooley, age 32, has cancer, and he has returned to

the United States for care—this time not for others, but for himself. His illness, and his typically heroic reaction to it, are described by his personal friend, Dr. Howard A. Rusk, in the New York Times for August 23, 1959. It is a moving tale of sacrifice, valor, and dedication. Everyone reading it will want to help at once Medico, a division of the International Rescue Committee, which helps to send doctors like Thomas A. Dooley, M.D., on their missions of mercy and kindness.

As a person who has suffered from cancer himself, I have special sympathy with Dr. Thomas A. Dooley. As a person whose own doctors are very encouraging with respect to his recovery, I feel confident and hopeful the same recovery will await this dedicated man, Dr. Dooley, who is needed so urgently by the backward and underprivileged races of mankind. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article by Dr. Howard A. Rusk, from the New York Times, entitled "Dr. Dooley's New Fight," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. DOOLEY'S NEW FIGHT—PHYSICIAN RELUCTANTLY LEAVES JUNGLE HOSPITAL TO BECOME A CANCER PATIENT

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

Late last Thursday, one of America's leading unofficial ambassadors, Dr. Thomas Dooley arrived in New York from his jungle hospital in Muong-Sing, Laos, 5 miles from the border of Communist China. At a hurriedly called press conference, the razor-thin (he has lost 28 pounds), driving and dynamic Dr. Dooley calmly announced that he had been ordered back from his post to start the toughest fight of his life. He had cancer.

Three months ago, while on a mission into the interior and while traversing almost inaccessible footpaths, Tom Dooley fell and injured the right side of his chest. The soreness persisted, but he was too busy to pay much attention to a "minor ailment" when there were so many people to treat and so many births to be attended to.

Two weeks ago he noticed a small growth on the chest wall; it had been the size of a pea and now was the size of a walnut. When a visiting surgeon happened by, Dr. Dooley asked him to remove it and take it to the nearest laboratory in Bangkok, Thailand, for examination. It proved to be malignant, but Dr. Dooley would not leave his post.

The Peiping and Hanoi radios had been calling daily for the natives of the villages he served to kill "this American spy." The American Ambassador in Laos had urged him to leave because he was in great danger. Dr. Dooley refused, for he did not want to leave "his people," nor let the Communists feel that they had driven him to cover.

CONFIDENCE IN AIDS

His greatest anxiety now is not the impending surgery nor the pain, but the time it takes and the fear that his patients will feel he has deserted them. He is confident, however, that his 2 assistants, Dwight Davis and Earl Rhine, 2 young premedical students from Austin, Tex., and 23 Lao students and the 5 Lao-trained nurses can carry all the services except major surgery.

Dr. Dooley, who is 32 years old, was a Navy physician in Indochina in 1954 after the fall of Dienbienphu, when Vietnam was partitioned into the Communist north

and the free south. Dr. Dooley's mission was to render medical aid to thousands of Vietnamese who chose to abandon their homes in the north and find freedom in the south. After his discharge from the Navy, he spent almost 2 years in Laos, where in 1956 he established his first hospital at Namtha, under the auspices of Medico.

Medico, a division of the International Rescue Committee, 255 Fourth Avenue, N.Y., is a nonprofit, nonsectarian voluntary organization, set up to facilitate scientific communication and to provide health services throughout the underprivileged parts of the world.

Today, Dr. Dooley feels greatly heartened by the change in this primitive jungle area during the past 3 years. More than 14,000 refugees from North China have come across the border, some seeking and obtaining help at his medical outpost, the only one in that part of the world.

The natives who 3 years ago knew nothing of communism have learned from these refugees, and from information sent out by the Laotian Government, what Communist aggression really means. They learned what has happened in the communes, and they know too that for the last 3 months no refugees have got across the border.

Dr. Dooley, who speaks the native language, points out with great pride that his is not a government operation nor an American operation; it is a partnership. The Government of Laos pays all the internal expenses: food, gasoline, coal, oil; the salaries of physicians, students, nurses; and provides whatever medicine it can. The rest comes from contributions from the American people, who have learned that there is no better tool to promote international understanding than help to the sick and the crippled.

Last year this one American doctor and his staff treated more than 36,000 patients at a total cost of \$35,000, less than \$1 a year for each patient. Drugs, supplies and surgical instruments were provided by generous American manufacturers. When the Dooley team moves to establish drugs and supplies are left, and natives carry on the services they have been trained to give.

OTHER MEDICO PROJECTS

Dr. Dooley's mission in Laos is only one of a number of Medico projects. More than \$500,000 worth of drugs was shipped by Medico to Dr. Albert Schweitzer's hospital in French Equatorial Africa, Dr. Addus Samad's hospital in Karachi, Pakistan, Dr. Gordon Seagrave's hospital in Nankham, Burma, and to Dr. Theodore Binder's hospital in Peru.

Last December, a team of six specialists from the John Hopkins Medical School spent 6 weeks on a teaching mission in Jordan. Working with Jordanian physicians, they diagnosed and treated more than 12,000 patients, leaving behind them not only healing, but understanding.

Medico is Tom Dooley's creation, now and for time immemorial. His own fight against cancer he considers just a skirmish, when the tools of health and healing can combat the international cancer of communism.

His work and his fight against disease and communism must continue. Industry must help; labor must help; the average citizen must help. Congress could help by passing the health for peace bill this session, to establish a new Institute for International Research.

Possibly new clues that would help Dr. Dooley win his fight against cancer might be found in the farflung laboratories of the world, which for lack of funds have not been able to develop their new ideas or new discoveries. But time is of the essence; next session, next year may be too late.

Much that is irresponsible has been said and written about so-called ugly Americans.

Many splendid Americans are daily preventing disease and death, relieving pain and assisting others in the struggle for freedom and a better life. Tom Dooley is truly the splendid American.

Air Landing Rights: New Facts of International Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JARMAN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a very timely article which appeared in the August 17 edition of *Time*, relative to the current competitive problems being experienced by U.S.-flag international airlines.

The article follows:

AIR LANDING RIGHTS: NEW FACTS OF INTERNATIONAL COMPETITION

As U.S. international airlines enter the jet age the United States is junking a belief as outdated as its piston planes. The belief was that U.S. flag carriers could hold their lead over a growing flock of aggressive foreign competitors without a drastic change in U.S. air policy. Last week the U.S. airlines got a new warning of the onward march of foreign competition. From the State Department came an announcement that Air France will get an additional U.S. gateway at Baltimore and a polar route to the U.S. west coast. BOAC will get the right to land at Tokyo on its San Francisco-Hong Kong run, which is expected to take \$7,800,000 yearly away from U.S. lines. A CAB examiner recommended that Air India be authorized to fly into the United States.

But the biggest threat is Russia's Aeroflot, the world's largest commercial airline. Its 1,600 planes fly 350,000 route-miles, serve 500 airports from Kamchatka to London. Airmen expect that one of the points of discussion between President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev will be yet another jump for Aeroflot—the right to carry passengers to and from the United States.

If Aeroflot gets rights into New York, Pan American World Airways will fly into Moscow. But the exchange does not tell the whole story. Aeroflot, which now matches International Air Transport Association rates (though it does not belong to IATA), is expected to behave for a while. But airlines fear that, as a totally subsidized State airline, it will eventually cut fares to aid Russia's economic offensive.

Despite last week's OK on new competition, U.S. lines found some cheer in the decisions. They showed a real change in U.S. policy to conform to the new competitive facts. What made the decisions different was not so much what the United States granted—BOAC, Air France, and Air India were entitled to the routes under reciprocal exchanges—as the manner of giving. France had formally denounced its bilateral air route agreement with the United States 13 months ago, insisted on getting "double trackage" rights, i.e., the right to serve any U.S. city where a U.S. carrier originates a flight for France. The State Department flatly refused.

CAB and the State Department have not always been so alert to protect the interests of U.S.-flag lines. When Great Britain and

the United States laid down the basic post-war air route pattern in Bermuda in 1946, the United States was the only nation equipped with planes to operate long-distance service. It campaigned for a free competition agreement, but the plane-short British forced a compromise that provided for an equitable exchange of traffic between nations signing a bilateral pact. Since then the United States has often ignored breaches by foreign airlines, drawn criticism from U.S. carriers for giving out fat new routes without getting much in return.

Now the State Department and the President, who has the final say about what international routes the United States gives out, are ending the giveaway period in favor of more horse trading and stricter rule watching. The new trend was forced by the awareness that U.S.-flag lines could follow the downward path of the U.S. maritime industry. Though 70 percent of all air passengers between the United States and foreign countries are U.S. citizens, the share of traffic carried by U.S. carriers has fallen from 75 percent in 1949 to 60 percent today. In the first quarter this year, BOAC nudged out Trans World Airlines as the second biggest transatlantic carrier (No. 1: Pan American), the first time a foreign-flag line has flown ahead of a U.S. line.

Foreign carriers have rushed into the United States in such numbers that 40 now draw from the U.S. market versus 22 in 1949. Most of them get far more than U.S. carriers out of the bargain, often add extra flights to siphon off as many passengers as possible in violation of the spirit of the Bermuda agreement. In return for permitting Pan American to serve Amsterdam, KLM flies into New York and Houston. Result: last year KLM collected \$29.4 million on 86,225 U.S. passengers, while Pan Am got only \$1,700,000 from 2,842 Dutch passengers. While cutting into U.S. markets, foreign carriers are strengthening themselves against inroads into their home territory; e.g., European carriers got IATA to place a special tariff on transatlantic jet flights because they do not have jets to compete with the Boeing 707.

As the only private, nonsubsidized air fleet in the world, U.S. carriers must find a better way to face competition if the United States is to keep its place as a powerful air nation. The most obvious solution would be Government subsidy, but most airlines themselves admit that this is a last resort. What they want is for the United States to show a tougher stand in route bargaining and in enforcing current agreements. In the next 5 years the jets will force a revamping of virtually all of the 54 bilateral agreements between the United States and other nations. Unless the United States trades much more shrewdly with foreign airlines, U.S.-flag carriers may not be able to compete in the jet age.

How Crime Rings Seek To Exploit and Widen the Already Perilous Traffic in Obscenity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a most significant interview with Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield appeared in the *New York Times* for August 23, 1959, regarding what he de-

scribes as the effort of organized crime rings to dominate a multi-million-dollar mail-order traffic in sordid and obscene materials.

I think I am as broadminded as any body about censorship. I abhor dictation and control of what people should read and see. But, Mr. President, literature is one thing and outright obscenity and pornography is quite another thing.

With some of my colleagues on the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I recently accepted the invitation of the Postmaster General to observe some of the materials which he and his subordinates have taken from the mails. I can only describe the exhibits as sickening. They were not art, they were not literature. They were disgusting attempts to pander to such degrading impulses as masochism, sadism and to virtually every form of perversion. One only can image the impact of these fiendish materials on the minds and habits of children, and it is toward young people that many of such obscenities are directed and sold, according to the information we received from Mr. Summerfield.

Because the Postmaster General has emphasized that crime rings are seeking to exploit this dangerous distortion of youthful minds, I believe the Senate and House should be alerted to his warnings. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article from the *New York Times* of August 23, entitled "Mobsters Linked to Smut Traffic," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the *New York Times*, Aug. 23, 1959]
MOBSTERS LINKED TO SMUT TRAFFIC—LUCRATIVE MAIL-ORDER TRADE IN FILTH LURES RACKETEERS, SUMMERFIELD WARNS

WASHINGTON, August 22.—Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield says organized crime rings appear to be moving into the multimillion-dollar, mail-order traffic in obscenity.

In an interview Mr. Summerfield said the chief postal inspector had evidence indicating the mobsters were trying to get a share of what already is a \$500 million-a-year racket.

Mr. Summerfield started a nation-wide drive against the racket last May 5. L. Robe Walter, a special assistant to the Postmaster General, said the department estimated that 1,500,000 children in the United States would become victims of the filth distributors.

The text of the interview with the Postmaster General follows in part:

Question: "Mr. Summerfield, you have said commercialized pornography has doubled in the past 5 years. How do you account for this expansion in the business?"

Answer: "Many factors have caused this increase. First, there is the lure of fantastic profits—which run into very high percentages—attracting more and more promoters into this filthy business. We should remember, too, that until recently promoters were, in many cases, given only light sentences by taking refuge behind legal technicalities in certain large cities."

TECHNIQUES IMPROVED

Other significant reasons include technical developments in photographic and printing equipment in recent years. More material can be turned out in less time, at less cost and in less space. Today, for instance, a small dwelling, or even a basement can

house modern machinery that turns out a sizable quantity of obscene material.

Question: "Is there any evidence bigtime, organized crime is getting into the business?"

Answer: "Yes. Our chief postal inspector, David H. Stephens, has reason to believe organized crime has entered the mail-orders obscenity business."

"Not long ago, in New York City, a multi-million dollar mail-order business in obscene and pornographic films, slides, pictures, and circulars suffered a devastating blow with raids in which our inspectors played a prominent role."

"Three of the East Coast's largest dealers were involved and more than 17 tons of pornographic material were seized in one dealer's place of business."

ADS FROM ABROAD

Question: "There have been reports of ads for mail-order pornography from sellers abroad. How can these overseas merchants be controlled?"

Answer: "There is a substantial amount of mail from overseas soliciting the sale of pornographic or obscene material."

"When this department discovers that a foreign operator is advertising the sale of obscene material by mail to this country, resulting in a formal com-issued."

"This order is sent to our postmasters at ports of entry which handle the mail from the particular foreign country from which the foreign operator conducts his business."

"Under this order the postmasters return all mail addressed to U.S. residents by the foreign pornographers, marking it unlawful."

Question: "Last year Congress authorized the Post Office to prosecute those in the business of mail-order pornography in the communities where the material is received, as well as at the points of mailing. How has this new power been used? Is it making a dent on the racket?"

Answer: "The new authority, giving the power to prosecute in home communities all over America where the damage is actually done—rather than in a few big cities where pornography operators have become entrenched behind legal technicalities—is the most effective weapon yet devised against the mail-order obscenity business."

"However, the new law is important in another respect. Not only does it make more prosecutions possible, but sentences are stiffened."

Soviet Bosses Tolerate but Discourage Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the second in a series of articles written by George W. Healy, editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, and who accompanied Vice President Nixon on his recent trip to the Soviet Union:

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune, Aug. 10, 1959]

SOVIET BOSSES TOLERATE BUT DISCOURAGE RELIGION—OLD FOLK GO TO CHURCH, HAVE NO JOBS TO LOSE

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

Moscow.—The Soviet regime tolerates religious activity and at the same time discourages it.

Officially, in Russia, no good stems from any source but the Communist Party. The party doctrine is that there is no God.

Intourist, the official and only travel agency of Russia, employs many young men and women as interpreters and guides. They are trained carefully to see that visitors hear and see what the Government responsible for Intourist wants them to hear and see.

Twice while I was riding in an Intourist automobile, with an Intourist guide, we passed churches. On both occasions I asked the guides if they attended church. Each answered, "I do not believe in God."

NONBELIEVERS

When I asked one of these guides if her mother and father believed in God she replied, "No, my mother and father are Communists."

The first Sunday we were in Moscow members of our party volunteered to report to me what they heard and saw in the churches where they worshiped.

Ernest Barcella of United Press International attended Roman Catholic services in St. Louis Church.

"I was never so depressed in my life," he said when he returned to the hotel. "The congregation was very small and consisted almost entirely of very old women and a few old men. I saw no young people at all. Even the priests were old."

Another Roman Catholic service in a residence was attended by several members of our group. There, Bob Considine, the Hearst columnist, told me, the priest was younger and some young people were at mass.

Ray Scherer, NBC news commentator, went to a Russian Orthodox church. His report was like that of Ernest Barcella—there were no young people in the church, only old ones.

BAPTISTS CROWDED

The brightest picture was painted by Ralph McGill, editor of the Atlanta Constitution, who went to a Baptist service. The church was crowded, he said, with young and old people. The music, according to Ralph, was magnificent.

When I talked with old Russian hands about this I got three explanations.

One said the Baptist service was well attended because the Soviet hierarchy hasn't "lowered the boom" on that denomination.

Another said the Baptist attendance has picked up since Billy Graham's recent visit.

The third gave what seemed to me a logical explanation. When the last of the czars, Nicholas II, through the official church, appealed to the people to stop the revolution, he got no response. "The excesses of the czars, of which there is ample evidence in Moscow museums, had alienated the people beyond redemption, and when the official church tried to stop them from overthrowing Nicholas, they rebelled against both czar and church."

ATHEIST MUSEUM

A museum in which exhibits which advocate atheism are displayed is recommended to tourists by the official Intourist guides. I didn't see it.

I'm sure that it's there, because I had the opportunity to talk with young people of Russia.

When we were in the air between Moscow and Sverdlovsk one of our party looked at his watch and remarked, "God being willing, we'll be on time today."

A young Aeroflot hostess, overhearing him, said, "God has nothing to do with it. If the weather permits we'll be on time."

Because I wanted to confirm what Ernest Barcella and Ralph McGill had told me, I spent the early part of our second Sunday in Moscow in shabby, rundown churches.

Without benefit of Intourist guide, I got a taxi driver to take me to the Baptist church. In front of the church was a Russian in his

late twenties who approached me and said in English, "Welcome to our church. We are glad to have you."

EVERY PEW FILLED

I had been told at the hotel that the first service at the Baptist church was at 8 a.m. The young Russian who met me, explaining that he spoke English because he had studied in a seminary in England, told me that the first service would not start until 9 a.m. but that I was welcome to join the crowd in the church.

It was then 7:40 a.m., but I went with my escort—the young seminarian—to the balcony of the church. When he took me to a vacant pew I was amazed to find that the church was crowded—every pew filled, except the single one to which I was taken. A throng was in the center aisle.

"When did these people start coming into church?" I asked.

"The church was filled at 7 a.m. It is communion day, but we have seats for guests," he said. "You will sit where Billy Graham sat when he came to our church."

I explained that I could not remain for the 9 a.m. service but that I would like to sit for a few minutes to observe the congregation. Most of its members were old women—handkerchiefs on their heads. The seminarian was the only young person I saw.

Leaving the church, I asked him to explain to my taxi driver that I wanted to go to the St. Louis Roman Catholic Church.

NO ALTAR BOYS

The scene at the Catholic church, as Ernie had reported, was depressing. The priest was old, and there were no altar boys. I had to leave before the Mass ended, to attend Mr. Nixon's final conference in Russia. Ernie told me that old men performed the services of acolytes.

Bob Considine, who is a Knight of Malta, told me that young people want to go to St. Louis—but if they go they or their parents are forced out of whatever jobs they may hold.

The old people can't work. They can afford to go to church.

Defense Education in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, exactly 1 year ago yesterday, on August 23, 1958, the House approved the conference report and sent to the President, H.R. 13247, which was signed into law on September 2, 1958, and became the National Defense Act of 1958. Mr. Speaker, this program could well be one of the most significant achievements of the 85th Congress, or for that matter of any Congress in recent years, for it strengthens one of the greatest and most important lines of defense we have in this era of the cold war and this age of spectacular and fast-moving developments in science.

With the launching of the first Russian sputnik, this country and the rest of the free world were shocked into the bitter realization that in some of the most urgently important phases of education and science, the Soviet Union had

not only reached our level but had surpassed us.

This rude awakening, unpleasant as it was, brought forcibly home to us that our freedom and our very survival were at stake. Accordingly, we immediately undertook a crash program, stepping up by a tremendous degree our then-existing activities in the field of guided missiles, and in the field of space and astronautics.

Mr. Speaker, while I recognize fully the vitally urgent need for stepping up our actual programs in national defense and believe they should be increased, I also should like to point to the fact that such programs as undertaken under the National Defense Act of 1958 strike at something basic and fundamental to our future, and is perhaps as important in the long run as the present defense program itself. This is true because this act looks to the long-range future, and is helping to prepare our youth and our schools to provide us with the brains, the technical knowledge, and the ability to cope with the scientific problems of the future. Mr. Speaker, the program under the National Defense Act is now underway, and it needs to be strengthened even more, but it is starting out to do a wonderful and most critical job and needs and deserves all the support that we can give.

As an example of how this program works, and of how it is being received across the Nation, I should like to point to an article appearing in the Bartlesville (Okla.) Examiner-Enterprise for Thursday, August 20, 1959. This article, which was written by Harry Culver of United Press International at Oklahoma City, describes the impact on the State of Oklahoma of the first 6 months during which the National Defense Act program got underway. I commend this article as excellent reading for every American who is interested in the workings of one of the finest programs established in recent years as a result of legislation passed by the Congress. Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert this article in the RECORD at this point:

DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT IMPROVES STATE SCHOOLS

(By Harry Culver)

OKLAHOMA CITY.—The National Defense Education Act got off to a million-dollar launching its first 6 months in Oklahoma, the State department of education reported today.

Under the act, which didn't get into operation until early this year, 340 school districts in 75 counties have already started improvement programs, principally in the field of science.

"It has really given science training a real shot in the arm," said Dr. Oliver Hodge, State superintendent of public instruction.

POINTS UP RESULTS

While the full effect will take years to measure, Earl Cross, administrator of the program for Oklahoma, pointed to these concrete results already appearing:

Many small and middle-sized schools have added physics, chemistry, and foreign languages to their curriculums.

Four to six schools are expected to teach Russian this coming year.

A spot check of 26 schools showed a 1,300-percent increase in the amount spent for laboratory equipment.

FUNDS MATCHED

Cross said he has been amazed and gratified by the response and results, which have been financed by only a handful of dollars in relation to the millions spent on common school education in Oklahoma.

Under the act, Oklahoma is expected to receive \$844,000 per year for 4 years to buy equipment and facilities for improvement in science, mathematics, and foreign languages.

This amount must be matched dollar for dollar by the local school district.

The first Federal grant to an Oklahoma school was authorized March 9, 1959. Between then and June 30, \$532,000 in Federal cash was approved for schools in every county of the State except Cimarron and Jefferson. Matched locally, this provided for a \$1,062,000 program.

STRESSES MATH, LANGUAGE

Hodge said the \$312,000 left over can be added to the current fiscal year's fund. This will make possible a \$2.3 million program for the 1959-60 school year.

Cross said science projects received priority the first year. The coming year, equal emphasis will be given to mathematics and foreign languages.

"The science laboratories in most Oklahoma high schools were in a deplorable condition," Cross said. "Moreover, the elementary science curriculum had amounted to little more than reading text materials."

He said most schools were so poorly equipped that first year expenditures went for very basic equipment, and for remodeling that included such items as running water, electricity and gas for laboratories.

"SEVEN UP" CONGRESS

In the mathematics field, purchases have included TV sets, films, slide rules, measuring instruments and geometric figures to "liven up" courses.

On the language front, money has gone for tape recorders, disk records, reference reading material and film. The step-up in this program is shown by approvals for 1959-60 for a \$30,000 project at Enid and a \$75,000 project at Midwest City.

While this fiscal year has barely started, 114 schools have already applied for \$217,000 in Federal money for the coming term.

Hodge said Oklahoma is far ahead of most States in starting the program because the administrative machinery was set up in the Sooner State even before the Federal money became available.

WIDE SPENDING PROMPTED

He said the act has provided a terrific incentive to improve training. And Cross pointed out the local dollar-for-dollar matching requirement encourages a school to spend its money wisely.

Cross said a random check of 25 schools showed they spent \$1.24 per pupil for laboratories in 1957-58 and \$16.54 in 1958-59.

Ardmore boosted its expenditure from \$1,081 to \$28,000, Bethany from \$135 to \$3,044, Clinton from \$576 to \$6,234, Duncan from \$813 to \$19,030, Vinita from \$350 to \$5,024, Beggs from \$44 to \$1,000, Lawton from \$710 to \$22,882, Elk City from \$250 to \$6,430.

A separate phase of the act sets up \$72,000 per year in Federal funds for testing and guidance. Sixty-seven districts in 42 counties received \$60,000 in Federal funds under this program up to June 30.

"Obviously," Cross said, "conditions more conducive to learning will soon prevail in most Oklahoma public schools."

Itinerary of Annual Official Tour of the Fourth District of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, with the adjournment of the 1st session of the 86th Congress, I am preparing for my annual official tour of the Fourth District of Indiana, to meet with the constituents I am privileged to represent.

This year I am planning to visit a number of the post offices in the district and will be available for conference and interviews at each of these places. I believe this will be convenient for persons who desire to discuss legislative or governmental matters with me.

These official tours of the district are always most helpful. They afford a firsthand opportunity of obtaining views of constituents on the most important legislative issues of the day and at the same time of furthering the understanding between the people and their Representative in Congress.

Upon the completion of the tour, I will then have my district office—room 925, Lincoln Tower, Fort Wayne—open to carry on my official duties while I am home between sessions of the Congress. Meanwhile, my office here—room 1511, House Office Building—will be open as usual for the conduct of official business.

I cordially invite my friends and constituents to call upon me for whatever service or assistance I can render with respect to their problems relative to legislative or governmental matters, either while I am on the tour or in my office.

The itinerary of my official tour is as follows:

October 14, 9:30 a.m.: Post office, Ossian.

October 14, 11 a.m.: Post office, Bluffton.

October 14, 2 p.m.: Post office, Decatur.

October 14, 4 p.m.: Post office, Berne.

October 15, 10 a.m.: Post office, Garrett.

October 15, 11:30 a.m.: Post office, Auburn.

October 15, 2:30 p.m.: Post office, Butler.

October 15, 4:30 p.m.: Post office, Waterloo.

October 16, 9:30 a.m.: Post office, Columbia City.

October 16, 1:30 p.m.: Post office, South Whitley.

October 16, 4 p.m.: Post office, Chubbuck.

October 20, 10 a.m.: Post office, Angola.

October 20, 1:30 p.m.: Post office, Fremont.

October 20, 4 p.m.: Post office, LaGrange.

October 21, 10 a.m.: Post office, Albion.

October 21, 1:30 p.m.: Post office, Kendallville.

October 21, 4 p.m.: Post office, Ligonier.

A Bill To Make Civil Service Retirement Available to ASC Employees on a Voluntary Basis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN V. CARTER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill in the House of Representatives which proposes to extend to the employees of the agricultural stabilization and conservation committees the opportunity to come within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act. I am joined in the introduction of this bill by the other Democratic Members of the House from Iowa, the Honorable MERWIN COAD, NEAL SMITH, and LEONARD WOLF.

All of us have, in recent weeks, received considerable mail from ASC people in our congressional districts of Iowa in which they have protested a ruling by the Iowa State ASC Committee making retirement mandatory at age 65. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the retirement age under civil service is specified at 70 years of age.

It seems to me somewhat shortsighted to force these men into retirement at age 65 when they have accumulated such a wealth of experience and when they still have several years of valuable service they could render to the program. Furthermore, such a mandatory ruling fails to take into account a man's individual capabilities and makes chronological age the only criterion of his value and effectiveness in his profession.

I want to emphasize that this bill would not force people to come under civil service retirement who do not desire to do so. This is intended to be purely a voluntary matter. The proposed piece of legislation is designed simply to empower the Secretary of Agriculture to prescribe and issue such regulations as may be necessary to make civil service retirement available to the persons desiring to take advantage of it.

I wish to point out that the Department of Agriculture has no policy which will prohibit a man in the ASC service from working until the age of 70 years.

I should add that my understanding of this matter is that the State committees are presently authorized to request and obtain an employee's resignation for reasons of unfitness or inability to perform his duties. Therefore, such a bill as I have proposed here would not preempt any prerogatives that the State committees now have in the area of personnel management. The purpose of the bill is simply to establish certainty as to retirement from ASC service where such certainty does not now exist. Judging from my mail, the ruling by the Iowa State Committee has had an unsettling effect on the morale of ASC employees, and it is simply my wish to restore that morale and at the same time make it possible to utilize the profes-

sional capabilities of ASC employees to the fullest extent.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 8774

A bill to bring employees of the agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act, employees of the agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees shall be held and considered to be employees of the Government of the United States.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to prescribe and issue such regulations as may be necessary to provide a means of effecting the application and operation of the provisions of such Act with respect to such employees.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, annuity benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act resulting from the operation of the first section of this Act shall be paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund.

The Trouble With Steel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an excellent editorial from the Oregonian on the steel strike. I commend it to all Members to be read by them:

[From the Oregonian, Aug. 21, 1959]

THE TROUBLE WITH STEEL

Steel management and the Steelworkers Union are alike in claiming that Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell's factual report on the strike favors their case. A careful reading of this document, however, will cause the American public to cry out, in the words of Shakespeare's Mercutio, when mortally wounded, "A plague o' both your houses."

Beginning in World War II, with the big steel formula, and continuing thereafter—sometimes with the help of big Government, sometimes by union-management negotiation, sometimes after strikes—management and union have jacked up wages and profits until these are out of line with industry generally.

One consequence has been to open the doors to importation of Japanese, British, and German steel, to destroy the competitive position of American steel in foreign markets, and to encourage the displacement of steel by aluminum alloys, plastics, and other products now on their way to giving the steel industry real competition in automobiles, appliances, and other goods.

Steel management did not show much outward concern with halting inflation before it took its stand before this strike. Our belief is that steel is much more concerned now with the future of the industry, from the standpoint of competition, than it is about inflationary wage and price increases. But the union leadership refuses to heed the warnings, although steel hourly and monthly earnings are the bellwether of industry.

A notable section of the report shows that although there has been only a slight rise in the number of production workers in steel, there has been a substantial increase (50 percent, or 34,000, in the first half of 1959) of research, administrative, professional, and clerical workers in steel. This anticipates improvements in technology and output per man-hour, which are essential if steel is to maintain its economic importance.

Steel imports now exceed steel exports, for the first time. The Japanese, particularly, have drastically lowered their prices. The British steel industry made a 2 percent reduction. Other steel countries are working toward an invasion of the American market. Aluminum and plastics are moving ahead.

The best thing that could happen to the steel industry would be a wage and price freeze, as previously pointed out on this page. Instead of encouraging the adamant union, the Mitchell report should give the membership a clear view of the hazards ahead, even though high steel profits are evident this year. The steel strike should be settled quickly on the basis of minimum changes, if any. Whether it likes it or not, basic steel may be forced to reduce prices to hold its position in the marketplace.

Bridging the Wide Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. QUENTIN BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following resolution adopted by the Kulm Lions Club of Kulm, N. Dak., pointing out the necessity of a bridge across the Missouri River:

"Whereas public interest has been directed to the necessity of a bridge across the Missouri River somewhere between Mobridge, S. Dak., and Bismarck, N. Dak.; and

"Whereas two bridges across the Missouri in South Dakota have been declared surplus since they had to be replaced by longer bridges because of Oahe Reservoir, and that these bridges have been suggested for relocation upstream from Mobridge, S. Dak.; and

"Whereas the distance between Mobridge, S. Dak., and Bismarck, N. Dak., is approximately 140 road miles, and that a point on the Missouri in Emmons County west of the city of Linton would be approximately half way between Mobridge and Bismarck, and that the stretch between these two cities is the longest stretch on the Missouri River without a bridge in either North or South Dakota, and that a public free bridge between these two points would be for the benefit and convenience of the public: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Kulm Lions Club, representing the merchants and professional men of the city of Kulm, N. Dak., That we go on record urging and requesting the Federal Government in cooperation with the State of North Dakota, to construct a bridge across the Missouri River at some point in Emmons County west of Linton, N. Dak.; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the State highway commissioner, U.S. Representatives DON L. SHORT and QUENTIN BURDICK and U.S. Senators MILTON R. YOUNG and WILLIAM LANGER."

The foregoing resolution was adopted at the regular monthly meeting of the Kulm Lions Club, held on August 18, 1959.

HAROLD LUCK,
President.
GOTTLIEB SCHOCK,
Secretary.

Russians Grim Generally, Enjoy Fun at Right Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the third in series of articles written by George W. Healy, editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, who accompanied Vice President Nixon on his recent trip to the Soviet Union: RUSSIANS GRIM GENERALLY, ENJOY FUN AT RIGHT TIME—PROVE CORDIAL WHEN OCCASION OPPORTUNE

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

Moscow.—Life in the capital of Russia is neither all drab nor all gay.

The report that Russians seldom smile is fiction. They are grim at work and on the streets, generally, but at the right times and in the right spots they have their fun. Some American tourists in Russia seldom smile.

Tourists now traveling from the United States to Russia must move under the auspices of Intourist, the official and only Soviet travel agency. Guides employed by the agency serve as companions and interpreters for the tourists. Theoretically, payment, in advance, to Intourist of a fee of 300 rubles per day entitles the tourist to room, food, Intourist guide services, and 3 hours' use of an automobile per day.

I saw some tourists who had been in Moscow 2 weeks without obtaining use of an Intourist automobile. They got the guide service all right, but had to hire taxis because when they asked for Intourist cars they were told that all had been engaged in advance.

When 11 other newspapermen and I made our first trip to the Kremlin, where Vice President Nixon was making his first official calls, we were accompanied by an Intourist agent. While we were waiting at the Russian equivalent of the White House, within the Kremlin walls, I suggested that I'd leave the group—and the guide—and take a walk through the central area of Moscow on my own.

UNGUIDED STROLL

Ray Scherer, the television and newsmen, advised against it. Without an interpreter, he said, I might have difficulty.

I walked alone across Red Square and past the Moscow Hotel. Between the Moscow Hotel and the Nacional Hotel I met Bill Hearst, the publisher, who was making his third visit to Moscow. He also was out for a stroll without Intourist guidance.

Using his directions, I had little difficulty finding several shops and making my way to the Hotel Ukraina, where our party was quartered. Incidentally, this hotel looks like the Singer building.

On the walk through downtown Moscow I received no smile from a Russian. The women who were walking, most of them on the heavy side, all had big bags in which they seemed to be carrying results of shopping and a week's wash. Without exception, they were in a hurry—staring straight ahead

and walking fast. There were few men on the streets at the time, shortly before noon.

I then got the impression that Russians don't like to smile. It was a wrong impression, for a few afternoons later when Arnold O. Beckman, the California instruments manufacturer, and I went to the Russian agricultural and industrial exhibition—an elaborate permanent installation—every Russian we saw seemed to be having a good time. They paid little attention to us unless we bumped in a crowd. Then they were cordial.

After we caught up with the Vice President, who had gone to the exhibition from the embassy, we saw a real demonstration of cordiality. Walking with the Vice President through the exhibition grounds was like crossing Canal at Royal at noon on Mardi Gras. He wasn't exactly mobbed, but he was close pressed by hundreds of Russians who smiled and waved at him.

Russians can be and are gay when the occasion is appropriate.

Russians like night life too, in addition to the ballet; and an incident in the night club of Praga restaurant, very much like scores of night clubs in the United States, created something of a sensation.

The time we visited this night club was our first evening in Moscow. The band was alternating between American music, with plenty of Dixieland and Strauss waltzes.

There were two parties of Americans in the restaurant, Tom Deegan, the New York railroad and public relations man, was host to one party. Tom should be remembered in New Orleans as the man who brought the Duke and Duchess of Windsor on Mardi Gras, 1950. Merle Oberon, the motion picture actress, and her husband were hosts at the other American table.

All others in the night club, which is sizable, were Russians.

ATMOSPHERE CHANGES

Russians danced with Russians and remained with Russians and Americans danced with Americans until Mrs. Robert H. Montgomery, who writes as Ruth Montgomery, and I did a Charleston. Russians stopped dancing to stare—and then started to try to do the old dance themselves.

A young Russian, well dressed, without tie, came to our table and asked Mrs. Montgomery to show him the step. She did, and thereafter Russians and Americans got "buddy buddy."

Richard Davies, an escort for the vice president's party, told me that an incident of this kind would have been unheard of 5 years ago. Dick Davies lived in Moscow from 1951 to 1953, when, he said, Russians did not speak to Americans in public places.

The first two things about Russia that seemed unusual were these: at this season there's little darkness, and men don't step aside to let women enter elevators or buses.

In July and August it is light enough to play baseball, without artificial illumination until 10 p.m. and it's light again at 3 a.m. I didn't stay up until 3 a.m., but know that it's light at that hour because I didn't pull the curtains on my hotel window the first night in Moscow.

Bootstrap for Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD two very fine edi-

torials on my program, "Operation Bootstrap, reservation style."

Following is the editorial from the Arizona Republic, Phoenix, Ariz.:

[From the Arizona Republic, Aug. 17, 1959]

BOOTSTRAP FOR INDIANS

Puerto Rico, once "the poorhouse of the Caribbean," now boasts the second-highest standard of living in Latin America. It ranks in sixth place as a customer of American goods. Since 1940, the annual per capita income of the islanders has increased fourfold and life expectancy has jumped nearly 20 years.

This miracle of economic growth is attributed to Operation Bootstrap, a far-reaching plan started in 1946 to industrialize the Puerto Rican economy and diversify its single agricultural crop of sugar. The heart of Operation Bootstrap is long-term tax exemptions to new industries and long-term leases of plants to industries that will move to Puerto Rico.

Representative E. Y. BERRY, a Republican Congressman from South Dakota, visited Puerto Rico last year and examined the results of Operation Bootstrap. He was so impressed that he now wants to apply the same sort of program to American Indian reservations, which are certainly among the most depressed areas in the United States.

Mr. BERRY represents 30,000 Indians living on four Sioux reservations in South Dakota, but his plan would extend to reservation Indians everywhere, including Arizona. It would give industries moving onto Indian reservations complete exemption from Federal, State, and local taxes for 10 years.

Representative BERRY points out that the U.S. Government now is spending about \$180 million a year on Indian welfare programs. The amount undoubtedly will increase, since four out of five Indians on reservations cannot get jobs. However, if industries could be lured onto the reservations by tax exemptions, the average Indian would "gladly swap a Government relief check for a weekly pay check," says Mr. BERRY.

Arizona's Navajo Indians, in the Four Corners area, are enjoying the first fruits of an economic boom, due to gas, oil, power, and uranium developments. But industrialization has been slow on the Navajo as on all other reservations. If tribal councils could offer tax concessions, as proposed in the BERRY bill, the basis would be laid for a Puerto Rican-type development on Indian reservations.

Congressman BERRY calls his project "Operation Bootstrap, Indian style." It has been endorsed by Indian tribal chairmen, Indian agency superintendents, church groups, and mission priests. It deserves the closest study by Congress at the soonest possible time. Certainly the United States owes as much to its first citizens, the Indians, as it does to its oldest Territory, Puerto Rico.

From my home State of South Dakota, the Mitchell Daily Republic has commented favorably on the proposal as follows:

[From the Mitchell (S. Dak.) Daily Republic, Aug. 18, 1959]

INDIAN-STYLE BOOTSTRAP

West River Congressman E. Y. BERRY reports enthusiastic response to his bill (H.R. 7701) "Operation Bootstrap, Indian-style," patterned after a successful Puerto Rican plan by which that commonwealth vastly improved its social and economic position.

BERRY hopes that approval of his measure will bring about similar improvement for American Indians.

Puerto Rico's Operation Bootstrap, as reported in Congressional Quarterly, is designed primarily to industrialize and diversify the island's rum-and-sugar economy by encouraging new industry to locate there.

Back in 1950 Congress passed a bill exempting Puerto Rico from U.S. individual and corporate income taxes, excises, estate and gift taxes and permitted the commonwealth to retain proceeds from its customs duties.

As a result, Puerto Rico was able to exempt new industries from municipal, corporate, partnership and personal income taxes for 10 years; from taxes on dividends or profits for 7 years, and from taxes on property from 5 to 10 years.

The Commonwealth government will sell or lease a plant on a long-term basis to new firms and offer them technical assistance. These exemptions go to industries never in operation in the island prior to June 2, 1947, to 34 specified industries ranging from animal feed to tinware manufacture, and to tourist and commercial hotels. Under this plan 600 industries have located in Puerto Rico.

Other changes made by Operation Bootstrap include its rise from a burden to the U.S. Treasury to sixth place as a major customer of American goods. The island now buys more from the United States on a per capita basis than Canada. In the past 20 years, Puerto Rico has increased per capita income fourfold. Life expectancy has increased nearly 20 years and infant mortality has been halved.

Patterning a plan for American Indians from Operation Bootstrap can work wonders on reservations where it is impossible to support, without Federal relief, the increasing population, BEARY believes.

His measure would authorize tax exemptions on Indian reservations the same as were allowed in Puerto Rico; it would authorize Indian tribes to set up corporations empowered to construct plants to sell or lease to industrial firms on a long-term basis, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Interior. The plants could be built with tribal funds, Federal loans, or through commercial loans to tribal corporations.

Industries moving onto reservations would receive complete exemption from Federal, State and local taxes for 10 years, the right to amortize property eligible for depreciation on a 5-year schedule, a deduction for 5 years from any Federal tax in the amount equal to three times the annual welfare payments paid to an Indian prior to his industrial employment, and Government aid in conducting on-the-job training for Indian employees.

BEARY contends that most Indians on relief "would gladly exchange a Government relief check for a weekly paycheck."

"Operation Bootstrap, Indian-style" would be a step in the right direction. Training and employment for the Indian people on their own reservations could lead to the elimination of Federal relief program, could improve their health and living conditions, could make them an economic asset instead of an economic liability. It deserves serious consideration.

The Expanded Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, at the time General Eisenhower became President of the United States in 1953, the National Government was collecting about \$850 million a year from the Federal gasoline tax. It was expending \$550 million of that gas-

oline money on highway construction and diverting about \$300 million to use for other purposes including foreign aid.

President Eisenhower felt that all Federal gasoline revenues should go into building more, better, and safer roads for the motorists who pay the gasoline taxes. President Eisenhower recommended that be done.

In the Republican Congress of 1954 this was accomplished by Congress providing grants to the States for highway building purposes of \$850 million a year or just about the amount of the gasoline tax revenues.

The result was a substantial speedup in highway construction.

But the President did not believe even this \$300 million a year increase in road funds was enough to do the road building job that must be done to provide the Nation's growing millions of motorists the roads they require.

THE EXPANDED HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Great as was the advance made in the first years of the Eisenhower administration in increasing highway building it was not great enough to satisfy the President's desire. He named a Commission to study the highway problem—the Clay Commission. The Commission recommended the building of 37,000 miles of the Interstate Defense Highway System into four-lane divided highways that would connect and serve nearly all cities of great population in the Nation. The Congress backed up the Commission's recommendation.

Under the leadership of Chairman GEORGE FALLON, of Maryland, of the House Subcommittee on Highways, legislation was drafted and enacted to fulfill the Commission's recommendations.

It is said, and I think correctly so, when this highway program is completed in about 16 years the American motorist can drive from the Canadian border, north of Bangor, Maine, to the Mexican border, south of San Diego, Calif.—a distance of about 4,000 miles—on a four-lane divided highway on which there is not a single road crossing or a single traffic light.

The same freedom from cross traffic over four-lane divided highways will prevail on many other highways running east and west and north and south across the Nation.

Most cities will be bypassed, the roads going around and not through the towns.

Instead of the \$550 million a year spent in 1953 and previous years and the \$850 million spent in 1954 and again in 1955 on highways, the National Government now is spending in excess of \$3 billion a year on building more, wider and safer highways. This is in addition to what the States spend.

WHO WILL PAY FOR THE ROADS?

Who will pay the cost of these new roads?

There has been some increase, of course, in the tax on gasoline and upon tires to finance this gigantic expanded highway program.

The road program, however, in the long run will pay for itself. Everyone using these highways will escape great wear and tear on their tires and cars. They will be safeguarded from being in-

involved in accidents that usually involve expensive automobile repair bills and often even more costly doctor, hospital, and medical bills.

Each year about 40,000 Americans are killed in traffic accidents. The Safety Council estimates that the four-lane divided highways with no cross traffic will cut these fatal accidents in half. Also, the motorists by traveling over wider and better aligned highways will be able to bypass cities and will save much time in getting from place to place.

ROADS PROGRAM HELPS PROSPERITY

The great road program the Eisenhower administration and the Congress has developed during the past few years also is playing an important part in keeping employment high, unemployment down, and adding to the general prosperity of the Nation.

Tens of thousands of American workers are finding employment in helping to build the new and additional highways.

In addition, other thousands obtain employment in the factories and businesses engaged in supplying the materials required in highway construction, such materials as cement, gravel, steel, lumber, and plywood. Still others gain work in factories engaged in producing roadbuilding equipment. Because of the highway program, there is less unemployment than there otherwise would be.

As in all great adventures, everything has not gone in the enormous road-building program as expected.

Too much emphasis, for one thing, has been given to taking care of big city needs first and letting the building of roads in rural sections go until later. The result has been that in the first years of the program too much money has gone into buying costly rights-of-way for highways and not enough into actual construction. Most of this, however, is now behind us and we can expect highway construction to go forward much more rapidly.

How enormous this highway program really is can be understood by a look at what the program is doing for our State of Washington.

In 1953 and previous years Washington State received about \$8 million a year of Federal aid for highway building. Under the first Eisenhower road program, started in 1954, Washington began receiving \$12 million a year of Federal funds for roads. This year, and in the years ahead, Washington State will receive grants in excess of \$50 million a year for highway building. Our State of Washington is receiving six times as much Federal money now for roads as it did a brief 7 years ago when President Eisenhower first came into office. Similar increases have been made to all other States.

America's expanded highway program unquestionably is the greatest public works undertaking in all the history of mankind. It should be continued to completion at the present rate and level of construction. By doing that the greater safety of American motorists will be insured and prosperity and employment will be kept at a high level.

Labor Bill Fight Leaves No Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, among the commentaries on the recent House action on labor reform legislation, the following article by Columnist Marquis Childs which appeared in the August 21 edition of the Washington Post is one I wish to include in the RECORD under permission to extend remarks:

LABOR BILL FIGHT LEAVES NO HEROES

(By Marquis Childs)

No matter what the final outcome in the dispute between House and Senate over labor reform legislation, the political wounds opened in the Democratic Party will be long in healing. The result, it is generally agreed, has been to widen the split between the liberal-labor wing and the conservative southern wing of the party.

A smoldering resentment remains, with the unhappy conviction that presidential ambitions took precedence over the welfare of the party. As to the welfare of the Nation, it was obscured by the fierce, knife-throwing factionalism that tore the House apart as the tough Landrum-Griffin bill was passed.

Politically speaking, it now appears that if a labor bill is finally adopted at this session—coming out of the Senate-House conference—the credit will go largely to Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, the majority leader. To put it another way, the leading Democratic presidential aspirant in the Senate, Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, will get at best a mark of passing on labor legislation.

The suspicion is strong in the House that JOHNSON planned it that way. If the Kennedy-Ervin bill, as approved by the Senate, had been matched by a moderate bill in the House, then JACK KENNEDY would properly have been identified as the father of labor reform.

The suspicion of LYNDON JOHNSON goes to the fact that 17 of the 21 Democrats from Texas in the House voted for Landrum-Griffin. At the same time they were, in effect voting against their leader, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, who had staked his reputation and prestige on stopping the so-called tough bill and putting over the moderate Elliott bill. A switch of 15 votes would have killed Landrum-Griffin. Why, House Members who got badly battered in the fight are asking, could not the great and powerful LYNDON JOHNSON have exercised some authority with the delegation from his own State?

It must be said, however, that opinion in Texas tends to be strongly antilabor, and the volume of mail pouring in on Texas Congressmen was overwhelmingly for a strong bill.

If organized labor made just about every mistake that could be made, overplaying the hand in an outrageous way, the northern wing of the party with its strong labor element will nevertheless have at least a veto at next year's Democratic convention. The Republican-southern Democratic coalition with Texas in the vanguard, so ably led by Republican leader CHARLES HALLECK, has left an indelible mark.

When the shouting of the victors has died down, the effect of this coalition on political fortunes next year may be more significant than anything else to come out of the controversy. By their victory the Republicans

blunted an issue which in the past they have exploited to the hilt—the charge that organized labor runs Congress and dictates the kind of legislation that is to be passed.

Not only President Eisenhower, who will not be running for office next year, but Vice President Nixon, campaigning for the Presidency, and his closest allies in the Government did yeoman work for a victory that the National Association of Manufacturers claims as its own. Nixon met wavering Republican Congressmen at breakfast on the morning of the test. His able and loyal lieutenant, Attorney General William Rogers, provided help in the big administration push.

It may be, of course, that the crime and corruption exposed by the McClellan committee had conditioned the public, including many trade union members, to accept what has been widely propagandized as a strong bill. But, quite possibly, there may be some early disillusion over just what has been achieved.

The comment of James R. Hoffa of the Teamsters Union, target of the most violent feeling, should not be overlooked. Hoffa said that with only minor changes his union could live with the bill passed by the House.

This bears out what Senator KENNEDY has been saying about the "tough" Landrum-Griffin bill. That is, that it will not substantially affect the big, powerful labor unions such as the Auto Workers and the Teamsters. But it penalizes smaller unions and the task of organizing, particularly in the South, will be all but impossible.

Perhaps, in view of this, the laurels of victory now being distributed will fade rather rapidly. By 1960 they may be as dust and ashes.

The Nation's Financial Troubles Similar to Those of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, thinking a suggestion from an able Michigan State senator—because the Nation's problem is similar—might give me an answer which would be helpful here, I wrote to my home senator, the Honorable Edward Hutchinson, of Fennville, Mich., who, for 13 consecutive years, has ably served the State, as both representative and senator, asking why Michigan, a prosperous industrial State, was in trouble financially. I received the following answer:

THE SENATE,

STATE OF MICHIGAN,

Lansing, August 13, 1959.

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CLARE: You have asked me why Michigan, a prosperous industrial State, is in its present financial difficulty.

The reason is this: Michigan has not been living within its means. The present tax structure, unduly charged as a patchwork, is essentially geared to the State's economy. When times are good and the economy expands, so do the dollars of tax increase. When the economy contracts with recession, so do the dollars of tax decrease.

The trouble in Michigan is that Governor Williams and his administration failed and

refused to reduce expenditures during the recent recession. He was directed to do so by the legislature but ignored the law.

Now the legislature is called upon to exact more of the people's goods, not alone to balance a new budget but to pay a deficit as well.

To accomplish this purpose, Republican senators propose a penny increase in the use (sales) tax. House Democrats, in Michigan's divided legislature, insist on writing into our tax system the philosophy of an income tax. They want just a little—a foot in the door. Each side is strong enough to block action. Neither side is strong enough to take action.

In Michigan, our economy is as fluctuating as automobile production. We need a stability in our tax revenues. Sensitive as our present tax structure is to the economy of the State, we would suffer even a greater feast or famine situation if our State revenues were tied to an income tax.

The Federal income tax system has been made to work successfully, only because the Federal Government has unlimited constitutional borrowing power. Michigan has no constitutional power to borrow money. Its operation is wholly dependent on tax collections. We Republicans maintain that changes in our tax system should be to provide a greater stability of tax revenues, and a State income tax in any form would defeat that principle.

Sincerely,

EDWARD HUTCHINSON.

Inter-American Development Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include copy of my newsletter which was released today.

KEENOTES BY REPRESENTATIVE ELIZABETH KEE, OF WEST VIRGINIA

WASHINGTON, August 24, 1959.—Quite often Congress passes significant legislation which is largely if not completely ignored by the press and the public. A case in point is the Inter-American Development Bank which was recently created by Congress with a capitalization of \$1 billion.

The United States will provide \$450 million of the capital. Latin American nations will provide \$550 million and will be represented on the governing board.

The significance of the new Bank lies in the fact that it marks an entirely new departure in our economic relationship with friendly nations to the south. Economic aid, in the form of direct grants and gifts, are to be played down. Instead, our Latin neighbors will look to the new Bank for loans to provide the capital necessary for economic development.

The United States is prone to forget just how important Latin America is to this country. Trade between the two areas runs into the hundreds of millions each year. Also, it is important to our national security to make sure that Communist regimes do not gain a foothold in the Western Hemisphere.

All of our neighbors to the south, with the possible exception of Mexico, are experiencing dangerous economic difficulties. All of them need to expand trade and to speed up industrial development. The United States cannot provide all of the capital that is

needed. Even if we could, it would not be good policy to do so. The countries themselves need to feel they have a vital stake in their own development programs.

The new Bank will fill this great need. It is going to be a businesslike operation. Borrowing nations will have to come up with sound programs which bank officials can accept as having a good chance of paying off.

This is a cooperative venture. Direct grants or gifts are too one sided to be completely effective.

This shift of emphasis in our economic aid program in Latin America is significant. I hope it will point the way to a gradual elimination of the economic aid program on the present basis.

Also, this year Congress approved another far reaching international financing plan which attracted very little attention. This was the International Development Association which is to be an adjunct of the World Bank.

It is hoped this new Bank can put to useful, productive work much of the \$3 billions in foreign currency which the United States has acquired since the end of the war. It would work like this: Country X applies to the World Bank for a loan of \$50 million. The World Bank feels it cannot loan but \$30 million. The new organization would then make a secondary loan of \$20 million, almost all in foreign currency of various kinds which can be used to buy materials in all parts of the world.

The new organization should make it possible for the World Bank to greatly step up its operations. And the more the Bank can loan, the less will be the need for direct grants of money by the United States to underdeveloped nations struggling to build a sound economy.

The people are getting tired of Congress voting billions each year for gifts to foreign countries. The new loan programs offer a sound, workable alternative and they should be much more successful. It puts our economic relations on a sound, businesslike basis and should in the long run help end the annual drain on our Treasury.

We've Done This Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, one of America's outstanding correspondents, Ernest K. Lindley, has made an excellent summation of his findings in Asia during his recent tour. While many individuals are looking at minute details of a particular program in a particular country, Mr. Lindley has brought into focus some of the fundamental accomplishments not only of our own program but of the activities of the Asians themselves. I am happy to insert his column that appears in the magazine Newsweek for August 24, 1959:

WE'VE DONE THIS RIGHT

(By Ernest K. Lindley)

The favorable turn of the tide in free Asia is not due exclusively to reaction against the Communist policies and deeds which I cited last week. Side by side with more realism about the Communists I found on my recent tour a better understanding of American purposes and, more widely than before,

friendly attitudes toward us. In talks with Asians from one end of the continent to the other I sought the reasons for this. Some are rather general, a few specific. Among the more important:

1. Time and experience have gradually convinced many doubting Asians that American policy really is anti-imperial, that it sincerely seeks to help the free peoples of Asia preserve their independence and achieve a better life. For a time many Asians tended to lump us with their former European masters. Increasingly, they have come to see us as a distinct breed (however, Asian feelings about Europeans, have been improved by Britain's enlightened colony-into-commonwealth policy and, recently, by the free choice that De Gaulle gave the French colonies). There is also less of a tendency to regard American capitalism as a form of imperialism. Most Asian governments now want the help of American private capital and management, although not all have taken the steps necessary to attract them.

2. Our policy of extending economic and technical aid, with no political strings attached, to the neutralist countries has improved their attitude toward us.

3. Year by year, there are more Asians who have had part of their education or training in the United States or under American guidance in their own countries. There are now scores of thousands of them—military officers, public-health experts, agricultural specialists, teachers, all manner of occupations. Overwhelmingly—a few go sour—they are friendly to us and give others a sympathetic view of America.

4. With the passage of time and the completion of some projects which took several years, the results of our economic-aid program are more visible and more widely appreciated. We have made mistakes (I will discuss these in a later column) but overall our aid program is a success.

5. Our defensive alliances and military-aid program have helped to generate confidence and stability, especially in the front-line countries. Generally there is a good, comradely relationship between Asian officers and the Americans who work with them. SEATO is increasingly valued even in some of the nations which for various reasons have not joined.

6. We further reassured our friends by two actions last year: Sending troops into Lebanon and supporting Nationalist China in the Red assault on the offshore islands. Our Asian allies sometimes wonder whether we will come when needed. Evidence that we will bolsters them. They find reassurance also in the SEATO military exercises, in which Western forces take part.

7. Our refusal to recognize the Peking regime is paying better dividends, now that the commune system and Tibet have shocked so many formerly neutralist Asians.

8. Many more individual Americans and Asians have come to know and like each other. Most Asians like American informality. Americans find that most Asians, when approached as equals and in a friendly way, respond cordially. Gradually we have built up a corps of people who understand the various Asian peoples and have won their confidence. Officially we are well represented. We have sent some misfits in the past and undoubtedly have some in Asia now. But on this last tour I encountered only a few and they were in minor posts. With two exceptions—one a gifted and respected semipro, Ellsworth Bunker, in India—every American Ambassador in Asia is a career officer. In some places a politician with a flair for public relations might do better than a professional diplomat. But we have a competent lot of Ambassadors in Asia, and some are very, very good. USIS has many very capable and experienced men, and I was favorably impressed with scores of other official Americans I met.

It is time to discard the ugly fiction that we have bungled in Asia. We have made mistakes but, on the whole, our policies are sound, reasonably well executed, and productive of heartening results.

A Time for Maturity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CARLTON LOSER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, a timely message on individual responsibility was delivered by the president of one of the leading educational institutions in Tennessee, David Lipscomb College, to the graduating class of George Peabody College for Teachers, in Nashville, Tenn., a few days ago. Under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial from the Nashville Banner which contains excerpts from Dr. Athens Clay Pullias' challenging address. I believe each Member of Congress will want to read the editorial, and it follows:

A TIME FOR MATURITY

Human progress is the sum of individual achievement, the contributions of men measuring with mind and heart and hand to the challenge of individual responsibility; not herded as sheep, or goaded by collectivists, into a pattern of intellectual conformity called mass thinking.

That vital concept of individual responsibility was the timely message of Athens Clay Pullias, president of David Lipscomb College, addressing the Peabody College graduating class—the warning that when individualism is in peril the future welfare of mankind is endangered, and that the only answer to this threat is mental and spiritual maturity.

One could note that it was that maturity of great minds that grasped the realities of individual worth and dignity—and of that principle founded a system of government recognizing unalienable rights. It accented the freedoms which brought into existence great institutions to enhance, by individual preparation and opportunities, the betterment of all mankind. And again, this age is the beneficiary of its labors.

Yet, as Mr. Pullias warned, in spite of this: "Changes of our time have led to a breakup of the foundation of values—including the moral and the ethical. A worldwide atmosphere of fear prevails * * * (and) finally and most serious is the threatened destruction of the individual by the State, the machine, the organization and general spirit of collectivism in our time. The individual is in peril."

That individual being is the basic unit in society. Achievements of the past and the threats to our future have meaning only in terms of the individual. The meaning of life itself—as he eloquently pointed out—is centered in the individual person, not in the state, or in some unfeeling social organization. "A nation makes war—but it is the individual boy who dies, and a lonely mother who weeps over his grave."

Every forward step by the human family in the long and painful climb out of the darkness toward the light has been taken by developing and freeing the individual person.

As he said, the most serious threat in modern life is that of destroying the dignity and value of the individual person. In the to-

talitarian state this destruction is accomplished directly by force; in the Western World it may come by more subtle processes—including the pressure for conformity, the leveling power of the group, the highly touted mass thinking.

"The only power which can save the individual from this destruction is for him to become the quality of person who can live with distinct purpose—free, strong, and fearless—at home with self, fellow man, and God . . . a mature person.

"Such a person can freely work together with other people of good will to promote the general welfare of mankind and the glory of man's Creator. But he will do so of his own free will and choice, not under the lash of group control."

That is the challenge to individuals in a free land—a message comporting with the ancient and fundamental spirit of America. It honors a creed founded in conscience which only the exchange of birthright for a mess of material pottage could disestablish.

Khrushchev Attacks Laos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is no accident that the Communists are stepping up their timetable of conquest in southeast Asia along with the Khrushchev visit to the United States. The facts in the following article should startle us into a realization of the real purpose of the Khrushchev visit:

FLOWERS FOR THE HOST

(By Joseph Alsop)

Nikita S. Khrushchev has now followed his acceptance of the President's invitation to the White House with an open display of contempt for his future host.

There is no other way to read the new Communist aggression in Laos. The situation there can become very serious, indeed, touching off another Far Eastern crisis of Quemo-like intensity. If the Communist aggression is not repelled, moreover, all the neighboring countries—South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Thailand—will at once find themselves in danger.

Nonetheless, the indication of Khrushchev's contempt for President Eisenhower and the Nation he leads is probably the most disturbing feature of the very disturbing Lao trouble. On this point, the facts speak for themselves.

In brief, the President's announcement of the coming Khrushchev visit was made on August 3. Very nearly simultaneously, the attack on Laos began. The attack took the form of border crossings from Communist North Vietnam into Laos by Communist infiltration units trained and armed for the purpose by the North Vietnamese. Such obscure guerrilla movements in those jungle-clad mountains can hardly be precisely dated. Yet the major border crossings quite certainly began after Khrushchev's mid-July acceptance of the President's invitation, even if some occurred before the public announcement.

The timing of this opening of the attack on Laos is inescapably significant. Yet a good many people in this increasingly wishful city, and especially a good many of the people around the President who had pinned their hopes on the Khrushchev visit, are

still trying to escape the meaning of this timing of the Laos attack. "It is Peking's enterprise, not Moscow's," they argue.

On this point, too, however, the facts speak for themselves. The attack on Laos was hardly underway, when Khrushchev received the organizer of the attack, the North Vietnamese Communist boss, Ho Chi Minh, for an extended state visit in Moscow.

While Ho was in Moscow, an obviously planned series of statements was issued. First, Ho's government in Hanoi blamed the trouble in Laos on the presence of a 150-man American mission to train the small Lao army. Then Mao Tse-tung's government in Peking virtually threatened war unless the U.S. military bases in Laos were instantaneously abolished. Finally Khrushchev's own Government in Moscow spoke out in clear terms, refraining from direct denunciation of the United States, but strongly supporting the North Vietnamese-Chinese Communist position in Laos.

From these facts, it may be possible to argue that the prime impulse for the attack on Laos came from Mao Tse-tung. But whoever was the prime mover, it is certainly not possible to argue that Khrushchev was anything but a knowing, willing accomplice in the Lao enterprise. The Ho visit to Moscow and the subsequent Moscow statement are the clearest proofs of Khrushchev's active complicity.

Khrushchev's purposes can be variously interpreted. The Communist interpretation was given by a high official who told this reporter, "It's the old tactic of the carrot and the stick." (When asked what was the carrot, he replied, "Why the Khrushchev visit"—which seems an unattractive sort of carrot.)

Khrushchev's aim perhaps is to extract from the President in the White House new terms for Asia as well as new terms for Berlin. In this, it must be added, Khrushchev is likely to have the indirect help of the British and Canadian Governments. Both are not merely summit-drunken but fixed in their idea as well that everything in Asia will be rapidly fixed up if we are just a little nice to Mao Tse-tung.

In any case the contrast between this time and last time is horrifyingly strong. Last time Khrushchev talked with the President of the United States. In 1954, he paid for his ticket of admission with the liberation of Austria and the dramatic though temporary restoration of normal relations with Yugoslavia. This time, crude threats to Berlin paid for the ticket; and as soon as the ticket was in Khrushchev's pocket, Laos was attacked.

No one who is not absolutely flannelheaded can see in this pattern anything but a display of the most profound, unalloyed and arrogant contempt. Whatever its sources, Khrushchev's contempt is a desperately serious political phenomenon. The sources need urgent investigation. But no search for sources is afoot, no doubt because careful search would reveal a distinguished soap manufacturer pouring out soft soap, which is still constricting the American defense efforts 2 years after the sputnik, under stringent orders from budget-obsessed higher authority.

Reply to the Carey Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I place in the RECORD

a copy of my reply to the form letter sent to many Members of Congress by Mr. James B. Carey last week:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 24, 1959.

JAMES B. CAREY,
President, IUEMWW,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have your letter of August 18 regarding my vote for the Landrum-Griffin bill, H.R. 8400. You do not like my vote on that bill and, of course, I take no exception to your so advising me.

I take strong exception, however, to your suggestions that I voted to punish or repress or weaken all labor unions, or that I yielded to pressure from any business organization. Those suggestions have no basis in fact.

My vote was determined by my own judgment, exercised in the light of my own conscience as to what was needed to protect the public and particularly union members and their families and small business against such abuses of power, whether by management or union officials, as have been exposed in various committee hearings. The foregoing statement has special importance in connection with the provisions in H.R. 8400 which relate to the Bill of Rights, organizational picketing, secondary boycotts, hot cargo, and no man's land. Enactment of H.R. 8400 will not, in my judgment, interfere with any legitimate union activity of which I have been informed.

You may be sure that I studied the effects of H.R. 8400 before I decided how to vote upon it. In that process I carefully considered the views of all who had written to or talked with me about abuses of power by either labor officials or management, and I talked with union officials and everyone else who came in to discuss H.R. 8400. Some union members who live in my district think that H.R. 8400 does not go far enough to protect them against loss of their union cards—and that means their livelihood—without a fair hearing.

Many union members and their families live in my district and you may be sure I advised union officials who had talked with me as to how I would vote.

Members of unions in my district are good citizens. They will resent and reject, as do I, your notion that if unions are to be strong, their officials must be allowed to continue abuses of power of the kind which H.R. 8400 seeks to prevent.

Taken as a whole, your letter confirms the need for legislation such as H.R. 8400.

Yours truly,

JOHN H. RAY,
Member of Congress.

A Story of a Good Samaritan in the U.S. Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, an incident has been called to my attention which warrants recognition.

Last January the wife and four children of T. Sgt. Roy G. Cauthern were en route through the South Plains area of Texas to join Sergeant Cauthern in Seattle, Wash. On January 18 Mrs. Cauthern and her children were in an

automobile accident. Mrs. Cauthern was hospitalized at the base hospital at Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Tex.

Maj. John W. Arnett, base administrative officer at Reese, learned of the predicament of the mother and four children, and he and Mrs. Arnett took the four children, ranging in age from 1 year up, into their home and clothed them, fed them, and kept them together until the airman was able to obtain leave and come to Reese Air Force Base.

The Arnetts have a couple of youngsters of their own, but they insisted upon keeping the four Cauthern children together, feeling that this would contribute to their welfare and to the convalescence of the mother in the hospital.

It makes one feel good to know that we have people in our country and in the armed services who have not forgotten the old virtues of thoughtfulness and sacrifice. It is good to live in a country which produces people like Major Arnett and his wife. I quote in part a letter of appreciation written through Sergeant Cauthern's commander to Lieutenant Colonel Mays and to Maj. John W. Arnett:

DETACHMENT 1,
14TH AVIATION DEPOT SQUADRON,
U.S. AIR FORCE, APO 942,
Seattle, Wash., March 12, 1959.

Subject: Letter of appreciation.
To: Commander, Detachment 1, 14th Aviation Depot Squadron, APO 942, Seattle, Wash.

1. I wish to express my appreciation to the commander, Reese Air Force Base, to Lieutenant Colonel Mays, base hospital commander, to Maj. John W. Arnett, base administrative officer, to Captain Range, base hospital, and to the other personnel of Reese Air Force Base for the hospitality you showed to my family, and to me, when my wife was injured on January 18, 1959, while en route to Seattle, Wash., to join me at my present assignment.

2. Major Arnett's taking my children into his home until I arrived and until my wife was able to depart, Lieutenant Colonel Mays personally greeting me at the hospital, Major Arnett's offering me the use of his private car while I was at Reese Air Force Base, his personal coordination of the rescheduling of my family's MATS flight out of Seattle, and the many other courtesies shown to me while I was at Reese Air Force Base was treatment I had previously thought reserved only for very high-ranking officers.

3. It gives me a sense of pride in being in the Air Force to have been associated with the commander, Reese Air Force Base, and the personnel of his command.

ROY G. CAUTHERN,
AF14034171, Technical Staff Sergeant,
Detachment 1, 14 Aviation Depot
Squadron.

Mr. Carey's Contribution—Arrogant—and
Stupid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Rec-

ORD, I include editorials from the August 21, 1959, editions of the Washington Post and the Washington Evening Star, respectively, which represent both a liberal and conservative journalistic appraisal of James B. Carey's threatening letter to the Members of Congress who voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 21, 1959]

MR. CAREY'S CONTRIBUTION

James B. Carey's letter to the 134 Republican and 95 Democrats who voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill in the House of Representatives was obviously written in anger and ignorance. His anger can be understood, but, as president of the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers and a vice president of the AFL-CIO, he should have been aware of how Congressmen respond to threats or anything suggesting threats. His naivete on this point may serve to stiffen the labor reform bill that the conference committee is hammering out and may swing dozens of votes to that measure in the final test.

Mr. Carey might have learned a lesson from the gas lobby, the utilities lobby, or Ambassador Hanihara, who represented Japan in Washington during the twenties. Ambassador Hanihara and the Coolidge administration were eager to dissuade Congress from enacting a Japanese-exclusion law, and they seemed to have a good chance of doing so until the Ambassador inadvertently referred, in a letter to Secretary of State Hughes, to the "grave consequences" which such a law would bring about in the relations between Japan and the United States. The Ambassador was merely forecasting what did in fact happen, but his words were interpreted as a threat and Congress voted the exclusion law almost unanimously.

It makes little difference whether Mr. Carey deliberately sought to intimidate Members of the House. His letter had a ring of arrogance that irritated friends as well as foes of labor. It marked for political liquidation all legislators who did not bow to the dictates of the unions on this issue regardless of how well they may have served their districts and the country in general. Such a crude and tactless challenge almost forces Congressmen who voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill to stand by it in order to prove their independence. And many citizens may be expected to cite the letter as confirmation of their belief that labor is riding too high.

Of course none of this is cause for a punitive attitude on the part of the conference committee. If there is reason, as we think there is, to modify some provisions of the Landrum-Griffin bill so as to avoid unjust restrictions on union organization in certain areas, Mr. Carey's offensive behavior ought to make no difference. But the inevitable result of his bluster—perhaps intended to impress members of his union—is to make objective consideration of the labor bill far more difficult.

[From the Washington Star, Aug. 21, 1959]

ARROGANT—AND STUPID

It is an arrogant exercise in attempted intimidation that is contained in the letter from James B. Carey, AFL-CIO vice president and head of the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers to the 303 House Members who voted for the Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill. Mr. Carey promises (threatens) that "we shall do all in our power" to see that political retribution comes to those who so voted.

Obviously, Mr. Carey overlooks first of all the fact that approval of the Landrum-Griffin bill in the House reflected a strong and deep public sentiment in favor of some restraint upon the labor racketeering and cor-

ruption that have been revealed so clearly in recent months. And apparently he overlooks also the likelihood that public sentiment "at the ballot box" is very apt to end up on the side of those who are target of such heavy-handed efforts at political blackmail. Mr. Carey's letter will do no good for organized labor, and may punish his friends in Congress (as well as those whom he threatens) by picturing them as bending to his will by "voting the right way."

White House Issues Text on Flag of the United States of America, Its Use and Background, Issued in Connection With Proclamation by President Eisenhower on Admission of Hawaii as the 50th State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of a statement issued Friday, August 21, 1959, by the White House giving the background history of the flag of the United States of America. This official statement was issued in connection with the addition of the 50th star to the flag of the United States on the official admission of Hawaii as the 50th State of the Union.

This statement is so informative and pertinent to the development of the flag of the United States as the symbol of our beloved Nation now that two additional stars have been added to the blue background of our national emblem on account of the admission of both Alaska and Hawaii as the 49th and 50th States, respectively, that I am sure the within text, as issued by the White House will not only be of interest but of historical value to all Americans.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I commend to all interested that they obtain copies of Public Law 829 of the 77th Congress and Public Laws 107 and 396 of the 83d Congress. These, I am informed, may be obtained from the Government Printing Office.

WHITE HOUSE TEXT ON FLAG LISTS ITS USE AND BACKGROUND

(Text of a statement issued Friday by the White House giving background on the history of the flag. The statement was issued in connection with the addition of a 50th star to the flag on the admission of Hawaii as a State.)

THE NATIONAL FLAG

In connection with the admission of Hawaii as a State of the Union, the President today issued an Executive order adding the 50th star to the Union of the flag. The new flag will supersede the 49-star flag which was prescribed on the admission of Alaska as a State of the Union.

By law, the new 50-star flag will become the official flag of the United States on July 4, 1960, the birthday of the Union. Display of the new flag before that time would be

improper. However, it would not be improper to display the 48-star flag or the 49-star flag after that date; with limited exceptions agencies of the Federal Government will continue to display the 48-star flag and the 49-star flag so long as they remain in good condition and until existing stocks of unused flags are exhausted. It is appropriate for all citizens to do the same.

Following is certain information with respect to the historical and symbolic aspects of the national flag:

History of national flag

Before we became a Nation, our land knew many flags. Long ago, the Norsemen probed our coastal waters sailing under the banner of the black raven. Columbus carried a Spanish flag across the seas. The Pilgrims carried the flag of Great Britain. The Dutch colonists brought their striped flag to New Amsterdam. The French explored the continent under the royal fleur-de-lis. Each native Indian tribe had its own totem and insignia. Immigrants of every race and nationality, in seeking a new allegiance, have brought their symbols of loyalty to our shores.

During our Revolution, various banners were used by the not-yet-united colonies. A green pine tree with the motto, "An appeal to Heaven," was popular with our young navy. The rattlesnake's warning "Don't tread on me," was displayed by aroused colonists along the Atlantic seaboard. The Moultrie liberty flag, a large blue banner with a white crescent in the upper corner, rallied the defenders of Charleston, S.C., in 1776. The Bunker Hill flag was a blue banner with a white canton filled with a red cross and a small green pine. The flag of the maritime colony of Rhode Island bore a blue anchor under the word "Hope." Strikingly similar to the Stars and Stripes was the flag carried by the Green Mountain Boys of Vermont at the Battle of Bennington on August 16, 1777.

When Washington took command of the Continental Army at Cambridge, Mass., in 1776, he stood under the Grand Union Flag which continued to show a dependence upon Great Britain. The canton of this flag was filled with the crosses of St. George (England) and St. Andrew (Scotland).

The first Stars and Stripes was created by the Continental Congress on June 14, 1777. This date is now observed nationally as Flag Day.

In this flag the 13 stars, representing a constellation, were arranged in a variety of designs. The most popular—with the stars in a circle so that no State could claim precedence over another—is known as the Betsy Ross flag, in honor of the seamstress who is supposed to have sewn the first one.

As the American frontier expanded, two new States were added to the Union, and these were incorporated into the flag. This meant that 2 stars and 2 stripes were added to the design—making a total of 15 each. It was this flag that withstood enemy bombardment at Fort Mifflin, Md., September 13-14, 1814, and inspired Francis Scott Key to write "The Star-Spangled Banner."

Later, when other States were added to the Union, the Congress, feeling that more stripes would blur the basic design, returned to the original 13 red and white stripes.

Since 1818, each new State has brought a new star to the flag. This growing pattern of stars could be said to reflect the growing dimensions of America's responsibilities, as the 13 stripes reflect the constant strength of our country's traditions.

The 50 States and the dates of their entry into the Union:

Alabama, December 14, 1819.
Alaska, January 3, 1959.
Arizona, February 14, 1912.
Arkansas, June 15, 1836.
California, September 9, 1850.

Colorado, August 1, 1876.
Connecticut, January 9, 1788.
Delaware, December 7, 1787.
Florida, March 3, 1845.
Georgia, January 2, 1788.
Hawaii, August 21, 1959.
Idaho, July 3, 1890.
Illinois, December 3, 1818.
Indiana, December 11, 1816.
Iowa, December 28, 1846.
Kansas, January 29, 1861.
Kentucky, June 1, 1792.
Louisiana, April 30, 1812.
Maine, March 15, 1820.
Maryland, April 28, 1788.
Massachusetts, February 6, 1788.
Michigan, January 26, 1837.
Minnesota, May 11, 1858.
Mississippi, December 10, 1817.
Missouri, August 10, 1821.
Montana, November 8, 1889.
Nebraska, March 1, 1867.
Nevada, October 31, 1864.
New Hampshire, June 21, 1788.
New Jersey, December 18, 1787.
New Mexico, January 6, 1912.
New York, July 26, 1788.
North Carolina, November 21, 1789.
North Dakota, November 2, 1889.
Ohio, March 1, 1803.
Oklahoma, November 16, 1907.
Oregon, February 14, 1859.
Pennsylvania, December 12, 1787.
Rhode Island, May 29, 1790.
South Carolina, May 23, 1788.
South Dakota, November 2, 1889.
Tennessee, June 1, 1796.
Texas, December 29, 1845.
Utah, January 4, 1896.
Vermont, March 4, 1791.
Virginia, June 25, 1788.
Washington, November 11, 1889.
West Virginia, June 20, 1863.
Wisconsin, May 29, 1848.
Wyoming, July 10, 1890.

Customs and usage as to flag of the United States

Laws have been written to govern the display of the flag and to insure a proper respect for it. Custom has decreed certain other observances in regard to its use. As a symbol of the Nation, standing for our heritage of liberty and justice, the flag is naturally held in highest honor by all citizens.

In recent years, the Congress of the United States of America has drawn together "The existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag." These can be found in Public Law 829 of the 77th Congress and in Public Laws 107 and 396 of the 83d Congress. Copies may be obtained from the Government Printing Office.

Cash on the Barrelhead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by David Lawrence, as published in the New York Herald Tribune of August 24, 1959, should make interesting reading for all concerned:

CAREY NOTE TO LEGISLATORS RECALLS LEWIS' SPENDING

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, August 23.—When the labor union bosses raise money to contribute to the campaigns of Members of Congress, must those who are elected disregard their per-

sonal convictions on the merits of proposed laws and do the bidding of the groups that furnished the funds? This issue seems to have been projected by James B. Carey, one of the top leaders of the AFL-CIO, whose recent letter to Members of Congress has caused a stir. He expresses gratitude to those who voted as labor wanted and wrote in bitter sarcasm to those who, having accepted campaign contributions from labor interests, voted against their wishes on the Landrum-Griffin bill.

Mr. Carey threatens reprisals at the ballot box and apparently the labor unions will withhold contributions next time from those Members of Congress who refused to consider a campaign contribution as a bribe.

JOHN L. LEWIS' VIEWS

There is nothing unusual about Mr. Carey's letters to Members of Congress. He should not be criticized as being alone in his viewpoint. For what he has written is in line with CIO policy for years. Indeed, John L. Lewis, while active in the CIO, was characteristically frank about the meaning of a contribution from laboring men to the campaigns of candidates for office.

When the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, having accepted big contributions from labor unions for his 1936 campaign, said in the midst of a strike in 1937 something that the labor union leaders didn't like, Mr. Lewis declared publicly:

"It ill behooves one who has supped at labor's table and who has been sheltered in labor's house to curse with equal fervor and fine impartiality both labor and its adversaries when they become locked in deadly embrace."

PAID CASH FOR FAVORS

In a biography of Mr. Lewis written by Saul D. Alinsky and published in 1949 by G. P. Putnam & Sons, the author tells of an interview with the labor leader during the Roosevelt regime. Mr. Lewis is quoted as having said:

"Everybody says I want my pound of flesh, that I gave Mr. Roosevelt \$500,000 for his 1936 campaign, and I want quid pro quo. The United Mine Workers and the CIO have paid cash on the barrel for every piece of legislation that we have gotten."

"We have the Wagner Act. The Wagner Act cost us many dollars in contributions which the United Mine Workers have made to the Roosevelt administration with the explicit understanding of a quid pro quo for labor. These contributions far exceed the notions held by the general public or the press. Is any one fool enough to believe for one instant that we gave this money to Roosevelt because we were spellbound by his voice? It is common knowledge that we spent approximately three-quarters of a million dollars in the 1936 campaign. And you might be interested to know that the \$500,000 direct contribution wasn't my price, but was the figure named by the White House, and I was given approximately 48 hours to get that money."

OTHER EXPENDITURES

"Certainly there was a quid pro quo—the right for labor to organize. But there was more than that. The sums we spent in 1936 were not only cash contributions that were made to the Democratic Party, but also were money expended in terms of salaries for organizers and other personnel who worked full time organizing and electioneering for Roosevelt. Radio time purchased, billboards, handbills, literature and all other paraphernalia that are part and parcel of the process of being elected President of the United States didn't come gratis."

The same interview reveals that in 1936 when the tensions between Mr. Lewis and Mr. Roosevelt had eased off somewhat and the Democratic President was trying in primary contests to "purge" certain Southern

Democratic Senators who appeared also to be antilabor, the United Mine Workers chief rendered a helping hand. Again Mr. Lewis is quoted in the Saul Allinsky book as follows: "Where did the money come from that Franklin D. Roosevelt siphoned into those Southern States to try to bolster up the fight against the anti-New Deal Senators? Where did the money come from?"

MINERS PAID

"I'll tell you where it came from. Right here, from the coffers of the United Mine Workers of America. It came by request of the President of the United States through one of his trusted aids. You tell this to the President, and if he questions it, and I'm certain that he will not, you may inform the President that I am perfectly willing to name names and sums, chapter and verse, to satisfy any slight amnesia that there might be on this particular issue."

"You ask me for gratitude in terms of an administration that we have literally poured our life's blood into supporting. You wonder that I do not express the feeling that one should have for a great champion of labor. I say that labor's champion has to a large extent here been a bought and paid for proposition. There is nothing we should be grateful for when we paid cash on the barrelhead at the price demanded for it."

PHILOSOPHY UNCHANGED

So the philosophy of the money raisers in labor's ranks hasn't changed much in the last 20 years since John L. Lewis spoke. In the 1958 congressional campaign when the labor unions boasted that a majority of the House of Representatives was elected through their help, the Federal records show a relatively small sum was contributed. Big amounts were, however, donated largely to State organizations which do not come under the Federal laws requiring the reporting of contributions. It is estimated that labor raised approximately \$10 million. Much of it was spent to uphold laws compelling workers to forego their civil rights and join unions.

Soviet Line Unchanged in 12 Years, Healy Finds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the fourth in series of articles written by George W. Healy, editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, who accompanied Vice President Nixon on his recent trip to the Soviet Union:

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Aug. 12, 1959]

SOVIET LINE UNCHANGED IN 12 YEARS, HEALY FINDS — CITES EHRENBURG-KHRUSHCHEV STATEMENTS

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

Moscow.—The Soviet party line regarding freedom of information, so far as my personal observation is concerned, hasn't changed since shortly after World War II.

At the end of that war, Ilya Ehrenburg was the editor of Izvestia, one of the two powerful official organs of the Soviet Government and Communist Party. The editor's chair now is held by the son-in-law of Nikita S. Khrushchev.

Mr. Ehrenburg, on official invitation, visited the United States. One of his stops was New Orleans.

RAPS ADVERTISERS

Driving one day he noticed several billboards on which were war messages sponsored by various advertisers.

"You shouldn't do a think like that," said he. "Think of letting some capitalist advertiser run a message for the government. It's disgraceful."

"How would you do it?" I asked.

"We would put up our own government billboards," said he. "Why ask people to buy war bonds or join the Marines? Tell them what to do."

My brief conversation with Mr. Khrushchev at the U.S. exhibition in Moscow was reminiscent of the conversation with Ehrenburg a dozen years earlier.

HEALY MEETS NIKITA

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON and Mr. Khrushchev had argued and debated in the modern home. Then they had exchanged pleasantries in the formal opening of the exhibition.

After the formal opening, the Soviet boss and the Vice President walked into the "glass house" of the exhibition, followed by their official parties. Again they started a debate, this time about free speech and free criticism of governments. Mr. Nixon argued for the virtues of free expression; Mr. Khrushchev dissented. A stable government, it was Mr. Khrushchev's position, should not tolerate public criticism.

Seeing me in the group behind them, Mr. Nixon asked Herbert Klein, his special news assistant, to have me step up and meet Mr. Khrushchev.

Introducing me, he said, "This is George Healy, the past president of the newspaper editors in America. His newspaper criticizes our administration when it thinks we are wrong, as do other newspapers. We think they have a right to criticize us. We also are confident that they will commend us when they think what we have done has been good. I believe George will tell about good things he may see in Russia. He and I are strong for a free press."

Mr. Khrushchev acknowledged the introduction, shook hands with a trace of a smile, said a few words to me in Russian and resumed his argument with Mr. Nixon.

WOULDN'T BALK NIKITA

The interpreter's translation of what he had to say in reply to Mr. Nixon's comment about a free press wasn't fast enough for me to catch it before Mr. Khrushchev hurried to the modern American kitchen exhibit.

From what I have learned in a quick look at Russia, I'm not sure I'd publicly criticize Mr. Khrushchev if I wanted to stick around in Moscow.

To be proclaimed the best disciplined people in the world, Russians—particularly the residents of Moscow—have less respect for police orders than any people I've seen.

COMMAND NOT ENOUGH

Police stopped people from literally running over the party of Vice President Nixon on the day of the opening of the U.S. exhibition in Moscow. But they didn't stop them by ordering them back. They stopped them by physically forcing them back.

When the Vice President was leaving the exhibition grounds, after N. S. Khrushchev and his heavy escort had departed, a crowd assembled around him at the exit. Some members of the crowd asked for autographs—others apparently wanted tickets to the exhibition.

One crowd attracts another, and this was the case here.

A police line was formed to prevent the second crowd from forcing its way into the

cluster around Mr. Nixon. A human chain was set up between the two crowds.

WOMAN, 60, DEFIANT

One woman, about 60, anxious for an autograph or a closer look at the Vice President, slipped under two policemen's arms.

Just as she reached the fringe of the cluster around Mr. Nixon a policeman who had not been in the human chain caught her left wrist. He gave her a pull, yanking her toward two policemen, each of whom got a grip on her arm and gave her a tremendous jerk. She spun twice, back through the human chain into the crowd.

She apparently was neither hurt nor resentful. The pull and the jerk were just part of the day's life of a disciplined Russian who doesn't propose to listen to policemen.

As far as it is from New Orleans, Moscow is no place at this season to try to hide from New Orleansians or other old friends.

On our first visit to the exhibition grounds in Sokolniki Park one of the first persons I saw was Rose Kahn, fashion editor of the New Orleans States-Item. That evening, at the dinner tendered by Ambassador and Mrs. Llewellyn Thompson my seating was at the table with Arthur Davis, New Orleans architect, and Mrs. Davis and with Angler Biddle Duke, the former ambassador to El Salvador, who has spoken in New Orleans several times, and Mrs. Duke. In the exhibition is a presentation of the Thomy Lafon school, planned by the Curtis-Davis architectural firm.

William Nichols, editor of This Week magazine, and Mrs. Nichols were in our section at the official opening of the exhibition.

House Antitrust Subcommittee Study Leads to \$50 Million Telephone Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the House Antitrust Subcommittee headed by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler], who is also chairman of the parent Judiciary Committee of which I am proud to be a member, is to be highly congratulated for its comprehensive and scholarly investigation of certain competitive aspects of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. This was part of a study of the consent decree program of the Justice Department's Antitrust Division, including a thoroughgoing examination of the oil pipeline decree, as well as the A.T. & T. decree.

The constructive and painstaking approach taken by this subcommittee has now been quickly followed by action of the Federal Communications Commission affecting the pocketbook of every telephone user. Flowing directly from the Antitrust Subcommittee's investigation was a recent FCC directive reducing long distance telephone tolls by a total of \$50 million.

Mr. Speaker, it is this kind of legislative surveillance by House committees and cooperation with them by adminis-

trative agencies that is a continuing credit to our form of government and way of life. An article in the current Democratic Digest and an article which appeared in the July 25 issue of the New York Times amplifies the background of this most important event to American telephone users, and under unanimous consent I include these articles in the Appendix of the Record:

[From the New York Times, July 25, 1959]

PHONE RATE SLASH ON LONG-DISTANCE ORDERED BY FCC—REDUCTION TOTALING 50 MILLION A YEAR APPLIES TO CALLS OF MORE THAN 300 MILES—A.T. & T. SCORES RULING—SEES GOOD RESEARCH, GOOD MANAGEMENT PENALIZED—REVISION DUE IN FALL

(By Richard E. Mooney)

WASHINGTON, July 24.—The Federal Communications Commission has ordered that long-distance telephone rates be cut by \$50 million a year.

The Commission announced today that the Bell System would revise its rates effective about September 15. The cut applies only to calls of more than 300 miles.

Two months ago the Commission was criticized by the House Antitrust Subcommittee for failure to act on its own staff's recommendations for rate investigations and reduction. It was also under attack for failure ever to set standards for measuring the adequacy of telephone rates.

The subcommittee, whose chairman is Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of Brooklyn, based its report on an investigation last year into the 1956 settlement of the Government's telephone antitrust suit by consent decree.

PENALTY IS ASSAILED

Frederick R. Kappel, president of American Telephone & Telegraph Co., which is the capstone of the Bell System, issued a statement here on the FCC action. He said that his company was being penalized for good research and good management.

"While earnings on our interstate long-distance business have improved in recent years," he said, "they are lower than they should be and well below earnings of business generally."

He attributed the improved earnings to "technical advances by Bell telephone laboratories, especially on very long circuits; efficient management, and more long-distance calls."

He said that the FCC directive "ignores the long-range interests of the public," which require added investment by the system to improve the quality of service, and add facilities needed for growth and national defense.

"These assignments call for financial strength," he said.

The last long-distance rate change was a \$65 million increase in late 1953, which amounted to an average 8-percent increase in toll charges.

There was no estimate available as to what percentage of reduction would result from the \$50 million cut. It is not possible to compute it from the 1953 increase because the volume of business has risen.

The actual amounts of reduction will be known soon, when A.T. & T. files with the FCC its new rate schedule, designed to accomplish what the commission has ordered.

A few examples of present long-distance rates from New York to cities more than 300 miles distant are: 95 cents to Portland, Maine, \$1.50 to Chicago, and \$2.50 to Los Angeles. Those are station-to-station daytime rates, subject to the 10-percent Federal tax.

SCOPE OF RULING

The reduction applies only to normal telephone service. That is, it does not apply to such things as private lines.

The FCC's action was made known in a brief statement issued in the late afternoon.

The Commission said that the order resulted from discussions that the Commission had initiated.

The Commission said that it had telephone rates under continuing review.

The House subcommittee, during its investigation, heard testimony from FCC staff officials to the effect that they had filed at least six memorandums with the Commission in the 1956-57 period on the fact that the rate of return on long-distance service was greater than 6½ percent. At least twice, the subcommittee report said, the staff recommended investigations looking toward rate reduction.

The significance of 6½ percent stems from the 1953 rate increase, which was designed to raise the rate of return to that level.

[From Democratic Digest, September 1959]

CELLER'S PROBING CUTS PHONE RATES

A \$50 million a year cut in long-distance telephone rates, starting this month, is directly traceable to the doggedness of Representative EMANUEL CELLER, New York, and other Congressional Democrats in putting the heat on the Federal Communications Commission.

The FCC had treated the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and its Bell System like long lost brothers. The Eisenhower administration was in office less than 9 months when the Commission, without public hearings, granted Bell an increase of about \$65 million a year in long-distance rates. Frieda Henock, a Democratic member of the FCC dissented vehemently (and wasn't reappointed when her term ran out). "This is the first general interstate telephone rate increase in the history of this Commission," she wrote. "In passing upon the reasonableness of such a sizable rate increase without sworn testimony and evidence subject to cross-examination, I believe that the Commission is abdicating its responsibilities."

That rate increase was designed to bring Bell's profits on its interstate operations to 6½ percent, although the FCC has never bothered to determine what would be a proper profit. In any event, Bell's interstate profits soared well past 6½—to 7.7 in 1955, to 7.8 in 1956, for example. The Celler subcommittee computed that in 1955-57 long-distance users were charged \$159 million more than was needed to produce a 6½ percent return. This year A. T. & T. split its stock three for one and raised its dividend.

Between June 1955 and October 1957 the FCC's own staff called its attention six times to the phone company's fat profits, and at least twice recommended strongly that action be taken looking toward a reduction. Nothing happened.

Then Representative CELLER's Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee began poking into the conduct of the FCC, as part of an investigation of peculiar goings-on in the Justice Department with regard to consent decrees. In that connection it brought out the extraordinary story of how Herbert Brownell, when he was Attorney General, took A.T. & T. by the hand and showed it how to go about getting a toothless consent decree that left it in full control of its monopolistic subsidiary, Western Electric, and never mind the antitrust laws. (The Pentagon, under Charlie Wilson, helped out on this pretty little game, letting A.T. & T. people ghostwrite the Defense Department's recommendations that Justice go away and not bother Bell.) But all that is another story.

The point here is that in the course of the consent-decree inquiry the Celler subcommittee dug out the facts about the FCC's ever so casual dispensing of rate increases.

Last May Congressman CELLER dispatched the chief counsel of his subcommittee to see FCC Chairman John C. Doerfer. Several

parleys ensued, and finally the FCC announced the rate cuts that go into effect this month—the first reduction in long-distance charges in 13 years. A.T. & T. stockholders needn't fret, since an FCC official is quoted as estimating that the profit on long-distance calls, even with the rate cut, will run from 6.7 to 7 percent.

Moral: never underestimate the value of the patient and unspectacular digging by Democratic Members of Congress and their staffs.

James B. Carey: Humorist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, a rereading of the letter I received last week from Mr. James B. Carey, president of the International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, confirms my original conclusion that the man is a humorist. The very fact that Mr. Carey sets out to intimidate those who voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill marks him as either a man with a sense of humor or as one who is so naive that he thinks Congress will grovel in the face of his awesome threats. Of course, there is the possibility that Mr. Carey is just another arrogant labor leader who is inclined to use his muscles rather than his head but I really do not think so.

In any event I have dignified his outburst to the extent of the following reply:

AUGUST 24, 1959.

Mr. JAMES B. CAREY,
President, International Union of Electrical,
Radio & Machine Workers, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MR. CAREY: Thank you very much for your letter of August 18. I am having it reproduced for circulation among my constituents in order to acquaint them with the ill temper and bad manners of certain labor leaders, which would seem to further justify our support of the so-called Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill.

Incidentally, I am amazed that you are so poorly informed in regards to the voting habits of the people of my district. In each campaign in which I have sought reelection the leaders of organized labor have hit me with everything in the book. That I have been victorious each time attests to the conservatism of the voters rather than to my popularity.

Again my warmest thanks for the best piece of campaign material I have ever received.

Very truly yours,

PAUL B. DAGUE.

It has always been my firm conviction that the leaders of organized labor have been completely out of step with the thinking of the people in the Ninth Congressional District of Pennsylvania. Public reaction, however, to such bald threats as made by Mr. Carey is, in my opinion, accurately reflected in the following editorial which appeared in the Daily Local News of West Chester, Pa., on August 21, 1959:

THREATS

The type of letter received yesterday by Members of the House who voted for the

Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill warning them that labor union members will try to throw them out of office represents the kind of thing that should not be countenanced in this country.

Representatives are chosen to represent all of the people and not the interests of simply one group of constituents. No Member of the House in recent weeks could mistake the sentiment of the people as a whole in regard to the need for curbing certain labor leaders of whom James R. Hoffa is a fair example. Because the public demanded effective labor legislation at this session of Congress, the Landrum-Griffin bill was approved by a margin of 178 votes.

Every House Member who supported that bill received a letter yesterday from James B. Carey, AFL-CIO official, warning them of what union members intend to do because they voted for what the union considers "punitive repressive" labor legislation.

Every properly registered citizen has the privilege of going to the polls at election time and voting for the candidate which he feels is best qualified for the office to be filled. Once elected, the official must be free to vote for legislation which he feels best serves the welfare of the people as a whole. He must be free to do this without fear of threats or reprisals. Otherwise, he could not possibly represent the people as he should.

It is also the privilege of every citizen to keep in touch with elected officials so that they may know how they (the people) feel in regard to current legislation. Officials welcome such contacts. But no official welcomes the kind of communication that has reached supporters of the Landrum-Griffin bill. In effect it said—because you voted for that bill, we're out to get you.

One Representative termed the letter "bitter and ill tempered," and in a reply wrote: "Please do not insult me by threats." That probably pretty well summed up the feelings of the 229 House Members who were the targets of Carey's letter.

The Honorable PAUL B. DAVU, who represents Chester and Lancaster Counties in the House, told the local News last night when he feels that he must bow to corruption in the ranks of union labor then his effectiveness as a Member of the House is over. Representative DAVU supported the Landrum-Griffin bill on the first vote when it squeezed through with only 28 votes to spare. He was also in the "aye" column on the final vote. His stand in regard to the kind of labor legislation needed to deal with corruption is thus a matter of record.

James B. Carey also sent letters to 201 other House Members who saw fit to vote against the bill, pledging them his support. That is his privilege. But letters which breathe of intimidation and mailed to representatives who voted in the interests of the national welfare, have no part in a Nation which believes in a free and representative government.

Reds Use Visitor To Give Credence to Party Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the fifth in series of articles written by George W. Healy, editor of the New Orleans Times-

Picayune, who accompanied Vice President NIXON on his recent trip to the Soviet Union:

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune, Aug. 13, 1959]

REDS USE VISITOR TO GIVE CREDENCE TO PARTY LINE—EXTEND FAVORS TO MAKE PEOPLE RESENT TOURIST

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

Moscow.—Tourists in Russia have it better than the home folks in several respects. But let the tourist beware.

Unwittingly, the American visitor may easily be used to give credence to the Soviet party line—that westerners, particularly Americans, are selfish, bloated aristocrats.

There are many ways in which visitors seem to be getting the better of things in Russia.

When Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON made news, that news could be sent to the outside world by correspondents traveling with the Vice President without passing through censorship. However, correspondents stationed in Moscow, including American correspondents, had to submit to the usual cable or wireless censorship.

VODKA RUBLES CHEAPER

The official rate of monetary exchange is 4 rubles for \$1. That's what everyone must pay for lodging, meals, and other necessities. But if the tourist wants to buy vodka, go to nightclubs and indulge in other luxuries, he can buy all the rubles he wants at 10 for the dollar. Not black market—legal.

The Sunday we made our second visit to the Kremlin there were no fewer than 10,000 people in double file in a line that extended four or five blocks outside the tomb of Lenin and Stalin.

Did we wait in line?

No. I'm ashamed to say, we didn't.

RUSSIANS STAND HOURS

We were Americans, not Russians, and the Russian Intourist guide insisted that we not go to the end of the line but accompany him to the head. It took us less than 10 minutes to get in and out of the tomb. Many Russians had to stand for 3 or 4 hours to see the bodies of their heroes.

Considering the party line that Americans are plutocrats, what could be more effective than for the Intourist Agency to extend favors to visitors from the West that would make rank and file Russians dislike them?

What would irritate a Russian more than to be kept in line while North Americans were escorted to the head of that line and quickly passed through the tomb in the Kremlin?

Because I wanted to be "on my own," I made minimum use of the guides. The one who took me to a food store gave me the notion that North Americans should regard special favors from Intourist agents in the light of "Greeks bearing gifts."

LINEUPS EVERYWHERE

Everywhere in Moscow, it seems, Russians queue up to pass through the tomb, to buy tickets to the U.S. exhibition (which Soviet officials seem to be limiting to the number of tickets bought by Americans to the Soviet exhibition in New York) and even to buy food.

The particular guide who took me to a food store found about a dozen Russians ahead of me in line at the canned goods counter. The guide told me that I could make my way to the head of the line to buy the caviar that I wanted. I said I'd prefer to wait my turn.

He remarked, "That's good. You'll make friends here."

Obviously, if you make friends by waiting your turn in line with 12 Russians at the food store you don't make friends by permitting guides to take you to the head of the line of 10,000 Russians at the Kremlin.

These are just a few of the incongruities apparent to the casual observer.

The Soviet Government denounces the American Government from day to day—but insists that American, and other, visitors be given privileges that the Russian people do not enjoy.

THEY USE BILLBOARDS

The Soviet Government denounces advertising as a crass weapon of evil capitalism but uses billboards by the hundreds—particularly in outlying areas—to advertise what it claims to be the advantages of communism.

No phase of U.S. Government is exempt from criticism by Soviet officials.

Civil defense proposals were a special target of F. R. Kozlov, first deputy premier of the Soviet Union, in one of his talks with members of the Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON's party.

"You talk about building shelters under your buildings to protect you from bombs," he said. "That's ridiculous. The subways I saw in New York are lousy. Why don't you build subways like we have—good subways and deep subways. You could improve your subways and provide bomb shelters at the same time."

If the fashion show at the U.S. exhibition impresses the Russians, there is a billion-dollar market waiting for some manufacturer.

MEN DON'T WEAR TIES

None of the Russian men at a supposedly fashionable party which we attended wore a tie; and, I was informed by lady members of our group, none of the Russian women wore a girdle.

Kindness is not a monopoly of the people of any country.

Finding a taxicab in downtown Moscow after a party breaks up is just about as hard as getting a taxicab on Broadway when the shows end.

Several of us were in the predicament of having to walk a couple of miles back to the Ukraina Hotel when an occupied taxi passed us. The occupant, observing our situation, halted the driver and had him back up to where we were standing. The lone passenger, a young man, spoke little English and we little Russian, but we managed to communicate that we wanted to be driven to the hotel.

When we reached the hotel we asked to be permitted to pay all or part of the fare. Our new-found friend refused. Nor would he give us his card or his name.

The Need for a Youth Conservation Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, on June 17 I introduced H.R. 7777 to establish a Youth Conservation Corps, a bill which is very similar to the one approved by the Senate last week. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we can secure action in the House on this measure during the present session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention and that of our colleagues in the House to an editorial entitled "Youth and the Land" which was published on Thursday, August 20, 1959, in the Washington Post:

YOUTH AND THE LAND

The plan approved by the Senate to establish a Youth Conservation Corps similar to

the depression-born Civilian Conservation Corps deserves to be judged in broader terms than its opponents, including the President, have apparently employed so far. Their objections to the cost of the venture need to be considered, of course, but we cannot for a moment believe that the expense would be anything like the astronomical scare figures cited by Senate Republicans. Indeed, is it not possible that the plan would result in some real—if not bookkeeping—economies?

The proposal is to enlist volunteer boys from 16 to 21 years of age for work in the national parks, forests, and wildlife refuges at basic pay of \$60 a month. "Make work" ought, of course, to be avoided—but considering the enormous public land holdings and the growing public demands upon national park facilities this ought not to be difficult. An efficiently administered program should increase the value of the parks and refuges in a most economical way, at the same time affording exceptional opportunities for young men to learn useful skills and to round out their own mental and physical development in a wholesome atmosphere. We think the plan could be a happy blending of two of the country's greatest assets—its land and its youth—and that the measure ought to be enacted.

Russian Versus American Military Code of Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LeROY H. ANDERSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the military forces of the world's two greatest nations have been changing their codes of military justice. This action has been a direct result of the Korean conflict. I believe the following news review of an article by Major Denis A. Cooper in the Air Force Judge Advocate General Bulletin is of much interest. It follows:

WASHINGTON.—The principle that the accused is presumed innocent until convicted by evidence beyond a reasonable doubt is considered "obsolete dogma of bourgeois law" by the Soviet Union. Red servicemen are unaware that the American serviceman enjoys the shield of presumption.

These are the key points made by Maj. Denis A. Cooper, Headquarters, USAF, in his article on military codes of conduct—United States and Russia—in the July JAG Bulletin. The new issue of the publication, put out by the Air Force JAG, was distributed this week.

Major Cooper in comparing the two "codes" says that the Soviets, as did this country, developed its code following experiences learned from the Korean war:

"The U.S.S.R. . . . appears to have watched the performance of some of our military personnel during captivity as well as their courtmartial trials after liberation." He said Soviet leaders were struck by the newly discovered necessity for new rules of behavior for a soldier in captivity and that modern but barbaric methods of warfare, revived by their own allies in Korea, had outdated their earlier code of military justice.

In their new code, Cooper said the Soviets laid down the following punishments for crimes of their servicemen taken prisoners:

1. Confinement from 3 to 10 years for voluntary participation "in works of war significance or in any project which he knows

may result in prejudice to the Soviet Union or its allies, if it lacks the elements of treason against one's country . . ."

2. Confinement for from 3 to 10 years for violence to fellow POW's or "cruel treatment of them, if committed by a prisoner in the position of a superior . . ."

3. Confinement for 1 to 3 years for commission of acts intended to harm other prisoners . . . for mercenary motives or in order to secure benevolent treatment for himself by the enemy.

The new publication contains separate articles on (1) applicability of the Hiss Act to court-martialed persons, (2) evolution of the Toth Doctrine, and (3) limitations on retired Regular officers when contracting with the Government.

Maj. Gen. Reginald C. Harmon is Air Force's judge advocate general. The JAG Bulletin is published bimonthly to provide a means for exchange of ideas and information of the JAG department.

It also discusses important legislation and special cases.

The July issue reports on General Harmon's "preventive law" program, which is designed to keep servicemen out of trouble by informing them in advance of legal pitfalls.

Welcome to Grand Master of California— An Address by Imperial Sir George E. Stringfellow, Imperial Potentate, June 29, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of an address by Imperial Sir George E. Stringfellow, Imperial potentate of East Orange, N.J., on the occasion of Grand Master Phil Myers being created a Shriner on June 29, 1959:

WELCOME TO GRAND MASTER OF CALIFORNIA

Good evening Illustrious Les White, gracious and effective Illustrious potentate of Al Malaikah Temple, under whose auspices tonight's dinner is being held. Good evening Most Worshipful Grand Master Myers and good evening to all the others who are assembled in the Town House in Los Angeles to honor the great Masonic leader of California who was recently elected to membership in Al Malaikah and who was created a noble of the Ancient Arabic Order of Nobles of the Mystic Shrine a few hours ago.

A word about Al Malaikah Temple. Seventy-one years ago this month Al Malaikah was chartered as the 40th Shrine Temple of North America. Today, Al Malaikah is second in membership and ranks very high in the councils of the 166 temples. Al Malaikah has provided the Shrine with three of its most outstanding Imperial potentates, in the persons of Fred A. Hines, 1910-11; Leo V. Youngworth, 1929-30; and Harold Lloyd, 1949-50. All of these nobles did much to elevate Al Malaikah from the 40th position in membership to second. All of these nobles did much to spread the gospel of the Shrine not only in sunny California but throughout North America. The Shrine owes them a debt of gratitude which it can never repay. I now refer specifically to my good friend and colleague, Imperial Sir Harold Lloyd, who in his modest and effective manner placed the Shrine in the show windows and

who currently is rendering a great service to our fraternity as chairman of the wills, bequests, and gifts committee and as a member of the board of trustees of the Shriners Hospitals for Crippled Children.

I indeed regret that I cannot be with you tonight to personally welcome the most worshipful grand master of Masons of California into membership in our fraternity, but I believe our friendship, established in the sacred precepts of Freemasonry is of such strength that he will accept my welcome, as head of our fraternity, from across the continent.

At the conclusion of my remarks I shall leave for Atlantic City to attend the 85th session of the Imperial council which will begin its deliberations next week. It is my hope that I may be privileged to greet the grand master and other officers of the Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of the great State of California at this year's Imperial council session.

I believe the Shrine has a destiny within the framework of our human society. The destiny of the Shrine, as I conceive it, is to provide fraternal relaxation among men of honor and integrity who already have experienced the intellectual and emotional rituals of Freemasonry and the rites; men who have learned that in Masonry and the rites there is hope for a better tomorrow.

The responsibility and destiny of Freemasonry is (as I conceive it) to perpetuate the principles of freedom and dignity of the individual for which our Masonic forefathers fought so valiantly. Our lives, our fortunes, and our honor are indelibly tied to the "Apron of Freedom" which is the theme of our 1959 session and which will be on display in Atlantic City as a symbol of Masonic honor.

Brother Myers and I have discussed the need of greater unity in Freemasonry—not uniformity, but unity.

There is need for the rites, as well as basic Masonry. There is need for the Shrine and all the constituent Masonic bodies which stem from the Blue Lodge. Since Freemasonry was introduced into North America, great men have served our fraternity. To mention a few—there was Washington, Franklin, Hancock, and Pike. They made their contributions to a better way of life through our fraternity. It is a historic fact that our way of life was largely created in the atmosphere of Freemasonry.

Dr. Walter M. Fleming, an eminent Mason, conceived the idea that there are times when Masons should get together just for the fun of being together. Doubtless it is that thought that prompted your meeting in Los Angeles tonight. Fleming wrote the ritual for the Shrine which is now on display in the Shrine rooms in the George Washington Masonic Memorial in Alexandria, Va.

Our way of life today faces an organized attack by a godless philosophy called communism. If it should succeed, our fraternity would be the first to be destroyed. There is no group of men in North America who are better qualified to meet this attack than Freemasons and, in my opinion, we will be unworthy of our heritage if we do not meet the challenge. The challenge is being met in a modest way behind tiled doors. Let us say publicly that the purposes of Freemasons of America have not changed from that of the members of St. John's Lodge of Boston who assembled in the Green Dragon Tavern, painted their faces and dumped the tea in Boston Harbor.

I am conscious of the fact that partisan politics has no place in Masonry or the Shrine. I submit that communism is a conspiracy to destroy our way of life and if we are worthy of our liberty, we will not be diverted by the assertion that Masonry and the Shrine should stay free of politics while this conspiracy destroys our liberty.

Worshipful Sir, I hope you are as happy today on being created a Shriner as the 800-

000 Shriners are to welcome you into our fraternity.

Good night to one and all, and may God bless and keep you well and happy.

Soviet Jets Used by Nixon Party Held Inferior Type

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the sixth in series of articles written by George W. Healy, editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, who accompanied Vice President Nixon on his recent trip to the Soviet Union: SOVIET JETS USED BY NIXON PARTY HELD INFERIOR TYPE—LENINGRAD FOUND MORE ATTRACTIVE THAN CAPITAL.

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

LENINGRAD.—Because the Soviet Government declined to permit U.S. jets to travel around Russia, members of Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON's party used planes of the official Russian airline, Aeroflot, for flights within the Soviet borders.

The party, greatly augmented by Russian, French and British news correspondents who joined us at Moscow, was assigned three Aeroflot TU-104B jets for the journeys to Leningrad, Novosibirsk and Sverdlovsk.

These planes cruise at about 500 miles per hour, compared with the 555 miles per hour averaged by our Pan American 707-321 transport on the record flight from New York to Moscow.

The Russian planes are powered by two jet engines built into the backswept wings. The American plane has four jet engines, suspended slightly below the wings.

Actually, the three Russian planes assigned to us were bombers. They are capable of quick conversion from passenger transports to military use. They have their bomb bays and their bomb hatches ready for action.

Cabins of these three planes were less comfortable than that of the 707-321. Ventilation is inadequate, and when the planes were on the ground—at this season—the heat was intense. Moreover, they carried their own house flies—even at 30,000 feet.

Each TU-104B carried approximately 100 passengers, 3 on one side of the aisle and 2 on the other.

STRAIN ON BELTS

They come in fast for a landing, or—in the language of aviators—"very hot." Their jet engines apparently are not reversible, because braking is supplied by release from their tails of two parachutes. When the parachutes open, passengers and crew have a sensation of "Whoa." It's a sudden strain against seat belts.

After leaving New York the Nixon party, or parties, established the practice of applauding loudly as the wheels touched ground on each succeeding landing.

Applause on one of the Russian jet landings was very sparse. The pilot hit the runway hard, and as the plane bounced several members of the party shouted, "I'm not going to clap for that one."

Leningrad, in my opinion, is a far more attractive city than Moscow. The latter is monotonous, except for the skyscrapers erected during Stalin's regime; and most of them are grotesque.

Comparing Leningrad with Moscow, it seems to me, is like comparing New Orleans with one of America's new oil cities. Leningrad is mellow and has a distinct character.

Its people, reflecting Nordic influence, also are attractive and seemed to me better dressed than those in Moscow. Buildings along the Neva River, which flows through Leningrad to the Gulf of Finland, have real charm.

My most interesting assignment in Leningrad was to board the icebreaker *Lenin* with Vice President Nixon, Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, and 11 other newsmen. We went aboard to inspect the vessel which the Soviets say will break ice through use of atomic power.

HEALY FIRST CHOSEN

With 300 newsmen on hand, including Russians, North Americans, British, French, and others, there just wasn't enough room on the *Lenin* for all correspondents to go aboard. A pool of 12 men was formed, 6 representing morning newspapers or electronic media and 6 representing afternoon newspapers or electronic media.

Through the luck of the Irish, when a drawing was made for the pool my name came out No. 1.

Admiral Rickover spoke briefly with the pool members before we boarded the ship. He understood that the Russians expected her to break ice to a depth of about 8 feet while steaming at 2 to 3 knots.

We had been told by the Russians that no photographers would be permitted aboard. No Western photographers were allowed on the ship, but her decks were swarming with Russian photographers when we climbed abroad. I thought they were newspaper photographers, but one of my colleagues said he suspected some of them were police.

ENGINE DISCUSSED

At any event, the inspection party held a discussion with its Russian hosts before going below deck.

Engines of the ship apparently are just like the engines of any modern steam-turbine electric ship. Sole difference is that the energy or heat to make the steam for the *Lenin* is to come not from coal or oil but from an atomic reactor. At least, that's the way this layman understands it.

The *Lenin*'s engines were operating when we went aboard, but they weren't driven by atomic energy. A pipe carrying steam from a landside installation crossed the wharf to the *Lenin*'s engine room.

Because I know very little about an atomic reactor and because it was very hot below decks, I excused myself from the inspection party after we passed through the engine room.

Just to see whether it could be done I climbed alone to the bridge. Three officers there seemed not at all startled to see me. None, however, spoke English, and I spoke no Russian beyond a few phrases.

OFFICER DIDN'T KNOW

When I returned to the main deck the first officer was standing at the boarding ladder. He spoke a little English. I asked him if he would tell me about the ship.

In reply to my question about the thickness of ice which the *Lenin* might break, he held up his thumb and middle finger and said, "We don't know if she'll break ice this thick or"—raising his hand high above the deck—"ice this thick. We just haven't tried her. She's a new ship."

The Soviets have made great propaganda capital of the building of the *Lenin*—having exhibited motion pictures showing how she is expected to perform.

The only unusual thing about the *Lenin* which impressed me was the extensive use of plywood in its construction. Doors, wardroom ceiling, furniture and other equipment of the ship is made of plywood. Metal short-

age may be an explanation, or there may be some other reason.

NO AIR CONDITIONER

No evidence of any air conditioning was apparent, but then there's probably no justification for an icebreaker to be air conditioned. Certainly not when she's in service.

As a member of the icebreaker news pool, I was expected to speak to all the newsmen at a briefing after we returned to the Europa and Astoria hotels.

Anything I had to say, of course, was anticlimax when Admiral Rickover made his report.

He believes the *Lenin* is good for what is expected of her—but represents no advance in the reactor art.

Philosophy of a Maverick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, BILL MEYER, of Vermont, calls them as he sees them. He is the first Democrat to win national office from Vermont in more than 100 years. His philosophy is courageous and refreshing. He has many friends among his colleagues. We appreciate his sincerity. We appreciate his concern for peace and his willingness to take action on his behalf.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues a fine article about BILL MEYER appearing in Labor on August 15, 1959, which under a previous consent is included at this point:

[From Labor, Aug. 15, 1959]

"MAVERICK" HOUSE MEMBER CALLS PEACE THE BIG ISSUE

"I see great dangers for any country whose prosperity is based on a war economy, like ours," declared Congressman WILLIAM H. MEYER, Democrat, Vermont, leaning back behind his desk, as he talked with a reporter for Labor this week.

Tall, husky and soft-spoken, Meyer created a minor sensation when he won Vermont's lone House seat last November. He was the first Democrat to win National office from the Green Mountain State since 1850.

Moreover, Meyer was identified as a pacifist. Actually, he says, he is not one. Instead he sounds more like an old-fashioned antimilitarist. Meyer is distinctive also in his resolve to speak out his full views, let the chips fall where they may.

Labor sought out the Vermonter this week to find how much effect he thinks this maverick-style approach has had in the session of Congress nearing its end.

MUST NOT DRIFT TO WAR

"To me," MEYER said, "the question of war and peace is the important issue today. That's why I entered politics. I say that we dare not let ourselves drift into war by hoping passively for peace while lacking the courage to work for it."

"In this session," he continued, "I've many times felt discouraged, as though I were working for a lost cause. But I think I've had some effect. I believe I've encouraged some fellow members to take more action on peace questions. Maybe I've made Congress think more."

MEYER estimated about 20 Congressmen agree personally with most of his "radical"

views on foreign policy, and about 50 agree with some of them. But few House Members, he indicated, have been willing to speak up.

"This whole place," said MEYER, "is pervaded with the idea that a Congressman's first job is to get reelected. Therefore, many of the things Members would like to do they don't do, because of the great political risk. But I feel that if you compromise right away, you'll get out of the habit of taking a stand."

COULD KILL DEMOCRACY

On foreign policy, MEYER said he believes that "we can't rely almost entirely, as now, on military deterrence, because it will probably result in the disaster of nuclear war." He believes that neutral zones should be created through mutual United States-Russian withdrawal of forces from world areas of friction.

He said he favors admission of Red China to the United Nations. He also favors halting nuclear weapons tests and a big push for mutual disarmament. Some national defense is needed now, MEYER said, but he recalled that a war economy "was the background of Hitlerism, too. It could kill American democracy and lead to a military dictatorship here."

On other issues, MEYER said, his stand generally resembles that of other progressive Democrats. For example, he noted, there aren't too many union members in Vermont. "But," he said, "three out of four times I would probably vote in a way organized labor would call favorable—because of my own views of what's right."

MEYER, a 44-year-old forester by profession, concedes that his independence—and his party label—may make it hard to get reelected. "They say being this way is no way to have a political career," he remarked. "But I must be true to myself."

Poison in Your Water—No. 157

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Portland (Oreg.) Journal of May 25, 1959, entitled "Dirty River Once Stank, Killed Fish":

DIRTY RIVER ONCE STANK, KILLED FISH

(By Watford Reed)

The Willamette River supplied water to cities along its banks early in the century.

By 1944 it was so foul that it stank.

Up to 1912 or 1914 swimming meets were held in Portland harbor. That ended when towns on the Willamette dumped in their sewage without treatment.

So it was that Portland, Salem, and Oregon City had to build expensive water projects high in the mountains, take over broad areas of watersheds and forbid human entry. Industry grew as population increased, and by 1926 pollution was so bad in the low water months of the late summer and fall that there was no oxygen in the water in Portland harbor. Fish died when they reached the harbor.

Shortly before the United States entered World War II, the State game commission dramatized the situation by lowering a cage of lively fish into the harbor while newsmen

watched. Within a few minutes the fish were dead—suffocated by lack of oxygen.

A group of men sat on a raft in the river at Portland for days as a stunt to spur the city to meet its quota in a war bond drive. The men's only complaint:

"The stench of the river makes us feel sick."

In 1944, two Oregon State College engineers made a survey and reported:

"Pollution in the Willamette River system is a State shame. This magnificent river is in part an open sewer in which tremendous quantities of untreated human sewage and industrial wastes are disposed. Pollution, along with other detrimental activities, has depleted a world-famous commercial and game fish fauna."

No fewer than 51 outfalls discharged raw sewage into the Willamette at Portland and 11 into Columbia Slough.

In the 1930's, several attempts were made to get an antipollution law through the State legislature. All failed.

In 1938, advocates of clean rivers put an initiative on the ballot to set up the Oregon sanitary authority. The voters approved by a 3 to 1 margin.

In 1944, Portland voters approved a \$12 million bond issue and a charge for the use of the sewers. Other cities followed suit under the prodding of the sanitary authority.

At the end of the war, only 4½ percent of the sewage that entered the Willamette had any kind of treatment. Not a single town on the main stem had a treatment plant.

Nor was any treatment given industrial waste.

By the end of 1957, almost 94 percent of the sewer-using population of the Willamette Basin was served by sewage treatment plants. Eighty public and semi-public such plants were in operation.

Industry cooperated in several ways. Some paper mills dug lagoons and poured their waste sulfite liquor into them for dumping into the Willamette at high water stages when it would do no harm.

The Crown Zellerbach mill at Leba on began to evaporate and burn waste liquor.

Publishers Paper Co. at Oregon City, lacking ground for lagoons, gives away waste liquor for use as a road binder. Because of it, miles of dirt roads no longer are dusty in the summer.

Long tanks that look like oversize silos—each containing 120,000 gallons of sulphite liquor—are pushed on barges to the Columbia River, where the papermill waste is drained into the bigger stream. This process, praised at first, now has begun to arouse criticism because of industrial pollution of the Columbia.

Portland and other Willamette Valley cities have spent a king's ransom—more than \$30 million—to clean up their stream.

Yet the State sanitary authority reports pollution only 16 percent less than it was in 1939.

The reason is twofold: Increasing population and growing industry.

In the words of Kenneth Spies, deputy State sanitary engineer:

"We haven't seen the end of either."

Industrial wastes have increased by 41 percent since 1950 and 93 percent since 1939, and the sewer population has increased by 73 percent.

A joint study by the sanitary authority and the pulp and paper industry brought out estimates that the five papermills on the main stem of the Willamette would have to reduce their pollution loads by 74 to 83 percent to maintain five parts of dissolved oxygen per million in Portland harbor—the minimum needed for fish life. They have reduced their pollution by an average of 67 percent.

Spies says: "The effluents of these five papermills were primarily responsible for the serious oxygen depletions which occurred in both the South Santiam River and lower Portland harbor in 1957."

Friendliness to Visitors Rises Far From Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the seventh in a series of articles written by George W. Healy, editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, who accompanied Vice President Nixon on his recent trip to the Soviet Union:

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune, Aug. 15, 1959]

FRIENDLINESS TO VISITORS RISES FAR FROM MOSCOW—GREETING IS ENTHUSIASTIC AT NOVOSIBIRSK

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

NOVOSIBIRSK, SIBERIA.—The greater the distance from the Kremlin, the greater the show of affection by the Russian people for the people of the United States.

This is the observation of an amateur diplomat after a week in Russia.

Whereas the reception given the party of Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, was on the chilly side in Moscow and warm in Leningrad, the reception given him and every member of his group in Novosibirsk was really hot. It was enthusiastic.

This city, 2,000 miles east of Leningrad, is less than 75 years old. It got its start when the Trans-Siberian railroad was under construction, in 1893. Now it is the largest city in Siberia, larger than New Orleans—with a population of about 900,000.

At the moment Novosibirsk is pushing a "balance agriculture with industry" program.

INDUSTRIAL ADVANCES

Its mayor, or his equivalent, who greeted us, emphasized that Siberia no longer deserves the bad name it bore for many years. Siberia, he insisted, is no longer a place for outcasts to be sent to die in salt mines.

A glimpse of this city and the nearby countryside supports the mayor's contentions.

Its traffic on the Ob River, which looks about like the Ohio at Louisville; its new hydroelectric plant 12 miles above the city; its machine stamping plant, which uses planning equipment and hydraulic presses made in the United States and Great Britain and sent to Russia in the days of lend-lease, and its other mills are impressive.

However, not one of these physical assets was as impressive to me as were the people of Novosibirsk. To use a word frequently uttered by Mrs. Nixon, they were "tremendous."

Very few Americans have visited this Siberian city of cold winters and hot summers. Among the few was Senator ALLEN J. ELLENBER, who came here several years ago.

CROWD JAMS STREETS

The Nixon party probably was the largest group of Western visitors ever received in Novosibirsk and the city really turned out. It was like Third Street in Baton Rouge on inauguration day.

Probably the finest building in Novosibirsk is its opera house or ballet theater, and when the Vice President went there for a presentation of "Swan Lake," the plaza in front and the streets on the sides were jammed.

Graciously, Mr. Nixon left the theater between third and fourth acts to speak to the crowd. I remained outside the theater after he returned to his seat.

Within minutes I was surrounded by thousands of interested or curious Russians, many of whom had never before been close to a North American. A young man pushed his way to my side, said he spoke a little English and offered to try to interpret for me.

I said I'd be happy to try to answer any questions about America.

ANSWERS QUESTIONS

The first was: "Why do you have to pay a doctor for medical service in your country?"

My reply was to the effect that people with means pay for medical service in the United States and that fine hospitals were available to give free treatment to those who cannot afford to pay.

The second question was: "Why do some young men and women in your country fail to get an education because they have no money?"

I explained that, in my opinion, any young man or young woman in the United States who desires an education can get it. I pointed out that many members of our party had worked their way through college.

As many questions were put to me and many answers given, my volunteer interpreter would brief the crowd.

CROWD OPENS WAY

When I saw that my bus was about to leave the front of the theater I asked that the crowd give me a lane to return to the bus. Very respectfully, the Russians stepped back, and I shook hands with 40 or 50 of them on my way to the bus.

My volunteer interpreter followed me to the bus, telling me that several members of the crowd, while shaking hands, had said, "We want to be your friends."

I gave him my card and asked him to write his own name and address for me. Although I had been cautioned that Russians and Siberians would be hesitant to establish any means of communication with members of our group, he quickly wrote his name, address, occupation and place of employment. He said he would like me to send him two articles from New Orleans.

If they'll go through the mails, he'll get what he asked.

Traveling behind the Iron Curtain, particularly beyond the Ural Mountains, with the Vice President of the United States is not all caviar and vodka.

IN OFFICIAL PARTY

When the official Nixon party was organized, two newspapermen were included for transportation to and from Europe and Asia by jetplane. Edwin Russell, publisher of the Harrisburg, Pa., Patriot and Evening News, was one. I was the other. Both of us qualified as members of the official party by virtue of our membership on the President's advisory committee for the U.S. exhibition in Moscow.

However, neither Ed Russell nor I traveled in the same plane with the Vice President, except on the leg of the journey between Warsaw, Poland, and Keflavik, Iceland. On this leg the Vice President rode the press plane. The listing of the official party carried an asterisk after our names—indicating that we were traveling on the plane or planes which carried the news correspondents.

This was entirely proper, because had we traveled with the Vice President and stayed at all times with him and other members of the official party, we doubtless would have

had advantages the other newspapermen on the trip did not enjoy. Ed and I wanted to cover the story like the others, and that meant that we should take the same chances and treatment as the other correspondents.

We may have made a mistake, but I doubt it.

The official party, with the exception of us two, was quartered everywhere in comfortable, almost luxurious dachas—or country homes. In two places we visited, quarters for the newsmen were primitive.

CONGESTION GROWS

Our accommodations in Moscow were average, with each man or woman given a single room and bath. At the Europa Hotel in Leningrad we started to quadruple. My assignment with with three other newsmen to what had been a parlor and bedroom suite. When we reached Novosibirsk, the congestion was real. I shared a room with seven other correspondents—with no running water.

The Russians apparently got mixed up on all room assignments, because Mr. and Mrs. Walter Ridder of the Ridder newspapers found themselves assigned to a room with two men; and Jinx Falkenburg, representing Newsday, found herself assigned to a room with seven men. After a reshuffling, rooms for men generally were occupied by six or eight men, and two rooms used by the women were occupied by four or five women in each case.

Standing in line, in 17th place, waiting to shave at a down the hall cold water tap in hotel No. 2 at Novosibirsk, I was joined by James "Scotty" Reston of the New York Times, in 18th place.

"Pretty rough, isn't it?" I said to "Scotty." "You're just learning again how it is to be a reporter," he replied. "You editors just get too soft."

Then, as an afterthought "Scotty" added, "I wish a certain official of your State could see you here. He'd ask, 'Who's crazy now?'"

To have the opportunity to be a reporter again and to meet the fine people of Novosibirsk was worth any discomfort we experienced—many times over.

Ed Russell and I would do it again—with 20 in a room, if they could be crowded in— which they couldn't in hotel No. 2.

Milton Eisenhower, after our departure from Novosibirsk, spoke to me about the rough time he was having—sleeping in luxurious quarters but having to get up at the same time as the rest of us.

"What we've got is rougher," I said to him. "but I'm sure it's a lot more fun."

Cross Country With the On-to-Oregon Cavalcade—XIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the on-to-Oregon cavalcade is back home in Oregon. The following daily accounts of the wagon-train journey takes the adventurers from near Baker, which is in Representative ULLMAN's district, to The Dalles, still a part of the Second Congressional District, the largest district in our State. The trip through Al's constituency is warmly described by author Rudy Roudebaugh of Drain:

[From the Drain (Oreg.) Enterprise, Aug. 6, 1959]

WAGONEERS WELCOME ICE IN BLUE MOUNTAINS AFTER IDAHO HEAT WAVE

(By Robert "Rudy" Roudebaugh)

July 26, Sunday: Had church services at 8:30 and spent rest of day passing out letters and answering questions.

July 27, 5:05: All ready to go and Roy is just starting to harness. 5:10: Heading west and crossing Alder Creek. Doc got one new shoe on his left front foot yesterday. 5:37: Left the valley and going up the Blue Mountains. 5:59: At Oxman, not even a wide place in the road. 7:29: There are big rocks all over the hills with short sagebrush and small cedar trees spotted on the hillsides. 7:40: Pleasant Valley (motel, cafe, service station). This valley is about one-quarter mile wide and 2 miles long. Hay and cattle raised here. 8:40: Going down hill and I'm using the brakes. 9:10: Stopped to water. Doc and Jan didn't drink very much as it's cool, making traveling easy. 9:24: We are on our way again. Janell got off to ride in an Army Jeep.

10:58: Entering Baker, population 9,529. 11:02: Baker County sheriff posse came to escort us in. Free pop was given to us by the Beefburger Fountain and Cafe. 11:26: Crossing the Powder River. 11:35: Recrossing the Powder River. 11:44: We are camped at the city park at Baker, elevation 3,440. The lunch was served by the JCettes. At dinner we were personal guests of the Livestock Association. I met an old friend from Lexington, Ed J. Nauenburg. He is now living in Baker. It was cold last night with a real strong wind. Ki and I had about 3 hours rest yesterday which is something if you don't believe us ask Andy. Janell, Ki, and I were on KBKR ratio station for about an hour this evening. You folks will be hearing it as the tape will be sent to Eugene.

July 28, 4:30: Pancake feed at old town in Baker, sponsored by the historical society. 5:05: All hooked up and ready to roll. There was dew on the grass and it was pretty cold. We are waiting on Roy. 5:52: Betty Herizi rode with me this morning. Ki and Janell never even got up for breakfast. 5:57: Crossed Powder River heading south on Cambelle Street on Highway 30. Logging trucks are all heading for the woods. The Baker Valley is about 30 miles wide and about that long. Mostly hay and grain grown here with cattle and sheep raised. 6:51: Can see timber in the south hills. Powder River follows the north foothills. 7:39: A load of 15 pine logs just passed us. The cattle along here are mixed shorthorns. Angus, whiteface. 8:38: Stopped at Haines, population 325, and watered. Was served coffee and cookies (special guest) and went through the Hitching Post Museum. 9:37: Leaving Haines and Roxie Cutting from Nehama is riding with us.

11:18: Crossed 45th parallel which is halfway between the Equator and North Pole. Most common tree through here is pussy willow.

11:36: Entering Union County and crossing North Powder River. 11:49: Entering North Powder River, population 425. Making camp at the high school. We have a big welcome sign here that says, "Oregon Centennial Wagon Train—North Powder Welcomes You in 1959—Come Again in 2059." Lunch was served to us by the North Powder Grange. They will also supply us with dinner.

July 29, 5:50: Ready to roll. Ki is on cook shift and (naturally) this was the best breakfast I've had since I've been on the trip. North Powder is supported by sawmills, beef cattle. Our feed and grain was donated by North Powder Grange. 5:57: Rolling out across Powder Valley.

We had ice all around us last night. It was a big change after the heat. Doc got one new shoe on his left rear foot. 8:15: Leaving Powder Valley. 8:26: At the summit and small pine trees on each side of us. 9:12: Met by the 4-H Riding Club. 9:58: Going down through a canyon. It has warmed up some. 10:02: Stopped to water. Jan and Doc each drank a pail of water. 10:18: Going west again. 10:34: We dropped off into Grande Ronde Valley. 11:30: Met by the LaGrande Maverick Riding Club. We must have about 100 riders with us now. 11:35: Queen Darlene and two princesses Pat and Karen of Joseph, Oreg., Rodeo.

12:10: Entered La Grande, home of Eastern Oregon College. 12:46: Arrived at armory. Lunch was served by the Salvation Army. Ki and I were invited to Neil Anderson's for the afternoon to bathe and rest. Neil is the sports editor of the paper here. Dinner was by the Lions Club.

July 30, 5:58: Perched up here on the wagon seat like a big ape and ready to take off. We had breakfast this morning by the Union Chamber of Commerce. 6:10: Rolling through the Grande Ronde Valley. Ki is still on cook shift. 6:28: Going through a grove of small pine trees. The sun is out and there is a small breeze. 6:42: Crossed the Grande Ronde River and going up a canyon with rocky hills on each side. 7:08: Crossed over the Grande Ronde River for the last time. Still in the canyon with pine trees on both sides. 7:16: Crossed 5 Point Creek. This part of the highway is under construction. 8:10: We have just pulled a long grade and stopped to rest for 15 minutes. 8:43: Hit the new superhighway, three lanes each way.

10:10: We dedicated the new highway. The Blue Mountain Boys came out to meet us. 10:31: We are camped at Strickland Flats. This place is just like any place a mile from Drain. We felt just like we were home. Mr. and Mrs. Lyle Hill were here to visit us this evening. We had a nice visit.

July 31, 5:36: Ready to go and leave Strickland Plate. 5:48: Finally pulling out. 7:30: Crossing railroad overpass going into Meacham, population about 50. It is a small place with a general store, post office combined. It's in the heart of the Blue Mountains, also the summit. 8:19: Emigrant Springs State Park. 9:03: Umatilla Indian Reservation. 3:59: Going over Deadman Pass. 10:42: Arrived at camp at the Umatilla Reservation.

August 1, 5:50: All ready to go. 6:05: Headed for Pendleton. We have five riders to ride in with us already. 6:22: We are coming into the wheat country; a little timber in the draws. 8:07: Came down a 7-mile hill. I guess Ki can breathe now as we are at the bottom. My brakes weren't too good, but didn't have any trouble. Wonder what happened to the National Guards, they aren't out to escort us. 8:45: Waiting at truck scales to take care of the traffic. 9:00: Here we go again. 9:54: Leaving Umatilla Indian Reservation. The Pendleton wagon just got in the lead. Population 15,174.

10:03: Entering Pendleton. Here is the Main Street cowboys of Pendleton to meet us. This is the oddest shaped town we've been in. 10:22: The band is out to greet us. It's a big deal here. 11:57: Entered the rodeo arena. Lunch served to us by the Ladies Pioneer Club and a beef dinner by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Mr. and Mrs. Merlin Allen of Walsburg, Wash. (old home Yoncalla), were here to visit us; also Bob Cellers and wife Ginger were here last evening.

[From the Drain (Oreg.) Enterprise, Aug. 13, 1959]

**WAGON TRAIN MEMBER "HUNG" FOR HOSS
STEALING IN EASTERN OREGON
(By R. "Rudy" Roudebaugh)**

Theda Clemens (Honalin) of Pendleton was a visitor of the Drain wagon. She wants some of her friends in Drain to write her at

116 S.E. 10th, Pendleton, Oreg. Joe Huckins and family from Portland were also visitors.

August 3, 5:49: All hooked up. 6:03: Leaving Round-up City. Going by Empire Machine Co. Biggest piece of equipment for sale is a D-7. 6:14: Crossing Umatilla River. We are in Umatilla County. 7:16: Just pulled up a 4-mile hill, 8-percent grade and the oil is slick. The mules are having a time standing up.

This is rolling country with wheat as main crop. It's about to be harvested. 10:14: Stopped to water Doc and Jan. They drank a pail apiece. We can see Mt. Hood from here. It's right straight north of The Dalles. 10:28: On the road again. 11:57: Crossing the Umatilla River again. We are hitting irrigation area—raising corn, alfalfa. 12:22: Making camp at the Ervin Mann ranch south of Stanfield 6 miles. Made 24 miles today. The Chamber of Commerce of Hermiston gave a banquet for us. There was a speaker there from Walla Walla on Oregon history.

August 4, 5:22: Ready to roll. We had about 4,000 people around here last night. Ki is on cook shift today. 5:57: Crossed a small river, but didn't get the name. It's pretty windy and cold this morning. Lots of beef cattle grazing along here. Can still see Mt. Hood today. 6:55: Going over a little rise about a mile long. Nothing but sagebrush on each side of the road. 7:14: At junction of Highway 207. 7:26: Crossed over Butler Creek. Hay and corn is raised along here. Corn is used for ensilage. 7:34: Lost nut on left front wheel, but it was found before the wheel fell off. 8:27: Entering Umatilla Ordnance Depot. 8:38: Entering Morrow County, leaving Umatilla. 10:04: Stopped to water. Doc and Jan drank a half a pail apiece. 10:16: Westward again. This area here reminds me of the sand hills of Nebraska except there is sagebrush here. 11:22: Queen Sheron and her court, Judy, Susy, Janet, Joan, from Heppne Rodeo, rode out to escort us into town.

12:24: The sheriff came out and picked up Gail Carnine for horse stealing. He had to stand trial and was hung by the neck as punishment (all mock of course). You will probably see it on television. Got our first glimpse of the Columbia River. 12:42: Made camp at Boardman public school on the football field. Lunch was served by all different club in Boardman. Dinner given by the Hug Water Melon Association.

August 5.—We had breakfast at Joe Fattone's Hitching Post Cafe. The queen and her court also had breakfast with us and rode to H Junction with us. 5:57: Waiting for Tex, he's decided to ride today. 6:07: Heading west. The trees through here are locust, cottonwood, poplar, and willow. The crops grown here are alfalfa, wild hay, corn for ensilage. Doc had his shoe reset on left rear foot. They seem to raise lot of Hereford cattle around here. 7:32: Going through a small desert, rocky, with sagebrush along the Columbia River. 9:40: Leaving Morrow County, entering Gilliam County. 9:50: Left the new Highway 30 and now on old Highway 30. 9:50: Crossed Willow Creek, and stopped to water. 10:16: Heading up a canyon. There doesn't seem to be any breeze and it's pretty stuffy. Second Lieutenant Domly is riding with me. He is the officer in charge of escorting us. 12:05: Camped on the George Shane and Sons ranch, 3 miles east of Arlington. He also donated the grain for us. Smokey Swape donated the hay (he's from Arlington). We were all given hotel rooms for baths and had dinner at the Pheasant Cafe, all donated by the chamber of commerce. Jan got a new shoe on her right front foot.

August 6, 5:45 and all hooked up. 5:57: Headed for home once again. We didn't have breakfast at camp this morning, we will stop at Arlington for breakfast with a choice of three cafes, all on the chamber of commerce. 6:57: Entering Arlington, population 680.

We have had our breakfast and ready to roll again.

8:02: Leaving Arlington. We have a rock ledge on one side of us and the Columbia River on the other. The river is between two railroads; it looks odd for two trains to run along side each other with the water between them. 10:11: Bialock, it's a small place and they seem to raise a lot of peaches here. 10:36: Philippi and family are here to take us to our camping spot. They are the people that own the ranch we will stay on. 10:48: Stopped to water and met John and Evelyn Lindol, friends of Wally and Ida Dyser of Drain. 11:05: Here we go again. It's really warmed up. 12:09: We have arrived at camp.

Ray Stratton and his Drain Black Sox team stopped to see us today on their way home and said they'd see us in Independence. Arlington will be under 20 to 40 feet of water in 6 years. It's such a pretty little town and old homes and young and old orchards will soon all be gone. The residences will be moved about half a mile up a hill. I guess I better mention why this all is going to happen; they are building a dam to be called John Day Dam, and this townsite will be flooded.

August 7, 5:53: All hooked up. 6:01: We are rolling homeward. Jan got two new shoes; right rear and left front. 6:26: We are going through rocky country. The rocks look like they have been burned.

Last night Ki visited the ruins of an old Indian village where it has been dug up and sifted for relics. She found two arrowheads. She was really impressed with this place. 8:27: Leaving Gilliam and entering Sherman County and crossing the John Day River. Janell just got out of bed and Ki and Jean Marshall from Roseburg just went back into the wagon for a nap.

8:21: We just heard the terrible news about the Roseburg explosion and fire. There is some wind this morning, but the sun is hot and it doesn't do much good. 9:05: Passing by the site of the John Day Dam. They have already started working on it on the other side of the river. 9:22: Just made a pull over a hill. 9:43: Entering Rufus. The farming area around here is one-half mile wide and 2 miles long. Doc and Jan had a ball last night. I never tied them up and they wandered all over. At 3 o'clock in the morning I had to get up in my shorts and feed and water them. They wouldn't leave me alone until I did. You see I sleep with my head on the tailgate within easy reach of anyone or animal. 11:50: We are pulling up over second rock ledge over the river and are wondering how the pioneers ever made it. They must have disassembled the wagons and lowered them piece by piece consuming many days. 11:04: Going through Briggs Junction. 11:15: Entering Briggs. 11:25: Stopped to make camp along the Columbia River.

Made 21 miles today. 11:27: We are stopped in front of the city hall. The president of the chamber of commerce is giving a welcome and accomplishment speech. This town is the end of the Oregon Trail.

August 8, 5:50: All hooked up and ready to roll. 6:01: And we're on our way. Last night we had a real surprise. Judy and Al Hollaman showed up. Friday night we had a family-style dinner given us at the Frontier Cafe at Rufus by Sherman County Club. The Dallas Industrial Club started out with us today, so we are well escorted. 6:45: Fulton Junction. 7:14: Entering Wasco County and crossing the Deschutes River. Leaving Sherman County.

Here comes a real Indian chief to meet us and take us to their village. Had a brief ceremony at the Indian village. 7:32: Leaving the Indians and on our way again. As we came through, Ki was given a pair of Indian beads and jar of something. 8:51: Jean Marshall crawled in the back of our wagon so she could get some sleep. Janell is

riding with Judy and Al. 9:08: Ki and I are looking up a rock ledge above 400 or 500 feet and wonder what's holding some of the rocks up there. Mount Hood sure shows up today with timber lying below that we have been looking for now for 4 months. 10:16: The Dalles Dam entrance. 10:29: Fifteen-mile Creek. We are now crossing it. We just went by a fruit stand and they came out and gave each of us a basket of cherries. 11:06: The Dalles, population, 11,250.

11:48: As we were coming into the city park to camp we had a real steep hill to climb. The blacktop was so slick none of the wagons could make it. Guess what? A Jeep came to the rescue.

United States Steel Battles School Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the Appendix of the RECORD an article by the distinguished columnist Drew Pearson. It seems to me that the United States Steel Corp. has been much explaining to do if the statements of Mr. Pearson are correct:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 24, 1959]

UNITED STATES STEEL BATTLES SCHOOL TAXES

(By Drew Pearson)

Not all the facts were told in Secretary of Labor Mitchell's revealing figures on steel profits and steel wages. What he didn't tell—and perhaps didn't know—is the battle of the giant United States Steel Corp. against school taxes at local levels.

To get the full story you have to go to Montgomery, Ala., and Morrisville, Pa. In each case United States Steel lined up its legal and lobbying might against better education, despite the fact it's just netted the biggest profit, during the last 6 months, in history—a quarter of a billion dollars. Here are two chapters in the story:

Pennsylvania chapter: In rural Bucks County, Pa., on the banks of the Delaware, United States Steel acquired 4,000 acres of farmland, built one of the biggest steel mills in the world, and upped school enrollment from 20,000 pupils in 1950 to over 50,000 in 1958. In Falls Township, where the Fairless plant is located, school enrollment increased by 943 percent.

To take care of the increase, Falls Township built 239 new classrooms in 5 years. Nearby Bristol built 263 classrooms.

To pay for them Falls Township borrowed so heavily that it now pays interest at the rate of \$689,275 a year. In 1950, before the Fairless plant was built, the town had no debt. Now 14.5 percent of the cost of the schools goes for interest on the debt. Meanwhile, taxes in the county have been increased 100 percent.

Taxes on the United States Steel property, however, have not been increased. The huge, sprawling plant is assessed at \$23 million though it cost around \$600 million. The U.S. Government even gave United States Steel a tax writeoff of \$200 million.

But efforts to increase local taxes for United States Steel have been stalled. For 5 straight years the school board has appealed the low tax rate, and for 5 straight years the Bucks County commissioners have appeared to favor United States Steel.

The commissioners are: John T. Walsh, chairman, Democrat; Adolph Andrews, Demo-

crat; and Thomas R. Lewis, Republican. They also serve as the board of assessment and review of taxes. Thus they themselves sit in review of their own assessments.

Because of this the school board appealed to Judge Edwin Satterthwaite, Republican, to force United States Steel to produce costs. But Judge Satterthwaite ruled that it would cost United States Steel too much.

NOTE.—Bucks County, onetime stronghold of Senator Joe Grundy, high-tariff Republican, has voted for the GOP since the Civil War—until 3 years ago when it went Democratic. A lot of voters now say they don't see much difference.

Alabama chapter: Down in Alabama, United States Steel's Tennessee Coal and Iron Division operates the biggest steel plant south of the Mason-Dixon line. Gov. John Patterson took it on in a bitter fight. In order to improve Alabama schools, Patterson proposed a sales tax of 1½ percent on new machinery, also a reduction of the consumers' 3-percent sales tax to 2½ percent.

Arthur Wiebel, president of United States Steel's operations in Alabama, has potent friends in the Alabama Legislature. He used those friends. He also came out with a public statement attacking the sales tax on machinery. Governor Patterson didn't backtrack. After a protracted legislative debate, he won.

DEFENSE EXCESS PROFITS

Congressman ALFRED SANTANGELO, the New York City Democrat who has already sparked the investigation of the munitions lobby, is now doing some personal investigation of his own. He has unearthed the fact that some of the biggest defense contractors owe Uncle Sam money on excess profits taxes and are refusing to pay.

Yet the Defense Department is heaping new profits on these same companies. Naturally the Congressman wonders how much the retired admirals and generals who work for these corporations have to do with this nose-thumbing of the Treasury.

Careful probing by the Congressman has unearthed the fact that a total of \$105 million in excess profits taxes is due the Government. But a battery of high-priced tax attorneys are resisting payment every inch of the way.

"These recalcitrant companies are led by North American Aviation," says SANTANGELO. "It owes the taxpayers \$29 million of excess profits through 1953-55. Yet in 1958 the Defense Department awarded North American contracts totaling \$647 million and in the first half of 1959 contracts totaling \$570 million.

North American has hired 27 retired military officers.

Other contractors against whom 1953-55 excess profits claims have been filed and who are still resisting payment are Boeing Aircraft, \$27.5 million due; Fairchild Engine, \$2 million; Lockheed Aircraft, \$12 million; Martin Co., \$9.7 million; Douglas Aircraft, \$12 million; and Grumman Aircraft, \$8.5 million.

All these companies continue to get huge slices of defense business.

Can We Do Less?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor speaks out for a continuation of the cessation of atomic tests. It points out that the Soviet

Union has promised that it will not be the first to resume testing and it asks, "Can the United States and Great Britain do less?"

Under a previous consent here is the text of an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor for August 13, 1959:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., Aug. 13, 1959]

PROLONG THE HALT IN TESTS

A cessation of atomic tests is already in effect. Unless one of the atomic powers is cheating, testing has been in abeyance since last fall. Continuation of this halt and the speedier development of ways to guarantee it are feasible targets for public pressures at this time.

The Soviet Union has now promised it will not be "first to resume testing." Can the United States and Great Britain do less? Are the risks involved in refraining from testing greater than those of a resumption? It seems to us that the answer to both questions must be No.

When the United States halted testing last October President Eisenhower indicated that it might be necessary to resume unless negotiations for a test ban produced agreement on an effective inspection system within a year. Progress on such a system has been made at Geneva. But the conferees are still stalled on some aspects of inspection.

One hitch was caused by discovery that underground blasts were more difficult to detect than had been believed. Now Washington has rather belatedly announced steps to offset this difficulty with more sensitive measures of detection. This useful move should be urgently pursued.

Pressure should also be applied to get action at Geneva on proposals to overcome differences between Soviet and Western representatives over the number, composition, and procedures of inspection teams. One hopeful suggestion from Prime Minister Macmillan would permit some reduction in the number of inspections but make them unexpected. Any inclination to cheat would face the risk of exposure by a surprise visit of international inspectors.

The nature of the Soviet system and its power to maintain secrecy impel the Western atomic powers to extra care to insure effective policing of any ban. However, there is reason to believe that Moscow has a real interest in limiting the nuclear club and a test ban is a first step.

France is already knocking imperatively at the door, with major nuclear tests scheduled within a few months. China is expected to insist on having its own atomic arsenal. A British-Soviet-American agreement to conduct no more tests and to set up an inspection system might not dissuade other nations from pushing their own tests. But whatever leverage it did provide would be far more than is now available.

Moscow knows that American policy on tests has been at a disadvantage because of divided counsels. The Pentagon feels that more tests are needed to perfect small atomic weapons and missile warheads. It has the backing of one group of nuclear scientists. Others have looked more favorably on a test ban. For a year and a half this second group has had the ear of the President. But so far American policy has not expressed the boldness and urgency required by the situation.

If the nuclear club is to be limited and vital progress made toward arms control, time is of the essence. A reasonable program would be to continue the holdback on new tests while more vigorously exploring every possibility of detection and effective inspection. This is a minimum basis for any effort to persuade France and others to join the standstill on tests.

Appendix

Education: The Federal Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Thursday evening, August 20, I had the privilege and honor of addressing the national convention of the American Federation of Teachers, meeting in Minneapolis, Minn.

Because of the attention directed in this address to legislation now pending before the Congress, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my address, entitled "Education: The Federal Role."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION: THE FEDERAL ROLE

(Address by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY before the National Federation of Teachers, Minneapolis, Minn., August 20, 1959)

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a singular privilege to be asked to speak to you tonight.

You know, I always feel at home with teachers. After all, I'm a sort of refugee from a classroom. And in the realm of public affairs, I honestly try to carry on what you begin in the classroom.

I salute you as teachers; I salute you also as an important and articulate part of the American labor movement. It is heartening to find teachers who say, as you do, "our strength is our affiliation with the AFL-CIO." And it is heartening that the teachers in their embattled struggles, from Calumet to New York, have had the support of the labor movement, which for years has been in the forefront of the struggle for public education as an essential requirement for political and economic democracy.

This is more than just a matter of mutual aid among those who work for a living, regardless of the color of their collars. Teachers in their fight for professional standards and for their rights as employees are also fighting the battle of the community for better schools. In this they have earned the support of all of us.

Within the labor movement your union has been a symbol of the importance of education and social progress, and a powerful force against the corrupting influence of those who have betrayed the labor movement from within. Congress will act this year to eliminate corrupt practices without crippling legitimate union activities. In treating the disease of corruption in unions, we do not want to prescribe a treatment that maims the patient in trying to cure the disease.

Many years ago, when I worked in the field of workers' and adult education, I learned to appreciate all the more the crucial importance of public schooling in our democracy. I learned that the decisions of men and women as citizens, as voters, as union members rested in large part on

the basic education they received in our schools.

This is true even more today than it was 20 years ago. For all the importance of science and technology in our educational system, in our lives and in our progress and survival as society we will stand or fall by our ability to cultivate human beings and train citizens. In the crucial competition for the preservation and triumph of freedom, we will stand or fall by our quality as a nation of citizens. This is the true meaning of educational systems to which you are devoting your lives. If you succeed, we cannot fail.

The greatest asset of any education system—along with its students—is not the classroom, nor the laboratory, the library nor the playing field. Its greatest asset is its teachers.

And, by the same token, an educational system cannot rise above its teachers. Through them flows the essence which a society imparts to its children.

The perilous world in which we live today forces us to reappraise both the educational structure and the educational tasks of our American society. We know that we are not doing as well as we can.

But to do better, we must understand clearly why we need to do better.

There is of course the direct competitive challenge of the Soviet Union. In fact, the very fact of Premier Khrushchev's forthcoming visit to the United States is a vivid demonstration of what a determined and well-financed educational drive has done to take a backward nation to a position of enormous strength and prestige in the world.

Among those of us most concerned with the massive challenge to our society from the Soviet Union have been our own scientists and engineers. Dr. Edward Teller and Adm. Hyman Rickover have repeatedly warned us that Soviet advances in science and engineering threaten actually to surpass achievements in our country.

It is not merely a question of what we ought to be doing in education. It has come down to a categorical imperative: We must consider education in terms of the life and death struggle among nations.

It should be sufficient to emphasize that we should set higher priorities on education because it is the right thing to do—because education is an indispensable means for enriching the lives of people—for raising the levels of human capabilities and for deepening understanding.

Yes, we are falling behind the efforts of other nations; and, equally important, we are falling behind our own needs, our own potentials. We are fall behind our own ideals.

Our own true needs and purposes, everywhere in the world, are to fulfill the real traditions and promise of America. As we do this, we grow stronger everywhere. As we fail to do this, we grow weaker everywhere.

I do not intend to discuss with you what you ought to teach, or how you ought to teach. These are questions of the greatest public importance, to be determined professionally within your profession. They are not within the scope of Government. The prime responsibility of Government is to marshal effectively the material resources of the Nation so that what ought to be taught can be taught, taught well, and taught to every

American—taught to every American up to the highest level of education he can attain.

I have no doubt that, if we can provide the material means, the education system and particularly its teachers can shape the content of education to express our highest intellectual and moral values.

In saying this, I do not imply that the quantity of education can take the place of quality. But quantity is everywhere a precondition of quality. When there are not enough classrooms and teachers, when teachers are grossly underpaid, when many students of ability are excluded from the educational process through lack of means, to talk only about quality of education without reckoning its costs and accepting responsibility for meeting those costs would be a fraud.

On the contemporary scene, my friends, our quantitative defaults in education are surcharged with qualitative defaults. When we say, as a nation, that we cannot afford to be better, that it would be "inflationary" to spend more for education, we are not talking sound economics. We are talking nonsense, and worse, downright immorality. We are saying that we value frills and luxuries more than the goods and services most vital in our lives. And when our productive resources of manpower and machines, if fully used, could give us both the essentials and the luxuries, the moral default of idle resources becomes even more apparent.

I know that all of you here are familiar with this default. But evidently, the Nation at large is not, or it would take arms in righteous indignation. And so I trust you will bear with me, while I bring a few facts to the strengthening of your cause.

You all know the dimensions of our classroom shortage in the public schools of the United States.

The number of classrooms built was not much more than those required to accommodate increased enrollments and replace classrooms abandoned as unfit or obsolete. A 200,000-classroom shortage today would be a conservative estimate.

To eliminate this shortage within 5 years, to replace classrooms abandoned and to cover new enrollments of more than 1.2 million students a year, requires about 107,000 new classrooms yearly during the next 5 years. This would require a 5-year construction program of about \$4 billion.

The States and localities, despite heroic efforts, have in recent years been able to expend about \$2½ billion a year for classroom construction. If, by the greatest efforts, they should average about 3¼ billion annually over the next 5 years, they could build 82,000 classrooms a year. This would still be about 25,000 short of the minimum need. By 1965 we would still be about 125,000 classrooms short.

If the Murray-Metcalf bill were enacted, and if funds thus made available were apportioned by the State and localities between capital outlays and teachers' salaries in accord with customary patterns, there would be about \$900 million available for classrooms each year for the next 4 years. This would just about close the gap.

Second, as to the shortage of public school teachers and the inadequacy of their pay.

In the spring of 1959, the consensus among leading educators was that the shortage of teachers in our public schools was about 140,000. Of this, about 40,000 were needed

to reduce the student-teacher ratio to workable levels. And about 100,000 were to replace teachers with insufficient training.

The task over the next 5 years, if realistically faced, is to recruit about 60,000 teachers a year to meet accumulated and accumulating needs, plus about 70,000 new teachers each year to replace those leaving the public school system. With this level of entrants into the teaching field, provided they are of high standard, it is estimated that the current qualitative shortage might be substantially eliminated 5 years hence.

It has been found impossible to recruit qualified teachers at this rate at prevailing levels of teachers' pay. Average pay in the public schools is now estimated at \$4,775; nearly one-fifth of all classroom teachers receive less than \$3,500; and only one-fifth receive as much as \$5,500. If we want the number and quality of teachers we need, we must be prepared to pay for them.

For the sake of justice, as well as for the sake of recruiting qualified teachers, we need to increase teachers' pay in the public schools over the next 5 years about 50 percent. Such an advance would bring teachers' salaries close to parity without advancing pay in other comparable areas of work.

States and localities cannot carry all of this increased burden, even if they expand their efforts more rapidly in the years ahead than in recent years. The Federal Government, with greater resources of national revenue, must act in the national interest to assert the priority of the Nation's education system. To do this, Federal contributions toward teachers' pay will need to become an established part of the finance base for education.

Enactment of the Murray-Metcalf bill, of which I am a sponsor, would go a long way toward meeting the needs.

As we look to our school system to lay the base of a competent and informed citizenry, so we look to our colleges and universities for the development of our intellectual leadership. And here, too, we are failing short.

The task of education in a democracy is to develop every intellect to the utmost of its capacity. It is a national disgrace that perhaps as many as 150,000 of our most gifted young people are barred from college because they cannot afford the cost.

The Defense Education Act of 1958 only scratches the surface of the need. At the time it was passed, I protested vigorously but in vain against its niggardly terms and grudging conditions. This is why I have proposed my students' aid bill, with appropriations for scholarships rising gradually to \$184 million a year by fiscal 1963. I have also proposed tax credits, up to \$450 a year for parents paying college tuition and fees.

Federal funds are also needed to assist the expansion of physical plants at colleges and universities, and for related purposes.

My friends, what are the main objections to an expanding educational program along these lines? Especially, what are the objections to the Federal participation which is essential to this expansion?

The first objection is an offspring of the spirit of segregation. My views on this subject are known to you all. I am happy that the AFT has taken a similar view. As a one-time teacher, I share your pride in your firm advocacy of the advancement of school desegregation. I do not see how anyone who is true to the vows of this profession can take any other position. I note, too, that it has cost you the support of some who would otherwise be your adherents. This is something else that you and I have in common.

The second objection is that Federal aid would mean Federal interference in the education process. In fact, by providing Federal grants to the States, which then could use the money for either classroom construction

or teacher salaries, we can restore local control. How much control over education does a local school district have when it is bonded to the limit, operating on split shifts in aging, inadequate buildings with underpaid teachers who do not have minimum teaching qualifications? The legislation I have introduced to give Federal aid to States for school construction and teacher salaries expressly prohibits any Federal control. In 1950, as chairman of the Senate School Construction Subcommittee, I sponsored the bill which became law and now provides money for school construction in areas where families in Federal service put too heavy a burden on local school facilities. Since that time Congress has appropriated more than \$1.8 billion for construction and operations of schools in such areas. There has never been the slightest hint of Federal control in the administration of this money.

The third objection is that we cannot afford the cost. This merits close attention, because of the fog of cultivated ignorance on this subject.

What is the Federal Government now spending for education? The amount proposed in the President's original budget for fiscal 1960 comes to only \$2.68 per year for every man, woman, and child in the United States. It comes to only about six-tenths of 1 percent of the total proposed Federal budget. It comes to less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the estimated total output of goods and services of the United States.

This is indeed a sad commentary upon our scale of national values, as registered by the budget of the Government of all the people.

We are told, however, that there are so many other essentials in the Federal budget that there is room only for a token payment toward our educational needs. This is far from the truth. The truth is that, as we have the needs, so too we have the resources, if we will but use them.

There is no true economy in neglecting the greatest priorities of our national needs, among which education ranks very high. It has not been sound economy, even by the narrower and more traditional economic tests. The same restrictive thinking which has neglected the great priorities has led to policies which have repressed our general rate of economic growth.

The slowdown in the rate of economic growth since the end of the Korean war has meant idleness of men and machines which has cost the country tens of billions of dollars. As a consequence, tax revenues of Federal, State, and local Governments, during the period 1953-58 alone, were \$30 to \$35 billion less than they would have been under conditions of full employment and normal economic growth. With these additional revenues, we could have met the great priorities of our national needs, without budgetary deficits or inflation.

Those of us who have urged policies for economic growth for the past 3 or 4 years have been scoffed at, laughed at, and chastised from the highest official places. Now I am glad to see that we have made some converts in those same places. The Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth, under the chairmanship of the Vice President, which at the end of June was sounding the alarms of inflation, now, less than 2 months later, has discovered that the "inflation" has been brought under control after all and solemnly proclaims the importance of economic growth. Now that we have converted them, I hope they succeed in converting those who make the budget and the economic policies of the Government.

We should know, by now, that we cannot protect the Federal budget by neglecting the needs of the Nation.

So, where should we go from here—and how?

Where would the money come from to do this job?

There are those who say that we should cut back on nonessentials, at least on luxuries, in order to get the things we need most. If this were necessary, I would favor it.

There are those who say that we should raise tax rates or impose new taxes to support these essential programs. If this were necessary, I would favor it.

I would vote for either of these if that was the only way to get the schools and other things we need so greatly. But this approach seems to me to neglect the productive power—the new technology—which is the hallmark of America.

We cannot afford, in the space age, to divide scarcity. We need instead to plan to share abundance. Our needs are not for one kind of public service, but for many. Our needs are for more public services, as well as for more private economic progress.

What makes democracy stronger than totalitarianism is not superior power to suppress one kind of progress in order to attain another. Our greater inherent strength, the great strength of democracy, is in the ability of free people to plan and use their free system, to sustain their values and serve their needs more fully than the totalitarians. We do not seek to excel them in the taxes which the state, in one form or another, imposes. We can excel them in the energies which we voluntarily release and put to use in the service of all men.

But this voluntary release of our energies requires purposefulness and planning. It requires a concert of action at all levels, private and public, local, State, and Federal.

If we attain this concert, we can activate and maintain the 5-percent average annual growth rate urged by the Rockefeller report and other competent studies. This growth rate would yield us, for the period 1958-64 as a whole, about \$400 billion more of national output than would result from the low average annual growth rate of less than 2½ percent from 1953 through 1957.

It would yield about \$70 billion in Federal, State, and local revenues, at existing tax rates. In Federal revenues alone, the yield would be more than \$50 billion.

On this basis, we could not only do the education job; we could also enlarge social security, improve health services, clear slums and redevelop urban areas, expand national security efforts, and participate in international economic cooperation on a worthy scale—and without inflation.

A Federal budget geared to these tasks, in a fully expanding economy, while it would increase in dollars, would steadily shrink in relation to the total economy. The budget would thus become less burdensome, easier to balance, and less inflationary.

We have the resources to meet our needs—and then some. The only question is whether we use them or let them languish. The only question is whether we can expand our thought, expand our action, expand our concept of private and public responsibility, to the challenge of the times.

We live not only in the space age of missiles, but also in the space age of economic and technical capabilities. We must lift our vigor and our courage to space-age proportions.

As we do so, our goal is not to outstrip another country or another society. Our goal is to realize, fully and freely, the best of ourselves.

Our aim is not to outstrip an adversary. It is to show the world what a free society is capable of, not only in material things but in the riches of mind and spirit which have been the greatness of democracy.

Our task is to make ourselves strong, not to fight a war but to prevent one—not to flaunt our strength, but to show that the strong can be also wise and patient and firm and persistent in the pursuit of peace.

The Food Stamp Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to extend the strongest possible endorsement for the amendment of Public Law 480 to include the food stamp proposal submitted by Representative SULLIVAN. From the human standpoint, I fail to see how there can be valid objection to this proposal. I have no quarrel with the operations of Public Law 480 itself. Presumably it has met a need to the satisfaction of a majority of my colleagues during recent years. At this point, however, a new need has arisen, and this is a domestic American need which should be closest to our hearts.

I believe most of us are familiar with the facts of the case, the millions of Americans who now receive surplus agricultural commodities, and the relationship between those millions and the number of millions of Americans who are chronically unemployed, the victims of technological advance in industry.

Some of us may be less familiar with the human conditions created by the need to subsist for periods of a year or more on a diet of three or four surplus commodities, as has been the case in the past. Careful inquiries among the long-term unemployed in certain depressed communities in my District have established to my satisfaction that families in these circumstances are receiving less than half of the necessary quantities of nutrients required to sustain health.

Ever since the opening of this session I have been very much disturbed by these findings, and particularly by the implications of those findings as applied to the children of needy families. In our deliberations since January we have discussed hundreds of bills and resolutions which were aimed at some improvement in the social, economic or political conditions prevailing in our country. In the climate of a growing wave of material prosperity, however, we have not undertaken to deal with the problems of those who do not presently share in improved economic conditions.

Area redevelopment legislation appears to be stalled, and this is a development which I believe we will have cause to regret. The number of areas with surplus labor is growing, rather than declining. The number of needy persons receiving surplus agricultural commodities is increasing. The number of communities whose industry is failing to keep pace with technological advance is also growing. One day we must deal effectively with this situation. For the moment, however, we must, as a minimum acknowledgment of our responsibilities to fellow human beings, act to make available to the needy at least such foods as will maintain a dietary standard sufficient to maintain sound health. If we

do not, these needy will become a progressively greater charge on their communities and on this Government.

Many of us have submitted bills calling for the appropriation of funds for the purchase of a wide range of foods for distribution to the needy. None of these bills has received committee consideration, and prospects for them are bleak. The food stamp plan is another approach to the same problem. For those who doubt that it will work, I say, we have no choice but to try it, in lieu of the failure of this Congress and the administration to offer anything else.

There are some 75 Members of this House who represent districts in which there are located depressed areas, and in which the distribution of surplus agricultural commodities is an important economic and political factor to be reckoned with. I cannot speak for all of them, but for myself, I congratulate the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] for the skill and determination with which she has led the fight to bring this proposal before us, and for the dignity and patience with which she has borne defeats during several previous efforts to accomplish this same purpose.

Futile Farm Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the task of finding the most practical and effective farm policy possible for this country is difficult. I do not believe that it is impossible.

Recently, the Fort Worth Star Telegram, of Fort Worth, Tex., published an interesting editorial entitled "Futile Farm Control." It is with the examination and study of all points of view that reasonable men arrive at the best possible solution to a problem, and this editorial represents a significant and important view.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fort Worth Star Telegram, Aug. 18, 1959]

FUTILE FARM CONTROL

A major factor in the frustration of efforts to end the agricultural surplus problem in this country by acreage allotments has been the increased proficiency of the modern American farmer. When his planting areas have been reduced, he simply has got busy and found ways of getting the same or bigger yields from less land.

The solution to this problem, however, is not merely to order more drastic acreage cuts. Or at least that seems to be one inference that can be drawn from some facts picked up by a group of Texas ranchers making a tour of Scotland. The Texans

have been amazed at the high standards of cultivation and the unbelievable productivity of the land tilled by the Scotsmen. "You just don't waste land here," one of the Texas visitors marveled. "I should say it has twice the productivity of ours."

Another Texan estimated that the British farmer must be getting as much out of each 300 acres as the Texas farmer gets out of a thousand. In northeast Scotland, the group saw wheat that was expected to yield 100 bushels to the acre, whereas 50 bushels is considered excellent in Texas. And this despite the fact that the Scotsman's soil has been under cultivation without interruption for 400 to 500 years.

Of course, in the case of Britain, the high productivity is essential because of the scarcity of land on which to grow food to supply the huge and ever-increasing number of mouths. But there can be little doubt that the American farmer would react with a similar stepup in production if an artificial shortage of land were created in an effort to cut down on the burgeoning surpluses.

With this information at hand, it should be clear that the farm problem can never be solved by acreage controls, and the sooner the puzzle is approached from another angle, the better will be the hope of finding an answer.

Greed, Waste, and Extravagance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the more one learns of the manner and the methods by which defense contracts are entered into and of the greed and selfishness on the part of the contractors as well as the failure on the part of the Pentagon representatives to consider the taxpayer, the more one wonders if the United States is not traveling in the same direction and to the same ultimate end as did Rome centuries ago.

An editorial, Mr. Speaker, appeared in the Lawrence Daily Journal-World on July 18, 1959, which points to just a small item of waste in the overall defense program, which I include with my remarks: [From the Lawrence (Kans.) Daily Journal-World, July 18, 1959]

A CLOSER LOOK

There is a lot more tragedy than mere unemployment in this matter of the Callery Chemical Co. and its high-energy fuel contracts with the Federal Government. In view of the events of the past week, one finds himself wondering more than ever just exactly how much tax money—real big tax money—the Government wastes each day, let alone each week, month, or year, through sheer foolishness.

The past week saw officials of the Callery Chemical Co. plant here forced to sever about 100 from its 180-employee payroll. Reason: Government contracts are expiring ahead of schedule and, until the local plant can achieve full-time commercial operation, there won't be enough work.

This is bad, for the people involved and their community. But the local plant was built by the company, at company expense, thus the firm will try to get it into all-out commercial production as soon as possible.

Though the worker total will be much smaller than anticipated for a while, the plant won't be abandoned and will continue to shoulder its burden of the tax load.

But take the case of the recently completed and dedicated \$38 million high-energy fuel plant the Navy built at Muskogee, Okla. While Callery is the operating contractor there, the plant was built with Federal funds, produced by tax money, expressly for the Navy.

Word is that the Defense Department is having a special agency study the current fuel needs to see if the country needs both the Muskogee plant and Model City, N.Y., Air Force plant, which was recently built at a cost of \$45 million. Neither is now producing at more than 50 percent capacity. The question is whether one plant can handle the work for both and then expand when and if the need arises. A decision is due in a month or so.

If the study shows it would be better to have one plant instead of two in operation, the United States will have either a \$38 million or a \$45 million plant—and a shiny new plant, to boot—standing idle. This could be one of our greatest all-time monuments to stupid planning and wasteful spending. If something like this doesn't arouse the taxpayers and make them express themselves to their Senators and Congressmen, nothing ever will.

Excuses? There are some, as you always get in Government affairs.

Federal officials say the contracts for both plants were let several years ago when it was anticipated the fuel would be needed by the Navy and Air Force. Subsequently, it has developed that the Navy has found diminishing usage for this kind of fuel.

If this has been a progressive thing, and the Navy has been getting more and more aware that its fuel needs would be less and less, why did it allow the Muskogee plant to be completed? Was it too proud to announce that the plant was not needed and should be halted, and that demands could be met at some other plant? Or was it simply a case of having the money and the overwhelming compulsion to spend it?

Some people are funny. They get money, and it burns holes in their pockets. As people try to climb Mount Everest "because it's there," so do some people—especially Federal people—seem to try to spend as much money as they can "because it's there."

Further irritation is provoked by the announcement that transferring the Muskogee plant to the Air Force would be in keeping with the Navy's current policy of gradually getting out of the boron fuel production business. The Lawrence Callery plant was the first to feel the sting of this decision, and locally it was a big sting. Now comes word that the local wound could well appear as little more than a pinprick if the Muskogee plant is mothballed due to foolish planning.

One can look at the Sunflower Ordnance Works on standby here, then take into account that there are similar plants in readiness around the Nation, and wonder why Federal agencies, military or otherwise, don't take better advantage of such facilities instead of building new ones like those at Muskogee.

The best answer to such a question came some time ago when a Journal-World reporter talked to a top eastern executive. At the time there was a good chance Sunflower might be reactivated to meet certain military needs and the executive had been contacted to see if he could shed any light on the subject.

"I'll be the first one to admit that Sunflower could be used for a lot of things they're doing now," the informant said frankly. "The trouble is that it seems every one in the Government wants his own little

pet project and doesn't want to use any facility that might have been used by somebody else. So instead of adapting existing facilities at a lesser cost, they spend a lot more for a new facility just for the pride of having their own special pile.

"There probably are a lot of uses that could be made of Sunflower, but you see it has a handicap to overcome. It has been an Army installation. For some reason, branches like the Navy and Air Force feel this has contaminated it.

"They seem to think it could be below their station to take secondhand something that the Army has had, a sort of a hand-me-down, as it were. So what do they try to do? Out of foolish pride and rivalry they try to get the money to build their own plant. The taxpaying public is stuck for the bill."

And some of us wonder why Government expenditures continue to rise, and our tax bills zoom into orbit right along with them. This, of course, has given rise to the currently popular question: Which will reach the moon first—the national debt or a rocket?

So what are we going to do about it?

Neely Named to Football Hall of Fame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, Jess Neely came to Texas in 1940 as head coach and athletic director of Rice Institute in Houston. He has made a reputation of excellence for himself not only in Texas but throughout the country. In the Southwest, where the best in football is generally the prevailing standard, Jess Neely has a reputation for developing teams just a little bit better.

Last weekend, the Helms Athletic Foundation Hall of Fame in Los Angeles named Jess Neely to its membership. No football coach still active in America today has as many victories on his record as Jess Neely.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news story from the Houston Press of August 22, 1959, on Jess Neely's election to the Hall of Fame.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEELY NAMED TO FOOTBALL HALL OF FAME—
HELMS FOUNDATION HONORS OWL COACH,
JIM TATUM, RED SANDERS

(By Bob Rule)

The illustrious coaching career of Rice Institute's Jess Neely was crowned with its greatest honor today when he was named to the Helms Athletic Foundation Hall of Fame. Announcement of Neely's election came from Los Angeles, site of the international sports shrine, established in 1948.

Honored along with Neely were four other coaches and six players. Included among the coaches honored are Henry R. (Red) Sanders of UCLA and Jim Tatum of North Carolina, both of whom died suddenly in the last year.

Also picked were Warren Woodson of New Mexico A. & M., a 28-year veteran of coaching, and Adam Walsh, who coached for 25 years at Santa Clara and Bowdoin.

The players honored were Frankie Albert (Stanford, 1939-41), Benny Friedman (Michigan, 1924-26), Edgar Garbisch (Army, 1922-24), William Hollenback (Pennsylvania, 1906-08), Nile Kinnick (Iowa, 1937-39), and Harry Smith (Southern California, 1937-39).

In the 12 years the Football Hall of Fame has been in existence, a total of 61 coaches and 61 players have been honored.

On the two lists are the greats of the past. Neely joins such coaching immortals as Bob Zuppke, Fielding H. Yost, Glenn S. (Pop) Warner, Amos Alonzo Stagg, Knute Rockne, and many others.

He also joins the two men who influenced his football career most—Dan McGugin of Vanderbilt, his head coach in college, and Wallace Wade, under whom he played, and coach at Vanderbilt and Alabama.

Neely received the news of his election today in characteristic fashion.

"Well, if you hang around long enough," he quipped, "I guess they feel like they have to do something for you. But I certainly do appreciate it."

No football coach still active in America today has as many victories on his record as Neely, who'll start his 20th season at Rice this fall and his 33d year as a head coach.

His teams at Southwestern of Memphis, Clemson, and Rice have won 176 games, lost 129, and tied 14. Included in those totals are four bowl victories and a single defeat.

Virtually every major honor his profession can bestow has come to the Rice Institute coach. He only recently served as president of the American Football Coaches Association and now is a member of the powerful football rules committee.

With this season, Neely will establish a new Southwest Conference record for the most consecutive years as head coach at a member school.

When he completed his 19th year last season, he tied the record held by Dutch Meyer of TCU, who previously had been voted into the Helms Hall of Fame.

"That's not exactly the type of record I'm interested in," Neely laughed yesterday. "Won and lost records are slightly more important."

Neely has served as both head coach and athletic director at Rice since 1940, when he came from Clemson College in South Carolina, and under his direction Rice's athletic facilities have become among the Nation's best.

The 70,000-seat football stadium, one of the most beautiful in the country, is one of the city's showplaces and the 6,200-seat fieldhouse is one of the best in the conference.

Both have been completely paid for out of athletic receipts, a tribute to Neely's executive ability.

The Rice coach is energetically preparing for the start of the 1959 season in just 10 days.

"I believe we'll have another good team," he says.

Values of Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, recently there have appeared in newspapers of Washington, D.C., articles reporting questions raised on this floor and in the other body about the worth of the Federal reclamation program, and particularly, how it relates to surplus crops.

Similar questions have been raised editorially—I believe by writers not completely informed.

In the Western States we know the value to our areas and to the Nation of this great program and we have able spokesmen to state those values, men who are thoroughly familiar with the actual workings of reclamation projects. On August 9, 1959, the Sacramento Bee and other McClatchy newspapers serving the Central Valley of California presented editorially what I consider to be an able and clear answer to these questions, setting forth true facts about reclamation and surplus crops and the values of the reclamation program. I am submitting this editorial for the information of the Members and, I hope, the enlightenment of those who have questioned the consistency of these programs. The editorial follows:

[From the Sacramento Bee, Aug. 9, 1959]
RECLAMATION PROJECTS YIELD WIDE VARIETY
OF ESSENTIAL BENEFITS

In this drought year of 1959, when the main rivers of California would be a series of dry sandbars were it not for projects such as the Shasta and Folsom Dams, it is no less than amazing that there are those who are critical of the western reclamation program.

A recent Washington, D.C., Post editorial deserves note because it reflects the astigmatic view shared by many in the East that the Federal program should be reexamined on the ground it brings more land into agricultural production while the Nation has large surpluses in wheat, corn, cotton, etc.

This is totally fallacious and shows a lack of knowledge of the true nature and overall purposes of these projects.

A quick answer, of course, is to point out the fact the crops largely produced on lands irrigated by those big Federal dams are not in surplus and are not under any Government program. That in itself should be enough but there is much more to the story. These great multipurpose projects provide a vast variety of benefits aside from irrigation.

They provide flood control. Without Shasta, Folsom, Friant, and other dams, California would have been subjected to a series of catastrophic floods during the last decade. The floods which did occur happened because projected dams had not been built.

They produce electric power. They aid navigation. They hold back the salt water from the sea which otherwise might spell ruin for the fabulously rich Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. They provide recreation for the people. And of extreme importance, they give many communities dependable supplies of domestic and industrial water.

Without the reclamation projects the great development of the West would have been seriously restricted. For example, without its allocation of 300 million gallons a day from Colorado River water stored behind Hoover Dam, Los Angeles would have reached the maximum of its population and industrial growth some time ago.

To a large extent the reclamation projects in California have not added significant acreages to agricultural production.

They have provided surface supplies to already producing lands which had been irrigated by pumping but which were threatened with extinction due to the failure of the underground supplies.

And in some cases the introduction of reclamation water has made it possible to transform land formerly devoted to grains, which are in surplus, to the production of fruits and vegetables, which are not.

The Post says it is time Congress gave thought to retiring land from cultivation

instead of adding more. And by inference one could gather the Post believes it might be a good thing to let the area to be served by the proposed San Luis project dry up.

It is hard to imagine anything more foolish. If ample water were provided much of the land growing grain and cotton inevitably would be turned to orchards and vegetable crops.

But even were cotton to be the chosen crop, the Post's point still falls flat. The San Joaquin Valley produces a long staple cotton which is in much demand, and the per acre yield is from 5 to 10 times that of some cotton-growing sections of the South.

If there is need to retire cotton land from production, it certainly would make more sense to retire some of the poor and tired land in the South than to let the extremely fertile acres in the San Luis area revert to a desert, which they will without San Luis water.

Moreover, in respect to the Federal San Luis project, while it is designed primarily for irrigation, it also is to be an integral part of a bigger plan to transport water to southern California where it will be needed for domestic and industrial purposes a little more than a decade hence.

The Post is generous enough in its appraisal to say the reclamation projects for the most part pay for themselves.

They do, and more. Not only do the users pay for the projects but the great developments which spring from these projects contribute vastly to the economy of the Nation in general and to the Federal Treasury in particular in the way of taxes.

For one to say the reclamation program is a case of the Government putting out money to produce surplus crops on which the Government must put out more money is missing the point at both ends. Such a statement either is due to ignorance or is rank misrepresentation.

Puerto Rico Does Not Want To Be a State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the New York Times magazine of August 16, 1959, there appeared an interesting article by Luis Muñoz-Marín, the Governor of Puerto Rico, which is entitled "Puerto Rico Does Not Want To Be a State."

I suggest that this article is good reading for pretty nearly everybody. It starts out with the idea that probably if one of our Senators or Representatives had his way, he would introduce a bill for Puerto Rican statehood; but Luis Muñoz-Marín, the Governor of Puerto Rico, demonstrates quite clearly in this article why they are satisfied with the status in which they are.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUERTO RICO DOES NOT WANT TO BE A STATE
(By Luis Muñoz-Marín)

SAN JUAN, P.R.—Puerto Rico, now a vigorous self-governing Commonwealth within the American political system, would be

smothered if some of its misguided state-side well-wishers, like Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ of New Mexico and Representative VICTOR ANFUSO of New York, had their way. They have introduced or proposed to introduce bills for Puerto Rican statehood. The bills have no chance of approval in Congress, and only minority support in Puerto Rico.

Recently, in the lobby of a Washington hotel, an old friend greeted me, "Well, Governor, pretty soon we should be seeing you up on the 'Hill' as a Senator from the 51st State." He meant it as a high compliment to Puerto Rico, and I was touched by both his warmth and enthusiasm. In the wake of Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood, a similar status for Puerto Rico seemed logical, simple, and desirable to him. He melted into the milling crowd of the lobby before I had an opportunity to outline to him the great complexities of Puerto Rico's circumstances, which make statehood neither logical nor desirable for Puerto Rico or the United States.

When I say that it is far better for Puerto Rico to remain a Commonwealth, it is with no insensitivity to the high honor which statehood implies. Nor is it because we seek independence—we definitely do not. Nor does it mean we are content to be less than a federated state—because, definitely, we are not less, but only different. Nor is it because we do not wish to share in the common expenses of the Federal Union, of which we are a part in a new way—since Puerto Rico is now proposing a formula by which it would begin to pay into the Federal Treasury as its economic growth allows it to do so.

Puerto Rico's history has been far different from that of Alaska and Hawaii, and the understandable tendency to speculate on possible statehood for Puerto Rico after the rapid accession of Alaska and Hawaii can lead men of good will far astray. Puerto Rico was a populous island with a long history and a well-defined culture when it first came into the American orbit in 1898 following the Spanish-American War. Alaska and Hawaii, on the other hand, were sparsely settled and ripe for colonizing from the mainland.

Alaska and Hawaii became incorporated territories, clearly destined for cultural integration and eventual statehood. Puerto Rico's special circumstances were early recognized when it became the first unincorporated territory, which implied that it would not be slated for statehood. At the same time it would have been obviously contrary to the American spirit that Puerto Rico should remain a colony forever.

Economic factors were very different, too. Both Alaska and Hawaii have been for many years notably wealthier than Puerto Rico is even now after 14 years of rapid economic progress since the end of World War II. The net annual average income of Hawaii, and probably of Alaska, is more than \$1,800, very little below the 1957 national average of \$2,027. Puerto Rico's per capita income of \$470 is still less than half of that of the lowest income State of the Union, Mississippi. Puerto Rico has little land in relation to population, no fuels, no significant mineral resources. That is why we have called the program by which we progress Operation Bootstrap.

These economic and cultural factors have, since 1898, made Puerto Rico's political evolution unique, and clearly different from that of Alaska and Hawaii. Indeed, as late as 1940, many sober, informed men in the United States considered Puerto Rico's economic and political problems insoluble, and were resigned to Puerto Rico's being a dependent poorhouse on a kind of permanent dole from the Federal Treasury, a place where poverty and hopelessness would constantly churn up social and political instability.

It took a double-barreled attack on these problems in Puerto Rico itself to lead to the relative prosperity of today, and to the visible social and political health and vigor of the island. First came the attack on poverty, temporary foreclosing political debate. Only when Operation Bootstrap was well under way did Puerto Rico address itself to finding a political status which answered the needs of its special relationship with the United States and its own economic and cultural circumstances.

To those who forget that peoples are the creators of political formulas and not their slaves, Puerto Rico seemed to have no way to turn. Continued existence as a territory or colony was impossible. The corrosive effects of colonialism, even a benevolent colonialism, could no longer be accepted, especially in the post-war period. Neither dignity, nor the swift course of history, nor common sense, nor the American tradition, would permit the continuation of such a system in the American context.

In contemplation of the inevitable end of colonialism, a sterile debate had raged for many years in the island between adherents of independence and those of statehood. The great majority of Puerto Ricans rejected independence on two counts: Puerto Rico's economy was by then so integrated with that of the United States that separation would have meant economic suicide and, equally important, Puerto Ricans had developed a deep and genuine attachment for their fellow U.S. citizens and for U.S. political institutions.

The great majority also rejected the possibility of statehood as totally unrealistic. Economically, statehood then would have meant another form of ruin for Puerto Rico—and still would, as we shall see in a moment.

The circumstances called for the same kind of political pioneering which created the Original Thirteen States themselves—a new projection which would be in the spirit of the 20th century, taking due recognition of the mutual interests of both the United States and Puerto Rico. The concept of a self-governing commonwealth had been foreseen as long ago as 1912 by Henry L. Stimson, then Secretary of War under President Taft. With far-sighted statesmanship Stimson observed that he saw no inconsistency between U.S. citizenship for Puerto Ricans and the ideal that Puerto Rico should have, when ready for it, completely autonomous local government within the American system.

This is essentially what happened when Puerto Rico became a Commonwealth in 1952. The official Spanish translation is *Estado Libre Asociado*—Associated Free State; Puerto Rico, in the generic sense of the term, is a new kind of state. Puerto Ricans are United States citizens, sharing with their fellow citizens in the continental United States a common defense, a common foreign policy, a common market, a common currency and the operation of practically all Federal laws. Puerto Ricans differ from other Americans in that they do not vote in national elections, have no voting representation in Congress, and have, on the other hand, autonomy in directing their local affairs, including the collecting and spending of their own taxes.

Nearly 7 years after its hopeful inception, how is the Commonwealth doing? It is doing remarkably well. I am happy to report. Operation Bootstrap has raised the per capita income from \$121 in 1940 to today's \$470. Living standards have virtually doubled in 15 years, perhaps the most rapid economic advance in any underdeveloped region in the world.

Certain development has been dramatic enough to attract high officials, technicians and students from all over the world to study our methods. Nearly 9,000 visitors from 107

different countries—from Nepal to Saudi Arabia, from Morocco to Bolivia—have studied how we have raised life expectancy from 46 years in 1940 to 68 years today, how we are rapidly winning the fight against illiteracy and how a whole people can be raised, in a few years, from despair and deepest poverty to relative prosperity and dynamic purposefulness.

The creation of the Commonwealth had political as well as economic lessons for the world. It was a notable achievement, in the postwar era, to end a colonial relationship in such a constructive, fruitful manner, devoid of the bitterness and violence which characterized the end of colonialism in many parts of Asia, the Near East and Africa. Puerto Rico clearly gave the lie to the persons (Communists and others) who are always ready to raise the cry of "imperialism" against the United States. It was patently impossible to square imperial exploitation with a people who are self-governing, who sent 40,000 of their sons into the Armed Forces during the Korean conflict (90 percent of them volunteers) and who are so effectively dramatizing the quality of U.S. democracy to thousands of earnest observers from all over the world.

The dignity of self-government has not only engendered an explosion of energy in economic affairs in Puerto Rico but has seen a lively ferment in cultural realms as well. No one who has visited Puerto Rico recently can be immune to the feeling that "things are happening." The Casals Festival, lively drama, ballet, opera, and symphony orchestra seasons are all part of the energized local scene. Puerto Rican painting and writing are in obvious renaissance. A people with new pride and new confidence and new creativity are clearly on the march.

In the light of this progress, it may seem strange that the sterile debate regarding possible statehood at any time in the foreseeable future should have been revived in Puerto Rico. Certainly persons who make any serious study of Puerto Rico's economics are aware that statehood, at this time, or for many generations to come, would mean a fatal crash for the island. It would be like a fully loaded airplane about to be airborne having half of its motors suddenly stopped.

Federal taxes would about double the already high taxload that the Commonwealth must impose upon itself in order to keep its public works and public services in line with its rapid economic development. Federated statehood would mean either breaking the back of the taxpayer and thus making further economic development impossible or cutting the public services so drastically that their decay would constitute a bottleneck for private enterprise and economic development.

There has been nothing automatic about Puerto Rico's progress to date. Only hard, uphill work has brought it about. And, while this progress has been notable enough to attract interest in many countries, our living standards, as I have indicated, are still far below those of the mainland United States.

The Federal Government has long been cognizant of the different economic situations of Puerto Rico and the harsh handicaps imposed by a population concentration of 658 persons per square mile in a mountainous island with virtually no resources. Never, since Puerto Rico was first associated with the United States, has the Federal Government applied Federal taxes here. This was to give the island a chance of economic development as well as to honor the principle of "no taxation without representation." Without this to compensate for the other disadvantages I have mentioned, Puerto Rico would still be in deepest poverty.

Most Federal grants-in-aid apply in Puerto Rico. These grants, like those allowed to

the States, are apportioned on the theory that they will benefit the United States as a whole. Matching funds for building certain roads and for hospital construction are cases in point.

The United States tariff is collected in Puerto Rico on foreign imports—which, by the way, are few, since most of our trade is with the United States—but the receipts go into the Commonwealth treasury after the cost of collection is deducted. In this way American manufacturers are protected from foreign competition while the Puerto Rican treasury is benefited. This is important because Puerto Rico is one of the world's greatest per capita consumers of United States products, spending \$700 million a year on them. The Federal excise tax on Puerto Rican rum, while it serves to protect American distillers, also reverts to the Commonwealth.

On the other hand, our association with the United States imposes some penalties on the Puerto Rican economy, for which our treasury is not compensated. Under the Sugar Act of 1946, for example, Puerto Rico loses considerable potential income by being denied the right to refine more than 11 percent of its own sugar production. In addition, shipping rates between Puerto Rico and United States ports are artificially high because they are governed by the coastwise shipping laws confining cargoes to American vessels. While these laws have the legitimate objective of subsidizing United States shipping for defense purposes, in practice they place a heavy share of this defense load on Puerto Rican consumers.

From the United States point of view, the accession of a State unable to pay Federal taxes except at the cost of economic ruin is obviously inconceivable. Puerto Rico, which as a Commonwealth is a showcase of American democracy before the world, would, as a federated State, become exactly the opposite: an economy in shambles, having to be kept alive by a WPA type of charity, with a people far more hopeless than during the worst of the great depression.

Nor has the United States the desire or interest to force the cultural assimilation of Puerto Ricans in Puerto Rico. Indeed, the fact that Puerto Ricans are probably the most bilingual people in the hemisphere, with deep understanding of and ties to both their fellow U.S. citizens and their Latin neighbors, has made Puerto Rico a valuable meeting place for people and ideas at a time when Latin America is in a state of far-reaching flux. Its unique position has been an undoubted asset for the United States in sensing changing currents in Latin America, and in translating its hemisphere policy into action.

But even now, however limited our means, Puerto Rico wants to make it clear that it intends to begin contributing to the Federal Treasury as its economic circumstances permit. There is now a bill before Congress whose purpose is to define the permanent association of Puerto Rico with the United States. One principle is clearly established: That Puerto Rico wishes, of its own accord and within its abilities, to help shoulder the Federal burden by contributing money to the Federal Government and by performing some functions in Puerto Rico now underwritten by U.S. taxpayers.

Puerto Rico is not looking for a free ride. On the contrary, it is just as anxious to carry its share of the financial load as its sons were to risk their lives in Europe and Korea—as a matter of pride and dignity, as our contribution to the whole.

When the strident chorus of nationalism begins to fade in Europe, Asia, Latin America, and Africa, some ingenious formula may permit the rational regrouping of new and old sovereign units on a sounder economic basis, just as the United States and Puerto Rico found a workable formula. The world

has become too small, too complex, too interdependent to permit indefinite political fragmentation at the price of widespread poverty. Where blind insistence on rigid, 19th-century-style sovereignty exists in defiance of economic logic, new forms of federalism are called for. Puerto Ricans are proud that they are contributing to the American political system a new form of federalism.

In dedicating the Puerto Rico Supreme Court Building, Chief Justice Earl Warren expressed this in words that remind us of the creative political genius of the United States:

"In the sense that our American system is not static, in the sense that it is not an end but the means to an end—in the sense that it is an organism intended to grow and expand to meet varying conditions and times in a large country—in the sense that every governmental effort of ours is an experiment—so the new institutions of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico represent an experiment—the newest experiment and perhaps the most notable of American governmental experiments in our lifetimes."

A new way of abolishing colonialism has been born.

Bill To Raise Membership Limit in the House Should Be Enacted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on August 18, 1959, I introduced a bill, H.R. 8715, to provide that the permanent membership of the House of Representatives shall be 438 Members in the 88th Congress and each Congress thereafter.

Under the provisions of my bill the temporary increase of two seats authorized by the acts admitting the States of Alaska and Hawaii would be made permanent. In addition, another seat would be added to provide for the additional Representative Hawaii will gain under the reapportionment of House seats that will be necessary as a result of the 1960 census. This procedure is in keeping with the precedent we have followed upon the admission of new States to the Union.

In the August 24 edition of the *Twin City Sentinel*, Winston-Salem, N.C., there appears an editorial containing a very fine analysis of my measure. With the belief that the contents of the editorial will be of interest to my colleagues, under unanimous consent I insert it in the Appendix of the Record, as follows:

BILL TO RAISE MEMBERSHIP LIMIT IN THE HOUSE SHOULD BE ENACTED

During the late President Taft's administration New Mexico and Arizona, the 47th and 48th States, were admitted to the Union. As the new States were entitled to representation in Congress, the size of both houses was increased. For the much smaller Senate this involved no problem. But the House, in which representation is based on population, had been steadily growing larger following the census years. So after the admission of the two new States, Congress in 1911 set the permanent membership of

the House at 435 members. This was done to prevent the House from becoming too large and unwieldy.

Ever since then, the representation of the various States in the House has been manipulated in accordance with the population figures shown by each decennial census, with the total membership remaining constant. Thus every new representative gained by North Carolina in the last four or five decades has meant losses in representation by other States.

Now two more new States, Alaska and Hawaii, have been added to the Union. In addition a number of States, especially California in the West and Florida in the South, have realized almost sensational population growth since 1950. This means that these States will gain several new representatives after the 1960 census. Meanwhile, permanent representation must be provided for the States of Alaska and Hawaii. One seat has been temporarily assigned each of these new States, but Hawaii is probably entitled to two on a population basis.

If seats for the new States as well as the seats gained by the faster growing States must all be provided under the present limitation of 435 seats, some of the slower growing States may be rather hard hit. So Representative BASIL WHITENER of North Carolina has introduced legislation to boost the membership of Congress to 438. This would take care of the new representation for Alaska and Hawaii. It seems designed primarily to prevent further losses of southern seats in the House.

Even with the enactment of the Whitener legislation North Carolina is expected to lose one Representative after the 1960 census, since its population growth, estimated at about 10 or 11 percent for the current decade apparently is below the national average. But eliminating the necessity of providing seats for the new States within present limitations might assure this State that it would not lose over one Representative. Conceivably if current population estimates are off base, it might prevent the loss of a Tar Heel Representative.

In any event, the Whitener legislation is very moderate and probably should be enacted. It would follow the 1911 precedent of resetting the total membership of the House after the admission of new States. It carries with it the possibility that no further changes on this account will be called for within the foreseeable future. (Puerto Rico may come in someday, but that day seems a long way off.)

It would not add appreciably to the present size of the House. And it might prevent a number of States on the population border line from losing a Representative (and consequently, an important electoral vote).

No Time To Relax—Focus in Laos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, is the important news in Laos the several improprieties that have been alleged in the administration of our foreign aid to that border kingdom or is it the increasing Communist threat to the independence of a small nation which has just attained its freedom?

Obviously the latter is the case and we must look to see that foreign aid funds are sufficient to the task. This is the lesson of how we will show that Premier Khrushchev's visit means to us no time to relax.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the New York Times of August 21 on the matter of mutual security appropriations which will be considered by this body shortly, may be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NO TIME TO RELAX

In the face of a noticeable growth of a new "Geneva spirit" of relaxation due to Premier Khrushchev's impending visit, the 10-man committee of prominent citizens headed by former Assistant Army Secretary Draper warns that the Communist leopard has not changed his spots and that we cannot cope with him unless we keep the free world strong. To that end the committee urgently recommends that the United States, in addition to its nearly \$40 billion Defense Establishment, provide at least \$2 billion a year in military aid to our allies and friends.

After studying the problem for 9 months the committee holds that Soviet Russia is still bent on controlling the world, that it is growing in economic power faster than the United States, and that the free world can meet the challenge only if it unites in national and individual dedication to freedom, and in hard and constructive work and thought rather than in a search for more comfort and leisure.

This warning is in line not only with the best thought of our military leaders but also with the word brought back from Moscow by Vice President Nixon to the effect that "strength is the only thing the Russian leaders understand," and that a position of strength offers the only hope for reaching agreements with the Soviets. This means both economic and military strength, which, in the foreign field, means continued economic and military aid.

The committee has already recommended various economic aid programs, including a billion-a-year lending program which the Eisenhower administration has sought to realize in the Development Loan Fund within the mutual security program and in the projected billion dollar International Development Association and the Inter-American Development Bank that would enlist other nations in helping underdeveloped countries to strengthen their economy. Now the committee concentrates on military aid, and its warnings are obviously addressed to Congress.

Congress is fully aware of the importance of military strength, and in the matter of our own Defense Establishment gave the President 99.95 percent of what he requested. But when it comes to so-called foreign aid, which buys no votes and contains no local boondoggle but buys more defense at cheaper cost, Congress invariably puts on political blinders. President Eisenhower has requested a total of \$3.9 billion for mutual security, including \$1.6 billion for military aid, which is \$400 million below the committee's recommendation. But in authorizing the program Congress cut down the total by \$353 million and the military aid by \$200 million. And the House has cut actual funds for the program to \$3.1 billion and military aid by another \$100 million.

President Eisenhower has appealed to the Senate at least to restore the House cuts, which, if permitted to stand, would seriously damage the country's international position. The Draper committee report powerfully supports this plea.

These Days—Undesirable Police Force**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the recent editorial by George E. Sokolsky entitled "These Days—Undesirable Police Force," is excellent and, accordingly, I desire to bring it to the attention of the Members of the House.

The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 22, 1959]

THESE DAYS—UNDESIRABLE POLICE FORCE

(By George E. Sokolsky)

What is altogether undesirable in this country is a national police, but many who agree to this proposition often advocate measures which must logically bring such a body into existence. J. Edgar Hoover, Director, the FBI, has always resisted the efforts of well-meaning persons to load down the FBI with the functions of the local police.

When a bomb is thrown at a building with the object of destroying it, this is a matter for the local police. During the past year or two, some synagogues and church buildings have been bombed or defaced. There can be little question but that some "hate" organization is responsible for this manifestation of ill will. There are many "hate" groups and they hate different things, although some of them have now reached a degree of antipathy that they hate everything that is different from what they are. There is also no question but that the willful destruction of property is a criminal act, punishable in our courts under existing law.

Representative CARLTON LOSER, of Tennessee, has introduced a measure, which has been approved by the House Judiciary Committee and which would, as worded, require the FBI to investigate any type of fire or explosion or bombing, including labor disputes, if there is a possibility that those perpetrating the act crossed State lines. This would enlarge the functions of the FBI beyond its capacity, either as to manpower or as to budget. It would also delegate to the FBI a task which is strictly local and which the local police anywhere in the United States should be able to handle if they attend to their business and are not fearful of local pressure groups.

The danger of developing a national police force is greater than the danger to the Nation of some bigot managing to evade the local police. The bigot who permits himself to destroy life or property will sooner or later be discovered and punished; however, the national police force can become a permanent institution. It is true that the people of this country have confidence in Hoover and recognize that he does not permit the FBI to be used for political purposes or to suppress opposition to those in power. However, Hoover will not always head the FBI and a national police force could be used by an unscrupulous person for deleterious purposes if he were so disposed.

As the legislation is written, the language is so broad that persons concerned with bombings would expect the Bureau to intervene in every case to discover whether Federal law applied, even if the bombings were the product of gangsters' wars.

Furthermore, it would seem that the FBI is already concerned with the bombing of churches or synagogues because of its duties

in protecting civil liberties. One of the liberties which all Americans enjoy is the right to worship God in whatever way each individual chooses or not to worship at all. The denial of religious liberty is the denial of the constitutional right of any person living upon American soil. Therefore, no new legislation is really required to permit FBI intervention in a case involving the bombing or defacing of a church or a synagogue. That duty is already theirs.

It is important that the role of the local police be preserved. The primary responsibility for the protection of life and property must rest with the local authorities. The tendency to drag the Federal Government into every phase of American life has not proved out over the past 20 years.

It is not wholesome for local police forces to develop undue dependence upon the FBI which has no function in labor disputes, contested local elections, gang wars, etc.

Many new problems arise each year, some out of the usual disturbed social conditions after wars, some out of household maladjustments in a transitional period. Such matters as the bombing of churches and synagogues are undoubtedly due to the social changes arising out of integration of Negroes in the South, some persons organizing to withstand the law.

Under present jurisdiction, such questions are limited to the States and local communities and there they should remain, unless there is absolute evidence of violation of constitutional rights of individual citizens whose civil rights are to be preserved.

Settlement of the Current Steel Strike**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the August 20, 1959, issues of the three McClatchy Newspapers of California, the Sacramento Bee, the Modesto Bee, and the Fresno Bee, edited by that fine newspaper man, Walter P. Jones. Entitled "Compulsory Arbitration Is Realistic Instrument," it discusses proposals for settlement of the steel strike and recommends that the public should be recognized as a third party directly involved in such disputes.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, Aug. 20, 1959]

COMPULSORY ARBITRATION IS REALISTIC INSTRUMENT

U.S. Senator ESTES KEFAUVER's commentary 6 months ago on steel industry-union quarrels over a new contract has become a casualty of time and long forgotten, perhaps, but it remains one of the few truths which have emerged out of all the gobbledygook given voice in regard to this year's strike.

KEFAUVER had proposed to David J. McDonald, president of the United Steel Workers of America, that the union limit its demands if the steel industry would pledge not to hike prices. In reply McDonald told the press he wished KEFAUVER would "keep

his nose out of my business." And KEFAUVER retorted:

Mr. McDonald's language dramatizes my position exactly. The price of steel is not just Mr. McDonald's business. It is not just the business of Mr. Roger Blough, chairman of the United States Steel Corp. It is the business of the people.

Exactly. It is the business of the people. And suddenly the people have rediscovered an old truth—that they are defenseless in crises of this scope, even though in the end they will have to foot the bill.

Congress, needled by growing concern by the people, is thinking in terms of giving the public recognition as a third party directly involved. For example, Senators JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York, and GEORGE D. Aiken, of Vermont, say the Nation needs to find some new techniques for "asserting the public interest."

They propose factfinding.

The Nation already has factfinding and factfinding. And still the public is defenseless. Why, pray tell, shy away from the only realistic instrument Congress could create for disputes involving great public interest—compulsory arbitration?

Here are two fundamental truths: A strike or a lockout in an industry of steel's importance to the economy, regardless of how justifiable, works a grave injury to the public good; in the end, are not the public rights far greater than the rights of either disputant?

The same arguments used against compulsory arbitration could be voiced as rationally against compulsory regulation of industry and labor. The Nation determined, in another hour of crisis, that one corporation should not hog all industry and it created the Sherman Antitrust Act. Was this an infringement upon private rights or a built-in protection for the people?

In another hour the Nation—whether wisely or not—enacted the Taft-Hartley Act when it suspected labor was abusing some of its powers. Was this an infringement upon rights or did Congress have the public good in mind?

Society has outgrown the jungle. Or it should have. We are a people governed by law, dedicated both to private and public freedoms. The rights of labor, the rights of management must be jealously protected. But so must the rights of the people.

Anything short of this is kowtowing to special interests in the mistaken image of protecting freedoms. If the day ever comes when Americans cannot live happily under law written for the greater good of the greater number, then on that day will a precious piece of America die.

Seapower Still Vital**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, at this time when there are so many varying thoughts on the part of those accredited with expert caliber touching the merits of conventional and atomic warfare, it is, indeed, interesting—and gratifying—to have the views of a well known and experienced naval officer on the subject.

Reference is made to the article by Capt. Frederick L. Oliver, U.S. Navy, re-

tired, distinguished naval correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, appearing in the June 10, 1959, issue.

Captain Oliver has long been a student of Naval strategy and geopolitics, and is well qualified to speak with authority.

Whatever force for destruction modern weapons may possess, the basic usage of the seas must continue to serve the needs of mankind, as Captain Oliver, in his brief, but illuminating and timely discussion discloses.

The article follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 10, 1959]

SEAPOWER STILL VITAL

(By Capt. Frederick L. Oliver, U.S. Navy, retired)

Few nations throughout the world are today so self-supporting that they can afford to dispense with foreign trade. And foreign trade is largely seaborne, which means cargoes carried in ships traversing the sea lanes which crisscross the oceans.

Oceans cover about 73 percent of the surface of the earth, and from time immemorial have provided highways over which moved the raw and finished materials on which nations have depended for their economic existence.

The need of a nation to utilize the sea lanes depends in great measures on its requirements. A manufacturing nation may require raw materials; an agricultural nation, manufactured goods. But whatever the dependence, an interruption of its seaborne trade can spell disaster to a country.

Strategists long since recognized the vital influence of seapower on national issues in which ocean-borne traffic entered. The Phoenicians, Greeks, and Romans in turn exploited the advantages presented by maintaining adequate seapower. By securing command of the seas, narrow as they were in their day, these nations dominated their world.

Over a period of a great many years, Great Britain's seapower was the keystone in the success of that nation in becoming and remaining a world power.

At no time in history has the importance of holding command of the sea been more forcefully demonstrated than in both world wars. During these hostilities, the very existence of nations depended on who controlled the sea lanes.

Now the Soviet Union's growing appreciation of the importance of control of the seas enters a picture which is further complicated by a rapidly increasing array of new weapons. No nation has better reason to know the importance of holding command of the sea than has Russia. Loss of this control in 1904 paved the way for Japan's victory over Russia's Army and Navy in the Far East.

Lack of access to the oceans of the world was a disadvantage under which the Russian Empire labored for centuries. This disadvantage has continued to exist. So it is small wonder to find that Soviet strategy today has gone into the matter of seapower with a thoroughness that is disquieting to the Western Allies.

Czarist Russia's military efforts were centered in its army. Its Navy was a secondary consideration, with a morale which reflected the inferior position to which it was relegated. A search of history will disclose that the Muscovite Navy had few victories to offset its numerous defeats, the most ignominious being at the hands of Japan's Navy at Tsushima in 1905.

Under the Soviet regime, its navy made little progress until after World War II.

Since then it has assumed a prominent role in the Soviet Union's plans.

Communism's avowed goal is world domination. Every move made by the Soviet Government is planned to strengthen its openly acknowledged policy of preparing itself to assume the role to which it aspires.

The growing Soviet fleet is specifically designed to further Communist plans. Foremost among Soviet aims is attaining the means for denying the free world unrestricted use of sea lanes.

For this purpose the Soviets are building a modern navy. Although it comprises a large number of efficient submarines, destroyer and cruiser construction has not been neglected. According to information released by the U.S. Navy, since 1950 the Russians have outbuilt the United States 6 to 1 in submarine tonnage, 9 to 1 in destroyer tonnage, and 14 to 1 in cruiser tonnage.

In view of this striking growth in Soviet naval strength, it is wise to take a look at the foreign import needs of the United States. Contrary to general belief, our country is far from being self-sustaining. Many years ago we did not have to import much save a few necessities, but needs have changed with the times, and today we lack sufficient amounts of some 66 out of 77 strategic raw materials which go into making today's complex weapons and other means for carrying on a modern war.

For instance, many raw materials vitally needed for producing essentials such as telephones, electronic gear, automobiles, tanks, aircraft and ships, must come from overseas in much greater quantities than is generally realized.

Some idea of these needs can be gathered from a few statistics. We import 75 percent of our bauxite and 80 percent of our asbestos requirements; 90 percent of the cobalt, antimony, and manganese we use; and 95 percent of the tin and chrome needed. In addition the time is in sight when most of our iron ore supply must be imported.

The above and many other needed strategic raw materials flow into the United States over more than 60,000 miles of vital sea lanes, traveled by thousands of merchant vessels. Air transportation cannot begin to fill the needs, nor are submarines able to carry more than a trickle of special materials.

How can it be made certain that the required supplies will continue to be received?

There is but one answer: The U.S. Navy must be maintained in such strength that it will be able to maintain its command of the sea against virtually all opponents.

Special Report on Labor Legislation by Representative Joseph E. Karth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. MCCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the recent newsletter of my distinguished colleague from Minnesota, Representative JOSEPH E. KARTH.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL REPORT ON LABOR LEGISLATION

WHAT THE PRESIDENT DIDN'T TELL YOU ABOUT THE GRIFFIN-LANDRUM LABOR BILL

On Friday, August 14, the House of Representatives passed the Griffin-Landrum labor bill, H.R. 8400. This bill has gone to a House-Senate conference committee which will attempt to iron out the differences between the Senate passed Kennedy-Ervin bill, S. 1555 and the House bill.

In the past 2 weeks my office has received hundreds of telegrams, letters, and cards expressing opinions on various measures dealing with labor reform legislation. My mail ran as heavy for the Griffin-Landrum bill as it did against that proposal.

As you might expect, those favoring the Griffin-Landrum proposal were mostly businessmen, executives, and professional people. Most of the mail opposing this proposal originated from labor union officials and men and women who are working people. Most of the letters asking for the Griffin-Landrum bill did not cite the need for a "strong labor-management bill"—rather they mentioned only a strong labor bill.

Almost every letter which was directed to me asking for strict Federal control over the affairs of unions, used James Hoffa and the charges against teamsters as the basis for the urgent need for legislation.

On Friday, August 7, I wired James R. Hoffa and asked him to resign his union offices. I sincerely feel that the enemies of labor unions are using him as an excuse to panic Congress into passing an antiunion measure. I am sorry that Hoffa did not accept my suggestion to quit and perform a real service for the labor movement whose interest he professes to want to advance.

A TRUE LABOR-MANAGEMENT REFORM PROPOSAL

Previously, I introduced a labor-management bill, H.R. 8540, which I am sure would have accomplished the avowed purpose of getting rid of crooks and racketeers, but not destroying the legitimate, free, democratic trade unions.

Everyone knows my background as a local union officer and as an international representative for the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers. I have negotiated labor contracts with huge companies such as the Minnesota Mining and with small companies such as the Sweeney Paint Co.

I believe I know what is involved in labor-management negotiations better than most any Member of Congress. I also believe that my experience qualifies me to determine what type of legislation will correct abuses and what provisions will actually be damaging to unions and business and might do serious harm to the functioning of a free, economic society.

THE GRIFFIN-LANDRUM BILL

Let me cite just a few examples of why I could not support the Griffin-Landrum bill.

1. It will discourage, if not stop altogether, responsible people from running for union office. Because of wording in the law, a local union officer can easily be booby-trapped into court action while conducting his union's legitimate business. He must then bear all legal defense costs himself, lose wages for the time he is in court and must wait until acquittal before his union can even offer to reimburse him. Many small locals could never afford to pay his costs in any event.

2. By giving State courts jurisdiction in a labor dispute involving small business, the Griffin-Landrum bill can lead to real trouble. For example, a St. Paul building contractor, who cannot qualify as being in interstate commerce under NLRB rules, may well find that if he wants to do business in Wisconsin, Illinois, Iowa, or the Dakotas he will

have to check all the State laws, and municipal and county ordinances that may affect relations with his employees. Should he run into legal trouble he might find himself as defendant before a justice of the peace or a municipal judge completely unfamiliar with any phase of labor law. The bill I supported provides specifically that the National Labor Relations Board must handle cases of this type, thereby giving a clear understanding to business and labor as to the laws under which they must operate.

3. This bill imposes undue expense on the small union in its harsh reporting requirements. Only by having the Secretary of Labor review some 40,000 cases can any of them be granted exemption. In my opinion, a proper provision would authorize the Secretary of Labor to demand a report only if he has been informed of abuses or improper procedures.

4. The Griffin-Landrum bill has completely inadequate reporting provisions for employers, thus failing to get at the Shefferman-type middleman. Any true reform bill should include safeguards against such foul operations.

5. The Griffin-Landrum bill has a bonding provision which eliminates all but five bonding companies, both within and outside the United States. (These companies are those who bond Federal employees.) If for some reason the five companies should refuse to bond a union officer or employee he could not hold office. It seems to me all legitimate bonding companies should be eligible. It appears that special interests have been introduced into this bill.

6. The Griffin-Landrum bill outlaws all hot cargo contracts, even those which have nothing to do with teamsters. This will greatly encourage the unscrupulous employer who is making products under sweatshop conditions. In effect, it will make a union man handle products which are being made under conditions that undermine his economic standards, and foster business-wrecking, cutthroat competition. In some cases it could force a worker to go through legitimate picket lines.

7. The Griffin-Landrum bill outlaws all organizational and recognition picketing by an uncertified union under conditions which give no recognition to the many cases where organizational picketing is a vital necessity in a union's legitimate organizing efforts.

In provisions such as this, one can readily see why the southern Congressmen were so eager to join with the Republicans to pass this bill. The South has been looking for means to stop union organization, so that they can continue to lure northern industry to a land of cheap labor. The southerners are not mainly interested in labor reform; they are interested in cheap labor, and the Griffin-Landrum bill will be one more assurance, along with their right-to-work laws, segregation laws, and poll taxes to keeping it that way.

8. The Griffin-Landrum bill makes no provision for voting by economic strikers. Failure to cover this, again points out that eliminating the cause of abuses was not uppermost in the minds of those who want the Griffin-Landrum bill.

9. The Griffin-Landrum bill does not give the Secretary of Labor or the Attorney General the right to bring action against union officers who discriminate because of race, creed or color. Why? Republicans and southern Congressmen joined to defeat such an amendment. Does this indicate they really want to protect the rights of the poor worker?

In addition to these points, I believe that passage of the Griffin-Landrum bill as it now stands will result in legal harassment that will break many unions because of the costs

of litigation. You might call the bill a "full-employment" measure for lawyers and a complete confusion bill for small business.

I hope the conference committee will correct the unworkable and unjust provisions of the bills passed by the Senate and the House. If they do not, and these provisions become the law of the land, I predict that the public will be clamoring for repeal within 2 years.

Schenectady Little Leaguers Headed for 1959 World Series

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the other day I had occasion to invite the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the Schenectady Little League baseball team had won the New York State championship for 1959 and was headed for the regional playoffs. Since that time I am happy to announce to the Members of the House that the Schenectady team has not only won the regional playoffs, but is now slated for the 1959 Little League World Series to be held in Williamsport, Pa., on Thursday, August 27. This is the third time that a Schenectady Little League team has played in a world series, and this fact alone is a credit both to the boys themselves, and to their parents, their coaches, and their trainers.

Because of the fine work which the Little League baseball team organization does in fostering principles of good sportsmanship, I am happy to bring this latest development to the attention of the Members of the House and, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Schenectady Gazette of Monday, August 24, describing the game in which the Schenectady team won the right to appear in the 1959 world series. Also included is an article from the same paper discussing the background of this award:

SCHENECTADY LITTLE LEAGUERS IN SERIES AGAIN—PLAY CANADA TUESDAY AT WILLIAMSPORT

(By Harry Shave)

WILLIAMSPORT.—Schenectady's Little Leaguers, who presented their hometown with its third Little League world series contender for its sesquicentennial birthday celebration Saturday, arrived here at the birthplace of Little League yesterday. Saturday at Staten Island, Schenectady defeated Bridgeport, Conn., 6-2 for the right to represent the eastern region in this international affair which starts tomorrow.

While Billy Neidel, Schenectady hurler, was scattering four of six Bridgeport hits, the bespectacled righthander had plenty of help from his teammates' bats. The big blasts from Schenectady's "quiet ones" came from Tommy Dinola, who hit a solo homer in the first inning and Dougie Wilkins, who drove in two runs with another homer in the fifth inning.

Neidel meanwhile, found Bridgeport his pie for most of the way. He went the full distance, fanning nine batters in the process. In gaining his sixth tourney victory, Neidel was in trouble only when two outs away from the ticket to Williamsport.

In the sixth, when Bridgeport got its two runs and spoiled Neidel's bid for another shutout, the opposition got a double and a home run off Neidel. With one out in the sixth via the strikeout route, Ron Conte doubled to left center and power-hitter Lou Cedrone parked one in the centerfield stands among the TV-decreased crowd of over 7,500 for the two runs.

Little Ken Stewart worked Neidel to a shaky 3-2 count but the Dorp righty got him out swinging for the second out in the sixth inning. The game was a closed book after Neidel promptly fanned Johnny Donoghue for the final out.

This win gave Schenectady an 11-0 tournament mark, the most number of games any team coming here can boast.

After Tommy Woods grounded out and Stan Stringham flied to left to lead off Schenectady's first inning, Dinola cleared the stands in right field to give Neidel a one-run cushion.

Schenectady, showing its keen infield defensive ability, checked Bridgeport in its half of the first. Stringham got the important third out with two men on when he made a fine play at second base on Stewart's grounder.

Schenectady got two more runs in the second for a 3-0 advantage. Starter Donoghue, looking for his fourth tourney win, lost control in the second, hitting both Bob Romph and Billy Jahnel. But the big damage was done when Neidel dribbled one to short and on the attempted putout at third, the ball wound up touching the railing on the dugout, under a Little League rule, both runners were given two bases, thus Romph and Jahnel scored.

One of the gems in the Schenectady infield shone again in the Bridgeport second. With one man on and two outs, first baseman Mike McGarry missed the tag on the runner going down to second on Cavaliere's grounder. Cooly, and with no effort, he beat the runner to first to retire the side.

Schenectady left two men on in the third but also chased Donoghue in favor of plucky Frank Deltoro. The little Bridgeport red-head got himself out of a one-out, two-on situation in the fourth.

However, Schenectady tagged him for three more runs in the fifth. That was when Wilkins homered over the centerfield fence after Dinola singled and McGarry reached first on an error. Deltoro was promptly relieved by Pete Halecka. Both Chet Godlewski and Jahnel got hold of Halecka pitches but fine infield play by Bridgeport prevented any damage as Schenectady again left two stranded.

In the consolation game at Staten Island Saturday, Chester, Pa., broke a scoreless game wide open in the fifth with a nine-run outburst to whip Barre, Vt., 9-0.

After being outfitted Monday in their new World Series suits, Schenectady opens the finals with a 2 o'clock engagement with Quebec, Canada, Tuesday. This game will be the first ever played at the new Williamsport Little League series site.

The second game on opening day pits Latin America against Hamtramck, Mich. Wednesday's lineup will see California going against Alabama in the first game and Oahu, Hawaii, meeting the European champions. Semifinals are set for Thursday, the consolation on Friday and the game for all the marbles is slated at 3 o'clock Saturday afternoon.

Schenectady-Bridgeport box score:

Schenectady		Bridgeport	
ABR	H	ABR	H
Wood, ss	4 0 0	S'va'gl, rf	3 0 0
Stringham, 2b	3 0 0	Ahern, ss	3 0 1
DiNola, cf	3 2 3	C'dron, lb	3 1 2
McGarry, 1b	4 1 0	Conte, lf	3 1 1
Wilkins, 3b	3 1 1	Stewart, c	3 0 0
Romph, lf	1 0 0	Donohue, p, 3b	3 0 0
Godlewski, rf	3 1 0	Atkinson, 3b, cf	2 0 0
Jahnel, c	2 1 1	Cyrcle, 2b	2 0 2
Neidel, p	2 0 0	Deltoro, cf, p	1 0 0
Bennett, lf	0 0 0	Halica, p	1 0 0
Totals	25 6 5	Totals	24 2 6

Schenectady..... 120 030-6
Bridgeport..... 000 002-2

RBI—DiNola, Wilkins (3). E—Schenectady 1, Bridgeport 3. 2B—Conte, DiNola. HR—DiNola, Wilkins. DP—Cedrons (unassisted). BB—Off Donohue 1, Deltoro 3, Halica 1. SO—By Neidel 5, Donohue 1, Deltoro 2. Hits and Runs—Off Donohue 1 and 3 in 2; Deltoro 3 and 3 in 3; Halica 1 and 0 in 2. HBP—By Donohue (Romph, Jahnel). Winner—Neidel. Loser—Donohue. U—Gnamling, Marino, Seesman, Rosen, Poallicelli, Niesl.

DOUBLE HONOR FOR LITTLE LEAGUE KIDS (By Harry Shave)

Schenectady Little Leaguers not only won a monumental trophy for its eastern regional supremacy; our 14 little gentlemen were presented with an unprecedented honor at the awards banquet Saturday night at Staten Island. The youngsters were given another team trophy by their hosts—the Wagner College trophy for conduct on the campus.

The award is given to the one team of the four regional finalists which cooperates the best, conducts itself best, and shows the best deportment. In making the presentation to Trainer Lindy Buonomo and Capt. Stan Stringham, the island hosts stated: "We were not in any way swayed by the fact that you boys won the championship; your conduct is most deserving of this honor. You are one of the finest, if not the finest, Little Leaguers we have ever had here on this campus."

Some kind of proud history is being made by our bunch from Schenectady. On almost eight counts this 1959 team has honors:

No. 1: Schenectady has earned an unprecedented third crack at Little League world series championship.

No. 2: Schenectady is one of eight teams in the first truly international affair—teams from Hawaii, Latin America, and Europe giving it the international aspect.

No. 3: Schenectady was the first team in regional history to receive both the championship trophy and the trophy for good conduct.

No. 4: To Schenectady goes the honor of being one of the two teams to initiate the new Little League ballpark here.

No. 5: Schenectady is the first team in Little League history to have two brothers, years apart, in world series play. Chuckie Neidel, first baseman with the pennant-winning champs of 1954, and Billy Neidel, present team's ace pitcher.

No. 6: Schenectady has a manager, Mike Maletta, setting a record. He's the first manager to get three teams this far in Little League history.

No. 7: Schenectady goes into its opening game with 11 straight tournament wins—a feat no team here can boast.

No. 8: It's ironic that a Schenectady team has made it here during the year its hometown is celebrating its 150th birthday.

(A fitting birthday present from 14 youngsters.)

Schenectady passed up an airplane trip here by vote of its boys. A 9-hour ride on a \$43,000 bus brought us here during a hanging drizzle, skies in Pennsylvania are threatening here today (Sunday). Little League head shrinkers on the national level spend a lot of time studying the strain on little league boys in tourney play. The kids are having a ball—it's the adults who are suffering.

Watching tourney games at this level is like having the first half of a telephone number daily double going at Saratoga and sweating out the second half.

Fran Maletta takes on added duties as we progress along this trail. She laundered and pressed our pretty well-beaten and meager clothing allotment, soothes the weary elders with an amazing amount of good humor, makes the hotel reservations, and comes up with some sterling off-hour activities, regulated to quiet seared nerves of the adults.

Little League Commissioner Bill Fitzgerald, first little league fan to lose his voice. It's down to a whisper now after shouting on our kids in the regional. Many of the adults here agree with us that our kids don't exactly fathom just what a tremendous job they have accomplished. To the kids, it seems, all this is just a matter of playing baseball and knocking off a bunch of other kids on the ball diamond.

Dougie Wilkins had struck out twice, in the first and third innings, before he walloped his three-run homer against Bridgeport. It wasn't until he saw his late-arriving parents that he clobbered the ball. His parents had just come into the stadium when Doug was awaiting his turn at bat.

Outfielder Jimmy Bennett was erroneously charged with two errors in the semifinal game at Staten Island. Scorers made a change in the lineup. Former pro basketball players here—Karl Heiner and Dick (Clubby) Bennett watched the games on the island.

Cenci said: "Mike has everything to win the series—pitching, power, hitting, speed, and a strong defense." Cenci said that Schenectady's defense "is so smooth you don't always notice how hard some of the plays being made are."

Suggestions for the Khrushchev Tour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Oregon Daily Journal for August 21, 1959, has published an editorial entitled "Suggestions for the Khrushchev Visit." The Journal, which is circulated in my home city of Portland, Oreg., supports my recommendations for the qualities inherent in America which the Russian dictator should be invited to see and observe for himself.

I am grateful that the editors of the Journal have decided there is some merit in my suggestions. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Oregon Journal be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUGGESTIONS FOR THE KHRUSHCHEV VISIT

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER has made a sensible proposal on sights to be shown Nikita Khrushchev when the Russian Premier visits the United States next month. Here's the list of things which the Oregon Senator believes should be included in the Soviet leader's American itinerary:

1. The National Institutes of Health at Bethesda, Md., where skilled medical researchers are seeking the answer to diseases which afflict Russians as well as all other members of the human race.

2. A typical American grammar school anywhere in the land, so he may know for himself that American children are not different from the children of his own vast nation.

3. The Grand Canyon of the Colorado, because no human being can see that spectacle without feeling awe at the handiwork of Him who created Russians and Americans and all other peoples.

4. A religious service at some small rural church in the American hinterland, so he may at least experience the spiritual atmosphere which moves the people of the United States.

5. A town meeting in which all the citizens of an American community are equal participants in the local government.

As NEUBERGER suggests, these things might move the powerful visitor from Moscow a whole lot more than the sight of belching factories, roaring missiles, and mighty machines.

"Let us show him the gentler, more compassionate and more human side of America," said NEUBERGER in presenting his proposal to the Senate.

It would, indeed, be too bad if the Russian leader's tour included only those things which emphasize the materialistic side of our free society with nothing to indicate the sincere desire of our people for a better life for all the world.

A Negro Mob Versus Two Policemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an editorial from the Delta Democrat Times, Greenville, Miss., which speaks for itself and merits the attention of all thinking citizens:

A NEGRO MOB VERSUS TWO POLICEMEN

A mob is a mob, whether its members are white or black and whether it erupts in Mississippi or Missouri or anywhere else.

That ought to be plain to all. But we doubt seriously that the NAACP will denounce the St. Louis Negro mob of 1,000 whose near-victims were not law violators but law officers.

Nor has the NAACP given any protest about similar incidents in New York City, Minneapolis, Boston, and even Memphis. And it is this oneness of that organization's concern for justice, its silent toleration of the Negro's record of violence in the cities of the North which make its activities suspect even among the most moderate southerners.

The two white detectives whose lives were saved from the mob only by the arrival of police reinforcements and trained dogs were pursuing a Negro thief in a Negro section. The attack came after they fired at the fleeing man, who escaped. Surely this would be worthy of NAACP attack even if it were the first such incident, which it is not. But don't hold your breath until it happens.

Nixon Leads Presidential Poll in New Hampshire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, every 4 years, national attention is focused upon the State of New Hampshire, which is the first to hold its presidential preference primaries.

At the present time, much is being heard about polls. To those of us who wish to see Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON nominated and elected President of the United States, it is most gratifying to learn that a poll of New Hampshire, taken recently by Opinion Research Corp., of Princeton, N.J., shows Mr. NIXON a 74 percent favorite in our State for the Republican nomination.

An article in the Boston Sunday Herald of August 23 gives the details of this poll. On behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLL PUTS KENNEDY OVER ROCKEFELLER—NEW HAMPSHIRE REPUBLICANS MAKE NIXON TOP CHOICE NOW

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON is the overwhelming choice of New Hampshire Republicans for the presidential nomination, with Nelson Rockefeller a poor second.

If the presidential election were to be held today, New Hampshire would go for Nixon over Kennedy, but for Kennedy if Rockefeller were the Republican candidate. Either Republican could defeat Stevenson.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY CAMPAIGN COULD CHANGE RESULTS

These are the outstanding findings of a sample survey of New Hampshire voters just completed by Opinion Research Corp. of Princeton, N.J. A total of 584 voters from 59 areas throughout the State was questioned, to provide a selection representative of the State's entire population.

The researchers warned that their survey, made from July 26 through August 5, does not take into account the effects of campaigning between now and the 1960 elections. In particular, they point out that a candidate who knows he is running second probably will devote more effort than one who is well ahead.

A surprising finding of the survey was that only a few of the Granite State voters said they preferred Nixon because he had done a good job with the Russians. His experience was by far the major factor. Asked their reasons for a preference for the Vice President, 36 percent of the Republicans interviewed and 36 percent of the Independents answered, "Because he is experienced." Only 4 percent of the Republicans and 16 percent of the Independents cited his "good job with the Russians," despite the fact that he was on his Russian tour at the time the survey was made.

SEVENTY-FOUR PERCENT FOR VICE PRESIDENT NOW

The survey showed that if a Republican presidential preference primary were held today with Nixon, Rockefeller, Lodge, Stassen, Case, and Goldwater the names on the ballot, the Vice President would receive 74 percent of the votes.

Rockefeller would be second with 11 percent, and Lodge third with 9 percent.

In a showdown between NIXON and Rockefeller, 80 percent of the Republicans selected for the survey chose NIXON, 15 percent Rockefeller, and 5 percent could not make a choice.

HOW DO REPUBLICANS IN NEW HAMPSHIRE RATE ROCKEFELLER AND NIXON AS PERSONALITIES?

One of the factors influencing voter preference among candidates is their rating of the man as an individual, in addition to his capabilities as an officeholder.

On this score, Republicans in New Hampshire rate NIXON and Rockefeller about equally well, 54 percent giving NIXON a very favorable rating and 50 percent giving Rockefeller a very favorable rating.

Thus, the edge that NIXON has over Rockefeller, at present, among Republicans is due to the influence of factors other than those relating to personality.

The question: "Here is a list of men who have been mentioned as possible presidential candidates for the Republican Party in 1960. Which one would you like to see nominated as the Republican candidate for President in 1960?"

The vote of Republicans

	Percent	Those who said they voted in the 1958 Republican primary
Nixon	74	70
Rockefeller	11	11
Lodge	9	10
Stassen	3	4
Could not say	2	2

The question: "And who would be your second choice?"

The vote of Republicans

	Percent	Those who said they voted in the 1958 Republican primary
Rockefeller	28	26
Lodge	28	28
Nixon	14	15
Stassen	11	9
Case	1	1
Goldwater	1	3
None of these	11	12
Could not say	6	6
Total	100	100

The question: "Here's an interesting experiment (hand respondent scalometer). You notice that the 10 boxes on this card go from the highest position of plus 5—or something you like very much—all the way down to the lowest position of minus 5—or something you dislike very much. Please tell me how far up the scale or how far down the scale you would rate?"

All voters

(In percent)

	Nixon	Rockefeller	Herter	Kennedy	Stevenson
Very favorable	46	41	42	48	16
Favorable	24	26	31	26	26
Neutral	21	21	17	18	32
Unfavorable	2	4	1	2	8
Very unfavorable	3	4	1	3	15
Do not know him	4	4	8	3	3
Total	100	100	100	100	100

¹ Voted in 1956 plus a proportion (34) of those too young to vote in 1956 but now old enough. The proportion of new voters used is based on postelection studies of voting participation in elections of the last decade.

Independents asked to choose from among the six Republicans the man they would most like to see the GOP nominee were for NIXON—54 percent. Lodge was second, named by 16 percent of the Independents, and Rockefeller third with 13 percent.

In a showdown choice between NIXON and Rockefeller, 62 percent of the Independents preferred the Vice President, 23 percent the New York Governor, and 15 percent could make no choice.

Thirty-nine percent of the voters who were questioned were Republicans, 28 percent Democrats, 31 percent Independents and 2 percent aligned in none of the three groups. Fifty-two percent were women; 48 percent men.

In religion, 53 percent were Protestant and 44 percent Catholic. Thirteen percent were in the 21-29 age group, 45 percent 30-49, and 42 percent 50 or older. By occupation of chief wage earners, the percentages were: Professional and business 20; white collar 10; manual 50; farmer 3; nonlabor force 16; undesignated 1. All were civilians.

The question: "Here is a list of men who have been mentioned as possible presidential candidates for the Republican party in 1960. Which one would you like to see nominated as the Republican candidate in 1960?"

The vote of Independents

	Percent
Nixon	54
Lodge	16
Rockefeller	13
Stassen	6
Case	1
Goldwater	1
None of these	4
Couldn't say	5
Total	100

The question: "And who would be your second choice?"

The vote of Independents

	Percent
Lodge	24
Rockefeller	17
Nixon	14
Stassen	10
Goldwater	4
Case	2
None	13
Couldn't say	16
Total	100

WHO RUNS STRONGER AGAINST KENNEDY IN A TRIAL HEAT FOR THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION—NIXON OR ROCKEFELLER?

At this time, NIXON is a stronger candidate against KENNEDY than is Rockefeller.

In a "trial heat" of KENNEDY versus NIXON, NIXON got the vote of 56 percent of the total voting population sampled. In contrast, Rockefeller received 39 percent of the vote in "trial heat" between him and KENNEDY.

Excluding the "Undecided" and "Other" vote the comparative strength of NIXON and of Rockefeller against KENNEDY is as follows:

	Percent
Rockefeller	42
Kennedy	58
Total	100
Nixon	58
Kennedy	42
Total	100

WHOM DO VOTERS BELIEVE CAN BEST HANDLE MAJOR PROBLEMS FACING THE NATION TODAY—NIXON OR ROCKEFELLER?

The following table shows the proportion of all voters who said that NIXON, or Rockefeller, would do the most effective job of handling each problem:

	NIXON	Rockefeller
	Percent	Percent
Dealing with Russia's leaders.....	75	13
Keeping the United States out of world war III.....	57	10
Dealing with the threat of inflation and increases in the cost of living.....	44	28
Keeping the country prosperous.....	41	26
Preventing tax increases.....	40	18
Racial integration in the schools.....	40	13

The question: "Which of these two men, Nixon or Rockefeller, if elected President, do you think would do the most effective job of handling these problems?"

All voters (In percent)					
	Nixon	Rockefeller	No difference	No opinion	Total
THE PROBLEM					
Dealing with Russia's leaders.....	75	13	4	8	100
Dealing with the threat of inflation and increases in the cost of living.....	44	28	14	14	100
Keeping the country prosperous.....	41	26	19	14	100
Preventing tax increases.....	40	18	24	18	100
Keeping the United States out of world war III.....	57	10	22	11	100
Racial integration in the schools.....	40	13	24	23	100

WHO RUNS STRONGER AGAINST STEVENSON IN A TRIAL HEAT FOR THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION—NIXON OR ROCKEFELLER?

At this time, Nixon is a stronger candidate against Stevenson than is Rockefeller, although both Nixon and Rockefeller received a majority of the vote in preference to Stevenson.

	Percent
NIXON.....	74
Stevenson.....	26
Total.....	100
Rockefeller.....	67
Stevenson.....	33
Total.....	100

The question: "Suppose the choice for the presidential nomination in the Republican Convention narrows down to RICHARD NIXON and Nelson Rockefeller. Which one would you prefer to have the Republican Convention select?"

The vote of Republicans		
	Republicans	Those who said they voted in the 1956 Republican primary
	Percent	Percent
NIXON.....	80	80
Rockefeller.....	15	16
No opinion.....	5	4
Total.....	100	100

The vote of Independents		
	Independents	Percent
		Percent
NIXON.....	62	
Rockefeller.....	23	
No opinion.....	15	
Total.....	100	

WHAT ARE THE MOST IMPORTANT REASONS FOR PREFERING NIXON, OR FOR PREFERING ROCKEFELLER, AS THE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE?

The most important reasons for preferring Nixon given by those who named him as their choice for the Republican nomination, both among Republicans and Independents, refer to the experience he has had.

In contrast, those who preferred Rockefeller were more likely to express a general liking for him.

Major reasons given for preferring		
	Republicans	Independents
	Percent	Percent
NIXON:		
He is experienced.....	36	36
He has had experience as Vice President.....	19	16
He is doing a good job as Vice President.....	13	13
Have heard more about him.....	10	17
He has done a good job with the Russians.....	4	16
Rockefeller:		
General preference expressed no specific reason given.....	28	23
He is capable, can do a good job.....	17	12
He is doing a good job as Governor.....	11	9
He is a sound businessman, knows financial problems.....	6	12

The question: "Suppose the presidential election were being held today. If (name of candidate) were the Democratic candidate and (name of candidate) were the Republican candidate, which would you like to see win?"

If "undecided" respondents were asked: "As of today, would you lean more to (name of candidate), the Democrat, or to (name of candidate), the Republican?"

Voters ¹		
	Percent	Percent
Kennedy and lean Kennedy.....	54	58
Rockefeller and lean Rockefeller.....	39	42
Other.....	1	
Undecided.....	6	
Total.....	100	100
Kennedy and lean Kennedy.....	41	42
Nixon and lean Nixon.....	58	58
Other.....	3	
Undecided.....	3	
Total.....	100	100
Stevenson and lean Stevenson.....	30	33
Rockefeller and lean Rockefeller.....	60	67
Other.....	2	
Undecided.....	8	
Total.....	100	100
Stevenson and lean Stevenson.....	25	26
Nixon and lean Nixon.....	73	74
Other.....	1	
Undecided.....	2	
Total.....	100	100

¹ Based on those who say they voted in the 1956 presidential election plus a proportion of those too young to vote in 1956 but now old enough. The proportion of new voters used is based on past election studies of voting participation in elections of the last decade.

Detroit Common Council Supports Minimum Wage Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was adopted by the

Detroit Common Council. I wholeheartedly support this resolution:

Whereas the present Federal minimum wage of \$1 an hour is inadequate to provide a bare subsistence in the United States today; and

Whereas, more than 20 million Americans lack the guarantee of even this inadequate figure and we are without any legal limitation on their hours; and

Whereas these shocking facts constitute a grave threat to our national economy, a challenge to our moral standards as a people and a peril to our reputation as democracy's showcase throughout the world; and

Whereas the existence of underpaid and overworked wage earners is a particular danger to the well-being of the people of Detroit. Unless a national minimum wage standard is established by Federal law, Detroit industries which pay a decent wage scale will suffer unfair economic competition from those in other communities which pay their employees low, substandard wages and are thus able to undersell our industries; and

Whereas there is now before Congress the Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill (S. 1046 and H.R. 4488) which would greatly ameliorate this problem by raising the Federal minimum wage to \$1.25 and include nearly a million additional workers under the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Detroit, That we hereby memorialize the Members of the 86th Congress of the United States to enact S. 1046 and H.R. 4488, a bill which would increase the minimum wage and extend protection to nearly 8 million additional workers; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, the Members of Congress representing Detroit and the U.S. Senators representing Michigan.

Adopted as follows: Yeas: Councilmen Lincoln, Patrick, Rogell, Smith, Van Antwerp, and President Beck, 6. Nays: None.

Hidden Scandal in Vietnam Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we have been hearing a great deal these days about alleged corruption and mismanagement in the mutual security program in Vietnam. I support the Senate investigation of these widely publicized charges. I believe in rooting out any corruption or mismanagement.

But I think the proportion is important, too. For this reason I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Hidden Scandal in Vietnam Program," which appeared in the August issue of Economic World, published by the Committee for International Economic Growth be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I think this article will help lend perspective to the current controversy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

HIDDEN SCANDAL IN VIETNAM PROGRAM

The most spectacular charges against the mutual security program have a way of coming to light at this particular season of the year—as the Congress moves toward final votes on appropriations to carry on the program.

This year has been no exception. During the last days of July, officials of the State Department and the International Cooperation Administration were on the carpet before a Senate committee—denying sensational charges of waste, incompetence, and scandal in the administration of the program in Vietnam—and explaining that certain mistakes have been made. The hearings may lead to investigations in the field and further reports—perhaps to new charges and countercharges.

In the meantime, here is what happened: Starting on Monday, July 20, the Scripps-Howard newspapers began a series of six articles by Albert Colegrove which was introduced in the Washington Daily News with the front-page headline "Fiasco in Vietnam: Our Hidden Scandal" and which began with the statement: "The American aid program in little free Vietnam is an outrageous scandal."

The general tone of this and succeeding articles is indicated by Mr. Colegrove's references to "wasted millions"; to "forking over bundles of American cash"; to "reckless, foolish, made-in-Washington policy"; to officials who "looked piously at the ceiling when the money melted away"; to American "bureaucrats who have tucked the damning facts away in secret files" and "desk-bound captains of Government furiously shifting official papers from 'in' basket to 'out'"—and who otherwise reside in "cozy bachelor apartments" or "spacious family villas" when they are not sipping gin and tonic at French-type sidewalk cafes in the "Paris of the Orient."

"The true story of this fiasco," wrote Mr. Colegrove, "has been hidden from the American public, which is paying for it."

THE SENATE INVESTIGATES

Senator MANSFIELD promptly called for special hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

The U.S. Ambassador, the mission chief and the head of the Military Aid Advisory Group to Vietnam flew in from Saigon to testify.

Hearings began on July 30. The more specific charges made by Mr. Colegrove and the replies by U.S. officials are summarized below:

1. That the United States contributed \$71 million toward the care and resettlement of 600,000 refugees who fled from Communist North Vietnam after the country was split by the Geneva truce, and that 3 years later \$22 million of this money was still unaccounted for, including \$8 million alleged to have been burned in a fire in 1955.

Answer: Nearly a million refugees from the north have been resettled and integrated into the Vietnam economy. With 5,000 to 10,000 refugees arriving daily, the United States, French, and Vietnam Government—plus American private agencies—pooled funds and resources to distribute relief before an accounting system could be developed. Some \$10 million of these funds cannot now be accounted for. The \$8 million cash reported to have been burned was not money but receipts lost in a fire started by a battle between Communist and government forces.

2. That 14 radio towers costing \$28,500 were bought over 3 years ago by the United States and "have never been seen."

Answer: In 1956 the United States bought 10 radio towers for Radio Vietnam at a cost of \$11,000. They are all installed and in operation. Late in 1958, the United States financed an additional 4 towers which arrived in Vietnam in May and are now in a ware-

house in Saigon. Sites are being prepared for eight of them, three others are in the process of negotiation, and three more remain to be selected.

3. That the former Director of Radio Vietnam "burned his books in the alley" before he was apprehended for filching \$446,000 in U.S. funds which are still unaccounted for.

Answer: The former Director of Radio Vietnam overspent his budget, requested \$446,000 in additional funds from the Government of Vietnam, and was dismissed for incompetence. No funds are missing.

4. That the next Director of Radio Vietnam insisted on air-conditioning the Saigon studios, ordered \$27,000 worth of equipment, and paid a contractor in advance for alterations—upon which the contractor "skipped the country."

Answer: There have been delays in preparing the studios for installation of air-conditioning equipment. The government of Vietnam dismissed one contractor and hired another to finish the job which is now expected to be completed in a few months, at which time the equipment will be installed.

5. That Radio Vietnam has three different teletype reporting devices, none of which is used.

Answer: This is true—the result of a "series of mistakes in judgment" by U.S. personnel.

6. That we are "buying jeeps, tanks, guns, tractors, even whole radio networks for an infant farm-economy" with "only 300 trained technicians by its own Government's count."

Answer: The U.S. aid mission has provided technical training for 38,000 Vietnamese and the Military Assistance Advisory Group has trained 33,000 in the military organizations. One of several Vietnam technical societies has over 300 members.

7. That American officials draw \$400 to \$800 a year in addition to salaries to offset the "fictitious high cost of living in Saigon."

Answer: U.S. military personnel stationed in Saigon receive a 10 percent "cost of living" allowance. This allowance for civilian personnel was discontinued in October, 1957.

8. That "these same officials get up to \$319 a month in so-called hardship pay" when "the average Government worker enjoys more luxurious living and fewer tensions than 90 percent of his tax-paying fellow citizens will ever achieve."

Answer: By act of Congress civilian personnel serving in Vietnam receive an additional 20 percent in salary because it is considered a hardship post. Living quarters are provided by the Government in accordance with the law. All Americans living in Saigon have household servants. The United States pays less in rent for its officials than any of six Western embassies surveyed recently. In the first 6 months of this year, 1561 out of the 2400 civilian Americans suffered from dysentery, hepatitis, and other illnesses—counting only those who received treatment at the U.S. dispensary. On July 8, 1958 two Americans on an official mission were killed by a bomb thrown by a Communist.

9. That Americans do almost all their food shopping at the "fantastic horn of plenty"—the U.S. commissary—to the annoyance of local merchants.

Answer: A survey in February 1959 showed that Americans were buying 75 percent of their meat, 83 percent of their fruit, and 70 percent of their vegetables from local merchants.

10. That an American businessman representing "hundreds of U.S. companies" reported the case of a bridge contract awarded to a firm even though the engineering specifications were inadequate; and that a complaint to the aid mission brought a reply which was paraphrased to mean: "Don't bother us; we only hand over the money; how it's spent is no concern of ours."

Answer: The businessman's complaint was investigated. The specifications for the bridge were reviewed by an American bridge engineer who found them adequate. The contract was awarded to the lowest bidder.

POINT OF AGREEMENT

Mr. Colegrove and Government witnesses were in agreement on at least one point—a paragraph in his series of six articles which said:

"True enough, we have accomplished our main mission. We have kept Vietnam from Communist conquest and from economic collapse."

An Organization Liberal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, August 25, 1959, is the first anniversary of the death of the Honorable Charles M. Finley. He died while serving his second term as councilman in the city of Philadelphia. He represented the ninth councilman's district of the city of Philadelphia with great devotion to the people of the district and to the city.

Charlie Finley, as he was affectionately called, was widely known in the city, the State of Pennsylvania, and in the Nation. He was friendly to people in all walks of life and was well regarded by members of both political parties and also by independent voters. He was an organization man and represented the 50th ward in the county committee of Philadelphia for a great many years. He had also represented the sixth senatorial district in the Democratic State Committee for many years, and was a member of its policy group.

In addition to his splendid organizing ability, which developed a highly successful political organization, and his allegiance to the city, State, and National Democratic organizations, he was also popular with independent voter groups and from time to time agreed with positions which they supported, when he felt that it was for the public benefit.

He was very devoted to the development of La Salle College and lent his efforts to support the enlargement of the college and its prestige.

He was a strong supporter of public libraries—and succeeded in acquiring two new city owned libraries for his district—which rapidly became the most heavily used branch libraries in Philadelphia.

He was greatly interested in the spare time problems of the people of his district and obtained for his constituents three new recreation centers, the substantial improvement of one and the purchase of ground for another.

He was especially zealous in his protection of the property rights of his constituents and intervened on their behalf frequently to preserve residential neighborhoods. He served as chairman of the city council committee on municipal zoning development and zoning with

great distinction. The whole city benefited by his intelligent administration in municipal development and zoning problems.

His death was a great loss to his community, to his friends, relatives and colleagues, and to his wife, to whom he was devoted. He left his mark upon the public as a man who was a politician, in the best sense of the word, a liberal, and an outstanding citizen.

Blockading Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it seems that history is repeating itself in civil rights. At the beginning of the year the President submits a modest proposal, it is criticized by some partisans as being too weak, the congressional year marches on with little being done and then, when an effort is mobilized near the session's end, the cries go up from the opposition that more time and deliberation must be given to the radical civil rights proposals at hand. The Civil Rights Act of 1957 has been constructive in its application and has fortified our constitutional form of government, our individual liberties, and our national well-being, notwithstanding the dire predictions during the lengthy debates 2 years ago. There can be no cogent reason for further delays in consideration and enactment of meaningful civil rights legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the August 21 New York Times which bespeaks the views of many in the Nation who look to the Congress for action on civil rights, prompt and effective, may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLOCKADING CIVIL RIGHTS

The time has come—in fact, is well past—for action on civil rights in both the Senate and the House in Washington and for public identification of those who are responsible for inexcusable delays.

Last February President Eisenhower sent to Congress a seven-point program to further the progress already made in securing equal rights for all Americans. The proposals were moderate indeed. They included extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission for 2 years, making obstruction of desegregation court orders a Federal offense, preservation of election records and the right to their inspection by the Attorney General, aid to communities in solving desegregation problems, and a Commission on Equal Job Opportunities under Government Contract.

Six months have now passed and no bill along these lines has yet been cleared for action either in the Senate or the House. Formidable roadblocks, manned by those who are opposed to any further civil rights legislation, are standing in the way.

In the Senate Judiciary Committee its chairman, Democratic Senator EASTLAND, of

Mississippi, and the southern Democrats on the committee are stalling off making a report which a majority of the committee wants. And they are doing so in spite of a plea from their Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights that a civil rights measure be promptly sent to the floor of the Senate and in spite of Senate Democratic Leader LYNDON JOHNSON's pledge that such a bill will be passed before the present session ends.

The House Judiciary Committee finally approved a diluted version of the President's program a couple of weeks ago—one which left out desegregation aid to communities and the Commission on Equal Job Opportunities which the President had called for. This bill must be cleared by the Rules Committee before it can go to the floor of the House. But Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia, chairman of the committee and bitter foe of civil rights, seems to be in the extraordinary position of being able to block any such action, with the backing of southern Democrats and some Republican members of the committee.

This sort of fiddling with basic human rights that are part of the American ideal does no credit to Congress or to those who engage in it or tolerate it. We cannot believe that such conduct is good politics any more than it is good morality.

Land Office of the State of New Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTROYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to challenge an insertion placed in the March 10, 1959, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix by my esteemed colleague and friend, Congressman LEE METCALF, of Montana. Articles which he quotes are not only without basis of fact in many respects but, in my opinion, wholly uncalled for with respect to the land office of the State of New Mexico and the present commissioner of public lands, Murray E. Morgan. I honestly cannot believe that LEE METCALF knew of the untruth and gross injustice of these articles concerning our land office because I know him to be a man of integrity and sincerity.

May I quote from one of the articles:

A few States are doing a conscientious job of managing their lands, but the administration of State lands in New Mexico is among those having the weakest record, and in New Mexico the land is administered by an elected land commissioner who generally is representative of the livestock interests.

Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. Mr. Morgan, the present commissioner, is a former newspaper editor and publisher. His predecessor was a businessman. In fact, of the 16 land commissioners who took office in New Mexico, I doubt if over 2 were ever associated with livestock interests. I have known Murray Morgan quite well for many, many years and I certainly consider him to be a judicious, conscientious, fair, and honest man. My convictions most certainly are borne out by

the overwhelming majorities he has enjoyed in both of his races to the elective post of land commissioner.

Mr. Speaker, I contend strongly and with unequivocal basis in fact that the administration of State lands in New Mexico has been a shining example of efficiency, economy, and honesty. In House Report No. 1778 to accompany H.R. 5992 in the 80th Congress, 2d session, New Mexico was specifically cited as a "good example" of how well the States had proven their ability to administer public lands.

In the report our House committee stated:

The evidence is conclusive that private interests operating under State controls have been eminently more successful in developing our oil resources than under Federal control. The State of New Mexico furnishes a good example. There are 11,500,000 acres of State owned lands in New Mexico, while the Federal Government owns in excess of 34 million acres. At the present time over 6 million acres of State lands, or 52 percent are under lease for oil and gas exploration, while only a little more than 2 million acres of Federal lands, or about 6 percent are under lease for oil and gas exploration.

In the five public land States producing oil and gas, the Federal Government owns approximately 36½ percent of the acreage but produces only about 13 percent of the oil and gas produced in these States. The 1946 total production from these lands was approximately 62 million barrels, while the production from State and privately owned lands in the same States was in excess of 380 million barrels. Thus, it will be seen that in these five "public land" States, where Federal and State owned lands are in direct competition with each other, development has been much faster and production has been much greater under State regulation than under Federal control. The total annual production of oil from the vast federally owned domain in 1946 was less than 12 days' production of the Nation. It must be conceded that the Federal Government has made a pitiful showing with respect to the development of public lands for oil and gas purposes.

Mr. Speaker, in the 83d Congress, Senate Report No. 133, to accompany Senate Joint Resolution 13, refuted the "oil grab" charge of the opposition to State ownership of the tidelands by saying:

For years the charge has been made, and it is still being made, that those who believe that the States themselves are best qualified to own and manage the lands and resources within their State boundaries are somehow participating in an "oil grab" as "stooges" of the oil industry. Nowhere in the long and voluminous record is there a scintilla of evidence even remotely substantiating such a charge.

The record of New Mexico's administration of the public lands entrusted to her keeping by Congress speaks for itself and is a matter of pride for the State and a matter of satisfaction to those beneficiary institutions who benefit from the revenues derived from these lands.

New Mexico administers her 13 million acres of State lands on 2½ percent of the revenue from those lands. The Federal Government administers its lands on 10 percent supplemented by additional appropriations by Congress. Last year New Mexico averaged a return of better

than \$2 an acre from her 13 million acres of land, while the Bureau of Land Management averaged less than \$1 an acre from the lands it administers. I would like to point out at this time that New Mexico, like other Western States, was prohibited from selecting lands known to be mineral in character, and that this remarkable record of earnings is in spite of this fact.

New Mexico, at the present time, through economical administration and efficiency of operation, has accumulated the sum of over \$155 million in its permanent funds for beneficiaries of the State land office. Besides this it has over the years given the beneficiaries over \$125 million for current operating budgets and the program has been so carefully handled that none of the permanent funds have ever been lost.

Mr. Speaker, may I also point out that unlike the complicated and seemingly slow procedures in the Federal oil and gas lease field, our New Mexico State Land Office has the reputation of expeditious and uncomplicated administration of such important matters. Our State oil and gas leasing procedures are on a strictly competitive basis on known geological structures and the leasehold interest can be depended upon, once it is established pursuant to land office directive. The same is true with respect to sale of State lands for in New Mexico everyone has an equal chance pursuant to advertising and public auction sale to the highest bidder. Seldom, if ever, would there be any possible cloud on title once the land office has completed the sale or issued a lease.

In short, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the record of performance of our State land office clearly refutes any charges that it is in consort with special groups or that it is operating in an inefficient manner.

Increased Civic Participation in NATO Consultations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I have often stated my belief that Government officials—even Senators—do not possess all the wisdom in the world. Indeed, our very system of responsive and responsible government is based in this assumption. In order to meet successfully the domestic and international problems of today, we must tap the intellects and energies of our individual private citizens.

For these reasons, on the international scene, in addition to supporting increased cooperation among our NATO allies' governments, I have also urged increased intercourse among these countries' private citizens.

Mr. Leo Burson, a Memphis delegate to the Atlantic Congress in London last

June, is an excellent example of the value of increased civic participation in our NATO consultations. Mr. Burson was one of several Tennesseans who helped to effect the success of the Congress, and he has made some interesting observations on the meeting since he returned with his family.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article that appeared in the Memphis Hebrew Watchman of June 18. This article should serve to point up the important role that spirited private citizens such as Mr. Burson can play in our continuing quest for a just world peace and understanding between nations.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Hebrew Watchman, June 18, 1959]

BURSON RETURNS FROM NATO CONGRESS

Leo R. Burson, a Memphis delegate just back from the NATO Atlantic Congress meeting in London lightened the hearts of Memphis mothers by stating categorically that "There seems little likelihood of major East-West war in the next 10 years." Mr. Burson gave as the basis of his reasons the following world developments:

1. The development of the hydrogen bomb.
2. The death of Stalin.
3. The Hungarian Revolution, which demonstrated the unreliability of the East European satellites.

In summarizing the achievements of the Atlantic Congress, Mr. Burson stated that "Six major principles guided our thinking:

- "1. The NATO military alliance has, in its first 10 years, preserved the peace of Europe.
- "2. Nevertheless, great changes have taken place in this decade that make essential increased cooperation among Atlantic nations in all fields.
- "3. No military alliance can endure unless supported by close political and economic cooperation.

"4. The time is ripe for these nations to build an Atlantic community with responsibilities extending to military, political, economic and scientific fields.

"5. The Atlantic nations are interdependent with the other nations of the free world. All these nations want peace and the preservation of their own conception of life. All have a common interest in the development of economic activity and social improvement throughout the world; all people have a common stake and status in a free world.

"6. The Atlantic community has a duty to help less developed countries to help themselves."

Mr. Burson was a U.S. spokesman on the all-important political policies committees. He was coauthor of the negotiation resolution which was adopted by the full of Congress and 2 days later laid the foundation of Secretary of State Herter's pronouncement to Gromyko that the Western Powers would not continue negotiations under the shadow of any ultimatum issued by Gromyko or Khrushchev. The negotiations resolution as adopted is as follows:

"While the primary need is to maintain and develop the cohesion, military security, and economic capacity of the Atlantic countries, because the worldwide Communist threat seems likely to be no less during the second 10 years of NATO than it was in the first, the Atlantic powers are nevertheless urged to undertake continued negotiations with the governments of the Communist bloc for the settlement of differences while re-

jecting duress, threats, and any kind of ultimatum."

Mr. Burson was accompanied on the trip by his wife, the former Josephine Wainman, their daughter, Linda, 17, and son, Charles, 15.

Mr. Burson said "I feel much good was accomplished at the Congress and expect to see many future, favorable results from it."

Before attending the Congress, they visited Norway, Sweden, Holland, West Berlin, East Berlin, and France.

Interest Ceiling on Government Securities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the following letter which appeared in this morning's New York Times deserves the thoughtful reading of all Members of Congress:

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The surprise decision of the House Ways and Means Committee to shelve the President's request for removal of the archaic interest rate ceiling on Government bonds should not be dismissed lightly. It is doubly inflationary and it will cause an increase in the servicing cost of the national debt.

The decision is inflationary because it will force the Treasury to refinance over \$100 billion of the national debt in short-term securities over the next year. With growing business prosperity the demand for short-term Government securities on the part of nonfinancial corporations will subside, and the Federal Reserve will be compelled to provide extra reserves, beyond the monetary requirements or real economic growth, to enable commercial banks to absorb an ever-larger amount of short-term Government securities.

In addition, the indefinite duration of the statutory interest-rate ceiling will generate further inflationary expectations, with the corresponding increase in the velocity of circulation of currency, and thus still more potential inflation. As an accompanying result there will be added pressures on the yields of outstanding long-term Government securities and on all interest rates.

The decision of the House Ways and Means Committee, if it is not reversed promptly, will accomplish exactly the opposite of its intention.

ADMINISTERED INFLATION

There will be attempts at exonerating the committee's responsibility for the inflationary consequences of its decision. It will be argued that our new inflation is of administered or cost-push kind and therefore unrelated to the national debt management and beyond the reach of monetary policy.

The argument does not hold water. The administered or cost push theory of prices deals only with one set of forces that act on the price level. It is not a general theory, and even in its partial relevance it has not yet been fully developed and demonstrated.

But even if one assumed that all inflation stemmed from cost push forces and corresponding price administration, national debt management and monetary policy would still be relevant in relation to the price level. We have no public policy to deal directly with wage and price administration.

RESTRAINT ON PRICES

The steel industry is a telling case in point. When cost push forces press on prices, monetary and fiscal policies are the only available price-level restraints to be used as public policy for general welfare. Faced with anti-inflationary monetary and fiscal policies, the cost push forces in our economy must depend on offsetting increases in the velocity of money or, if velocity is checked too, they are saddled with the responsibility for the resulting unemployment.

By forcing our national debt management and monetary policy systematically to over-expand the supply of money, the House Ways and Means Committee's decision has not only caused the resurgence of a potential demand-pull inflation but has also removed the only existing public policy checks on the cost push forces in our economy.

Congress must find a way to correct the dangerous monetary situation before it adjourns. The political leadership that permitted the hasty House committee decision must be made aware of the fact that general economic literacy is not so low that people will fail to detect the source of the grave consequences that will follow if the interest rate ceiling on long-term Government bonds is not removed now.

CYRIL A. ZEBOT.

WASHINGTON, August 22, 1959.

Creation of International Development Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, there appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of today, August 25, 1959, a very timely and interesting editorial entitled "The IDA Makes Headway." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE IDA MAKES HEADWAY

It is highly gratifying that under the leadership of Treasury Secretary Anderson negotiations have progressed rapidly toward creation of an International Development Association to assist underdeveloped countries. The Governors of the World Bank will consider the matter further at their September meeting, and it is possible that a specific plan will be laid before Congress next year regarding American participation.

The proposal for this new international lending agency has grown out of the resolution submitted by Senator MONRONEY in February 1958. The purpose of IDA would be to supplement the established lending activities of the World Bank and of individual member nations with a new international source of loans repayable on longer terms at lower interest rates and, when warranted, in local currencies.

Many of the emergent nations of Asia and Africa have found it impossible to qualify for the hard-currency 6-percent loans of the World Bank. The IDA would not only help to meet their needs, but encourage wider participation in such an assistance program by the other industrial nations which would

subscribe capital to the institution. If the project continues to be pushed vigorously, as it should be, the IDA ought to be in business in 2 years.

The Two Faces of Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, Khrushchev, the Red dictator, has been invited to visit the United States.

This startling fact should warn the American people to be on guard.

The object of this master conspirator is to confuse the White House, and to lull our people into a sense of false security by creating the illusion that peace is just around the corner.

William Randolph Hearst, Jr., with Bob Considine and Frank Conniff, know the real Khrushchev. For their interviews with him and their reports of the way he operates, they have won the Pulitzer Prize and the Overseas Press Club Award.

As a public service, they have started a series of articles about "K" in the Hearst newspapers.

The chapter headings in the first article are revealing: "Has Vast Knowledge of United States," "Shot Them Without Trial," "He'll Be Jolly Good Fellow," "They Wanted Bigger Game," and "Khrushchev Surprised Them."

To prepare the American people for the worst, I include for reprint in the RECORD the first article in this series, published in the Boston Sunday Advertiser, on August 23, 1959. It is appropriately titled: "The Khrushchev I Know: Coarse, Bold, Adroit, Tough, Ruthless": THE KHRUSHCHEV I KNOW: COARSE, BOLD, ADROIT, TOUGH, RUTHLESS

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr., with Bob Considine and Frank Conniff)

A historic, Pulitzer Prize winning interview by the Hearst task force with Nikita Khrushchev gave the world its first clear picture of his emergence as the master of world communism.

Now, with the Soviet Premier scheduled to visit the United States, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., and his reporting colleagues present an authoritative, searching analysis of the man, his politics, personality and problems.

They tell you what to expect during his visit and provide the facts you should have in understanding his actions and his motives during his stay here. This is the first of a series of articles which will continue in Monday's Boston American.

I first met Nikita Sergeivitch Khrushchev at central party headquarters, Moscow, on the bitter morning of February 5, 1955. I last talked with him at the American exhibition in Sokolniki Park a few minutes after his stormy scene with Vice President Nixon near the kitchen of our model house, last month.

Over that 4-year span I encountered him a number of times at diplomatic receptions (which he can make very informal) and spent two very long private interview

periods with him, accompanied by members of the Hearst task force. The first of these reports, by Kingsbury Smith, Frank Conniff, and myself, won the Pulitzer Prize. The second, with the present task force, won the Overseas Press Club of America's award for best foreign correspondence.

I cite the above simply as a means of presenting our credentials as reporters who have more than a reference-room knowledge of the important subject involved.

You are going to meet this man Khrushchev whether you want to or not. From the moment he sets foot on our native soil September 15 until his departure, he will be all but impossible to escape or ignore.

His rough, calculating peasant's face will stare frankly at you—as if sizing you up—from your newspaper and your television set. His words, no matter how provoking, ill informed or ill advised, will be faithfully recorded and reported by a small army of newsmen. He'll be talking to you, or at you, from all available platforms, ranging from the podium in the General Assembly of the United Nations all the way to a tree stump in an Iowa cornfield.

It is better to know something of this man. To dismiss him as a braying jackass, given to bouts with the bottle, is in our estimate a dangerous evasion. To quake and quaver at his sweeping boasts that he could annihilate us is equally foolish.

Therefore, this and the articles which follow in the Hearst Newspapers during the coming week constitute an honest effort to describe and perhaps even explain, this simple-looking but in many ways complex world leader. In effect, we're going to try to tell you "what makes Nikki run."

HAS VAST KNOWLEDGE OF UNITED STATES

What follows is a distillation of impressions gained through personal and sometimes rough contact with Khrushchev, talks with such soaring authorities as Sir Winston Churchill, Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and Prime Minister Harold Macmillan, briefings by our Embassy people in Moscow and Warsaw, and our own studies.

Khrushchev likes to recall his youth as a simple swineherd, then as a mine boy. But this self-taught man possesses a statistical knowledge of America's industrial and agricultural strengths and weaknesses that will astonish President Eisenhower.

He filled countless little and often humiliating roles during his slow but sure ascent to his dictatorship, including the role of court jester and wild gopak dancer for such influential patrons as Stalin, Kaganovich, Bulganin, and Mikoyan. But once in control, past favors meant nothing. He banished men who made him.

In his historic down-grading of Stalin before the 20th Party Congress in 1956, Khrushchev cried beratingly, "Even if the disastrous tactics of the opposition made it necessary to purge them, it was scarcely necessary to exterminate tens of thousands of Communists."

This was a reference to the big purge of 1937. Khrushchev helped make it big. On Kaganovich's recommendation, Stalin sent Khrushchev to Kiev, to clean out dissension in the Ukraine, and gave him the title of general secretary of the party at the Ukrainian capital. His first act was to call a meeting of the top 120 members of the Ukrainian Government. When they had assembled, Khrushchev signaled for NKVD goons to enter the hall. He had arranged a simple ambush.

SHOT THEM WITHOUT TRIAL

As Khrushchev read off the names of his fellow Ukrainians, each man was roughly seized and carried off under arrest, then shot without trial. Khrushchev had bagged all the local leaders except Parnas Lyubchenko,

an accomplished surgeon who headed the People's Council of Commissars in the Ukraine. Lyubtchenko detected that he was being lured into a trap and sped to his villa, where for 4 hours he and his wife held off NKVD forces under Col. Ivan Serov (destined to head Khrushchev's security police years later when Khrushchev ordered the murder of Lavrenti Beria). Lyubtchenko and his wife, running out of ammunition, blew their brains out with their last two bullets rather than face the type of "justice" Khrushchev was meting out to his countrymen.

But this will not be the face he turns to America. His buoyant manner, robust sense of humor, earthy outlook, mastery of the prophetic proverb and corn of personal charm will make him an intriguing visitor to many who prefer to take him at his face value. He'll talk peace morning, noon and night, and with such warmth that the unwary might come to believe it is an invention of purely Russian character.

HE'LL BE JOLLY GOOD FELLOW

He'll talk of peaceful coexistence, too, and the need of more United States-Soviet trade and cultural exchanges. He'll have many and probably amusing comments to make on American women, labor-saving devices, creature comforts and luxuries—some of them all but reminiscent of Will Rogers. At 65, the one time machinist's apprentice and roistering street fighter will wear out all but the strongest young aids assigned to him by the State Department and his own Embassy.

He'll disappoint many who expect him to act the grim part of Communist boss and dictator of a colossal intrigue against mankind's freedom. There will be times during his visit when you may actually catch yourself saying, "This fellow's not dangerous. He's a regular guy."

He'll also disappoint many who expect or hope that he'll arrive with an olive branch clamped in his teeth and be simply overwhelmed by our cluttered capitalistic life of cars, good housing, appliances, freedom of speech and religion, forests of TV antennas and the like. Unless the man has changed a lot since the last time I saw him, he'll sound off on anything that doesn't suit him. No matter what he is shown he will be prone to remark that they do it better in the Soviet Union. You can say almost anything about N. S. Khrushchev—except that he is predictable.

Khrushchev may look as "square" as his suits. Russian intellectuals laugh at his brogue, which still smacks of an unlettered day when he spoke neither Russian nor Ukrainian but a coarse patois that borrowed from both. He could hold his belly and laugh uproariously when a kindly foreign Ambassador attempted to tell him how to act when he called on Queen Elizabeth II at Buckingham Palace.

But no man of any discernment can doubt that he is one of the ablest and most adroit political figures of this century, or perhaps any other era.

He came to the fore so swiftly, as far as the world at large is concerned, that people still have trouble spelling his name, and not too many wholly comprehend the incredible scope of his personal power. One day he was a blurred face in the second or third row of group pictures featuring Stalin, Molotov, Mikoyan, Bulganin, Zhukov, Malenkov, Kaganovich, Voroshilov. The next day (as history is measured) there he was, front and center—undisputed—his enemies scattered to the four winds of the U.S.S.R.

THEY WANTED BIGGER GAME

I witnessed some of the first rumblings of this volcanic political explosion that aforementioned day in February 1955, when Kingsbury Smith, Frank Conniff, and I trooped into his Moscow office.

Frankly, we were looking for bigger game: Molotov, let's say, and Malenkov. We were in Leningrad and on our way out of the country when we learned that Bulganin had succeeded Malenkov as Premier and would see us at the Kremlin. We rushed back.

Khrushchev was "filler" material while we hunted down the bigger names. Certainly, he had been a secretary of the Central Committee since 1949 and first secretary since September 13, 1953. This was the particular job from which Stalin had ruled despotically over his empire for 30 years.

But we were prepared only to have our ears bent by a torrent of dialectics, be gassed by the foggy gobbledygook the party spokesmen dote upon. We knew his background, his years as a party hack, dutiful stooge, willing accomplice and his slow climb to his present position in the days following Stalin's death.

KHRUSHCHEV SURPRISED THEM

Khrushchev surprised us. Ten minutes after our interview began an assistant quietly entered the room and told him he was wanted on the phone. Khrushchev cut him off as with a sabre. "Nyet," he almost shouted, his little eyes blazing. He would take no calls, and we gathered the impression that that meant calls from any of his apparent superiors.

The questioning stayed on party matters for a time, but Khrushchev grew restless. We started to ask questions in fields in which he had no known knowledge or authority. On a question concerning the foreign policy of the Soviet Union we expected him to say, in effect, "You'd better take that up with Molotov." Or, on trade questions, it would have seemed natural for him to refer us to Mikoyan, or on military matters to Marshal Zhukov.

Not Khrushchev. He had all the answers and spoke them in a big, bold voice that should have warned us—an actually did—that there was much greater power here than met the eye. In truth, we were witnessing the emergence of a man who, in the light of his nuclear arsenal and method of delivering war-heads, wields more unobstructed power than any individual in history.

New York City Looks to Its Housing Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the mayor of New York has designated a distinguished citizen of New York, J. Anthony Panuch, to make a survey of city policy and organization on housing problems. Mr. Panuch, an attorney, brings to the task considerable experience in administration and governmental reorganization. The experience of New York's housing programs have been so valuable in national legislation as to make them a matter of common interest to the whole country.

I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times editorial of August 21 commenting on this appointment, may be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE CITY'S HOUSING TOPSY

Mayor Wagner has taken the unusual step of going outside the administration, even to the point of enlisting a Republican, for the direction of a survey of city policy and organization on housing problems. He has chosen for this task J. Anthony Panuch, a New York lawyer experienced in administration and governmental reorganization.

Mr. Panuch is asked to develop and submit to the mayor by February 1 "specific recommendations for a comprehensive city policy and program for housing and urban renewal, including correlation of the city's functions, policies, programs, plans, and operations in the field of publicly aided private housing, slum clearance, tenant relocation and neighborhood conservation." He will propose organizational realignments and legislation if necessary.

Among the city agencies or officials operating in this area now are the city housing authority, the slum clearance committee, the urban renewal board, the department of buildings, the city planning commission, the controller's office, the deputy mayor and his assistant, and the bureau of real estate.

Ordinarily this is an assignment that might have gone to the city administrator, Charles F. Preusse. He would undoubtedly have done a good job on it. However, in our opinion it will be beneficial in this case to get a detached, objective inquiry from the outside, completely free of association with the personalities involved, that will look at the problem of agencies that have, to a degree, grown up like Topsy. More correlation seems to be needed, but the case is as yet unproved for one monumental agency of government that will take over all housing action.

While the mayor spared the city administrator this housing job, he gave him only the day before another task of backbreaking size, determination of the feasibility of surveying the whole network of social and welfare services in the city, both private and public. The assumption is that, after consultation with the many agencies that are interested, a broad survey will develop.

Here is a splendid opportunity not only for elimination of duplication, for more effective approach, but also for improvement and enlargement of service to meet unsatisfied needs, as in the area of our aging population. So we shall have, beginning simultaneously, two studies of large importance to the people of New York, and both in good hands.

A Resolution That De Witt Clinton Be Suitably Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the Members of the House to a resolution I have introduced today that De Witt Clinton, one of our great statesmen, be honored by placing his portrait on a revenue stamp, bond, or similar document.

For decades millions of our citizens have carried the picture of an American statesman in their pockets every day.

Almost daily that picture has traveled everywhere on earth—into private homes, into schools and universities, into factories and offices, into royal mansions and national parliaments, on to athletic fields, and on to this earth's bloodiest battlefields. I would say that it is the world's most traveled face. That picture was a portrait-in-miniature and it appeared on revenue stamps on all cigarette packages that are taxed for revenue. And that small picture was a portrait of De Witt Clinton, a New York statesman and one of the most gifted of the Founding Fathers of our Republic.

It is with a certain degree of sadness, that, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I must look to the withdrawal of that portrait from circulating among our foreign friends. De Witt Clinton's picture will not make these universal tours as the U.S. Internal Revenue stamp, class A 20 of series 125 has been dropped this summer from all cigarette packages. In a peculiar way, it will be a loss to the free world as that great American face, framed in blue, preached in his own silent fashion of the dignity and of the opportunities to be had and cherished under the democratic ways of life.

To the host of people who were interested enough in his identity to investigate and make a simple research of his life, De Witt Clinton's career and deeds provoke admiration for our country that could inspire his memorable achievements for her and his fellow men. For incredible, indeed, was this life based on self-sacrifice, service to others, and idealism. And what a pity it will be to let his memory disappear into that shadowy land of almost complete obscurity.

A hasty epitome of his career discloses only too well the solid worth of De Witt Clinton's contributions to the infant democracy that was the America of his day. As a young boy outside of Newburgh, N.Y., he had to do a man's work on the family farm as his father was away fighting as an officer in the patriots army seeking American independence. With the war over and won, De Witt could pursue his studies in a nearby academy. Later he enrolled at Columbia College and graduated from that institution receiving his diploma from the hands of George Washington, the President of the United States. Thus, he is among the first graduates of the now Columbia University, honor man of his class, and he was the graduation speaker—talking for a half hour in Latin on the values of liberal arts.

De Witt Clinton later studied law and was admitted to the State bar in 1790 at the age of 21. His uncle, George Clinton, was called the father of New York State because he was elected the first Governor and served for six successive terms for a period of 18 years. It was but natural, therefore, that De Witt Clinton should turn to politics and he became his uncle's secretary. Later he was elected to the State legislature, then to the senate of the State. In 1802 he was U.S. Senator representing New York here in our Capitol. Resigning his

duties in Washington, he ran for mayor of New York City. He was elected mayor and 11 times he was returned to that post by his people. In 1812 he ran for President of the United States and was defeated by James Madison in a close election. Subsequently, he was elected Governor of New York three times and he died while in that office.

In a letter of introduction to President Jefferson when De Witt first went to Washington as U.S. Senator, his uncle wrote, among other things—

This is my nephew * * * you will not find him without gifts of mind * * * and in politics, his motives are ever pure.

These may be the clues to De Witt Clinton's popularity with the electorate, his many sided gifts and his purity of intentions in their use. They truly made him an outstanding statesman. As a writer—W. R. Alger—once said:

True statesmanship in the art of changing a nation from what it is, into what it ought to be.

De Witt Clinton seemed to be ever guided by this principle. As a young legislator in New York he helped to overthrow the system of allowing the Governor to propose all names for office holders, and instituted a general replacement of the defeated party members by the members of the party victorious in the elections. As U.S. Senator Clinton, he introduced the 12th amendment to the Constitution to prevent the recurrence of the tie votes for President as in the case of the 1800 elections. As mayor of New York City he promoted public education, city planning, city fortifications, public sanitation, and relief of the poor. He constantly advocated the removal of political barriers on Roman Catholics, the abolition of Negro slavery, and the softening of the severity of punishment for debtors.

When Governor of New York he never forgot the needs and the potentialities of the city he served so well. Nor did he forget the potential greatness of his native State. In 1815 he presented a memorial to the New York Legislature about the construction of a canal that would join the Hudson River to Lake Erie. This was to be the Erie Canal—an amazing dream and a colossal undertaking for that era. The ordinary canal of that day was 30 miles and the Erie Canal was to be 364 miles long. He foresaw the benefits to the people settled in the Middle West. He foresaw his own State grow with great strides through this canal. Towns and cities would be expanded, new ones would rise and agriculture, commerce and manufacturing would increase and wealth would pour into his State from all directions. And his beloved New York City would grow to unbelievable size and become the metropolis of the Nation.

Two years later the bill authorizing the building of the canal was passed. As canal commissioner and Governor, De Witt Clinton unceasingly pushed this project, notwithstanding the constant bitter and unrelenting harassments from political enemies and foes of the canal.

Eight years passed and in 1825 the canal was a reality and Governor Clinton had triumphed. In the next 9 years it paid off the State's entire cost with interest—the amount of \$8½ million. It cut freight rates from Buffalo to Albany from \$100 a ton to \$15 a ton, and travel time from 20 days to 8 days. The land boom along its right-of-way alone justified its existence, and the population of New York City soon tripled itself and more.

De Witt Clinton could have gone to greater national prominence; he could again aspire to the Presidency but for the loyal affection and support he held for a man who had flowered forth on the national scene. He loved and advocated the deepest support for Andrew Jackson for President of the United States. He would never oppose him. Sufficient for him were the daily sacrifices and services he could render his people in New York. And these services were multiform. He was completely interested in the arts and sciences, living out the theories he enunciated on his graduation day. He was interested in education and followed the system of John Lancaster. He was founder and president of the New York Historical Society, president of the American Philosophy Society, and president of the American Science Association. His was a many-sided genius and an intellectual sea that seemed to touch every shoreline of thought.

His uncle, Gov. George Clinton, once wrote of him that his motive in politics were pure. Nothing so proved the point better than those last days of his life. Although seriously ill in bed, he left that sick bed because as Governor he had a duty to perform for justice sake. A condemned criminal had asked for a review of his case and Governor Clinton felt that justice lay on this poor man's side. As a result of this action, De Witt died suddenly soon afterward and he died in debt, leaving his family in want. He who had done so much for his people through sacrifices, service, and idealism, had left nothing for his own burial, and like his Master, he was buried in another man's tomb. Surely his was pure public service, honest statesmanship; he never commercialized his dignity as a public servant by compromise.

As humanity divides itself today into "lifters and leaners" with so many all too willing to lean on others, it is refreshing to recognize a real lifter, a man always willing to shoulder the burdens of office without flinching, and a man who counts not the cost in serving others. Even American historians have been a little unkind to Mr. Clinton and few of our Americans are cognizant of his true greatness. We can at least thank the kind providence that kept his memory alive by a living picture even though it is small and so often taken for granted on a simple cigarette package. There was none so handsome in all Washington when he was here as U.S. Senator.

May we look forward to the day when that picture will appear on our postage, currency, or our savings bonds. As he now leaves those revenues stamps, let us at least take him into our hearts.

His deeds, his words, his genius for public good and freedom must inspire us all—and most of all our neighbors living under oppression and in political darkness beyond the seas.

School Construction Legislation Needed To Provide More Classrooms for Expanding Pupil Population

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is satisfying to me to learn of the action yesterday of the Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in recommending what the news services have called "a compromise bill proposing a billion-dollar, 2-year program of Federal grants to the States for school construction."

In a statement released Sunday, I expressed the opinion that Congress should not adjourn its present session without passing school construction legislation.

It was emphasized, however, that as a cosponsor of S. 2, and as a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which has jurisdiction over legislation in the field of education, I still believe in the need for a comprehensive measure which would include assistance for upgrading teachers' salaries, but I added:

It is not enough for us to merely say we're for legislation of this type. What is more important is that we bring to passage at least that part of the program which has good prospect of being enacted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point a news account of my statement by the Associated Press to its West Virginia member newspapers and published by a number of them in their editions of August 24, 1959.

There being no objection, the news accounts was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Daily Mail, Aug. 24, 1959]

SENATOR RANDOLPH WANTS FEDERAL SCHOOL AID BILL

Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, has called for immediate action to begin the attack on the long-range problem of the shortage of classroom space.

In an announcement from Washington, RANDOLPH said Sunday that Congress should not adjourn its present session without passing a school construction bill. He said he would reiterate that stand for consideration Monday by a Senate subcommittee.

RANDOLPH is a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. That committee has jurisdiction over legislation in the field of education.

The West Virginia Senator said he supports a comprehensive measure which would include assistance for upgrading teachers' salaries.

"It is not enough for us to merely say we're for legislation of this type," RANDOLPH commented. "What is more important is that we bring to passage at least that part of the program which has good prospect of being enacted."

RANDOLPH said that opposition in Congress and from the Federal administration to parts of the comprehensive Federal assistance for education legislation would block what he called "the necessary program of increasing the number of classrooms for our ever-expanding school pupil census." He continued:

"We are all aware of the importance of the American custom of local responsibility and control of public education. But let us at least be clear in our understanding of the origins and the reasons for this tradition."

"The threat of Federal control is a myth, and the fear of it is spun from fantasy and a misreading of our history."

"The quality of education in the United States is a national issue, rather than a merely local one. And yet it is the only national problem that we have not attempted to solve on a national basis."

Khrushchev's Arrogance and Contempt for American Military Power Made Clear in Context of Invasion of Laos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. OLIVER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, on August 18, I contributed a few observations pertinent to the impending visit of Premier Khrushchev of Soviet Russia to America, scheduled for September. These may be found on pages 14899-14900 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day.

I stated that this visit of the Soviet dictator should be received with an attitude of passive nonacceptance, so far as any official recognition by Congress is concerned.

One of the basic reasons that I expressed for my position on this vital issue is that Khrushchev's visit will be enveloped in an atmosphere and environment of deceit and insincerity. This is already becoming obvious in the news reports from Laos where communistic aggression is pursuing the same old tactics of force and violence.

It is clearly manifest that Khrushchev has been completely advised of Red China's intent to take over Laos. Almost simultaneously with the President's announcement of Khrushchev's visit, the Laos aggression began.

Khrushchev's participation in these plans of Communist aggression cannot be pinpointed but the pattern is clear because it is only another move toward the same objective; namely, domination of the free world.

Khrushchev is one of the master minds in this conspiracy whose target is world power, calling for the subjugation of all who stand in the way.

Congress, remaining in session during the visit of this despot, and indicating passively its nonacceptance of his brand of merchandise by refusing to fraternize with him will fulfill its responsibility of representation of those in America who challenge the policy of diplomatic appeasement which is gaining ground among our current leaders.

Mr. Speaker, the recent column of Joseph Alsop in the Washington Post of August 25, and the letter to President Eisenhower by one of Maine's responsible citizens, Mr. Herman D. Sahagian, of Waterville, Maine, express in further detail my own sentiments.

FLOWERS FOR THE HOST

(By Joseph Alsop)

Nikita S. Khrushchev has now followed his acceptance of the President's invitation to the White House with an open display of contempt for his future host.

There is no other way to read the new Communist aggression in Laos. The situation there can become very serious, indeed, touching of another Far Eastern crisis of Quemo-y-like intensity. If the Communist aggression is not repelled, moreover, all the neighboring countries—South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Thailand—will at once find themselves in danger.

Nonetheless, the indication of Khrushchev's contempt for President Eisenhower and the Nation he leads is probably the most disturbing feature of the very disturbing Laotian trouble. On this point, the facts speak for themselves.

In brief, the President's announcement of the coming Khrushchev visit was made on August 3. Very nearly simultaneously, the attack on Laos began. The attack took the form of border crossings from Communist North Vietnam into Laos by Communist infiltration units trained and armed for the purpose by the North Vietnamese. Such obscure guerrilla movements in those jungle-clad mountains can hardly be precisely dated. Yet the major border crossings quite certainly began after Khrushchev's mid-July acceptance of the President's invitation, even if some occurred before the public announcement.

The timing of this opening of the attack on Laos is inescapably significant. Yet a good many people in this increasingly wishful city, and especially a good many of the people around the President who had pinned their hopes on the Khrushchev visit, are still trying to escape the meaning of this timing of the Lao attack. "It is Peiping's enterprise, not Moscow's," they argue.

On this point, too, however, the facts speak for themselves. The attack on Laos was hardly underway, when Khrushchev received the organizer of the attack, the North Vietnamese Communist boss, Ho Chi Minh, for an extended state visit in Moscow.

While Ho was in Moscow, an obviously planned series of statements was issued. First Ho's government in Hanoi blamed the trouble in Laos on the presence of a 150-man American mission to train the small Laotian Army. Then Mao Tse-tung's government in Peiping virtually threatened war unless the U.S. military bases in Laos were instantaneously abolished. Finally Khrushchev's own government in Moscow spoke out in clear terms, refraining from direct denunciation of the United States, but strongly supporting the North Vietnamese-Chinese Communist position in Laos.

From these facts, it may be possible to argue that the prime impulse for the attack on Laos came from Mao Tse-tung. But whoever was the prime mover, it is certainly not possible to argue that Khrushchev was any-

thing but a knowing, willing accomplice in the Lao enterprise. The Ho visit to Moscow and the subsequent Moscow statement are the clearest proofs of Khrushchev's active complicity.

Khrushchev's purposes can be variously interpreted. The Communist interpretation was given by a high official who told this reporter, "It's the old tactic of the carrot and the stick." (When asked what was the carrot, he replied, "Why the Khrushchev visit"—which seems an unattractive sort of carrot.)

Khrushchev's aim perhaps is to extract from the President in the White House new terms for Asia as well as new terms for Berlin. In this, it must be added, Khrushchev is likely to have the indirect help of the British and Canadian Governments. Both are not merely summit-drunken but fixed in their idea as well that everything in Asia will be rapidly fixed up if we are just a little nice to Mao Tse-tung.

In any case the contrast between this time and last time is horrifyingly strong. Last time Khrushchev talked with the President of the United States, in 1954, he paid for his ticket of admission with the liberation of Austria and the dramatic though temporary restoration of normal relations with Yugoslavia. This time, crude threats to Berlin paid for the ticket; and as soon as the ticket was in Khrushchev's pocket, Laos was attacked.

No one who is not absolutely flannel-headed can see in this pattern anything but a display of the most profound, unalloyed and arrogant contempt. Whatever its sources, Khrushchev's contempt is a desperately serious political phenomenon. The sources need urgent investigation. But no search for sources is afoot, no doubt because careful search would reveal a distinguished soap manufacturer pouring out soft soap, which is still constricting the American defense efforts 2 years after the sputnik, under stringent orders from budget-obsessed higher authority.

HERMAN D. SAHAGIAN,

Belgrade Lakes, Maine, August 18, 1959.

President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am one of that vast body of American citizens appalled and ashamed by the thought that soon we of this great and free country will be called upon to act as host to a man, the dictator of the Soviet Union, Khrushchev, who instead of preparing to visit the Nation he someday hopes to bury, and whose children he foresees someday growing up under communism, ought rather to be standing before an international bar of justice answering for his crimes against humanity.

As an American of Armenian ancestry, as an American then whose parental nation today writhes in the agonizing grip of Soviet Russian communism, of which our guest Khrushchev is today the leading champion and exponent, I am unable to explain either to myself, or to my interested friends, how it has come about that last week we were asked by Presidential proclamation to observe Captive Nations Week, and that this week we are being asked to be civil to the captor himself.

The invitation tendered to the Communist leader merely underscores the obvious cynicism of the great American gesture in favor of those submerged nations [which] look to the United States, as the fortress of freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence. . . . You cannot serve, sir, the great cause of freedom in one breath and genuflect before the tyrant with the next.

I can well imagine the utter terror, yes, the utter terror, that struck the heart of the people of the enslaved nations, of Ar-

menia, of Poland, of Lithuania, of the Ukraine, of the other captive states, when they were told that their oppressor, Khrushchev, had been invited to visit the United States—the same United States—which they had heard over their clandestine radio waves, had just the past fortnight bowed its head in prayer for them, and had vowed to work for their liberation and independence; for Khrushchev's visit, to the 19 enslaved nations of the U.S.S.R., takes from the heart of the people another one of those threads of hope that have sustained them through the dark ages of Russian Communist domination and exploitation.

Khrushchev's visit to the United States of course will constitute a major cold-war victory for the Soviet Union since it will impart a cloak of respectability on the dictator of communism and also on the system and government he represents.

The visit will accord communism, the Soviet Union, and the Communist dictator billions of dollars of free publicity which otherwise could not be purchased. Our newspapers will be full of Khrushchev; every move, every gesture, every word, every whisper, will be recorded. And our guest will bluster around, kissing babes, like every American politician—running a campaign to elect communism in this country. God help us.

Some of us, sir, remember well the thought you expressed in your press conference several weeks back in which you said that you felt you shouldn't meet Khrushchev unless some encouraging progress was made at the foreign ministerial meeting at Geneva. What ever happened to Geneva, Mr. President?

The man we will press to our bosom, sir, is known by our Ukrainian colleagues as "Hangman of the Ukraine." I have been wondering if Americans find it a virtue to invite criminals and hangmen into their homes, that our National Government has invited Khrushchev to partake of our hospitality as a deserving guest?

For instance, I wonder exactly what would have happened if, sometime before World War II, the U.S. Government had announced that Adolph Hitler, the hangman of Buchenwald and Dachau, had been asked to visit us here in these United States as our guest. Hitler and Khrushchev are coequals, sir, for both are guilty of the direct crime of all-national genocide.

As specifically, I find it difficult to believe that a professional atheist, the anti-God himself, will be our guest, and that I am being asked to retain my composure as I observe this man, who, for instance, helped divest the great Church of Armenia of its dignity, plausibly coarse through the blessed cities of our Nation. "Religion," said his god, Lenin, "is the opiate of the people."

Has not the U.S. Government a brief on this man, this criminal, this Khrushchev, that it honors him?

Does not the Government know that Khrushchev played a leading role in the Red famine engineered by the Kremlin in the Ukraine to annihilate more than 4,500,000 patriotic Ukrainian peasants? That Khrushchev later directed the genocide of 10,000 additional Ukrainians at Vinnitza, in order to suppress these freedom-loving people? That, though a Russian, he conducted the great purges in the Ukraine? That he was sent by Stalin after the last war to put down succeeding patriotic demonstrations in the Ukraine—a job which he did with a ruthlessness seldom paralleled in history? That he suppressed patriotic uprisings in Georgia, Poland, Armenia, and Hungary in 1956; sent the armies of his lackey China into Tibet, acted against the Ukrainian free underground in the Carpathia, and just recently, personally ordered massive units of the Red Army to enter Sovietized Armenia to suppress

firmly tendencies to oppose governmental policies there—a movement incidentally initiated, on Soviet admission, by disgruntled former Americans who were duped by Communist propaganda into taking up residence in the U.S.S.R.

We have been told that Khrushchev has been invited here so that he might see for himself the full might and invincible spirit of America, and thus to restrain his "impetuousness" and thus ensure the peace.

Khrushchev knows and appreciates after his own fashion the greatness of America—and it is this greatness that constitutes America in Khrushchev's eyes the chief obstacles to the Communist dream of world revolution and world domination. There isn't a thing that Khrushchev will see or hear in this country that he or his intelligence has not already seen or heard. He comes here not to be impressed, but to impress.

I have read with a good deal of interest your personal admonition that America should not demonstrate in the presence of their "guest" to this country, but I know personally that many of our great organizations, as well as our nationality language, religious, and cultural groups are planning dignified demonstrations of protest of the presence in our midst of a man who should be shunned like the plague, rather than be elevated to the dignity of a human being, spotless, pure, and good.

My home will be trimmed in black throughout the days that Nikita Khrushchev is in the United States of America; for I shall pray for those who have fallen to the violence of this man—and to the vile system he represents.

Sincerely,

HERMAN D. SAHAGIAN.

(Copies to Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Senator EDMUND MUSKIE, Representative FRANK COFFIN, Representative CLIFFORD MCINTIRE, Representative JAMES OLIVER.)

The New Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, yesterday's New York Times contains an excellent editorial analysis of the second housing bill recently passed by the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE HOUSING COMPROMISE

The more one looks at the fine print in the new compromise housing bill passed by the Senate after President Eisenhower's veto of the earlier bill, the more one is impressed by how far the managers of the bill have gone to meet the President's objections. To be sure, there is a little more money in the bill than was requested in the President's original program. But most of the objectionable features of the earlier bill have been dropped.

For example, there is no longer a requirement that the Federal National Mortgage Association purchase special assistance mortgages at subsidy prices. A proposed new program of special FNMA loans to mortgage lenders has been removed. The public housing authorization has been limited to roughly

the amount approved for most recent years. There is a special provision to make sure that slum-clearance funds will not all be absorbed by larger cities. The authority for still another and dubious extension of the term of repayment of ordinary Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages has been eliminated.

These are concessions of substance. Compared with the original bills introduced by Democratic housing managers in both House and Senate, and compared even with the bills that passed both Houses originally, the new bill has gone far more than halfway toward the administration's wishes. The House would do well to accept the Senate bill and send it to the President. He in turn would be hard put to it to justify another veto.

Unemployed Versus Unemployable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, some people are out of work because there is no demand at the moment for their knowledge or skill. Farmworkers, and others whose employment is seasonal become unemployed during periods of each year. Industries lay off help during fluctuations within the economic life of a particular enterprise, or during a general economic decline.

These people are out of work temporarily.

Heretofore classified as "unemployed," is another, separate and distinct group known as the unemployable.

We became conscious of their particular problems after World War II. The decline of some older, and unprogressive enterprises that were concentrated in one-industry communities, brought us face to face with the new challenge of chronic labor-surplus areas.

Most of these displaced workers were no longer young. They had been molded by occupations requiring little or no skill. When their jobs disappeared, they had little to offer the new growth industries that might move in to fill the economic vacuum of these distressed areas. In an age of increasing labor skill and labor specialization, they were unwanted.

They became known as the unemployables.

In our efforts to solve this human as well as economic problem, we are developing Federal legislation to assist in the recovery of these areas. Grants to encourage the building of modern plants and to provide the services needed by growth industries are essential. But if we overlook the employables, this assistance will not be productive or constructive. Putting it plainly, they need training in new job skills, in order to be of value to themselves, their families, and their communities. To focus thinking on this problem, I ask consent to reprint in the RECORD this recent editorial from the Evening Tribune, published in Lawrence, Mass.

UNEMPLOYED VERSUS UNEMPLOYABLE

With U.S. employment getting back to the record highs it established before the recession, we find a sharper light focusing on the "hard core" unemployed who have been out of work 15 weeks or more.

Some 900,000 fall into this category, and of them nearly 550,000 have been without jobs more than half a year.

The people in the hard core group are not faceless. Most live in areas that have become more or less permanent pockets of depression—coal mining sectors in Kentucky, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, once thriving textile producing communities in New England, and so on.

The bulk of the chronically unemployed are nonwhites. And for the most part the individuals in this hard core are unskilled workers, traditionally the last to be hired, usually left by the wayside in all but the great booms.

Congress has not yet been able to manage effective aid to distressed regions. But any program would seem limited in promise which did not contain plans for lifting these people out of their unskilled status.

In this increasingly mechanized age, to be unskilled may mean not only being unemployed but being unemployable.

Civil Defense Is Also Peacetime Preparation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, New York City has been recently visited by mechanical failures which resulted in depriving heavily populated areas of my home community of electricity. In our modern, complex, urban society this is a civic disaster of great magnitude. Fortunately, the civil defense organization in New York was able to meet the challenge of the emergency situation which resulted, proving again—to those who may still doubt—that civil defense is prepared to function not only during a military emergency but during a peacetime crisis as well. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of August 21 on this subject.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 21, 1959]

CIVIL DEFENSE ON THE JOB

While the police department took over the principal task of safeguarding lives and property in last Monday night's electric power failure in upper Manhattan, the emergency did provide a small test of the civil defense organization. Sixty-two auxiliary policemen, 23 wardens, and 53 rescue men on trucks were on the streets and in Central Park making themselves useful. The police commissioner's office reports that they responded promptly to call, and were helpful. More men were ready if needed. Civil defense equipment, such as mobile generators, was ready, and some went into use, as in hospitals and for floodlighting.

This was, of course, only a minor foretaste of what a real civil defense emergency

could be, if real disaster struck the city. But it gave us something to think about, and was sufficient reason for a review of organization, equipment, sufficiency of funds, and adequacy of volunteer personnel. Civil defense was ready, apparently, for a small emergency. How big an emergency would it be ready for?

Why We Are Losing the Third World War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an address by Peter Wheeler Reiss entitled "Why We Are Losing the Third World War." I was very much impressed by the sound thinking displayed in the speech, and I am sure the Members of the House will likewise be impressed.

The address follows:

WHY WE ARE LOSING THE THIRD WORLD WAR
(Address by Peter Wheeler Reiss, cum laude graduate of Marquette University)

Distinguished Rotarians and honored guests, recently in a letter to the editor appearing in the Sheboygan Press, I was referred to as "a very naughty boy" who yells "communism." Now, I am not sure whether or not this "very naughty boy" label fits me, but I am positive that I shall continue to yell "communism" as long as there are Americans who refuse to recognize the diabolical nature of this international conspiracy. But before I get into the heart of my topic, allow me to tell a joke—not because I am a particularly good comedian, but because this form of introduction has been made mandatory by local 625 of the International Speakers Union, headed by Jimmy Coffa, of which I am a member. You see, we have a "closed shop."

Well, it seems that at the Teheran Conference in 1943, a picture was taken of Joe Stalin, Winston Churchill, and Franklin Roosevelt. After the picture had been taken, each man made a statement. Joe Stalin stressed that he was the leader of the great proletarian revolution, and that under him the proletariat would smash the imperialistic powers and would actualize the Communist goal, the classless society. Not to be outdone by Stalin, Churchill stated that God had decreed that he should lead the free world into a new era of peace and prosperity. When Churchill had finished, Roosevelt took his prepared speech, ripped it up, and threw it to the ground, saying bitterly, "Winston, I never decreed anything of the kind."

As you know, my topic is entitled, "Why We Are Losing the Third World War." Many of you may question this title; namely, you may say, "What world war?" This is a reasonable question, and I shall attempt to give a reasonable answer.

In my opinion, an intelligent definition of war is "that state of affairs which exists when a nation or group of nations carries out a systematic policy of conquest using force or the threat of force as a weapon."

Now, since 1939, the international Communist movement, under the leadership and control of the U.S.S.R., by using force or by threatening to use it, has gained control of 8 million square miles of territory (an area 2½ times larger than continental United

States, excluding Alaska) and has enslaved 800 million people (a population five times greater than that of our own country.)

From these figures, it becomes evident not only that world war III is going on, but also that we are losing it. Hence, we must proceed to find out why we are losing, for in order to correct our shortcomings, we must first understand what they are.

Our basic shortcoming has not been military weakness. This is illustrated by the fact that from the end of World War II until the early 1950's, the United States had a monopoly on the atomic bomb; yet in spite of this tremendous advantage, the Communists took over control of East Central Europe, Mainland China, North Korea, the southern half of Sakhalin, and the Kurile Islands. During this period of nuclear monopoly, we could have said, "Commies, free the people you have enslaved or suffer the horrible consequences." Instead, American mothers and fathers succumbed to Communist propaganda, and cried, "bring the boys home," as if it was logical to spill blood in order to defeat fascism and yet allow its twin brother, communism, to expand. This ostrich act on the part of American citizens brings out the real source of our failure in the third world war; namely, that the responsibility for the unfolding disaster does not rest with our leaders of the past 20 years, but as they may have been—the blame for our gradual surrender to atheistic communism lies with individual American citizens, since in a free society, government is no better than the people it represents. When mothers and fathers cry "bring the boys home," a Congressman better do so, or he will soon find himself in a political graveyard.

This brings us to the vital question, what is wrong with Americans? The basic answer, in my opinion, is twofold; we are suffering from intellectual and moral decay.

Our deteriorating intellectual standards can easily be seen in the average movie or TV program. Cowboys, sex, and crime are the usual subjects. But a more serious manifestation of our intellectual decay can be seen in the average American's ignorance of the nature and designs of communism. For instance how many Americans can define the term "dialectic" as employed by Communist philosophers? How many can recognize a Communist-front organization? How many realize that the Reds have sworn to smash us with their clenched fists, once we have been put to sleep by their electrifying peace overtures? Since most Americans aren't aware of these things and do little or nothing to fill these intellectual gaps, it is little wonder that the Reds are beating us to the punch.

However, a more basic cause for our gradual surrender to communism is the moral decay which is presently corroding the foundations of American society. We are getting soft. Materialism is becoming the national religion. The standard of living appears to be our sole yardstick for measuring the state of the Union. Drunkenness, divorce, and artificial birth prevention are looked upon as virtues in many social circles. Worse yet, God has been put in a closet. Besides being abstracted from public education, He is seldom referred to in conversation, unless of course the speakers employ the fashionable pastime of cursing.

Since we are turning away from our eternal end and devoting our attention to purely material considerations, it is little wonder that we are willing to compromise in the face of threats from a dangerous enemy; for it takes real courage, character, and belief in an eternal destiny to sacrifice for truth, justice, and religious principles.

These basic weaknesses have undoubtedly been observed by all of you. The next logical question then which presents itself is, what can be done about them?

First, on the intellectual front leading citizens like yourselves must become expert anti-Communists. In order to achieve this goal, I suggest that you read three books. The first is Louis F. Budenz's "The techniques of Communism," published by Henry Regnery Co., Chicago, 1954. This book will give you excellent insights into the nature of communism, since the author was a leading Red for many years, and hence is speaking from actual experience. The second book is Anthony T. Bouscaren's "A Guide to Anti-Communist Action," again published by Henry Regnery Co., Chicago, 1958. This book will show you how to become an active participant in the fight against communism. The third book needs no introduction. It is J. Edgar Hoover's "Master of Deceit," published by Henry Holt and Co., New York, 1958. This homework will not be as easy as reading a novel naturally, but it will be much more rewarding. Moreover, to preserve our freedom and to extend it to those behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, sacrifices must be made, and this is one of them.

However, since truth is useless unless one has the will to carry it out, the spiritual front, becomes the most important area for improvement and development. On the spiritual front, every intelligent American must be able to explain why he is Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish, and if he cannot come up with an answer, then he must look for the true religion. Once he has found it, he must live up to its principles. He must be courageous in defending his faith and anxious to spread it; for if one is indifferent toward religion, then the struggle between communism and the free world becomes a ball game between two second division teams; it really doesn't matter who wins.

Above all, let me stress that individual effort is the key to success in the fight against communism. One dedicated anti-Communist can influence at least five other people, each of whom can influence five more, and so on—until this chain reaction transforms America.

Once America has been transformed by such a campaign, then things like the Berlin crisis will no longer trouble us. Instead of talking about these matters at Geneva, we can ask the Commies embarrassing questions such as, why are they afraid to hold free elections in East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Albania, Bulgaria, Rumania, North Korea, North Vietnam, Mainland China, and Russia itself? If they refuse to discuss these matters, then we can break off diplomatic relations with the Communist bloc, hence ending a very unsuccessful relationship and also terminating the espionage system which the Reds have built up around their Embassies in our country.

Meanwhile, we can promote guerrilla warfare in exposed Communist controlled areas, such as Albania, North Korea, North Vietnam, and China. American troops would not have to be used. The Greeks could cross the border into Albania, the South Koreans could slip into North Korea, etc. Now some of you may be saying to yourselves, "this guy is really in orbit—this would mean a nuclear war." In answering this objection, let me again refer to the example given to us by the U.S.S.R. The Commies have constantly taken chances when we could have crushed them. In order for either side to win, risks must be taken. Hence, we must start running plays on the Communist side of the 50-yard line, for a strictly defensive strategy is always tactically and psychologically disastrous. If we were to pursue the policy I have outlined, the U.S.S.R. would have two alternatives, nuclear or limited warfare, since I don't believe it would follow our "do nothing" example of past years. If the Reds resorted to nuclear warfare, their goal

of world conquest would literally be smashed, since there would be little left of this planet to occupy. Thus, it appears that limited warfare would be their response, in which case our chance for a complete victory would be overwhelming, not because we are well prepared for this type of war (we need a lot of improvement in this area), but because with the help of effective propaganda the satellites would undoubtedly revolt, along with many in Russia, especially in dissatisfied areas such as the Ukraine.

This is not the only plan which might bring us victory in the Third World War. Probably at present or after you have done some thinking and reading on the matter, you can come up with a much better solution. But always remember the wise statement of Mao Tsetung, leader of Red China, "to compromise is to lose."

And also remember, that an organization like yours with its fine principles of service to community, church, and country, is especially well qualified to participate in such a campaign.

In conclusion, therefore, I urge each of you to become intellectually qualified and spiritually dedicated anti-Communists; for you have nothing to lose but the chains of an onrushing tyranny, and a free, peaceful, and happy world, under God, to gain.

Our Battle Against False Slogans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, early in August the distinguished president of the International Association of Machinists, Al Hayes, was a keynote speaker at a joint conference on the aircraft, missile, and related electronics industry at Kansas City. He addressed more than 400 delegates representing his own union and the United Automobile Workers.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Mr. Hayes' address as it appeared in the Machinist paper of August 13, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the Record. The title of Mr. Hayes' address was "Our Battle Against False Slogans." It is an excellent address and one which deserves the attention of all of us who believe in social justice.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OUR BATTLE AGAINST FALSE SLOGANS

(By Al Hayes)

I am sure it's not news to you that we face the most strongly organized opposition in our history. Organized wealth is stopping at nothing in an effort to put organized labor in its place, so that once again industry—including this industry that you here represent—can have the sole right to dictate the terms and conditions of labor.

So thoroughly have the opinion-forming media, the press, radio, TV, and the magazines distorted the truth about labor that today many people seem to believe the chief problem confronting union members is their union. The impression is abroad that if union members had no union they would have no problems.

This impression, false as it is, is being carefully spread, in an effort to develop a hysteria in Washington, in an effort to convert an essentially liberal Congress into an antiunion Legislature capable of exploiting tragic infiltration of crooks in a few unions to push through punitive class legislation that will strip our members of their power to defend their wage rates and their working conditions.

PROFITS AND WAGES

In the steel industry, the distortion is even more absurd. A conscious effort has been made to give steelworkers a guilt complex about seeking a small, well-justified wage increase. A long-term propaganda campaign has so thoroughly misled the public that they now frequently blame high prices on wage rates when, in fact, wage rates have little to do with prices.

I don't have to remind this audience that unit labor costs—not wage rates—influence prices. It's not how much a man earns, but how much he produces, that determines cost.

Somehow, the American people and the Canadian people have been led to believe that high corporation profits are the just due of stockholders—economically desirable and socially admirable. On the other hand, any increase in the wage rates of workers is considered socially unjust and economically undesirable. Higher interest charges by banks and insurance companies are cheered—even when paid by a Government that is admonishing everyone else to reduce their demands for Government funds.

We used to be told that increased purchasing power would help Americans consume the products of our farms and factories. Today we are told that increased purchasing power is inflationary even when our industry is working at less than capacity.

The situation is no more absurd than if we began to believe that night is day and that up is down. Perhaps if enough newspapers and magazines and politicians uttered these absurdities often enough, people would believe them too.

The propaganda barrage, which is today victimizing the steel workers, was not prepared for them alone. We must expect that when our negotiations begin in a few months, the aerospace industry will not be outdone. Then the barrage will be aimed at our members, as today it is aimed at the steel workers.

TRUTH ABOUT INFLATION

Because we must be prepared to meet the same false issue when our negotiations open, let me remind you of the truth about inflation.

The truth is that for 60 years retail prices, in the United States, have edged up on the average of $2\frac{1}{2}$ percent each year. A $2\frac{1}{2}$ -percent price increase a year has been normal in the United States. If prices begin to go up faster than normal, we would have some reason for concern and some reason to question our policies.

The truth is that prices have not been rising faster than normal. Over the past 10 years, prices have been going up more slowly than normal. The actual average increase in retail prices over the past 10 years has been 1.8 percent. Instead of more inflation, we have been having less inflation.

The danger of inflation is a false slogan—coined by labor's enemies to talk us out of legitimate wage increases and to frighten away our friends.

FOREIGN COMPETITION

Of course, dangerous inflation isn't the only false slogan we will face. There is also the charge that we are making it difficult for American industry to compete with foreign producers, that if we continue to press for higher wages and other cost items—no matter how justified—we will make it impossible for them to compete.

The instinctive reaction of some management is to blame organized labor for most of our competitive problems.

Whatever the problem may be with foreign competition—and I am not going to belittle a very real problem—American industry will never be able to compete with the Japanese, with the Russians, or even with Germans on a basis of who can pay the lowest wages. That has never been the American way—I doubt it ever will be.

In the past, our industry has competed successfully, despite the fact that it paid the highest wages, maintained the best working conditions and just about the highest standard of living in the world.

Our industry has been able to compete successfully because wage rates do not determine prices. The labor cost in the price of any article is not the hourly wage rate, but the unit labor cost—the number of items the employees can produce or service in an hour.

American industry has dominated the world market because American labor is the most productive in the world—not because it is the cheapest, with the lowest standard of living.

In fairness, let me report to you that some executives agree with me on this. Recently, one—whom I shall not name—told me that after World War II, his company had licensed a Japanese firm to build one of its small planes, thinking the Japanese could best meet a growing demand in the South Pacific. This American company soon discovered that, despite what we would consider miserably low wage rates, costs of manufacturing this airplane were far higher in Japan than they were in the United States.

PRODUCTION IS KEY

Again I remind you that it is the unit labor cost, not wage rates, that influence the price of a commodity. Or, to put it another way, it isn't how much a man is paid but how much he produces that governs the cost.

Improved mechanization, increased ingenuity, and higher productivity are the methods by which we will best the foreign competition—not by reducing the American standard of living.

As a matter of cold fact, American industry has improved its position—wage wise—in the last few years. Wage rates in the United States have gone up proportionately less since 1950 than they have in West Germany, Britain, Norway, and France.

Using 1950 as 100 in the index, hourly earnings in manufacturing industries in the United States are now about 141. In West Germany, the wage index is 166; in Berlin, 165; in Norway, 169; and in France, 202.

They can't successfully blame what is happening in foreign trade on union wage rates. The facts do not support them.

Surely this moment in the world struggle for freedom, for dignity of the individual is no time to give us our fight for economic justice. The strength of the free world, the strength of democracy in the struggle against communism lies in the hope, the knowledge, and the health of free peoples.

Address by Hon. August E. Johansen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address by

Congressman AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, of Michigan, to the 93d annual banquet, State Camp of Pennsylvania, Patriotic Order Sons of America, at the Abraham Lincoln Hotel, Reading, Pa., Monday evening, August 24, 1959:

THE WAR WE ARE WAGING

Mr. Toastmaster, members of the State Camp of Pennsylvania, Patriotic Order Sons of America, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am greatly honored by the invitation to address your 93d annual banquet, in this 112th year of the Nation's oldest patriotic society of native Americans. I doubly appreciate your invitation because I have been advised that it was extended on the suggestion of two gentlemen whom I regard very highly.

One of these gentlemen is a most distinguished Pennsylvanian, a great American, and one of this Republic's very favorite Democrats, the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, on which I am presently privileged to serve.

The other is the brilliant, enormously hard-working and completely dedicated staff director of that committee, Mr. Richard Arens.

The fact that both of these gentlemen are members of the Patriotic Order Sons of America is a tribute alike to them and to the order.

I hope you will pardon one further personal reference. I am happy to report that I have a relationship to the great State of Pennsylvania which I believe can be regarded as advantageous both to me and to the Keystone State.

The obvious advantage which I can claim is that I am a native of Pennsylvania. The advantage which the State can claim is that I was removed therefrom early in my first year of life, thereby absolving Pennsylvania of any responsibility for subsequent developments in my career—political or otherwise.

Mr. Toastmaster, since the subject of my address "The War We Are Waging," has to do with the international Communist conspiracy, and with the resistance of America and Americans to that conspiracy, my remarks would scarcely be realistic or timely if they ignored a major development which has occurred since I accepted your invitation.

I refer, of course, to the August 3 announcement of the impending visit of Premier Khrushchev to the United States and the scheduled return visit of the President of the United States to Soviet Russia.

In broaching this matter I am mindful of two admonitions. I recall the words of Ecclesiastes, or "The Preacher" that there is "a time to keep silence, and a time to speak." Perhaps the order in which the two alternatives are listed is itself a broad hint as to the proper priorities. Nevertheless, Ecclesiastes did make it clear that there is "a time to speak."

Furthermore, I also recall the admonition and warning of Abraham Lincoln that "to keep silent when one has the duty to speak out is a sin."

I would not knowingly be guilty of irresponsible or inflammatory speech, particularly in a matter as grave as this. But I believe that there are circumstances in which silence likewise can be irresponsible. I further believe that public silence, if widely and generally imposed or acquiesced in, either as a matter of supposed expediency, or because of moral indifference, or a "father knows best" state of mind, or an atmosphere of blackmail threats, could go far toward snuffing out and suffocating the priceless flame of freedom and honest dissent.

Therefore, I have chosen to speak my judgment and my conscience on this matter again tonight, as I have already done on earlier occasions.

Let me sum up my views on the subject under three main points:

1. I believe the Khrushchev invitation was a grievous mistake. It is a step which I regret and deplore. Having said that, and except as this opinion has a bearing on my views of how we may deal most wisely, firmly, and effectively with the situation we now face. I see no useful purpose in belaboring that point. Let me say only this, that in my judgment Mr. Khrushchev himself had provided, long before the invitation was extended, the most convincing and compelling reason why such an invitation ought not to have been forthcoming.

In the same breath with his warning in 1956 that "we will bury you," Mr. Khrushchev also said, "If you don't like us, don't accept our invitations and don't invite us to come to see you." I have no doubt that the fact that the invitation to Mr. Khrushchev was extended in the face of this very blunt statement will be exploited to the utmost by Khrushchev and the leaders of international communism, in their propaganda efforts to equate the invitation, and all "courtesies" ensuing therefrom, with American approval of communism, Soviet rule, Communist interpretations of "peace" as noninterference with nibbling subversion, and approval of the unsavory Mr. Khrushchev himself.

2. There is, as the old adage points out, no use crying over spilt milk. But it is immensely important in this business that we avoid spilling any more milk. I address that comment alike to the leadership of the Nation, to the over-cautious "let's don't do anything that will rock the boat" segment of the public and the public-opinion molders, and to those who are sincerely outraged by the invitation to, and the pending visit of, Mr. Khrushchev.

So far as the national leadership is concerned—including the State Department and some of the cooperative columnists and commentators who obligingly echo its views—I see a grave danger of overzealous efforts to "shush" expressions of disapproval of Mr. Khrushchev, and what he stands for, prior to and during his visit.

Certainly there must be every possible safeguard against violence or threat of violence. That is not only proper, but it is a major obligation of the Government and the American people. But any propaganda effort to regiment, overawe, or frighten the American people into silence is, both from the standpoint of principle and of the practicalities, a grievous blunder.

As an example of what I am talking about I refer to last Saturday's Drew Pearson column. Mr. Pearson claims that the State Department is worried that if there is "too much criticism" of Mr. Khrushchev's projected visit "he might do what he did regarding his proposed visit to Scandinavia." And then Mr. Pearson added—whether he was speaking for the State Department or Pearson probably isn't too important—"Cancellation of the Khrushchev trip to the United States after all the advance buildup would lead to seriously strained relations between the United States and Russia."

I seriously question the accuracy of that conclusion. I believe the statement falls into the same category as most of the arguments for a "peace at any price" approach to Soviet Russia. I believe Mr. Khrushchev will see to it that Soviet-American relations become "seriously strained" or somewhat thawed whenever he thinks either state of affairs will serve his purposes.

Be that as it may, I believe we are here treading on very dangerous ground for quite a different reason. I believe the line of argument advanced by Mr. Pearson, or the State Department, or whoever it is, involves the possibility of "seriously strained rela-

tions" between the American people and their Bill of Rights.

I see no significant difference between a blackout on American criticism of international communism, or of Mr. Khrushchev, or of Mr. Khrushchev's visit, on the grounds that such criticism might displease Mr. Khrushchev, and a blackout on such American criticism as a direct result of a demand or decree from Mr. Khrushchev. Furthermore, I don't believe Mr. Khrushchev himself would see very much difference, either.

Somewhere along the line we had better recognize the fiendish skill of Communist blackmail techniques and make it clear to all concerned that submission to such blackmail is too high a price even for a vague hope that world tensions will be relaxed.

If we are going to have anything really important to show Mr. Khrushchev, now that he apparently is coming over here, it is this: Evidence that we understand Communist methods and goals; that we are united as a free people—notwithstanding all of the diversities of free people—in our opposition to both the methods and goals of communism; and, most important of all, that we have a vigor of will and purpose adequate to meet and survive their challenge.

I suspect it is going to take more than the amiability and protocol of a sightseeing tour provided by our leaders, and more than tongue-tied politeness on the part of our people, to accomplish an effective and convincing showing on this score.

3. It is an American tradition and, in the final analysis a practical necessity, that only one voice can speak authoritatively for the Nation in foreign affairs. That is the voice of the President of the United States. That voice is truest, most effective, most powerful when it is evident to all the world—and particularly to those who represent peril to our country—that it speaks the sentiments and will of the overwhelming majority of the American people.

The record is clear that international communism in this present crisis seeks to drive a wedge between the people and their leadership, that it seeks to go over the head of the President of the United States to invoke what the Communist worker calls "public opinion for peace (and) peaceful coexistence . . . the most powerful political force in the world."

Even as international communism adopts this tactic—of which Mr. Khrushchev's visit is a major item—it does not hesitate to denounce the Nation's leadership, and the leaders of capitalism, as "merchants of death" and enemies of peace. That tactic must not be permitted to work.

Neither can those—and I am one—who have questioned the wisdom of the Khrushchev visit permit a difference of judgment on this matter to stand in the way of earnest hopes and prayers and earnest efforts to encourage and support firmness, courage and clarity in the words that the President of the United States will soon be speaking to our friends abroad, to the peoples of captive nations, to Mr. Khrushchev and the leaders of world communism, to the people of Soviet Russia, and I trust to the American people themselves.

A long time ago it was written: "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?"

May the President of the United States speak clearly and faithfully for the people of the United States in the days just ahead. At the risk of seeming presumptuousness, I hope that the President will, with discretion but great firmness and faultless timing, say something like this to all concerned:

"Eagerness to avoid war—if we think no deeper than this single desire—can produce outright or implicit agreement that injus-

tices and wrongs of the present shall be perpetuated in the future. We must not participate in any such false agreement. Thereby, we would outrage our own conscience. In the eyes of those who suffer injustice, we would become partners with their oppressors. In the judgment of history, we would have sold out our freedom of men for the pottage of a false peace."

At the risk of seeming presumptuousness, I voice the hope that the President will courageously speak, both privately and publicly, for "an observance of human rights and an end to subversion organized on a worldwide scale."

At the risk of seeming presumptuousness, I venture the hope that the President will bring a firm and bold reminder to Mr. Khrushchev that "the American people feel strongly that certain peoples of eastern Europe, many with a long and proud record of national existence, have not yet been given the benefit of (the) United Nations wartime declaration (of the right of peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live)."

At the risk of seeming presumptuousness, I venture the hope that the President will impress the fact—as his best judgment dictates with respect to time and place—that (for 42 years) "the activities of international communism have disturbed relations between other nations and the Soviet Union" (by seeking) "throughout the world to subvert lawful governments and to subject nations to an alien domination (thereby adding) to distrust and therefore to international tension."

At the risk of seeming presumptuousness, I venture the hope that the President will not forbear to say to Mr. Khrushchev—in the complete candor of private conference if not in the glare of public discussion—that "in the aftermath of (the subjugation of Hungary by naked armed force) world respect for and belief in Soviet promises (sank) to a new low."

At the risk of seeming presumptuousness, I venture the hope that the President of the United States will emphasize, as earnestly as words can do, that "the Soviet Union has nothing whatsoever to fear from the United States . . . anywhere . . . in the world, so long as its rulers do not themselves first resort to aggression," but that "open measures of armed attack . . . would start a chain of circumstances which would almost surely involve the United States in great military action."

And because you may indeed by now think me unpardonably presumptuous in seeming to put words in the President's mouth let me say that every statement with regard to which I have expressed a hope is a statement which the present President of the United States has heretofore made, and in every instance made publicly, and in some instances made in the presence of Mr. Khrushchev himself.

We, the people, are not of little faith, Mr. President, with respect either to your leadership, or ourselves, or our cause. But we know the value of emphasis by repetition. We need to hear our own will and voice speaking through your voice.

We need, and we need urgently, the unifying and clarifying trumpet call of words telling us, telling Mr. Khrushchev, and telling the world once again that peace can be established "only if we stand uncompromisingly for principles." In the face of the smiles of communism, we need to discipline our own eager friendliness, our sometimes impulsive good will, and even our deep desire for peace.

We need to remind ourselves, to be reminded yet again by our leadership, and to remind those who appear to proffer the hand of friendship, that the smiles of communism

are belied today in the captive nations, belied in Tibet, belied in Latin America, belied in Laos, belied in Berlin, and belied by Communist activities within our own country.

We need to recall the words of Lenin that "as long as capitalism and socialism exist, we cannot live in peace; in the end, one or the other will triumph, a funeral dirge will be sung either over the Soviet Republic or over world capitalism."

We need to recall, even as he visits us with a display of amiability, that Mr. Khrushchev himself has said: "If anyone thinks that our smiles mean the abandonment of the teachings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, he is deceiving himself cruelly. Those who expect this to happen might just as well wait for a shrimp to learn how to whistle."

We need to recall the boast of Dmitri Manuilski, onetime head of the Soviet delegation to the United Nations, spoken in the early 1930's:

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 to 30 years. To win we will need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep."

"So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clinched fists."

And, finally, as a footnote to all this—and as a reminder that an early President of the United States enunciated the Monroe Doctrine—I point out the statement made last week by Gen. C. P. Cabell, Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, to the National Security Commission of the American Legion. I quote:

"The Communist Party of the Soviet Union also gives specific direction on what Latin American Communist Party action should be. For example, the Communist Party of Cuba, called the Popular Socialist Party, has been given guidance on how to penetrate and exploit the government of Fidel Castro. Primary targets for Communist penetration in Cuba are the agrarian reforms, trade unions, and the Army. These targets of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union are so important that back in May of this year they sent under alias to Cuba a Soviet intelligence officer, Vadim Kotchergin, as a member of a Soviet trade union delegation. His assignment was to give guidance to Cuban Communists. Kotchergin has since returned to Moscow."

To my fellow Americans, who offer the sincere but superficial comment that "talking is better than shooting," I offer the double observation: First, that there seems to be quite a little shooting going on today and, second, that no one knows better than the Communists that talk can be as deadly and fatal as bullets.

And, to my equally sincere and superficial fellow citizens who shudder at the prospect of "stalemate," I point out that the Communists themselves with their fondness for the word "nyet" seem much less apprehensive of a stalemate. And, I further point out that an equally firm American "no" holds no graver peril for us and, indeed, is infinitely safer than continued concessions and piecemeal surrender through appeasement.

We know from the record, Mr. President, and there is, I am sure, no occasion to remind you of the fact that "firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right," has been rewarded not once but many times in this administration by lessened pressures and tensions and by receding threats of armed force.

We have the faith that it will continue to be so and that in such firmness—rather than in the undisciplined longing for peace and eagerness to be friends on which the Communist leaders place their openly declared expectations of ultimate triumph—lies the surest and, indeed, the only hope for peace with justice and for the survival of free men and nations.

Passing of an Outstanding Woman: Miss Elizabeth A. Smart, Legislative Secretary of Women's Christian Temperance Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I doubt if I ever met an advocate of a cause who was more fair, more understanding or more gentle and kindly than Miss Elizabeth A. Smart, of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, who died last week of cancer.

Miss Smart was an educated woman of infinite patience, who represented the temperance movement with dignity, integrity, and fairness. She was never intolerant or antagonistic of those who disagreed with her. She never threatened, bullied, or attempted belligerence. A person of brilliance, she made no effort to display her learning ostentatiously. One never learned from Miss Smart herself that she was a distinguished member of the bar, the wearer of a Phi Beta Kappa pin, the author of many learned papers on government and the law. She rarely touted her own prowess.

I counted her as my friend, I shall always recall with pride that she invited me to be the principal speaker several years ago at the annual memorial services held by the Women's Christian Temperance Union in Statuary Hall in tribute to the historic Miss Frances Willard, of Illinois. I doubt if Frances Willard, herself a person of courage and honor, could have had a more fitting admirer and devotee than Elizabeth Smart. Their qualities were quite similar and parallel in many respects.

Because Elizabeth Smart died of cancer, I shall think of her when I renew my efforts for a crash program of medical research which seeks the answer to the grim riddle of cancer. Having suffered from this disease myself, I have a particular interest in its conquest—especially when we know that it recently has claimed such useful lives as those of John Foster Dulles, Matthew M. Neely, Elizabeth A. Smart, and many others. Friends closer to Miss Smart than I was privileged to be, have told of the characteristic serenity and bravery with which she faced death.

Mr. President, in memory of Miss Elizabeth Smart, of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, of which she was the longtime and capable legislative

secretary, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a sketch of her career and causes, which has been prepared at my suggestion by Clayton Wallace, executive director of the National Temperance League, Inc.

Members of the Women's Christian Temperance Union are fortunate, indeed, to have been represented here in our Capital for nearly two decades by this woman of refinement, education, and compassionate motives. All who knew her will continue to honor and respect her memory. Miss Elizabeth A. Smart was a remarkable and gifted person.

There being no objection, the sketch was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ELIZABETH A. SMART

Miss Elizabeth A. Smart, who had served since 1940 as legislative secretary of the National Women's Christian Temperance Union, died after a long illness in Washington, D.C., on August 16, 1959. Miss Smart had also been national corresponding secretary of the National WCTU in Chicago from 1948 to 1950 and consultant at the United Nations for the World WCTU.

A native of New York State, Miss Smart was admitted to the New York State bar, and was owner of the Washington County Post, of Cambridge, N.Y., her legal residence. She was a member of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, Washington County, and New York State Bar Association, Women's Bar Association of District of Columbia, National Association of Women Lawyers, National League of American Pen Women, Phi Beta Kappa, etc.

Miss Smart was for several years the secretary of the National Temperance and Prohibition Council and was chairman of its legislative committee at the time of her death. She was active on Capitol Hill, spending much of her time in contacting Senators and Congressmen on behalf of temperance legislation. She was the author of the Washington Letter which appeared regularly in the Union Signal, giving complete information about bills relating to the problems of alcohol and narcotics and other legislative matters with which her organization was concerned. The Washington Letter was published from 1940 until the present time.

Miss Smart was deeply devoted to the cause of temperance and worked sacrificially for national legislation to ban liquor advertising, and for other measures to reduce drinking and encourage total abstinence. She was able and courageous in her crusade for beneficial laws. Elizabeth Smart will long be remembered as a kindly, conscientious, consecrated, and competent temperance leader whose life was a powerful influence for all that is good.

Panama Canal: "Make the Dirt Fly"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, because the history of the Panama Canal is a subject that tends to become engrossing whenever one has been thoroughly exposed to it, I am always

alert to new angles of its fascinating story.

The latest is an interesting excerpt from the book "Make the Dirt Fly", by Rose van Hardeveld, published in 1956 by the Pan Press, Hollywood, Calif., and reprinted in the August 19, 1959, issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

The indicated excerpt follows:

THE CANAL SHAPED ALL OUR DAYS AND NIGHTS

In the rotunda of the administration building at Balboa Heights, the murals done by W. B. Van Ingn, assisted by Berry and Remson, presently depicted the stage of the canal construction which we were now able to watch daily from our house on the very edge of the cut. A group of lithographs by Jas. Pennel, scattered throughout the building, also preserved many of these scenes for posterity.

The 6- or 7-mile gash from Bas Obispo through Empire on a workday was really an awe-inspiring spectacle. Between 40 and 50 huge shovels smoked and whanged at different elevations. Each shovel had its own short spur of track, then the track alongside for the dirt train.

The loosening and digging out of the dirt and rocks was a herculean task, but not much bigger than the disposal of that mass. On the average, 3,700 carloads a day were hauled out of that canyon. I had often wondered in the past which was harder for the housewife: cleaning vast quantities of dirt from a room or disposing of it after she got it out. What a feather in her cap if she could do as the canal diggers did, and use the refuse to form new land for new cities, or to put a solid floor into the ocean on which to build a wall to keep ships from being battered by the elements.

It was quite difficult to realize that there was other work than digging going in the canal construction. The big machine shops at Gorgona and the many men employed there composed another and still different unit of which I knew nothing beyond the fact that they took care of the machine repairs and such machine construction as was done on the zone.

On very infrequent passings-by on the train we could see the huge forms, and knew that thousands of feet of concrete were being poured for the locks. We knew that an immense dam was being constructed at Gatun.

We knew that the course of the Chagres was being changed, and the encroaching water was killing an entire forest. Yet to us, busy with our daily tasks on our particular end of the job, Colonel Sibert's work was hazy and distant, very important of course, but not nearly so absorbing as our work, it seemed to me.

I neglected my housework many times to walk to the edge of the cut to watch the progress of the work and visualize the day when ships would be moving past this very hill on which I stood. Nothing else seemed quite so important as this immense project moving gradually and steadily to completion.

Nearly all the women and children felt the same way, and we would usually encounter our neighbors at one vantage point or another when we responded to the irresistible attraction of the dramatic view. This was our life. All other things were subordinate.

To see water surging through this yawning canyon, ready to carry ships up and down its mighty locks, was the destiny toward which all our days and nights were shaped. (From "Make the Dirt Fly," by Rose van Hardeveld. Copyright, 1956, by Rose van Hardeveld, the Pan Press, Hollywood, Calif.)

Freedom Challenges Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, for many years the United States and the free world have been attempting to break through the Iron Curtain. At last, there are some signs of success. The Nixon-to-Moscow trip cracked the Curtain. The upcoming Eisenhower-Khrushchev visits may serve to widen the crack, provided they can be held in a favorable climate, instead of amidst a rash of brushfire wars created by Communist aggression, such as is now occurring in Laos and Tibet.

The breakthrough, if it can be followed up on a wider scale, has provided an opportunity for Western ideas to get directly to the Russian people, undistorted by Communist propaganda or sponsorship.

Intermittently, we are receiving reports that, time after time, when Russians and Americans have an opportunity for discussion, the Russian people demonstrate an almost insatiable desire to learn more of progress in this country and of the conditions under which we live.

In instances where there have been clashes of ideas—that is, United States versus communism—the presentation of free world ideas have invariably made a tremendous impression upon the Russian people. This has been true of the Vice President's trip, of the U.S. exhibit in Moscow, and even in the experiences of U.S. youth at the Red-sponsored World Youth Festival in Vienna, Austria.

Recently, there have been an increasing number of newspaper reports of this situation: First, the Green Bay Press-Gazette, of Green Bay, Wis., published a challenging editorial entitled "When Communism Meets Free Speech," relating to the Youth Festival in Vienna; second, an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor entitled "Young Ambassadors," outlining the experiences of U.S. guides at the Moscow exhibit, and third an article in the Washington Evening Star entitled "U.S. Exhibit Visitors in Moscow Cannot Believe Our Labor Story."

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorials and articles printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Green Bay Press-Gazette]

WHEN COMMUNISM MEETS FREE SPEECH

The Red-sponsored World Youth Festival in Vienna is running into a lot of trouble and all because its leaders have tried to keep up the pretense that it runs on democratic principles. Communist youth apparently haven't yet come to realize that their philosophy is successful only when there is no opposition.

The group is meeting for the first time in a free country, apparently with the aim of being liberal. But that immediately means a lessening of control. There are no tours of the wonders of the Communist systems as there were in Moscow last year, although a Soviet sponsored trip through Russia is planned to follow the convention. Defectors have been reported from a variety of satellite countries despite the careful screening processes given the youths. Disgruntled representatives, particularly from the United States, have moved out of the approved barracks where the word can be regulated.

The American problems started on board ship when other college students bound for Europe decided in an open forum that American representatives to the festival were helping Red propaganda machines. Then a Chicago group rose up in revolt against the New York Red-lining leaders although they quite naturally were not recognized as bona fide by the sponsors of the convention.

But the dangers of open debate have really boomeranged on the Reds. A seminar supposedly nonpolitical and dealing with the uses of atomic energy started out as a sneering attack on the United States by the official speaker, Prof. George Vinogradov of the Soviet Academy of Science. But he lost the floor when unable to answer a question by a listener and an American nuclear reactor engineer and then a Munich University law student took over. J. A. Ransahoff, who heads a firm of consultants on nuclear energy in Washington, pointed out how atomic energy has been put to peaceful uses. Then Armin Pollman refuted the Russian charge that the United States had supplied the West Germans with nuclear weapons. Poor Vinogradov never did get back to convince any doubters about the role Big Brother was playing in the atomic field.

The World Youth Festival has always been a Commie gimmick. But if a few more argumentative anti-Reds attend and the meetings are held in free countries, the advocates of the dictatorship of the proletariat are going to look even sillier. After all the losses by the free world in the propaganda war, it's nice to have won a battle.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 19, 1959]

YOUNG AMBASSADORS

Guides at the U.S. Exhibition in Moscow have found that they are asked many more questions about themselves than about the exhibits. Soviet citizens, they discover, are more interested in simply talking to Americans and learning how they live than in examining the fine cars or automatic dishwashers.

The corps of 75 Russian-speaking guides, 20 to 35 years old, mostly college or graduate students, has worked long hours answering questions. They have developed patience and good humor in the face of heckling. They find reward in the attentive listening of groups curious as to costs of living, wage levels, reports of unemployment, opportunities for education, freedom of travel, racial problems, art, literature, and many other facets of life in America.

To be sure, the Soviet press has gone to great lengths to belabor the exhibits as unrepresentative and to magnify any untoward incident. In spite of this, the guides have made a good impression. It is probably only fair to say that the attendants at the Soviet Exhibition in New York found need of tact and poise, and also deserve credit for a hard job well done.

The exchange of such groups of people-to-people envoys is bound to erase many misconceptions on both sides, create a wholesome measure of respect, and find areas in

which Russians and Americans have common interests—quite outside the pros and cons of Marxism.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

U.S. EXHIBIT VISITORS IN MOSCOW CAN'T BELIEVE OUR LABOR STORY

(By Vladimir Chavrid)

(This is an excerpt from a report by a U.S. labor economist, Vladimir D. Chavrid, on his observations at the U.S. Exhibition in Moscow. Mr. Chavrid, who was born in Russia, was assigned to the exhibition by the Labor Department to answer questions about the worker's life in America.)

I wish there were 20 American labor economists here familiar with American economic life. All of them could be busy answering thousands of questions of how the American people, and especially the average American worker, live. For the average Russian the hunger for knowledge, for facts about Americans, must be far greater than his hunger for food.

The questions most frequently asked deal with unemployment, wages, hours of work, living conditions, social security, unemployment insurance, and many others in this general area.

The attacks on the American way of life have been quite frequent and severe since the beginning of the exhibition. For the last few days, however, these have ceased for some reason or other.

The report was written just prior to the announcement of Khrushchev's visit to the United States. To all of us, however, these attacks are one of the real indications of the success of our exhibition.

Do the Russian people believe what we tell them about America? After being here for several weeks and discussing with them our way of life, both at the exhibition and at other places, I am sure that the overwhelming majority believe what we tell them and what the exhibits show them.

At the Labor Department exhibit in the dome when some controversial matter develops between myself and some Russian professional propagandist, the crowd invariably will side with me rather than with him. These professional agitators invariably show up as soon as a sizable group of people begin to listen to my presentation.

For example the other day at the labor exhibit I was explaining to a group of some 50 Russians the American social security programs. The group was vitally interested. Immediately a professional agitator broke in and told the crowd that this social security program did not apply to Negroes or foreign-born persons—that opportunities for these people in America were very poor.

This was an excellent opportunity for me to tell the crowd about myself—how I came from Russia some 30 years ago and how I was able to obtain an education in the United States and also a responsible job in the Labor Department. The agitator kept breaking in that I had already answered his question, but the crowd kept saying I should tell about myself and other groups like myself in the United States.

Frequently the agitator becomes embarrassed and disappears. It may be of interest to know that as soon as the Russian visitors learn that I was born in Russia of modest parentage, they are extremely sympathetic and I could stay and talk there, as I often do, for as long as 4 hours at a stretch. It is often physically impossible to break away from the crowd.

When I leave the stand many continue to follow me asking questions that they might have been uneasy to ask in the presence of the professional agitators. Many thank me most profusely for answering their questions

while others apologize for their professional agitators. It is literally impossible to stop and answer a single question of one Russian without attracting a crowd of 50 or more Russians within a few seconds. Such is the hunger for knowledge about the United States.

Text of the Two Public Laws of the United States of America Governing Rules and Customs Pertaining to the Display and Use of the Flag of the United States of America—Also Correct Flag Courtesy Suggestions Issued by Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) as Handy Reference for Pocket Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the full text of the two statutory provisions of Congress governing the display and use of the flag of the United States of America.

On account of the coming into the Union of the United States of America of the two newest States, to-wit, the State of Alaska and the State of Hawaii, and the resulting addition of two stars to the flag of the United States of America, making a total of 50 stars therein, it appears very pertinent, appropriate, informative, and guiding to all concerned that these two public laws, to-wit, 829 of the 77th Congress and 107 of the 83d Congress, be now made available to yourself and all the Members of this great legislative body. No doubt they, as the case with myself, are receiving many inquiries in the premises.

Furthermore, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States have appropriately published a very neat vest pocket size card entitled "Correct Flag Courtesy." And so, I am pleased to accompany the text of this card with this extension.

The above-mentioned matters follow:

CORRECT FLAG COURTESY

This is a reminder of how to properly pay tribute to the American flag. It has been specifically designed by the VFW as a handy reference that you can carry in your pocket at all times.

During the ceremony of hoisting or lowering the flag, or when the flag is passing in a parade or a review, all persons should face the flag, stand at attention, and salute.

Those present in uniform should render the right hand salute.

Men not in uniform, should remove their headdress with the right hand and hold it at the left shoulder, the right hand being over the heart.

Men without hats should salute in the same manner.

Women should place the right hand over the heart.

The salute to the flag in a moving column should be rendered at the moment the flag passes.

When the national anthem is played and the flag is not displayed, all present should stand and face toward the music.

Those in uniform should salute at the first note of the anthem, retaining this position until the last note.

All others should stand at attention, men removing their headdress.

When the flag is displayed, all present should face the flag and salute.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 359

Joint resolution to amend Public Law Numbered 623, approved June 22, 1942, entitled "Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America"

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law Numbered 623, approved June 22, 1942, entitled "Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America", be, and the same is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That the following codification of existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, established for the use of such civilians or civilian groups or organizations as may not be required to conform with regulations promulgated by one or more executive departments of the Government of the United States.

"Sec. 2. (a) It is the universal custom to display the flag only from sunrise to sunset on buildings and on stationary flagstaves in the open. However, the flag may be displayed at night upon special occasions when it is desired to produce a patriotic effect.

"(b) The flag should be hoisted briskly and lowered ceremoniously.

"(c) The flag should not be displayed on days when the weather is inclement.

"(d) The flag should be displayed on all days when the weather permits, especially on New Year's Day, January 1; Inauguration Day, January 20; Lincoln's Birthday, February 12; Washington's Birthday, February 22; Army Day, April 6; Easter Sunday (variable); Mother's Day, second Sunday in May; Memorial Day (half staff until noon), May 30; Flag Day, June 14; Independence Day, July 4; Labor Day, first Monday in September; Constitution Day, September 17; Columbus Day, October 12; Navy Day, October 27; Armistice Day, November 11; Thanksgiving Day, fourth Thursday in November; Christmas Day, December 25; such other days as may be proclaimed by the President of the United States; the birthdays of States (dates of admission); and on State holidays.

"(e) The flag should be displayed daily, weather permitting, on or near the main administration building of every public institution.

"(f) The flag should be displayed in or near every polling place on election days.

"(g) The flag should be displayed during school days in or near every schoolhouse.

"Sec. 3. That the flag, when carried in a procession with another flag or flags, should be either on the marching right; that is, the flag's own right, or, if there is a line of other flags, in front of the center of that line.

"(a) The flag should not be displayed on a float in a parade except from a staff, or as provided in subsection (1).

"(b) The flag should not be draped over the hood, top, sides, or back of a vehicle or of a railroad train or a boat. When the flag is displayed on a motorcar, the staff shall be

fixed firmly to the chassis or clamped to the radiator cap.

"(c) No other flag or pennant should be placed above or, if on the same level, to the right of the flag of the United States of America, except during church services conducted by naval chaplains at sea, when the church pennant may be flown above the flag during church services for the personnel of the Navy.

"(d) The flag of the United States of America, when it is displayed with another flag against a wall from crossed staffs, should be on the right, the flag's own right, and its staff should be in front of the staff of the other flag.

"(e) The flag of the United States of America should be at the center and at the highest point of the group when a number of flags of States or localities or pennants of societies are grouped and displayed from staffs.

"(f) When flags of States, cities, or localities, or pennants of societies are flown on the same halyard with the flag of the United States, the latter should always be at the peak. When the flags are flown from adjacent staffs, the flag of the United States should be hoisted first and lowered last. No such flag or pennant may be placed above the flag of the United States or to the right of the flag of the United States.

"(g) When flags of two or more nations are displayed, they are to be flown from separate staffs of the same height. The flags should be of approximately equal size. International usage forbids the display of the flag of one nation above that of another nation in time of peace.

"(h) When the flag of the United States is displayed from a staff projecting horizontally or at an angle from the window sill, balcony, or front of a building, the union of the flag should be placed at the peak of the staff unless the flag is at half staff. When the flag is suspended over a sidewalk from a rope extending from a house to a pole at the edge of the sidewalk, the flag should be hoisted out, union first, from the building.

"(i) When the flag is displayed otherwise than by being flown from a staff, it should be displayed flat, whether indoors or out, or so suspended that its folds fall as free as though the flag were staffed.

"(j) When the flag is displayed over the middle of the street, it should be suspended vertically with the union to the north in an east and west street or to the east in a north and south street.

"(k) When used on a speaker's platform, the flag, if displayed flat, should be displayed above and behind the speaker. When displayed from a staff in a church or public auditorium, if it is displayed in the chancel of a church, or on the speaker's platform in a public auditorium, the flag should occupy the position of honor and be placed at the clergyman's or speaker's right as he faces the congregation or audience. Any other flag so displayed in the chancel or on the platform should be placed at the clergyman's or speaker's left as he faces the congregation or audience. But when the flag is displayed from a staff in a church or public auditorium elsewhere than in the chancel or on the platform, it shall be placed in the position of honor at the right of the congregation or audience as they face the chancel or platform. Any other flag so displayed should be placed on the left of the congregation or audience as they face the chancel or platform.

"(l) The flag should form a distinctive feature of the ceremony of unveiling a statue or monument, but it should never be used as the covering for the statue or monument.

"(m) The flag, when flown at half staff, should be first hoisted to the peak for an instant and then lowered to the half-staff

position. The flag should be again raised to the peak before it is lowered for the day. By "half staff" is meant lowering the flag to one-half the distance between the top and bottom of the staff. Crepe streamers may be affixed to spear heads or flagstaves in a parade only by order of the President of the United States.

"(n) When the flag is used to cover a casket, it should be so placed that the union is at the head and over the left shoulder. The flag should not be lowered into the grave or allowed to touch the ground.

"Sec. 4. That no disrespect should be shown to the flag of the United States of America; the flag should not be dipped to any person or thing. Regimental colors, State flags, and organization or institutional flags are to be dipped as a mark of honor.

"(a) The flag should never be displayed with the union down save as a signal of dire distress.

"(b) The flag should never touch anything beneath it, such as the ground, the floor, water, or merchandise.

"(c) The flag should never be carried flat or horizontally, but always aloft and free.

"(d) The flag should never be used as drapery of any sort whatsoever, never festooned, drawn back, nor up, in folds, but always allowed to fall free. Bunting of blue, white, and red, always arranged with the blue above, the white in the middle, and the red below, should be used for covering a speaker's desk, draping the front of a platform, and for decoration in general.

"(e) The flag should never be fastened, displayed, used, or stored in such a manner as will permit it to be easily torn, soiled, or damaged in any way.

"(f) The flag should never be used as a covering for a ceiling.

"(g) The flag should never have placed upon it, nor on any part of it, nor attached to it any mark, insignia, letter, word, figure, design, picture, or drawing of any nature.

"(h) The flag should never be used as a receptacle for receiving, holding, carrying, or delivering anything.

"(i) The flag should never be used for advertising purposes in any manner whatsoever. It should not be embroidered on such articles as cushions or handkerchiefs and the like, printed or otherwise impressed on paper napkins or boxes or anything that is designed for temporary use and discard; or used as any portion of a costume or athletic uniform. Advertising signs should not be fastened to a staff or halyard from which the flag is flown.

"(j) The flag, when it is in such condition that it is no longer a fitting emblem for display, should be destroyed in a dignified way, preferably by burning.

"Sec. 5. That during the ceremony of hoisting or lowering the flag, or when the flag is passing in a parade or in a review, all persons present should face the flag, stand at attention, and salute. Those present in uniform should render the military salute. When not in uniform, men should remove the headdress with the right hand, holding it at the left shoulder, the hand being over the heart. Men without hats should salute in the same manner. Aliens should stand at attention. Women should salute by placing the right hand over the heart. The salute to the flag in the moving column should be rendered at the moment the flag passes.

"Sec. 6. That, when the national anthem is played and the flag is not displayed, all present should stand and face toward the music. Those in uniform should salute at the first note of the anthem, retaining this position until the last note. All others should stand at attention, men removing the headdress. When the flag is displayed, all present should face the flag and salute.

"Sec. 7. That the pledge of allegiance to the flag, "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the

United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all," be rendered by standing with the right hand over the heart. However, civilians will always show full respect to the flag when the pledge is given by merely standing at attention, men removing the headdress. Persons in uniform shall render the military salute.

"Sec. 8. Any rule or custom pertaining to the display of the flag of the United States of America, set forth herein, may be altered, modified, or repealed, or additional rules with respect thereto may be prescribed, by the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, whenever he deems it to be appropriate or desirable; and any such alteration or additional rule shall be set forth in a proclamation."

Approved, December 22, 1942.

S. 694

An act to prohibit the display of flags of international organizations or other nations in equal or superior prominence or honor to the flag of the United States except under specified circumstances, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(c) of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America", approved June 22, 1942, as amended (36 U.S.C., sec. 175 (c)), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence:

"No person shall display the flag of the United Nations or any other national or international flag equal, above, or in a position of superior prominence or honor to, or in place of, the flag of the United States at any place within the United States or any Territory or possession thereof: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall make unlawful the continuance of the practice heretofore followed of displaying the flag of the United Nations in a position of superior prominence or honor, and other national flags in positions of equal prominence or honor, with that of the flag of the United States at the headquarters of the United Nations."

Approved July 9, 1953.

Francis Cardinal Spellman Praises Humanitarian Program for Social Welfare of Fraternal Order of Eagles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on August 6 the Fraternal Order of Eagles, one of the most progressive and social-minded organizations in the United States, held their international grand aerie dinner in Toronto, Ontario, as part of their 61st annual convention. Because the Eagles always have stressed brotherhood among nations, it was appropriate that this convention should be held on the soil of our good neighbor to the north, Canada. I am proud, myself, to be a longtime member of the Eagles.

The principal speaker at the banquet was His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York. Cardinal Spellman stressed the theme of social responsibility and moral law. He discussed, eloquently, the Ten Commandments and demonstrated how the social welfare program of the Eagles has upheld the highest ethical concepts of the Ten Commandments. Because I have so long admired the Fraternal Order of Eagles, for their advocacy of such humanitarian programs as social security and jobs after 40, I would like to read to my colleagues this particular paragraph from the moving address by Cardinal Spellman:

You have shown constant and compassionate interest in the welfare of all—those innocents orphaned by the malice of men and those made fatherless by the guns of war; persons of all ages from the high chair to the rocking chair, the bedridden slowly wasting away, the neglected and the crippled desperately needing understanding and rehabilitation, as well as the healthy in body but sick in soul or in mind—all these have shared the strength of the Eagles, all have known the warmth of their deep, personal devotion and assistance. Deeply and humbly grateful am I for the signal honor you bestow upon me, you who are yourselves distinguished by courageous sacrifice in the service of your fellowman.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the Record the text of the address given at the 61st international grand aerie convention dinner of the Eagles in Toronto by Francis Cardinal Spellman.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS GIVEN AT 61ST INTERNATIONAL GRAND AERIE CONVENTION DINNER, TORONTO, ONTARIO, CANADA, AUGUST 6, 1959, FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES, BY HIS EMINENCE FRANCIS CARDINAL SPELLMAN

Dear friends, there are no words richer or more meaningful than the Ten Commandments; and, there is one Commandment which I believe, if honestly lived by men could bring true happiness and a just and enduring peace to all peoples and all nations of God's earth. It is the most sacred and greatest declaration of all time, in which our Lord commands us fully and faithfully to love Him and Him alone, and plainly tells us that each is his brother's keeper: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, and with thy whole soul, and with thy whole mind . . . and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

It is upon this commandment that your Fraternal Order of Eagles was founded, the humane organization whose members, for more than 61 fruitful years, have tirelessly, selflessly served the sick, the sorrowing, the maladjusted; the very young, the aged and the teenager. And the only measure of the Eagles' giving is the need of their neighbors—their brothers.

You have shown constant and compassionate interest in the welfare of all—those innocents orphaned by the malice of men and those made fatherless by the guns of war; persons of all ages from the high chair to the rocking chair, the bedridden slowly wasting away, the neglected and the crippled desperately needing understanding and rehabilitation, as well as the healthy in body but sick in soul or in mind—all these have shared the strength of the Eagles, all have known the warmth of their deep, personal devotion and assistance. Deeply and humbly

grateful am I for the signal honor you bestow upon me, you who are yourselves distinguished by courageous sacrifice in the service of your fellowman.

Since I have known it was to be my privilege to be with you this evening I have meditated upon your many-faceted, merciful works, especially the preservation of our countries' youth. I do not say "guidance" because the difficulties of our youth daily become more acute until we are now faced with the task of actually saving our young people before we can effectively guide them.

The Ten Commandments award has unique significance when applied to the youth of our present day society, because the Commandments constitute a communication from Almighty God, a code of conduct given to us by our Creator. Actively to employ the commandments in our plans for the salvation of our children as God created and intended them to be, holds the only key to the achievement of a successful program of hope and help for today's children, the mothers and fathers of tomorrow.

In these perilous days the Biblical narrative of the Ten Commandments has special significance. You will recall how Moses went alone to the top of the mountain to receive this divine communication and how in his absence the people grew restive and created for themselves a god of their own, a golden calf. And they worshiped his graven image. You have raised the tablets of the commandments on the Clark County Courthouse lawn ever to stand a reproach to all those in our age who have created their own god whom willfully they worship while constantly endeavoring to convert our Nation's youth along the pathways of their own degraded, godless living. For adults to desert God is tragic, but to teach children to abandon Him constitutes a heinous crime, the brutal rape of souls.

There are many forms of this perversion and perhaps the most widespread and popular is the perversion of "freedom". When hypocrites apply this sacred term to contemptible schemes in order to prey on the weaknesses of unformed characters under the banner of "freedom of speech," or "freedom of the press," they are victimizing not only our children, but endangering our Nation's treasured heritage preserved for us by the precious blood of generations of our beloved sons, fathers, brothers and husbands.

Who can measure the damage to the souls of our youth when our freedoms are violated by traitors of true liberty and are twisted and wrought by them into weapons for our own destruction? Those who raise their voices in defense of the innocent, attempting to filter the moral smog from the atmosphere of today's degenerate, amoral society, in order to protect our young from the vipers who feed upon and fill their pocket-books from the demoralization of our children, are often accused of witch-hunting and censorship. And censorship has become a repugnant word. But censorship there must be—censorship of conscience—fashioned in the spiritual mold of the Ten Commandments.

Pictures and books which corrupt and destroy the moral fiber and ideals of youth, these dangers must be eliminated if we are to discharge our sacred duties to our children. Thousands of dedicated men and women are striving by example and concerted efforts to protect and preserve our youth, our countries and our civilization from the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah, despite the determined efforts of vicious, venal enemies of youth, those evil men and women who deny the one true God and live in open defiance of His Ten Commandments.

When discussing moral problems endangering our children, people often limit themselves to the consideration of obscene material. Actually the problem is much

wider in scope, striking at the very roots of man's allegiance to God. Perversions cause unspeakable evils, but equally disastrous is the failure of justice to enforce laws to prohibit these evils.

What then are we to do, what action shall we take to preserve and guide our children to godly living and love of neighbor? Shall we pass more laws to break, make more and longer speeches, cry "doom" in a louder voice? The time has long passed for such efforts as these. The only effective solution will be found when adults strive to live God's Ten Commandments conscientiously and constantly, making each and every one of us "his brother's keeper," which means too, keeper of his own soul. The Ten Commandments must be explained and demonstrated to our youth in the laboratory of daily living and the instructors must themselves be inflamed by love of God and neighbor, and thus by their own example save our Nation's children from degeneration and destruction.

For more than 61 years the Fraternal Order of Eagles has worked for the welfare of our youth. This is perhaps the most important of your manifold activities because the object of your concern in the preservation of the real wealth of our nations—the salvation of our children living in freedom under God.

These, dear friends, are my reflections on the credo expressed in your manual: "Freedom under God's law in our world is the Eagle's goal." May God bless your work. May He give you the strength to carry your ideals to yet higher peaks on the wings of your Eagle—God's Ten Commandments.

(Commenting on the visit of Mr. Khrushchev to President Eisenhower, the Cardinal concluded: "I think it would be a wonderful thing of Mr. Khrushchev would have an opportunity of reading, studying, meditating, and with an unusual, extraordinary grace of God, believing and practicing the Ten Commandments. I think it would be wonderful. What a tremendous transformation would take place in this war-ravished poverty-stricken, fear-enshrouded world. A miracle such as has not taken place since the time of Christ Himself would be worked and the hearts of suffering human beings everywhere would be uplifted. . . . I certainly shall pray that Almighty God will work a miracle to save our world from imminent threatening destruction.")

The Housing Compromise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of August 24, 1959:

THE HOUSING COMPROMISE

The more one looks at the fine print in the new, compromise housing bill passed by the Senate after President Eisenhower's veto of the earlier bill, the more one is impressed by how far the managers of the bill have gone to meet the President's objections. To be sure, there is a little more money in the bill than was requested in the President's original program. But most of the objectionable features of the earlier bill have been dropped.

For example, there is no longer a requirement that the Federal National Mortgage Association purchase "special assistance" mortgages at subsidy prices. A proposed new program of special FNMA loans to mortgage lenders has been removed. The public housing authorization has been limited to roughly the amount approved for most recent years. There is a special provision to make sure that slum-clearance funds will not all be absorbed by larger cities. The authority for still another and dubious extension of the term of repayment of ordinary Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages has been eliminated.

These are concessions of substance. Compared with the original bills introduced by Democratic housing managers in both House and Senate, and compared even with the bills that passed both Houses originally, the new bill has gone far more than halfway toward the administration's wishes. The House would do well to accept the Senate bill and send it to the President. He in turn would be hard put to it to justify another veto.

Policeman Is West Virginia Historian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a recent edition of the employees' magazine of the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. contains an article about a West Virginia native who has become an outstanding authority on West Virginia history.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

POLICEMAN IS WEST VIRGINIA HISTORIAN—
MATHENY'S LIBRARY UNIQUE
(By Bob Hathaway)

H. E. Matheny leads a double life. On the job, he is a Goodyear policeman—off the job, he is a well-qualified history scholar.

His specialty is West Virginia history, and his library on the subject is better than any other—even those of the West Virginia Department of Archives and History and West Virginia University.

It consists of approximately 1,500 books with an auction value of \$20,000.

More than 100 of his books are "unique," a term used by collectors to describe a book that is one of its kind and irreplaceable.

A native of Parkersburg, W. Va., Matheny came to Akron at age 15. He says that Parkersburg, in those days, was a "Saturday night town." Everyone from the surrounding countryside would put on his best clothes and go to town on Saturday evening.

Fifteen-year-old Matheny, after his first week in Akron, was feeling homesick. When the first Saturday night rolled around, he dressed up and headed for the center of Akron. Nothing was happening.

Assured that Akron was the duller town in the world, he was even more lonesome for West Virginia. With nothing to do, he went into a book store and asked for a history of West Virginia—that started a hobby that has lasted and mellowed since 1925.

Matheny's collection includes books, manuscripts and printed materials of all descriptions. One volume, dated 1793, is a copy of the first book ever printed in West Virginia.

He has 10,000 file cards that cross-reference and triple index the material. Among the most interesting reading are his broadsides or posters designed for making public announcements.

Although many single items are worth \$100 or more, Matheny's favorite volume is one that has little value to other collectors. "The Memories of a Little Girl" by Maggie Alice Matheny is a handwritten account by his mother describing a covered wagon trip that she made as an 8-year-old to Oregon and back.

Matheny has 31 county histories of West Virginia, each worth more than \$25. He is one of four serious collectors in this field.

Matheny does not restrict his activities to collecting. The books that line the den in his home serve as references for numerous articles and stories he writes for West Virginia newspapers and popular magazines.

Recently Matheny completed a book titled, "Bishop Alexander Campbell, Editor, Printer, Publisher, and Bookseller." Publishing of the book is being sponsored by the Disciples of Christ Historical Society.

Campbell was one of those exceedingly dynamic men of the 1800's whose interests and influence ranged from farming to theology and whose life was perfectly suited to tickle the fancy of a biographer.

Many books and publications of all kinds that came from Campbell's publishing house are included in Matheny's library. Matheny's next literary effort will be a book on Civil War Gen. Thomas M. Harris, of Harrisville, W. Va.

Matheny started at Goodyear in 1928 in final inspection and went with the police department in 1942. His wife, Sceva, worked in the balloon room during World War II. They live in Uniontown.

Statement of Senator Richard Neuberger in Support of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the action taken by this Congress in approving House Joint Resolution 115, which authorizes the purchase of land and architectural competition for the erection of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial, has been a most heartwarming experience for me and the members of my family.

I wish to take this means to thank my colleagues, and particularly the members of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, for making possible this everlasting tribute to my father.

Mr. Speaker, among those who took an active interest and part in this endeavor is my admired friend and colleague, Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon, a member of the Commission.

May I say I was most impressed by his clear presentation of the facts before the Senate Committee on Rules and Ad-

ministration. And I might add, his remarks about Franklin Delano Roosevelt mean much to me and my family, as does the action of our distinguished majority leader, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, who introduced the resolution during the early days of the session.

I deem it a personal privilege and honor, Mr. Speaker, to have the opportunity to insert in the Record the complete text of Senator NEUBERGER's statement of August 19, 1959, in support of the F.D.R. memorial.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, OF OREGON, BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 115, AUGUST 19, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear today in behalf of House Joint Resolution 115, which is vital to the paying of an overdue tribute to a great American, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. As a member of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, I should like to review briefly the background and provisions of this legislation.

House Joint Resolution 115 was introduced January 9, 1959, by Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, a congressional member of the Roosevelt Memorial Commission. It was reported favorably by the Committee on House Administration on March 13, and was passed unanimously by the House on July 23, 1959.

The provisions of House Joint Resolution 115 are simple: It reserves a 27-acre portion of West Potomac Park near the Tidal Basin as a site for the proposed Roosevelt Memorial. It authorizes the Commission to hold a competition for design of the proposed memorial and authorizes not more than \$150,000 to be appropriated for expenses in conjunction with the competition.

In considering this measure, these points should be noted:

Planning: In holding the competition, the Roosevelt Memorial Commission will consult with the Commission of Fine Arts, the National Capital Planning Commission, and the National Park Service. The proposed memorial will not be a "sore thumb" architecturally in the effective implementation of Washington, D.C., planning.

Indeed, the National Capital Planning Commission not only approved the Tidal Basin site for the proposed memorial, it raised the 10 acres originally recommended by our Commission to 27 acres.

In addition, the House Committee on House Administration, in favorably reporting House Joint Resolution 115 last March had this to say about the site selection:

"In recommending the passage of House Joint Resolution 115, the Committee on House Administration is of the opinion that no more appropriate site for the proposed Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial could be chosen than the one recommended in West Potomac Park. The erection of the memorial in that particular section of the Nation's Capital would be fulfilling the post-war goal and dream of the late President that the temporary buildings erected on the Mall and adjacent parklands, many of them dating back to the First World War, would be removed as soon as possible after the conclusion of World War II. Most of these temporary buildings still remain in this area although the purpose for which they were erected is no longer valid.

"The Committee on House Administration commends the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission for its painstaking efforts which have resulted in recommending that portion of West Potomac Park which lies between Independence Avenue

and the inlet bridge as a most proper location for this memorial."

The Advisory Committee to the Roosevelt Memorial Commission has recommended, and House Joint Resolution 115 specified, that the proposed memorial shall harmonize in all respects with the Washington Monument, Jefferson Memorial, and Lincoln Memorial. Chairman of this Advisory Committee is the eminent American architect Pietro Belluschi, who was formerly a resident of my State of Oregon and is now dean of the School of Architecture and Planning of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The other members of the committee, who will assist our Commission on conducting the memorial design competition, are similarly distinguished architects and planners.

Finally, the design chosen will be submitted to Congress for approval.

Financing: The \$150,000 authorized by the resolution will be used for expenses in the conducting of the design competition and for cash prizes to winners of the competition. If architects had been retained to submit designs for the memorial, the cost would have been approximately the same, if not more.

Erection of the memorial itself is proposed to be financed through private subscription.

Mr. Chairman, these briefly are the cold details of this legislation. There are, however, more than just a few facts involved in the measure which the committee is considering today.

It is not sufficient to say that Franklin Delano Roosevelt served as President of the United States longer than any other man has served or likely will serve in the capacity. Neither is it sufficient to say that he guided our Nation through 12 of the most difficult years in our history—out of a great economic calamity and through most of the world's worst conflict. Words are not capable of carrying the meaning of Franklin Roosevelt's service to this land.

A monument cannot completely convey this meaning adequately. But it can indicate to future generations some of the depth of the respect and love of a grateful people for a great leader.

Mr. Chairman, the paying of this deserved tribute has been overly delayed. In the 14 years since the Nation mourned the death of Franklin Roosevelt, we have seen many men honored—not unjustifiably—for lesser service. Formation of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission was authorized by Congress in 1955 for the purpose of proposing a memorial. The Commission has met and submitted three interim reports. We now come to the action phase.

The House has acted unanimously. As the days of the session of Congress wane, I need not stress the necessity for swift approval on the part of the Senate. I urge that this committee give rapid and favorable consideration to House Joint Resolution 115 in order that we may proceed with the overdue honoring of a great American.

Imbalance Seen in Tax Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, my colleagues will recall that earlier this session I introduced a bill, S. 1885, propos-

ing to establish a Hoover-type commission to carry out an overhaul of the tax system.

Today, the Nation is having money troubles. The Federal Government is having difficulty balancing its budget. State governments, too, are finding it increasingly hard to pay mounting bills. Local communities experience difficulty in locating sources of revenue to provide community services and meet other costs.

With these ever-greater demands on our available tax sources, it is increasingly important that we (a) avoid undue overlapping of Federal, State, and local taxes; (b) attempt to assure that the tax burden is equitably distributed; (c) make an effort to bring our tax laws up to date in relation to our changing economy; and (d) revise the tax laws to knock out special privilege clauses wherever these are not merited, and, insofar as possible, write new tax laws that would stimulate—not curb—economic progress.

As I understand it, the House Ways and Means Committee is now planning to undertake study on various aspects of the tax structure. This committee—as the taxwriting body of the Congress—has, for the most part, done a splendid job in its efforts to carry forward legislation for improving laws in this field.

In proposing a tax commission, however, I have felt that Mr. John Q. Public, too, should have a voice in the modification of our tax laws. As will be recalled, the proposed 12-member Commission would include at least 6 persons from private life.

Recently, the Christian Science Monitor carried a thought-provoking article entitled "Imbalance Seen in Tax Policy." Although I am not in agreement with all the conclusions reached in the article, I believe that this commentary by Mark E. Richardson on some of the defects in our tax system merits the attention of thoughtful men concerned with challenges we face in this field.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMBALANCE SEEN IN TAX POLICY

NEW YORK.—During the course of the maneuvering before congressional committees discussed in my first article, the executive branch of the Government has played a very strange part which is not generally understood by the taxpaying public.

The executive, through representatives of the Treasury Department and taxpayer groups, to the extent that they are organized, have presented opposing points of view on many proposed changes in tax law.

The congressional committee has considered the opposing points of view and drafted a statute giving effect to its decision between the parties. The taxpayer is through. He has either won or lost.

Not so with the Treasury Department. Resting in its hands is the right to draft the regulations which will control the administration of the law as written. Given the least confusion or ambiguity, the Treasury has an opportunity again to have its way even though it might not have prevailed before the committee.

Few taxpayers are conscious of the innumerable occasions when an apparent congressional intent has been perverted by regulation. Of course, the taxpayer has the right of ultimate recourse to the courts, but here he encounters doctrines of "presumption of right" pertaining to the Government's findings or of "protection of the revenues." This latter doctrine always means the protection of Government revenues—not of the individual taxpayer's revenues.

ECONOMY SHIFTS

Before summarizing any comments or suggestions for a better tax policy, there is one other important matter which has received very little attention.

During the early years of our income taxes, the rates were quite low, and the amounts applied to all classes of taxpayers were very similar. The corporate form of business enterprise was not as prevalent at the time of the enactment of the income tax, in 1913, as it is today. A much greater percentage of business than at present was carried on then by sole proprietorships, joint enterprises, and even trusts.

As the nature of our economy changed, the advantages and disadvantages of different forms of business became more important. Our tax structure did not keep pace with economic changes. The Internal Revenue Code today is full of provisions which vary so greatly in their application that sound business judgment must give way to tax expediency when a business is being formed, changed in nature or location, or liquidated.

A sometimes simple business decision to form a subsidiary or to combine two old companies now is influenced primarily by available exemptions, possible tax on the shareholders or unrealized gain, the effect or availability of carryovers and carrybacks, the treatment of tax purposes of intercorporate debt and dividends, available credits, ad infinitum.

IMBALANCE CRITICIZED

A very drastic change which might be made in our tax policy would be to reconstruct our tax law in order to eliminate the undue influence upon business decisions of the imbalance in tax applications.

Why should the income from any business—grocery store, delicatessen, pharmacy—be taxed differently if it is run by a sole proprietor than if it is run by a corporation owned completely by the same proprietor? More pertinently, why should such income be taxed once in one form and twice or more in another?

It would seem that income, for tax purposes, should be divided into three classes: income from personal services, income from investment, and income from the production, processing, or merchandising of commodities.

Investment income that represents distribution of income previously taxed should be exempt; that which represents a cost to others in determining their own tax should be taxed to the recipient. This type of income classification would not be nearly so complicated as those under which we now labor.

REVISION AWAITED

The tendency to rewrite the technical provisions of the code or to materially change them at each session of Congress is one which the Members of Congress ought to deplore rather than implement. It now is almost axiomatic that any change in the tax law necessitates the development of other changes at a rate approaching geometric progression.

While a recodification of the Internal Revenue Code has taken place several times in the last generation or so, a true reconsideration and rewriting of the code still awaits accomplishment despite all of the lip service paid to it. Once such a rewriting is accomplished, subsequent changes in rate

structure to meet considered budget requirements should be simple, without revision of the technical provisions.

Elimination of the "second chance" given to the Treasury to have its way would materially increase the confidence of taxpayers and expedite settlement of their tax liabilities. The drafting of regulations interpreting congressional enactment should not be vested in the executive branch.

LONG TENURE URGED

The Office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, a stupendous administrative job, should not be subjected to change every time there is a change in national administration: the Commissioner should have long tenure of office (possibly 15 years) and should be responsible directly and only to the Congress for drafting of regulations and the administration of the tax laws.

Removal from office should never be at the whim of the administration but only subject to provisions similar to those now applicable to the Comptroller General.

Above all other considerations, the tax rate structure should be so flexible as to be almost automatically adjusted upon the determination of the Federal budget requirements.

Changes in the budget as submitted by the executive branch of the Government should only be concurrent with changes in tax rates estimated to produce required revenues. The haphazard, independent development of appropriations and tax laws, without immediate conformation, should be stopped.

Carey Letter Is Unworthy of U.S. Labor Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, along with many of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, I received a threatening letter several days ago from Mr. James B. Carey, president of the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers.

Because Mr. Carey resorted to outright intimidation, he has been justifiably criticized in the press and by many people, regardless of their views on labor reform legislation.

I am sure that, in addition, Mr. Carey received many answers to his letter from the Members of Congress he vowed reprisal against. As one such Member, I sent him my answer on August 20.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD Mr. Carey's letter and my reply:

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ELECTRICAL,
RADIO AND MACHINE WORKERS,
Washington, D.C., August 18, 1959.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Only you know, in the privacy of your own conscience, whether you carefully considered the possible consequences of the Landrum-Griffin bill when you voted for it on August 13, 1959. If you did, and realized that it is a punitive, repressive measure intended to weaken all labor unions and thereby all working men and women, you have much to answer for. If you did not, and merely yielded to the pressures of the chamber of commerce and

the National Association of Manufacturers, your guilt is perhaps even greater.

You should realize now, if you did not during the heat of battle, that this vindictive assault on the labor movement will, in the long run, prove to your constituents that you are less interested in individual rights and democracy than in property rights and the concentration of power in the hands of big business.

You may believe that you are safe in such action because organized labor is relatively weak in your district, and cannot call you to account for the damage you have sought to do to it. You may be right—at the moment.

We wish to assure you, however, that we shall do all in our power to prove to the working men and women in your district that you have cast your lot against them and they should therefore take appropriate action at the ballot box.

Very truly yours,

JAMES B. CAREY,
President.

AUGUST 20, 1959.

Mr. JAMES B. CAREY,
President, International Union of Electrical,
Radio, and Machine Workers, Wash-
ington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CAREY: Throughout the day I have been rereading your threatening letter of August 18.

I can't tell you how sorry and disappointed I am to receive such a letter from a man who has been elected to a very high position in the labor movement. The letter is not only unworthy of you, but it embarrassed the great membership you are obliged to represent.

Up to now, the mail I received on labor legislation has been extremely helpful. The great majority of letters, cards, and wires were from people in the first district who favored the Landrum-Griffin bill. But I must say that the people who supported the Elliott and Shelley bills were just as kind and considerate as they could be in their letters to me.

People who are just as partisan in their opinions as you, Mr. Carey, were courteous, reasoned, and balanced in their judgments.

For example, until you wrote nobody implied that I was uninformed, stupid, or a tool of special interest groups. I was not threatened in any way until your letter arrived. The people who have disagreed with me have managed to tell me so without shaking their fists—in a spirit of the interchange of ideas, without resorting to abuse.

Since the Landrum-Griffin bill has passed, the response has been gratifying. Even folks who are still unconvinced that the Landrum-Griffin bill was the best we could do, share, in a sense, the belief of the Washington Post and Times Herald which says editorially today:

"We do not think the labor movement will suffer any real loss. * * * Nor will any union be killed by a reasonable compromise of the present Senate and House bills—unless it be some racket-ridden units that are a disgrace to organized labor in any event."

You did not ask me why I supported the Landrum-Griffin bill, but I believe you deserve to know why. I feel the bill provides the best means by which we can correct the abuses which exist in some areas of the country, and still remain true to the goal in not being punitive to the many unions which have been dealing fairly with their memberships.

Your letter is really unique, Mr. Carey, in that you have not given me your views on the important subject of labor legislation. Its purpose was to convey a threat. I am not, in any way, afraid of what you pledge to do to me because I believe that such a

threat, underscored as it is with anger and revenge, will get nowhere.

But, if I may, I would like to give you a word of advice. You hold a very responsible position in the labor movement, and I am sure that the many fine people you represent are looking to you for leadership. You owe it to these people to be an effective spokesman for labor. Because you wrote the letter you did, you damaged your effectiveness greatly. I believe that you owe your constituents—the rank and file electrical, radio, and machine workers—a great deal. You might begin repaying their confidence by exercising the reasoned, temperate leadership they have a right to expect.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT H. QUIE,
Member of Congress.

REA Proves To Be Sound Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to a column from the Greenville News of Greenville, S.C., of August 23, 1959, by J. M. Eleazer, Clemson extension information specialist, entitled "REA Proves To Be Sound Investment."

Mr. Eleazer, well-known writer and friend of the farmer throughout South Carolina, has done a magnificent job of condensing the tremendous good that rural electric cooperatives have done for this Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, for it is one I believe every Member of Congress would enjoy reading.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REA PROVES TO BE SOUND INVESTMENT

(By J. M. Eleazer)

A little over a thousand to one.

That's unusual odds. Yet it applies to the 1,082 REA Cooperatives that are up with or ahead on their repayments to the Government.

Yes, when these great rural service organizations celebrated their 24th anniversary the past May, only one was in arrears on its scheduled repayments.

To help get electricity to the farms and far places in this country, the Government has loaned these farmers' cooperatives \$3.8 billion. Repayments on principal amount to \$599.7 million, interest payments \$357.6 million, and advance payments ahead of due dates amount to \$141.7 million.

This remarkable record prompted REA Administrator Hamill to say:

"In the late 1930's, a lot of people were wondering if those new rural electric systems were going to be able to meet the payments on their Government loans when due. Today they have their answer. The rural electrification program has proved one of the soundest investments ever made by the people of this country."

Back when REA came on the scene, few farms had electricity. Private companies have been active in this field, too. And now

few farms are out of reach of this great boon to rural life.

Even those most optimistic did not at first dream of the increasing use of electricity would rapidly find in the rural areas. So the result has been that most rural lines had to be rebuilt or modified to carry the greater load, and it's still increasing. For electricity is more and more becoming the house servant and the handyman for every family.

At first electricity was mostly for lights and maybe the radio. Then came cooking, hot water, motors, refrigeration, air-conditioning, and maybe heating will be next. And the puny wires of the early days just couldn't carry the current that's needed now.

On a cold night the other winter our current went off. Lights went off. Supper stopped simmering on the stove, and company was coming. The furnace went off and the house started getting cold. The radio and television went dead. And we were just about on dead center there until it came back on. Yes, electricity has grown into one of the necessities of life in this day and time. The REA has sure played a big part in bringing it to the hard places.

Operation Bootstrap—Reservation Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a portion of a letter Mr. George V. Labadie, Sr., of Pawhuska, Okla., has written and is circulating to both Indians and non-Indians regarding my Indian self-help bill which I have dubbed "Operation Bootstrap—Reservation Style."

The author, George Labadie, is one of the outstanding Indian leaders of the country. His untiring efforts in behalf of H.R. 7701 demonstrates his grand decision to be of service to the Indian people.

Part of his letter is as follows:

I am enclosing a bill introduced June 12, 1959, by Congressman E. Y. BERRY from South Dakota. Also attached to the bill is a full explanation concerning same.

READ CAREFULLY

I firmly believe the program under this bill is the solution to the most important phase of the Indian problem. Congressman BERRY, author of the bill, is from South Dakota, has been a Member of Congress for 9 years and comes from an Indian country. He is on the Committee on Indian Affairs in the House, known as the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and as such member has rendered valuable services to the Indians.

The Osage Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma, of which I am a member of the Osage Tribal Council, has received splendid support and cooperation from Mr. BERRY in all our tribal business and legislation before the Congress of the United States. If the Indians in this country want progress and advancement from their present pitiful economic position, then let us all get behind H.R. 7701, which is the title of the proposed legislation introduced by Mr. BERRY.

I have been before the committees of Congress for 42 long years beginning in 1917 and

during those years many plans have been initiated by the Indian Bureau and also the Congress of the United States concerning the welfare of the American Indians.

PRACTICALLY ALL OF THESE PLANS HAVE FAILED

Under this bill, H.R. 7701, generations of Indians can learn a trade, receive compensation for their services and become self-sustaining and independent from relief from their Government. But most important, this bill will restore their self respect and allow each Indian who participates in this program a decent standard of living for himself and his family.

Manners for the Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. HART. Mr. President, all of us are troubled by the approaching visit of Mr. Khrushchev. I found the course of conduct recommended by an editorial in the Catholic Standard of August 21, 1959, a most responsible one. I believe the country would benefit from its counsel, and for this reason I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANNERS FOR THE VISIT

It is certainly understandable that the President should wish that Khrushchev be given a polite reception by the people of this country. It is understandable also, once the President had made his decision, that he should wish to contrive somehow a "friendly atmosphere" in which to conduct his conversations.

It is just as true that the President could not and would not expect Americans to be hypocritical or to deny their principles by hailing our self-appointed executioner who has bluntly boasted that he "will bury" us. We cannot conceivably be true to the Declaration of Independence and our Constitution which proclaims men to be free and equal by right of God's creation and cheer Khrushchev, covered with the blood of freemen, who only recently in Poland blasphemed God. It is very difficult to see how any loyal American can honestly cheer Khrushchev.

We feel also that the incisive speech by Senator Dodd on this subject, to which so little press notice was given, contained a very apposite paragraph, "The American people, confronted now with exhortations to give Khrushchev a friendly reception, are being propagandized into a position of either applauding the Communist dictator or of appearing to hinder efforts to relax tensions." The Reds can use either or both of these effects to their own devastating advantage.

It is completely irrelevant to state that Americans should cheer Khrushchev because the Vice President was cheered by the Russians and the Poles. The Vice President is not Khrushchev. The Vice President was rightly hailed by the Russians and Poles because of the Nation he represents as well as his personal merits. Khrushchev represents the world's bloodiest tyranny and is himself a willing, guilty leader of that conspiracy. Long before he was the "Butcher

of Budapest" he was the butcher of the Ukraine where he, in the land of his birth, supervised the ruthless suppression of his own section at the estimated cost of 4 million lives.

Regardless of the undeniably good intentions of the President and those who favor Khrushchev's visit, how can one compose the contradictions of free Americans cheering Khrushchev along Constitution Avenue? Is this a service to freedom and peace? Or is this a subversion of freedom and peace? Can cheers for the man who wears the red mantle of Stalin, appropriately killing and exiling his rivals, as he rides next to our President possibly advance the cause of justice, the basis of peace, as our President has acknowledged? Is there any conceivable legerdemain that could make the victims of Khrushchev believe that the cheers are not not for him and his villainy but for the Russian people and peace?

This is not to imply that a demonstration against Khrushchev would be advisable. The only deportment consonant with our principles, we feel, is a cool, formally correct reception that permits no denial of our heritage.

Interest on Government Savings Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. PELL. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received the following telegram from Reno Odlin, National Chairman of the Savings Bond Advisory Committee.

This points up the critical problem of the ceiling on savings bonds interest.

I urge my colleagues to give this telegram a thoughtful reading because I am convinced that before Congress adjourns consideration should be given to this most vital problem:

TACOMA, WASH.,
August 25, 1959.

The Honorable THOMAS M. PELL,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

I earnestly hope the House will act to remove the ceiling on savings bonds interest. You know my long association with this program. I can feel the demoralization and letdown that is going on all over the country on account of the utterly unrealistic rate which now prevails. In my work as national chairman I am getting reports of this nature from all over the country. This is a program that affects over 40 million people and comprises over \$42 billion of the Treasury's debt management problem. Whatever you and your associates may think about other aspects of the fiscal and monetary situation, the savings bond program surely merits realistic treatment to keep the thing going. I hope this session will not conclude without giving us the tools to work with. Momentum in a program of this magnitude once lost is very hard to regain. Revision of these rates to a level that makes sense in the present market will revive the whole program and give us an opportunity to be extremely helpful in the overall problem of distribution of the national debt in a noninflationary manner. It will also play fair with those millions of people who have bought bonds and are holding them, and with the millions who continue to buy them

from month to month on the payroll savings plan. I ask your cooperation in urging this upon your colleagues.

RENO ODLIN.

Our Confused Civil Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, a recent column by Sidney Andorn published in the Cleveland News of August 12, 1959, clearly indicates the confused and muddled status of our civil defense program.

Mr. Andorn correctly points out that subaverage planners are drawing big salaries to head up the very confused Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. As a result of their activities and service, the Nation has spent nearly \$1 billion of taxpayers' money and has less security than when the program began.

I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I commend it to my colleagues in the Senate.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Now It's EVERY MAN FOR HIMSELF

(By Sidney Andorn)

It isn't indifference or apathy which has us so seemingly unconcerned about civil defense, Mr. President.

It's disgust.

Disgust with stupid leadership.

In a letter to New York's Governor Rockefeller you said the average American's indifference to civil defense must be overcome for the Nation's protection.

You should become better acquainted with the average American, Mr. President.

We don't want to be killed.

PLANNING BELOW AVERAGE

If you're really concerned about the Nation's protection you'd better look into the subaverage planners drawing big pay to head up civil defense.

Planning analyst for the evacuation of metropolitan centers in Ohio is working on expectation of 3 hours' attack warning.

Navy's new Project Teepee hopes to extend warning time from the present 15 minutes to 30 minutes.

Navy says Teepee won't be working for another couple of years.

WHAT ARE ACTUAL FACTS?

So what is it, Mr. President? Three hours' warning time in which to evacuate millions, or 15 minutes' warning time in which to say our prayers.

Or is it evacuate or go underground? New York has tossed out the evacuation program as useless.

New York's plan now, which your letter commends, calls for a voluntary program of providing shelters.

So after we've spent millions on civil defense it's every man for himself.

WAGER THEY'RE ALL SET

Now we're to get out our little shovels and our sacks of cement and dig ourselves shelters.

Nobody, however, tells us where to dig, how much cement, how deep to go, how big to build.

Nobody tells us where to get the dough for these diggings.

Don't you find it significant, Mr. President, that none of our visitors to Russia report on the Commies' civil defense?

You can bet it's not, as with us, that they're caught with their plans down.

View From the Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, as one who has respected and admired the American Farm Bureau for the position it has taken on agricultural programs, I submit the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of August 17, 1959. The farm bureau is one of the great organizations of the country and its members come from small as well as large farms. I have personally witnessed local meetings of the organization where issues are debated and voted on. The results of the votes are forwarded to the State headquarters and ultimately to the national office.

When Mr. Shuman speaks it is fair to assume therefore that his views coincide with the thinking of the majority of farm bureau members. For that reason, they are entitled to every consideration.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 8, 1959]

VIEW FROM THE FARM

"Today's burdensome surpluses with their fantastic storage costs are symptoms of a sick farm program which has infected the business of agriculture with the disease of Federal aid and control."

Now, people reading those words might conclude they came from some city slicker so ignorant of the farm he thinks prize-winning calves always come in pairs a couple of inches above some shapely ankles.

Not so. Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, was the speaker. The Farm Bureau Federation represents 1.6 million farm families throughout the country, but does not, of course, claim to speak for all of them. It can speak for a considerable majority of its members, however, for frequent polls the federation holds invariably show opposition to the support programs.

The farmers would be vastly better off, Mr. Shuman told an audience recently in New York, if the Government would permit them to use the free marketplace to supply consumer needs. Government subsidy programs based on parity serve neither the interests of the consumer or the farmer, he added.

Nor of anybody else, for that matter. Consumers and farmers pay taxes (somebody once figured out that there are 51 taxes hidden in one loaf of bread) and the taxes they've paid for the monstrous farm program might be enlightening to some who don't realize the figures. Since 1954, and including 11 months of fiscal 1959, the farm program has realized losses of \$5.8 billion.

In addition to paying farmers for things they grew and for things they didn't grow, the Government also spent some pretty impressive sums of money the farmers didn't get a dollar of.

For example, the Commodity Credit Corporation reports for the 11 months ending last May 31 that carrying charges alone on crops amounted to \$495 million, interest amounted to \$145 million, and general overhead—that euphemism for a bureaucracy that has moved in on the farmer faster than a corn borer through the lower forty—has cost the taxpayer \$39.3 million in the same period.

Well, if a wasteful program such as this isn't even liked by farmers it's supposed to benefit, what in the world keeps it going?

Mr. Shuman had an answer for that one, too. "Though farmers often have asked that these programs be changed, the Congress has not yet taken effective action."

And that, so far as letting the public know who is really to blame for the follies of the farm program, ought to help separate the sheep from the goats.

The Steel Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two editorials concerning the steel strike be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily News, Aug. 21, 1959]

MITCHELL STATES THE FACTS—STEEL REPORT A WARNING TO INDUSTRY AND UNION

Taken together, Secretary of Labor Mitchell's factfinding report on the steel strike and his comments upon releasing it must be considered a solemn warning to both the industry and the union to come to terms soon or risk Government intervention.

Mr. Mitchell's report is restrained and objective—so much so, in fact, that each side interprets it as supporting its own position. It is also so comprehensive and balanced as to leave the general public, for whom it was ostensibly designed, lost in a sea of statistics and unable to make up its mind.

Some of the statistics appear to back management points in the 5-week-old controversy, while others support the union argument. In general, the report shows that steel wages and prices are ahead of those in industry generally.

The careful balancing and counterbalancing of fact in the 40-page document surely indicates a Government view that there is room for giving ground on each side.

While the Secretary carefully refrained from taking sides, it is significant that at his news conference he strongly underlined his belief that neither management nor union representatives have bargained as intensively as they should.

His idea of bargaining is that they should meet continuously and not on a 2- to 4-hour basis with a Friday to Tuesday weekend.

"Both sides," he warned, "should realize that they have a responsibility to the Ameri-

can public to settle this as expeditiously as possible."

How soon he thinks the strike problem will reach the critical stage may be inferred from his comment that very serious shortages of steel will begin to appear if a settlement is not reached by the latter part of September or early October.

As a one-man committee appointed by the President, Mitchell has made a soft beginning. But the tenor of his remarks indicate that as time goes on the Government will start exerting pressure for a settlement.

Mr. Eisenhower has repeatedly stressed his desire that the administration should not intervene in the dispute. Despite inferences to the contrary, it is reasonable to believe that he has been concerned not so much by political considerations as by a clear knowledge that he cannot properly invoke the Taft-Hartley law until the public interest is deeply involved.

Such an involvement would occur if a serious steel shortage should develop, as Mr. Mitchell suggests, a month or so from now.

One point in the report bears closely on one of the crucial issues in the strike, which is the question of output per man-hour. The steel companies have argued that steel prices have been forced up because increases in employment cost have exceeded increases in output per man-hour.

According to the Mitchell report, the industry's rate of annual increase in hourly output per worker since the war has been only 3 percent, compared with 3.7 percent for the economy as a whole and 3.1 for manufacturing plants.

This has occurred despite an increase in capital investment per production worker from \$9,000 in 1947 to about \$20,000 in 1957.

The administration has insisted all along that any steel settlement arrived at should not be inflationary. Mr. Eisenhower has held also that any wage boost granted should be tied to productivity.

While there is nothing that is new in any of the material assembled by Mr. Mitchell, the mere bringing it all together for re-examination and public appraisal may serve to throw new light on the complex issues involved.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Aug. 21, 1959]

THE STEEL INDUSTRY AS EMPLOYER

Secretary of Labor Mitchell's compilation of the facts regarding the steel industry as an employer ought to prove helpful in ending the steel strike. He and his department deserve credit not only for assembling a mass of relevant material but also for presenting it in readable form.

Probably neither union nor management will be overjoyed. Mr. Mitchell's facts show that both sides have exaggerated their claims and their grievances. Steel labor is well paid by any standard of comparison that can be employed. Steel profits are high this year but they are not as outrageously high as the union has tried to make them appear and over recent years they were actually below the average for comparable industries.

On the other hand the union's featherbedding, however damaging it has been, has not blocked all efforts toward increasing the efficiency of the mills. The union can show from Mr. Mitchell's report that output per man-hour of the wage earners in the mills has increased by 3 percent a year, a higher rate of increase than is credited to the rest of the working force in the steel industry. Management can reply by quoting Mr. Mitchell's figure of an average gain of 3.7 percent in output per man-hour for all the Nation's economy.

Probably the most serviceable section of the report is that dealing with wage settlements in recent months in other industries. What this shows is that about half the

wage earners concerned in the new contracts received increases of at least 7 or 8 cents an hour, with some additional fringe benefits, or, to put it the other way around, half received less than these amounts.

It does not follow necessarily that the steelworkers union will settle for the median amount but that would be a pretty good place to start the bargaining, especially in view of the fact that the employers have given numerous indications that they regard the figure as reasonable. The featherbedding problem will remain, but Mr. Mitchell's figures have placed it in perspective.

Some day this strike is going to end and, if negotiations follow the usual course, it will end with concessions on both sides. Meanwhile it is costing millions of dollars to wage earners and companies alike, giving both an incentive to reach a settlement. The possibility of Government intervention under the Taft-Hartley law will become a probability as the Nation's economy is squeezed for lack of steel. Mr. Mitchell's facts and figures should help speed the reopening of the mills.

Nice Words About Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, recently I received the following letter regarding the National Music Camp located at Interlochen, Mich. While this is not in my district, I am proud of my whole State and her accomplishments:

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF COMPOSERS,
AUTHORS AND PUBLISHERS,
New York, N.Y., August 20, 1959.

The Honorable MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN: On August 10, as the immediate past president of the American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers (ASCAP), I was invited by Dr. Joseph Maddy to attend the dedication services of the scholarship lodge our society contributed to the National Music Camp at Interlochen, Mich.

As a professional songwriter for many years, I had heard much about Interlochen and what this camp has done over a period of 32 years for the youth of America. This was my first visit. There is an old saying "Seeing Is Believing" and what I saw is something I will long remember. I saw the Interlochen student of today becoming the teacher of tomorrow in schools and colleges throughout the Nation. I saw the epitome of discipline in this great operation and what's more important I saw approximately 1,200 youngsters being guided by able and conscientious counselors, whose sole aim is to make them—good citizens of the future. As a dyed-in-the-wool New Yorker, and a former showman who has traveled all over the country, believe me the State of Michigan can be justly proud of this camp's success.

No doubt the Members of Congress have given their support, directly or indirectly, to this wonderful achievement. For this you are to be commended. If more States throughout the Union could boast of a comparable activity, I am sure there would be less juvenile delinquency.

I am sure that I voice the sentiments of everyone connected with music when I say that although Michigan is the center of the

automotive industry, it is also a great cultural center educating the youth of America in the arts and particularly in the universal language—music.

Hope I haven't taken up too much of your time, but I just couldn't resist telling a Michiganite how a New Yorker feels about your National Music Camp.

Respectfully yours,

PAUL CUNNINGHAM.

Visit of Premier Khrushchev in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, upon several occasions, I have made statements in criticism of the administration's invitation to Premier Khrushchev to visit this country.

As another supplement to my earlier remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two letters from readers which appeared in yesterday's issue of the Washington Evening Star. These letters express some of the shock and disgust felt by American citizens. How much greater must be the disillusionment of the millions of enslaved persons behind the Iron Curtain, and the victims of communism throughout the world, when they find that America, the bulwark of freedom, is embracing with open arms, as it were, the tyrant chief of world communism.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Aug. 24, 1959]

As a taxpaying citizen, I am curious to know whether President Eisenhower consulted with the immediate families and relatives of the pilots shot down over Turkey on September 2, 1958, as to the advisability of inviting Mr. Khrushchev to this country. As near as I can gather, the correct reason as to why this plane was shot down has not been forthcoming, nor has the State Department been able to secure an explanation although two very important Russian diplomats recently visited this country.

I would also like to know if the President has asked the families and relatives of some of the prisoners now held behind the Iron Curtain, whom the State Department has been unable to release, and likewise, the families and relatives of many of the men lost in Korea.

In the diligent quest for peace, it is hardly necessary to shake a murderer's hand.

J. KEITH CROMER, M.D.

Does Khrushchev's visit signal the final step in the master plan of the Communists to take over this country and to establish a world totalitarian dictatorship? A Russian Communist leader predicted that it would be so.

Dimetry Manulisky, a prominent Red Party leader speaking before the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow in 1930, declared: "War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 to 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise."

The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions. The capitalistic countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fists."

A few years ago inviting a dictator to this country to be wine and dined would have been considered treason—or, at best, unpatriotic. Where are the voices of the "anti-Fascists" of the early forties who called out against appeasing Hitler? Would the Nazi Hitler have been invited to visit America? Are not both Khrushchev and Hitler dedicated to establishing a totalitarian world dictatorship?

Congress should force President Eisenhower to rescind the invitation to Khrushchev immediately.

KENT COURTNEY.

NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Mission With Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the 10th in the series of articles written by George W. Healy, editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, who accompanied Vice President Nixon on his recent trip to the Soviet Union.

The article follows:

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune, Aug. 18, 1959]

MISSION WITH NIXON—RUSS SCRIBES PUT IN PLACE AT FINAL MOSCOW MEETING—HEALY TELLS OF RESTON QUERY THAT DID TRICK

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

(Tenth of a series)

WARSAW, POLAND.—Sunday, August 2, was a great day in my life.

That's the day I saw a U.S. newspaperman put a crowd of Russian newspapermen in their places, and it's also the day I got out of Russia.

After going to two churches, I had the great privilege of watching James "Scotty" Reston of the New York Times handle the Russian press at Spaso House.

Spaso House is the U.S. Embassy, scene of Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON's final public appearance in Russia.

When we were driven to this final conference we found all the front seats occupied by Russian reporters and photographers.

NIXON IMPARTIAL

Mr. NIXON, wisely, I think, recognized as questioners just as many Russians as Americans or British. The Russian questions were translated into English by an interpreter of the Russian Government, who in turn translated English questions into Russian for the Russian group. The answers also were given in two languages.

Most of the Russian questions weren't really inquiries—but speeches, pressing the Communist Party line.

As an example, here is a "question" by a representative of the Moscow radio named Zorin:

"Mr. Vice President, I have the impression that the conditions are such that representatives of the Soviet press have less opportunity of putting questions to you than foreign correspondents. The foreign correspondents you have with you on the trip have better opportunity of putting questions to you than the Russians. I want to insist that you give us Soviet correspondents the same opportunity to put questions to you. I am a representative of Moscow Radio, and my name is Zorin. I have a question. The Soviet Union has repeatedly suggested a ban on nuclear weapons to eliminate the arms race among nations and to put an end to war. The Soviet Union has made the same proposal after 1949 when it became known that the Soviet Union was the possessor of the nuclear weapon. The demand became stronger after 1953 when the Soviet Union became the possessor of thermo-nuclear weapons. Why, then, does the United States so persistently not want to put an end to all the atomic and nuclear weapons and eliminate all stocks of such weapons? My second suggestion is closely connected with the first one. In your television speech last night you touched on the open-sky plan. Why, since the Soviet Union accepted that suggestion in a form which excluded the using of that plan for intelligence purposes, the United States would not hear?"

WOULD STOP TESTS

Mr. NIXON's reply, of course, was that the position of the United States was that it seeks not simply the writing of a paper but the stopping of the tests.

Then a representative of Pravda, official paper of the Soviet Union, a man named Litoshko, came in with a "question" similar to that of Mr. Zorin.

"Scotty" Reston got in his lick: "Mr. Vice President, in view of the questions put to you here by our Soviet colleagues, may I ask whether during your conversations you discussed with Mr. Khrushchev the aggressions in Korea or Indochina, or the Hungarian uprisings?"

The Vice President ruled out the Reston question as improper—in view of his policy of not disclosing the specific substance of discussions, on Russian soil, with top level Russian officials.

Although the question, technically, was improper, I suspect the Vice President was glad that it was asked.

I was.

PASSPORT HELD UP

It looked for awhile like I was not going to make the trip to Warsaw. As a matter of fact, it looked like I wasn't going anywhere.

Shortly before pickup time on Saturday afternoon, August 1, I got the bad news from Tommy Tuck of the United States Embassy in Moscow that no visa had been issued for me to visit Poland and that my passport had not been returned. In other words, I had no permit to travel.

Others in the Nixon party were ready to go—visas and everything set.

When it was announced at a "briefing" that I had not been cleared to stay with the party everyone in the group was sympathetic. Some made suggestions as to how I should make my way back, alone, to the United States.

Naturally, I wanted to stay with the group. When you're in Russia or Siberia the phrase "collective security" comes to have real meaning. You're glad to be there with American friends, but you'd hate to be there all by yourself.

Representatives of the United States Embassy questioned me as to whether I had done anything which might be considered offensive to the Polish Government. I thought of a brush which I had with some Poles in Washington during World War II,

but it didn't seem to me that this should have any bearing on my request for a visa.

Tommy Tuck and Richard Davies, State Department escort officer, went into action. At Tommy's request, the U.S. Embassy in Moscow telephoned the U.S. Embassy in Warsaw. Special action by the Polish foreign office was requested.

HALTED SECOND TIME

After several hours' suspense, I was told that my visa might still come through. I told our State Department representatives that I planned to go with the group to Warsaw—passport or no passport.

Late Saturday, my passport, with a Polish visa, was returned to me; but that was not the end.

At the Moscow airport Sunday I had to surrender this passport, with passports of other members of our party, for a final clearance before we could board the plane for Warsaw. When passports of the other members of the party came out with clearances, mine remained with the Russian officials.

Whatever the reason, clerical mistake or otherwise, I didn't get my passport and visa back for almost 2 hours. Our charter flight from Moscow to Warsaw was scheduled to depart at 3 p.m. We didn't get off the ground until 3:45 p.m.

I was the last man on the plane—holding up the bridge game for the championship of jet stream Russia, Siberia, and Poland.

West Virginia Legionnaires Active in National Convention; State Legion Memorial Address Cited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the American Legion, now holding its annual convention in Minneapolis, Minn., doubtless is providing a forum for the advocacy of the best in Americanism by sincere men and patriots who have given much of themselves that it shall be perpetuated.

More than 100 West Virginia Legionnaires are in attendance, headed by Department Commander Bonn Brown of my home city of Elkins. I forwarded to Commander Brown today the following telegram, which is of vital interest to veterans:

Senate Resolution 19, to establish a standing Senate Committee on Veterans Affairs, of which I am a cosponsor, has been favorably reported by the special subcommittee of Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. I am on record with a forthright statement to the full committee supporting this resolution and I am attempting to have the measure reported for action by the Senate at the earliest date possible.

The Highlanders, a noted bagpipe band composed of 26 members, including the color guards, received merited recognition during the famed Legion parade yesterday. This musical organization from the H. W. Daniels Post in my home county is under the leadership of my fellow townsman, I. H. Gainer, with C. S. Kump in charge of the color guard.

In this connection, I am reminded of the memorial address by Department Chaplain George L. Cutlip before the recent State convention at Parkersburg, W. Va., in which he spoke of the Bill of Rights as our "crowned jewels," our "treasured freedom which we are privileged to display through the affairs of our country."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the memorial address by Chaplain Cutlip.

There being no objection, the address was ordered printed in the Record, as follows:

OUR CROWN JEWEL—MEMORIAL ADDRESS AT THE AMERICAN LEGION CONVENTION, DEPARTMENT OF WEST VIRGINIA, JULY 26, 1959, PARKERSBURG, W. VA.

(By George L. Cutlip, department chaplain)

Being a minister, it is difficult to begin an address without a text. Therefore, I have selected two sentences. In Psalms 56: 3-4 are these words, "When I am afraid I put my trust in Thee. In God, whose word I praise, in God I trust without fear," and, also, in the Psalm 72: 11, "Ye, all kings shall fall down before Him; all nations shall serve Him."

We have observed a beautiful ceremony, "The Post Everlasting." This we do to honor those who have paid the price for freedom. But in keeping with the theme of Abraham Lincoln, in his Gettysburg address, "It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Thomas Wolfe, in his book "You Can't Go Home Again" states: "I think the true discovery of America is before us. I think the true fulfillment of our spirit, of our people, of our mighty and immortal land, is yet to come. I think the true discovery of our own democracy is still before us."

David Douglas Duncan writes a story of a young soldier in the Korean war. The soldier was cold, bearded, clothes were showing signs of battle wear, and he had taken time out to eat his meal of a can of frozen beans, you know, those famous canned beans, and he was breaking each bean loose with his fork—and weighing the situation with all seriousness. He was asked by a passerby soldier what would be your request right now, if you had the privilege. His reply, "Give me tomorrow."

As the psalmist faced the many hardships of life, fears overshadowed him. He felt the tread of the enemy, the piercing of the arrow and the battleax, yet behind all these fears that crept into his life there was something that led to a trust in God. In our preamble, we say, for God and country, we associate ourselves together. We associate ourselves together for specific purposes. One is to overcome the fears that haunt our Nation, fear of world conflict, conflicts more destructive than those we have experienced. Here, we honor our comrades who have fallen in the many wars of the past, praying that no such an experience may befall our children. These are among the fears and unrest that haunt us each day as we read our papers and listen to the news on our audio-visual communication.

But again the psalmist said that all nations shall serve Him. This was the hope and dream of the psalmist as he wrote his beautiful songs. However, experience throughout the long period of human history teaches that liberty must be won in every generation and can be had only by "eternal vigilance." The Ten Commandments, the Magna Carta, and the Bill of Rights have each come into being at a time of great distress. They clearly represent the desire of a people who had paid a high price for their independence and were determined to keep it.

There is the story of a group of boys who built a shack in the woods. Each boy contributed his share of old lumber, nails, and covering. With a lot of pounding, sawing, and sweating a little shack was erected and the boys were very proud of the achievement. This was a magic example of cooperation. By pooling all their resources, a cozy retreat had been erected that protected them from the winds and rains.

But there were only a few days of the peaceful cooperation before one of the fellows became dissatisfied with the arrangement and began to tear off his boards and take them home. Each fellow joined in with his exasperations and likewise tore off his boards. Soon the cooperative enterprise was over, and only a trampled patch of weeds marked the place of the efforts of a neighborhood of boys.

Why have I told you this story? You say that happens with any gang of boys. Yes, it does, and it makes about as much sense as we do sometimes with our reasoning regarding our freedom and safeguarding against our fears. It is the united effort of every one of us that makes our Nation great and wards off our fears of destruction, fear of the might hand of tyranny, fear of the destruction of our American way of life.

Like old Caleb at the age of 85 years, when he was given the privilege to select the best of the land under the command of Joshua, he replied, "Give me the hill country." Thomas Wolf challenged his readers that much lies ahead for America—that the true democracy lies ahead. These are prophetic words, yet they bear much consideration.

We gathered here because we have had a common experience of at least two wars, and some three—World Wars I and II, and the Korean war. Our freedom has been challenged. We have come to realize that not all nations have learned to serve a God who is sovereign; nor to respect the rights of others, even though we may differ in certain idealism.

Our treasured freedom is the Bill of Rights—our "crowned jewels" which we are privileged to display through the affairs of our country.

They provide that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people to peaceably assemble, and to petition the government for redress of grievances."

Freedom is a man at a lathe, or at the desk, doing the job he likes to do, and speaking up for himself. It is a man in the pulpit, or on the street corner, speaking his convictions.

It is a man puttering in the garden in the evening, and swapping talk with his neighbor over the fence. It is the unafraid faces of men and women and children at the beach on Sunday, or looking out of the car windows speeding along a beautiful highway.

It is the man saying "Howdy," without looking cautiously over his shoulder.

Freedom is the air you breathe and the sweat of your toil. It is you, every American like you, with your chin up, daring anybody to take your Americanism away from you. It is you, unafraid—with an unflinching

trust in God. "For God and Country we associate ourselves together"—"In God we trust without a fear." This is the freedom—this is the America our comrades died for that we might live as free men. It is to us, the living, to be dedicated—unafraid—to the unfinished task remaining before us, and to discover the true democracy that lies ahead.

Poles Dressed Up—Smiling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the 11th in a series of articles by George W. Healy, editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, who accompanied Vice President Nixon on his recent trip to the Soviet Union.

The article follows:

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune, Aug. 19, 1959]

MISSION WITH NIXON—POLES DRESSED UP—SMILING—MASSES APPEAR MORE FREE THAN THEY ARE IN RUSSIA

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

(Eleventh of a series)

WARSAW, POLAND.—Although some of us had come to regard the Ukraina Hotel in Moscow as akin to a second home, moving from Moscow to Warsaw was like crossing from a forbidding swamp to a promised land.

Switching from the Russian Aeroflot jets to the Trans World Airways 707-171 was comparable to leaving an old local accommodation mixed train to board the Panama Limited.

The flight from Moscow to Warsaw passed swiftly. Only an absence of trunk highways made the terrain below, seen occasionally through the overcast, appear any different from the rolling country of northwest Louisiana.

Our reception in Warsaw, to put it conservatively, was sensational—and unexpected. The Polish city did everything it could to make us feel welcome, from carpeting Vice President Nixon's automobile with flowers to applauding all of us every foot of the way from the airport to the Grand Hotel.

Practically all the men and women and many children in the lines along the highway and streets through which we rode were well dressed—western style. Few men were without ties. All smiled or waved a cordial welcome as we passed.

When the Nixon automobile was alongside, the shout was "Nix-on" or "Pat."

Through the 10-plus miles from the military airport to the hotel I heard not a single "Go home, Yankee," and saw not a single unfavorable gesture.

That more than 250,000 people turned out was remarkable, considering there had been little advance notice of our coming. The Warsaw newspaperman, a staunch Socialist, who estimated that the Nixon crowd exceeded 250,000 told me that Nikita S. Khrushchev attracted about 100,000 3 weeks earlier.

Our first night in Warsaw was memorable. The nation's association of newspapermen, comparable with the National Press Club in Washington, or with IBI in Rio de Janeiro, entertained at a cocktail party and buffet. On the program was presentation of a motion

picture showing steps in the restoration of Warsaw.

Although it was more than 14 years ago when the last bomb fell on the city, Warsaw still has heavy war scars. Just across the street from the Grand Hotel is a vacant lot, with scattered bricks reminding that a building once stood there. Coming from the airport we passed several bombed buildings whose ruins cry for demolition. The walls lean dangerously.

People of Warsaw with whom I talked expressed optimism as to the outcome of the Nixon visit. The president of the journalists' group (I can't spell his name), who was in New Orleans in 1957, suggested that the visit will bring much closer ties between the United States and the Polish People's Republic.

Thousands of Poles who went to the airport to inspect our TWA 707-171 jet were disappointed. They found the military airport closed to civilians. Before its ramp was removed at the Moscow Airport, more than 5,000 Russians had passed through this plane.

To the U.S. visitor, Warsaw definitely is a warmer city than Moscow, figuratively speaking. Its people extended the same kind of welcome to our party that was extended in Siberia—where visitors seldom are seen.

Poles definitely have more freedom than the masses in Russia. Their churches and church schools apparently are functioning normally.

European editions of U.S. newspapers, the New York Times and the Herald Tribune, are on sale here. In Russia they are not available, the official explanation being that demand for them is not great enough to justify their importation.

Poles, I found early, aren't enthusiastic about either Russian culture or the Russian language. When I said to a waiter, "spaseebo," the Russian word for "thank you," he frowned. Poles whom I met prefer to be spoken to in Polish, in French, or in English.

The Polish newspapermen were particularly helpful to our party. They provided each of us a list of editors and reporters of Warsaw newspapers and periodicals who can speak English. On the list were 61 names, with telephone numbers. As in Moscow, there apparently are no telephone directories in Warsaw. At least, we couldn't find one.

Trybuna Ludu, the organ of the Central Committee Party, expressed to us the feeling of the leaders of Poland regarding our visit. This newspaper, which I was told is just as official for the party in power in Poland as is the official organ of the Communist Party in Russia, resurrected a phrase which long has been in mothballs—the phrase "coexist." We heard of coexistence once in Russia, when Mr. Khrushchev spoke at the U.S. exhibition.

"The Polish People's Republic and the United States are states with different social systems," said the Polish official organ. "Independent, however, of the social-political differences, both states and their nations can and should coexist between themselves in harmony and friendship, developing a mutual cooperation particularly in the economic and cultural fields, doing everything which is possible within their power to make peace permanent on earth and to prevent the most horrible of catastrophes which an atomic war could be for humanity."

This newspaper reminded us that while the United States with a capitalist system has developed the world's greatest productive capacity, the Polish nation "when it lived under a capitalist system in the period before September 1939, not only could not raise itself from economic backwardness and improve its welfare, rather, the system pushed it further into greater poverty and misery."

We were left no room to doubt that Poland prefers socialism to capitalism—this on the

basis of what we read in the Polish papers and what we heard from Poles with whom we talked.

Although Poland is a Russian satellite, we hear in Warsaw no mention of communism.

My horseback opinion is that Poland differs from Russia in official attitude toward other nations. The Kremlin unquestionably would like to impose communism on the whole world. Polish leaders, barring stooges of Khrushchev in Warsaw, aren't interested in what kinds of government other nations have so long as those nations permit Poland to have its socialism.

Increase of Acreage Limitation of Oil and Gas Leases in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I have received a letter from a person eminently well qualified to discuss the merits of recently vetoed H.R. 6940, a bill providing for the increase of acreage limitation of oil and gas leases in Alaska. The author of this letter, Mrs. Irene E. Ryan, is a graduate mining engineer, the first woman graduated in that field from the New Mexico School of Mines, a senator in the Alaska State Legislature, and chairman of the Alaska State Committee on Natural Resources.

I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Ryan's letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF ALASKA, SENATE,
Juneau, Alaska, August 19, 1959.

HON. E. L. BARTLETT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BARTLETT: The act of the President in vetoing legislation granting an acreage increase for oil leasing in Alaska did not come as a surprise to Alaskans. The testimony given in opposition in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the adverse statements originating from the Secretary's office in the Department of the Interior led us to expect the President's action.

There is no question in my mind that the result will be detrimental insofar as oil and gas exploration programs in Alaska are concerned. It would be impossible to evaluate just how detrimental for the simple reason that we cannot know the cuts that will be made in the exploration programs the several hundred oil companies and independent producers had been considering for the State. It will have an immediate effect upon anticipated revenues from lease rentals that would accrue to the State for two reasons:

1. The amount of new acreage taken under lease will be materially restricted;
2. Leases now going into their fourth and fifth years of rental payments and held by individuals—most of them Alaskans—will expire and return to public domain.

The individuals simply do not have the money to pay continuing rentals; nor do they have the money to pay for the initial

geological and geophysical exploration work which might show them if the leases are, in fact, worth keeping. They are now foreclosed from turning over the leases to companies able and willing to do such work because such companies and independents have already saturated their acreage allowable. Many people have asked me why the adverse report was given by the Department of Interior and why the President vetoed the bill. Obviously, the President depended upon the advice of one of his Cabinet members, the Secretary of the Interior.

I cannot agree with the reasons given by that Department for their nonsupport of the bill. I have read their testimony before the committee with extreme care and find that it hinges entirely upon the statement that they do not believe the increase would be helpful or desirable or that it would promote the development of oil and gas in Alaska as contemplated by the Mineral Leasing Act.

In hearings held in Alaska and attended by the general public as well as the industry, it was made abundantly clear that the present acreage limitation was, in fact, hampering the exploration and development program in our State. The reasons were given with great detail by specialists in the industry and in such a manner that they were grasped by all attending. It was also evident at the hearings that the desire for an increased and realistic acreage limitation in this great State was not the desire of one or two major companies but was the solid and uniform thinking of the 21 major oil companies represented and approximately 30 independent operators. These are the people who are not only leasing lands in Alaska, but budget funds which run into the millions annually for geological and geophysical exploration in the State.

The State has two present and future sources of revenue from its petroleum resources. They are land lease rentals and royalties from oil or gas produced. In comparing the possible return to the State from these two sources, it is obvious to anyone who cares to play with the figures that royalties from two or three major fields would far surpass rental payments. It is also obvious that if discoveries are not made, revenues from lease rentals will decrease rather than increase. However, it is further evident that for the next several years the lease rentals will be an important factor in balancing the State budget. We must then, for the immediate revenue need, encourage continuing leasing and, for our long term hopes, keep the industry's interest in exploration in Alaska active. We know that the industry must balance the possible returns from money spent in Alaska with the same dollars spent anywhere else in the world, not only this year but in future years. We are most anxious that our laws and the Government administering them keep Alaska in a reasonably competitive position.

We find, then, that the Department of Interior does not believe the increase would be helpful or desirable, whereas the industry that will actually have to spend the money for exploration and development testifies that it is needed.

It may not have been so intended, but the expertly prepared and profuse testimony in opposition to this bill which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 4 and August 6 leads to several wrong conclusions on the part of the average reader. They are points which I have been asked to explain and are as follows:

1. That, were the acreage increased, a major company could lease 600,000 acres at a very low cost, have the advantage of listing it as a reserve in their assets, and would therefore not spend any money in explora-

tion and development. This is not a true picture of the facts:

(a) Completely wildcat acreage cannot be listed as a reserve. Oil company reserves are known and quantitatively measured pools of oil and gas. It is quite possible that a 600,000 acre lease block in Alaska actually contains no oil or gas in commercial quantities.

(b) Furthermore, the 600,000 acres allowed would be leased under a Federal noncompetitive lease which is issued for a period of 5 years with a possible 5-year extension. An exploration program to properly evaluate the 600,000 acres would take a minimum of 5 years in Alaska. Any company holding such acreage knows that it will have to explain to its board and stockholders the ultimate value of the holding to the company. Since its value can actually be found only after extensive geological and geophysical exploration and since it would take in the neighborhood of 5 years to acquire this basic information, there would be no such thing as holding and freezing land under lease.

(c) Geological and geophysical exploration in Alaska is expensive. It also leaves dollars in Alaska and ultimately acquires for the benefit of the State the information obtained. This phase of an exploration program is divided into (1) rough geological reconnaissance, (2) rough geophysical surveys, and (3) detailed geophysical surveys and geological mapping.

I have before me the costs of one of the companies operating in Alaska. They have spent \$340,000 in rough geological reconnaissance to look at 30 million acres, a cost of \$0.0114 per acre. They have spent \$177,000 for a rough geophysical survey to evaluate 1,152,000 acres, or a cost of \$0.155 per acre. They have spent \$350,000 in a detailed seismic survey to evaluate 300,000 acres, or a cost of \$2.84 per acre. Even the detailed seismic survey is not the final step in this phase of the exploration program. Continuing seismic surveys, together with a well drilled for stratigraphic information as much as for finding of oil is necessary before the company can make a decision if the acreage is worth retaining for a further search for oil.

2. That, were the acreage limitation increased, a major company could then be in a position to control the oil industry in Alaska.

(a) There is no industry, in spite of the giants within its ranks, that is so competitive as the oil industry. The only way, even with the increased acreage allowable, that any one company could control the oil industry in Alaska would, in fact, be if the only field in the State existed under their acreage block. Considering the extensive probable petroleum provinces within the State, this possibility seems to me rather remote.

3. That there will be fewer wells drilled if this acreage limitation is increased rather than requiring the companies to apply for nonchargeability through development contracts.

(a) It is true that the final answer to the question of whether particular acreage does embrace commercial deposits of oil and gas can only be found by drilling. However, to require the drilling of a well as a primary and mandatory provision of obtaining a lease would result in such an expensively wasteful program that the cost of each barrel of oil found in Alaska would be priced right out of the market. Drilling is the final and the most expensive step in a long and expensive exploration program.

(b) Every dry hole drilled is a discouragement to the industry. Even after applying all the scientific techniques available in studying an acre of wildcat ground, the ratio of successful wells, industrywide, remains 1 in 10. It is important that the industry's experience in this regard in Alaska does not develop a lower ratio if we are to keep their interest here. Mandatory and indiscriminate drilling requirements could easily, at

the present time, bring about this result and could, in fact, result in a completely wrong conclusion; i.e., that there is little commercial oil in the State.

4. That an oil company can increase its acreage holdings without any limitations under development contracts and unit agreements.

(a) The development contract is a useful means of securing nonchargeability of acreage, but it is not the sole answer to the present problem in Alaska. In the first place, although a development contract granted to a single company may embrace hundreds of thousands of acres, not all the acreage within its defined borders is necessarily owned by nor controlled by the company.

(b) To obtain a unit agreement, the company must have completed a sufficient geological and geophysical program to support an immediate and mandatory drilling program.

(c) This means that the company will have already spent from \$2 to \$5 an acre on lands, including those over which it has no ownership or control and which, by the time the program has reached the point that the company is willing to embark on a unit agreement, have been leased by other individuals and companies.

The testimony given to the Senate Interior Committee already points out that the size of Alaska and its potential oil provinces scattered in some seven geographic areas demands special consideration if equity with the other States is intended. Despite the President's veto and the action of the Department of Interior, I still believe this legislation is necessary and good for all the people. Senator ALLOTT's testimony indicated that his objections to the bill would be removed if other legislation pertaining to amending lease rentals, wiping out option provisions, and other amendments to the oil and gas laws, which are now in Senate Interior Committee, were considered at the same time. I would urge the early consideration of these measures with full hearings and recommend that one of them be amended to increase the acreage allowable to 600,000 acres without geographical division in the State of Alaska.

Very truly yours,

IRENE E. RYAN.

Address by Dr. T. Keith Glennan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present a very able address of Dr. T. Keith Glennan, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, delivered on August 24, 1959, to the fourth U.S. Air Force technical symposium on ballistic missiles and space technology held in Los Angeles, Calif.

The address follows:

Address by Dr. T. Keith Glennan, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Before the 4th USAF BMD Symposium on Missiles and Space Technology, Los Angeles, Calif., August 24, 1959

It is my purpose this morning to discuss with you some of the conclusions that we of the National Aeronautics and Space Ad-

ministration have reached after almost a year of operation. There could be no more appropriate forum for such a discussion than this fourth technical symposium on ballistic missiles and space technology. The members of this audience represent a solid core of the science-industry-Government team that is responsible for the achievements of our national space effort to date. I hardly need add that you make up the team upon which the vital space work of the future must depend.

There is a tried and true formula for speech preparation that runs something like this—tell them what you are going to say—say it—and then tell them what you have said. I am going to attempt to follow that format this morning as I speak out on basic problems that confront us—problems that are common to all who labor in these missile and space technology fields.

Specifically, I want soberly to examine with you the present state of the art in these fields. While I yield to no one in the extent of my enthusiasm about the future in this business, I will not be painting a rosy, pie-in-the-sky picture of manned space transports, civilian colonies, and manned military bases on the moon or other planets, warehouses in space and the like. There seems to be a contest going on in this country in which substantial numbers of people are attempting to outdo each other in predicting exotic accomplishments in space in the next few years. In my opinion, there is need for more commonsense and good technical judgment to be injected into this picture. While there are others more able than I to handle such an assignment, my position as Administrator of NASA compels me to state my convictions in these matters as part of my responsibility of keeping the Congress and the public fully and currently informed.

As you know, it was just 1 year ago last month that the President signed the bill establishing the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Building on the foundation of organization, personnel, plant assets, programs, and problems transferred from the NACA, ARPA, and the military services, NASA was a going concern from the day we announced that we were in business, the 1st of October 1958. We lacked, as did all of the others engaged in the space business, a full realization of the complexity of the technological problems facing us. And we were neophytes—probably still are—in our understanding of the costs to be incurred in a hard-hitting, broadly based national space program. But we had—and we still have—enthusiasm and real zeal for the great adventure that still lies before us: the discovery of new knowledge about our universe and the application of that new knowledge and supporting technology for the benefit of mankind everywhere.

Now, what have we learned from our successes and failures of the past year? And what are we planning for the future as a result of our experiences—both good and bad? Remember, please, that I am speaking about the civilian space program—not the military program. However, they are closely related—and are interdependent in many ways and it is probable, therefore, that some portion of my remarks may have applicability in the military area, as well.

In the first place, we have learned that we are not nearly as far advanced in space technology as we had thought or hoped. Our experiences in the space vehicle field have been less than completely satisfactory. The ratio of successful launches to what has been termed by some as "successful failures" has not improved very much in the past year. And as soon as we began to plan for second generation experiments we found that we were facing some hard facts of life in the propulsion and guidance fields. Even today, every shot we make—either by the military

or by ourselves in NASA—is a shot in which there is little or no margin for even a slight deviation from planned performance parameters. In thrust capability, in guidance-injection, midcourse and terminal, in thrust control—in all of these areas there is much that must be learned and applied before we undertake the difficult missions we all talk about so glibly.

Secondly, it is becoming clear that we cannot and should not attempt to undertake all of the hundreds of projects that are being recommended to advance our understanding of the space environment. We haven't the manpower, the facilities or the funds. More important than any of these, however, is the fact that it seems to me that we will make progress faster if we move at a rate that will enable us to understand a bit more about the things we have already done and the information we have already acquired from successful experiments that are behind us.

Probably more than any other single matter, the question that plagues all of us is one of reliability. When will we be able to count on being successful in launching and placing into orbit or on the desired trajectory in deep space as many as three out of four of our intended experiments? We should admit, quite frankly, that with distressingly few exceptions, we have not achieved complete success in any mission to date—success in the sense that the payload has been injected into orbit or into a deep space trajectory within reasonable limits of the planned flight objectives and in the sense that the payload has performed its mission satisfactorily.

Now lest you think I am being unduly harsh, let me hasten to say that our competitors in the U.S.S.R. have reported only their successful flights to date. We know they have had failures. We don't know, in any instance, whether even their announced successes have really come any closer to the intended objectives than have ours. And I am mindful of the truly great accomplishments that the United States has managed in the past 2 years in the space field. Indeed, I am proud to be one of those associated in a responsible way with this national effort where success or failure may well have implications far beyond the immediate civilian or military utility of the experiments we attempt.

We are the one nation in this world which has developed its position of leadership through the application of science and technology to the alleviation of man's back-breaking burdens while continuing to protect the rights of the individual citizen. For us to play second fiddle in this space business is to admit that we have lost a part of our genius for experiment—for taking a competitive risk—for searching out new facts about nature that ultimately will improve the well-being of mankind everywhere. No; we cannot and I am sure we will not fail to demonstrate once again that free men—when challenged—can rise to the heights and overcome the lead of those who build on the basis of the subjugation of the rights of the individual as they dictate to him the path he must take in response to the demands of the state.

Now that may seem to be a bit of histrionics to the sophisticates in this audience but it is the creed by which we must guide our actions in the days ahead. And we are not going to achieve our goals by wishful thinking about difficult technical problems.

But I'm afraid I'm being carried away by my own convictions about the basic capabilities that reside in our people while the realities of this business await attention. Having told you very, very briefly about the more important bits of realism that have been impressed upon us during the past year,

let me now tell you something of our thinking about the future.

First, as to program—we have had to face up to the fact that we simply cannot do everything that is proposed either by members of the scientific community, other agencies or by our own people. Some of the firing schedules we developed 9 months ago lacked the realism that now characterizes our planning.

Within the next year, I think you will be able to note an orderliness about the attack our people will be making in the space sciences area. Thus far we have been engaged in completing experiments planned for the International Geophysical Year. In fields such as astronomy, meteorology, and the physical sciences, we are developing a determined and well-planned program. Lead times for most of these experiments will be long and will call for continuing high levels of effort and support. Unless we can achieve this goal, we will lack, ultimately, the underpinning for the entire space program and may miss the really important discoveries that now lie hidden from our view.

We plan to concentrate our initial efforts in deep space on lunar missions—near miss, orbiting and hard and soft landings of payloads. In this program we will develop the techniques necessary to accomplish missions into deeper space and will use them for such missions as their reliability and the opportunity permits.

Second—as to basic research and advanced technology—we expect to support greater effort in the universities, other nonprofit institutions, and in industry in both basic research and in advanced development of systems components. In the development of better methods and devices in the fields of guidance, control, telemetry, auxiliary power units and sensors of all types—in all of these areas, we see the need for greater concentration of effort. Through such actions we hope to improve the reliability of the systems which will employ these components.

Third—as to booster systems—it is becoming increasingly apparent that greater efforts must be placed on simplification and reliability. As a corollary, it seems quite clear that continued attention must be given to reduction in the number and varieties of rockets and rocket booster systems for use in the space business. It is unlikely that these systems will become off-the-shelf production items in the foreseeable future. With limited numbers of firings in prospect, reliability can be expected only if the variety of systems is kept at a minimum. It will be cheaper to waste payload space in using an oversize booster that becomes reliable through continued use than to tailor boosters for each specific mission with the attendant lowered reliability that surely will result from infrequent use.

As we move ahead in our program, using newly developed vehicles of larger size and with more stages, the problems of achieving successful flights will increase. Recognizing the statistical success thus far achieved with the single- and two-stage missiles and the number of firings required in their development period, we must ask the question as to the probable success of a seven-stage vehicle required to land a man on the moon and return him to earth. Clearly, major advances in research and development techniques leading to greater vehicle reliability must be accomplished. Both the cost and development time will be prohibitive if vehicle development depends, as it does now, so heavily on "trial by fire." As a part of our program we are currently studying methods for development that might lead to earlier success of our flight vehicles, and the progress we make here may well determine how long it will take to do the advance missions that we are all so anxious to accomplish.

Finally—as in most other advanced technologies—a vast new area of materials research is being opened up by our space exploration requirements. As you well know, many materials exhibit different properties when used in radiation fields and in the vacuum of space. These materials must be improved or other materials found or developed to replace them. Magnesium, for example, sublimates in a vacuum—and effectively disappears. Another phenomenon—two moving metal surfaces in a vacuum tend to weld together by molecular adhesion. Our engineers and scientists are facing many such problems, but the list is far too long to catalog here.

My point is simply this: We have used up much of our missile technology. We have drawn heavily on our capital—the knowledge and experience accumulated by the military services, by industry and by NASA and others over the past 10 years or so. We must replenish that capital with new knowledge. From here on out, space research is going to be a matter of the same determined plugging away that has characterized aeronautics research—and, indeed all scientific endeavor.

As for Russian space achievements, we have learned that while they use their successes effectively for propaganda—and are able to hide their failures—their public claims have been, to the best of our knowledge, factual. Their scientists, however, are not the giants they would have us believe—they simply started working in this particular field 6 or 7 years before we did. It would be tragic if we had to admit they were working harder today than we. But they have set for us some targets by the success of their efforts thus far announced.

For instance, while we have no information which lead us to believe that the Russians have solved all of the guidance problems I mentioned earlier, obviously their guidance is good and obviously they are not standing still.

One of the most sensible men in our business today is my good friend, Dr. Lee DuBridge, president of the California Institute of Technology. I presume that most of you have read his article in the August issue of Harper's magazine. I think that he offers the most reasonable analysis of our present situation that I have seen lately.

Dr. DuBridge reminds us that conditions in space are completely outside all human experience up to now. He points out that the essential elements that sustain life—among them air, water, and food, as well as fuel for the craft—are missing. All these things, including instruments and other kinds of equipment, will have to be carried along with the astronaut, creating the biggest problem in logistics that has ever faced an expedition into the unknown.

Dr. DuBridge goes on to say that at the presently unattainable rate of 93,000 miles per hour—the speed required to overcome the gravitational attraction of the Sun—it would take 3 weeks to arrive at Mars, more than 3 years to visit Neptune, and 28,000 years to reach Alpha Centauri, the nearest star.

He emphasizes that maneuvering in space calls for totally new techniques of motion. No object in orbit can overtake another one, or lie in wait for it. Instead, it must be intercepted by a trajectory based on complex calculations, and on adjustments in course and speed of the utmost exactness.

The energy requirements for space vehicles are most formidable, and Dr. DuBridge cites the problem of sending a single man with a minimum amount of equipment (weighing in all about 1 ton) on a trip to the moon and back. A rocket with about 300,000 pounds of thrust—and we have such rockets—will carry him to the vicinity of the moon. But the weight of fuel needed to

land him on its surface will treble the necessary thrust raising it to 900,000 pounds. To bring him back and land him safely on the earth increases this to at least 5 million pounds of thrust—several times the amount provided by the biggest single rocket engine now under development by NASA.

In spite of these difficulties, and others equally challenging to engineers and physiologists, Dr. DuBridge is not discouraged; nor am I. We share the belief that space exploration by mankind within the solar system is both feasible and necessary—that it is indeed inevitable—and that it may offer rewards enough, in knowledge and in practical benefits yet unknown, to keep humanity occupied for the next hundred years. We recognize that the total cost will be colossal, but that the unforeseen—and unforeseeable—dividends, spread out over the years, will justify the cost.

Some Americans, as I and no doubt many of you have learned, have quite a different outlook. The other morning I had breakfast in the coffee shop of a Washington hotel. Two men were at an adjoining table. One was in a table-banging temper. When he mentioned what he called "this space folderol," I naturally pricked up my ears. I confess that I eavesdropped a little which wasn't hard since he had a powerful voice and made no attempt to lower it.

Among other things, he said—and I quote—"We had a 3-inch rain in Washington last Saturday. So what happened? The drains need working over so badly that a good deal of the city was flooded. People had to swim away from their cars."

"Now," he went on to say, "with a situation like that, right here in Washington, why in the name of commonsense are so many millions being spent on such nonsense as shooting a lot of hardware to the Moon? Who cares about the Moon? There's plenty to do down here without wasting money on things like that."

There is, of course, a fundamental difference between solving the problem of overloaded storm drains and sewers in Washington and conducting research and development in space. For the drainage problem there is a ready solution needing only money to complete the loop. Research in space and the development of useful applications of knowledge gained through that research requires imagination, courage, and lots of money. It may well prove to be one of the most exciting and profitable ventures of all time. But it is so easy to be carried away by our own enthusiasms to the point where we begin to ignore realities. It is obvious that the man I overheard is not convinced that research, and particularly research in space holds much promise for him.

Naturally, I do not agree with the gentleman's opinion about this matter. I do, however, concede that he had a right to his opinion and I am afraid that there are many others like him—persons who are less than excited over trips to the Moon and the building of way stations in space. Our problem—yours and mine—is to be as responsible as possible in our public utterances in this field. Overstatements of wonders that are to come may be exciting to some people—but I seriously doubt that those on whose understanding we must depend for continuing support will be thus convinced.

Speaking of support—you will note that I have said nothing directly about costs. That is a story in itself with which most of you have some familiarity. I would say only that space program costs will increase substantially in the years ahead if we are permitted to carry out the programs now believed to be desirable and necessary in both the civilian and military fields.

If you term this a sobering picture, I have made my point. But I do not intend it to

be a pessimistic one. Our horizons will be bounded only by the limits of our imaginations, our ability to perform responsibly the tasks we undertake and by our ability thus to convince the Congress and the public of the worth and urgency of our programs. It is high adventure we are experiencing—let us be worthy of our trust.

Depressed Domestic Mining and Mineral Industries

SPEECH

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 177) declaring the sense of Congress on the depressed domestic mining and mineral industries affecting public and other lands.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, first I would like to add my word of commendation to the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for bringing this resolution not only to the committee but to the House floor for action.

Certainly no harm can come from the passage of such a resolution, and possibly a great deal of good may result.

While this resolution is directed to the executive branch of Government, I am confident nothing will be accomplished until Congress itself decides to protect the American mining industry from complete destruction through the importation of foreign mineral products.

It is the importation of foreign minerals that has destroyed the American mining industry and will continue to destroy the American mining industry until tariffs and quotas are levied on such imports. Congress sits idly by and condemns the executive branch for not protecting the industry through the peril point and escape clause in the Reciprocal Trade Act.

With one hand the Congress directs the executive branch and the State Department of the executive branch to contract with these foreign countries for the imports of their mineral products, and then on the other hand when these imports do come in and do flood our market and put our mining industry out of business, they condemn the executive branch for not invoking the peril point and the escape clause provisions of the act.

The responsibility, Mr. Chairman, is that of Congress. It is Congress that represents the people of these United States and the industries of these United States. It is Congress and Congress alone that has the authority to levy import tariffs, quotas, and duties. That authority, that responsibility, and that duty is placed upon the shoulders of Congress, and we cannot shift it to some other branch of Government.

Those who espouse the one-world philosophy contend that we must keep our borders free to all foreign imports, and if we have an industry which cannot compete with foreign competition, the companies engaged in such industry should go out of business and the people employed in such industry should find work elsewhere because, they contend that Americans, with all their ingenuity and efficiency, must be able to compete with countries less fortunate than ours.

This argument, Mr. Chairman, does not take account of the fact that our industries and our mines are not given an opportunity to compete on the same basis with foreign industry and foreign mines. This argument does not take into account the fact that the cost of operation of a mine or an industry in the United States cannot start on an equal footing with its foreign competitors.

That argument does not take into account the fact that the cost of operation of a domestic mine or a domestic industry, which must be added to the cost of the product before we can hope to begin to compete, are such items as salaries, taxes, and foreign aid.

Competitors of the American mining industry operating foreign mines are able to hire help working for one-half or one-third of the salary that must be paid to American workmen. Not only that, but they are working 12 hours a day 7 days of the week, where labor in the United States operates under wage-hour laws, minimum wage laws, a cost-of-living standard that is being forced higher and higher annually. The labor expense, which is a large part of the domestic mining cost cannot be offset by efficiency in operation.

The second thing the internationalists forget in their contention that domestic industry must be more efficient to compete with foreign industry and foreign minerals, is taxes. The internationalists would like to have us forget that our foreign competitors are not required to add to the cost of their production, the defense of their country. The American taxpayer defends them. The American mine and the American mining industry carries a heavy burden of taxes to defend their competitors in these foreign countries. American labor carries a heavy burden of taxes to defend, if you please, the laborers in these foreign countries who are in competition with them. Yes, the American producer is required to add to his product the cost of the defense of not only the peoples of these foreign countries, but the very industries that are in competition with them. This cost must be added to the cost of the domestic product, all of which is free to the foreign competitor.

Not only is the domestic mining industry and domestic labor defending them, but they are at the same time required to finance these countries for the operation of their own government. Through foreign economic aid and public assistance, we are constructing public powerplants and reclamation projects for the nations within whose borders the competing mines are located. They are not required to pay taxes to finance these

programs in their country. The American taxpayer, the American miner, and the American laborer are carrying that burden for them—a burden which must be added to the product we are producing and must be added to the cost of our minerals before we are permitted to even begin to compete with foreign imports.

The third unfair competition the American mining industry is required to meet, and which is added to the cost of the product produced domestically, was brought out forcefully on the House floor last week when we were debating the extension of Public Law 480.

Not only are the American industrialist, the American laborer, and the American miner required to pay taxes to maintain the agricultural support program, but in addition to that, we turn around and give to the people of these competing countries the food and fiber necessary for them to be able to live on a starvation wage that is being paid by the mines in these foreign countries.

Not only is the domestic mining industry required to pay taxes to maintain and defend his foreign competitor, and at the same time compelled to compete with low salaries and low standards of living, but in addition to that, he is forced through Public Law 480, through our foreign aid program, and through these other assistance programs to provide the food, free of charge in many instances, that goes into the household of the laboring man employed by these competing industries.

No, Mr. Chairman, the internationalists argue that if the American industrialist and the American miner are not able to compete with foreign industry and foreign minerals through greater efficiency, greater per capita and greater per hour production, then they should go out of business.

Equalize these burdens, Mr. Chairman, and American industry and American mines will meet the competition of any country in the world. Equalize the variance in the standard of living, equalize the variance in the salary differential, require them to pay for the food that the American taxpayer has purchased from the American farmer, require them to levy their own taxes to finance their own public works programs, and, Mr. Chairman, require them to levy their own taxes to pay for their own defense and the defense of the rest of the free world, and our mines and our industries will compete with the mines and industries of any country in the entire free world.

Until that is done, it is the duty and the obligation of this Congress to levy upon the foreign importer the cost of this unequal burden that is levied upon the American producer, the American laborer, and American industry, through an import tariff or an import duty, or at least, Mr. Chairman, an import quota.

I sincerely hope this House will pass this resolution. I hope some good will come from it, but I know, as every Member on this House floor must know, that this Congress cannot shift its responsibility and that this problem cannot be

solved until Congress is willing to fulfill the obligation and duty reposed in it by the Constitution and protect these industries as the Founding Fathers provided they should be protected and, as we have learned by experience, they must be protected if the economy of this Nation and the strength of this Nation is to be preserved.

East, West Comparisons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the 13th in the series of articles written by George W. Healy, editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, who accompanied Vice President Nixon on his recent trip to the Soviet Union:

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Aug. 21, 1959]

EAST, WEST COMPARISONS—FINDS FRIENDLY SPIRITS, MATERIAL WELL-BEING

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

(Thirteenth of a series)

WASHINGTON.—It would have been very easy to have had breakfast in Warsaw, lunch in Kefauver, and dinner in New Orleans the day we returned to the free world.

Our TWA jet left Warsaw about 10 a.m., Polish time, was in Iceland about noon and in Washington about 4 p.m. An Eastern Air Lines turbojet was scheduled to take off from Washington at 6 p.m., Washington time, and to be in New Orleans before 8 p.m., New Orleans time.

Instead of making this connection, I stayed in Washington to get rest, to write a summation for the Associated Press and to reflect.

What had we found in Russia, Siberia, and Poland that we did not expect to find?

How were the lives of people in Moscow, Leningrad, Novosibirsk, Sverdlovsk, and Warsaw different from the lives of people in New Orleans?

All members of our party, I believe, feel that we found a much more friendly spirit—outside Moscow—than we expected to find.

On my own part, I found Russia's life much more capitalistic—outwardly—than I expected to find it. Although hotel employees and guides, all employees of Intourist, the official travel agency run by the Government, declined tips, I found none who refused the gift of an automatic pencil or of chewing gum. All seemed interested in earning rubles to buy things for their own use.

For years after the revolution of 1918, I was told, Gum's—Moscow's largest store—was closed. It had been operated as a capitalistic venture for the profit of its owners. As I understand the situation, the Communists closed this big store because it was a symbol of capitalism and because the people should be taught to obtain necessary goods by cooperative effort. The purchase of luxury goods was forbidden.

Gum's (it's pronounced Gooms) is open again and its shelves are loaded with luxury goods. I won't vouch for the quality of these goods, but Russians are buying them.

Gum's is owned and operated by the state, but for all intents and purposes it seems to be run just like big department stores in the United States.

As to dress, nowhere save in Warsaw were men and women as well clothed as are the men and women in New Orleans. Even with Warsaw, I believe New Orleans has the edge.

Physical facilities in no city which we visited can compare with physical facilities in New Orleans. Take the airports, for instance. There, at Moisant International Airport, the passenger is told at what gate he should board his plane. At Moscow Airport and the others we visited, there was just one gate. When that gate is opened you walk out on the big ramp and try to find a plane with a large number on its fuselage matching the plane number on your ticket.

The large hotels which I saw have one entrance and exit. You can't walk in the Baronne Street entrance and go out at University Place or in the Gravier Street entrance and out the Common Street side. One member of our party expressed suspicion that this single entrance-exit makes it easier for somebody to keep tabs on somebody.

The Russian jets, as mentioned earlier, don't reverse their jetstream, as do modern American jets, to achieve braking. They release two parachutes from the tail section to serve as brakes. I believe the technical name is drobrachutes.

If there is a variety of food in Russia, I looked in the wrong places. It definitely is possible to get tired of borscht, caviar and vodka. Restaurants where we ate in Poland offered a greater variety.

Aside from physical things, I found a pride on the part of Russian people in their workmanship and in their plants which I had been told I would not find.

No man could have escorted a group of visitors through an industrial plant more proudly than a superintendent escorted us through the stamping mill at Novosibirsk.

That was the day the party was split in several parts and several of our drivers got lost. The bus I was riding, fortunately, reached the main entrance to the plant. Standing on the steps there was what appeared to be an official reception committee. Vice-President Nixon, however, was not with our group.

Austin Kiplinger, the Washington magazine and newsletter man, nattily dressed and wearing a hat, walked up to the reception committee. He and the rest of us were greeted warmly. Our inspection of the big plant was started, with hundreds of off-duty workmen following us. Halfway through the inspection we met Mr. Nixon, surrounded by a handful of followers.

I suspect his driver took him to the wrong entrance. The plant superintendent who was showing us the works, I believe, thought Mr. Kiplinger was Mr. Nixon.

A Constituent Writes About the National Science Foundation Summer Institute Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a thoughtful letter from Kingsley W. Wightman, of Oakland, Calif.,

who participated in a summer institute in Utah this year under the auspices of the National Science Foundation. This is a sincere and unsolicited endorsement of a Federal program. As such, I believe it will be of interest to all Members of Congress, and under permission to extend my remarks, I include it in the RECORD, as follows:

Congressman JEFFERY COHELAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As a participant in the summer institute program of the National Science Foundation, I wish to report to you my impressions of this program.

This summer I attended a science institute for secondary schoolteachers at Brigham Young University in Utah. I firmly believe that this institute provided one of the finest programs in secondary science education any teacher could possibly have. My background in chemistry, physics, and geology has been vastly broadened and deepened by what I learned this summer, and I feel much more qualified to instruct my students now than I did before I attended the institute.

I also feel that Brigham Young University is particularly suited for offering a program of this type because of its outstanding facilities, its excellent staff, and its comfortable living quarters.

I sincerely believe that the summer institute program of the National Science Foundation should be carried on indefinitely. In my opinion, it is one of the finest pieces of legislation for the improvement of education that has ever been enacted.

Cordially yours,

KINGSLEY W. WIGHTMAN.

Rockefeller and Stassenism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in a previous insertion on page A6694 of the August 3 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I called attention to the fact that the type of thinking going on in the Rockefeller camp is not only contrary to the facts and the polls, but is countering the cohesive forces of the Republican Party which have been steamrolling into action, and, moreover, have been more recently, leveling some very difficult obstacles.

I also stated that the type of public relations being produced by the Rockefeller forces is a great disservice to the Governor. I do want to reiterate and reemphasize this fact by pointing out that the statements made by his aids, and subsequently by Rockefeller himself, smacked of Stassenism, or in other words, a pathetic attempt to initiate another "dump Nixon campaign."

I think Rockefeller should take a lesson from history and read the papers which have recorded the sad story of those who made previous, and similar blunders. One article in particular which I cite as a case in point was written by Ralph McGill and appeared in the August 24 issue of the Washington Evening Star.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include at this point, the article by Mr. McGill:

ROCKEFELLER'S DENIALS RAPPEL—REPUDIATION OF STATEMENTS ABOUT POLLS IS LINKED TO CONFERENCE WITH DEWEY

(By Ralph McGill)

Fiddling Bob Taylor, who once was Governor of Tennessee and later a U.S. Senator, was good at a hoedown or a verbal knock-down.

He was a Democrat, and once, in campaigning in Republican east Tennessee where political factionalism was about to break the safety valve on the emotional boilers, he flung out, in his opponent's hometown, the damning verse:

"Oh, he wiggled in and he wiggled out
And left the people all in doubt
As to whether the varmint that made the track
Was going out or coming back."

The lines of this biting quatrain were hardly said before mountain pistols were out, but cooler heads prevailed and there was no bloodshed.

It grieves me to say that I thought of this little doggerel on reading the political dispatches from Albany, N.Y., in which Gov. Nelson Rockefeller issued categorical denial of statements attributed to him in one of those not-for-direct-quotation chats while he was in Puerto Rico at the national conference of Governors.

For a couple of weeks, without denial, statements had been attributed to the Governor as follows:

1. He had set a November deadline for making a decision as to what he would do about becoming a candidate for the GOP nomination.

2. He would make his decision on the basis of the public opinion polls at the time—the polls would be the controlling factor.

In a press conference in Albany, following a weekend meeting with former Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, who seems to be masterminding the unofficial Rockefeller campaign, Mr. Rockefeller repudiated the attributions. They were, he said, not true.

Now, I am one who worries and bites nails about what seems to me to be too frequent lack of responsibility by a free press. But if the Governor will pardon me, I do not believe that the able, experienced newspapermen who covered the Puerto Rican conference could have been so far off base as to be slapped down with a complete denial. Governor Rockefeller is, I am sure, a charming gentleman, but he looks even worse in denial than he did before.

It was no secret that the statements about polls being a controlling factor was an unwise one. It is not yet possible to take the pulse of the American people by polls and be confident of the right answer. The mood of the people changes with events. Polls are one reason why the campaign of Senator JOHN KENNEDY is not advancing, but standing where it was some months ago. He has relied too much on too many polls in too many categories of age, occupation, etc.

One readily can understand that Governor Dewey would be alarmed about any reference to polls as the determining factor. Polls selected him President of the United States in 1948. And a lot of newspapermen, in the cold gray dawn of the morning after, took an oath that as long as they thereafter lived they would go out and see for themselves rather than depend on the statisticians.

It was politically necessary for Governor Rockefeller somehow to manage to change the image of himself as having no capacity for decision until informed by the facilities of Madison Avenue poll takers. But the

method of it and the outright denial means simply that he is saying veteran political reporters at Puerto Rico were utterly and completely in error. He didn't have the grace to say he may not have made himself clear.

This, if the Governor will pardon me, is difficult to accept. It is especially so since he did not make up his mind to deny the attributed statements until he had taken a poll of Governor Dewey, one of the most pragmatic of political advisers.

If the press at Puerto Rico was, indeed, entirely in error, there should have been an immediate correction on the day following their publication. The opinions attributed to the Governor assuredly should not have been allowed free circulation for 2 weeks to be, finally, denied after a conference with Governor Dewey.

"Nelse," as the public relations humanizers seem to be asking us to call Governor Rockefeller, doesn't look too good in this little controversy. The image of him is more fuzzy than before.

Good To "Be Back Home" in Moscow After Siberia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the ninth in the series of articles written by George W. Healy, editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, who accompanied Vice President Nixon on his recent trip to the Soviet Union:

GOOD TO "BE BACK HOME" IN MOSCOW AFTER SIBERIA—ROUGH LANDING FAILS TO DAMPEN ENTHUSIASM

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

Moscow.—If anyone had told me 2 weeks ago that I'd ever be talking about it being great to "be back home" in Moscow, I'd have told him he was off his rocker.

After 4 days in Siberia, that's the way most members of the party accompanying Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON were talking.

When we took off for Novosibirsk most of us kept our rooms in the Ukraina Hotel, Moscow. Aeroflot, the Russian airline, cut our baggage weight allowance, and we had to have some place to keep our gear.

Our rough landing returning to Moscow failed to dampen the enthusiasm of members of our party about getting back to the Ukraina. It doesn't compare with first-class hotels in New Orleans, but it's a happy home compared with Hotel No. 2 in Novosibirsk and the Bolshoi Urals in Sverdlovsk.

At least you have your own shower, with hot water, at the Ukraina.

LONG WAY TO GO

The Russian people have no illusions about living standards in the United States being higher than those in the Soviet Union. Their master's voice, that of Nikita S. Khrushchev, repeatedly tells them that the United States is ahead but that the U.S.S.R. is catching up—fast. In 7 years, he has said, the U.S.S.R. will be ahead.

Just a few casual observations lead me to believe that Mr. K. is wrong—definitely. The U.S.S.R. has too far to go.

People in the United States have not just hundreds of things that people in the

U.S.S.R. don't have, but literally thousands of things.

A case in point is the telephone book. No Russian city I visited had a telephone directory. If you didn't know the number of the person or company you wanted to call, you just didn't call them.

It took most of our group a couple of days to learn how to work the eccentric dial telephones in the Hotel Ukraina. Then, when we moved to Siberia there were no telephones or telephones that didn't work.

ICEBREAKER "LENIN"

Cameras sold as luxury goods in Russian stores apparently are not up to date. Workmen at the hydroelectric station we visited near Novosibirsk obviously had never seen a Polaroid camera before Walter Ridder, of the Ridder newspapers, took their pictures with Vice President Nixon and immediately delivered prints to them. They were amazed.

Reports that Russian women carry big bags because the stores have no paper in which to wrap their purchases are false; but the paper used in the country is of inferior quality.

On the basis of a layman's observation, it appeared to me that the Mississippi Shipping Co.'s liner, *del Mar*, launched soon after the end of World War II, is a more modern vessel than the pride of the Russian maritime service, the icebreaker *Lenin*, which is about the *del Mar*'s size. The *del Mar* certainly presents fewer fire hazards than the *Lenin*, with its heavy use of plywood.

This comparison, of course, doesn't apply to method of propulsion—inasmuch as the Russians say they are going to run the *Lenin* with atomic power.

OUT OF REACH

Thousands of things Americans accept as everyday necessities rather than luxuries apparently are out of the reach of most Russians. The United States of America has many wonderful things about which Russia apparently is yet to learn.

In all of Moscow, I saw not a single filling station. I did see a taxi driver take a can of fuel from the trunk of his taxi and pour its contents into his gasoline tank. I also saw another taxi driver pumping up a flat tire with an old-fashioned hand pump.

"Old hands" in Moscow told me that gasoline is obtainable at depots operated by the Government and that the price is astronomical. Russia unquestionably has made great progress in recent years and continues to make progress.

Still, on the basis of Mr. Khrushchev's public utterances, I believe that his country is a great deal farther behind America than he thinks.

If ever I go back to Russia, I'm going to write to Mr. Khrushchev, or his successor or assigns, before I go and say:

"Please, in your next 5-year plan or 7-year plan won't you include: A telephone book with every telephone; a stopper for every washbasin; restaurants where the patron doesn't have to wait interminably for service?"

RUSSIAN BUREAUCRACY

Westbrook Pegler, who remained in Moscow while we went to Siberia, told me that the longer he remained the more he was convinced that the Russian bureaucracy is the most inefficient in the world.

Bob Considine, another columnist, went stronger. "If these guys run their military establishment like they run the rest of their business," he said, "they couldn't lick Peru."

Remembering the terrific fight the Russians made in World War II, when men wise in Russian affairs were predicting that they could not stand up to the Nazis, I can't

go along with opinions which hold that the Soviet Union is weak.

The Russians must be spending a large part of their budget for new weapons. Mr. Nixon mentioned 25 percent of national income. To the best of my knowledge his estimate was not challenged.

Despite heavy military spending, Russia is improving living standards. The tragedy is that most of the people seem to credit communism alone for their improvement and to give no credit to their own industry.

Russians are reminded constantly of the people's suffering in the reigns of the Czars—just as Poles are reminded of the evils of autocratic regimes in that nation.

What both Russians and Poles have today probably is better than the serfdom of earlier years; but what the people behind the Iron Curtain don't know is how well off they really would be if they enjoyed freedom.

They're moving; but I don't think they're moving fast enough to catch us.

HOUSING DESPERATE

The housing situation in Moscow seems more desperate than in other cities we visited. Scores of flats are under construction, but the work seems slow.

Esthetically, these buildings leave much to be desired. They have the disadvantage of looking like Harlem tenements, with the advantage of being placed with some open ground around them.

Russians living in other parts of the country can't move to Moscow, the Soviet showcase, unless the Government grants them a special permit.

BRIDGE OVER SIBERIA

Bridge players generally get together, no matter in what part of the world they may be.

It wasn't long on this trip before Frank Holman of the New York Daily News, produced two decks of cards and the game was on.

Jinx Falkenburg, of television and Newsday; Ruth Montgomery, of the Hearst headline service; Alfred F. "Mike" Flynn, of Pan American World Airways, and I were the most avid devotees of the game. Occasionally, Alan L. Otten, of the Wall Street Journal, "cut in."

Because she has long legs and is athletic, Jinx was designated to be first on the plane after every stop and to "grab" the four seats of the Aeroflot plane with a table.

The teams of Falkenburg-Flynn and Montgomery-Healy played for the bridge championship of Siberia at 40,000 feet over Europe and Asia.

We know it was for the championship, because a Russian kibitzer—who knew where every member of our party was every hour—seldom took his eyes off the game, but obviously didn't understand it. If he didn't know bridge, nobody in Siberia did.

Back in Moscow, as we planned to forsake the Aeroflot planes to travel to Poland in a Trans World Airlines 707-121 jet, an arrangement was made to save Jinx Falkenburg the run to the ramp every takeoff time. Ruth Montgomery saw her old friend, Charles Thomas, former Secretary of the Navy and now president of TWA, in a restaurant and made a deal with him. Either those seats with the table were going to be reserved for the bridge game or TWA was going to have some new hostesses.

The match was seesaw for days, with first one team and then the other in front. After more than a score of rubbers were played, over a distance exceeding 12,000 miles, the Falkenburg-Flynn team was the winner by a bare 200 points.

Public Law 480 Through the Looking Glass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the August 20, 1959, issue of the Journal of Commerce concerning the recent extension of Public Law 480:

OUR KIND OF PEOPLE

"It really looks as though the Americans are going to extend Public Law 480 once again." The Mad Hatter laid down his newspaper and stared fixedly over his bifocals at Alice.

"Is that good?" Alice asked.

"Yes and no. I daresay the Americans think it's good. It means they can trade more of something they don't want and can't use for more of something else they don't want and can't use. Sometimes I suppose it's better to have more of something else than more of just plain something."

"Stop. You're talking in circles again," Alice said sharply. "What has all this nonsense got to do with public law—what was it?"

"Four eighty. Let me explain this: The Americans grow a lot more wheat than they can eat or sell; other things, too, but let's take wheat. The Government buys what they can't use or get rid of. It's been doing that for years. Now it has so much wheat and other crops there's hardly any place left to store it. Soon there'll be no room for people."

"Dear me! Why don't they stop growing so much wheat, then? Or people?"

"I knew I should have never broached this subject to a woman," the Hatter said angrily. "That's very complicated. I'm talking about Public Law 480. Under Public Law 480 the Government can dispose of some of this by . . ."

"Dispose of it? Does that mean give it away?"

"Well, no. They give some away, but they can't give it all away. Like I said, it's very complicated. Some North American farmers still sell their wheat overseas. So do some other countries. But the American Government pays very high prices for the wheat it buys; it does that to keep prices up. So if it gave away all its wheat, prices would break because nobody is going to buy anything he can get for free. Then the farmers and other countries producing wheat would be very angry. They are angry anyway, of course."

"Then you mean they sell it?"

"Well, yes, by which, of course, I mean no. Let's say the Americans 'sell' \$100,000 worth of wheat they don't want to Wamaria; you remember Wamaria? Splendid little country. Well, the Wamarians either pay for it in metals or in \$100,000 worth of their own currency, the wampa."

"Oh, this is beginning to sound very tiresome," Alice said impatiently. "Then the Americans do sell it. What's so unusual about that? They can use the metals or go out and spend the wampa someplace else."

"Not so fast," the Hatter said, raising an admonishing finger. "Not everything is as simple as it looks. The Americans don't need or want Wamarian metals any more

than they want or need their own wheat. So far as the wampa is concerned, it isn't worth much anyplace outside of Wamaria; it isn't even worth much in Wamaria. Do you follow?"

Alice looked thoughtful. "It is beginning to sound interesting, now."

"Yes, and what happens is, instead of just being stuck with surplus wheat the Americans are now stuck with metals they don't want, with wampa or both. Sometimes, though, they'll use some of the wampa to build, say—a road in Wamaria. Then they'll loan or give the road to the Wamarian Government."

"That is very curious," Alice replied. "Now let me think. If they want to give Wamaria wheat, why not give them that and forget the road? Or if they want to give them a road, why not build the road and forget the wheat? Why make it so complicated?"

"You just don't know the North Americans, my dear. To know them is not only to sympathize with them but to like them. Whether they sell their wheat is of no importance to them. What is important is to get rid of it; and, in the process of getting rid of it to look like they're selling it. Remember, appearances are very important in North America."

"Still, it still make some sense," Alice said. "I suppose they put all those wampa aside for a rainy day; then when they need them they'll spend them."

The Mad Hatter laughed uproariously. "Indeed they won't. Yes, they accumulate them, just like they accumulate wheat. But the only way they got any wampas out of Wamaria was promising that they wouldn't spend them, except when and if the Wamarian Government said it was OK, and that will probably be never."

Alice sighed again, smoothed down her dress and looked dreamily up into the trees that arched above the garden. "You know what, Hatter," she said after a minute. "I think I'd like North Americans. They sound like our kind of people."

Home to Freedom: Some Conclusions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the 14th in the series of articles written by George W. Healy, editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, who accompanied Vice President NIXON on his recent tour of the Soviet Union:

HOME TO FREEDOM: SOME CONCLUSIONS—MORE GOOD THAN BAD WILL COME FROM THE KHRUSHCHEV VISIT

(By George W. Healy Jr.)

Back home and, thank you, singing "God Bless America."

Looking back on 2 weeks behind the Iron Curtain—2 weeks that seemed a long, long time—calls for expression of some opinions and conclusions.

Among other things, it seems to me that most Americans—and I certainly was one of them—have underestimated the economic growth of the Soviet Union.

Prior to the revolution of 1917 the industrial output of Russia was one-eighth of

the industrial output of the United States. Nikita S. Khrushchev told us that Russia's industrial output in 1958 had risen to one-half of the U.S. industrial output. Our personal observations indicate that he was not exaggerating—much. Observers better qualified than I to judge industrial capacity have estimated that Russia's production is about one-third of that of the United States.

"We are confident that the day is not far off when our country will overtake our American partner in the peaceful economic competition," said Mr. Khrushchev, "and then will at some point come alongside America, salute her with a signal and move on."

Russia may catch the United States in industrial production, but I don't believe that the day when she will do it is not far off.

Mr. Khrushchev, who impressed me as a cross between an old-line ward heeler and a Hoffa-type labor boss, unquestionably is cocky. As a consequence, I believe that he underestimates the U.S. capabilities.

This brings up the matter of the exchange of visits between President Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchev.

We first heard of arrangements for this exchange while we were in Russia. Since the announcement came from the White House and from the Kremlin, some of our group expressed fear that Mr. Eisenhower had "pulled the rug out from under" Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON. This was not the case. Discussions looking toward the exchange had been in progress for some time, and I am sure the Vice President was informed of these discussions just as the President was kept informed of Mr. Nixon's activities on the trip.

The suggestion that the President had assigned his brother, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, to make the trip to "take the play away from" Mr. Nixon was published by some columnists before we left America. I believe there was no truth in this suggestion. Dr. Eisenhower made the trip for precisely the same reason several others of us made it. We were members of the President's Advisory Committee for the U.S. Exhibition in Moscow and, as such, were invited to become members of Mr. Nixon's official party.

I might add that if Dr. Eisenhower took any play away from Mr. Nixon, or attempted to take any play away from him, it happened while I was looking the other way. I'm sure it didn't happen.

Should Mr. Khrushchev have been invited to come to the United States?

Many Americans object to Mr. Khrushchev's coming. A New Orleans pamphleteer, Kent Courtney, contends that the coming visit "is the second biggest step forward for world communism since the Russian Revolution of 1917—second only to the Soviet-United States alliance during World War II."

In this connection, I believe it apropos to quote the conclusion of an editorial from the St. Louis Review, a Catholic publication:

"Our perspective . . . is somewhat different. It is based on the fact that Saul would not have become Paul unless he had taken the trip to Damascus."

"Obtuse as Nikita may be to the American way of life, he knows a great deal about industry and science, mines and the military, competition and enterprise. All that we can show him will only enable him to make a comparison between communism and capitalism. Khrushchev does not need a comparison—he needs a conversion."

"In heaven's name let us hope that he sees our churches, our altars, our Christians, our spiritual and corporal works of mercy. Let us hope that he sees an entirely new concept of man on his visit to our country. If we let this opportunity pass we may never

have another. Let's provide everything but the bolt of lightning that will knock him from his horse—and depend on God for that."

Personally, I think the prospect is that more good than bad will come from the Khrushchev visit. If, as Mr. Nixon believes, the Russian chief has concluded that America is weak he should have ample opportunity to see for himself that we are strong.

Mr. Nixon feels that it is better to talk with the Russians than to fight with them.

There can be no question that Mr. Khrushchev preaches communism as superior to capitalism. He preached that sermon to us—at the opening of the U.S. exhibition. If he attempts to preach it again on his visit to the United States, I doubt that he will have any more conversions than he obtained in Sokolniki Park—where there were no defections from the West to the East.

As strong as is the desire of the Kremlin to spread communism throughout the world, I don't believe there is any danger of America going Communist through any action by Mr. Khrushchev, Mr. Kozlov, or any other Russian. If America goes Communist, it will be the fault or the doing of Americans.

Our greatest weakness lies in ourselves—in our failure to recognize that all the blessings which we have, which Russia does not have but which Russia seeks, stem from the freedom for which our forebears fought, freedom which we seldom appreciate enough.

I am in agreement with my friend Frank Holeman, of the New York Daily News, quoted earlier in this series, when he says:

"President Eisenhower was dead right when he said we can lose the struggle between free enterprise and a managed economy—and thus lose our freedom—unless all groups in the United States begin to exercise a lot of self-discipline."

"Worse than that, we can lose the economic and political hold if we keep raising prices. We can become a second-class power while we're gaily paying each other higher prices and wages unrelated to the real cost of production. In a few years, the Communists will be flooding world markets at rock-bottom prices, or below."

"As much as anything else, we need to reawaken our deep national pride, which seems to sleep between wars. Many Russians have enthusiasm for their way of life, believe it or not. All over the country are signs 'Work for the victory of communism.' We need the same kind of enthusiasm or more, for freedom."

I agree also that it would be better to die in an all-out atomic war than to live the way most Russians do, in a police state.

I've been there, and I'm glad I'm back.

Carey Letter and Lewis' Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following very interesting and enlightening column by David Lawrence on the subject of campaign contributions in retrospect, which appeared in the August 24, 1959, edition of the Washington Evening Star:

CAREY LETTER AND LEWIS' VIEWS—FORMER CIO CHIEF QUOTED ON QUID PRO QUO FOR POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

(By David Lawrence)

When the labor union bosses raise money to contribute to the campaigns of Members of Congress, must those who are elected disregard their personal convictions on the merits of proposed laws and do the bidding of the groups that furnished the funds? This issue seems to have been projected by James B. Carey, one of the top leaders of the AFL-CIO, whose recent letter to Members of Congress has caused a stir. He expresses gratitude to those who voted as labor wanted and wrote in bitter sarcasm to those who, having accepted campaign contributions from labor interests, voted against their wishes on the Landrum-Griffin bill.

Mr. Carey threatens reprisals at the ballot box, and apparently the labor unions will withhold contributions next time from those Members of Congress who refused to consider a campaign contribution as a bribe.

There is nothing unusual about Mr. Carey's letters to Members of Congress. He should not be criticized as being alone in his viewpoint. For what he has written is in line with CIO policy for years. Indeed, John L. Lewis, while active in the CIO, was characteristically frank about the meaning of a contribution from laboring men to the campaigns of candidates for office.

When the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, having accepted big contributions from labor unions for his 1936 campaign, said in the midst of a strike in 1937, something that the labor union leaders didn't like, Mr. Lewis declared publicly:

"It ill behooves one who has supped at labor's table and who has been sheltered in labor's house to curse with equal fervor and fine impartiality both labor and its adversaries when they become locked in deadly embrace."

In a biography of Mr. Lewis written by Saul D. Alinsky and published in 1949 by G. P. Putnam & Sons, the author tells of an interview with the labor leader during the Roosevelt regime. Mr. Lewis is quoted as having said:

"Everybody says I want my pound of flesh, that I gave Mr. Roosevelt \$500,000 for his 1936 campaign, and I want quid pro quo. The United Mine Workers and the CIO have paid cash on the barrel for every piece of legislation that we have gotten."

"We have the Wagner Act. The Wagner Act cost us many dollars in contributions which the United Mine Workers have made to the Roosevelt administration with the explicit understanding of a quid pro quo for labor. These contributions far exceed the notions held by the general public or the press. Is any one fool enough to believe for one instant that we gave this money to Roosevelt because we were spellbound by his voice? It is common knowledge that we spent approximately three quarters of a million dollars in the 1936 campaign. And you might be interested to know that the \$500,000 direct contribution wasn't my price, but was the figure named by the White House, and I was given approximately 48 hours to get that money."

"Certainly there was a quid pro quo—the right for labor to organize. But there was more than that. The sums we spent in 1936 were not only cash contributions that were made to the Democratic Party, but also were money expended in terms of salaries for organizers and other personnel who worked full time organizing and electioneering for Roosevelt. Radio time purchased, billboards, handbills, literature, and all other paraphernalia that are part and parcel of the process of being elected President of the United States didn't come gratis."

The same interview reveals that in 1938 when the tensions between Mr. Lewis and Mr. Roosevelt had eased off somewhat and the Democratic President was trying in primary contests to "purge" certain southern Democratic Senators who happened also to be antilabor, the United Mine Workers' chief rendered a helping hand. Again Mr. Lewis is quoted in the Saul Alinsky book as follows:

"Where did the money come from that Franklin D. Roosevelt siphoned into those Southern States to try to bolster up the fight against the anti-New Deal Senators? Where did the money come from?"

"I'll tell you where it came from. Right here, from the coffers of the United Mine Workers of America. It came by request of the President of the United States through one of his trusted aids. You tell this to the President, and if he questions it, and I'm certain that he will not, you may inform the President that I am perfectly willing to name names and sums, chapter, and verse, to satisfy any slight amnesia that there might be on this particular issue."

"You ask me for gratitude in terms of an administration that we have literally poured our life's blood into supporting. You wonder that I do not express the feeling that one should have for a great champion of labor. I say that labor's champion has to a large extent here been a bought and paid for proposition. There is nothing we should be grateful for when we paid cash on the barrelhead at the price demanded for it."

So the philosophy of the money raisers in labor's ranks hasn't changed much in the 20 years since John L. Lewis spoke. In the 1958 congressional campaign when the labor unions boasted that a majority of the House of Representatives was elected through their help, the Federal records show a relatively small sum was contributed. Big amounts were, however, donated largely to State organizations which do not come under the Federal laws requiring the reporting of contributions. It is estimated that labor raised approximately \$10 million. Much of it was spent to uphold laws compelling workers to forgo their civil rights and join unions.

Sverdlovsk, Off Limits to Most, Is Industry Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the eighth in the series of articles written by George W. Healy, editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, who accompanied Vice President Nixon on his recent trip to the Soviet Union:

SVERDLOVSK, OFF LIMITS TO MOST, IS INDUSTRY CENTER—NIXON PARTY WARMLY RECEIVED BY PEOPLE

(By George W. Healey, Jr.)

SVERDLOVSK, SIBERIA.—This old city, where the last of the Romanoffs were killed, is off limits for tourists.

Unless you obtain high level official permission, Sverdlovsk is a closed city. The Intourist Agency has no office here.

Just east of the Uran Mountains, in a natural corridor which provides the easiest passage through those mountains, Sverdlovsk has

grown rapidly in recent years—from 140,000 in 1926 to 775,000 in 1959.

The explanation? Simple. Many industrial plants were moved here from combat zones west of the mountains in World War II. More plants have been built in Sverdlovsk since the war—gaining the city the designation of "the Pittsburgh of Siberia."

Although Sverdlovsk is 880 miles west of Novosibirsk, the party of Vice President Richard M. Nixon, in three Russian jets, made the flight in no time at all. The planes covered the journey in 2 hours and there is a 2-hour time difference between the two cities. Thus we arrived in Sverdlovsk at the same hour that we left Novosibirsk.

Here we encountered a warm greeting—in cool weather, chilly enough at night for trench coats.

Unlike the low buildings of Novosibirsk, the buildings of Sverdlovsk—more Russian than Siberian—achieve heights of six or seven stories.

After Hotel No. 2 at Novosibirsk (and that's the only name we ever knew for that primitive establishment with eight in a room), the Bolshoi Ural Hotel in Sverdlovsk was a palace, even if your room was on the third floor and the shower—with the first hot water in several days—in the basement.

In front of the hotel is a beautiful plaza, complete with fountain.

The last day we were in Sverdlovsk a large crowd gathered in the plaza to see the Nixon party board buses and automobiles for transportation to the airport.

JUST POOR CAPITALIST

Several of us wandered into the plaza and were surrounded immediately by curious Russians. One, knowing a few words of English, principally "don't mention it," started an interrogation. A young woman, who explained that she was a teacher of Russian in a school in a nearby town, volunteered as interpreter.

She translated several respectful questions and my answers before the man who started the interrogation asked her to put a very long question to me. I asked her what he was saying and she told me she preferred not to translate. The man continued to talk and I recognized something that sounded like "capitalistic aristocrat."

I told the teacher that I thought the man was inferring that I was a capitalistic aristocrat and that I'd appreciate her telling him that I was no such thing but just a poor capitalist trying to learn something about Russia.

DRAWS LAUGH

She translated what I said, and most of the men and women laughed loudly.

Then the young woman explained to me that the man, who left when the laughing started, was attempting to start a political argument and that she did not desire to translate under the circumstances.

Jack Steele, Washington correspondent for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, told me he had a similar, more violent experience. A man attempted to start an argument with him aboard a public bus in Novosibirsk. A woman on the bus interceded, gave the man a verbal going over and stopped his talk by socking him on the jaw.

Jack said he learned firsthand why Russian women won their recent track meet with American women.

They might do very well in the ring, too.

STORE WELL STOCKED

A visitor to Russia, I believe, expecting a great shortage of consumer goods, might be surprised by offerings of the largest department store in Sverdlovsk. It's a four-story building, with wide stairways but no elevators; and every department seemed well stocked. There was an abundance of luxury

goods (it seemed to me of doubtful quality), and people were buying.

In the men's department were all kinds of ties. None that I examined had any kind of label. And, strangely, I didn't see a single male shopper in the store who wore a tie. That may be the reason the cravat stock was so large.

I asked a young Russian how its people seemed to have so much more money to spend than I expected. "Take my case," said he. "I have a salary of 2,000 rubles a month (\$200). My mother, my father, and I live in one of the new apartments. We have two rooms, a bedroom and a parlor and a kitchen and bath. I sleep in the parlor. Our rent is 80 rubles a month (\$8). Naturally, I have money to spend for souvenirs."

This in a country where small tomatoes sold for 6 rubles (60 cents) each in Moscow and for 4 rubles (40 cents) each in the remote city of Novosibirsk. Wool caps like the Cossacks were sold for 55 rubles (\$5.50), but more modern attire was higher. Cheap-looking raincoats were priced at 500 rubles (\$50).

Editors of the western Siberia newspapers called on us at the Bolshoi Urals Hotel and—of course—we treated them to vodka and caviar.

Reciprocating, they invited those of us who didn't care to visit a powerplant to be their guests the following afternoon at a lakeside picnic.

When they called for us in a bus they drove past dozens of well populated, sandy beaches to a desolate spot on the lake—where the shore was all rocks. Crosby Noyes of the Washington Star and I attempted to swim. The air was warm, but the water was like ice. We stayed in only a few minutes.

None of the hosts, including a photographer who doubled as a comedian, could speak any English. Our only Russian words, were *dah* (yes), *nyet* (no), *zah meer* (to peace), *spaseeba* (thank you) and perhaps one or two others.

The hosts had brought plenty of vodka, smoked salmon sandwiches and caviar, and the comedian-photographer put the emphasis on the vodka when he began serving.

CUPS LEAK VODKA

Either Russian paper cups are not up to the quality of American paper cups, or Russian vodka is more potent than you think. As the comedian-photographer would pour a few ounces of vodka into a cup it would all filter through the cup's bottom before he could hand it to the guest for whom it was intended.

After trying two cups, then three, then four—placed inside each other—our server finally found that seven cups, used as one, would hold a drink.

We never did learn why our hosts drove us past those fine sandy beaches to the forsaken spot where we tried to swim. Maybe they didn't want their friends to know they were running around with Americans.

Chet Holifield: A Man of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, big issues need big men. Control and development of atomic energy is a big issue. Our colleague, CHET HOLIFIELD, is a big man.

Conscientious, practical, hardworking, warmly friendly and a truly humble man, CHET HOLIFIELD is in many respects a Congressman's Congressman.

It is a pleasure to see the recognition given to our friend in the New York Times, August 24. Under a previous unanimous consent I include the text of the article entitled "A Man of Atomic Energy, CHESTER EARL HOLIFIELD":

WASHINGTON, August 23.—At the age of 15 CHESTER EARL HOLIFIELD traveled from Arkansas to California to seek his fortune. At the age of 19 he owned his own men's clothing business—so was never able to finish high school. Nor did he ever take a formal course in science. But today, at the age of 56, CHET HOLIFIELD, as he is now called, probably knows more about nuclear power, nuclear weapons and missiles than any other Member of the House of Representatives.

As chairman of subcommittees of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, he is the driving force behind reports now coming off Government printing presses on the hazards of fallout from atomic tests and warfare, on the methods of disposing of nuclear waste materials, and on the probable effects of nuclear war.

LITTLE TIME FOR PARTIES

CHET HOLIFIELD rarely goes to parties. He has given up golf and hunting and fishing. "My wife and my doctor reproach me for it," he says, "but I have no time now."

By day he devotes himself to fighting in Congress for more information on nuclear weapons and warfare, for Government support of nuclear power, nuclear submarine and aircraft projects.

And at night, until 11 or 12 most evenings, he studies.

"It is a continuing challenge to keep on top of these subjects, not to mention other sidelines," he says.

Whether fighting for civilian control of nuclear energy, for public power, against the Atomic Energy Commission or for public shelters against atomic attack, Mr. HOLIFIELD is mild in manner but sharp of tongue.

He demanded the resignation of Lewis L. Strauss as Chairman of the AEC and criticized his successor, John A. McCone, for what he called planning on a pitifully small scale.

And a year ago he asserted that "there is at present no national plan for survival, and there is nothing I can see that will insure the survival of any major segment of our society in the event of an enemy attack."

STILL OWNS BUSINESS

Mr. HOLIFIELD's forceful personality stood him well in the clothing business, which he still owns, at Norwalk, 12 miles from Los Angeles. The same year he went into business he married the former Vernice Caner. They have four daughters, all married, and eight grandchildren.

Becoming interested in politics during the depression and the New Deal days, in 1936, Mr. HOLIFIELD managed the successful campaign of Jerry Voorhis, a Democrat, for the House of Representatives. And when the Voorhis district was split up to allow for increased population, Mr. HOLIFIELD was elected as a Democrat from the 18th District of California in 1942. He has represented it since.

Representative HOLIFIELD's interest in atomic energy was confirmed in July 1946 by his appointment by President Truman to the Commission that went to Bikini in the South Pacific to see, as Mr. HOLIFIELD puts it, "atomic fusion at work."

Three years later he was chairman of a subcommittee that recommended, against powerful contrary advice, that the United States go ahead with production of a hydrogen bomb. In January 1950 President Truman agreed, and in the early fall of 1951

the United States exploded its first hydrogen bomb.

"We beat the Russians by 9 months," Mr. HOLIFIELD recalls proudly.

But along with this sense of achievement came knowledge of the awful power of the bomb, of all the dangers and potentialities of nuclear power.

"I felt I wanted the people to know," he says, "the truth about it, not just wild statements. I wanted the world to get behind the Iron Curtain, too. I have worked pretty hard at it. I guess it's a kind of conscience effort."

Judge Samuel A. Weiss Honored at Duquesne University Graduation Exercises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to call to the attention of Congress a singular incident involving a former Member of Congress, the Honorable Samuel A. Weiss, judge of the Common Pleas Court of Allegheny County, Pa.

Judge Weiss started his political career at the same time I did in 1934 as an elected member of the House of Representatives in Pennsylvania.

From there he was sent to the U.S. Congress where he served with honor and distinction until he was called back home by a grateful constituency to become a judge of the courts of our great State.

He has served long and well and the honor bestowed upon him by Duquesne University, his alma mater, attracts to the respect and affection in which he is held by all who have had the pleasure and privilege of knowing him over these many years.

I submit for the RECORD a reprint from the Pittsburgh Legal Journal, a report on this citation given August 7, 1959:

JUDGE SAMUEL A. WEISS RECEIVES DOCTOR OF LAWS DEGREE—LOCAL JURIST HONORED AT DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY GRADUATION EXERCISES

Duquesne University graduated 171 students, 62 with advanced degrees, at its summer commencement exercises held today (Friday, August 7) on the campus of the school.

The ceremonies marked the end of the 6- and 8-week summer sessions, and were held for the first time in the Mills Auditorium of Rockwell Hall.

Honorary degrees were awarded the Honorable Samuel A. Weiss, Duquesne alumnus and judge of the Court of Common Pleas of Allegheny County; Sidney V. Levine, president of Ad Press, Ltd., New York City; and Msgr. Robert B. Navin, S.T.D., president of St. John College of Cleveland.

Judge Weiss received the doctor of laws degree; Mr. Levine, doctor of commercial science; and Monsignor Navin, doctor of education. The Very Reverend Vernon F. Gallagher, C.S.Sp., chairman of the board, made the presentations.

Monsignor Navin delivered the commencement address, especially commending the

Legalizing the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles S. Rhyne, a prominent attorney of Washington, D.C., and former president of the American Bar Association, has been instrumental in promoting world peace through world law. He is to be commended for his efforts in this important field.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address that Mr. Rhyne delivered to the Junior Bar Conference on "Legalizing the World":

LEGALIZING THE WORLD

(Address by Charles S. Rhyne, Washington, D.C., former president of the American Bar Association, former chairman of the Junior Bar Conference, before Junior Bar Conference, Hotel Fontainebleau, Bal Harbour, Fla., Aug. 23, 1959)

Twenty-one years ago I attended my first Junior Bar Conference convention. The great men of the day were Arthur T. Vanderbilt and John J. Parker. What a thrill it was to see and hear them in action. The great idea they were urging was modernization of courts and legal procedures—judicial administration improvement. They called for traffic laws and courts adapted to automobiles, rather than the horse and buggy. They urged our dedication as lawyers to a program of service to the public as well as to our clients.

At their urging the Junior Bar Conference assumed major tasks in bringing this judicial administration improvement idea to reality. Junior Bar Conference members collected the facts State by State on courts and court procedures. And upon these facts Vanderbilt and Parker built their reform programs.

"Old men for wisdom, young men for action" were the Junior Bar Conference watchwords. Since that time the "wisdom" of Vanderbilt and Parker and the "action" of Junior Bar Conference have brought about tremendous advances in judicial reforms. In the traffic field alone most of the evils then rampant are either gone or going. A Junior Bar Conference national chairman—Jim Economos—has devoted his life to ramrodding this program. And while his hair is graying and his middle rotund, his zeal has never once slackened, nor has his identification with Junior Bar Conference—even today he is "credited" in the minds of most lawyers as a Junior Bar Conference representative.

At my first Junior Bar Conference meeting I never for one moment envisioned appearing before you someday as an old man to seek to harness your energies for yet another great public service crusade. Yet here I am—asking you to help legalize, and thus stabilize and bring order into, the relations between the peoples and nations of the world; to help achieve world peace through application of law, legal procedures and the courts to transnational relations of nations and individuals.

Under the ceaseless prodding and the inspired leadership of Vanderbilt and Parker these past years have witnessed great progress in modernizing judicial administration and legal procedures. Yet were they alive today they would be the first to say

that this progress is small when compared to the job to be done. Until their untimely and unfortunate passing they never overlooked an opportunity to call for more and more effort to achieve the great goal of a more perfect justice for all men.

Due to Vanderbilt and Parker and their disciples in the Junior Bar Conference, and the bar generally, nearly all men today accept the need for modernization and reform of courts and legal procedures. Their idea has come of age. They have won the biggest part of their battle. For while their proposed reforms have been slow in coming and the setbacks many, the idea is implanted so firmly that it will never die out. Modern courts and modern legal procedures we have in some places. They will eventually be universal.

Vanderbilt and Parker planted their great idea deeply in the minds of the public as well as in the minds of lawyers. This public awareness and the resulting public opinion pressures are largely responsible for bringing about the improvements which have been achieved. The formula for success has been to spread the idea lawyer to lawyer to public and public to politician so as to bring about essential governmental action. That lesson I would now apply to a program to modernize international law and the international courts so that they can replace weapons as the decision mechanism in resolving international disputes.

World law is in its infancy. Men do not yet fully accept the idea that the rule of law can achieve and maintain order and stability internationally.

But the idea is better known and more widely accepted today by more people throughout the world than ever before. We are in some respects where Vanderbilt and Parker were 21 years ago. I earnestly hope it will not take 21 years to make this idea come of age. We probably do not have that much time before the arms race explodes into world holocaust. Events press hard for action in our quick-moving era. But in this pressurized context no idea holds greater potential for a peaceful world than that of creating legal rules based upon the immortal principles of the rule of law to govern transnational relations.

To make world law come of age we must convince men everywhere that law will do the job internationally that diplomacy, arms, agreements and treaties have been unable to do—at least they have not done it up to now. To convince men, we must prove to them by facts and sound logic that law can supply principles which will provide standards to guide the relationships of men and nations transnationally. We must persuade men and nations to choose to operate internationally under these standards rather than upon the present operational basis of capacity for mutual annihilation.

In the past we have made a mistake in our struggle for peace by going at the matter negatively. We have concentrated on getting rid of war, getting rid of tension and getting rid of armament.

But you cannot get rid of war, tension and armament and leave a vacuum. We will get rid of them only to the extent that we put something else in their places. What is that something? In the human story it has always been the rule of law in every civilized nation.

The concept of a rule of law as a step toward peace provides a positive idea around which we can rally the imaginations and hopes of people everywhere. Law is something everyone understands and practically everybody respects. Law is a concept that has not been spoiled by verbal distortion as have such words as "peace" and "democracy." Law is everywhere known to be the

class "because of the very great sacrifices made to complete your education—many working full time, and taking courses to fit yourselves better for positions in life and for the service of others."

He also gave the graduates his views on several controversial topics: "The world today is confused and mixed up because it does not recognize or will not accept the truth." This ignorance or rejection, he said, is a "faulty application of the most basic principles of the natural law."

He cited the much-discussed decision in the Chatterly case, referring to the recent lifting of the ban on the novel "Lady Chatterley's Lover," where, he said "one man's freedom to advocate an idea, admittedly immoral, is upheld even though it is in direct opposition to the public good." He suggested that this was a situation where freedom had degenerated into license.

Monsignor Navin concluded by attacking the frequently advocated theory of custom-regulated morality as evidenced in general approval of divorce and birth control. "It is significant," he said, "that the very groups which originally brought about restrictive legislation on birth control information now favor banning all such legislation. If it was wrong then, could it be right now?"

"You are saved this confusion and mental mixup because you have a definite philosophy which guarantees you consistency and stability in decision and action," he added. "You are in a position to do an immeasurable amount of good in bringing the truth to others—absolute, unchanging truth. This is the starting point."

Three students, two of whom are nuns, were graduated with honors. They are: Luetta Mae Camp, 903 Stuebenville Avenue, Cambridge, Ohio; and Sisters Mary Angelina Caralle, S.S.J., and Grace Madeleine Lawley, S.S.J., both of Mount St. Joseph, Wheeling, W. Va.

More than one-third of the graduating class was nuns, the majority receiving bachelor of education degrees.

The exercises were preceded by mass, celebrated by the Reverend Edmund R. Supple, C.S.Sp., of Duquesne, and sung by the Sisters of St. Joseph Choir, from Wheeling.

The citation which was presented to Judge Weiss follows:

"CITATION: HON. SAMUEL ARTHUR WEISS

"Samuel Arthur Weiss, jurist, Congressman, philanthropist, sportsman, dedicated alumnus, friend to all:

"Your career has been a varied and rich career. Persevering industry in the face of many difficulties, carried you through college and law school with distinction. Meanwhile, your athletic ability kept pace with your scholarship when you excelled as captain of the varsity baseball and football teams.

"Your career in law and politics has been one of steady progress. The voters recognized in you a champion of their rights and a man of integrity when they elected you twice to the Pennsylvania Legislature, three times to the U.S. Congress, and twice as a judge of the Court of Common Pleas of Allegheny County.

"People of every race, creed, and nationality have felt the warmth radiating from a sincere and brotherly concern. It has embraced hospitals, lodges, boys' clubs, education, the military services, and religion.

"Because your alma mater is grateful to you and because she takes pride in you as a distinguished citizen, I ask our Very Rev. Chairman of the Board to confer upon you the degree of doctor of laws, honoris causa, with all the rights and privileges thereunto attached, and cause you to be invested with the hood appropriate to that degree.

"Very Rev. HENRY J. McANULTY, C.S.Sp.,
"Acting President."

familiar, the normal—indeed the only—alternative to force in organized society.

What can the Junior Bar Conference do? I propose that the Junior Bar Conference do two things: (1) set up task forces to contact young lawyers in every nation on earth to find out how these young lawyers of other lands think this job can be done and how we can work with them to legalize the world; (2) help collect the facts and experience upon which a world law system can be erected just as we collected the facts and experience for Vanderbilt and Parker on courts and legal procedures.

The job I ask you to do cannot be done in a year or a decade. It is one for continuous effort over the years just as in the case of court and legal reform. We strive for perfect justice always, yet we never quite achieve it. So on world law we must work and strive knowing full well that perfection is not achievable. But a world ruled by imperfect law is so much better than a world ruled by armed might that a choice is not hard to make. And the people will make that choice once the lawyers convince themselves, and then the people, that law is the answer.

The new uncharted, unexplored frontier of today is not in science despite the miraculous accomplishments and the potentials there. The real unexplored frontier of our day is the creation of the legal rules under which nations live together on this earth—each sharing its riches in peace in a world shrunken by fast transportation and communications; peace not on a community, State or national basis, but peace on a world-wide basis.

Little by little we are realizing that our own hopes and destinies are irrevocably linked to the hopes and destinies of our fellow men at home and abroad. To live in peace is beyond question the greatest current desire of all peoples. The cry of "Peace unto you" is and has been the most welcome cry to the ears of man from before the days of Christ until now—as witness Vice President Nixon's outstandingly successful trip to Russia.

The expanding horizons of the world promise fabulous rewards to those who are bold enough to brave the unknown. And make no mistake about it, our greatest unknown is still in the area of procedures, rules, and other machinery under which humans can get along together peacefully. Again, I recall to your minds that a study of civilization's development reveals beyond question that the rule of law is the best idea man has ever developed for this purpose. Our job is to give legal form and expression to this great idea as applied to the needs of the new world of today. The principles of the law can be used to map the way out on this new frontier so that man may harness modern technology for his benefit rather than have it used for his death. Under the rule of law we can live together rather than die together as we most certainly will if the rule of force continues to control the fate of humanity.

No one really knows as yet how to make law prevail throughout the world but we of our generation must be the first to attempt this task.

We can begin our exploration of the unknowns of this frontier with full awareness that the carnage and waste of war constitute the blackest pages in the history of man and that advances in law chronicle the brightest. What war or other killing or enslavement of man compares in the esteem of mankind with the Ten Commandments, the codes of Hammurabi, Solon, and Justinian, the Magna Carta and our own Constitution?

I am asking you to take part in a movement that is now already successfully under-

way. The march toward a world ruled by law is making electrifying progress on four fronts:

- (1) Within the organized bar;
- (2) Within the executive and legislative branches;
- (3) Within university law schools and research centers;
- (4) Within public opinion.

Through contacts with lawyers in 74 nations we have acquainted them with what the American Bar Association is doing and hopes to do in this field and have asked for their cooperation and assistance. Without exception the lawyers of the world have welcomed this movement and many of these lawyers of other lands are already working with us on plans to bring the movement to fruition. Tomorrow we will present a report for the committee on world peace through law to the house of delegates outlining the work and developments during the past year. We will outline the continental conferences, the world conference of lawyers, and a specified agenda for such conferences, which we recommend to capitalize upon lawyer interest and activity throughout the world. We also set forth the concrete steps we recommend to bring transnational relations under the rule of law.

On the executive front the President, the Vice President, the late Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, and the Attorney General of the United States have all within the past year made strong statements supporting the rule of law internationally. Such concerted action by four such national leaders is in itself almost unique. In the Congress, by resolutions, speeches and other activity its Members have more and more demonstrated their interest and support for the rule of law in world affairs. And a mere glance at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD indicates that this interest in accelerating on an ever-increasing scale. Governors, mayors, State attorneys general and other State and local officials have also expressed their interest and support.

On the research or university level the creation of the Duke World Rule of Law Center with Arthur Larson as its head, and work of great importance now being done at Harvard, Chicago, Northwestern, Cornell, Southern Methodist, Miami, and numerous other universities all over the world, are spotlighting this subject as never before.

Never before has so much effort and money been expended just to collect the materials in which international law may be found. And finding the law in this field—just as in other legal fields—is one of the big undone jobs we must accomplish. There is a lot of international law—there are many rules that apply internationally—but digging them out can never be done without the basic legal materials. You as young lawyers constantly find the law for your seniors in many fields of domestic law. You could not perform that task at all if the essential books, opinions, etc., were not available. Making international law available is a big task that universities and researchers can perform and are performing. And due in part to the rise in general university interest—and lawyer interest—one finds that law students are more interested in taking courses in international law. This too is a most essential development. In the past this subject has been looked upon as a mysterious field chiefly of interest to a few professors. Now the shrinking of the world in the jet age has thrown nations and people together and suddenly lawyers, law students and others realize that we must have rules to regulate these ever-closer and ever-accelerating contacts.

President Eisenhower's comment recently on the research scientists who produced

satellites and split the atom and the researchers in medicine who produced the polio vaccine, that "the apparently visionary researcher is likely to produce unexpectedly practical results," applies equally to legal researchers and workers in the international law field. Their work is being put to more and more practical use daily. Here, as in the case of all great ideas, the idea of a world ruled by law is often labeled impractical and idealistic. In addition to the President's answer, I recall to your minds that our Government under our Constitution was so labeled 170 years ago both at home and abroad; yet it has worked practically and ideally to give man more effective protection of individual rights, more widespread justice, more equality under law, more evenly distributed economic opportunity, more security in person and property and greater personal freedom than any governmental system ever developed in all the history of mankind. The framers of our Constitution included lawyers of the kind that we sorely need now in the international field, lawyers who have, in the words of the late "Bull" Warren, of Harvard, "ideals and a realistic approach to the task of implementing the ideals as a practical matter."

In the area of public opinion, we find that governmental leaders of the world, when the potentials of world law are explained to them, are beginning more and more to express views in accord with those of President Eisenhower on this subject. Prime Minister Nehru, Chancellor Adenauer, Prime Minister Diefenbaker, and many others have spoken out in support of increased reliance upon the rule of law in world affairs. Great lay leaders of our country and the world like Henry Luce, Erwin Canham, religious leaders like Cardinal Cushing and Bishop Pike, to name only a few, have constantly and strongly urged that the rule of law is an answer to the problem of world peace. In the news media field several hundred editorials and news commentaries have expressed favorable views upon this subject. And "Law Day, U.S.A." has given great nationwide recognition and impetus to this development.

We of the legal profession are concentrating on building the necessary legal foundation and framework for the world. More and more people are realizing that if you are ever going to have a world ruled by law that foundation and framework must come first. Talk about disarmament and enforcement is really looking to the ultimate rather than to the first essentials. Disarmament and enforcement will follow if we get the necessary law and the needed judicial machinery. Summit discussions and meetings of leaders of nations may end tensions but they do not erect this legal framework which experience within nations proves we must have to achieve lasting order and stability.

So in asking you to join and aid this movement I am asking you to support an idea many are already pushing with all their capacity. The idea is on its way but it needs all the help it can get from all who sincerely desire a peaceful world. I am sure you have such a desire. I am sure also that no group can do more in translating that desire into reality once you focus upon the problem, acquire the knowhow and develop a program for action. You can perform no greater public service. No greater challenge exists for you as lawyers.

Let us march together again on this new crusade for the benefit of the public good as we have marched so successfully on court and legal reform. Let us see to it that ours is an age of unlimited progress rather than unlimited destruction. Only through making it the age of the law can this goal be achieved.

Sad Poles Wave Goodby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the 12th in the series of articles written by George W. Healy, editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, who accompanied Vice President Nixon on his recent trip to the Soviet Union:

[From the Times-Picayune, Aug. 20, 1959]

SAD POLES WAVE GOODBY—KITCHEN CABINET BORN HIGH IN 500-M.P.H. JET

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

KELFLAVIK, ICELAND.—Leaving Warsaw was not as pleasant as entering Warsaw.

Like the day we arrived, there were thousands of men and women and children on the streets the day we left. Many of them waved and shouted to us. Some of them, the older ones, wiped their eyes as they waved goodbye.

Although its people are reputed to have more freedom than is enjoyed by the people of any other satellite of the Soviet Union, the Poles in Warsaw—I believe—know that their hundreds of thousands of relatives in the United States enjoy greater freedom than do they.

Perhaps as they waved to us the day we left many of them would have like to some with us.

One of the most competent, and most understanding correspondents riding our press plane was Frank Holeman of the New York Daily News. It was Frank, a very tall young man, who back in 1950 took a tuxedo with him on a quick assignment—to Korea. Naturally, when the assignment turned out to be the coverage of a war, the tuxedo didn't see much service. However, when Frank returned to Washington—having worn thin all the clothes, save the tuxedo, which he had taken with him—the tuxedo served him in good stead. He found moths had feasted on clothes which he had left in Washington, so he wore the tuxedo until his tailor could fit him with new business suits.

Frank's description of the scene of our departure from Warsaw bears repeating. "We waved goodbye to a lot of friendly people in Warsaw this morning on the way to the airport with Vice President Nixon," he wrote. "They laughed and clapped, and some threw bunches of carnations and gladioli. Here and there along the way, though, you'd see a man or a woman wave, smile, then suddenly turn sad. . . . There was really something pathetic about the whole episode. In 12 hours with our big jet transport planes, we would be in a different world, the free world. The poor Poles would still be right there in the Communist world, which many obviously detest."

"We learned a lot of new things about that Communist world in our 2 weeks with Nixon. It may not sound like a long time to you, but 2 weeks behind the Iron Curtain can be a lifetime."

It seemed, indeed, a long time since we had breathed freely—conscious of the protection of the American flag on American soil.

Unlike other legs of our journey, Vice President Nixon rode the leg from Warsaw to Kelflavik aboard the TWA 707-121 jet plane. Mrs. Nixon and other members of his official party continued to ride the Military Air Transport Service jet transport which followed us into every airport.

About the time we were over Denmark the Vice President held a conference and organized a new club. All the men and women who flew with him to Russia, to Siberia and to Poland were initiated as members of "The Vice President's Kitchen Cabinet," an organization reminiscent of Mr. Nixon's debate with Nikita S. Khrushchev in the kitchen of the model home at the U.S. exhibition in Moscow.

Although we were flying high above the clouds the news conference conducted by Mr. Nixon for almost 2 hours was as effective as any I ever attended. Certainly the British and Canadian and American correspondents who heard the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Prime Minister Winston Churchill at the Citadel in Quebec were no more attentive than the homing newsmen questioning and hearing the Vice President as they moved toward the new world at approximately 500 miles per hour.

The scene at the airport before we took off from Warsaw was impressive. There was a large band, and the Polish Army was represented by one of its crack drill teams.

John Charles Daly, the electronic newsmen, gave his colleagues justification for loud laughter when, walking preoccupied across a ramp, he got in front of the drill team. When he realized that the drill team was about to run him down he had to break into a run.

Dr. Oskar Lange, vice president of the Polish council of state, was the last official of an Iron Curtain country who spoke to us.

To me, Dr. Lange's words had a ring of sincerity when he said, "In our opinion your visit has been a practical manifestation of that peaceful coexistence which we here in Poland so ardently desire and of the principles which we apply in our policy."

Observing how much the Poles love their families, their homes, their animals, and their flowers—it is difficult to consider them potential enemies of any peace-loving country. Whether the Kremlin has convinced many of them that the United States is not a peace-loving country, of course, is undetermined.

Their attitudes toward the Nixon party indicated to me that the Kremlin has not succeeded in this regard.

If I were called on to choose tomorrow between making a return visit to Moscow, to Leningrad or to Warsaw, I would choose Warsaw without hesitation.

The flowers in the boxes which decorate Warsaw's every light standard are as beautiful as any I have ever seen. Its men are as courteous as true southern gentlemen. Its women are charming and gracious.

It might have been good if some of those Poles who waved could have come along with us.

Red China Should Not Be Admitted to the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I considered it a privilege to vote for the resolution that rejects any and all proposals that Red China be admitted to the United Nations.

Red China is an outlaw nation. She poured her Red troops into Korea and

by this barbaric aggression plunged the free world into a bloody war that cost tens of thousands of young men their lives. Although that war long since ended, Red China still holds many American prisoners.

It is unthinkable that Red China now should be permitted to crash the gates and gain admission to the United Nations with whose efforts for world peace China repeatedly has manifest she has no sympathy.

Some argue that if Red China is admitted to the U.N. she might reform. To this, I reply let Red China reform first and prove by her actions that she is worthy of membership in the U.N.

It would be a display of weakness on America's part for the Congress of the United States to go on record as favoring admission of Red China, after all her outlawry, into the U.N. I was proud to vote for the resolution keeping the United Nation's membership doors closed to Red China. In that vote I am certain I expressed the almost unanimous sentiment of the constituents whom I have the honor to represent in Congress.

Tribute to Delegate Burns of Hawaii

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying this well-deserved tribute to a great American, John A. Burns of Hawaii, who leaves us shortly to return to the shores of his beloved homeland.

In the relatively short time that Mr. Burns served in this body, he carved for himself a prominent place in the history of our Nation. Two new stars have been added to our flag—two new States—and almost a million residents of Alaska and Hawaii have been granted first-class citizenship since John Burns arrived in Washington only a few years ago. Despite one-sided odds against him in the fight for Alaskan statehood and then for Hawaiian statehood, John Burns—more than any other single person—was the leading architect of the two statehood victories.

By his tireless efforts, persuasiveness, and sincerity of purpose, John Burns won the respect and support of his fellow Members of the House. Enactment of the statehood bills was a joint victory in which all Americans shared.

John Burns has served the people of Hawaii ably and conscientiously as their last Delegate. Those of us who value his friendship will truly miss him in the difficult times ahead. We greet the first Congressman from the State of Hawaii, DANIEL INOUE, of whom John has spoken of so highly. I trust that in the not too distant future, John Burns will

return to Washington to continue his outstanding record of service to his State and Nation. Until then, John, we wish you good luck and Godspeed.

Poison in Your Water—No. 158

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Madisonville (Ky.) Messenger of October 13, 1958, entitled "Menace of Salt in the River Green":

MENACE OF SALT IN THE RIVER GREEN (From the McLean County News)

There's another problem to be concerned about on our Green River.

That's the serious problem of contamination from oil wells in Green County.

This situation came to light this week in three different stories on the new oil pool near Greensburg. The pool there differs from most in Kentucky in that the oil lies under a big quantity of salt water. In producing the oil, this salt water is pumped to the top of the ground. It is estimated that 20 barrels of salt water is pumped out for every barrel of oil. This salt is finding its way into Green River and contaminating the river in that area. In some places the water is several times as salty as ocean water.

This new contamination can have several serious results. It can hamper operation of any industrial plants that use river water in processing. This has already happened to the Tennessee Gas Transmission Co.'s gas stripping plant at Gabe. Wednesday reports came that there was damage to the Kentucky Utilities plant at Green River.

The threat of such contamination will certainly be a drawback to obtaining any substantial new industry in this area that would depend on river water.

Another bad effect would be on wildlife, such as fish and ducks, which might be killed or driven away. Upriver farmers who use creeks for water supply have been forced to sell their livestock.

Perhaps the most direct threat is to our city water supplies. Livermore and Calhoun depend entirely on the river for their water supply and a considerable number of farmers in the county also depend upon water purchased from the city systems in dry periods.

Apparently, at this stage there is not much we here in McLean county can do about the problem. This is another occasion on which we must depend on our state agencies to protect our interests. We think they are alert to the situation and will find some remedy.

Meanwhile we should keep a close watch on the situation and support our city governments in any action necessary to safeguard our interests.

The Kentucky Water Pollution Control Commission has given the oil operators 30 days in which to halt the pollution of the streams. We hope the commission will be successful in its efforts.

However, at the rate the pollution is increasing, 30 days may be too late to avoid serious damage.

History of Benedictines in Cleveland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article entitled "Historical Review of the Benedictines in Cleveland," which appeared in the Slovak News of August 13, 1959:

HISTORICAL REVIEW OF THE BENEDICTINES IN CLEVELAND

Archbishop Joseph Schrembs, D.D., invited the Slovak Benedictines at St. Procopius Abbey in Lisle, Ill., to establish a foundation in Cleveland. Assigned to St. Andrew's parish at East 51st Street and Superior Avenue, the first Benedictine, Rev. Stanislaus Gmuca, O.S.B., arrived on February 2, 1922, while Rev. Gregory Vanisak, O.S.B., the founder, remained at St. Michael's Church in Chicago until he was elected conventual prior of the independent priory that was established at 10510 Buckeye Road on September 1, 1929. Meanwhile, Rev. George Luba, O.S.B., had organized Benedictine High School, which first opened its doors at St. Andrew's parish on September 8, 1927. The high school, too, was transferred to the new site at East 105th and Buckeye Road for the fall term in 1929.

Abbot Stanislaus Gmuca, O.S.B., was elected as the first abbot of St. Andrew's Abbey on August 8, 1934, and remained in office until his resignation in 1946. Abbot Theodore Kojis, O.S.B., was elected to office on June 20, 1946. During Abbot Stanislaus' term of office the new Benedictine High School at 2900 East Boulevard was built in the spring and summer of 1940. The new abbey building was completed in 1952 when Abbot Theodore was host to Archbishop Edward F. Hoban, D.D., and Abbot Primate Bernard Kaelin, of Rome, who solemnly blessed the new abbey and an extension of the high school buildings.

Benedictine High School is staffed chiefly by members of the abbey, but approximately 14 lay teachers are employed in the teaching of a thousand boys each year. In addition to winning its share of scholastic, scientific, and journalistic honors, Benedictine High School has won renown in all major sports during the past dozen years. The Bengals won city championships in football, basketball, baseball, golf, and bowling in a decade of athletic glory seldom equaled in Cleveland interscholastic competition. In 1957 the Benedictine gridiron team won the State football championship, an achievement that was the crowning point of a long, uphill struggle to the Bengals' greatest triumph in 30 years of competition against the best high school teams in Ohio.

Behind the scenes of Benedictine's rise to fame and glory, the monks of St. Benedict live their daily lives according to the holy rule of the patriarch of western monasticism in which the motto "Pray and work" ("Ora et labora") is perhaps the predominating feature. Thus, the priests and Brothers work in the advancement of religion and education not only here in Cleveland but elsewhere. Besides administering Benedictine High School, St. Benedict's parish in Cleveland, priests of the abbey are engaged in parochial work in Chicago, East St. Louis, Ill., and Superior, Wis. Chaplains are assigned at the Benedictine Sisters' Convent in

Tinley Park, Ill., and in the Jednota Home in Middletown, Pa.

For a quarter of a century several priests (notably the Very Reverend Gregory Vanisak, Rev. Paschal Kavulic and Rev. George Luba) were editors of the Ave Maria, a religious monthly publication in the Slovak language, which has a nationwide circulation of 5,000 readers. Moreover, the official headquarters of the Slovak News, a semi-monthly newspaper (a weekly until July 1, 1957), for the past 10 years has been in the old abbey building. The editors of both the Slovak and English sections of the paper have been members of the Benedictine High School faculty these years. Moreover, Rev. George Luba, O.S.B. (who succeeded Rev. Ivan Kramoris, O.S.B.) editor of the Zenska Jednota semimonthly magazine for 100,000 members of the First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union, has been in that office for the past 22 years.

Members of the Order of St. Benedict here are active in Catholic organizations, societies and clubs, namely, the First Catholic Slovak Union, the First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union, the Knights of Columbus, the Catholic War Veterans, the Catholic Order of Foresters, the Slovak Catholic Sokol, the Pennsylvania Slovak Catholic Union, the Ladies Pennsylvania Slovak Catholic Union, the Slovak League, the Slovak Catholic Federation, the Slovak Catholic Cadet Union, and the Catholic Slovak Benefit Organization. All of these at some time or other have made financial contributions to the building or maintenance of Benedictine High School. However, at the top of the list of organized benefactors of the school is the Benedictine Dad's Club, which in the past 12 years has contributed more than \$300,000 to the school fund. Moreover, the Cleveland diocese through the efforts of Archbishop Edward F. Hoban, D.D., contributed a substantial sum to the extension of the high school in 1952.

Parochial work, especially on weekends, has always been an integral part of the work of the Benedictine priests who feel honored and privileged to serve in an auxiliary capacity in the work of God under the direction of the hard-working diocesan clergy throughout the diocese of Cleveland.

We Must Fight Filth in the Mails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include this excellent editorial from the Macoupin County Enquirer:

WE MUST FIGHT FILTH IN THE MAILS

The Post Office Department's drive to stamp out the mailing of obscene materials to children is receiving widespread support from the press, radio and TV commentators, public-spirited organizations and Members of Congress, officials report.

"We are most gratified by the wholehearted editorial support being accorded by the press," Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield said. Good progress toward solution of the problem is being made, he stated, but added that "persistent, intensive action on a nationwide scale will be necessary to cope with the determined plans of the filth racketeers to continue expanding their business."

These plans, he said, are aimed in large part at children. Recent reports, as well as testimony before Congress, have pointed out that the traffic in obscenity has doubled in just the last 5 years, and can double again by 1963 if the parents of America do not take a concerted stand within their own communities to wipe out evil.

There are steps the Postmaster General emphasizes, that every community can take. Alert parents are the most important source for direct action against the mail order "merchants of filth." The minor child need not have indicated interest in the material to receive solicitations through the mail to purchase obscene literature and photographs. It is the responsibility of the parents to take action when such material comes into the hands of their children through the mails. Parents can work closely with teachers to detect obscene materials in the possession of children and to determine the origin of such material. Such efforts can be instrumental in the prosecution of traffickers in mail-order obscenity.

Perhaps most importantly, parents can cooperate with the schools in taking positive steps to help their children develop wholesome interests in good literature and art—making it readily available to them at home, in the classroom, through literary and library clubs, and through student groups.

The ultimate aim of all concerned, the Post Office Department believes, should be the forging of an active, continuing relationship among the local post office officials, civic organizations, representatives of the local government, the press, the radio and TV, and every parent, by which the community can present a united front in its determination to stamp out the purveying of mail-order obscenity to children.

Momentous Question of Labor Reform Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of my newsletter because of its relationship to the momentous question of labor reform laws:

HOMESTRETCH

As we enter the homestretch in this session of Congress, many thoughts cross the mind of a Member of Congress.

He wonders sometimes whether, with all of the conflicts, special interests, greed, envy, and sometimes even hate, that we are able to get anything done at all.

It's strange, but true, that the American public only gets the surface news and little of the real background and reasons for some of the actions of Congress and Government in general.

If I would attempt as a Congressman to give you only my views you would still be getting a single viewpoint.

However, during the session, I've tried to keep you informed on as many subjects as time and space would allow.

Behind the headlines and news, there are many angles that just can't be given the coverage they deserve. With your interest at heart, I want to cover our last remaining days and some of the highlights of the actions of Congress.

STRIKES

For many years, since man first discovered he could hire some other person to work and make a profit on his efforts, there has been a continuing economic fight.

One of the weapons used by the working masses in this warfare has been the use of the strike.

There's no question that strikes have at times created havoc with loss of life, injuries, destruction of property, want and hunger as part of the picture.

Strikes haven't always been called for the purpose of gaining wage increases. Sometimes men have had to strike to protect their jobs, especially the older workers who for years were discarded and tossed out to make room for younger and faster producers.

There have been times when strikes were called for overtime pay, vacations with pay, recognition of unions, insurance and welfare benefits, safety devices and almost anything you can think of.

It wasn't always a pretty picture and those of us who come from industrial and mining communities have very vivid memories of cold winter days and barren tables.

It was from this kind of a situation that the Wagner Act emerged and labor found itself blessed with new powers and privileges.

During the next generation, unions grew, wages and fringe benefits climbed and the American economy became the envy of the world.

Much water has gone over the dam since the passage of that act commonly called the Magna Carta for laboring men and women.

It was material for a growing antagonism to crop up on the part of employers and the first major attempt to curb labor ended up in the famous Taft-Hartley Act passed in 1947.

During the years that have intervened from that day to this, new and stronger demands have come forth for more stringent labor legislation, aided and abetted by the strange, illegal, and sometimes outright dishonest records of some of labor's officials.

A distortion of the facts seems to have resulted from the backdrop of Senate hearings by the McClellan committee and the personal political ambitions of Senator JACK KENNEDY, ballooned and favored by the antics of his younger brother on TV, etc.

All of these so-called labor-management control bills are purported to be in the interest of labor peace.

Recently, the Public Affairs Institute, conducted by Dewey Anderson and Associates sent out a timely observation entitled, "Labor Peace?"

I am passing it on to you with the hope that you too will stop and wonder about the facts behind today's events and issues.

"All the time that Congress is feverishly debating what kind of legislation we ought to have to bring an end to labor-management malpractices and to curb the power of alleged union bosses what may be an infinitely more important story is going unnoticed.

That is the story of the steady increase in labor-management practices before the National Labor Relations Board.

Month after month the Board's business mounts. Month after month the bitterness of strife between union workers and their employers mounts.

Instead of labor peace as the authors of our labor-management legislation tell us is their goal, we are getting industrial warfare.

With 500,000 Steelworkers out on strike and another 100,000 workers laid off in related industries in what is obviously one of the sharpest labor-management disputes we have had in many years, it might be a good time to look at the more general picture and see what is happening on the labor front.

Here are some of the recordbreaking highlights:

The General Counsel issued 297 unfair labor practices complaints—the greatest number ever issued in any one quarter.

Unfair labor practice cases filed by employers numbered 563; an increase of 126 percent over those filed during the same quarter a year ago.

Unions filed 1,021 unfair labor practice cases for an increase of 41 percent over those filed by unions during the corresponding period of 1958.

These increases are not something new. They are part of a pattern of increasing tensions and disputes that has shown itself clearly for at least the past year and a half. Why?

Any objective study of the attitude of many segments of industry during the past few years will show an obvious determination to crack down on organized labor.

Both the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce have been conducting a never-ceasing campaign against labor, constantly using the timeworn clichés of "labor bossism," "labor monopoly," and "labor corruption."

In this the McClellan committee hearings have been a never-failing and convenient source of citable evidence to be used against all unions whether they are among those which have been investigated or not.

Right-to-work supporters, despite the setbacks suffered at the polls last November, have never ceased to press for harsher States' rights legislation to weaken and perhaps even destroy unionism in the name of protecting it.

In Congress itself there is a group of Senators and Representatives who spend much of their time in the fight to enact legislation that would further restrict union activities and discredit labor.

The drive of business to enter the political field more actively and more openly is a reflection of business hatred of labor strength.

It's all very well to keep pounding away on corruption within the labor movement. But how about a little investigation into the reasons for the recordbreaking charges and countercharges that are overburdening an already overburdened NLRB?

One of the amusing remarks that helped to break the tension when the labor bill was voted upon centered around the fact that the Speaker SAM RAYBURN lost all of the southern bloc except a scattered dozen or so and was supported almost to the man by the northern group of Congressmen.

One House Member was heard to remark "How do you expect to win the fight with a Yankee Army and a Confederate general?"

While mentioning the beloved Speaker, it might be well to note that Sam is no anti-union advocate by any stretch of the imagination.

The Speaker wanted and fought for labor reform and opposed labor annihilation.

Lost in the shuffle apparently are the real issues, minimum wage extension, social security improvements, reduction of income taxes in the lower income brackets, industrial and area redevelopment, decent housing legislation, reexamination of our trade and aid programs recognized now by many as inimical to our economic well-being, Federal standards for unemployment compensation, aid from the Federal Treasury for our hard pressed educational system, military influence peddling in war contracts and the other field of endeavor where the effect upon our daily lives touches all of us in and out of labor.

One wonders whether it wasn't planned that way. By hammering at Hoffa, Beck and unions, the people were made to forget the problems that loomed so high on the horizon in January.

Winter passed, spring has come and gone—summer is in its twilight, fall is waiting in the bullpen, and winter's icy fingers are reaching for our economic throats, yet all that's happened is that Congress has passed a bill curbing the economy of the country, moving completely into the orbit of the corporate semimilitary state and the President has caused Joe McCarthy to roll over in his grave by inviting Khrushchev to visit the White House.

It's been said often that consistency is the hobgoblin of small minds—there are few small minds in Washington.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. DENT,
Member of Congress.

Adlai's Back and Available

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, there are three things I wish the people of our great Nation would keep in mind as November 3, 1960, comes closer and we decide on our next President.

These three things also should be kept in mind by the Democrats next July in Los Angeles.

They are: First, Adlai is the best man; second, Adlai is available; third, Adlai will be elected.

There is much evidence for all these propositions but, under a previous consent, I will include only a small part of it to wit, an item from the New York Times of August 22 about his arrival back in the United States, Arthur Krock's column from the August 25 New York Times, and an article from the current Look magazine.

One admonitory word to Fletcher Knebel, the author of the Look article: It is not correct to refer to "Democratic fat cats," but maybe you did not write the headlines. In the text you refer to "well heeled" or "major" contributors. That is better. Republicans have fat cats and Democrats, proportionately speaking, have only slim kittens.

Whatever the breed or size of cat, they prefer Adlai.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 22, 1959]
STEVENS ON SAYS EUROPE SEES GAIN FOR KHRUSHCHEV IN VISITS—REPORTS BEWILDERMENT AT REVERSAL OF U.S. POLICY ON HIGH-LEVEL TALKS

Adlai E. Stevenson reported yesterday on his return from Europe that the impending exchange of visits between President Eisenhower and Nikita S. Khrushchev was regarded abroad as a great achievement for the Soviet Premier.

The twice-defeated Democratic candidate for President interpreted the exchange himself as a reversal of the policy toward the Soviet Union advocated by John Foster Dulles, the late Secretary of State.

"I was surprised by President Eisenhower's sudden reversal of the Dulles policy," he commented, "and many European leaders, who had little advance notice, were be-

wildered by the news that instead of rigid resistance to any high-level meetings, the President was himself going to Moscow and Mr. Khrushchev was coming to Washington for intimate talks."

He voiced the opinion that President Eisenhower's visits with the political leaders of Western Europe prior to his meetings with Mr. Khrushchev would dispel any misgivings that the announcement had caused.

DISAVOWS PRESIDENTIAL HOPES

In an hour-long interview after his arrival at New York International Airport, Idlewild, Queens, Mr. Stevenson renewed his declaration that he would not seek the Democratic nomination for President next year.

As to a possible draft, Mr. Stevenson commented: "I have never thought for a moment it was possible for me to be drafted in 1960 and I have no reason to think it now."

Commenting on the announcement that New York Democrats would advance Mayor Wagner next year for the vice-presidential nomination, Mr. Stevenson said:

"I have a high regard for Bob Wagner. He is highly qualified for public office, including the vice presidency. But I don't know what his ambitions are."

In discussing the Eisenhower-Khrushchev visits, Mr. Stevenson remarked:

"It is a good thing for our leaders to meet informally without a gallery and get the issues and conflicts on the table. But it will take a long time really to change the false ideas and mistrusts. The tensions will continue to rise and fall, as Russian policy dictates. So let us not expect early results from these meetings."

As for Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON's visit to Russia, Mr. Stevenson commented:

"I think Mr. Nixon's visit to Russia was a good thing—especially for Mr. Nixon."

Several years ago, he went on, Mr. NIXON had called him un-American or disloyal for talking about the implications of Russian economic growth.

"Now," he said, "he is saying the same thing. But it is better late than never and I believe in adult education, especially for Mr. Nixon."

While Mr. Khrushchev is in the United States, he should be treated politely, Mr. Stevenson declared.

"I wish he would come to Chicago so that I could return some of the courtesies extended to me in Russia," he added. "I would like to show him around a typical small town, like Libertyville or around my hometown of Bloomington and my farm nearby."

Mr. Stevenson plans to spend the weekend in New York and return to Chicago next week.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 25, 1959]

AN ALMOST IDEAL POSITION TO BE IN

(By Arthur Krock)

The presidential nominee of the last two Democratic National Conventions has returned from his latest trip abroad to a party situation which he should find suitable to whatever ultimate political purpose he has in view.

If he wants the nomination again, Adlai E. Stevenson has the favoring fact that in the event of a deadlock at Los Angeles in July 1960, which is moving from the possible toward the probable, the convention is much more likely to turn to him than to anyone else. If he is adamant against making a third run and/or won't be given the opportunity, the prospect grows that he could exert a major influence on the convention's choice. And if the candidate wins, the way will be open for Stevenson to employ his great talents in high Government office—maybe that of Secretary of State, for which he is admirably fitted. Many who know him well suspect he would be happier in that

post than in any other, and that it would fulfill an early ambition from which only a first presidential nomination by a draft unique in American politics could have diverted him.

Perhaps comfortable reflections of this nature were passing through Stevenson's mind as he faced the reporters and the questions as to 1960 he knew to be inevitable. At any rate, the news photographs were those of a man in genuine good spirits. What he said on public affairs had that sensibility and gentility the public has learned to expect from him. And the digs at Vice President Nixon, which are routine for the Democratic politicians whom the party "liberals" especially admire, Stevenson, as is his wont, administered with the gaiety of Cyrano running an opponent through.

It was this turn of his interview that suggested the leader who, though abjuring any activity toward a nomination, not only is available for the highest honor in the gift of his party but wants to be sure his party keeps that availability in mind. The tactic is classic and has been effective when a subsequent convention takes a number of ballots without making a nomination. And mandatory in this tactic is that the politician interviewed brackets himself in the public consciousness with the most probable nominee of the opposition. Stevenson's replies to the questions of the press conformed precisely to these specifications.

But that may have happened because the routine of taking a crack at Nixon has become fixed in the practice of Stevenson, former President Truman and certain other Democrats. Little the Vice President says or does escapes their derogatory, deprecatory or ironic comment.

All of them in the heat of campaigns have said very harsh things about the Republican Party and its standard bearers. For example, Truman charged Eisenhower with having become influenced by the Nazi concept of a master race. In the last days of the 1956 campaign Stevenson called Eisenhower's state of health and vigor into question as capable of meeting the exigencies of a second term; also the activities of those Republicans who had pressed renomination on the President in the circumstances of his medical record.

But Nixon's specific charge that Communists had been negligently allowed to infiltrate and remain in Democratic administrations, and the graver implication of treason Democrats saw in this charge, have made him personally and permanently anathema to most of their national leaders. The constant professions of these leaders that Nixon would be the easiest Republican to beat might rob them of their fervent wish to prove it in 1960, particularly if this estimate is reflected in recurring sample public opinion polls. Nevertheless, the Vice President continues to be the target to which Democrats who presume to aspire to the Presidency seem to be drawn by some kind of unbreakable magnetic force.

Thus Stevenson in his interview coupled his estimate that Nixon's visit inside the Iron Curtain was useful with the comment "especially to Nixon." And when he expressed gratification that the Vice President had come around to his view that the chief Soviet threat is economic, Stevenson added he was in favor of "adult education—especially for Nixon."

This may only be the effect of a settled Democratic routine. But routine also, for a politician who wants to preserve his availability, was Stevenson's conditionally negative attitude toward a party Presidential nomination which soon afterward was proved to be wide open by the check New York Democrats administered to the front runner, Senator KENNEDY.

DEMOCRATIC FAT CATS STILL PREFER ADLAI (By Fletcher Knebel)

Adlai E. Stevenson is the leading choice for the 1960 Democratic presidential nomination among well-heeled contributors to the party. Despite his two defeats by President Eisenhower in 1952 and 1956, Stevenson led all Democratic presidential aspirants in a Look poll of the men and women who supplied most of the financing for the 1956 State and National campaigns.

JOHN F. KENNEDY, the 42-year-old Massachusetts Senator who has been winning most opinion polls of rank-and-file Democrats, rates second as the choice of the party's financial backers.

Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, is in third place.

Look polled the men and women who contributed \$500 and more to various Democratic organizations financing the 1956 campaigns. They gave a total of \$2,820,000 to Democratic party groups, according to the Senate campaign spending committee headed by Senator ALBERT GORE, Democrat of Tennessee. A sizable proportion gave \$2,000 or more, and some contributed more than once. Many family names are old standbys as donors to Democratic war chests over the years. Most can be expected to contribute to the 1960 campaign.

Poll cards were mailed to 1,610 people on the Gore committee's list of Democratic contributors. Returns were received from 728 of them.

The names of the top eight men in the running were arranged alphabetically on the cards. In the space left open for "other" choices, more than 20 Democrats received votes. Only two, however, received more than two votes. They were Senator ESTES KEFAUVER (Tennessee), with four, and Representative CHESTER BOWLES (Connecticut), with three.

In addition to conducting the anonymous card poll, Look also asked contributors for their comments. The remarks of some of those willing to be quoted, along with the amount the Gore committee says they contributed in 1956, follow:

Kenneth T. Anderson, Emporia, Kans., cattleman (\$7,000): "I was for Adlai Stevenson twice, and I think the country is paying a high price for not having him in office now. My preferences in order are Stevenson first, Humphrey second, Symington third."

William Benton, New York publisher and former U.S. Senator (\$23,657): "My views are flat and pronounced. I'm for Stevenson, and I hope we have the good sense to nominate him."

F. Joseph Donohue, Washington, D.C., lawyer and Senator KEFAUVER's 1956 campaign manager (\$1,500): "I'm for SYMINGTON."

Robert W. Dowling, New York real estate executive (\$12,500): "My preference is KENNEDY. And I hope he makes it clear that if elected, he would name Stevenson as Secretary of State."

Mrs. Marshall Field of New York, widow of Chicago department-store owner (\$9,500): "I might change my mind, but I think I prefer HUMPHREY at this stage."

William J. Fitzgerald, Boston, Mass., executive (\$500): "I prefer KENNEDY. I suppose I am slightly prejudiced in that he is approximately my age, a native of Massachusetts and a man with whom I politically agree. He is a man of fundamental integrity, whose intelligence and youth are sorely needed."

Miss Winifred Jones Gladwin, of Santa Barbara, Calif. (\$10,000): "My preference is for Stevenson and nobody else."

Louis A. Kohn, Chicago, Ill., lawyer, who is given credit for "discovering" Stevenson 15 years ago (\$10,600): "I'm naturally for Stevenson, although whether he can get it again is a question in view of his two defeats. I just don't know who I'd favor after him."

Mrs. Albert D. Lasker, New York philanthropist (\$64,400): "I don't have any preference—not yet."

Jubal R. Parten, Houston, Tex., oil executive (\$11,700): "I'm for LYNDON JOHNSON. He's extremely well qualified."

Lou Poller, Miami, Fla., businessman and 1956 KEFAUVER backer (\$14,500): "I'd be for KEFAUVER if he runs. If not, SYMINGTON and JOHNSON in that order."

John M. Redding, Washington, D.C., public-relations man (\$4,000): "There's no question KENNEDY is in the lead now, but I think we'd have fewer problems with SYMINGTON, and he'd make a fine candidate."

Martin Segal, Jacksonville, Fla., investment broker (\$5,000): "Several men would make excellent candidates. I think the best possibility is SYMINGTON. If he can't make it, Stevenson."

Dewey D. Stone, Brockton, Mass., business executive (\$13,400): "I'm for my friend JACK KENNEDY."

The major contributors to the Democratic Party, it's worth noting, are concentrated in just a few sections of the country. More than a third of the 1956 money was given by New Yorkers. Outside New York, only the District of Columbia and three States, California, Illinois, and Pennsylvania, gave more than \$100,000.

The significance of the poll seems to be that roughly one-third of the people who financed the last Democratic presidential campaign are ready to do so again with Stevenson at the head of the ticket. Two-thirds of them, however, would prefer another candidate. Stevenson does a bit better with the wealthy people than with Democrats generally, judged by the Gallup public-opinion polls. KENNEDY, on the other hand, does a bit worse with the contributors than with rank-and-file Democrats.

SYMINGTON is in much higher favor with contributors than with the rank and file. He gets 13 percent of the Look poll and only 6 percent of all Democrats in recent Gallup polls. HUMPHREY also does better with contributors than with the rank and file. Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON stands slightly better with all Democrats than with contributors.

Since few contributors to the party are convention delegates, their influence is debatable. Nevertheless, Democratic candidates and organizations come back to them year after year for money. On this score alone, the party's financial backers do get a hearing.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent; *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Industrial Development Abroad: Threat or Opportunity?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, unfortunately, the developing unfavorable trade trends—that is, a disproportionately large volume of imports as opposed to the decreasing volume of exports—is a matter of deep concern to industry, labor, and our whole economy.

Realizing the significance of this situation, a number of important questions have arisen in relation to a more effective trade policy:

First. Do our economic aid programs help to create industrial development abroad that will one day, if it has not already, compete with and take over markets of U.S. commodities?

Second. How can we best meet the increasing competition from the expanding industrial plants of our allies?

Third. What should be our economic policy in relation to efforts by the Soviet Union, Red China, and other Communist nations attempting to gobble up our markets and undersell us—or dump products, if necessary, to cripple our foreign markets?

Fourth. What should be our policy on imports, particularly as these adversely impact the economy causing slowdowns in industrial activity and loss of jobs?

To find answers to these, and other, complex questions, we need a careful re-examination of our domestic and foreign economic policy; trends in world production; relative competitive position of United States and foreign products on the world market now and in the future; a review of what possible action can, or should, be taken in terms of tariffs and quotas; and other problems.

Naturally, we must not create barriers that would choke off our own economy—and the economies of our allies. At the same time, adequate measures are necessary to protect domestic industries.

Although our economy is now healthy, we had better read the handwriting on the wall. The time to deal with the rising challenges is now—not after we get into a position in which the whole economy—not just single industries—find themselves hard hit by the developing competitive situation in the world market.

Recently, the Research and Education Committee for a Free World for a National Trade Policy, under the direction

of Leon Edminister, prepared a special study entitled "The Industrial Development Abroad: Threat or Opportunity." Although the digest—prepared by the Committee for International and Economic Growth—presents no cure-all solution for the increasingly significant issue of competition in world trade, it does, I believe, shed light on factors that need to be considered in relation to our overall trade policy.

I ask unanimous consent to have the digest printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the digest was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ABROAD: THREAT OR OPPORTUNITY?

Two questions are posed for consideration: "Does U.S. public or private investment in productive enterprise overseas build up injurious competition for U.S. exports in world markets and invite low-cost competition in our home market?"

"Or may it be expected, by increasing purchasing power in other countries, to result in larger markets for U.S. exports and through competition to stimulate increased productivity at home?"

"These questions have often been raised in the past. They are being raised again today as the United States and other industrial countries consider the problem of lending the underdeveloped countries the capital they need to build more modern economies with higher living standards."

MAJOR FACTORS

Major conclusions of the study are:

"1. More than half of the exports of manufactured goods from industrialized countries today go to other industrialized countries—this in spite of the fact that the population of the industrial group constituted only about one-fourth of the world population (1953 through the first half of 1958). Per capita exports of manufactured goods from industrialized countries to other industrialized countries are about five times those to nonindustrialized countries.

"As countries become industrially more mature they tend to specialize increasingly in the particular categories and subcategories of manufacturing in which they enjoy a comparative advantage. As their overall productivity increases, their standards of living—reflected in increasing and more selective per capita consumption—also rise. It is this circumstance that accounts for the growth, rather than shrinkage, of trade in manufactured goods among these countries as their industrial economies continue to expand.

"2. Increasing production of manufactured products has been historically accompanied by increased imports of manufactured products.

"It now remains to consider whether there is reason for supposing that there is any strong cause and effect relationship between the increases in production and in imports of manufactured goods.

"There is ample justification for this assumption. . . . Take the case of a country with an almost completely non-industrial economy. When manufacturing is intro-

duced, more of the country's labor supply begins to work for wages. More people live in urban centers. Internal trade between town and country springs up and increases. As industry and commerce grow, the money incomes of population rise. With higher incomes the desires of the people for a greater variety of goods and services to meet their wants can be increasingly satisfied.

"Some of the increased output of manufacturers . . . may be of a kind that tends to displace in the home market or in export markets manufactures previously supplied by the industrialized countries. While particular industries in the older countries may feel the effect of such displacement, other industries will stand to gain from the newly-created and expanding market for a growing diversity of products.

"3. The statistical data appear to indicate that the increase in imports in industrializing countries are not in capital goods alone but also in consumer goods. For the older industrialized countries this is a likely inference from the fact that imports of manufactured goods trended upward along with increased domestic production, most of the time at about the same rate, for the long period of nearly 50 years prior to the 1930 depression. Recent data furnish more concrete evidence. Over-all postwar import figures for Latin America and individual data for Mexico and Canada, distinguishing between imports of capital goods and consumer goods, indicate very definitely that this point holds true for these countries . . . countries that are in the earlier or middle stages of industrialization.

"Future trends

"What are the potentialities for increased trade between developed and underdeveloped countries as the latter industrialize and under what conditions are these potentialities most likely to be realized?

"The potentialities for the growth of U.S. foreign trade are suggested by the following table, which shows the intensity of U.S. trade relations with the industrialized countries as compared with our trade with underdeveloped countries.

"U.S. exports per capita to specified countries in 1957

Country:	Dollars per capita
Canada.....	235.00
Netherlands.....	50.00
United Kingdom.....	21.00
Germany.....	19.00
Japan.....	14.00
Iran.....	4.10
Egypt.....	1.67
Indonesia.....	1.28
Pakistan.....	1.32
India.....	1.10
Thailand.....	3.24
Burma.....	.87
Ceylon.....	1.45
Ghana.....	2.12
Ethiopia.....	.33

"From the data in these tables it is apparent that even modest increases in the incomes of consumers in the underdeveloped countries (say 2 or 3 percent a year) could lead to a great increase in their foreign trade, including imports from the United States.

"On the economic side there are at least three indispensable conditions to the po-

tentialities for increasing market outlets for the industrially advanced countries:

"Necessary conditions"

"Continued economic growth in the industrialized countries. The first essential is that the economies of the industrialized countries shall be healthy and expanding. Under these conditions it will be much easier for the industrialized countries to profit from changing patterns of trade and competition. Economic contraction or stagnation in the industrial countries causes rigidity, fear of change, demands for import restrictions, and a reduction in imports which slows or obstructs economic development both in the industrialized countries and elsewhere.

"Maintenance of liberal commercial policies. It is of vital importance that the commercial policies of the free world be such as to encourage multilateral trading and the continuous expansion of international trade. Unless this condition is met it will clearly be difficult either for underdeveloped economies to grow or for the United States and other industrial economies to profit from their growth.

"The continuance and further strengthening of GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) as the chief instrumentality for protecting and enlarging the volume of international trade is of the utmost importance to the United States and the entire free world. Its usefulness would be enhanced by the establishment of a permanent administrative organization to replace the makeshift arrangements under which it is now administered.

"Flexibility in adjusting to and taking full advantage of changing competitive conditions. This is the heart of the matter, upon which all else depends. Will industry in the developed countries make the necessary adjustments to assist and profit by the economic growth of the underdeveloped countries? Will industrial leadership be flexible and resourceful? Or will it be dominated by a purely defensive attitude, and seek to freeze existing patterns of trade in the face of inevitable economic change?

"Conclusion"

"Growing industrialization in the less developed countries of the free world will over the years undoubtedly result in increased competitive pressure on some industries in the United States. At the same time, it will open vast opportunities for others. The pattern of trade will change continuously; but total trade and advantage will increase.

"Growing world industrialization is, therefore, a threat only if American industry, business, and Government react to it defensively and with hostility. If we regard it not as a threat but as a challenge and go forth confidently to meet it, it offers an opportunity beyond measure to safeguard freedom and build better lives for all free men."

Address of Gen. Lauris Norstad on Crucial Importance and Present Status of NATO Armed Forces Which He Commands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address given by

Gen. Lauris Norstad, Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, at the National Convention of the American Legion in Minneapolis, Minn., August 25, 1959. General Norstad, an officer and leader of whom all Americans are very proud, reports frankly on present differences within the NATO alliance and the common interests which unite:

SPEECH OF GEN. LAURIS NORSTAD, SUPREME ALLIED COMMANDER, EUROPE, AT THE NATIONAL COMMANDER'S DINNER, 41ST NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, HOTEL LEAMINGTON, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., AUGUST 25, 1959

An anniversary occasion such as this 41st Convention of the American Legion is bound to be a time of memories. To have it take place in Minnesota, my native State, makes it particularly so for me. I am glad to be home and I am honored to be with you.

The Legion's part in American life is an important one. Your good works are many, your influence is broad. You are deeply concerned—as are so many of your old comrades in arms in NATO—with the peace and security of the free world. You of the Legion who have served in three wars and in many foreign lands have better reason than most to appreciate the respite of peace and the importance of looking after our defenses.

Therefore, in bringing you the greetings of the soldiers, sailors, and airmen of the Allied Command in Europe, I know I speak for them when I thank you for your understanding and for your help in keeping the free world strong.

The memories evoked by this occasion go back over 40 crowded years to the men of vigor and vision who founded the Legion and laid down the rules by which it has flourished. The names, many of them now inscribed on the long rollcall of history, themselves evoke memories—Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., Ogden Mills, William J. Donovan, Bennett Clark, Franklin D'Oller.

But you have not invited me here to speak of the past. Our greatest interest is in the present and the future.

THE MEETINGS IN PROSPECT

The chance of the calendar brings us together at an exciting hour. Events are now in train that are certain to bear heavily on our relations with Soviet Russia and with our allies in Europe, and on the position of the United States throughout the world.

In the curious political lingo of our day, there will soon occur what history may remember as a famous confrontation—President Eisenhower's meeting with Premier Khrushchev. That meeting will bring us, in the person of the President, face to face with the leader of a surging world power that is bent on overturning the world order. Much that is important to all of us here and to, I dare say, the Russians, as well as to the masses whose fate they control, may be influenced by this meeting. If, as Mr. Nixon has suggested, the experience of exchanging ideas with the President, and of looking at America, accomplishes nothing more than to rid the Soviet leader's mind of some of his appalling misconceptions about us, a useful purpose will be served.

Other matters, scarcely less important in themselves, are also in progress. Tomorrow morning the President flies to Europe for talks with a number of national leaders. He will again meet many of the statesmen with whom he has been transacting the business of the North Atlantic Alliance. He will also meet, but for the first time since the war, General de Gaulle, President of France, an ancient nation and our first ally.

In the background of these meetings—one of them with a self-avowed adversary who wants to measure our land and our people, the others with allies who stand with us

in common defense of common principles—Americans can discern afresh one of the most urgent needs of our time. That is the need of nations to make themselves understood.

The process of broadening our knowledge of the Russians, and of persuading them that we are not the depression-haunted, power-grabbing monsters that their propaganda has invented, is only one aspect of that problem in national exposition which nowadays is called communication. It is equally important for us to continue trying to make ourselves understood to our allies, while at the same time we heed what they are saying to us in our mutual interest. To be sure, each may speak from his own special approach to changing circumstances, yet our relationship is on the solid ground of common purpose.

There never was a ship, however, stanchly built, that did not creak or groan as she rode the seas. So it is with an alliance. And an alliance that rests uniquely, as does NATO, on the principle that its members shall have equal representation—moral equality—in the common councils, is subject to more than the usual strains. NATO's effectiveness cannot be measured by simply counting up the number of troops and weapons which it is able to deploy. Its true strength depends rather upon steady surveillance of those issues which concern the member nations, great and small, in their pursuit of improvement. Without the sense of unity, of shared purpose, which can be achieved only by unwearied striving, the number of divisions in our order of battle loses all meaning.

There is a continuing charge upon the alliance to stake out the common ground. It is no secret that France, for example, has recently asserted certain new ideas concerning her place among her allies. It is certainly no secret that President de Gaulle seeks for France a larger role in the broad strategy of the West. Thorny though the issues are, they must be grasped. However, before I single out any of these for discussion, let me refresh your conception of the aims which NATO was founded to serve, and the concepts which have governed its evolution over a 10-year period.

THE BINDERS OF THE ALLIANCE

These aims and concepts were set forth in the North Atlantic Treaty, which was signed in Washington on April 4, 1949. That treaty has often been described as one of the shortest and clearest of international documents.

As proclaimed in its preamble, the central aim is "to safeguard the freedom, common heritage, and civilization of their people, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law." Nothing could be more forthright, more admirable. We know what we stand for. And to show, further, that we mean what we say, we as allies have bound ourselves—and I quote again from the treaty—"separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid," to "maintain and develop [our] individual capacity to resist armed attack." Alongside this declaration is a clear pledge by all member nations that an attack on any one will be taken as an attack upon all. These are the binders and the stiffeners in the NATO concept of collective security.

It was, of course, the initial threat to Berlin, more than a decade ago, which inspired these aims and solidified these concepts. Before that, Czechoslovakia had been corrupted from within; and Greece had barely been snatched as a brand from the Communist burning. Even those of us who stood at the center of decision during those harrowing events find it hard to recapture the sense of urgency that we then felt. The force and rush of aggressive events startled a world which had thought that the end of

the war marked the beginning of peace. The dramatic emergence of the Atlantic Alliance, combined with the brilliant technical success of the airlift, reduced the pressure on Berlin and on a Western Germany that still lay shattered. The respite was momentary. While the alliance was still debating, a year after its founding, how best to set up and operate its new apparatus of collective security, there fell the sudden blow on the Republic of Korea, and a fresh wave of apprehension swept the world.

The swift return of the threat raised NATO from a hopeful abstraction to the strong and active coalition that we now see. General Eisenhower left his desk at Columbia University to go to France and there set up the headquarters which I now command. It is at SHAPE—Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe—that the military planning for the NATO Alliance is done; there are centered the control of the troops and military resources of 15 nations.

The ideas that have regulated the development of these forces have undergone radical changes since 1951. In this informed company, I need note only three. One was a concentration on the principle of integrated ready forces—formations, whether of land, sea, or air, brought under a central direction, shaped to serve a common strategic plan, and prepared to execute their tasks with that confidence which can come only from close association and long practice.

From the point of view of military planning, the time-space characteristics of modern military weapons have compressed Europe into one-tenth its World War II dimensions. Hence the need for a variety of forces, trained, fused, and ever on the alert. This is what is meant by integration.

Another idea of equal importance was to give NATO forces a nuclear capability. That idea was slow to mature. First there was the problem of supply, a question of quantity and quality. On the American side, there was also the problem of preserving the technical integrity of a weapon that was still novel. Lastly, there was an understandable hesitation about embarking on a defense based largely on such weapons. The Soviet Union, however, was already moving in that direction. The NATO heads of government, meeting in December 1957, took note of the Soviet course when they stated:

"The Soviet leaders, while preventing a general disarmament agreement, have made it clear that the most modern and destructive weapons, including missiles of all kinds, are being introduced in the Soviet armed forces. In the Soviet view, all European nations except the U.S.S.R. should, without waiting for general disarmament, renounce nuclear weapons and missiles and rely on arms of the preatomic age.

"As long as the Soviet Union persists in this attitude, we have no alternative but to remain vigilant and to look to our defenses. We are therefore resolved to achieve the most effective pattern of NATO military defensive strength, taking into account the most recent developments in weapons and techniques.

"To this end, NATO has decided to establish stocks of nuclear warheads, which will be readily available for the defense of the alliance in case of need."

The third idea was to make explicit the task of NATO's ready forces in Europe. Under the definition that evolved, these forces have to perform two functions. First, they must provide a shield for NATO's territory and people. Second, they must contribute to the deterrent and thereby assist in preventing war.

In Europe, the tactical situation is urgent, complex, and acute—more so than many Americans may appreciate, with their fenceless frontiers. There the adversary strains

against NATO's fences, throughout the more than 4,000 miles from farthest Norway to eastern Turkey. Along the European fence, strategy must provide a reasonable margin for a response short of pressing the button of catastrophe. Such a margin answers the possibility of an action started perhaps by miscalculation or perhaps by a rashness that would be repented. If the shield forces, with their own striking elements—nuclear weapons included—are powerful enough to cope with the action in its critical developing phase, a pause can be imposed on the adversary. He will be forced into a fateful decision—whether to enlarge an incident into an action, or an action into war, knowing that his so doing would cast into the scales of battle the full weight of NATO's powers of retaliation.

This is the novel element contributed to the deterrent strategy by the forces based in Europe. In my judgment, it is an indispensable element, for it alone could return to statesmanship a final chance before force would take over from reason.

THE QUESTION OF QUESTIONS

Perfection can never be expected of a coalition strategy. Because nations differ in personality, an agreed strategy has to be the product of a painful search for safety through compromise. It has been so in NATO, just as within our own military establishment. Yet, while our differences of opinion have on occasion been sharp, we have always reconciled them. It is hard to quarrel with success. The plain fact is that NATO's strategy has worked. Behind the line that curves from Norway to Turkey, the Western nations have prospered. Nothing—I repeat, nothing—has been lost.

This is not to suggest that the pressure has relaxed. Again last fall Khrushchev tightened the screw on Berlin. For the moment, while the statesmen confer, the danger seems to have receded. When, or in what guise it may return, we cannot say. Khrushchev leaves us in no doubt that his business in Berlin is still unfinished. Only the other day, he said the position of Germany within the Western Alliance and the related situation of Berlin is the question of questions, the problem of problems.

Question and problem remain in suspense. That they do so is proof that a position of strength, resolutely maintained, is the surest guarantee of a continuing equilibrium. Plainly, our strength in place has enabled us to impose a second pause in the Soviet's maneuverings against Berlin and the German Republic beyond.

We can draw confidence from the course of events so far. At the same time, certain happenings remind us that our alliance must be patiently cultivated. For example, the French search for a stronger position has led to differences. Disquieting as these differences are, they are not nearly so important to France herself or to her allies as are the bonds that hold them to the alliance. In the Berlin crisis, France stood solidly with her allies. For me, an international commander, this was a heartening experience in the mutual support that can be achieved when matters of great moment are at stake.

CERTAIN FRENCH ISSUES

The new issues which France has raised are both political and military. Because of their dual character it would be unbecoming for me, the servant of 15 countries, to intrude my own opinion. It is enough for me to identify certain of these issues. The French desire for a stronger voice in the strategy of the West is a broad one and includes a particular interest in her exercising a major influence in any decision involving the use of atomic weapons. In the field of NATO interests, all members have subscribed to the principle that the voice

of one nation would receive as much attention as that of its neighbor. Anything beyond this must necessarily be worked out by the allies having common interest.

France has stated her desire to become a nuclear power in her own right, and to have the United States share its nuclear secrets with her, thus saving her time, effort, and expense in developing her own weapons. Affecting the solution of this problem is, of course, the existing U.S. law, which is explicit about the conditions on which nuclear information and equipment can be given to other countries. Behind the law lies a concern as to the effect that wider dissemination of nuclear knowledge might have on the great issues of peace and war. The fact that under this law France is not receiving American technical assistance in the development of weapons has made for a sense of grievance.

The requirements of NATO in the nuclear field are responsive to the facts and circumstances of the hour. Knowledge refuses to be contained. Ideas are in flux. Military requirements necessarily reflect changes—technical, tactical and political. It may well be that policies will have to be adapted to new facts and circumstances; that the nuclear responsibilities of NATO authority will have to be broadened.

A symptom of existing differences, of developing French interests, was the inability to reach agreement on the matter of storing nuclear weapons in France for the general defensive needs of the alliance. From this failure stemmed my decision to move from France certain air squadrons which had been based there. These squadrons were and are essential to our NATO strategy. At a time of mounting tension—the Berlin crisis—we could not accept a situation that left a considerable part of our defense force indefinitely separated from its weapons. A shield strategy is an effective instrument of deterrence only in the degree that its capability to strike back is ever in place, ever ready. The transfer of the squadrons was therefore essential, but it was greatly regretted by the two nations most directly concerned: the United States and France. It was certainly regretted by me.

Another aspect of the French situation deserves our study. This is the harsh and bitter war in Algeria, which is drawing a great part of France's Army, her efforts and her wealth. To achieve a peace, to find a solution, is scarcely less important to the stability of the alliance than it is to France herself. For the Algerian war colors and conditions the French outlook not alone on domestic questions but also toward the great Atlantic security system whose center is the geography and spirit of France.

THE NATO BUCKLER

Happily, the issues that now concern us will soon be discussed by men who are no strangers. Eisenhower and de Gaulle, who dealt with each other 15 years ago as generals in the heroic enterprise of liberating France, now meet as Heads of State. Their mutual esteem, and the traditional friendship of their two great countries, give promise that matters will be approached in a breadth of spirit that will enrich the ancient association of France and America, and enhance the parts they play in the great alliance.

In conclusion, I quote a distinguished French statesman-scholar, André Francois-Poncet, who wrote only the other day, "The buckler of peace, the rampart of liberty in the world, is the Atlantic alliance."

So long as men think that way, so long as they have the insight to pierce through the momentary surface distractions, the great end which all of us seek through collective security—a life without war, without fear and without slavery—will still give noble purpose and direction to our generation.

Our Medical Research Investment—Is the Salk Vaccine Worth \$1.26?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the National Health Education Committee, with headquarters in New York, is doing an excellent job in providing the American public with much-needed information on the vital subject of medical research.

One of the committee's recent high-quality publications points out, in dollars-and-cents terms anyone can understand, just how much we are spending on lifesaving medical research, in contrast to the amounts we spend on amusements to help us enjoy life. The study notes that the Government medical research expenditure of \$215 million a year amounts to \$1.26 a person, less than the per capita spending of Americans for cosmetics, liquor, tobacco, greeting cards, and numerous other items.

The dramatic story of the statistics contained in the National Health Education Committee pamphlet is well summarized in an excellent and challenging editorial published in the Eugene Register-Guard, of Eugene, Oreg., for August 13, 1959. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled, "Is the Salk Vaccine Worth \$1.26," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS THE SALK VACCINE WORTH \$1.26?

It is a proper function of Government to assist the citizen in protecting himself against a foreign invader. That our Government does, to the tune of some \$39 billion every year. Is it not an equally proper function of Government to help the citizen protect himself against other enemies—the germs or deteriorations that cause tuberculosis, cancer, heart disease, mental illness, and cerebral palsy? This is the question that comes up when one leafs through a beautifully put-together brochure issued by the National Health Education Committee. The argument of the committee is not that the Government should provide medical treatment, but that it should play a greater part in making possible the research that will lead to cures.

The \$39 billion we spend to ward off possible enemy attack is money well spent. But it is spent to save lives that might not be endangered. Yet we knew that 1,636,000 Americans will die this year—1,147,270 of them from heart disease and cancer. To meet this threat of certain death the Government spends only \$215,800,000. That is for all medical research. The same Government which spends only \$26 million a year for research into arthritis and metabolic diseases spends \$157.8 million a year for research into the diseases of plants and animals. Mental illness, the leading cause of disability (as contrasted with death), afflicts 16 million Americans and puts a patient in every second hospital bed in the country. For research in this field we spend \$27 million a year. For the geological survey we spend \$38 million. Somewhere we have lost our sense of values.

Nor is it only in the public area that our values seem to have been twisted out of shape. Look at what we do privately:

That \$215 million the taxpayers spend for medical research amounts to \$1.26 a person. For face cream, lipstick, face powder, and make-up bases, we spend \$1.39. Tobacco costs us \$34.30, liquor twice that much. Foreign travel costs us \$14.10 a year, greeting cards \$2. And the figure again for medical research—\$1.26.

The small amounts we have spent for research have paid off. Since 1944 deaths from pneumonia have decreased 24 percent. Maternal deaths have decreased 83 percent. Percentage declines since 1944 in other death rates include nephritis, 65 percent; syphilis, 74 percent; influenza, 74 percent; appendicitis, 78 percent; tuberculosis, 81 percent; and acute rheumatic fever, 83 percent.

These battles are not won, but they are being won. Now, thanks to research, we have 18 compounds that cause temporary regressions in patients with various types of cancer. Another 10 cure (that's right, cure) in varying rates transplantable animal cancers. As these battles go on, as cures and near-cures are discovered, Americans live longer, work longer, earn more money, pay more taxes.

Since 1944 research has been such that 1,823,175 lives have been saved. Thus is the country that much more populous than it otherwise would be. These people work. In 1957 they paid \$623 million in Federal taxes.

Figures can be tricky, but the figures from this vantage point make it appear that medical research, far from being subsidized by the Government, is helping to support other programs. These people who, by 1944 standards, would now be dead, paid \$623 million in taxes. The medical research program that kept them alive cost us only \$215 million. That is as good a return on an investment as the American people will ever make.

The Salk vaccine alone, even without the money return, would have been worth more than \$1.26.

Democrat Lists Nixon Virtues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Long Beach Press Telegram of August 16 carried the following letter to the editor which seems pretty well to sum up what a lot of Americans—both Republicans and Democrats—think of our fine Vice President:

DEMOCRAT LISTS NIXON'S VIRTUES

EDITOR: The writer has long been intensely interested in helping get the right men at the helm in high offices of our country. It is so important. It does seem that Theodore Roosevelt was practically flawless for his high office and now Richard Nixon looms up the same way, but what his chances are remains to be seen.

Please allow me, a Democrat, to list his qualifications:

1. Brought up right in a Christian home; had to work hard.
2. Finished college; lawyer, popular debater.
3. Has ideal wife and family, with harmony.
4. Was a good U.S. Senator and battled some Reds at core of our Government into

prison. Splendid southwest Pacific war record. Lieutenant Commander, U.S. Navy.

5. Had 6 years close up under Ike, where he has learned much, and has been most productive vice president we ever had.

6. A proven fighter, yet shows perfect self control and tact; when Ike was ill he conducted himself most admirably.

7. He has proved that he knows more about dealing with Russians than any one, unless it is Ike himself. We need him there and they know and like him.

8. He looks like somebody; not old, not too young.

9. He can dish it out, sharp, cutting and clear, justly, and he can take it with a smile.

10. He doesn't pollute his system with cigarettes.

The man is head and shoulders above anyone in either party for the all-important job when Ike leaves.

JEFFERSON JONES.

House Victory for Food Stamp Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, Missouri is extremely proud of Representative LEONOR SULLIVAN, of St. Louis, and the State is highly gratified that Mrs. SULLIVAN's fight for a food stamp bill has met with success in the House. The entire Nation owes Mrs. SULLIVAN a debt of gratitude for her 5-year struggle in this field of legislation and I ask unanimous consent that two newspaper editorials dealing with food stamp legislation be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Aug. 24, 1959]

MRS. SULLIVAN'S BIRTHDAY GIFT

The House of Representatives gave Mrs. LEONOR SULLIVAN, of St. Louis, a welcome birthday gift when by a vote of 232 to 127 it adopted the food stamp plan for which she has been battling the last 5 years. If approved by the Senate and not vetoed by the President, it will be even more welcome to the country's needy families.

Under the Sullivan plan, the Secretary of Agriculture in his own discretion could issue stamps good for up to \$1 billion a year in designated surplus foodstuffs. The Republican objection has been that it would put the Department of Agriculture into the welfare business. Why should it not—especially since the Department already makes some commodities available for distribution?

To avert a veto, Mrs. SULLIVAN this year presented her plan as an amendment to a bill which authorizes the distribution of an even greater quantity of surplus foods overseas. The Senate and the President will find it difficult to advance a valid reason for not giving food—food which otherwise might rot—to the Nation's hungry.

[From the St. Louis Globe Democrat, Aug. 23, 1959]

HOUSE VICTORY FOR FOOD STAMP PLAN

Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, like most members of her sex, has a sturdy determination, which after 5 years has put through the House of Congress her plan to

distribute surplus food through grocery stores by means of stamps. The plan is intended to provide food items for needy families.

Her proposal was tacked on to an overseas food dispersal program, which the House voted 323 to 127, and which now goes to the Senate.

We have supported Mrs. SULLIVAN in this proposal because of the basic excellency of the idea. It may not be adopted at this session of Congress, and many problems will be encountered in developing such a plan—among them, persuading the Secretary of Agriculture to put it to work under the discretionary power the proposal gives him.

It has been opposed by the administration, which brands it costly and unwieldy and contends it would make the Department of Agriculture a "welfare" unit.

But we think Congress is beginning to see the merit in Mrs. SULLIVAN's idea, which is to provide for our own ill-fed citizens with portions of the vast stores of surplus edibles in the Nation's bins and warehouses. The country has long deemed it humanitarian to feed the needy in foreign lands.

Mrs. SULLIVAN may be overly optimistic when she says the Senate is more favorably inclined to passage of a stamp plan. However, she has exhibited some smart political maneuvering in getting her 5-year-old proposal this far.

No one has produced a better plan or fought any harder for its recognition.

Congress should support Mrs. SULLIVAN in her persistent efforts toward outlawing hunger.

Taxation of Certain Retirement Benefits of Nonresident Aliens SPEECH

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in support of H.R. 135 which would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income amounts paid by the United States to certain nonresident alien employees or their beneficiaries.

Earlier this year Mr. KEOGH, the author of the above bill, introduced H.R. 135, and I later introduced H.R. 6847 which was identical. These bills had the same objective but the State and Treasury Departments both opposed their enactment. In opposing the bill the State Department suggested similar legislation which had been previously recommended by the Treasury Department after consultation with the Department of State and the Civil Service Commission. Upon receipt of a copy of this report from the committee chairman, I immediately introduced the suggested legislation which became H.R. 7673.

After receiving favorable reports from both State and Treasury Departments on my bill H.R. 7673, the Ways and Means Committee decided to amend H.R. 135 in such a manner as to make it identical to H.R. 7673 and report it favorably.

By way of clarifying the objectives of this bill, Mr. Speaker, the purpose is to provide tax relief for nonresident alien individuals receiving civil service annu-

ties after retiring from U.S. Government employment abroad. Since such persons are classified as nonresident aliens not engaged in trade or business in the United States, their earnings from such employment are exempt from income tax. Upon retirement, however, that portion of the civil service annuities in excess of the allowance for investment in the retirement fund is subject to the flat rate of 30-percent withholding tax imposed on income derived by a nonresident alien from sources within the United States.

Speaking as one who spent several years in the Foreign Service, I can assure you that the imposition of this tax upon the annuities of nonresident aliens has caused great hardship and in some instances has engendered resentment against the United States because of its failure to comply with what is assumed to be its contractual obligation to pay retired alien employees a pension not subject to withholding tax. Actually, nonresident alien employees consider their pension as deferred compensation, and since their earned income is not taxable, they expect their pensions also to be tax free. When one realizes that in many cases these pensions amount to \$600 or less per year, it is indeed unfortunate that it is subject to a 30-percent tax and I certainly feel that it makes our Government look somewhat ridiculous in the eyes of foreign governments.

I would like to quote from a letter I received under date of June 29, 1959, from Mr. Marciso San Agustin, president, National Association of Retired Civil Employees, Chapter 9, Cavite City, Philippines:

Your great and magnificent Government had done much in our country. The independence that we now enjoy was due to your magnanimous generosity. We, your former employees, are highly grateful for our retired status, and only claim and beg for a little more compassion to our distressed situation in our retired status, now that we are old, mostly infirm, almost crippled, unable to devote ourselves to any useful or gainful occupation with which to increase our small income, now being slashed by the inexorable 30-percent levy from our annuities. We only ask to be allowed to enjoy a little sunshine in our miserable homes during the remaining years of our lives.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge my colleagues to take favorable action on H.R. 135 and remove this 30-percent tax from the annuities of our retired nonresident alien employees abroad.

Early Drillers Wanted Water When They Brought in Oil in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Texans of an earlier day were plagued by a black liquid which kept bubbling up when they drilled water wells.

Today that black liquid, oil, is eagerly sought after. And it has helped build the growing economy of the State of Texas. Oil wells have given rise to dozens of related industries and have generally helped increase Texas' economy. Tomorrow is the 100th anniversary of the discovery of oil in the United States which has meant so much not only to Texas but to the Nation and the world.

Mr. President, as part of a salute to the oil industry and related businesses in Texas and the Nation, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article by John Lakeman, printed in Texas, the rotogravure magazine of the Houston Chronicle for Sunday, August 23, 1959, and entitled "Texas' First Oil—They Wanted Water."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TEXAS' FIRST OIL—THEY WANTED WATER

The driller threw his hat to the ground, stomped it hard, and muttered angrily. A dirty black liquid bubbled up through the pipe he was poking into the ground to get water for thirsty Corsicana.

He had finally struck artesian water, but oil gurgled up with it. To the driller and his crew, that meant extra hours of hard work. They had to shut out the contaminant so the water would be fit for Corsicanans to drink.

Before the job of casing off the oil was finished, the news had spread over the countryside. Oil.

The original purpose of the well was forgotten by the excited crowd that gathered to see the greasy fluid that soaked through the soil around the well pipe. But the driller was still more concerned with water than with oil.

He did not realize, on that hot summer day in 1894, that he was witnessing the birth of a new Texas industry—one that, in a few decades, would become the greatest single source of wealth in his State.

That industry 65 years later would provide jobs directly for one out of every eight persons in the State, and indirectly for additional thousands who would supply the services and equipment it would need. It would also provide millions of dollars in tax money and royalty payments to build Texas schools and roads.

But the future was not so bright for the water well drilling rig that gave birth to the State's petroleum industry. A careless smoker in the knot of spectators contributed his bit to history by touching off the State's first recorded oil blaze, a fire which destroyed the derrick. Despite precautions, the same fate befell the second and third wells drilled in that area, and the driller who unwittingly served as midwife at the birth of Texas oil almost went bankrupt.

In spite of those early setbacks, more wells were drilled, yielding just enough crude to fan the sparks of excitement. The quiet farming center became the State's first boom town. Speculators thronged in to lease farm land and city lots for drilling. Every bed and cot in town was rented.

By 1897, Texas production of crude oil reached 65,975 barrels, with Corsicana accounting for almost all of it.

Corsicana was indeed the birthplace of Texas oil—the scene of the first discovery and exploitation of the resources in commercial quantities. The first refinery in the State was built there. However, this was not the first time oil had been found in the State.

In 1543, Spanish explorers in DeSoto's expedition found petroleum asphalt float-

ing on the waters of a bay near Sabine Pass. They used that tar to paint the bottoms of their storm-battered ships so they could sail safely on to Mexico.

Even before the Spaniards came, Texas Indians knew of magic springs where greasy bubbles popped to the surface and a dark film spread across the waters. Indian legends say those springs had strange medicinal powers and were capable of healing all manner of ills, both internal and external.

The fact is, the Corsicana well was not even the first successful oil well drilled in Texas. In 1866, just 7 years after Col. Edwin Drake drilled the famous first well in Pennsylvania, a Texan named Lynis T. Barrett sank a shallow oiler near Nacogdoches. And Barrett's discovery was no accident like the one at Corsicana. He was actually looking for oil.

His well doesn't count as a commercial producer, however, although Barrett made a pretty good living peddling the 10 barrels a day he bailed out of the hole. His neighbors bought it to cure their ills and quiet their squeaking wagon wheels.

Compared to what was to come in the early 1900's, Barrett's oil was only a drop; Corsicana's, only a trickle.

The 20th century was a few days old when, on a small hill near Beaumont, a green stream shot 200 feet into the air. The gusher at Spindletop spouted 100,000 barrels of crude oil a day—many times more than any previous well, and Beaumont exploded into another boom town.

Spindletop was the result of the faith of one man and the resourcefulness of two brothers. The man whose faith led to the discovery was Pattillo Higgins, a one-armed Sunday school teacher. On outings with his class of youngsters, Higgins would poke his cane into the soil on the hill and set fire to the escaping gas. Higgins knew there must be oil beneath the knoll. He worked for years to get a test made, and lived to see so many drilling rigs in operation.

The resourceful brothers who drilled the difficult hole were Al and Curt Hamill, veterans of the Corsicana boom and pioneers in rotary drilling. They were the first oilmen to use drilling mud in their operations, mixing the slurry fluid by driving cattle through their slush pit.

After Spindletop opened Gulf Coast production, the story of Texas oil shifted to the north and west. At Electra, in north Texas, cattleman W. T. Waggoner drilled for water for his herd. It was 1904, and the range was dry. When his fourth consecutive water well filled with oil, Waggoner lost his temper. "Damn the oil," he shouted. "I want water."

At Thrall, in 1915, another "water well" spouted oil. At Burkburnett, farmer S. L. Fowler decided to make one try for oil before selling his land. He hit the big Burkburnett townsite pool in 1919.

Oil came to west Texas in 1923, when the Santa Rita wildcat, named by Catholic backers for the Saint of the Impossible, accomplished the impossible. The drillers brought in a gushing well in Reagan County—in a region geologists had marked off as completely unsuited for oil production. Much of the West Texas crude came from lands owned by the State university system and brought millions in royalties to Texas colleges and universities.

Boomtowns sprouted all over the Texas oil patch. Some still live as thriving cities. Others died when the oil that nurtured them trickled out.

Many men willing to take chances tried their hand at the oil game. Some won and became rich and famous. A larger number lost everything they owned, or could borrow. A few early winners later lost their fortunes, but by persisting in their efforts, became winners again.

One of these men was Columbus Marion (Dad) Joiner. Seventy-year-old Dad Joiner had made and lost two fortunes in the Oklahoma booms before he moved to Texas. His first two attempts to find oil on his 1000-acre lease in Rusk County failed.

The third well, stopped once when he ran out of money and restarted with funds scraped from every available source, blew in October 3, 1930, during the dark days of the great depression.

That well opened the prolific east Texas field—the greatest oilfield ever discovered in the United States—and swung the petroleum pendulum back to the east.

A boom to end all booms hit east Texas. Longview almost split at the seams. In less than 15 months after Dad Joiner's discovery, more than 3,600 wells dotted the field, and production reached 110 million barrels. The producing area proved to be 43 miles long and 5 miles wide, and eventually contained nearly 30,000 wells.

East Texas oil flooded the market plummeting prices so low that producers had a hard time selling their oil for 10 cents a barrel. From that period of economic chaos and waste sprang the necessity for State control of oil production to conserve the valuable natural resource that was spilling upon the market—and upon the ground.

Because it had controlled the flow of oil and developed a tremendous reserve producing capacity, Texas was able to open the spigot during World War II and supply 80 percent of the Nation's increased wartime oil needs. If another war breaks out, the State may be called on to repeat that feat.

In recent years, the waters off the Texas coast have been probed for oil. As yet no large deposits have been found. In fact, not enough oil has been tapped to pay for the costly exploration and drilling operations carried on at sea.

But east Texas oilmen are still looking, on land and at sea—and with a sharper, better-trained eye than their forebears possessed. Science has reduced the odds they face to some extent, but the oil business is still a big gamble. One well out of 9 may hit oil or gas; about 1 in 44 a field of commercial size.

However, there is always the possibility that another Spindletop or east Texas lies waiting to be tapped. That's what keeps exploration crews hunting and drill bits boring throughout the State.

Sioux City: Largest Stocker-Feeder Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Sioux City (Iowa) Journal of August 24, 1959:

SIoux CITY: LARGEST STOCKER-FEEDER MARKET

Arrival the other day of one of the first fall shipments of fine feeder cattle from the western ranges reminded us that Sioux City is the largest stocker-feeder market in the world. In 1958, for example, 679,636 head of stocker and feeder livestock originating mainly on the ranges of Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Nebraska were sold on the Sioux City market. They went to thousands of feeder buyers in 20

States in the Corn Belt and elsewhere throughout the United States.

At Omaha, the large central public market to the south of us, only 512,462 head of stocker and feeder cattle were handled last year. That poses a logical question: Why is Sioux City the leading market for this type of livestock, instead of Omaha or Kansas City?

We put the question to Ray Rodeen, president and general manager of the Sioux City Stock Yards Co., and here's his answer:

"We believe that there are many reasons for Sioux City excelling as a stocker and feeder market, among them being more aggressive commission firms and programs for soliciting business by the market as a whole; our proximity to the heart of the Corn Belt, where the largest share of the cattle in the United States are on feed; the ability of livestock feeders to purchase livestock out of first hands direct from the commission firm, who is the agent for the rancher at Sioux City.

"Approximately three-fourths of the feeder livestock are purchased by farmers in the commission firm alleys rather than through a group of dealers, as is the case in some markets.

"At Sioux City we truly have an open competitive market on which all buyers and all sellers have an equal opportunity to operate."

Those are some of the reasons Sioux City tops the Nation's markets on this type of livestock—a natural geographical advantage plus a go-getting attitude on the part of commission firms and a free competitive system of buying and selling.

The importance of the stockyards to our area is readily apparent. And to those Siouxlanders who never have visited the yards, we suggest they take an early look. It's an impressive sight to see thousands of cattle, sheep, and hogs gathered together in the sale pens. It proves that we live in the center of the finest agricultural area in the world.

The Fight Against Mastitis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, an article on a disease affecting the dairy herds of this country has been brought to my attention. The disease is mastitis. Believing the article dealing with the disease and its control will be of interest to my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE FIGHT AGAINST MASTITIS

Every citizen who drinks milk or consumes milk products has a stake in the battle now taking place on the Nation's farms. The battle is against mastitis, a bacterial disease that attacks the udders of cows. Currently, it is the No. 1 farm disease, and costs the dairy industry \$252 million every year in lost milk, diseased animals and medication. This cost, naturally, is reflected in the price we pay for milk.

Ten years ago mastitis was most commonly caused by streptococcus germs which

could be controlled by medication. But the common cause of mastitis has changed.

Today, the most common cause of mastitis is staphylococcus bacteria, which resist even the most powerful antibiotics. This is the same resistant staphylococcus germ which is causing infectious outbreaks in hospitals, sometimes resulting in human deaths.

But mastitis isn't just a farm problem. There are signs it may become a human menace as well. Scientists do not regard pasteurized milk as a source of staphylococcus infection in man, but they say that 'staph' germs can develop in the cow's udder and infect persons who contact the animal.

In the udder, these germs may develop increasing resistance to drugs because of improper medication. A new breed of infectious germ, as yet unknown to science, might develop if this trend continues.

The implication of this danger is clear. Mastitis must be stopped. The history of dairying shows that if a concerted effort is made, the disease can be licked. Not too long ago, tuberculosis and brucellosis were more dreaded than mastitis. Dairy farmers, veterinarians, county agents, and processors got together and whipped these diseases. They can do the same with mastitis.

Definite steps have been taken in this direction. Early in 1958, experts in dairy science and veterinary medicine met at a 2-day mastitis symposium in Chicago at the invitation of the Jensen-Salsbery Laboratories, Inc.

These authorities agreed that good herd management, routine veterinary inspection, proper diagnosis, and specific treatment were essential for mastitis control. They pointed out most emphatically that do-it-yourself treatment by the dairy farmer is not the answer, and may even contribute to the spread of the disease.

In the first place, these experts said, the farmer cannot diagnose all cases of mastitis, and, consequently, can treat only the obvious cases. Many hidden cases go undiscovered, and remain to spread infection.

In the second place, the farmer cannot select the proper medication or administer the proper amount. What worked for him 10 years ago may not work today. By giving the wrong medication, he can make the disease worse.

The problem of incorrect medication has been recognized by the Food and Drug Administration. It has limited the dosage of penicillin, the drug often used to treat mastitis, to 100,000 units, and has forbidden farmers to use milk from cows until 72 hours have passed after the last treatment.

Unless these precautions are followed, there is danger of penicillin being included in market milk and endangering the health of nearly 17 million people in this country who are sensitive to penicillin.

Recognition of sound mastitis control programs has now been followed by two important developments. The first is the availability of new mastitis compounds which contain no penicillin.

The second development is the organized enlistment of county agents to help the fight against mastitis. There are 3,500 county agents in this country whose work is both Federal and State supported. Their job is to acquaint farmers with the latest agricultural methods, and help them solve their farming problems. To the farmer, the county agent is a most important person.

The county agent's role in the mastitis battle is vital. He must convince the farmer to adopt scientific mastitis control procedures. The county agent is the person who must instruct the dairy farmer in the changing character of mastitis causes, and urge him to consult the veterinarian.

At the same time, the county agent is the only person who can work with the farmer

in achieving good herd management that is essential for mastitis control. Clean barns, proper milking techniques, and clean milking equipment are commonsense precautions that some dairy farmers have overlooked, preferring instead to rely on "miracle drugs" to cure mastitis after it breaks out. The county agent is the person who can remind the farmer that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

The outlook is encouraging. Backyard meetings of county agents, veterinarians, and farmers are being held. In several States, 4-H clubs and the Future Farmers of America are sponsoring mastitis control programs to teach farm youngsters how to deal with the disease. Universities and colleges are using their extension services to teach farmers about current mastitis-fighting methods.

As these developments progress, they will mean increased prosperity for dairy farmers. But most important, they will mean a safer, more abundant milk supply for all of us and further conservation of our most precious asset—the Nation's health.

Vice President Nixon's Address on Khrushchev Visit, Given at American Legion National Convention in Minneapolis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from the address given by Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON on August 25, 1959, before the 41st National Convention of the American Legion in Minneapolis, Minn. Mr. NIXON dealt forthrightly with the Khrushchev visits—and how we should conduct ourselves, correctly civil and without demonstrations, in order, if possible, to convince the Communist dictator that the American people and their Government are strong, resolute, and united in opposition to his plans for achieving world domination by force or otherwise:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS OF THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AT THE 41ST NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., AUGUST 25, 1959

I recognize that there are a substantial number of Americans in this audience and throughout the Nation who are deeply concerned about the visit of Mr. Khrushchev to the United States. There are many who believe that no good and much harm can come from such a visit.

There is no question but that there are minus as well as plus factors in appraising the possible results of the Eisenhower-Khrushchev exchange of visits. On balance, I believe the decision to invite Mr. Khrushchev to come to the United States was correct.

In indicating my reasons for reaching this conclusion, may I first remind you of the background from which I speak. I have made a comprehensive study of the philosophy, tactics, and strategy of communism as set forth by Marx, Lenin, Stalin, and other Communist leaders. On the basis of those studies, I know that Communists throughout the world are united in working for one

objective, Communist rule over all the people of the world.

I know from experience that the Communist Party in the United States, like all Communist Parties throughout the world, is directed and controlled from Moscow and has in the past and will in the future engage in espionage and subversion in order to serve the interests of Communist governments wherever they are opposed to those of the United States or other free nations. And I can vividly recall that it was just a little over a year ago Communist-led mobs made an unsuccessful attempt on my life in Venezuela.

I have just returned from the Soviet Union where I have had the opportunity to speak at length with Mr. Khrushchev and to appraise the present tactics and strategy of the world Communist movement. On the basis of that visit, I can say unequivocally that the only significant change in Communist tactics since the death of Stalin is that Mr. Khrushchev and other Communist leaders now say they will accomplish their objective of world domination without resort to war.

Subversion and espionage in the United States and other non-Communist countries continue to be directed and supported by the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. The rigid positions of the Soviet Government on such issues as Berlin, disarmament, setting up an inspection system for prevention of surprise attack, and ending atomic tests, are the same now as they were before these visits were announced.

It would be naive and wishful thinking to assume that the visit of Mr. Khrushchev to the United States will result in any basic change in the Communist objective of world domination or their adherence to policies designed to achieve that goal.

We should be under no illusions that Mr. Khrushchev's belief in the superiority of the Communist system will be changed in any significant respect by his seeing the great productivity of the American economy. Everything he sees in the United States will be seen through Communist eyes and the picture will be distorted or magnified so that it fits into the rigid description of free societies which the Communist doctrine has painted for over 100 years.

Nor should we be under any illusions that better understanding between the Soviet leaders and ourselves is all that is needed to resolve our differences and to assure peace. There are some deep and basic conflicts of interest and ideology which all the good will and mutual understanding in the world will not settle. Charm, words of friendship, gracious toasts, are not going to have the slightest effect in deterring Mr. Khrushchev from his basic objectives.

What useful purpose then will this visit serve? Putting it in its simplest terms, while understanding alone will not bring peace, misunderstanding could provoke war. And it is because his visit can serve to reduce the possibilities of such misunderstanding that it could contribute to the chance that we can settle our differences without war and, therefore, deserves the approval of the American people.

What does Mr. Khrushchev really believe about the United States and the free world?

Based on my conversations with him and my analysis of the statements he has made, publicly and privately, through the years, here is a thumbnail sketch of a man who holds in his hands the greatest power any one man has ever held in the history of civilization—who by his decision alone could press the button which could start a chain reaction which would destroy civilization as we know it.

First, here are some things he believes which are true. He is aware of the fact that the United States has great military strength. While he constantly boasts of his superiority

in the missile field, he has publicly stated in his speech at Dnepropetrovsk on July 28 that no nation today can initiate a war without suffering terrible destruction in return.

He knows the United States is a rich country economically with a high standard of living. He has paid us the compliment of setting as the Soviet goal catching up with and passing the United States in the production of consumer goods.

I believe he is convinced that President Eisenhower is a man who wants peace and who insists that the United States remain strong only because he believes this is the way to keep peace.

But he also has some dangerous misconceptions about the United States and the free world which, in the mind of a man with such awesome power in his hands, constitute a terrible risk to the peace of the world.

Here are some of the things he presently believes about us and our policies:

"Freedom in the United States exists only for those who have money and power and not for the working people."

"Capitalists in the United States have turned the society in which they rule into a paradise for the rich and a hell for the poor—a kingdom of the dollar, of harsh exploitation of millions of people to enrich a handful of monopolists."

"In the United States and other free countries the working people are given the right to vote for various representatives of the ruling class but have no right to participate in the work of the legislative bodies."

"However beautifully the ideologists of imperialism may dress up the capitalist system, it still remains a system by which millions of people are enslaved by a comparatively small handful of exploiters, a system in which poverty and mass unemployment reign."

The words I have just quoted are not mine but his—taken directly from his public statements. And these ideas he reiterated to me in my conversations with him. Because he believes these things he has reached other conclusions which he has stated to me and to others who have talked with him: that millions of people in the United States do not support the President in his firm stand against Communist aggression; that both of our major political parties are controlled by a few rich monopolists and are not responsive to the will of the people; that our economy has reached its peak and is on the way down; that the nations of the free world alliance are divided and when the chips are down will not unite in resisting aggression.

Put yourself in his place. If you possessed great military strength with uncontrolled and absolute power to use that strength to accomplish your purposes; if also you were fanatically dedicated to the philosophy that your economic and political system should and would rule the world; and if in addition you believed you were confronted by opponents who were divided and who lacked the will to resist aggression, would you not be tempted to be far more aggressive in your policies than if you had other ideas as to the strength and will to resist of those who might oppose your aims?

Mr. Khrushchev will be here for only a relatively brief time, but, in his conversations with President Eisenhower and in his trip across the country, there is no doubt in my mind but that he will see and hear some things which will change his preconceived notions about the United States and which in turn will give him pause before he embarks on a course of action in the future which might be contrary to our vital interests.

He will find that not only are we strong militarily and economically, but that the American people have the will to use their strength to defend our freedom or the free-

dom of others any place in the world. He will find that the overwhelming majority of the American people are as dedicated to our system as he is to his. He will find that we will no more tolerate being pushed around than will he.

In a nutshell, if we are to have a Soviet leader with such power in his hands, it is better to have one who knows the world than one who is isolated in the Kremlin.

But what about the dangers of such a visit? There are some who fear that the American people will be lulled into a false sense of security and trust by this exchange. I think that those who believe this to be the case underestimate the intelligence of both our people and our leaders.

It is true that throughout American history we have a record of being a trusting and forgiving people in our relations with other people, but it is also true that we are a people who do not like our trust betrayed and when it is we react accordingly.

When President Eisenhower meets Mr. Khrushchev, you can be sure he will have in mind: The record of major treaties and agreements broken by the Soviet Government—50 out of 52 since 1933; the fact that subversive activities against the United States and the governments of other free nations continue despite Soviet protestations to the contrary. There will be fresh in his memory the fact that Mr. Khrushchev failed to carry out the commitments made at the last Geneva Conference and instead encouraged and stimulated Communist probing actions against the free world in the Middle East and the Far East. And if there was any doubt that we would go into this conference with our eyes open, the Soviet Government's support of the Communist forces in Laos provides a grim and timely warning of what we should expect.

I have had the rare opportunity of seeing both Mr. Khrushchev and President Eisenhower in action both publicly and privately, and I can assure you that the fears of those who believe that President Eisenhower may be taken in or bluffed by Mr. Khrushchev are completely without foundation. There is no doubt whatever but that the interests of the United States and the free world will be vigorously, firmly and aggressively represented by the President in this meeting.

Another objection to the visit is the possible effect on our allies. The President's trip to Bonn, Paris, and London provides a complete answer to this objection. As the President has made abundantly clear, it is not the American way to negotiate, in the absence of our allies, problems that vitally concern their future. We reject the concept that two great powers—the United States and the U.S.S.R.—should decide the fate of other peoples without consultation with them.

A major objection to the visit is the effect it may have on the captive peoples of Eastern Europe. You can be sure, however, that under no circumstances will this exchange of visits result in statements or actions on the part of the United States indicating our approval or acquiescence in the status of the peoples of Eastern Europe.

We do not question the right of the people of these countries, or any other for that matter, to have a Socialist or Communist government if they so desire. But we believe that all people should have a right to choose the kind of government they want. The people of the satellite nations of Eastern Europe have never had an opportunity to exercise that right since World War II. We recognize that their right of choice cannot be obtained by armed intervention on our part. A so-called war of liberation would liberate only dead bodies and ruined cities. But we will continue to support through peaceful means realization of the objectives that the peoples of these satellite

countries be given the opportunity to choose the kind of government they want.

I believe that the American people should give Mr. Khrushchev a courteous reception when he visits the United States. I do not suggest this because I believe a courteous reception is going to affect one way or the other his ideas about our system, but because this is the American way of doing things. Visitors in our country, regardless of how much we disagree with them, should not be subjected to the rowdiness and riots for which the Communists were responsible when I was in South America.

The discussions President Eisenhower will have with Mr. Khrushchev, involving as they do such basic differences and conflict of interest, will be difficult at best. In the cause of the peace with justice that we all want, let us by our conduct see that those discussions are conducted in the best possible climate.

Resolutions of Oregon AFL-CIO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Oregon AFL-CIO, meeting in its fourth annual convention at Seaside, Oreg., August 3-7, 1959, adopted a number of resolutions pertinent to legislation before the Congress this year. I was particularly pleased to note the unanimous adoption, by the group, of Resolution 73, which endorses my bill, S. 1162, to provide an appropriation of \$500 million for cancer research through the National Cancer Institute, of the National Institutes of Health.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this resolution—together with Resolutions 31, concerning expansion of social security assistance; 34, concerning use of surplus foods; 51, concerning employment practices; and 81, concerning scrapping of obsolete ships—be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 31

Whereas the Forand bill, entitled H.R. 4700, which would liberalize cash monthly payments and provide hospital, surgical, and nursing home care for persons on social security; and

Whereas the maximum possible allowance provided under social security is inadequate to pay extensive bills arising from illness; and

Whereas such suffering would be avoided and hospitals and public and private assistance would be relieved of a substantial burden; and

Whereas the future well-being and happiness of all of us depends upon the social security provision we establish for widows and elder citizens: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this fourth annual convention of Oregon AFL-CIO call upon Congress and the President of the United States to make the Forand bill into law. We also advise the Oregon congressional delegation to support the passage of this law.

Adopted August 7, 1959.

OREGON AFL-CIO.

RESOLUTION 34

Whereas the Department of Agriculture has been stockpiling various commodities for years in its farm surplus program; and

Whereas these stockpiles of food commodities have created an ever-increasing cost to the Federal Government, and we, as taxpayers, share this cost; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon AFL-CIO meeting in annual convention support Senate bill 1884, which would provide the availability of surplus foods for individuals who are in need of more nourishing food, and also to provide a better balanced diet, and that the Oregon congressional delegates be advised to support the passage of such legislation.

Adopted unanimously August 7, 1959.

RESOLUTION 51

Whereas one of the greatest menaces to the economic stability of our country and certainly one of the greatest menaces to the security and well-being of many American families is a continuing lack of job opportunities for many heads of those families; and

Whereas the people who are working have to support those who are not, either through taxes or direct charitable contributions, which impose an additional financial strain on all classes of citizens; and

Whereas organized labor has emphasized its concern over the plight of the 3 million still unemployed during this time of prosperity and has called for immediate, positive action to remedy this situation; and

Whereas we feel that this distress among American families would be most effectively relieved by giving priority in new hiring to the unemployed heads of families; and

Whereas the agencies of government should take the lead in alleviating this dire situation, by setting up a system of priority which would favor the hiring of family breadwinners, regardless of sex; and

Whereas Postmaster General Summerfield has issued a directive ordering a larger percentage of women to be hired in the postal service, without regard for veterans preference or whether they are the heads of families; and

Whereas we feel this directive is harmful for the following reasons:

1. It disregards veterans preference—both male and female—since the ratio of hiring is to be determined on the basis of sex, which circumvents by Executive decree the law giving veterans preference, which law was enacted to compensate servicemen for being uprooted from their communities and denied, during the period of military service, the ordinary opportunities for advancement which they would have had in continuous civilian employment; and which was further enacted to provide a place for those maimed in the military service.

2. It shows no consideration for the pressing needs of many breadwinners of either sex who are desperately seeking a chance to work so that he or she may support his or her family according to a decent, American standard of living.

3. It will promote dual employment in the postal service since the spouse can coach the applicant in what to expect in a civil service examination. And this when most communities in the United States have many families in which there is a desperate need for work on the part of the family breadwinner.

Resolved, That the Oregon AFL-CIO in convention assembled at Seaside, Oreg., August 3 to 7, 1959, go on record as opposing the preferential hiring of women in the Post Office; and be it further

Resolved, That the Postmaster General be requested to rescind the directive for the preferential hiring of women in the Post Office, and that preference be given to veterans and heads of families, regardless of sex, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Oregon delegates in Congress, asking them to use any influence or legislative action necessary to insure preference for veterans and heads of families.

Adopted August 7, 1959.

OREGON AFL-CIO.

RESOLUTION 73

Whereas the Constitution of the United States directs that the Government shall provide for the general welfare; and

Whereas cancer is a cold and calculating disease inflicting immeasurable mental and physical anguish on its victims; and

Whereas two out of every three families in the United States shall be stricken by this disease; and

Whereas almost 2½ times as many Americans died of cancer during World War II as were killed in action on all our worldwide battlefronts, and in 1 year claimed more than 10 times the number of Americans who perished in the 3 years of fighting in Korea; and

Whereas Senator NEUBERGER has introduced a bill—S. 1162—in the U.S. Senate to provide an appropriation of \$500 million to be continuing until it is used to fight this killer: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon AFL-CIO, 1959 convention endorse S. 1162, a bill offered by Senator NEUBERGER to provide an appropriation of \$500 million for cancer research to be used by the National Cancer Institute until the fund is exhausted, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Oregon delegation in Congress.

Adopted unanimously August 7, 1959.

RESOLUTION 81

Whereas the dismantling and scrapping of excess and obsolete ships from the reserve fleets provided employment for our workers in the Pacific Coast States; and

Whereas many of these ships are being purchased by so-called dummy corporations and then towed to Japan for dismantling and scrapping by cheap labor; and

Whereas this practice deprives our workers of employment they should be entitled to; and

Whereas the situation creates unfair competition for local companies employing American workers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oregon AFL-CIO vigorously oppose the scrapping of obsolete ships in foreign countries; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to our congressional delegation in Washington.

Adopted unanimously August 7, 1959.

Maj. Gen. William P. Fisher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. HESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to one of the distinguished military officers on the Washington scene who is soon to leave. Maj. Gen. William P. Fisher, the Air Force Director of Legislative Liaison, is to become in a few weeks the Commander, Eastern Transport Air Force, Military Air Transport Service at McGuire Air Force Base, N.J. Bill Fisher is an airman for whom I have great respect and admiration. He

was born the son of a Congregational minister in Atlanta, Ga. He grew up in Southern Pines, N.C. He graduated as an engineer from North Carolina State College in 1934 after a 2-year interruption of his education to work. He then became a flying cadet in the Army Air Corps. After completion of his flying training he competed for a Regular Army commission which he won in October 1936.

On December 7, 1941, Bill Fisher, then a major of 2 days' standing, was wounded in the Japanese attack on Clark Field in the Philippines. His airplane out of action, he led his squadron, the 28th Bombardment Squadron of the famous 19th Bombardment Group, as it fought on the ground as an infantry unit. But he was soon back in the air fighting the Japanese from Java. After a short interval in the States, he returned to the war as a colonel in command of the 308th Bombardment Group under Maj. Gen. Claire Chennault in China.

During the Korean conflict Bill Fisher commanded the Far East Air Forces Bomber Command until assigned as Inspector General of the Strategic Air Command. He came to his Washington assignment in Air Force Legislative Liaison from the post of Deputy Commander, 8th Air Force.

That firm determination and immense ability which made him a great combat air commander has made him unusually effective as the Director of the Air Force's legislative liaison activities. He has represented the Air Force most ably in its relations with the Congress during the past session. I am convinced he will continue to do big things for the Air Force and the Nation in his new post. I am sure that I speak for the Congress when I wish Bill Fisher every good wish for continued success.

Cities for Men and Motorcars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article concerning city planning for Washington, which I think makes a great deal of sense.

This article was taken from the Athens College Newsletter and, I believe, contains a practical, and yet imaginative, suggestion for this city.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITIES FOR MEN AND MOTORCARS

WASHINGTON.—The cities of North America, choking on their growing car populations, are turning to Asia for ways to escape strangulation; or rather, they are turning to a compact, tense Greek who is applying in Asian countries his concepts on how to help man avoid domination by the machines he has created.

This Greek, architect and engineer, Constantine Doxiadis, now 40, is perhaps the foremost world authority on a science, he has named ekistics—the science of human settlement.

He was already chief of town planning for Athens at 23, and Greece's head regional planner at 25. During the Axis occupation he ran a Scarlet Pimpernel band of fellow technicians and achieved the improbable by kidnaping the Italian counterespionage service complete with archives and commanding general.

At the end of the war, Doxiadis became his country's Minister of Reconstruction, survived 21 changes of government in 5 years, and rebuilt much of Greece for far less money than anyone thought was possible. Now he heads Doxiadis Associates, his own firm, which acts as engineering and planning consultants to the Governments of Persia, Iraq, Pakistan, Lebanon, Syria, Ethiopia, India, and Greece for projects which total \$500,000,000.

He has been visiting the United States, brought over to advise on planning for the future of Norfolk, Detroit, Philadelphia and Washington, D.C. (through lack of time, he had to turn down an invitation from Cincinnati). The plan which he proposes for Washington gives a sample of the imaginative Doxiadis approach.

Washington lies in the shape of a wineglass formed by the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers. The stem of the wineglass flows south to the sea. At the bottom of the glass, like an undrunk sediment, lies Washington's forgotten area, its biggest slum. This is known as the southwest, bounded to the north by what is now the heart of the city, a broad strip of Government buildings running 4½ miles east and west between the two sides of the wineglass.

Doxiadis proposes that this vast slum should be cleared as the new capital area of Washington. Large buildings, hotels and apartment houses should be erected there, so designed that as the Government grows they can be easily converted to offices. Further growth should be along the stem of the wineglass, downstream along the river to the sea.

The new triangular capital area would be one of large waterfront piazzas like Venice's Saint Mark's Square, and would be approached by water. Giant hydrofoil water buses doing 60 miles an hour would bring the people upstream and to their work. Tourists would board similar buses from the jetties of waterfront motels downstream on the Potomac.

The Potomac River, a giant freeway already built, should be used as the axis of growth for Washington.

Cities are no longer the static organisms they were in the Middle Ages, when they remained unchanged in size for centuries within their walls. And they cannot be built in ever-growing circles, because in a circular pattern, as the city grows and its center grows within it, traffic to and from the center becomes progressively heavier and chokes movement.

The center of a Doxiadis city is like a narrow cone, flaring out in the direction in which the city is moving. The increased traffic does not all try to converge from every direction toward an evermore congested central point, but moves in parallel streams toward a central backbone which grows longer as necessary.

The streets are in a grid that divides the city not in small blocks, as now, but in large rectangles called sectors, which could be 1 mile long by half a mile wide. Streets outside the sectors are superhighways in which the motorists can travel at high speed.

From this grid of superhighways, small access roads stick into the sectors, rather like the black keys on a piano. The houses

in each sectorline, the access roads and the perimeter form the frame for a park area where only pedestrian traffic is allowed, and where shops, cinemas, and schools are located in a setting of trees and fountains.

Each houseowner can choose his own style of house, and individual dwellings may resemble one another only in having two doors—one leading to the garage and the superhighways (the door to the machine world) and a second door to the human world, opening onto the interior of the sector.

A Doxiadis city provides for several thousand families in each sector, where privacy is secured by high garden walls and trees, where children are no longer in danger of being run over, where the strain of a mechanized civilization is left in the garage and the colossal waste of man-hours on commuting is ended.

In this design for living, man and his motorcar exist in contiguous but separate worlds. The city does not lose its citizens and revenue to the suburbs, whence people now flee noise and traffic only to find themselves captives of the car, without which they and their families are immobilized, and in what is not a quiet community, but a mere characterless dormitory.

The Doxiadis cities are already more than dreams. He is building them in Asia. One is the new Bagdad, a city of 100,000 people rising on the west side of Iraq's old capital.

When the People Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Bridgeton Evening News, a newspaper published in an industrial area of my district, which very lucidly and concisely summarizes the general reaction on the passage in the House of the Landrum-Griffin labor bill. The editorial follows:

WHEN THE PEOPLE SPEAK

The people have spoken through their leader, President Eisenhower, on the labor reform bill. And Congress has listened.

This is what happened in the House of Representatives last week when the strongest of three labor bills went through on a roll-call vote by a margin of 28 votes.

The astounding victory, which came despite fierce pressure from the Hoffa forces and other union leaders, proved that the President had the people back of him when he castigated bad labor practices in a public address just recently.

Those Democrats from the Northeastern States who went along with labor's cracking whip can only stand up to be counted. They should be listed, but for their own constituents to see.

Unfortunately, the vote wouldn't have been that close if national representatives had been less obligated to the unions—and their political funds at election time. This is also a blight on the free system of America and one that cannot be solved as easily as others.

But at least the House has acquitted itself with credit and honor, thanks to the coalition of Republicans and enough good-thinking Democrats who came through.

The controversial labor bill now goes back to the Senate where it is hoped the great tumult from the people will be heard and recognized by our senior lawmakers, who previously passed a measure that was lacking in punch and purpose. Let Senator KENNEDY, who has been active in exposing the vicissitude of labor evils and racketeering, be man enough to go along with the strong bill that the President endorses, and show the Nation that he has the courage of his convictions, despite the danger of offending the labor vote.

Actually, those who voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill will get support from the rank and file of labor which has been "taken in" by the money grabbers within its movement. The working man has no time for violence in his union, nor the practice of taking his dues for the support of hoodlums to carry out strong-arm methods.

It was the Hoffa influence and his defiance that helped to bring about passage of this strong labor control measure. The people are fed up with this kind of power which defies the Government and everything decent and good within it.

Senate passage of this new labor bill will serve notice on Mr. Hoffa and his 100 lawyers that the people rule this Nation—through those they elect—and that his will cannot prevail in a system dedicated to free enterprise and love of liberty.

What You Can Do About Khrushchev's Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the upcoming visit of Mr. Khrushchev—representing a new tactic in East-West negotiations—presents a new challenge to us.

There are, of course, differing ideas as to whether or not the invitation to Khrushchev should have been extended at all. However, President Eisenhower, the standard-bearer of our foreign policy, has made the decision that, in his judgment, will serve the interests of our security and world peace. The American people—in a unified, bipartisan manner—I believe, should give full support to that decision.

This does not, of course, presume an "open arms" welcome to the Soviet Premier.

We realize, of course, that there are a great many people, particularly from the captive nations, who resent, and understandably so, the Premier's being invited to this country.

It should, of course, be made abundantly clear for the public and our allies, that the invitation does not represent approval of communism or of Communist tactics that have resulted in international tensions and threats to world peace.

Nevertheless, I feel that the American people can, should, and will act in a dignified and reasonable manner in attempting to provide the climate in which the Eisenhower-Khrushchev talks and

exchange visits may have the best opportunity for positive accomplishment.

Yesterday's New York Times published an article suggesting "do's and don'ts" entitled "What You Can Do About Khrushchev's Visit." As illustrative of provoking ideas on the visit I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT YOU CAN DO ABOUT KHRUSHCHEV'S VISIT

The decision to have Premier Khrushchev visit this country has been made. Now it is up to the American people to meet the challenge of that decision.

This event may mark a turning point in history. The question is—in what direction? The world is watching and wondering how we will receive this man who has threatened to bury us—the man who did just that to the Hungarian Freedom Fighters.

If he finds us naive, uninformed, and easy to deceive, he might be encouraged to risk adventures leading toward war. But if he finds us realistic, tough-minded, well-informed and united, he may well adopt a more cautious course.

Mr. Khrushchev is not coming to the United States to offer significant concessions or recant his life-long enmity toward us and our values. He is coming prepared to score a propaganda victory, with confidence in his ability to arouse false hopes, weaken our resolves and cause us to make substantial concessions. He must not succeed in such a mission.

You, as an individual American, can do specific things to help make this historic event a turning point toward a better world.

President Eisenhower can tell Mr. Khrushchev that we know the score, that we are not fooled by words without deeds, that we stand fearlessly for real peace with freedom and justice. But only you can make him believe this.

SEVEN THINGS YOU CAN DO

Think of yourself as a participant in this historic event and not a mere spectator. You will then find ways to act effectively. Here are seven suggestions:

1. Keep the reception truthful: Communists, fellow travelers and other extremists must not be allowed to take over and create a false impression. By calmly voicing your views you can encourage responsible, loyal Americans to reflect the true public temper with dignity and self-discipline. Khrushchev should be met with civil silence.

In addition to giving the visitor a polite hearing, you can convey a realistic reaction to his visit. For example, well reasoned, fact-filled letters to the Editor in thousands of local papers and publications will go a long way toward giving Mr. Khrushchev our views straight from the shoulder. Dignified meetings under responsible auspices at times and places removed from contact with his visit can serve to make clear the voice of countless refugees from captive nations.

You can help make sure that people understand how important it is that Khrushchev's reception be orderly and correct. Street demonstrations by insulting crowds is a familiar tactic he has used many times. Soviet rowdies at the Vienna Youth Festival discredited themselves with such demonstrations a few weeks ago. Non-Communist young people who went to Vienna with plans of their own showed how intelligence

and courage can win even against trained street fighters.

2. Know what Khrushchev wants: His major propaganda objectives are revealed in volumes of Communist theory and by years of acting it out. There has been no repudiation by him and he has often repeated the hard core ideas.

Soviet aims are thoroughly documented in the current bestseller, "What We Must Know About Communism" by Harry and Bonaro Overstreet. Here are a few points to keep in mind:

(a) The Soviet Premier wants to lull us into a false sense of security—to make us believe that the kind of peace we want can be had at the next summit conference for the asking. But the last time President Eisenhower met him at the summit—1955 in Geneva—his smiles and joviality were a cover for Soviet penetration of the Middle East, and encouragement of his Chinese allies to start shooting their way to Formosa.

(b) He wants to force us out of West Berlin and clamp down on that island of freedom. He wants to make it appear safe for the Western allies to withdraw, and at the same time dangerous to stay.

(c) He wants to create dissension among free world allies, to isolate us from our friends, so the Soviets can pick them off one by one.

(d) He seeks always to wheedle us into accepting past Soviet conquests and forgetting the plight of the captive peoples. This he considers a basic price for peaceful co-existence.

(e) He continues to demand acceptance of paper agreements banning atomic weapons without any workable inspection or effective control.

(f) He wants us to fear nuclear war so desperately that we will back away whenever the Soviets warn us that standing firm would risk such war. He wants us to believe that the Soviet Empire is now so powerful that we have no choice but to make the bite-by-bite concessions he demands.

3. Know what we want: It is not enough to realize what he wants; we must know what we want and why.

Basically, we want governments to respect and protect God-given rights of the human person, as affirmed in our Declaration of Independence:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

(a) We relentlessly seek a real peace, one that will assure all peoples freedom from fear of direct or indirect aggression.

(b) We want to strengthen and keep the free world united to prevent any further Soviet takeovers.

(c) We believe in self-determination, and we say that the way to unify divided nations like Germany, Korea, and Indochina is by free elections. The way to find out whether nations we call captive really want their Communist rulers is to let them choose freely between Communist and non-Communist candidates.

(d) We want to help nations stand on their own feet and achieve their own goals so they can become good neighbors and traders. And we try to strengthen their capacity to resist constant Communist pressures—economic, political, and military.

(e) We want to reduce the burden of armaments by reaching agreements that are enforceable through adequate international controls.

(f) We favor the free exchange of information and ideas between East and West. Soviet acceptance of this idea requires that they stop jamming foreign broadcasts.

4. Know what Khrushchev represents: As Al Smith used to say, "Let's look at the record." You can help spread the facts about the Soviet record from Lenin's seizure of power in 1917, through Stalin's takeover in Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Albania, Rumania, and Bulgaria, to the current Communist aggressions in Tibet and Laos.

If Khrushchev's visit serves to draw attention to the Soviet record and sharpens world understanding of what he stands for, it will really mark a significant turning point. It is not enough to be against communism; we have to know precisely what it is and why we resist it. People who know can not be misled or confused.

For example, if each one who knows the facts encourages someone who doesn't to find out, there will soon be no danger of Communists winning propaganda campaigns.

5. Know Khrushchev's personal record: How many people know the bloody story of his rule over the Ukraine in the 1930's? It was so vicious that the people of the Ukraine welcomed the German army as liberators. And in 1944 Khrushchev was sent back to punish them.

His speech to a closed meeting of the Supreme Soviets in 1956 exposing some of Stalin's crimes ignored the fact that he was actually a leader in the blood purges and a denier of Stalin's worst excesses.

Anyone familiar with Khrushchev's biography will never make the mistake of taking him seriously as an apostle of peace and friendship. Knowing the facts is the best insurance against being deceived or used.

6. Know how he distorts, confuses and misleads: Lenin taught: "We must be able to resort to all sorts of stratagems, maneuvers, illegal methods, evasions, and subterfuges * * * to make practical compromises, to make agreements, zig-zags, retreats. * * * The present line of peaceful coexistence may be just another 'zig' that will be followed up by a 'zag' to new aggressions. Soviet leaders have shifted back and forth between relaxations of tensions and threats, between peace offensives and ultimatums. Khrushchev sometimes 'zigs' and 'zags' on the same day, using a mixture of peace and war talk.

Be familiar with the way Communists use the free world vocabulary to mislead. When Khrushchev says "Fascist" or "capitalist" he means everybody who isn't a loyal Communist. When he says "noninterference in internal affairs of other countries" he means "everybody else stand aside and let us 'liberate' our neighbors from their 'Fascist' governments." Take note of Communist phrases like "peace and friendship" (the current slogan) and "people's democracy." Be aware of the Communist way of dodging embarrassing questions: "I've never heard of that * * *," "You are misinformed * * *," "A malicious fabrication by our opponents," "You bring that up to aggravate tensions when I am trying to reduce tensions. * * *"

7. Take personal responsibility for promoting public discussion: Get people in your community to talk over how they can best participate in this event as citizens.

(a) Arrange discussions in homes, churches, clubs, Grange Halls, veterans' organizations—wherever people meet.

(b) Ask your local editors, radio and TV station managers to help provide the essential background information.

(c) Encourage librarians to feature displays of books and pamphlets that will help readers understand the truth about communism.

(d) Urge groups to adopt resolutions expressing their views and to send supporting statements to President Eisenhower.

Is the World To Sit Silently by While the Whole Tibetan Race and Culture Are Being Systematically Destroyed—Genocide—By the Communist Tyranny in China?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post:

THE REDS ARE GUILTY OF GENOCIDE IN TIBET

People in the comfortable countries, including the United States, have grown so used to reading about mass murders in far-away places that it is hard for them nowadays to feel these things as real. Atrocities have become commonplace. Have Red China's army and secret police been killing Tibetans in large numbers? Of course. But murder by Communists is such an old story that most of us merely turn the page to murders by juvenile delinquents.

The Chinese Reds are not simply suppressing a rebellion by taking the lives of the rebels. More than that, they seem to be killing Tibetans because they are Tibetans; thus they commit the crime of genocide, which means the slaughter of a people.

That matter has been investigated by the International Commission of Jurists, an alliance of lawyers with headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland. Its record is one of sharp struggle against tyranny. After the Tibetan uprising in early spring this legal group called on its branch in India to search out the facts.

Experts were appointed by the Indian Commission of Jurists to interview witnesses and collect and study documents. After 2 months of investigation, a report has been rendered by the general secretary, Purshotam Trikamdas, who was once secretary to Mohandas K. Gandhi.

The Indian commission has found "a prima facie case that . . . there has been an attempt to destroy the national, ethnic, racial, and religious group of Tibetans by killing members of the group and by causing serious bodily and mental harm. These acts constitute the crime of genocide under the Genocide Convention of the United Nations of 1948." Prime Minister Nehru, however, has said that, because of the absence of Red China from the United Nations, he doubted that the U.N. could take up the Tibetan case.

However, the charge of genocide was soon made officially by the legal head of the Tibetan Government, the Dalai Lama, speaking from his place of refuge in India. "Complete absorption and extinction of the Tibetan race is being undertaken," he declared. There is "terrible deportation and execution of innocent men."

A former delegate from India to the United Nations, B. S. Gilani, says that Red China has an "ultimate aim. It wants to colonize Tibet."

Hitler similarly wanted to colonize Poland and other countries of eastern Europe. To that end he murdered vast numbers of their inhabitants. Stalin committed genocide repeatedly, long before that term was coined to give the crime a particular name. In two continents, from the Baltic to central Asia and farther north in Siberia, he

exterminated, he deported, he colonized. Men and women and children who escaped immediate death were shipped around like low-grade cattle. There are places like Kazakhstan, in Asia, where colonists from other parts of the Kremlin's empire have become the majority; those natives who remain are outnumbered in their own country.

Now Mao Tse-tung and his fellow slave-masters in Peking are apparently committing the same wholesale crime in Tibet. In view of the charges by the Dalai Lama and the Indian Commission of Jurists, the United Nations should make a thorough investigation, even if the guilty nation is not a U.N. member. Otherwise, what good is the U.N.'s Genocide Convention of 1948?

A Texan Serves the Nation—Lt. Gen. Bernard A. Schriever Is Missile Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Lt. Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, Chief of the Air Force Air Research and Development Command, was a pioneer in the field of missiles.

The record of this man, who was born in Germany, grew up in San Antonio, Tex., and graduated from Texas A. & M. College, shows he is well qualified for his post.

Recently Ralph Dighton of the Associated Press, wrote an article telling of General Schriever's colorful career.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. Dighton's article as printed in the Dallas (Tex.) Times Herald for Sunday, August 23, 1959, under the title "Schriever Stands Up and Is Counted—From Texas Caddy to Missile Chief."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHRIEVER STANDS UP AND IS COUNTED—FROM TEXAS CADDY TO MISSILE CHIEF

(By Ralph Dighton)

Early next month the Air Force hopes to stamp "operational" on the Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile.

The expected announcement will mark a significant stride toward eliminating the critical gap—once estimated as 3 years—between the American and Soviet long-range missile programs.

Among the men largely responsible for whipping U.S. missile technology back into the race with Russia is Lt. Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, Chief of the Air Force Air Research and Development Command.

Russia first claimed possession of an ICBM on August 26, 1957. The United States had to wait 15 months before the Air Force blasted its first experimental Atlas from Cape Canaveral over the full 5,000-mile-plus South Atlantic range.

Now, less than a year since that test, the Atlas is about to join the Air Force arsenal of weapons. None could feel greater satisfaction over this development than Schriever—

er—who won his present post and his general's stars fighting for missiles.

It was not an easy fight. There were times when he laid his career on the block, an obscure Pentagon colonel and former German emigrant bucking generals who would not believe the space age was about to dawn.

But in little more than 5 years Schriever has rocketed to three-star general and built missile technology into a \$2-billion-a-year industry.

HONORED BY TEXAS

Schriever's success was recognized last May by the State of Texas, where he grew up. A joint session of the Texas Legislature honored Schriever's mother for her own and her son's achievements. The legislators gave Mrs. Schriever, now crippled from effects of a stroke, a bouquet of roses and a standing ovation.

Schriever was visibly shaken by the tribute.

"What a wonderful day this is for her," he said to a friend, his eyes dimming with memories. "What a wonderful day."

Handsome and broad shouldered, this man with the sky-blue eyes sometimes is mobbed for autographs by women in the factories he visits on production-spurring tours. Men, too, like him instinctively. His subordinates frequently find their regard bordering on awe.

One of his favorite phrases is, "Stand up and be counted."

"If you believe in something," he says, "fight for it—at least until a decision is reached on a higher level. Then, whether you're right or wrong, stand up and be counted."

MODEST ABOUT ROLE

Schriever is inclined to be modest about his pioneering role in missile development. "It was my job to look ahead, he says.

He has been credited with fighting for missiles since 1950, when they were more closely related to science fiction than military science.

"It just isn't true," he says, with characteristic frankness. "I did not become sold on missiles as weapons until late in 1952, when technological advances showed that nuclear warheads could be made small enough to fit missile nose cones.

"Up to that time I had been more interested in big bombers as a deterrent force. Then the picture changed. With smaller payloads, missiles became practical."

By 1954, when the Air Force decided to set up a missile research and development center on the west coast, it was obvious that the man for the job was the man who had fought for their existence.

First, as a crackerjack engineer, Schriever knew missiles and how they should be made.

Second, he was a topflight administrator, a paperwork genius in development and planning.

MISSILE GROUNDWORK

Schriever, then a brigadier general, was sent to Inglewood, Calif., to lay the groundwork for what was to become the Air Force Ballistic Missile Division.

In the years since 1954 Schriever has flown hundreds of thousands of miles in this country and abroad in the cause of missilery. He spent much of this time in Washington, selling his program to Congress.

Schriever was among those who pushed the idea for setting up production facilities while development of the Thor intermediate range missile was still underway. He argued that this compression of lead time would mean that the missiles would be ready for deployment much sooner. Thors are now operational in bases in England.

His aide, Capt. Robert Crabbs, says Schriever rarely gets more than 3 or 4 hours' sleep a night when traveling. On a typical cross-

country trip he will take a group of subordinates with him as far as Omaha or Chicago, send them back on another plane, and during the rest of the flight work with another group that has flown out to meet him.

CHECK PRODUCTION SNAGS

Many of the general's trips are to check on snags in production.

Dan Kimball, former Secretary of the Navy, who now heads the missile-building Aero-Jet-General Corp., says:

"He beats contractors over the head to keep them on schedule. He has even worked some of my executives over with a wire brush—and we keep on schedule."

What drives Schriever so hard?

A clue comes from retired Lt. Gen. Lawrence Craigie, now vice president of American Machine & Foundry, a supplier of missile launching equipment.

"You have to know about his childhood," says Craigie. "Ben seldom speaks of it, but I feel sure one reason he loves this country so much is his early experience, his own personal knowledge that this is a place where a kid who can't even speak English can rise to a position of great trust and responsibility."

BORN IN GERMANY

When Bernard Schriever, born September 14, 1910, in Bremen, Germany, arrived in America in 1917, effigies of Kaiser Wilhelm swung from lampposts across the land.

Through a rising tide of anti-German hysteria, his mother hurried with him and his young brother Gerhard to a haven with friends at the German-American community of New Braunfels, Tex. There they awaited the release of her husband, a German seaman who had been interned at the outbreak of hostilities.

His father died in a factory accident at San Antonio shortly after his release. Schriever's mother went to work as housekeeper for a wealthy family in San Antonio.

Mrs. Schriever's employers gave her a small house on a golf course. The boys operated it part time as a refreshment stand until their benefactors died and Mrs. Schriever took over the stand full time.

Ben began caddying and took up golf with characteristic determination. By the time he reached high school he was a golf prodigy. He still shoots sub par golf.

Harvey Penick, now a professional at Austin, says: "What a waste of talent. Here he is fooling around with missiles when he could have been greater than Hogan."

A. & M. GRADUATE

Ben received a B.S. in engineering from Texas A. & M. in 1931 and joined the Air Force. He has been in the service ever since, except for a brief period as a commercial pilot in 1938. He married a general's daughter (they have three children), became a Wright Field test pilot, took a master's degree in aeronautical engineering at Stanford University in 1942, then flew 63 bomber missions in the Pacific.

After the war Schriever was sent to Washington as Chief of the Scientific Liaison Section. In 1949 he entered the National War College and upon graduation went into the Pentagon. There he demonstrated his ability to handle tremendous detail and inspire those around him.

At 48, as the Air Force's research and development chief, Schriever today is making decisions which could affect this Nation's survival.

If he does his new job well, there may be even higher rewards. Some observers believe he may be marked for the top Air Force job—Chief of Staff.

But it would be difficult for any reward to surpass one he already has—the accolade from the Texas Legislature.

Home Rule for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on July 28, 1959, I testified before the House District Committee in support of my bill, H.R. 4630. My testimony was as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK, JULY 28, 1959

Mr. MULTER. For the record, I am Abraham J. Multer, Representative from the 13th District of New York.

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear here this morning in support of home rule for the District of Columbia.

At the outset may I say that I understand and respect the views of other Members of Congress who oppose home rule for the District. At the same time I very vigorously and sincerely disagree with them.

It is my opinion that not only should the hearings go forward expeditiously, but that a bill should then be reported to the House so that the House may work its will as to whether or not the District should have home rule and if so the form that that home rule should take.

Mr. McMILLAN. Will the gentleman yield for a question at that point?

Mr. MULTER. Surely.

Mr. McMILLAN. I take it you do not favor the discharge rule before the Rules Committee that would not permit the House to work its will?

Mr. MULTER. I do not know as of this moment of a discharge petition, if that is what you are referring to.

Mr. McMILLAN. I am referring to the discharge rule that provides for a 1-hour debate on the home rule bills.

Mr. MULTER. I do not think a discharge petition has been filed yet but, most respectfully, I hope it will be filed and I hope to be one of the first to sign the petition, and I hope in short order the petition will be signed and the legislation will be brought before the House.

Mr. McMILLAN. Perhaps I misunderstood you. I understood you to say you wanted the House to work its will, and the House cannot work its will on this legislation in the period of 1 hour.

Mr. MULTER. I understand your statement, but I do not agree with it and cannot subscribe to it.

[Applause.]

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Officer, if anyone attempts any applause or any other demonstration in the room, I want you to see who it is and promptly remove him.

The OFFICER. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. Proceed, please, Mr. Multer.

Mr. MULTER. Addressing myself further for the moment to Chairman McMillan's remarks, it is my firm opinion that the House can work its will on any bill that is brought before it, whether it comes before it through the committee procedure of being reported by a committee and then by a rule, or without either report from the committee or a rule. And when a discharge petition is filed and it is signed by the necessary number constituting a majority of the House, that is the will of the House that the House shall determine whether they shall pass on the legislation. That is the first question the

discharge petition puts before the House. The House can then decide it will not consider the matter, or, on the other hand, if the majority says it will consider the matter, the House proceeds to determine what it will do with the bill and perfect the bill if that is the will of the majority. It is my considered opinion that it is and that the majority will so express itself in favor of home rule for the District and will bring forth a bill that will give to the District a modicum of home rule, probably not as much as I would like to see, and probably not as much as other Members would like to see, but, at the expense of referring to the cliché that maybe this is just a foot in the door, I for one am willing that we get that foot in the door or that toe in the door and move forward from that. If we get some kind of home rule for the District this year, after we have had some experience under it I hope we can perfect it and give to the District more and more home rule.

I have before me the letter from our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. McMILLAN, dated July 27, which was addressed to me and I believe to all the authors of other home rule bills, in which he states that among other things he will request the chairman of the subcommittee to insist on all authors of bills making an oral statement so that we will be able to get all the information possible on this subject.

Mr. McMILLAN. That is correct. That letter was sent to the author of every bill because this is an important question and I think every member who thinks enough of this question to introduce a bill should come in and explain how he can get by the Constitution. You are a good lawyer, and we want you to tell us how you can get by article I, section 8, of the Constitution.

Mr. MULTER. I will get to that in a moment, sir.

I would first like to say that this is rather an unusual request. The chairman himself, Mr. McMILLAN, has been the first to violate it by having the chairman of the subcommittee read his own statement, and I respectfully suggest that other members who desire to file a written statement be permitted to do so and to file it just as though he had made it orally.

Mr. McMILLAN. Of course, everybody may submit a statement, we will be glad to have it, but we feel any man who introduces a bill should be willing to come in and explain it. I did not introduce a bill.

Mr. MULTER. I understand. I do trust the committee will take the view that when 26 Members of the House introduce an identical bill, if one or more come in here and explain the bill and they explain in writing or otherwise that they support that bill, that would be a sufficient record.

I do not pretend to know all about home rule or all about all the bills that have been submitted, but I think it is high time, after the other body has five times in the last 10 years passed a bill for home rule for the District, it is high time this committee report a bill to the House so that the House can decide by vote if it wants home rule for the District and to what extent.

Mr. McMILLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. McMILLAN.

Mr. McMILLAN. I do not know whether you were here when we had the bill before the House and the House spent 2 whole days on home rule?

Mr. MULTER. I recall it, sir.

Mr. McMILLAN. And the bill was not passed.

Mr. MULTER. I recall it, sir.

Mr. McMILLAN. According to the radio and television and the newspapers it would appear we have never had one before the House.

Mr. MULDER. It has been 10 years since we had one, and I think it is time the House decide whether the people of the District are entitled to the right of representation as well as the burden of taxation. One goes with the other, and without both we do not have the democratic form of government—with a small "d"—that we brag about to the free world and that we like to talk about during campaign time, and that goes whether we believe in States' rights or a central government. That is unimportant. Certainly all should agree that everybody has a right to vote and elect their representatives and their representatives should have a right to participate by voting on every piece of legislation passed or considered which affects their lives and their property and their rights.

I have introduced two bills. One bill, H.R. 4630, is the bill which is preferred by the administration. While I have disagreed vigorously from time to time with the administration on many problems—and probably will again many times before this administration leaves office—this is one time I am willing to go along with them again with the idea in mind that this is half a loaf and this half loaf is better than no loaf.

I will not take the time to discuss each of the sections in that bill. I did place a detailed analysis of the bill in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the course of a special order I had on February 17. It appears at page 2312 of the RECORD and subsequent pages up to and including page 2317.

The other bill which I introduced, H.R. 8081, is the so-called Morse bill, and it is quite like the one which the Senate has now passed and sent to this body. I will not take the time to analyze that bill either.

The first bill calls for elected local legislators and an appointed Governor.

The second bill calls for an elected mayor and city council and so forth.

Both bills present the primary issue—

Mr. DAVIS. Will you designate them by number?

Mr. MULDER. Yes, sir. The first bill is H.R. 4630 and the second bill is H.R. 8081.

Both bills present the first and primary issue the Congress must determine, and that is, Shall there be home rule?

Mr. DAVIS. I shall have to ask you to suspend until we can have the noise stopped outside.

(Brief suspension of the hearing.)

Mr. DAVIS. Some of the people who attended the hearing this morning seem to be determined to make this the same kind of situation which prevailed in Havana last week. If we just had the beards and machetes we would have a pretty good duplication of it out in the hall this morning and we apparently would be ready to begin the distribution of land and other property.

We will proceed in an orderly way, and I think you can proceed now, Mr. MULDER.

Mr. MULDER. Mr. Chairman, I think before we go much further I ought to direct the attention of the committee to one of the primary rights of citizens of our country. It starts with the Declaration of Independence and it is written into our Constitution with such bold letters and big type that none can misunderstand it, and none should ever forget it, and that is the inherent right of citizens of our country to assemble publicly and to peaceably petition their legislators and their Congress, and that is what these people are trying to do who are in this room and out in the hall, and if there is any disorder the committee must bear the responsibility for it by not providing adequate room for these people to come in and quietly attend the hearing and hear what is being said.

Mr. DAVIS. Will you yield at that point?

Mr. MULDER. As soon as I finish this point.

I submit this hearing should be adjourned to a larger room, if one is available, which I

am sure it is, so that we can all, citizens outside, and citizens inside, listen quietly and orderly and give them the orderly hearing I am sure they all want.

I yield, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Mulder, as I stated in answer to a question by our colleague, Mr. Wier, a moment ago, we have been able to hear all the legislation that we have had hearings on in this room. We are able to hold these hearings here now and will hold them here in an orderly fashion and will hear everyone who desires to be heard on this legislation.

This is a staged demonstration, as you well know and as all of us well know, and its purpose is not to present any facts to the committee but to bring pressure on it. I do not think it will succeed.

We will be glad to hear you and we will be glad to hear every other interested person.

You may proceed.

Mr. MULDER. Mr. Chairman and my distinguished colleagues on the committee, although I did not participate in the preparation for this demonstration or in the march on the Hill, I approve of it and I remind you gentlemen that the Boston Tea Party also was a staged demonstration, a demonstration against the King and his tyrannical use of his powers. It did not have its effect. It resulted in a war, a revolution, and the birth of this country.

I am sure that no such demonstration will ever again result in war in this country to attain for the people the privileges and rights that are guaranteed to them by the Constitution, and I am sure the Congress will eventually give them all the rights they are guaranteed by our Constitution, including the right to elect a voting Representative to the House of Representatives and to elect their own local officials.

With respect to the specific question that was tendered by Mr. McMILLAN of whether or not home rule legislation would be constitutional, may I suggest that in the same article I, section 8, the Congress is given the power to coin money and regulate the value thereof, yet no one denies that the National Bank Act and the Federal Reserve Act are constitutional. They have been tested and found constitutional and I have not heard anybody in recent days argue against the constitutionality of the National Bank Act and the Federal Reserve Act. Both acts take from the Congress, by the Congress's own legislation, and give to the Comptroller of the Currency and to national banks and to Federal Reserve banks the right to do that which is reserved to the Congress in this same article, this same section, with reference to money.

How much more important is it that we give personal rights—the right to vote, the right of representation—to these people by legislative enactment. We do it every time we create a State. I know the answer will be, "But look at the particular language of section 8, clause 17." I do look at it, but I do not overlook when I get to the same article, same section, clause 18, the same Constitution says, "The Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

I think that is the complete answer to any argument that may be urged that home rule legislation would be unconstitutional.

Mr. McMILLAN. While you are on that subject, were you in Congress when we had the last hearings on this subject?

Mr. MULDER. I came here in 1947, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McMILLAN. You were not a member of this committee at that time?

Mr. MULDER. No, sir; I was not.

Mr. McMILLAN. We had a statement from the late John W. Davis, who I am sure you will agree was one of the greatest constitutional lawyers in the United States.

Mr. MULDER. One of the greatest.

Mr. McMILLAN. He sent down a statement to the committee stating we did not have the right as Members of Congress to delegate our authority in this respect.

Mr. MULDER. I respect the opinion of the late John W. Davis as a great constitutional lawyer. I disagreed with him in this instance, as I have in other instances. Without going into the details, I recall distinctly one case that went to the Supreme Court in which we were on opposite sides. The Supreme Court unanimously agreed with me. And I hope if the home rule bill goes before the Supreme Court it will again agree with me. I think the arguments for constitutionality of the home rule bill are of much greater weight and have more validity than the respected and respectable opinion of the late John W. Davis.

Mr. BROTHILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULDER. Yes.

Mr. BROTHILL. We appreciate your stating your views. However, it seems our Founding Fathers went to great lengths to make sure Congress would exercise authority over the District of Columbia, because they added some words to emphasize that language that would otherwise be superfluous. They said Congress shall have power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever. The language without the words "exclusive" and "whatsoever" would still make sense, but they added the words "exclusive" legislation in all cases "whatsoever." It seems to me their intent was to exercise the authority of Congress over the city.

There is and has been for several years a resolution pending before the House Committee on the Judiciary to grant to the citizens of the District of Columbia who are American citizens the right to vote for President and Vice President.

To my knowledge no consideration has been given by the Judiciary Committee to that legislation. I have not heard of any Member of Congress who objected to that proposal to give the citizens of the District of Columbia the right to vote for President and Vice President, but there does not seem to be the same desire to give them that right—which seems to me to be more important than to give them the limited authority involved here. And it will be limited because whatever bill is passed there will be the question of how much voice the local people would have, but in voting for President and Vice President there would be no question about it, and I am certain the House would pass an amendment to give these citizens of the District of Columbia the right to vote for President and Vice President, and it would go through.

I am wondering why the people interested in this legislation do not start a discharge petition to discharge the Judiciary Committee and bring that bill before the House?

What do you say about that?

Mr. MULDER. I say let us not pass the buck.

Mr. BROTHILL. I am not passing the buck.

Mr. MULDER. I am willing to join with you tomorrow in filing a petition to discharge the Judiciary Committee from further consideration of the bill to pass a constitutional amendment to give the citizens of the District of Columbia a right to vote for President and Vice President.

Mr. BROTHILL. Do you not think that is a more important bill?

Mr. MULDER. I think it is a very important bill and I am willing to join in filing a petition to discharge the Judiciary Committee, but I think we should leave no stone unturned to give them both bills.

Mr. BROTHILL. You would eliminate the constitutional question by a constitutional amendment to give them that right.

Mr. MULTER. I do not think you need a constitutional amendment. I agree the weight of authority is with you in saying there is need for a constitutional amendment, but I would risk passing a law and giving the right to them and I would risk what would happen in the U.S. Supreme Court as to whether that bill is constitutional or not.

Mr. BROTHILL. I will not argue with you on that.

Mr. MULTER. I say let us do the two things. Let us do the three things. Let us pass the constitutional amendment, too. By the time the constitutional amendment is adopted I think the Supreme Court would have passed on the constitutionality of the legislation. I am willing to vote for the constitutional amendment because it is one sure method to give them the right to vote, but I would not forgo the right of Congress to give it to them without a constitutional amendment.

Mr. BROTHILL. I am merely suggesting that we eliminate the ambiguity. I do not think that would be difficult if the Judiciary Committee would hold hearings on the legislation before it.

Mr. MULTER. But this is before us now.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. MULTER, would you prefer to finish your statement and then answer questions?

Mr. MULTER. No; I think it is much better that the questions be asked and the answers given as the questions arise.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. MULTER, will you yield?

Mr. MULTER. Surely.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I want to express my sincere regard for our colleague, who is a very distinguished member of our committee and who is always loyal to his interests. I think I heard you say you would be in favor of giving the District a voting representative in Congress, and if I heard you correctly, is it your idea that the next step probably that would be undertaken would be to make the District a State with two or more U.S. Congressmen and two or more U.S. Senators, and if that is granted I wonder what you think about giving them voting representatives in the Senate, too?

This is a great concern that I have. We hear so much about taxation without representation. If we grant some kind of home rule would the next step be, "We are still being taxed without representation," and what would be the position of the great city of New York and the State of New York and down the line? That is the question that puzzles me.

Mr. MULTER. It gives me no trouble, Billy, and may I take a moment to say I appreciate the compliment you pay me. It gives me no trouble because I so frequently refer to the history of the city of New York and State of New York and what happened to my town or city of New York. We did not always have home rule there. We do not have complete home rule yet but we have more than many cities. We had to fight for it all the way and today we have more than many other cities.

It does not bother me that you have a bill—I do not think it is on the list but I think our distinguished colleague from Texas, Mr. TEAGUE, has introduced a bill that is known as a nonsovereign State bill.

Mr. DAVIS. Do you have the number of that bill?

Mr. MULTER. No, I do not, but the newspapers referred to it. I do not know the number of it but that bill, I think, calls for a voting Member of the House of Representatives and two voting Members of the U.S. Senate.

I do not go for half representation. I say if a citizen is entitled to be represented he is entitled to full representation. If he is entitled to vote he is entitled to vote on

everything that concerns him. But I am willing to take this step by step, and I think the first step is to give him some home rule. I do not know of any prohibition against home rule up to 75 years ago. No one tested its constitutionality. It was good at that time. Why could not home rule be good today?

I think the constitutional question is one that should be resolved by the Supreme Court if and when it is tested, but in the meantime I think we should move forward and give the taxpaying citizens of the District of Columbia of the United States of America the right to vote for their local officials and to govern themselves.

And that reminds me of this situation:

If what is said about home rule being unconstitutional is true, and if this language means precisely what it says, that the Congress reserves to itself all the legislative power concerning this District of Columbia, then indeed our Founding Fathers were very foolish and impractical, and I disbelieve that because if that is so everything that is done today by the Commissioners is illegal and unconstitutional. I have not heard anyone say that. Every time you give the Commissioners or the Public Utilities Commission the right to issue a rule or regulation, whether it involves health or sanitation or transportation, that is legislation and a legislative power, and if the Congress did not have the right to give that authority to the Commissioners or to the Public Utilities Commission or any other District Commission, then everything they have done is unconstitutional and everyone who violated an ordinance and paid a fine was fined illegally, and I do not think that is so.

This is my position on these bills and I hope very shortly you will go into executive session and bring forth a bill that can be acted on promptly.

Mr. DAVIS. We appreciate your statement.

I want to ask you some questions about some of the points you touched on.

Mr. MULTER. Surely.

Mr. DAVIS. I notice in House Resolution 320 that you are listed as one of the four Representatives which that resolution provides for recognition by the Speaker to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of H.R. 4630, which is one of the bills you referred to in your statement.

Mr. MULTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. You are familiar with House Resolution 320?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, I am.

Mr. DAVIS. That resolution provides that all points of order against the bill are waived and it provides that general debate shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by you or whoever requested the rule for consideration of H.R. 4630, and a Member who is opposed to said bill to be designated by the Speaker.

The resolution further provides that no amendment shall be in order to the bill except those offered by direction of the Member requesting the rule, which could be you or one of the three other Members named in the resolution, and that amendments so offered may be offered to any part of the bill but shall not be subject to amendment.

That strikes me as being a very harsh and stringent gag rule.

This bill, H.R. 4630, is a bill which has 83 pages in it. This resolution also provides that it shall be considered as read when the debate has been ended.

What is the reason for all these various provisions?

Mr. MULTER. All the reasons I have ever heard urged since I have been a Member of the House in support of closed rules can and

should be urged in support of that closed rule. It is no different from any other closed rule that has been reported by the Rules Committee and adopted by the House, and you know, I am sure, the House does not have to adopt this closed rule.

Mr. DAVIS. It expresses your attitude?

Mr. MULTER. That is right, because I think a bill of this kind ought to be considered just as we can consider bills out of the Ways and Means Committee dealing with billions of dollars under a closed rule without amendment when there is much disagreement. Surely we can consider a bill of this kind under the same rule and determine once and for all the issues it raises in this session of Congress and that is, whether or not home rule shall be given to the District and whether or not they shall at least have the right to experiment under home rule for a while.

Mr. DAVIS. How does the gentleman feel that restricting these debates to 1 hour will further the purpose of having home rule this session? Does not the gentleman know that 1 day's debate or 2 days' debate or any reasonable time would not jeopardize the passage of the bill if the House wants to pass it? I would like to know why you want to restrict it to 30 minutes to those in favor and 30 minutes to those opposed when you cannot begin to touch the various provisions in this 83-page bill in that length of time?

Mr. MULTER. May I be presumptuous enough to suggest that the reason for the limitation to 1 hour is that I do not think if you talked about this bill for 10 days a single vote would be changed.

Mr. DAVIS. Is that the gentleman's attitude about legislation generally?

Mr. MULTER. No; it is not.

Mr. DAVIS. Why does the gentleman say it about this bill?

Mr. MULTER. Because on this particular bill I think every Member of the House has made up his mind whether he is for or against home rule and will vote accordingly regardless of how much debate there is.

Mr. DAVIS. Would you say every Member of the House is familiar with the provisions of H.R. 4630?

Mr. MULTER. Just as he is not now, I would say after 20 days' debate every Member would not be familiar with every provision of the bill.

Mr. DAVIS. You do not think debate would inform him as to the provisions?

Mr. MULTER. Debate would inform those willing to stay on the floor during general debate.

Mr. DAVIS. The gentleman knows you have a right to get them on the floor and keep them there.

Mr. MULTER. You cannot if there are 100 on the floor, and that is less than one-fourth of the Members of the House.

Mr. DAVIS. I differ with the gentleman as to the necessity to explain the provisions of a bill.

Mr. MULTER. Before we leave the matter of limitation of debate, I have learned the hard way that all good legislation is the result of compromise, and I am willing to compromise if you and others who feel about it the way you do say 1 hour is not enough. I am willing to agree with you on how much time for debate there should be.

Mr. DAVIS. Let me get the gentleman's idea on how much time he thinks would be reasonable?

Mr. MULTER. I have said I do not think any amount of debating—

Mr. DAVIS. You are a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, are you not?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, sir; I am.

Mr. DAVIS. That committee reports out many bills and the Rules Committee has always allowed reasonable time for debate on bills out of that committee.

Mr. MULTER. That is right.

Mr. DAVIS. You have referred to tax bills. We all know the reason tax bills come before the House on a closed rule is that experience has demonstrated that it is almost impossible to pass a tax bill unless it comes up under a closed rule.

The gentleman referred to tax bills involving billions of dollars. Appropriation bills also involve billions of dollars and they come up under a closed rule.

Mr. MULLEN. Sometimes they do.

Mr. DAVIS. Almost always, but you can offer an amendment any time you want to and get a hearing before the House, and House Members are not prevented from offering amendments and expressing themselves about such amendments as they may offer, and certainly the appropriation bills I do not think can be considered as of lesser importance than the subject matter of this legislation.

What do you say about that?

Mr. MULLEN. I say this committee is in charge of that situation. Most of these bills have been before this committee since January. Most of them have been before Congress every session for the last 10 years. I am not accusing anyone of being dilatory, but I am suggesting the answer to any discharge petition is that the committee has had ample time to report out a bill and that the committee can be in control of the kind of rule you wanted brought forth. It is still within the power of this committee to control that.

Mr. DAVIS. Is it your attitude, then, that because the committee has not held hearings on these bills up to this time, to eliminate all the legislative processes and go ahead and adopt these stringent provisions provided for in this resolution which have already been outlined here and assume that this bill, H.R. 4630, is so perfect that no Member of the House other than the four named in House Resolution 320 would be capable of offering an amendment to it that would improve it?

Mr. MULLEN. I am sure I can talk for the other three colleagues mentioned in that resolution. None of us claim to know it all, none of us is perfect, and none of us claim we can bring out a perfect bill.

Mr. DAVIS. Why have you restricted it so that the other 433 Members of the House would have no opportunity to offer an amendment or debate it?

Mr. MULLEN. Because the discharge petition and the closed rule is as much a part of the legislative processes as the committee system.

Mr. DAVIS. Why have you restricted it further so that if one of these four Members does offer an amendment that no Member of the House will be permitted to amend that amendment?

Mr. MULLEN. The same principle applies here regarding the offering of amendments to amendments as to other bills.

Frankly, none of us at this time foresee the necessity for amendments. However, during the course of the debate things may be suggested to improve the bill, and I am sure my colleagues sponsoring this bill will agree to any amendment that will improve the bill.

Mr. DAVIS. But you would not agree that any other Member who disagrees with the propriety of any provision in this bill could offer an amendment?

Mr. MULLEN. Most respectfully I say to you we had a choice, a hard choice. We could have an open rule and permit amendments until the end of the session of Congress—whether dilatory or otherwise is unimportant—but under an open rule it could go on until adjournment. Or if it is a closed rule it must be a closed rule not in part but completely, otherwise those who want this legislation will see it talked to death.

I say that to you most respectfully.

Mr. DAVIS. Again I disagree with the gentleman most respectfully because I am convinced under the rules of the House there cannot be carried on any such dilatory tactics as the gentleman has referred to. I thoroughly disagree with the gentleman regarding the reason he gives for completely eliminating the voice of the House in passing on the provisions of the bill, which is what this gag rule would do.

Mr. MULLEN. If the majority of the House disagrees with us the rule will never be adopted. If it agrees with us it will be adopted. That is the democratic way, again with a small "d".

Mr. DAVIS. I think the gentleman obviously wants to be democratic, but if there has ever been an autocratic gag rule presented to the House in the history of this country, this is it.

Mr. MULLEN. I urged the same arguments when I was opposed to the gag rule on bills I did not like.

Mr. DAVIS. Did the gentleman change his opinion?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I think it should be pointed out that there is a difference in the procedure followed by the Ways and Means Committee in seeking these closed rules and the very stringent procedure that is being followed here; that is, that this bill has never reached the stage of committee consideration.

The bills which come out of the Ways and Means Committee have received careful studious consideration by that committee and must be recommended by that committee before the Rules Committee will even give consideration to granting a rule. I think there is quite a difference in the procedure. This is a bill that has been arbitrarily selected and as a bill which the proponents seek to push through the House without giving the House an opportunity to work its will on the legislation.

There is quite a bit of difference in the procedure.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Kearns.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment my colleague. I think he is very honest and sincere in his conviction. There is also one thing very interesting about him. He always has a very great sense of humor.

Mr. MULLEN. Thank you, sir.

Mr. KEARNS. Especially when he said he thought every Member of the House had their minds made up whether or not they would uphold home rule.

I would like the record to show, at least some conscientious person living here in Washington did not think so because my telephone rang at 3:30 this morning and at 4:30 this morning asking me to vote for home rule.

I had illness in the family back home so I thought nothing of it and I answered the phone.

There is one conviction I have and I am very sure about it, that when George Washington stepped off this 10-mile square and said, "This shall be the seat of the Federal Government," he never anticipated, neither did we, that the bureaucracies of Government would get to the numbers they are and people would come here as they have, in droves. I share the thinking of my colleague from Virginia about their right to vote for President and Vice President, but in the years that I have had the privilege of serving here on the District Committee, I do not see possibly how the Federal Government can act, be effective in their designated duties being subjected to a municipally controlled government.

I mean it sincerely. Then, too, where are you going to get the money to pay for this? The first year you are going to be in the red. The second year more in the red, the third year more in the red, and coming to Congress

every year for money. You do not have the taxable potential here to run as other municipalities do.

There are many things considered. My goodness. You talk about the resolution here. We should have as much debate and read the bill on a subject like this as we would on passing a labor bill here in the Congress. To ever think of getting this through, on that type of thing, my dear friend, I don't think it is fair to the people. I don't think it is fair to the Congress, and above all I don't think it is fair to our concept of our form of Government.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MULLEN. Mr. Chairman, may I thank Mr. Kearns for the remarks he made about me and indicate to him that I feel as strongly as he does at the annoyance that was tendered to him. I think it was deliberate annoyance and if they did that to me as strongly as I feel about this bill, I might change my vote. That might change my vote faster than anything else. I think that kind of annoyance and nuisance just cannot be condoned. It is wrong.

With reference to the financial situation the gentleman referred to, may I there again call upon my personal knowledge of operations in the city of New York. We have the second biggest budget in the country. There is no budget bigger than that of the city of New York except that of the U.S. Government.

But we do not hesitate to come to the Congress, and our mayor comes down here regularly asking the Congress to help us out financially. And every other city does. Every State does, too. The District of Columbia will be no different than it is now.

Mr. McMILLAN. Has the city of New York had any assistance to help operate the city government from the Congress of the United States?

Mr. MULLEN. If we take "government" in its all-inclusive term, which I am sure we must, and that is the entire operation of the city of New York, we get money for the city of New York for housing, without which we would have no public housing. That comes from the Congress.

Mr. McMILLAN. I am talking about operating the city government. I want to get some, too, if you can get some in New York.

Mr. MULLEN. Our mayor and our city council, elected by the people of the city of New York, our board of estimate, elected by the people of the city of New York, have their salaries and expenses paid out of the budget which is raised by taxation upon the citizens of the city of New York, those residing and working there.

That does not give us all the money we need with which to operate.

Mr. McMILLAN. Since the gentleman is one of the leaders in this proposed legislation, I wonder if he could tell the committee who he would provide or give permission to vote here in the District of Columbia.

It seems that we have so many categories of people here as brought out in the last hearings who would not be permitted to vote in the District, I wondered who you would permit to vote.

Mr. MULLEN. I would permit to vote in the District any person who has a bona fide legal residence in the District and has had it and maintained it at least 1 year prior to the election in which he participates.

Mr. McMILLAN. That would exclude Government employees?

Mr. MULLEN. Those Government employees are voting back home now. A Government employee comes down here from back home and lives in a house and he registers from the last place he voted. He takes a Government job and he can vote forever and a day from that residence even though the house is torn down.

It is still his bona fide residence according to the law.

Mr. McMILLAN. There are 2,500 people working here on Capitol Hill. Would they be permitted to vote?

Mr. MULTER. If they give up their legal residence back in their home State and establish a bona fide residence here and maintain it at least 1 year prior to election, they should have a right to vote.

Every citizen of the United States should have the right to vote once in a general election but not in two different places, in one place only.

Mr. McMILLAN. How about Navy personnel? Would they be permitted to vote here?

Mr. MULTER. They vote from their bona fide legal residence at home.

Mr. McMILLAN. Who would vote in the District?

Mr. MULTER. They would not vote in the District unless they changed their legal residence.

Every man has that right. If I did it and moved out of the State I would lose my seat in Congress. That is not a right, but a privilege. If I want to give up that privilege by moving out of my home State, that is my business.

I can move anywhere within the State and still retain my right to vote within that State.

Mr. McMILLAN. We all know that. The record should show who shall be eligible to vote in the District of Columbia should this bill become a law.

Mr. DAVIS. Can the gentleman tell us what percentage of the residents of the District of Columbia would be excluded from voting under his bill by reason of the fact that they maintain a legal voting residence in some other State?

Mr. MULTER. I have no such statistic, sir. I am sorry I cannot give it to you. I don't know if anybody has that statistic.

Mr. DAVIS. That would be quite a substantial number, would it not?

Mr. MULTER. I would not even try to guess, sir. I don't know. I have never seen any figure that attempted to give it to us. I do know that most Government employees have been moving out of the District and living in Maryland, nearby Maryland, nearby Virginia. But how many still live in the District, I have no idea.

Mr. DAVIS. The gentleman, I believe, stated in his initial statement that every person was entitled to have the right to vote for representatives.

Did I understand you correctly?

Mr. MULTER. I did say that although that is not in any of the bills that are before you.

Mr. DAVIS. Why, then, especially in view of your feeling, is that not included in H.R. 4630 and these other bills?

Mr. MULTER. We are trying to get as much support for a bill as possible. We tried to bring forth the least controversial bill and that is why the resolution, H. J. Res. 320, refers to H.R. 4630, which is the so-called administration bill. Frankly, I think if we took the other bill which was passed by the Senate the Republicans in the House would probably not support us. They will support the President's bill, the administration's recommendation and that is the bill which I put in under H.R. 4630. This is one instance where I think we need all the bipartisan support we can get. I am willing to compromise and give up the Morse bill for the administration bill for the Republican support.

Mr. DAVIS. I have read some of the provisions of H.R. 4630, not all of them as yet, although I intend to, but I notice that this bill provides for a Governor and a Secretary. I notice also that although the gentleman has expressed himself very sincerely and

earnestly as being in favor of giving the people of the District the right to vote and self government that this bill does not give them the right to vote for the Governor and the Secretary the highest two offices in the bill.

It provides that those officers shall be appointed by the President and also provides that they can be removed by the President at his pleasure.

Mr. MULTER. That is right.

Mr. DAVIS. Why does the gentleman wish to prevent the people of the District from voting for those two high officers and yet have the right to vote for certain others?

Mr. MULTER. I think you put it unintentionally in reverse, Mr. Chairman. I do not want to prevent them from doing that.

Mr. DAVIS. Your bill does that.

Mr. MULTER. The bill does not give them that privilege. I hope some day we will get a law that will give it to them but this is, I think, as far as we can go at this time.

Mr. DAVIS. Isn't that one of the most important things you could give them?

Mr. MULTER. It is a very important thing, but it is not the most important thing. In order to get a bill past a Presidential veto I am willing to go along with the President in this instance and let him have the appointive power and hope in 1961 we can change it and have a President who will go along with elective power and give up his own appointive power.

As of today I do not think we can get the President to go along with a bill that will permit us to elect the Governor or the mayor, as the case may be. He will go along with a bill which will call for an appointment by himself or by his successor.

Mr. DAVIS. I have noticed that many people threatened the Congress in recent days and weeks with a possible veto by the President.

I am glad to have your voice added to the list.

Mr. MULTER. Many a time, and the housing bill is one time, when I said, "Let's override the President's veto and let's send him a bill whether he likes it or not, which we think is a good bill," but there there is a difference of opinion as to the contents of the bill, as to whether it is inflationary or less inflationary than that which he wants.

Mr. DAVIS. Are there any further questions?

Mr. BROYHILL. One more question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Broyhill. I would like to compliment the gentleman for a very fine statement, particularly for his excellent sense of humor.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you, sir.

Mr. BROYHILL. As the gentleman knows, when the Federal city was laid out, 100 square miles, a 10-mile square, in 1847 the portion west of the Potomac was ceded back to the State of Virginia, 66 square miles. Has the gentleman ever given consideration to the desirability of ceding a large portion of that part that was contributed by Maryland back to the State of Maryland and let the residential areas and a large portion of the business areas be part of the State of Maryland and then reduce the size of this Federal City?

It was done once before. I wondered if we might cut down some more of it.

Mr. MULTER. Under our system of government you cannot force a gift upon people, and I do not think Maryland would accept the gift. I do not think Maryland would accept the cession.

Mr. MATTHEWS. If you will yield.

Mr. BROYHILL. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I believe all of our colleagues from Maryland have introduced home rule legislation. I believe I am correct.

I know they are sincerely anxious to give our people voting rights such as people in the State have. I am not so sure of that. I wonder, with their enthusiasm and their active cooperation, if maybe the State of Maryland would not be glad to have the opportunity of gaining so many fine citizens from here in the District of Columbia. I am really serious about that. We were talking a while ago about everybody having different ideas about home rule. I want to say to my colleague I have talked to many Members of the House who say they are in favor of some home rule and actually at least four or five Congressmen have suggested that that fundamental idea is right. I know it is difficult. I know it can't be worked out easily, but they said, "It would get rid of all my objections if we could tie in the District with Maryland." I do not think that is a facetious suggestion. I want to emphasize it. Many a Congressman has spoken to me about it.

Mr. BROYHILL. I want the record to show that over a hundred years ago Virginia did its share and its part.

Mr. DAVIS. I would like to ask the gentleman, what is the reasoning behind the provisions in this bill, H.R. 4630, which do not or would not give any representation whatever in the Senate to residents of the District?

Mr. MULTER. Again, we have tried to follow tradition and what we think will gather the greatest number of votes, the most support.

Mr. DAVIS. What objection do you see in the residents of the District having representation in the Senate?

Mr. MULTER. I see none, but I do not think we can get that kind of a bill through today. I think what we have to do is first give them territorial status, representation as Alaska and Hawaii had before they had statehood, a nonvoting delegate, the same as Puerto Rico has, a nonvoting commissioner, giving them a nonvoting representative in the House first and eventually give that representative the right to vote.

Mr. DAVIS. Eventually give them statehood.

Mr. MULTER. Whether statehood or not, or simply a right to participate in the right of the Government of the Nation I think is unimportant. I respect all of those who so sincerely urge the States rights theories. I am not a States righter. I think this Government and this Nation of ours can grow and prosper and continue to be the greatest country on God's earth without individual States reserving to themselves all the powers they demand. I think today, with communications what they are, with transportation as fast as it is, when you can get in a matter of hours from one part of the world to the other—not the country, the world—that you do not need this decentralization of Government to the States that we did need many years ago so that whether the District of Columbia has a representative form of self-government is not the test. Every citizen has a right to vote for President and to vote for a Representative in the House of Representatives, and two Senators in the U.S. Senate. I think those are things that they are entitled to. I do not think the Congress is ready to give them to them at this time. Eventually I hope Congress will see fit to do that. I think this bill is as far as we can get a majority of the House to go at this time. The Senate has already indicated they will do this. This is as far, I think, as we can go today, to get a bill to the President which he will sign.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I do not want to belabor that point, Mr. Chairman, but the gentlemen in the other body are so anxious to have us adopt it I wonder why they are opposed to a delegate.

Mr. MULTER. I have said to those who discussed it with me over there, "We will get

two Representatives in your body there some day from the District of Columbia."

Mr. DAVIS. Of course, all this legislation ought to be aimed toward fairness and justice and toward securing the appropriate voice in the Government. I presume that is what is behind it.

The gentleman has just stated he does not see too much need for continuance of States rights. I believe that was the substance of what was just said. If I have misquoted you, I wish you would correct me, but if State lines and State functions are to be eliminated, it would seem to me that that is all the more reason why the citizen should have a stronger voice in the Federal Government, in the concentrated Government here in Washington.

If they are not to have States rights, not to have the rights of a citizen of a State, then if their status is to be changed, they ought to be given as strong a voice as possible in the operation of the Federal Government and if you deny them representation in the Senate, you are just giving them what might be called second-class citizenship. Is that not right?

Mr. MULTER. There is substance of what the gentleman says but I say if we cannot give them all the gentleman suggests we have, let's give them part of it now. I will join the gentleman in giving them the rest of it. I will join the gentleman and anybody else in this House or in the Senate to give them all the complete representation and rights that they should have, including the right to elect a voting Representative to the House, and two voting Senators in the U.S. Senate and to vote for the President and the Vice President. I will go along with anybody who will go all the way and I will also go part of the way part of the time until we can get part of it and gradually move along.

Mr. DAVIS. Inasmuch as the gentleman is the present witness before the Subcommittee I just want to get all these matters stated as clearly as possible.

Are there further questions?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I think it might be well for Mr. MULTER to describe to the committee the means by which the Federal contribution to the District Government will be determined, if any, and why there should be a Federal contribution if we are to grant autonomy to the city itself, any contribution other than a payment in lieu of taxes on the same formula as payments are made in the States.

Mr. MULTER. I think a complete answer would be that if you can set up a local home rule government here and you enact legislation which will require the Federal Government to pay to the local government a sum each year in lieu of taxes upon the full appraised or assessed value of all of the operations of the U.S. Government in the District, they will have more money than they will need and they will be able to make a contribution back to the U.S. Government. That, of course, is a fair way of handling the situation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You are referring to a payment on property owned by the Federal Government?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What are you going to do about parks and playgrounds owned by the Federal Government, deed them to the city?

Mr. MULTER. Do you think we in the Congress ought to exercise jurisdiction over them, operate and maintain them?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Quite obviously I do not, but we are doing it at the present time. Do you feel those should be deeded to the city so that they would relieve the Federal Government from paying in lieu of taxes?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, but relieve the Federal Government of its obligation to support them, no, because most of the people who

use those recreational facilities in and around the District of Columbia are the tourists, American citizens who come to their capital from all over the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Those tourists bring money into the capital, don't they?

Mr. MULTER. That is right.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is not a city in the United States who would not be tickled pink to have these facilities provided for their city by the Federal Government and let them enjoy the benefits of it, is there?

Mr. MULTER. I am not so sure about that. It is an economic situation you cannot argue intelligently about unless you have the exact figures and know precisely what we are talking about. I think we can generalize about it, but it will get us nowhere. The fact is even if we give home rule to the District, the U.S. Government must, in my opinion, continue to make a fair contribution to the maintenance of those facilities in and around the District of Columbia that are used by all of the American citizens.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Isn't that going quite a bit further than the Federal Government does with respect to other cities?

Mr. MULTER. What do we do with our national parks outside the District?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not referring to national parks.

Mr. MULTER. Don't you think the recreational facilities of parks in the District of Columbia are national parks?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let's stick to this situation for a minute. You mentioned facilities. Isn't it your purpose to put the city of Washington on exactly the same footing insofar as possible as Kansas City, New York City, Chicago, or other cities and municipalities?

Mr. MULTER. I cannot say that I can't say that any bill goes that far. I do not think you can ever go all the way in the District of Columbia as long as this is the capital of the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is the very point. That is the very reason.

Mr. MULTER. I do not think we ought to confuse the issue.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is the reason the fathers gave for setting this aside as a separate district.

It gave Congress exclusive control over it. Mr. WILLIAMS. They didn't see at that time a country stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Rio Grande to Canada and they did not foresee all of the difficulties and problems we have today. I am sure one thing they did foresee is that no American citizen should ever be deprived of his right to participate in his own government. I think that is what we should concentrate on here in this bill. We will worry about the financial situations and the financial problems a little later.

Let's give these people their basic, fundamental right to govern themselves.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You think this bill does it even though it does not give them a voice in the Senate nor does it give them a vote in the House?

Mr. MULTER. It gives them only a part of what they are entitled to.

Mr. DAVIS. Are there further questions?

Mr. MULTER. You still insist that all of the provisions of House Resolution 320 remain in that resolution?

Mr. MULTER. I am willing to discuss with those who are of a mind to compromise, a compromise resolution in exchange for support for the bill or the resolution.

Mr. DAVIS. What is your position on those things that I asked you about?

Mr. MULTER. As of now, sir, I favor that resolution but my mind is never closed to improvements or amendments that may get additional support for it.

Mr. DAVIS. What would be the method of changing the provisions of this resolution? Has the gentleman studied that any?

Mr. MULTER. First, I think we would have to determine what support we can gain for what amendment. I mean this would have to be a matter of sitting down around the conference table and a matter of give and take.

I think it can be worked out. If there is a will to bring a bill to the House and get it enacted, I think we can work out a method of doing that.

Mr. DAVIS. You won't know whether there is a will to do that or not, will you, until the House votes on this resolution?

Mr. MULTER. We can try to improve it in advance. I think we have a pretty good idea of who is opposed to the resolution, who is opposed to the bill, and if any of those Members are willing to give up some of their opposition in exchange for an amendment, either to the rule or to the bill, I think all of the sponsors of this legislation, including those representing the people in the District of Columbia, I am sure, will be happy to appoint a committee and sit down and discuss with the opponents of the measure how it can be improved so as to eliminate their opposition.

Mr. DAVIS. Does the gentleman have any move in mind of bringing about such a conference?

Mr. MULTER. Frankly, I did not.

Mr. DAVIS. Or such a discussion?

Mr. MULTER. No. I have nothing in mind, because until this morning I had no idea there was any will to compromise or any desire to compromise on the part of the opponents of the measure. If there is such a desire and such a will, we would be very happy to sit down and discuss it.

Mr. DAVIS. But as of now the gentleman does not have any such move in mind?

Mr. MULTER. No.

May I make one more very frank statement about this entire matter, and please believe that I do not intend to offend anybody.

Starting again in my home district, where many people say I come from a one-party district, where in the last election I got some 78 percent of the vote, I might just as well resign or never run again if I voted against a home-rule measure such as these that are before this committee.

I appreciate that many Members in this House and on this committee are in the opposite position, where, if they voted for a home-rule measure, they might just as well resign or not run again. Those are the political facts of life. There isn't much we can do about it, except I think we all, as good American citizens, ought to combine and concentrate our efforts toward bringing something before the House and let the House work its will; and when the majority has spoken, we bow in humility and say, "This is it; maybe we will be the majority next time."

Mr. DAVIS. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Multer.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you, gentlemen, for listening to me.

Oregon's Representative Porter Visits Cape Hatteras, Sees Benefits of Similar Oregon Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the able Representative from Oregon's

Fourth District, CHARLES O. PORTER, has returned from a personal inspection of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Area, and has expressed enthusiasm for the development there under National Park Service auspices. Mr. PORTER is sponsoring in the House proposed legislation similar to my own bill (S. 1526) which authorizes establishment of the Oregon Dunes-Sea Lion Caves National Seashore Recreation Area. So the favorable impression he received of the Cape Hatteras Recreation Area was of special interest to me. Mr. PORTER's comments on Cape Hatteras were reported in an article written by A. Robert Smith, and published in the Oregonian of July 20, 1959. I ask consent to include it in the Appendix of the RECORD with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregonian, July 20, 1959]

TOUR OF NORTH CAROLINA DUNES BUOYS
PORTER'S STAND

(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, Democrat, of Oregon, has made a personal inspection of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area and returned more enthused than before about the merits of the same type development at the Oregon Dunes. Cape Hatteras, on the Outer Banks off the North Carolina coast, is the only National Seashore Recreation Area in the country. The National Park Service hopes to create similar seashore parks at a number of other suitable, scenic coastal sites.

"I was very much encouraged by the operations of the Park Service," PORTER said. "They certainly know how to handle such an area."

PORTER drove the entire 80-mile length of the Cape Hatteras area, saw slides at a park service museum, had a jeep ride over the sands, was escorted about by the park superintendent, and talked with natives of the area.

"Nobody was complaining about it," PORTER said of local residents.

He noted that the State of North Carolina is planning to invest \$3 million in a bridge across Oregon Inlet, a body of water which separates two of the islands which make up the Outer Banks.

"That shows how much the State thinks of it," he said.

Viewing Cape Hatteras, he said, gave him a better vision of what could be done at Oregon Dunes. He said he pictured museums of natural history, nature talks and beach walks conducted by park rangers, long beaches untouched by commercialization, swimming in the fresh water inland lakes as well as in the ocean.

"I can see a museum of the sea at Florence," said PORTER.

He obtained a set of slides showing Cape Hatteras which he said he plans to send to Oregon to be shown in the communities in the area of the Oregon Dunes. PORTER hopes to arrange House hearings in Oregon after Senate hearings in October.

PORTER still thinks, however, that the precise boundaries of the Oregon Dunes National Seashore should be described in legislation authorizing it. No boundaries are described in the legislation as introduced by him in the House and by Senators RICHARD L. NEUBERGER and WAYNE MORSE in the Senate.

MORSE has been especially critical of the idea of letting the Secretary of the Interior determine where the exact boundaries should be without Congress having any check over that authority. NEUBERGER has defended the

idea of allowing the Interior Department to use its own discretion.

DUNES HEARINGS AWAITED

Joe W. Penfold, conservation director, Izaak Walton League of America, takes NEUBERGER's side. His conservation organization is promoting the seashore bills. He said: "We are pleased that the legislation sets fairly broad acreage limitations on the areas to be considered for authorization within which, if authorized, the Secretary of Interior may acquire lands. This is a sound method, as has been demonstrated at Big Bend, Cape Hatteras, Everglades, Virgin Islands, Fort Clatsop, Shenandoah, and other national parks and monuments established under similar or identical procedures.

"During the course of hearings, of course, the committee will be able to study specific boundaries in more detail, and may, if it appears desirable, describe them with more preciseness. We note also that the Secretary, before designating any authorized area, would be required to consult with the Governor of the State concerned and to hold hearings.

"Beyond this, and before the Secretary could spend any Federal funds for land acquisition, he would be required to come before Congress, in the usual appropriation process, for funds. This provides Congress with still another opportunity to assure itself that the program is being carried out soundly and within the congressional intent.

"These appear to be adequate safeguards against any possibility of abuse of administrative authority. At the same time, it provides means at the administrative level whereby the most sensible areas can be worked out in terms of National, State, and local interests."

Tobacco Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I warned the House last year time and time again about unfair trade policies. I particularly emphasized the adverse affect of so-called reciprocal trade upon agriculture—especially tobacco. Some of the newspapers in the tobacco area really whooped up support for a 5-year extension of this phony reciprocal trade bill. I predict under this trade law all of our tobacco experts will dwindle away. Not only that but foreign nations will blackmail our State Department into permitting more and more imports of tobacco. All of this being done, Mr. Speaker, to a country that at one time was the only nation in the world growing and exporting tobacco. The following letter indicates what is going on:

LIGGETT & MYERS TOBACCO CO.,
Durham, N. C., August 24, 1959.

HON. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The Committee for Reciprocity Information has scheduled hearings beginning September 15 to gather information preparatory to forthcoming tariff negotiations with Cuba. Cigarettes and

smoking tobacco are on the list of items which Cuba has proposed to renegotiate.

We have not the slightest doubt that renegotiation in this instance will mean a proposal to raise the Cuban tariff still further against American cigarettes. This gives us great concern because of the adverse effect on all those engaged in growing tobacco and manufacturing cigarettes, and we seek your help in pointing out to our officials the hurtful nature of the suggestion.

It would come with ill grace from Cuba to take this kind of step against American cigarettes because the U.S. imports from Cuba nearly 20 times as much tobacco as Cuba imports from the United States. In 1958 Cuba imported \$1,900,000 worth of cigarettes, but Cuba sent to the United States cigars and tobacco worth \$34 million. Furthermore, the present Cuban duty on cigarettes (well over 150 percent of factory price) requires that they be sold in Cuba at three times the price of the locally manufactured brands. Only 4 percent of the total consumption of cigarettes in Cuba are imported American cigarettes.

In view of the foregoing, we propose to protest most vigorously to the Committee for Reciprocity Information and we hope that you will express to the State Department your interest in this situation.

Yours sincerely,

Branch Manager.

Wilson County, Tex., Farmers Help Christian Rural Oversea Program Build Friends for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, any country is made up of the people who inhabit it. And the more the people of one country know about the residents of another, the more the ideals of understanding and cooperation are furthered.

The Christian Rural Oversea Program, known as CROP, is doing a magnificent job of people-to-people diplomacy. By working with farmers and ranchers in this country, this program sends help and animals and seeds to farmers in other countries. These people are helped to help themselves.

A meeting was held last Friday in Floresville, Tex., to plan the participation of Wilson County in this program. Wilson County has been generous in its support of this program in the past. Last year I attended the Peanut Festival in Wilson County. The peanut growers of Wilson County have an outstanding record of support for our overseas goodwill efforts. Similar meetings are being held in other parts of Texas and the Nation, with gratifying response.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter to Mr. Sam Fore, Jr., of the Floresville Chronicle from G. James Huston, Texas CROP executive director, telling of some of the activities of the program. The letter was printed

in the Chronicle-Journal for Friday, August 21, 1959, under the heading "Important CROP Meeting To Be Held at Floresville Courthouse August 21—Appeal to All Wilson County."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**IMPORTANT CROP MEETING TO BE HELD
FLORESVILLE COURTHOUSE AUGUST 21—APPEAL
TO ALL WILSON COUNTY**

Mr. SAM FORE, Jr.,
Floresville Chronicle,
Floresville, Tex.

DEAR MR. FORE: We are again setting up plans for a CROP campaign in Wilson County. I am sure you are interested in this project for helping to relieve the suffering of destitute people overseas. We need your help in making plans and carrying out this campaign.

Last year's collection of \$508.50 from Wilson County was used to help send peanut butter to refugee camps in Belgium and France. The people in these camps, because of disease, disability, and age, are not acceptable for repatriation in any country. Many of them have been in the camps since World War II and will remain there until they die. Another part of the shipment was sent to orphanages in Italy.

Our organizational meeting is set for Friday, August 21, at 8 p.m., in the district courtroom in the courthouse at Floresville. I hope that you will be able to attend and that you will help us by giving this meeting all the publicity possible. You may be able to bring others with you who are interested in agriculture and relief. It is important that we have a good attendance at the meeting.

Everyone urged to attend from all parts of the county.

Yours truly,

G. JAMES HUSTON,
Texas CROP Executive Director.

How Big Budgets Get That Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a splendid editorial from the Atlantic City Press, pointing out how the Members of Congress are subject to pitfalls during the session in our efforts to keep the Government budget at a level with spending. The editorial follows:

How Big Budgets Get That Way

Earlier in this session, Congressmen's pen pals, the voters, jammed the mails with pleas for the Government to live within a balanced budget. Some sobered solons switched to the side of the savers, and many a big-spending proposal bit the dust.

Now it appears that while the battle is won, the war is far from over.

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, has unlimbered his adding machine to discover that bills still pending before Congress could increase the Federal budget by \$187 billion over the next 5 years—an increase of about \$40 billion a year, or 50 percent over the present staggering budget.

Few of these bills are likely to pass this year. It's too late in the session, and the piles

of mail are too fresh in the Congressmen's minds. But each of these bills is alive because some powerful group wants the money spent. That the people want the money saved may be beside the point in the long run.

What often happens is that those who are for Federal aid to abattoirs team up with those who want subsidies for xylophone schools and a lot of other organizations with itchy palms. They all agree to support each other's bills, and a giant and powerful spending bloc is formed in the Congress. That's how the civilian budget has gotten so big as it is.

Those who want something will fight long and hard for it. Those who are just generally opposed to senseless taxing and spending usually limit their efforts to pained outcries at infrequent intervals. During the lulls between outcries, the spending gets done.

The only long-term answer, from the taxpayer's point of view, is to elect stinger men to Washington. Oh, it's all right to elect men who are generous with their own money—philanthropists and the like. But the voters had better choose men with the intelligence and courage to say firm "No's" to the countless groups and special interests who covet the taxpayer's money.

If Congressmen would say "we can't afford it" more often, husbands wouldn't have to say "we can't afford it" so often to their own families.

Oregon Citizens Hail Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, recently I received a copy of a resolution adopted in Portland, Oreg., by representatives of certain Communist-dominated countries expressing their appreciation of congressional passage of Senate Joint Resolution 111, which designated the week following the Fourth of July as Captive Nations Week. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution sent to me by this group be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We Americans of European descent, representing the captive nations of Poland, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Armenia, and the Ukraine, assembled in a general meeting on August 2, 1959, in the hall of St. John's Ukrainian Orthodox Church, 6401 Northeast 10th Avenue, Portland, Oreg., have adopted the following resolution:

"We are deeply moved by the proclamation of the Captive Nations Week and express our heartfelt appreciation to the Government of the United States. This proclamation is of great significance because it gives a ray of hope of liberation for the millions of peoples enslaved by the Soviet communism.

"The United States, as a stronghold of liberty and the leader of the free world, has embarked upon the only right road in her struggle against communism in order to establish a lasting peace with freedom and justice for all. We pledge our unreserved

support to these policies of the Government of the United States of America."

JAMES S. HONCHARIW,
Chairman of the Meeting.
KONRAD DE HACKBEIL,
Secretary.

PORTLAND, OREG., August 2, 1959.

The Carey Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, as did many of my colleagues last week, I received an intemperate, threatening letter from a prominent labor official criticizing my vote on the Landrum-Griffin substitute labor reform bill. I refer to James B. Carey, president of the powerful International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, AFL-CIO. I incorporate his letter in my remarks at this point:

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ELECTRICAL,
RADIO, AND MACHINE WORKERS,
August 18, 1959.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN: Only you know, in the privacy of your own conscience, whether you carefully considered the possible consequences of the Landrum-Griffin bill when you voted for it on August 13, 1959. If you did, and realized that it is a punitive, repressive measure intended to weaken all labor unions and thereby all working men and women, you have much to answer for. If you did not, and merely yielded to the pressures of the chamber of commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, your guilt is perhaps even greater.

You should realize now, if you did not during the heat of battle, that this vindictive assault on the labor movement will, in the long run, prove to your constituents that you are less interested in individual rights and democracy than in property rights and the concentration of power in the hands of big business.

You may believe that you are safe in such action because organized labor is relatively weak in your district, and cannot call you to account for the damage you have sought to do to it. You may be right—at the moment.

We wish to assure you, however, that we shall do all in our power to prove to the working men and women in your district that you have cast your lot against them and they should therefore take appropriate action at the ballot box.

Very truly yours,

JAMES B. CAREY,
President.

Now, generally, I find it hard to stimulate much enthusiasm for a mimeographed or multigraphed form letter, but I read Mr. Carey's missive with considerable care and replied to him as follows:

AUGUST 26, 1959.

Mr. JAMES B. CAREY,
President, International Union of Electrical,
Radio and Machine Workers, Wash-
ington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAREY: I have your form letter of August 18, 1959, a copy of which I understand was sent to all my colleagues who voted for the Landrum-Griffin version of the labor-management reform bill.

Neither your intemperate characterizations, your threat to get me nor your erroneous assumptions concerning my study of the measure impress me as worthy of a high official of a powerful labor organization.

No representative of the National Association of Manufacturers or the chamber of commerce "pressured" me or even contacted me. I believe, however, in the right of petition and would have welcomed their views as I did those of six officials of the Teamsters Union and three officials of building trades unions with whom I discussed at some length the differing provisions of the various proposals.

I heard nothing from you or your union—but would have welcomed any proof you could submit—as I requested of the other union officials—that specific language in any of the various bills would hamper legitimate organizational and collective bargaining activities of unions. My conception of the duty of a legislator requires more than simply voting by labels or adjectives unsupported by fact and logic.

Requiring democratic procedures and honesty in handling funds in labor organizations cannot possibly harm the rank and file union member, though it may well curb dictatorial officials insensitive to their position of trust with respect to the rights and the funds of those they represent. Shielding innocent third parties, managers, employees and consumers, from being drawn into someone else's labor dispute and preventing "sweetheart" contracts and representation not actually desired by the free choice of employees are reforms demonstrated by the McClellan Committee investigations to be necessary and should not impair legitimate union activities.

Consequently, it is a misrepresentation to describe legislation designed to achieve these goals and no other as "punitive," "repressive" or "killer" legislation.

I believe my colleagues, like myself, are far more likely to be impressed by logic than by threats.

To assist in advising the working men and women of my district on this very important issue, I will be happy to send a copy of your letter and of this reply to anyone living in the Second Congressional District of Michigan whose name and address you furnish me.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER.

Mr. Speaker, as one might expect, Mr. Carey's threats did not go unnoticed by the public. As an example I include at this point an interesting commentary from the August 23, 1959, edition of the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot:

JAMES CAREY'S MISTAKE

Leaders of organized labor in America apparently have become panicky since their defeat on the Landrum-Griffin bill in the House. And men in that state of mind are likely to make mistakes.

That is probably what James B. Carey, AFL-CIO vice president, did with his "we'll get you" letters to Members of the House who voted for the labor bill.

The action is all the more strange because there are precedents which prove that the tactics are wrong.

Labor was unable to defeat the Taft-Hartley bill, even with all the pressure that was applied and with a veto by former President Harry S. Truman.

After the debacle, labor took after the late Senator Robert A. Taft, throwing all of its power into an effort to "get" him.

The result was the greatest political victory in the Ohio Senator's career. The opposition of labor almost made him President.

More recently, the passage of the Landrum-Griffin bill in the House showed the ineffectiveness of the Carey type of politics.

Labor lobbyists swarmed over the Capital, applying all the pressure they could. They lost because the people rallied behind the controversial measure.

It is likely that many of the Congressmen followed the wishes of their constituents with some misgivings. They know that the voice of the people is loud, when it is heard, but that the public generally will not remain "steamed up" over a given issue for any great length of time; that the men who work at politics every day in the year can be very effective.

That is why traditional politicians fade out of sight when hit by a successful reform movement. They carefully avoid stirring up any controversy until the reformers lose interest.

Thus Carey's letters handed the Congressmen exactly the ammunition they need to rally support when they come up for reelection. The letters will be carefully preserved to be brought out at campaign time to remind the people that their will prevailed.

And if Carey goes through with his threat to punish "labor's enemies" he will reelect a lot of men who voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Carey threatens to "do all in our power to prove to the working men and women" in my congressional district, the second of Michigan, that I have cast my "lot against them" and that "they should therefore take appropriate action at the ballot box." That, of course, means he must conduct an educational campaign.

In my letter, I offered to assist him, by sending a copy of his letter and a copy of my reply to any resident of my district for which he would furnish names and addresses.

Timely Health Topics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following three articles of importance to the Nation's general health submitted by Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, director of industrial relations of the National Chiropractic Association, with offices in Washington, D.C.:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Tuesday, July 7, 1959]

DOCTOR WARNS LIVING IN PAST FOSTERS AGING

(By Roy Gibbons)

If you aspire to grow old gracefully, don't yearn for a return of the good old days, the director of industrial relations for the National Chiropractic Association suggested Monday.

"People who live in the past grow old accordingly," said Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, of Washington, D.C., in an interview at the association's 64th annual meeting in the Sherman Hotel.

HOW TO AGE GRACEFULLY

Proper nutrition, correct posture, and self-control head the list of factors that are most important in helping achieve a graceful old age, he said.

Murphy then recommended these additional rules for persons over 40:

1. Slow down. You may be able to go as fast as before, but if you do you are inviting old age to come prematurely.

2. Avoid fatigue. It is a killer. Fatigue produces poisons that injure the nervous system and hasten the onset of old age.

LEARN TO RELAX

3. Learn to relax even while you work. You will be able to do your job more easily and save wear and tear on your nervous system.

4. Don't whip your nerves with your emotions. The habit of making emotional scenes will play havoc sooner or later with your digestion, lead to constipation, high blood pressure, or heart disease.

5. Cultivate patience. You can control yourself. Cultivate an unruffled attitude toward other people, circumstances, and your work.

6. Watch your waistline. Excessive fat after 40 is detrimental.

[From Healthways magazine, August 1959]

POLLUTION: A GROWING HEALTH MENACE

(Edited by A. L. Gregory)

Pollution of air and water was named as a great health menace by Dr. Emmett J. Murphy recently. Dr. Murphy is director of industrial relations of the National Chiropractic Association.

"For years we have been pouring raw sewage and industrial wastes into the rivers and streams of our nation," Dr. Murphy said. "We have spoiled much of our recreational areas, and we have contaminated the source of water for home and personal use. Millions of acres of river banks are not fit for American children to play on, and the stream itself will not support fish or wildlife," he continued.

Pointing to the dangers to public health from polluted air, Dr. Murphy warned that the lungs of the people in the United States are being filled with poisonous gases from exhausts of motors and from the industrial smog created in certain highly populous areas.

The problem of pollution is one which should be attacked at every level of government. In our homes and around our homes, each of us should see that he does not contaminate, clutter, or befoul either land, water, or atmosphere in such a way as to render it less beneficial to ourselves, to our neighbors, or to our children.

Towns and cities should review their practices of sewage disposal, industrial waste carry-off, and any other problems contributing to water pollution. Soil erosion needs to be controlled in agricultural areas.

Ordinances need to be enforced to keep car exhaust and heavy smokes and odors from industries from befouling the air which we breathe.

Urging complete community awareness of the problem and action to control it, Dr. Murphy predicted that the United States could return to being a playground for the coming generation, rather than a land of wasted resources, if contamination of air and water were controlled.

[From the Washington Sunday Star, Aug. 9, 1959]

POISON ON WHEELS

It is good to note that General Motors, in cooperation with the Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research, is planning to finance a thoroughgoing study of the actual and potential evils inherent in exhaust fumes from trucks, buses, and private automobiles. The project is altogether timely and very much to the point, and it is to be welcomed and commended as something that ought to stimulate the entire automotive industry into doing far more than

it has done so far in this challenging and worrisome field.

There can be no doubt, in any case, that the contaminating materials released by vehicular exhausts markedly exceed industrial smoke as the principal cause of poisonous smog and other noxious atmospheric conditions in all our great urban centers. Experts like Surgeon General Leroy E. Burney of the U.S. Public Health Service make no bones about the situation. They feel sure that our municipal traffic, because it is the chief contributor to these conditions, must be dealt with as a factor definitely associated with malignant tumors and such afflictions as asthma. In Dr. Burney's opinion, as expressed some months ago to the first National Conference on Air Pollution, "We know that cancer-producing agents are in the air we breathe. . . . We know that lung-cancer rates in the largest cities are twice as high as those in nonurban areas. The case has not yet been proved, but the weight of circumstantial evidence grows heavier as research progresses."

These are words that speak pretty much for themselves. With our population increasing at an explosive rate, we face the prospect of massively expanding motor traffic throughout our country. As far as metropolitan public health is concerned, this makes it all the more important, if not urgent, to carry out just such studies as the one being contemplated by General Motors. Everybody, of course, and not just GM, has reason to take a lively interest in the problem.

The President Must Submit Better, Sounder, and More Specific Proposals to the Congress Than Heretofore if Federal Debt Is To Be Reduced and Stability Restored to the Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the President must submit better, sounder, and more specific proposals to the Congress than heretofore if the Federal debt is to be reduced and stability restored to the dollar.

In a single day, recently, the President told a political rally in Washington, D.C., that—

It is the Republican Party that fights for responsible, sensible fiscal policy.

And sent Congress a message asking: First. A sky-is-the-limit policy on Federal interest rates. This was turned down by the Congress.

Second. Another increase in the limit on the public debt. This was granted by the Congress.

The President has been talking economy, without calling attention to the performance record of his administration. Actually, the Federal debt has increased by \$19 billion in the past 6 years, and the cost of interest on this debt has risen from \$5.8 billion to \$8 billion during the same period.

Obviously, the President must provide better, sounder, and more specific recommendations to the Congress than heretofore, or the Federal debt will continue to rise, and inflation will destroy the earning power of our people.

I have, therefore, prepared a resolution which I am offering today calling upon the President to provide the Congress advice, suggestions, plans, and proposals, including legislative recommendations by January 1960, which are better, sounder, and more specific than heretofore to provide for the reduction of all business and agricultural subsidies and a corresponding reduction of all Federal income taxes.

I include here the text of my resolution, as well as an article from the Democratic Digest, of September 1959, which discusses some aspects of the current economy drive which have been generally overlooked by that part of the press which is oriented toward the Eisenhower administration:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 361

Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the reduction of Federal expenditures and requesting the President to provide the Congress advice, suggestions, plans, and proposals, including legislative recommendations, by January 1960, which are better, sounder, and more specific than heretofore to provide for the reduction of all business and agricultural subsidies and a corresponding reduction of all Federal income taxes

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the sense of the House that in view of the increase in the Federal debt by nineteen billion dollars in the past six years, and the increase in the cost of interest on the Federal debt from five billion eight hundred million dollars to eight billion dollars during the same period there is a pressing need for substantial reductions in Federal expenditures in order to reduce the staggering burden of our ever-increasing Federal debt with its constantly rising interest and refinancing charges and resulting dangerous inflation. The House finds that business and agricultural subsidies to big businessmen and to big farmers, including but not limited to direct grants, disguised grants in the form of nonrepayable loans, postal subsidies, shipping and airline subsidies of various kinds, accelerated tax amortization programs, and indirect grants through long-term, low-interest-rate loans, and other methods and programs, although desirable as a means of assisting these special groups to retain their relative positions in the economy, should be reexamined in the light of the overall need for rigid control and a sizeable reduction of Federal expenditures.

SEC. 2. In view of the foregoing, the President is requested to prepare and transmit to the Congress by January 1960 advice, suggestions, plans, and proposals, including legislative recommendations which are better, sounder, and more specific than heretofore, to provide (1) for the reduction by not less than twenty-five per centum of all business and agricultural subsidies, together with such other specific proposals, including specific legislative recommendations, as he may deem advisable in order not only to prevent further increases in Federal expenditures but to actually reduce them, and (2) for the reduction of Federal income taxes in aggregate amounts equal to the total of the reductions in subsidies effected for the taxable years involved pursuant to such legislative recommendations.

[From the Democratic Digest, September 1959]

THE STATUS QUO SEEKERS: THEIR SCAREWORDS, "INFLATION"; THEIR TARGET, "PROGRESS"

Ever since the great crusade (the great crusade, that is, for the bankers and the big industrialists) came sweeping into Washington under the banner emblazoned with that magic word—Eisenhower—the crusaders have been desperately searching for a way to obstruct the program which the Democrats had designed to improve the welfare and security of the people.

Early in the crusade, of course, the crusaders found that they could not fight the program head on; any direct efforts to deny people the much-needed schools, housing, highways, medical programs, etc., were answered by the people at the polls. Any lingering doubts which the Republicans might have had about this were dispelled by the elections of 1958.

However, never ones to be daunted by the expressed wishes of the people, Republican hucksters continued their search for a way to merchandise an obviously unattractive program. And early this year they finally hit on what is certainly the most effective packaging yet for their negative ideas. They decided that one way to fight the people's welfare programs would be to come up with something positive which the people could be for (a balanced budget). But it might be even better, they decided, to come up with something scary which all the people could be against (inflation).

So they did both. The first faint stirrings of a skillfully promoted and now mushrooming scare over inflation were heard last January and February when the President began holding press conferences at an unprecedented pace. (After his seventh consecutive conference, the Wall Street Journal, trying to contain its enthusiasm, remarked: "Not in nearly 5 years has Mr. Eisenhower held so many successive meetings with reporters.") The reason for Ike's sudden romance with the press soon became clear: He let it be known that despite the missile gap and the Berlin crisis, the one thing he wanted to talk about at his press conferences was inflation. Sooner or later would come one of his little sermons about the dangers of spending.

The next day, most of the Nation's editorial pages (and the following week such publications as Time and U.S. News) would translate his ambiguous sermons into a grammatically (if not economically) sound, continuing campaign against the Nation's newest scareword. As Don Campbell, business columnist for the Indianapolis Star, wrote: "Add to the Red peril and the yellow menace the name of inflation as one of the key bogeymen of the 1950's."

However, the Republican merchandisers were aware that press conference sermons were not enough. The Wall Street Journal and other papers reported that the President had also launched an all-out letterwriting campaign designed to drum up support for the fight-inflation drive. Secretary Seaton joined in (he was reported to have written about 100 letters) as well as Secretary Ezra Benson and Secretary Arthur Flemming.

The general theme of the letters was that everything must be done to support the President's budget because not to support it would lead to inflation. Most of the letters went to publishers asking for editorial support. As Ike put it: "Help in any way you think proper."

NEEDED NO URGING

Not that the publishers of most newspapers needed any urging. They had been printing editorials about economizing for years. But they were, no doubt, gratified at this new idea of fighting the welfare programs with the bogeyman inflation. And, no

doubt, they were equally gratified that Eisenhower himself was finally going all out in an effort to block the Democratic programs—what the Republican press had helped put him in the White House to do anyway.

At the same time, the Republican national committee joined in the fight—although, considering the administration's failure to balance the budget or curb inflation, it is not clear just who or what the GOP was fighting. Nevertheless, the national committee, certain it had found an effective way to block Democratic programs, picked up the cry of "inflation" and began coming out with a few gimmicks of its own. An example: The committee made available to GOP Congressmen tapes for a canned radio interview with Budget Director Maurice Stans. The Congressman contributes his voice to the tape by asking Mr. Stans questions. For instance, the Congressman asks: "One final question, Mr. Stans. What can the average citizen do to help maintain a sound dollar and to fight inflation?"

Mr. Stans, in a reply already taped, says there are many things, such as recognizing "the fact that the more the programs that are urged upon the Congress, the more difficult it is to hold the line, and it is important that people not on the one hand ask for or insist on a balanced budget and on the other hand petition their Congressman for new programs of spending of one kind and another."

In other words, the Republican Congressman, with Mr. Stans' help, is saying in effect: "Now folks, no matter how much you think we may need those new schools, or new highways, or to keep up with the Russians in guided missiles, remember if we have those things it will cause inflation and we all know how bad that would be—otherwise, why would Mr. Stans, speaking for the President, be so worried?"

When efforts to promote something reach the point where Congressmen are coming out urging the people not to write in requesting much-needed schools, low-cost housing, improved highways, and a crash missile program, it is high time to ask: Who is really behind this campaign? And the answer is not hard to find, as every day a new barrage of full-page, anti-inflation newspaper ads is fired at the American public.

The real hidden persuaders hiding behind Ike and his constant cry of inflation are the big corporations, the big bankers, and the big insurance companies. They have been spending thousands of dollars (which could well be going into taxes to help offset the Eisenhower budget deficit) on an all-out advertising campaign to establish a fear-of-inflation climate. For instance, Republic Steel, the Young & Rubicam Advertising Agency, the Institute of Life Insurance, and the American Iron and Steel Institute have all joined in the effort to wreck the public welfare programs by trying to frighten people to death with the threat of inflation. (For examples of what the status quo seekers have been saying in their ads see above.)

Other groups joined in: A Sound Dollar Committee was formed with headquarters in New York; the Chicago Tribune launched an all-out drive against inflation and asked the 21-State National Industrial Council to urge newspapers in other States to join the drive. (The Tribune also reported that from the golf course in Augusta, the President said he was following the drive with keen interest and congratulated the Tribune on its efforts.) The Advertising Council, public service unit of the advertising industry, was also approached for help. But the council is still undecided about what to do—partly because of the obviously political nature of the anti-inflation drive.

As Congressman CHESTER BOWLES, Democrat, of Connecticut, told a college news conference audience: "This has been an extraordinary skillful publicity campaign. I

have never seen anything to equal it." Although conceding that there are a lot of honest people genuinely concerned about inflation (including the President), BOWLES said: "There are a lot of other people who have been trying to stop public housing, depressed area bills, social security programs, and all the rest." Both these groups, BOWLES explained, "have joined arms in a great alliance and they have learned they can't lick housing and depressed area bills and social security by a frontal attack so they have tried a flanking attack, so they have equated public housing, urban development, social security, with inflation. It has been extremely skillful."

Meanwhile the hidden persuaders, who have been stirring up so much excitement about inflation, have been reaping the gains of higher interest rates and showing no inclination to lower prices, despite the record profits recorded in many industries. Just recently, for instance, United States Steel announced all-time high net profits for the first 6 months of the year: \$255 million. The same pattern held true for the other steel companies: Inland Steel reported a net income of \$42.1 million for the first 6 months of 1959—more than double the net income for the same period last year. (For record-setting prices see table below.)

But the steel companies continue to cry that they cannot meet labor's demands without further price increases—which would be inflationary. (The steel companies have in the past always raised prices after a wage settlement, usually two or three times more than would be necessary to offset the increased wage costs. For instance, according to a study made by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER's subcommittee, although the steel companies raised their prices \$6 a ton in 1957, "a reasonable guess as to the magnitude of increased labor costs which have arisen from the July 1957 adjustments in wages and other benefits falls somewhere between \$2.50 and \$3 per ton.")

Behind the inflation hysteria, of course, is hidden one of the most cynical political maneuvers in history: the attempt to discredit all Democratic efforts to initiate the much-needed domestic and military programs by reiterating the emotional, fear-ridden word "inflation." If the President were really scared of inflation he would be willing to listen occasionally to students of our economy other than the representatives of big banking and big business who make up his numerous bridge and golf foursomes. If he did, he might learn a few things about prices which his big banking and big business friends have failed to tell him—such as the fact that one of the greatest causes of inflation today is the increased interest rates which have helped drive prices up on every item which the consumer must purchase on credit; or the fact that many costs have been held up artificially by "administered prices"—a fact given impressive substantiation by industry's unusually high profits.

However, the President continues to listen only to representatives of big business. Consequently his idea of the way to fight inflation is to come out—as he did recently—against raising the minimum wage to \$1.25.

But Ike never seems to show the same concern about raising the wages earned by bankers—which is what raising the interest rate amounts to. As Senator PAT McNAMARA, Democrat, of Michigan, said: When Ike took office he must have taken two pledges of allegiance, one of which goes like this:

"I pledge allegiance to the banks,
And to the benefits for which they stand,
High interest, compounded
With tremendous profits for all."

While many are beginning to recognize the great inflation conspiracy as a concerted effort by big business to block the people's welfare programs, Ike persists in seeing a conspiracy working against the people. "I believe the public will soon realize . . ." the President said last February, defending his inadequate budget, "that we are engaged in a contest between the public interest and a wide array of special interests."

IKE'S SPECIAL INTERESTS

Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, replied: "If President Eisenhower's definition of 'special interest' is old folks who have to live in firetraps instead of safe nursing homes; colleges which have no place to house their students; people of low and middle incomes who need a decent place to live; cities full of slums breeding poverty and crime which want to clean out those slums, and veterans who are in need of homes, . . . then I want to urge the Democrats to continue to help those kinds of special interests."

Despite his campaign promises and despite 6 years in office in which he has done nothing to get at the real causes of inflation, the President continues to say: "By golly, we ought to do something about this inflation." Meanwhile, prices continue their upward creep. Recently the Bureau of Labor Statistics announced that at the end of June the consumer price index had reached an all-time high, 124.5. Everywhere, low- and middle-income families were feeling the pinch. "It is just like being peeked to death by gnats," a Los Angeles homeowner lamented to a Time correspondent.

Ironically, the people are beginning to see the swarm of gnats for what they really are, despite the gigantic campaign to make inflation a scareword to be used every time someone mentions a public need. Recently the Gallup Poll announced that in answer to the question: "Which political party . . . do you think is most interested in keeping prices down?" the majority answered, "the Democratic Party."

It is more than possible that of all the phony slogans which the great crusaders have run up the flagpole, the great "fight inflation" campaign will make the loudest backfire yet.

PROFITS OF 428 COMPANIES GAINED 75.6 PERCENT OVER A YEAR EARLIER IN SECOND QUARTER

The columns below show corporate profits reported for the second quarter of 1959, and those for the like quarter of 1958, with percentage changes, by groups. Where individual company reports cover 3-month periods other than calendar quarters, the nearest comparable periods have been used:

	2d quarter, 1959	2d quarter, 1958	Change from year ago
			Percent
10 Aircraft makers.....	\$7,208,000	\$18,892,000	-61.8
4 Airlines.....	13,788,000	13,156,000	+4.8
19 Autos and equipment.....	543,706,000	135,828,000	+300.1
21 Building materials.....	122,196,000	70,450,000	+73.4
14 Chainstores.....	33,707,000	31,023,000	+8.6
19 Chemicals.....	152,062,000	87,020,000	+74.7
12 Department stores.....	44,164,000	32,881,000	+34.3
5 Distillers.....	19,757,000	13,283,000	+47.6
9 Drug makers.....	26,891,000	23,649,000	+13.7
14 Electrical equipment.....	87,191,000	66,393,000	+31.3
7 Farm equipment.....	85,472,000	47,342,000	+80.5
16 Food products.....	51,200,000	51,007,000	+0.3

	2d quarter, 1959	2d quarter, 1958	Change from year ago
			Percent
9 Mining and metals.....	\$32,939,000	\$23,717,000	+123.2
5 Office equipment.....	43,463,000	33,416,000	+30.1
15 Petroleum and products.....	386,482,000	303,823,000	+27.2
15 Pulp and paper.....	41,547,000	33,088,000	+25.6
9 Railway equipment.....	23,063,000	11,385,000	+102.6
8 Rubber companies.....	41,296,000	25,083,000	+64.5
21 Steel manufacturers.....	321,077,000	121,894,000	+163.4
12 Textiles.....	12,638,000	2,028,000	+523.2
8 Tobacco companies.....	57,293,000	50,162,000	+14.2
17 Tools and machinery.....	30,156,000	15,564,000	+93.7
97 Other companies.....	189,462,000	130,041,000	+45.7
Total, 366 Industrials.....	2,386,726,000	1,341,285,000	+77.9
35 Railroads.....	147,583,000	59,296,000	+148.9
27 Utilities.....	119,554,000	110,622,000	+8.1
Grand total, 428 companies.....	2,653,863,000	1,511,193,000	+75.6

Time and Tide Wait

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, now that we are approaching the end of the session, and with the rush that will probably occur in the enactment of several remaining pieces of legislation, with the resultant raising of blood pressure and heart action, I deem it timely and fitting to insert in the Record, an editorial appearing in the New Jersey County Government by the editor in chief and also freeholder of Ocean County, Mr. A. Paul King.

I hope that all Members will give thought to the contents of this editorial during the long awaited recess, and remember it in the 2nd session of the 86th Congress. I am sure if we do this, there will be less reason for Dr. Calver to watch over us, as I have noted recently he is making it a point to be in attendance in the Chamber during the debate of any highly controversial measures.

I might also point out that there is no better time of the year, weatherwise and for complete rest, relaxation and health, than a sojourn on the New Jersey shore during the months of September and October.

The editorial follows:

TIME AND TIDE WAIT

A midsummer day's dream seems to reverse the adage that time and tide wait for no man on the Jersey Shore. But while the clock stops at the zenith of the summer sun on the coast of Monmouth, Ocean, Atlantic, and Cape May Counties, the cash registers keep ringing a tune of prosperity. Another month will tell the tale. In the State's biggest industry—a recordbreaking income of a billion and a half dollars.

Such a relaxed calm before returning to the busy, everyday grind is a good time to consider 12 ways of how to join the coronary club. They apply to elected officials as well as to harassed businessman. Check them off. See if you are ready for your membership card:

(1) Your job comes first, everything else is secondary;

(2) Go back to the office evenings, Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays;

(3) Take the old briefcase home on nights you don't go to the office (this gives you an opportunity to review all the troubles and worries of the day);

(4) Never say "No" to any request, always say "Yes";

(5) Accept all invitations from everybody to anything;

(6) Don't just eat a relaxed meal, plan a conference at mealtime;

(7) Fishing or hunting are a waste of good time and money (besides you never bring back enough fish or game to justify the time or expense);

(8) It is a poor policy to take all the vacation time allowed you;

(9) Golf, gardening, bowling, cards, and most conversation are also a waste of time;

(10) Never delegate responsibility to others, carry the entire load yourself at all times;

(11) If you job calls for traveling—work all day and drive all night to make that appointment next morning;

(12) Promises to your family and friends come last; head down, now—keep charging ahead. Think how efficient you are and how much time you are saving.

Depressed Domestic Mining and Mineral Industries

SPEECH

OF

HON. DENVER D. HARGIS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 177) declaring the sense of Congress on the depressed domestic mining and mineral industries affecting public and other lands.

Mr. HARGIS. Mr. Chairman, the present sad plight of the hard-pressed miners and mine operators in the lead-zinc areas of my home district make the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 177 a matter of great concern to me. The aims and purposes outlined in this resolution are truly commendable, and are worthy of unqualified support.

We need to make every possible effort to restore domestic mine and mineral production to a high level. We must do something to curb unemployment in mining areas. And above all, we must take

steps toward ending the ruinous policy of impoverishing this Nation's mining areas through continued and excessive purchases of foreign imports. Immediate action is imperative.

In April this year, I went along with four of my House colleagues—En EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma; CHARLIE BROWN and WILLIAM J. RANDALL, of Missouri; and J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, of Colorado—for a firsthand look at the lead-zinc situation in the tristate area of Kansas, Oklahoma, and Missouri. The tour included sections of my own congressional district in southeast Kansas.

The conditions we found were appalling, and they are no better now. Decreased prices because of foreign imports have caused a virtually complete shut-down of the mines for 2 full years. Unemployment in this area is as bad as it was during the worst years of the depression in the 1930's. Two-thirds of the miners and their families have left this once-prosperous region. Many of those remaining are enduring privation and hardship.

In Picher, Okla., alone, we found that more than 700 families were on relief. Many were dependent on Government distribution of surplus foods.

This was once the leading lead and zinc production area in the United States. Now, employment has shrunk from thousands of men to fewer than 100 men. The few that are left are fighting a constant battle, through pumping and maintenance, to prevent mining properties that are still valuable from deteriorating.

We need a full-fledged plan for reorganization of the entire Government-related program. And this should be followed promptly by remedial legislation. Action must be taken to assist this essential industry—reduce economic losses in the mining areas—and put an end to the personal tragedies resulting from unemployment and dire need. This program is an urgent necessity.

It is up to Congress to begin corrective measures at once. The resolution now being considered is a meritorious effort. Its passage would be a long and decisive step in the right direction.

Amendments to War Claims Act Urged by Polish National Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following letter which I received from Mr. Louis L. Slivinski, president, Council No. 86, Polish National Alliance of the West Side, Edwardsville, Pa., urging that amendments be made to the War Claims Act to include claims of victims of Nazi war crimes:

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: There are now living in the United States thousands of victims of Nazi persecutions during World War II. Among them are former prisoners of war, prisoners of concentration camps, forced laborers and internees. Some of them were citizens of the United States at the time of war, many others became citizens later and others are here as permanent residents.

The Nuremberg trial and other war crime trials have proved to the civilized world the guilt of the Nazis of the mental and physical torture and inhuman treatment of these unfortunate human beings. Their claims for compensation were never paid.

There are bills pending in the House of Representatives of the United States to compensate in part the above-mentioned victims of Nazi persecutions; H.R. 2913 introduced by MACHROWICZ, H.R. 6513 by DINGELL, and H.R. 6519 by BLATNIK. Under the War Claims Act of 1948 as amended certain German assets were seized in the United States to be used as compensation for losses suffered by U.S. citizens as a result of World War II.

The above bills are amendments to the War Claims Act as amended to extend its provisions to include the claims of the victims of Nazi war crimes. Under these bills the compensation of these persons would come from Nazi assets seized in the United States and would not burden the U.S. taxpayer.

We respectfully ask you to examine, consider and support these bills and thus help these unfortunate victims of Nazi oppression.

Yours very truly,

COUNCIL NO. 86, POLISH NATIONAL
ALLIANCE OF THE WEST SIDE,
LOUIS L. SLIVINSKI, President.

Armed Services Retirement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the August 7 edition of the Northern Virginia Sun is of such vital concern to all military personnel, both active and retired, that I submit it here for inclusion in this Record.

I know my colleagues will join me and the Sun in extending a sincere commendation to Mr. John J. Ford, of Vienna, Va., and the Navy Times, for his part in making this development in the military retirement situation known to members of our armed services and the American public.

[From the Northern Virginia Sun, Aug. 7, 1959]

HIGH COST OF RETIRED PAY

A neat piece of reporting by John J. Ford, a Vienna resident who covers Capitol Hill for the service weekly Navy Times, has turned up a still secret Defense Department study which says military retired pay is going to cost the United States \$3.4 billion annually by 1963. Ford pried the story out while investigating the chances of increased retirement pay for military personnel who left active duty before June 1958, when the new pay scales went into effect.

There has been evidence for some time that Congress and the Defense Department were a bit worried about the rising cost of retired pay. The \$3.4 billion bill for 1933 is based

on present pay scales, too. The figures were compiled by an outside actuarial firm working for the Defense Department.

The completed report may well ruin any chances of the extension of new pay scales to pre-1958 retirees, Ford's article says. He adds that it may lead to a wholesale overhaul in the armed services promotion and retention systems.

There is no question that it will be ammunition for the proponents of longer service careers before retirement eligibility is established. As things now stand, 20 years is the minimum time in uniform required in order to leave via the retired list. Many people believe that an individual should stay in service for 30 years in order to qualify for retired pay. Ford's story certainly will help their case.

Eisenhower Leadership Has Led to Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, in his 1952 campaign President Eisenhower promised to tidy up the national debt. Now we know what he had in mind. On June 30, the fiscal year ended with the largest Federal budget deficit in our history, \$12 billion. During the time the President has been in office the public debt has increased from \$267 billion to \$284 billion.

The cost of interest on the public debt has risen from \$5.8 billion to \$8 billion, and the President has requested \$8.6 billion for debt services in fiscal 1960.

The national debt has indeed been tidied up.

Let us all take note of the fact that the total Federal budget in 1939 for all purposes was only \$7.9 billion during the height of the New Deal era under President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Obviously, things have been going from bad to worse during the past 6 years.

In order to help bring some soundness and stability to the dollar, and to save the taxpayers money I am introducing today a resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the reduction of Federal expenditures and requesting the President to provide the Congress advice, suggestions, plans, and proposals, including legislative recommendations by January 1960, which are better, sounder, and more specific than heretofore to provide for the reduction of all business and agricultural subsidies by 25 percent and for a corresponding reduction of Federal income taxes.

I include here for the information of my colleagues an article entitled "The Fabulous Fiscal Fiasco" which appeared in the Democratic Digest of August 1959:

THE FABULOUS FISCAL FIASCO

The Republican Party, loudly trumpeting farewell to the second Eisenhower recession, is trying to brush under the rug the consequences, past, present and threatened, of its own fiscal irresponsibility. The Democratic Party, thunders the GOP, is the

party of budget-busters, of inflationists, of financial hooligans. The din created by the elephant has reached such a pitch and volume as to persuade the unwary that the fellow might have something there. The Digest, therefore, desires to submit some sobering truths about the Eisenhower administration and its banker-minded fiscal policies.

(The statistics at the end of the article lists certain indisputable facts which the elephant is having great difficulty hiding under that rug.)

President Eisenhower, a fiscal innocent who was putty in the hands of his first Secretary of the Treasury, industrial titan George M. Humphrey, and who is equally malleable for the greatest Secretary of the Treasury since Humphrey, namely, Robert A. Anderson, appears to be as trustful today as ever.

If he found it galling that the results of the Humphrey-Anderson advice forced him to ask Congress in June to raise the ceiling on the public debt, and ask it also to abolish the historic 4½ percent limit on Government bond interest, he took solace in the cry of "inflation, inflation"—a magic word used by all Republican fiscal wizards to explain why they have gotten the Government's financial affairs into such a stew.

The Cabinet of millionaires, inheriting from the Democrats a high prosperity without inflation, had scarcely taken the oath before Secretary Humphrey, with a let-George-do-it nod from Ike, started raising interest rates. The Treasury upped the rate on Government bonds far above the requirements of the market—from the previous Democratic rate of 2½ percent to a charitable 3½. (Charitable to the banks and corporations, that is.) The effect on interest rates in general was electric—and a vicious circle began to rotate, generating inflation as it turned. "Why, I can remember," Humphrey mused fondly, "when 7 percent interest was normal. We thought nothing of it." (Today the banks' prime rate, the interest charged gilt-edge commercial borrowers, has climbed to 4½ percent—and the price of money is scaled up rapidly for the less favored.)

Humphrey also sponsored a \$7 billion tax cut, of which three-quarters was given unfairly and foolishly to corporations and higher income individuals. Foolishly, because this policy caused investment in productive capacity to outrun consumption, with unhappy results. Columnist Joseph Alsop wrote last month: "There would be no budget-balancing problem today, as there would be much less inflationary pressure, too," if Humphrey had not put over this "profligate" tax cut.

Humphrey presided over the first Eisenhower recession (1953-54), and converted the recover of 1955 into the stagnation of 1956-57. The second recession was leering around the corner as he bowed out and returned to his counting houses in the summer of 1957.

The Republicans choose to blot the recessions from memory, and to assure us that all is now rosy. They blithely advise Congress that the fiscal policies under which the recessions occurred should be not only ratified but intensified. To be sure, the vast Eisenhower deficits have cooled off the GOP's infatuation with tax cutting, but the ardor for tight money is unabated. The balanced budget is given precedence by a veto-brandishing President over (1) adequate defenses against an opponent of unexampled might; over (2) the encouragement of a swifter growth by the economy, and over (3) the urgent needs of a multiplying population in such fields as education, housing, urban blight, and conservation of natural resources. (Creeping socialism.) Fiscal management under Eisenhower continues to follow classic Republican theory—as imagi-

native as Calvin Coolidge, as dynamic as Herbert Hoover, as progressive as the trickle-down philosophy of McKinley's day.

The Democratic Party is just as devoted to a balanced budget as the Republicans profess to be—despite their mammoth deficit of fiscal 1959. Speaker SAM RAYBURN pointed out July 2, in a sharp rebuke to GOP propagandists, that the Democratic Congress had already cut \$353 million off the Eisenhower budget requests, and he predicted the cuts would reach \$500 million to \$1 billion. But those savings, basically, are no more than a prudent overseeing of the routine housekeeping of the Government. Let us look beyond such details to the big picture.

In the House of Representatives a few weeks ago Representative CHESTER BOWLES, Democrat, of Connecticut, noted that our animal output of goods and services, remains more than twice that of the Soviet Union. But he quoted Allen W. Dulles, head of the Central Intelligence Agency, as a warning that a much greater rate of growth is enabling the U.S.S.R. to close the gap rapidly. He cited this somber statement by Dulles:

"If it is true that our industrial growth (between now and the end of the new Soviet 7-year plan) will be only 2 percent a year, the United States will be virtually committing economic suicide."

The truth is, the average growth rate of our economy in the first 6 Eisenhower years was only 1.3 percent annually.

TIGHT MONEY STOPS GROWTH

Growth is faster this year, but already the administration (abetted by the Federal Reserve Board) is applying the brakes of tight money. Economists of the top rank reported in July that the "repressive policies now in effect might well lead to an average annual growth rate" for 1958-64—the approximate term of the Soviet 7-year plan—of less than half of the 5 percent annual rate which "we need and can readily achieve."

In 1953-58, these economists said, "we fell more than \$150 billion short of full production, and suffered about 10 million man-years of unnecessary unemployment. In addition, Federal, State, and local governments collected about \$30 to \$35 billion less in revenues than a full rate of economic growth would have generated at existing tax rates."

The economists commented: "The erroneous methods used to fight inflation have contributed greatly to this poor economic performance. Especially, the tight money policy and successive retrenchments in the Federal Budget have been powerful factors in the deficient rate of economic growth."

They continued: "Now in 1959, we are moving upward again as we did in 1955. And once again, we are misreading the signs and applying the wrong policies. The Federal Reserve Board is now reactivating with a vengeance the tight money policy, which has proved to be economically repressive and socially regressive, and a very frail weapon against inflation. In accord with the misguided FRB policies, the Administration is asking for the removal of ceilings on interest rates. Budgetary retrenchment is again being given precedence over the neglected priorities of our national and international needs."

"Few, if any, of the fundamental maladjustments which contributed to the erratic and low growth rates of recent years have been corrected. Some of them are now being further aggravated—for example, the further forced decline of farm income, and

the immense drive against wage adjustments."

But the President seems content. The oracles of the White House stoop, Messrs. HALLECK and DRICKSEN, are radiant. The Republican National Committee's mimeographs brim with happy tributes to prosperity. The moneylenders are happy, too—

The Federal Reserve Board reports that profits (after taxes) of its member banks rose 25 percent in 1958. Since the last Truman year, bank profits (again after taxes) have increased by 75 percent.

George Champion, president of New York's biggest bank, the Chase Manhattan, says a "prime rate" of interest even higher than the 4½ percent, established last May is possible. (He awaits it with open arms.) Henry Clay Alexander, chairman of the Morgan Guaranty Trust, "looks for a continuing rise in the cost of money." (His welcome mat is out.)

Government programs to help home building have felt the hot breath of tight money. Congress a few weeks ago had to raise from 4½ percent to 5½ percent the interest allowable on housing loans guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration. Similarly, the Federal Housing Administration is said to be pondering a raise to 5½ percent in the interest permitted on FHA-guaranteed loans. (Even at the existing rate, a typical FHA mortgage negotiated today would cost \$5,700 in interest, against \$4,500 in 1952.)

But the GOP, although it has given us more inflation than we ever had before except as a result of war, still insists that high-priced money is the best weapon against inflation. Is it working that way? Perhaps it has deterred some people from buying homes. But look at this—

In May alone, consumers increased their outstanding installment debt by \$443 million (seasonally adjusted), the Federal Reserve Board reported in July. That was the biggest jump since September 1955. We may be sure that there was a hidden tax on much of that buying—for higher interest is in effect a tax, imposed by the Government's tight money policies, and payable to lenders rather than to the Government. But the point is, tight money did not dampen the buying urge—hence did not work against inflation.

Actually, higher interest rates are of themselves inflationary, since they increase costs without increasing production. "Few things have contributed as much to inflation as rising interest rates," Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, said recently.

A budget deficit is supposed to be inflationary. Yet Mr. Eisenhower, who loves to denounce inflation, told Congress in June, as casually as if he were asking it to pass the butter, that higher rates necessitated his requesting \$500 million more to pay the interest on the public debt than he had asked in his budget message only 5 months earlier.

One penny and part of a second penny out of every tax dime now go to the unproductive cost of carrying the Federal debt. The effect of tight money and inflation are reflected also in the debt burdens of the States and cities, of school districts and of public utilities, of home and automobile buyers—indeed, in one way or another, of every American.

And the Republican Party, failure going to its head, is proud of it.

On June 30 last, the fiscal year ended with the biggest peacetime Federal deficit in history—around \$12.5 billion.

Total 6-year Eisenhower deficit—\$19.4 billion versus record of first 6 Truman years; \$3.7 billion surplus.

Public debt: When Truman departed, \$267 billion. On June 30 last, \$284 billion.

Cost of interest on public debt: In Truman's last full fiscal year, \$5.8 billion. Requested by Eisenhower for fiscal 1960, \$8.6

billion (up half a billion from his January estimate). The total Federal budget in 1959 for all purposes was \$7.9 billion.

Progress Toward Weather Modification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the honor of acting as moderator of a panel of outstanding scientists and experts who discussed "Weather Modification and Space Exploration" at the 46th Annual Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, meeting here in Washington.

I consider the information provided by the three speakers so important and timely that I would like to make summaries of their remarks more generally available.

One of these papers is presented herewith. It summarizes the address of Dr. Earl G. Droessler, director of Atmospheric sciences program of the National Science Foundation.

Dr. Droessler's summary follows:

Mr. Moderator, ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure to bring you the greetings of the National Science Foundation and our best wishes for the success of the 46th National Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. I should like this morning to present to you information on the space exploration and weather modification programs of the Foundation.

First, may I take a moment to introduce the National Science Foundation for we are relatively a new organization, having been established by the Congress in 1950. The Foundation is an independent Federal Government agency dedicated to the promotion of scientific progress through support of basic research and of education in the sciences. Many of your boys and girls attending high schools, colleges, and universities are assisted in their science courses by programs of the National Science Foundation. Their science teachers are encouraged to broaden their knowledge of science and to develop their teaching skills through attendance at a variety of summer institutes which are held at many colleges and universities throughout the country under the auspices of the National Science Foundation. The college students themselves compete for over 1,000 National Science Foundation fellowships each year, and professors at our colleges and universities are provided with grant money to undertake basic research in such fields as mathematics, biology, chemistry, physics, oceanography, and atmospheric sciences.

Each year the Foundation uses the budget moneys received from the Congress to increase the national scientific wealth in terms of improved research environment, research skills, and research facilities. This activity represents a major annual investment in our national prosperity and welfare.

Now, I shall briefly discuss the Foundation's interest in space exploration—I say briefly because this is a new field of scientific experimentation and technology, and the Congress has wisely decided to establish a new Government agency to direct the na-

¹ "Inflation, Cause, and Cure," a study directed by Leon H. Keyserling for the Conference on Economic Progress, Washington, D.C.

tional program. The new agency is called the National Aeronautics and Space Agency, and I am sure that Dr. Porter, who follows me, will have more to say about the NASA programs and about future prospects in this area.

However, I believe we must understand that with the coming of the space age we did not create new sciences; actually, we still depend upon our trained physicists, astronomers, and upper atmosphere scientists to carry forward our understanding and exploitation of outer space. Inasmuch as many of these scientists are now supported by Foundation grants, we fully expect that we will continue to support their scientific work which, in many instances, will lead into space experiments. Through close cooperation between the Foundation and the new Space Agency, arrangements will be made to schedule such experiments on the high flying rockets and satellites.

On weather modification, I can speak more fully because here the National Science Foundation has received special responsibilities from the Congress. Just about a year ago, July 11, 1958, Public Law 85-510 was signed by the President. The law directs the Foundation "to initiate and support a program to study research and evaluation in the field of weather modification." Public Law 510 was a direct outgrowth of the work of the Advisory Committee on Weather Control which was so ably chaired by our next speaker, Captain Orville. For 4 years the Advisory Committee studied and evaluated public and private cloud seeding experiments and encouraged programs aimed at developing both physical and statistical evaluation methods. The final report of the Advisory Committee was issued in December 1957 and it stressed particularly the importance of basic research and recommended that the Government give full encouragement and support to the widest possible research as the fullest and most direct way to success in any attempt of modifying the weather.

The National Science Foundation moved promptly and vigorously into this new area of responsibility. A program of atmospheric sciences was established and weather modification research and evaluation was placed therein. I should like now to list some of the things we have been able to accomplish over the past 10 months:

First. The Foundation sought the advice and assistance of outstanding scientists and engineers in framing its program; for weather modification is an area of research involving many talents and disciplines. It embodies knowledge of meteorology, statistics, mathematics, physics, chemistry and engineering. Therefore, in October 1958 an Advisory Group on Weather Modification, composed of distinguished civilian experts, was appointed by the Director of the Foundation. The Advisory Group has fashioned general and specific guide lines within which the program has been carried out.

Second. The program has established direct contact with all known private weather engineers and consulting groups in the country. We have informed them of the new weather modification program and have asked for and received full cooperation.

Third. A series of workshop conferences were set up to stimulate and initiate research and evaluation and to bring together interdisciplinary scientific and engineering groups that must be involved in a program expansion. The first of these workshops studied the problem of improved measurements and instrumentation for cloud physics and weather modification. The second brought together mathematicians, statisticians, and cloud physicists to develop new approaches on the design and evaluation of field test programs. The third meeting will call together meteorologists, physicists, and

chemists to discuss theoretical and experimental research regarding the scientific basis of weather modification.

Fourth. The Director of the Foundation invited the several interested Government agencies to appoint representatives to the Interdepartmental Committee on Weather Modification. This Committee was formed to keep the governmental activities fully advised of the national efforts in this expanding area of meteorology, and to encourage coordination among them. The Committee will insure a cohesive and effective U.S. program in which other Federal agencies are expected to participate by taking charge of projects suitable to their interests.

Fifth. Last, but certainly not the least, we have done something in a very positive way by launching a full-scaled \$1,130,000 research program on weather modification. This was announced by the Director of the Foundation in March of this year. The program consists of 13 grants and contracts for laboratory research, field experiments, evaluation of present theory and practices, and study of modern meteorological methods directed toward weather modification. In announcing this program Dr. Waterman said: "We believe that these investigations are most necessary at the present stage of development of weather modification theory and practice. Until now, weather modification studies have been complicated by a large proportion of trial-and-error experiments of uncertain results, many without the controls necessary to assess their meaning and significance. The work under the NSF program will increasingly move from scattered and unrelated investigations to efforts soundly based on scientific knowledge."

"The National Science Foundation program has the objective of studying more intensively than has been attempted before the scientific basis of weather modification, through support of competent scientists working in cloud physics and allied fields. Under this program a full range of laboratory and field experimental work will be carried out using techniques of physics, chemistry, and mathematics, all of which play important roles in meteorological research."

The 13 research grants and contracts have been made with universities and research organizations and also include one grant to the U.S. Weather Bureau. If you wish to examine the details of this program, I would be pleased to leave a copy of the NSF announcement with the chairman for inclusion in the proceedings of the convention.

What lies ahead in weather modification: First and foremost, we are hoping that the Foundation can keep its program going for a long enough time to be really meaningful, considering the complexity of the problem. This means that we should provide steady support for at least 10 to 15 years. Nothing is more critical and essential to lead man to his ultimate control of weather—whatever that may be—than long term, stable support for the best scientific minds we can bring to bear on the problem.

I know that this convention has a particular interest in water resources, and you want to know how weather modification may fit into your future plans. We should keep in mind that the Advisory Committee on Weather Control found that the seeding of winter-type storms in mountainous areas in the western United States produced an average increase in precipitation of 10 to 15 percent from the seeded storms with heavy odds that this increase was not the result of natural variations in the amount of rainfall. Therefore, I believe that in the planning of water development for these mountainous regions in the years ahead, consideration of the potentials of artificial cloud seeding and weather modification will have to be made.

In addition to precipitation increases, the prospects of weather modification are attractive because of other possible benefits. These include the suppression of hail storms, decrease in lightning storms, a reduction in the frequency and severity of floods, and even a possible diminution of hurricane intensity and damage. The fact that the present scientific basis for expecting such results is meager does not necessarily mean that the longer range prospects are negative, for the scientific examination of the problem has just begun on a systematic basis.

Landrum-Griffin and Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. QUENTIN BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn., of August 24, 1959:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP, MONDAY,
AUGUST 24, 1959

Who would have thought that a labor bill, that contains no mention whatsoever of agriculture, would end up by putting farmers behind the legislative eight-ball? But that's just what is happening.

It's no fault of the laboring man, who's working for better take-home pay, just as is the farmer. But, as you know, there's been a big scare over a few bad actors in the leadership of a couple of big unions. That's been the signal for a general attack on labor by nonunion groups. Farmers have seen that same pattern repeated against farmers—under the leadership of the Secretary of Agriculture. By playing off commodity group against commodity group, and city people against farm people, the farm Secretary has raised hob with the farm program and farm prices.

That's the price farmers are paying, and it it not over yet. Now labor is up against the Landrum-Griffin bill, which has passed the House. It wouldn't have passed except that the Southern Dixiecrats joined the Republicans (at least most of them) in voting for the bill, which sincere labor people say will hamstring the unions if it ever becomes law.

The northern city Democrats are plenty sore about that. They want no part of the Landrum-Griffin labor bill, because most of their constituents in the cities work for wages and this tough bill would strip unions of their most effective weapons in the battle for better wages. So the city Democrats are boiling mad at farm district Southerners who voted for the bill, almost as a bloc, as well as at Republicans. In the past, northern city Democrats have been mighty cooperative in voting for farm measures, but now they are inclined to strike out at any farm legislation.

The northern Democrats, and the group of levelheaded Republicans who analyzed the situation and voted accordingly, are trying to patch up these wounds. Maybe they'll be able to, but the city Democrats seized their first chance to hit back at the Dixiecrats by voting solidly against CCC barter provisions in the Public Law 480 bill, sponsored by Cooter of North Carolina.

So the Dixiecrat vote on the Landrum-Griffin labor bill, which doesn't even mention farmers, has chilled the working relationship in Congress between city Democrats and the

farm-State Members. The situation is serious. Washington farm observers are saying that chances for good farm legislation in 1960 and 1961 are endangered. Maybe it can be patched up before then. We certainly hope so. The farmers have some very capable friends in Congress who are working on it, men like McGovern of South Dakota, Anderson of Montana, Burdick of North Dakota, and others.

But farmers need to understand that their margin of victory on the farm bills they've been able to get through Congress has been thin as a thread. That means that farmers, fewer in number each year, need to double and triple their organizing activities. Not one single farmer who wants to be farming 10 years from now can "leave it up to George" to carry on the fight for better legislation and stronger co-ops.

The Late Eugene Meyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include a tribute paid to the late Eugene Meyer, publisher of the newspaper the Washington Post and Times Herald, by the Cuban delegation to the extraordinary session of the Council of the Organization of American States, on July 24, 1959:

HOMAGE BY THE COUNCIL OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 24, 1959, ON THE OCCASION OF THE DEATH OF MR. EUGENE MEYER, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF THE WASHINGTON POST AND TIMES HERALD

The interim representative of Cuba, Dr. LEVI MARRERO ARTILES, "Mr. Chairman, the Cuban delegation has the honor to propose to this distinguished Council that we observe a minute of silence, on our feet, as a homage to the distinguished journalist, Mr. Eugene Meyer, publisher of the newspaper the Washington Post and Times Herald, who died recently. The cause of democracy in all our countries had ever in Mr. Meyer a large-hearted and firm defender. The people of Cuba found in the Washington Post, under Mr. Meyer's guidance, a broad understanding of its ideals and sacrifices. It is for this reason—and I believe I express the feelings of the Cuban people and their revolutionary government—that I have spoken these brief words of homage to an exemplary journalist and a representative of the highest moral and intellectual values of American democracy. Thank you."

The chairman, Dr. GONZALO ESCUDERO, Ambassador of Ecuador, "The Chair, agreeing entirely with the remarks of the Ambassador of Cuba, and interpreting the unanimous sentiments of the Council, allies itself to this motion; therefore, let us proceed to observe a minute of silence, standing, in homage of this eminent journalist who has died."

The representative of the United States, Mr. JOHN C. DREYER, "I wish to express the gratitude of my delegation for this homage to a distinguished American, Mr. Eugene Meyer, which the Council has just rendered at the suggestion of the delegation of Cuba."

Woolworth To Mark Kirby Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader, of August 19, 1959, which reports that the 75th anniversary of the founding of F. M. Kirby's first store in Wilkes-Barre and the 80th anniversary of the F. W. Woolworth Co. will be marked in Wilkes-Barre by a Kirby-Woolworth Founders' Days celebration in the near future:

WOOLWORTH TO MARK KIRBY ANNIVERSARY—EARLY DAYS RECALLED

The 75th anniversary of the founding of F. M. Kirby's first store in Wilkes-Barre and the 80th year of the F. W. Woolworth Co. will be marked in Wilkes-Barre by a Kirby-Woolworth Founders' Days celebration in the near future, according to Everett W. Chance, local Woolworth manager.

Similar events have been held in Lancaster, where F. W. Woolworth's first store was established and in Erie, where Seymour H. Knox, first located his 5-and-10-business.

Simultaneous with the Wilkes-Barre Founders' Days event, honoring the late Fred Morgan Kirby, the Scranton Woolworth store will stage its affair honoring the late C. S. (Summer) Woolworth, its founder.

DINNER PLANNED HERE

Prior to the start of the local sales event, a dinner will be held on September 18, at the Westmoreland Club.

With over 3,250 stores in operation today in 11 countries of the world, the firm has 1,800 stores advertising in daily newspapers, a trend of recent years in the 5-and-10 chain.

Kirby's original store, located on East Market Street, was put in operation in 1884 with \$500 representing his entire savings, plus \$100 borrowed from his father, and \$600 which Charles Sumner Woolworth, of Scranton, invested with him in the new venture, to be known as Woolworth and Kirby's.

To satisfy his desire to have his own store, he bought out Mr. Woolworth's half interest in the next year. But the association between the two continued and they with Frank Woolworth sought each others advice and studied each other's merchandising methods and at times pooled their purchasing power to acquire better values for their customers at 5 and 10 cents.

SECOND STORE OPENED

In 1889 Fred Kirby opened his second store at Williamsport and in 1891 he moved his store in Wilkes-Barre (which he was beginning to consider his adopted home) to the corner of East Market and Washington Streets.

Nine years later, in 1899, while he was opening stores in the Eastern and Middle Western States, the Kirby Building on Wilkes-Barre's public square was built. At its completion, F. M. Kirby & Co. moved into its new, larger accommodations with suitable ceremonies.

In 1908 the Wilkes-Barre store moved to South Main Street. At the opening, the street was jammed for hours. Special police tried in vain to keep the crowds in order, windows and tempers were smashed. The beautiful F. M. Kirby & Co. store, its bigger-than-ever values, the great crowd itself were the talk of the town for weeks.

FIVE AND DIMES

By 1911, five-and-dime stores were familiar sights on the main streets of many American cities. Sumner Woolworth had 18; his brother, Frank Woolworth, had 318; Mr. Charton had 53; Mr. Knox, 112; Mr. Moore, 2; Fred Kirby, 86.

In 1912 they took the next logical step. They combined under the name F. W. Woolworth Co., each partner continuing active in the company management. F. J. Weckesser of Wilkes-Barre, who had begun with F. M. Kirby & Co. in 1895 as manager of the company's Baltimore store, continued as district manager under the merger. He later became a director of the company and continued until his death. Today, Mr. Kirby's son, Allan P. Kirby, railroad magnate and financier, serves as a director of the Woolworth Co.

None of the five founders of the original modern Woolworth Co. is living. The last survivors were Fred M. Kirby and C. S. Woolworth, the boyhood chums of the old corner store.

Mr. Kirby became one of America's leading philanthropists—his contributions to educational, religious, scientific, and recreational groups and institutions has by 1940 reached the vast total of \$68 million.

Some of the organizations which have benefited in whole or part from his contributions are Wyoming Seminary Endowment and Sprague Memorial Hall, Guthrie Clinic and Robert Packer Hospital at Sayre; Wilkes-Barre General Hospital, Angeline Elizabeth Kirby Memorial Health Center and Maintenance Endowment, F. M. Kirby Park and Maintenance Endowment; Irem Temple, Wilkes-Barre Institute for Girls (now Wyoming Seminary Day School), Kirby Hall and Endowment of the Chair of Civil Rights, Jewish Welfare Association, American Red Cross, and Leonard Hall of Lehigh University.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, among the most thoughtful and respected newspapermen in the State of Oklahoma is Mr. Milt Phillips, publisher of the Seminole Producer.

In an editorial, August 13, Mr. Phillips urged the public not to be misled by demands for a specific label or a package deal in labor legislation but to concentrate on results—sound legislation to curb the abuses brought out by the McClellan committee:

THE NAMES OF AUTHORS NOT IMPORTANT
THING

(By Milt Phillips)

By the time this appears in print the House of Representatives may have concluded consideration of labor reform legislation. As this is written it appears a majority of the House Members in Congress are convinced that legislation curbing abuses of labor union powers must be enacted at this session. It also appears a majority of House Members do not want to enact legislation that will seriously injure legitimate union functions. We have said in this column, and we again reiterate, a vast majority of the people of the Nation do not want to impair

or injure legitimate union activities. It is the abuses of union powers which have brought resentment to a high pitch among the people all over the Nation. It is not an easy job to provide legislation which will effectively curb racketeering and abuse of union powers and at the same time preserve to honest, sincere union members the rights to which they are entitled under this democratic form of government. Of course there are some union leaders and members that want unlimited powers regardless of the effect such powers have upon the Nation and all the people. Likewise there are those who so bitterly oppose any kind of union labor function that they would destroy the unions by legal means or any other means. The vast majority of people in the Nation do not agree with either of these extreme viewpoints.

A problem sincere lawmakers face is the lack of understanding by the average citizen on how legislation is enacted.

For example, this present labor reform legislation was first passed by the U.S. Senate. The bill passed by the Senate was a weak bill with little enforcement powers. Senator McCLELLAN, of Arkansas, tried to strengthen it during Senate debate on the bill.

Senator McCLELLAN attempted to put into the legislation a "bill of rights" for union members and the public. He was unable to get very much of his proposal into the Senate bill as it was finally enacted.

Senator JOHN KENNEDY, an aspirant for the Presidential nomination, has helped dig up much of the dishonesty, corruption, and malpractices of mobsters operating under union labels. But the Presidential aspirant is trying to ride the fence on the labor reform legislation.

Unlike McCLELLAN, KENNEDY is trying to appease the union extremists while playing to the demand of the people for adequate laws to control the abuses uncovered by the McClellan and Kennedy committees.

The Senate-passed labor reform, weakened far below the necessary safeguards recommended by McCLELLAN, was sent to the House of Representatives.

There it was referred to the House Labor Committee for study and hearings.

Under pressure of Hoffa and other leaders of organized labor, the House committee changed some of the weak Senate provisions, and in some ways even softened the already soft Senate bill by lessening penalties for violations of the proposed law.

However, the House committee bill, as finally sent to the floor of the House Tuesday, contained some sound provisions, and if penalties had been imposed sufficiently rigid to provide enforcement, might have helped to clean up some of the abuses brought out in the congressional investigations.

Then President Eisenhower endorsed legislation proposed by two Representatives, one a Republican and the other a Democrat. The Eisenhower endorsement brought some possibility of making the labor reform legislation a partisan issue.

However, Senator McCLELLAN, an Arkansas Democrat, joined Eisenhower in endorsing the bill proposed by the Representatives, LANDRUM and GRIFFIN.

In the meantime, a California Congressman named SHELLY, a former union organizer, introduced another proposal which was endorsed by many of the labor officials. It gave the unions even more power to abuse.

Thus the House of Representatives faced the problem this week of trying to develop sound legislation which would curb abuse of union power by dishonest and corrupt union officials, and yet would not penalize honest and properly operated labor unions.

The Members of the House of Representatives faced a tough job.

Whatever legislation the House passes this week must be returned to the Senate for concurrence or rejection.

Since the Senate passed a very weak piece of legislation, it is naturally expected that body will refuse to concur in House changes from the Senate bill.

So the Senate will refuse to concur and ask for a conference. A small number of House and Senate Members will be named to a joint conference committee and this committee will attempt to work out a bill satisfactory to both branches of Congress.

Therefore the House Members this week, especially those like TOM STEED and CARL ALBERT, who want sound legislation protecting the public, the union members and the national security, are having a tough time trying to get House colleagues to write a good, sound bill from all of the proposals, and in addition, pass a bill which has some chance of getting Senate approval.

As individual citizens, we folks back at home in the congressional districts, have the problem of trying to show our Representatives how we feel about this labor reform legislation.

Inasmuch as the Landrum-Griffin bill had more real controls and provided more rigid penalties for violation of such things as "hot cargo" clauses in union contracts, "blackmail" picketing, refusal to permit union members to vote secret ballots and other needed legal controls, the public used this specific bill in urging their Congressmen to support labor union reform legislation.

However, what the average citizen—a vast majority or all the people of the Nation—really want is legislation that will curb mobsters and racketeers and assure that members of labor unions will have the right to express their views without coercion and threats from entrenched officials.

The average citizen cares little what name is attached to the legislation.

They want adequate labor reform legislation enacted.

If the House will enact legislation outlawing "hot cargo," prohibit with rigid penalties "blackmail" picketing and boycotts, and give unions back to the membership where democratic processes will prevail, the public is sufficiently aroused that Senate approval will follow.

Citizens must remain alert—not get themselves all tied up with some "package deal" under any name, whether it be Landrum-Griffin or some other name—but insist that the major reforms so urgently needed are included in the final legislation. That will assure progress in cleaning up corruption and dictatorships in the labor unions where these conditions now exist.

Sincere Congressmen in both the House and Senate should be encouraged to do this. Let's not get ourselves all worked up over some specific name or title of legislation.

But let's not relax one iota in insisting that reforms, with enforcement teeth, must be enacted by this present Congress before the Members return home.

Hawaii Teaches a Lesson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the North Adams (Mass.)

Transcript which expresses most eloquently the great lesson of toleration and understanding which the State of Hawaii is teaching all America:

HAWAII TEACHES A LESSON

The appearance of the newly elected Hawaiian congressional delegation in Washington will be an auspicious occasion for most Americans. The exceptions will be those persons, mostly in the South, who have been fighting a losing battle for white supremacy.

One of the State's two Senators is the son of an indentured Chinese immigrant. The State's lone Representative, a hero of the famous Nisei fighting unit in World War II, is the son of a naturalized Japanese clerk. They will be the first Members of Congress of Chinese and Japanese ancestry.

We hope Senator HIRAM L. FONG and Representative DANIEL K. INOUYE will be productive Members of the congressional body. Time alone will tell about that. What is most important for the moment is that America has now taken into its national leadership people of Asian ancestry. The impact of that will certainly not be lost in the Far East, where this country's standing has long been harmed by its anti-Asian prejudice.

In the new State of Hawaii more than half of the 80 offices at stake in this week's election were won by Americans of Asian descent. That is as significant as the makeup of the congressional delegation.

Racial snobbery undoubtedly exists in Hawaii, but it is no different than the social and religious snobbery that exists almost everywhere in this country. The Hawaiians, however, have managed to eliminate racial discrimination. If all people are afforded equal rights, the silly pretensions of superiority by one group or another are harmless.

In some ways many of this country's older States have a lesson to learn from its newest member.

Free Elections in East-Central Europe Should Be Made a Condition for Any Future Summit Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following letter from Mr. Stefan Korbonski, chairman, Assembly of Captive European Nations, New York City, concerning free elections for east-central European countries:

ASSEMBLY OF

CAPTIVE EUROPEAN NATIONS,

New York, N.Y., August 12, 1959.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD: I am glad to convey to you the assembly's appreciation of your excellent address, delivered on July 23, in the House of Representatives, requesting that free elections in East-Central Europe be made a condition for a summit conference.

The subsequent invitation to Mr. Khrushchev to visit the United States has lent even more weight to your address. The unwelcome and harmful effects of this visit can be, at least partially, offset by confront-

ing the Soviet dictator with a determined attitude of the United States to discuss the case of the subjugated East-Central European countries. Prolonged silence and inaction by the West on these countries, coupled with the increased prestige that Premier Khrushchev will derive from his U.S. tour, would only strengthen the suspicion of the captive peoples that they have been "written off." As for the tragic consequences of final hopelessness and disillusionment in the captive European countries, you have clearly and graphically described them in your address.

We at the assembly have also been very impressed by the resolution on the fulfillment of the wartime pledges requiring free elections in Eastern Europe, introduced by you on the same day in the House of Representatives. When it will be passed—and we are confident that it will—it will mark a new milestone in the long list of your distinguished contributions to our countries' freedom cause.

Sincerely yours,

STEFAN KORONSKI,
Chairman.

Distinguished Service to Agriculture Award to Senator Frank Carlson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, at the 45th annual meeting of the Missouri Farmers Association at Columbia, Mo., on August 24, the Honorable FRANK CARLSON, Senator from Kansas, received the award for distinguished service to agriculture. Following is the citation used by the president, Fred V. Heinkel, in presenting the award:

Because of your genuine interest and leadership in the encouragement of farmer owned and controlled cooperative associations and your sincere and demonstrated friendship for farmers; and because of your particular and thorough understanding of the difficult problems involved in the production and marketing of our great wheat crop, and your dedication to finding a solution to these problems, a solution which is of vital importance to the farmers of Missouri, Kansas, and the rest of the Midwest's great Wheat Belt, we feel that you have fully earned and deserve the highest honor and award the Missouri Farmers Association has to offer.

Therefore, the board of directors of the Missouri Farmers Association has voted unanimously to bestow upon you the MFA's award for distinguished service to agriculture.

FRED V. HEINKEL,
President.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the Missouri Farmers Association honored our distinguished colleague from our adjoining sister State. Hereafter follows the speech of the Honorable FRANK CARLSON delivered on this auspicious occasion:

SPEECH BY SENATOR FRANK CARLSON, ANNUAL MEETING, MISSOURI FARMERS ASSOCIATION, INC., COLUMBIA, MO., AUGUST 24, 1959

It is an honor and a privilege for me to appear on your program today. We folks in Kansas have always had a great respect for the farmer in Missouri and especially for

your active, hard hitting Missouri Farmers Association.

After accepting your kind invitation to speak here today, I spent some time thinking about a wide range of topics which I would have liked to discuss with you. As you probably know, a Senator becomes involved in so many activities today that he has difficulty in keeping up to date in any one field. After considering several alternatives, I decided to try to organize my thoughts and observations regarding the current impasse which has developed in the farm policy field.

I ask, What, if any, progress has been made in national farm policy in the past 30 years? I ask, Why do we find it so difficult to reach a common agreement on desirable revisions in farm price support legislation?

And finally, I ask, How and in what manner can we expect to make progress in improving farmers' bargaining power in months and years immediately ahead?

These are the questions that interest me, and I believe they are questions in which you are interested.

When I consider the first question, "What, if any, progress has been made in national farm policy?" it occurred to me that it was just 30 years ago that we first made the stabilization of farm prices a national policy objective. The Agricultural Marketing Act, the first national legislation having as its objective the stabilization of farm prices, was passed in 1929 with the active support of President Hoover.

Those of you who have as many gray hairs as I do will remember that the Agricultural Marketing Act created a Federal Farm Board with a price stabilization fund of \$500 million and a charter to assist in the development of regional and national marketing cooperatives. The Board hoped that, with the help of credit from the \$500 million stabilization fund, these cooperatives would be able to stabilize market supplies and prices.

President Hoover, especially anxious that this new Board should succeed, prevailed upon Alexander Legge, the former president of the International Harvester Co., to become its first Chairman. Soon after taking office Mr. Legge explained the purpose of the Board in a U.S. Chamber of Commerce meeting in these words:

"Nearly 10 years of discussion, controversy, and compromise led Congress, in its wisdom, to declare that permanent solution of the agricultural problem lies in collective action on the part of the farmers. It created the Farm Board to help producers organize for such action, both as to production and marketing of their crops, the purpose being to enable them to put their industry on economic parity with other industries."

Apparently the chamber of commerce opposed farm price stabilization 30 years ago, just as it does today, for later in the same speech Mr. Legge said:

"Is there any reason why those who have prospered and grown apace through governmental aid and assistance to various industries should object to the farmer getting his?

"You fellows, better organized, got yours while the farmer, unorganized, failed to get anything."

"The farmers have little or nothing to say about what their product brings. Costs of production can be passed along to the buyer by nearly everyone but the farmer. Unorganized, he has to take for his product what the other fellow is willing to give him."

No one knows how successful these first efforts at farm price stabilization would have been under normal peacetime conditions. We know, of course, that they were unable to stem the tide of economic recession which set in in the fall of 1929.

We usually think of the Federal Farm Board as having failed in its price stabiliza-

tion efforts. But it was this first Farm Board experience which convinced Mr. Legge and other farm leaders that production and marketing controls were essential for the success of farm price stabilization policies.

Mr. Legge, with his background of manufacturing experience, was a vigorous advocate of balancing supplies with available markets. After several years of service, in his letter of resignation to President Hoover, he included this significant sentence:

"While there are still a few of the agricultural leaders who lower their voices when they speak of production control, yet practically all of them have accepted the principle as essential."

The production control programs of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration in the 1930's were a direct outgrowth of the Farm Board's experience. The Secretary of Agriculture in 1933 also inaugurated price-support loans direct to producers. In the fall of 1933 producers of cotton and corn who had kept production in line with their allotments were offered loans on their crops at above-market values. This was the beginning of direct price-support programs as we know them today.

The price support features of the farm program increased in popularity throughout the 1930's. It became increasingly difficult, however, to hold production in line with the volume that could be marketed at the support price levels with continued large unemployment rolls. Just as a matter of interest I looked up the records and found that the loans and inventories of the Commodity Credit Corporation increased from \$279 million in 1938 to \$1.7 billion at the end of 1942.

I often wonder how our farm price policy would have met this problem of growing stocks in the prewar years if high levels of employment could have been achieved and World War II could have been avoided.

World War II generated economic forces, just the opposite of those prevailing in the 1930's, and gave us an opportunity to try out Government price supports as economic incentives for increased production. The experience of the war period was not particularly revealing, however, for market prices remained well above support price levels most of the time.

Production goals replaced quotas and, to increase production, farmers were given all possible incentives feasible in view of wartime conditions. They responded with such vigor that per capita food consumption (in part associated with fuller employment) increased 6 percent. In addition, large quantities of food were supplied to the Armed Forces and to our allies.

Senator ANKEN, of Vermont, recently said: "In fact, the increase in agricultural production in America was largely responsible for winning the war, and was a feat which was exceeded only by the men in the fighting forces themselves."

"After the war the productive power of American farms was instrumental in putting countries of Western Europe and other parts of the world back on their feet."

"This had hardly been accomplished when the Korean war broke out; and there was increased demand for certain commodities, particularly wheat."

"Again the American farmer responded."

The 6 years following the Korean war have given us a different kind of experience. It has been a frustrating experience for farm leaders, farm program administrators, and farm-minded legislators.

During the last 6 years net farm income has been almost \$20 billion less than in the previous 6 years.

Farm prices are now 17 percent lower than 6 years ago and the trend is still downward in spite of the general business boom in progress.

Farm production in 1958 was 15 percent higher than the new record levels achieved in 1952-53, and total production in 1959 may equal or exceed 1958.

We have bartered, sold for local currencies, and given away at home and abroad \$8 billion of farm products.

Government loans and inventories of farm products have increased to almost \$9 billion and further increases are expected under present legislation as currently administered.

Net budget expenditures of the Department of Agriculture in the past 6 years have reached \$28 billion.

Prof. Dale Hathaway of Michigan State University, who spent 1956 on the staff of the Council of Economic Advisers, made a widely accepted appraisal of recent U.S. farm policy in the May issue of the *Journal of Farm Economics*. The key points in this appraisal are as follows:

1. The program probably has maintained farm income (both in the aggregate and per capita) at levels higher than would have existed in the absence of a program. (Other reputable economists estimate that net farm income would have been one-fourth or more lower without supports in recent years.)

2. The program that has operated has not seriously impeded agricultural adjustment, especially the adjustment of the agricultural labor force.

3. Aggregate agricultural efficiency probably has not been impaired by the program.

4. Despite the conclusion that our recent program has not been a major contribution to the present difficulties in agriculture, neither has it contributed positively to a solution of the problem.

5. The program has failed, despite massive expenditures, to bring a solution to the U.S. farm problem.

To Professor Hathaway's appraisal I should like to add the following too often overlooked facts:

Over the past 30 years, with farm price supports in operation most of the time, the cost of food in terms of workers' earnings has dropped sharply. A weekly market basket of food for a family of three which cost 25 percent of the worker's average weekly earnings in 1958 would have cost 48 percent of a worker's weekly earnings 30 years earlier.

Food costs less in the United States in terms of workers' wages than anywhere else in the world. Although Government costs of farm price support programs are higher than they should be, they equal only 5 percent of the money spent for food at retail. If the pro rata share of farm program costs had been added to the cost of food, workers in 1958 would have spent only 26 percent of their weekly earnings for a market basket of food as compared with 35 percent for the same food 10 years earlier, and 41 percent 20 years earlier.

Throughout the last two decades, output per hour of farm labor has increased at a rate equal to two to three times that of the nonfarm worker. Largely because of this rapid increase in efficiency, people have left the farms in record numbers in the past 20 years. Yet workers in agriculture, mostly independent farm operators, receive less than half as much for their labor as non-farm workers. The economic benefits of this increase in efficiency have largely been passed on to the processors and consumers.

When I reflected on the second question, "Why do we find it so difficult to reach a common agreement on desirable revisions in farm price support legislation?" I found it especially challenging. Actually, in the past 6 years I have given a good deal of thought to this question. And I have changed my views somewhat over the period.

In the past several months it has seemed to me that the single most important factor

has been the wide difference in views as to the economic facts relating to agriculture. I am told that for the country as a whole, perhaps a third of the farmers believe farm income will drop sharply if effective supply management programs are not adopted soon; an equal number of farmers just as sincerely believe that farm income will be maintained at present levels or will be increased by lower price supports and the removal of production restrictions; and the other third of the farmers are undecided as between these two points of view.

The proportion of farmers holding each of these views differs in the different farming areas. A large majority of the tobacco, cotton, and wheat producers apparently believe in the need for production controls while only a minority of the corn and livestock producers appear ready to accept production controls or believe them to be feasible for their products. There also is a wide diversity of views with respect to the effectiveness of acreage controls and of market prices as incentives in adjusting supplies to available markets.

In my opinion if we could more nearly agree on the relevant economic facts we could rather quickly agree on desirable changes in farm price support legislation. All of us would prefer more, rather than less, individual freedom in our farming operations. All of us would prefer to do away with price support programs and production controls if farm prices and farm income would not fall to disastrously low levels.

I am not an economist and it is not my purpose to attempt a review of all the important facts relating to farm price support programs. There are, however, three misconceptions which I would like to clear up. First, the evidence does not support the often made assertions that control programs have been ineffective and that farm price support programs have stimulated greater production.

Official statistics compiled by the Department of Agriculture show that in the last 5 years production of the basic crops has been held 21 percent lower than the non-basics, using 1952-53 (the last 2 years before acreage controls and marketing quotas were invoked) as the base period. The production of the basic crops, feed grains other than corn and soybeans (crops increased most by diversions from the allotment crops) in the last 5 years has averaged 2 percent lower in relation to the 1952-53 base than all other (non-price-supported) crops. Obviously production controls have not been as effective as they should have been but they have held production in check, as compared with that of the non-price-supported crops.

Second, the economic facts do not support the propaganda to the effect that the producers of the non-price-supported products, especially livestock, have demonstrated the superiority of free market policies in recent years. In the 6 years 1953-58, on a net basis 94.5 million tons of feed grains and wheat were removed from commercial market channels by surplus disposal and Government storage programs.

Had these additional feed grains and wheat remained in commercial market channels, their outlet would have been livestock feeding. Livestock feed grains supplies would have been 14 percent larger for the entire 6-year period. In the absence of price-support programs on feed grains and wheat, total livestock feeding would have been about 14 percent larger, thus increasing supplies and lowering prices of livestock products generally.

Hogs which would have utilized about half of the increased feed supplies would have been sent to market in about 16 percent larger numbers. An increase in marketings of this magnitude, on the basis of recent Department of Agriculture analyses, would

have lowered hog prices one-third or more below what they actually were.

While we are discussing farm surpluses and the effect they have had on farm prices generally, I want to discuss briefly our crop surplus problem in Kansas. Wheat is the basic crop and the farmers are very much concerned and embittered about the continuous reminder to the public about the cost to the taxpayers for the storage of wheat and cost of the program. Wheat is the political football—the whipping boy for those who do not know the farm problem.

Admittedly, we have a surplus of some 120,917,000 bushels of wheat stocks in all storage positions as of August 7. On August 7 corn stocks in the United States were 1,033,431,000 bushels and this figure will go up about 340 million bushels in the next 2 or 3 weeks, or to a total of 1,373 million bushels.

With the present anticipated corn yield this year, corn could also be a great burden in our farm surplus problem.

Stocks of oats on August 7 were 36,495,000 bushels—grain sorghums 269,912,000 bushels.

I mention these figures because the wheat farmers of this Nation have been receiving the brunt of criticism for surplus crops that are not limited just to wheat.

The third misconception relates to the potentialities of market expansion as a solution for the current imbalance between supplies and market outlets.

The evidence does not support the optimism often expressed regarding the widening of markets which will occur with lower prices. Although I have always supported programs for market expansion I believe we should be realistic in our expectations.

In spite of the greatly increased promotional efforts in recent years, 9 percent more American consumers, with 10 percent higher real incomes in 1957, bought 11 percent more food, including more higher cost meats and fewer cereals and potatoes than in 1952. Yet farmers received \$600 million less for this food in 1957 than for the smaller quantity taken 5 years earlier.

Prof. Murray Benedict of the University of California, a long-time student of national farm policies, says: " * * * so far as food is concerned, once a nation is as well fed as ours now is, demand can grow only about as fast as population grows."

Official reports show that in the 4½ years of surplus disposal operations ending December 31, 1958, we removed a total of \$10.7 billion of farm products from commercial markets by disposal and net storage programs. These disposal and storage programs provided an outlet for \$2.4 billion of farm products a year. Had these extra products moved through commercial markets, they would have caused a sharp decline in prices. The most recent studies available indicate annual farm income would have dropped by at least twice this amount.

In my opinion far too small a part of our expanded research programs in recent years has been devoted to an objective study of farm price-support program results.

There has been far too much propaganda based on misconceptions of agriculture's basic economic problems. There has been far too little comprehension of the economic significance of the output—increasing effects of rapid technological change in food production at a time when the peoples of the industrialized Western World already are well fed. There has been far too little understanding of the economic effects on farmers of the market pricing policies of big business and big labor.

I believe that if we could get widespread common understanding of the economic facts and relationships in these fields it would not be difficult to reach agreement on desirable revisions in price support legislation.

This brings us to a consideration of the third question, "How and in what manner can we expect to make progress in the near future in improving farmers' bargaining power?" I hope you won't be disappointed if I fumble this one a little.

Although I am vitally interested in farm problems I am not a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Consequently, I have not become involved in the cross currents of conflicting recommendations which almost overwhelm the members of the Committee on Agriculture.

As I see it, however, producers of the basic crops—with the exception of corn—have a tolerable satisfactory history of price stabilization and supply management through marketing quotas. Producers of the more important perishable crops appear to have learned how to use marketing agreements and marketing orders effectively in stabilizing their market supplies and prices.

Dairymen have been able to stabilize their prices with the help of Federal milk-marketing orders, where the milk goes into fluid use and price-supporting Government purchases as necessary for manufactured dairy products.

While it is difficult to discover any clear trends in recent farm-policy developments, it appears to me that these groups are likely to maintain and improve on such price-stabilization measures as they now have. As technological progress continues to expand the productive capacity of the agricultural plant faster than markets expand, the producers of these other products may be more or less successful in balancing their supplies with market outlets available at stable prices and in diverting their unused resources into feed grain and livestock production.

For the farm economy as a whole we are now producing 6 to 9 percent more products than can be sold in commercial markets at stable prices. Most of this excess capacity is likely to be diverted into feed and livestock production. Since feed grains and livestock products now make up two-thirds of total farm marketings, an expansion of some 8 to 12 percent in feed grains and livestock would be necessary to absorb current excess productive capacity in agriculture.

In addition, stocks of both feed grains and wheat are excessive. Even though exports are expanded as much as possible through continued Public Law 450 programs, it is probable that a part of these excess stocks can only be liquidated by feeding them domestically to livestock.

Every effort must be made to expand our export of farm commodities. The export of these farm commodities means not only dollars for farmers, but it has been, and will continue to be, an important part of a program of bringing closer relationships with countries that do not have an abundant food supply. Food for peace must be more than just a slogan; it can and must be a reality.

Recently the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, of which I am a member, reported to the Senate a bill, S. 1771, which is known as the International Food for Peace Act of 1959. I am a cosponsor of that bill.

From a humanitarian standpoint, I know of nothing we can do as a nation that will win friends faster and more permanently than getting food and fiber into the hands of the needy.

The distribution of this food to underdeveloped countries where there are millions of needy and undernourished people is more than a commodity-disposal operation; it has important psychological value. In my opinion, it is one of the most effective forms of foreign aid.

Although attention was centered on wheat in this session of Congress, CCC loans and inventories of feed grains already are 10 percent larger than the loans and inventories

of wheat. It seems almost certain that by this time next year CCC investments in feed grains relative to wheat will be even larger than at present. Hog prices will be distressingly low, poultry and egg prices will be less than fully satisfactory, and cattle prices will be starting their cyclical decline as marketings increase.

If there is anything to the old saying that necessity is the mother of invention, I am inclined to believe that in the next year or two increasing Government stocks of feed grains and declining livestock prices will force Midwest farmers to agree upon some program for improving their bargaining power.

Undoubtedly, it will have to include placing a part of our cropland in a conservation reserve. The central issue that should receive a great deal more study and discussion is whether or not more direct market supply management programs will be needed to make a conservation reserve program reasonably effective for feed grains and livestock products.

This has been a rather long statement, but the agricultural problem today is a complex and badly misunderstood problem. We and the public have been confused by the substitution of cheerful and hopeful statements for vital economic facts.

It is my hope that the leaders of our farm organizations, the farmers themselves, and our citizens generally will take a realistic view, with the hope that we may work out a solution which will maintain price stabilization and give the American farmer his fair share of our national income.

Businessmen Receive Government Aid, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, long before I arrived in Congress, I had heard a great deal about farm subsidies. Knowing full well that our Government was the most subsidizing Government in the world, I was amazed to find that people generally were only concerned with and aware of—farm subsidy. Coming from a city district, it was unpopular for me to support high farm price levels. However, in so doing, I pointed out that business generally prospered from subsidies by vastly greater amounts than did the farmer. In fact, the farmer looks like a "piker" in comparison.

Although 90 to 100 percent of parity may not be the answer to the farmers' dilemma, it is the best program at the moment. I do, however, sincerely hope that this Congress will come up with a better answer so the farmer can prosper along with the rest of society. I am mindful of the fact that the farmer is a great consumer of factory-made goods, hence provides substantial employment in cities like the one I represent.

In making my position clear, I have stated publicly I would support the elimination of all farm-price subsidies if all other subsidies, both direct and indirect were likewise eliminated. I still maintain that position, and do not while so

doing, consider vital defense work a subsidy.

In reflecting on this subject, I read a most interesting article in the Catholic Bulletin by Father James Vissard, S.J. The article follows:

[Catholic Bulletin, Aug. 21, 1959]

BUSINESSMEN RECEIVE GOVERNMENT AID, TOO

(By Father James Vissard, S.J.)

"It's no fun to be sober when everyone else is drunk" is the somewhat flippant reply recently given to a business executive who criticized subsidies to farmers. "We're pouring billions of tax money down a rat-hole," he insisted, "and what have we got to show for it? I'll tell you, mountains of surpluses that nobody wants and on which we're paying more than a million a day for storage."

This business expert had his easy answer to the farm problem: "Get Government out of agriculture. Let the supply and demand of the market determine what farmers will grow and what price they'll get."

"The efficient operators will make money, the others will get out. Food will be cheaper, inflation will be checked, taxes can be cut." To him it's that simple.

What do you say to a man like that? Don't you feel that while he may know a lot about business he understands very little about agriculture and its problems? Aren't you also tempted to give him a flippant or even an angry answer and let it go at that?

Yet we can't afford to ignore him or treat him lightly. He represents the viewpoint of too many millions of voters and too many influential people both in business and in government.

The prevalence of such views proves how bad have been agriculture's public relations. Of course, public misunderstanding and resentment are particularly difficult to overcome when the Secretary of Agriculture is himself one of the farmer's, and the farm program's, chief critics.

So, what answer do you give to the businessman and the millions like him?

Perhaps you don't have time to give him a patient and detailed explanation of why the welfare of over 4 million farm families is important to the Nation, of what problems they alone face of all our economy's primary producers, of how much of the Agriculture Department's budget actually goes to farmers and what portion directly benefits nonagricultural businesses and other parts of our population or of how lower food prices have kept the cost of living down while everything else has been rising.

You might want to tell him that you're not happy either with the present farm program and that you have your own ideas of how it can be improved.

But instead of being too apologetic, why not put the businessman on the defensive? Tell him that farmers pay taxes, too, and that they're tired of subsidizing him. He may say, in surprised protest, that he isn't getting a dime from the Government. If that's true, he's one of a mighty small minority in big business.

Ask him, for instance, if his company has ever taken advantage of the fast tax write-off available to industries related to defense. That subsidy has already amounted to billions. So has the depletion allowance granted to oil and mining companies.

Find out if some of his products are among those purchased by the Government for stockpiling often only a polite name for buying to keep prices up.

No public outcry has been made about that though the government-held hoard of strategic materials cost more than the at least equally valuable, and strategic, stockpile of food he complains about.

Perhaps he benefits from the \$500 million yearly post office subsidy given to magazine

publishers—Time, Life, Look, Saturday Evening Post, etc.—and direct mail advertisers.

Or does this free enterprising businessman get his Government help through the grants and other aids to the merchant marine and airline industries?

And then, of course, there are the tariffs and import quotas. These carefully lobbied protections against overseas competition take money out of the pocket of every consumer, particularly the farmer who has to buy price protected goods while he sells in the open market.

If the businessman virtuously protests that none of these Government supports reach him, don't let him off the hook. Find out how much of the \$40 billion yearly defense budget is spent in his industry.

If he's in electronics, chemicals, airplanes, missiles, heavy construction, steel, road-building or any of a dozen other major lines the chances are that a large part of his business, and profit, comes from Government contracts, paid for out of farmers' taxes too. Perhaps the subsidy is a little less direct than some the farmer receives, but ask him what shape his business would be in without it.

In other words, I think it's time for farmers to howl too. They ought to raise the roof. They've been made the whipping boy for all kinds of critics who never turn the mirror to themselves.

If those critics consider subsidies to be dirty they ought, in all logic and decency, to fight to end all Government programs of aid including those which help them. Otherwise they ought to lapse into embarrassed silence and leave farmers alone.

Ceremony Honoring Speaker Thomas B. Reed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK M. COFFIN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, this morning you very kindly participated with the Maine delegation in the House in a ceremony in the rotunda of the Old House Office Building, in which we presented a new stone pedestal to support the Gutzon Borglum bust of Thomas B. Reed, late Speaker of this body. This presentation fulfills a keen desire on the part of some of us who have long been irked by the hollow plywood base, simulated to look like marble, which has hitherto served as the pedestal for a bust of a noted son of Maine, carved by a noted sculptor. What irked us was not any real or fancied slight, but the un-Maine-like idea of apply cosmetic skill to make wood look like something else. We could tolerate solid wood that looked like wood, or solid stone that looked like stone, but not hollow wood with face of stone.

Speaker Reed himself looked like what he was—a large, hearty, vigorous, and courageous man. With the thought that the membership might be interested in some of the contributions of Speaker Reed, I am inserting the remarks I made at our little ceremony this morning:

Mr. Speaker and honored guests, on this occasion it may be appropriate to note that at one time Maine occupied a position in national politics comparable to that occupied by the State of Texas, today. We are here, today, to dedicate a new pedestal for the bust of Thomas Brackett Reed, Speaker of the House of Representatives in the 51st, 54th, and 55th Congresses. In his last two terms the President pro tempore of the Senate was Senator William P. Frye, of Maine, and Asher Hinds, of Maine, author of "Hinds' Precedents," was Parliamentarian in the House. A little earlier, the powerful combine of James G. Blaine, Nelson Dingley, Reed and Frye controlled the political fortunes in Maine and occupied central positions in the Republican Party on the national level. Then, Maine possessed five seats in the House of Representatives.

Today's dedication is a statewide affair. Speaker Reed represented the first district, Congressman OLIVER's constituency. The granite for the pedestal was quarried in Stonington, in Congressman McINTIRE's district. The cutting and finishing of the pedestal was done in my own district. We are paying tribute to a leader from our State and to the State itself.

Thomas Brackett Reed was born in Portland in 1839. A graduate of Bowdoin, he set out for the West to teach school and practice law in California. Apparently having seen all he wanted of that far land, he returned to his home State to make his career as representative and senator in the Maine State Legislature, attorney general, and finally Congressman from Maine's First District. He was first elected in 1876 and served continuously until 1899, when he resigned.

First nominated for the post of Speaker in 1895, Reed was elected to that post in 1899, when the Republicans controlled the 51st Congress. He was reelected in the 54th and 55th Congresses, resigning in September 1899, in disgust over the Spanish war and the annexation of Hawaii.

Speaker Reed is most noted for his contributions to majority rule in the House. As a member of the Rules Committee he had succeeded in ending filibustering on election cases, and on the tariff bill of 1883. His rules were adopted in the 51st Congress, dropped by the 52d, revived by the 53d, and restored by the 54th. They marked the first in the major steps toward modernization of House procedures and coincided with the compilation of the impressive "Hinds' Precedents."

In dedicating this monument to Thomas Brackett Reed, we are honoring a great line of Speakers who have brought the House to its present stature. Not the least of these greats is our present Speaker, the embodiment of tradition and respect for the need for democratic processes in our deliberations and actions. This pedestal is the product of the Maine coast, a symbol of integrity and an example of the craftsmanship which also marked the career of Thomas Brackett Reed.

I should mention, here, that we are indebted to the Deer Island Granite Co., of Stonington, Maine, and the James P. Murphy Co., of Lewiston, Maine, for the pedestal. They have donated this to the House of Representatives without any cost to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to present to you, for your library in Bonham, Tex., a simple and homely memento of Thomas Brackett Reed. This is a bootjack, designed for colder climates than yours, but suitable. I am sure, for removing the boots for which your State is famous. This was given by Mrs. Frances W. Spencer, owner of the Thomas B. Reed house in Portland, Maine. The jack belonged to Mr. Reed, and may serve as a

reminder to all of us that even the mighty must stoop to jack a boot.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, may I thank you for your cooperation in this, as in so many other matters, and offer to you my own admiration and good wishes for your continued leadership in the House.

Air Landing Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned that during the past several years, the representatives of our State Department engaged in bilateral air agreements with other nations that might have an adverse effect upon U.S. airlines. There is no desire on our part to see this country unfairly or artificially restrict the growth of our foreign-flag competitors, large, or small, provided they are engaged in traffic recognized as primary under the worldwide system of agreements into which the United States has freely and so generously entered.

However, no foreign-flag airline competitor to the U.S.-flag carriers should be allowed to prosper at the expense of the United States by engaging in traffic to which it does not have a primary entitlement. We must look to the future that our survival in the field of international commercial air transport should not be imperiled by the operations of the heavily subsidized airlines of foreign countries.

It is difficult enough for American free enterprise to compete in a field where subsidized foreign aviation has a free reign. The inexcusable thing is to see U.S. free enterprise being stifled by its own Government. It is the clearly announced policy of the Congress, as set forth in the Civil Aeronautics Act, to further the promotion and development of American air transportation systems both at home and abroad.

A very enlightening article appeared in the August 17, 1959, issue of Time entitled "Air Landing Rights," which sheds additional light and presents new facts of international competition. I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to this splendid article, which is as follows:

AIR LANDING RIGHTS—NEW FACTS OF INTERNATIONAL COMPETITION

As U.S. international airlines enter the jet age, the United States is junking a belief as outdated as its piston planes. The belief was that U.S.-flag carriers could hold their lead over a growing flock of aggressive foreign competitors without a drastic change in U.S. air policy. Last week the U.S. airlines got a new warning of the onward march of foreign competition. From the State Department came an announcement that Air France will get an additional U.S. gateway at Baltimore and a polar route to the U.S. west coast. BOAC will get the right to land at Tokyo on its San Francisco-Hong Kong run, which is expected to take \$7,800,-

000 yearly away from U.S. lines. A CAB examiner recommended that Air India be authorized to fly into the United States.

But the biggest threat is Russia's Aeroflot, the world's largest commercial airline. Its 1,600 planes fly 350,000 route miles, serve 500 airports from Kamchatka to London. Airmen expect that one of the points of discussion between President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev will be yet another jump for Aeroflot—the right to carry passengers to and from the United States.

If Aeroflot gets rights into New York, Pan American World Airways will fly into Moscow. But the exchange does not tell the whole story. Aeroflot, which now matches International Air Transport Association rates (though it does not belong to IATA), is expected to behave for a while. But airlines fear that, as a totally subsidized state airline, it will eventually cut fares to aid Russia's economic offensive.

Despite last week's OK on new competition, U.S. lines found some cheer in the decisions. They showed a real change in U.S. policy to conform to the new competitive facts. What made the decisions different was not so much what the United States granted—BOAC, Air France, and Air India were entitled to the routes under reciprocal exchanges—as the manner of giving. France had formally denounced its bilateral air route agreement with the United States 13 months ago, insisted on getting "double trackage" rights; i.e., the right to serve any U.S. city where a U.S. carrier originates a flight for France. The State Department flatly refused.

CAB and the State Department have not always been so alert to protect the interests of U.S.-flag lines. When Great Britain and the United States laid down the basic post-war air route pattern in Bermuda in 1946, the United States was the only Nation equipped with planes to operate long-distance service. It campaigned for a free competition agreement, but the plane-short British forced a compromise that provided for an equitable exchange of traffic between nations signing a bilateral pact. Since then the United States has often ignored breaches by foreign airlines, drawn criticism from U.S. carriers for giving out fat new routes without getting much in return.

Now the State Department and the President, who has the final say about what international routes the United States gives out, are ending the giveaway period in favor of more horse trading and stricter rule watching. The new trend was forced by the awareness that U.S.-flag lines could follow the downward path of the U.S. maritime industry. Though 70 percent of all air passengers between the United States and foreign countries are U.S. citizens, the share of traffic carried by U.S. carriers has fallen from 75 percent in 1949 to 60 percent today. In the first quarter this year, BOAC nudged out Trans World Airlines as the second biggest transatlantic carrier (No. 1: Pan American), the first time a foreign-flag line has flown ahead of a U.S. line.

Foreign carriers have rushed into the United States in such numbers that 40 now draw from the U.S. market versus 22 in 1949. Most of them get far more than U.S. carriers out of the bargain, often add extra flights to siphon off as many passengers as possible in violation of the spirit of the Bermuda agreement. In return for permitting Pan American to serve Amsterdam, KLM flies into New York and Houston. Result: last year KLM collected \$29.4 million on 86,225 U.S. passengers, while Pan Am got only \$1,700,000 from 2,842 Dutch passengers. While cutting into U.S. markets, foreign carriers are strengthening themselves against inroads into their home territory; e.g., European carriers got IATA to place a special

tariff on transatlantic jet flights because they do not have jets to compete with the Boeing 707.

As the only private, nonsubsidized air fleet in the world, U.S. carriers must find a better way to face competition if the United States is to keep its place as a powerful air nation. The most obvious solution would be Government subsidy, but most airlines themselves admit that this is a last resort. What they want is for the United States to show a tougher stand in route bargaining and in enforcing current agreements. In the next 5 years the jets will force a revamping of virtually all of the 54 bilateral agreements between the United States and other nations. Unless the United States trades much more shrewdly with foreign airlines, U.S.-flag carriers may not be able to compete in the jet age.

Newsletter of the Honorable James Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from my distinguished colleague and friend, Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, to his constituents. What Representative ROOSEVELT has to say in his letter is most worthwhile, and I commend it to the attention of my fellow Members:

AUGUST 1959.

DEAR FRIENDS AND CONSTITUENTS: Since I last wrote to you, the Landrum-Griffin labor bill has been passed by the House, and, thus, almost 6 months of hard work in the labor-management field has gone right out the window. The Landrum-Griffin bill, apparently originally written by Senator GOLDWATER, of Arizona, is a bad bill, which was put over by the systematic distribution of hokum through virtually all our channels of communication.

For months we have been subjected to a steady drumbeat of propaganda about the need for a "strong" labor bill, which rose to crescendo with Mr. Eisenhower's impassioned radio and TV appeal for the Griffin-Landrum bill. Throughout this long campaign the technique was identical—first a recitation of the evils discovered by the McClellan committee and then the plug for a "strong" bill, thus leading the reader or the viewer to believe that what was meant by a "strong" bill was a bill that would oust the racketeers and thieves and clean out the corruption.

Actually, nothing could have been further from the truth. What the administration and the Republican leadership and some of the southern Democrats and the National Association of Manufacturers and all their assorted payrollers and mouthpieces meant by a "strong labor bill" was a bill that would contain amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act solely calculated to cripple and penalize perfectly honest, legitimate unions. It was simply a situation in which an old-fashioned, all-out, NAM union-busting drive was being cloaked by a sanctimonious plea for ousting the racketeers.

If you have any doubt about this, just read the three bills that the House fought over: the Landrum-Griffin bill, the Elliott

bill, and the Shelley bill, or as it is sometimes called, the Shelley-Roosevelt bill. You will find that in the areas where the McClellan committee recommended that action be taken, the three bills are virtually identical, except that the Shelley bill extended its penalties to employers and labor-brokers as well as union officials. In other words, the Shelley bill hit everybody that was in any way concerned in labor racketeering or stealing or illegal profiteering at the expense of the worker.

But, because the Shelley bill was an honest, straightforward attempt to correct the abuses found by the Senate committee, and because it did not attempt to use these abuses as an excuse for undercutting legitimate union activity, and because it contained no sly, antiunion phraseology—it was labeled the "weakest" bill; whereas, the Landrum bill, which did not cover nearly the ground that the Shelley bill did in the area of corruption, but which did contain provisions extremely damaging to honest labor activity, was labeled the "strongest" bill and plugged for by everybody from Mr. Eisenhower to the lowliest NAM lobbyist in an all-out, and apparently successful, drive to convince the country that the "strong" bill was strong in the sense of protecting the worker.

Such are the uses of propaganda, and Lord help us all if we don't learn to distinguish between truth and hokum before Madison Avenue swamps us completely in syndicated piffle.

Exactly the same applies to the anguished caterwauling about inflation that emanates from the White House every time Congress considers any type of bill that might possibly do the general public some good. If you spend a dime for a general improvement, says the administration, you add to the perils of inflation. And if you build a school or aid a housing program or add a couple of dollars to a pension to enable somebody to stay alive, then you have breached the dam irretrievably and allowed the floodwaters of inflation to sweep everything before them.

Probably no sillier thesis was ever maintained by presumably sane men but this administration, aided by its corps of publicity experts, is making a lot of people believe it. Meantime, the same administration, having successfully diverted the public attention by yelling about public extravagance, shovels money to the bankers with both hands by progressively raising Federal Reserve interest rates and fighting to raise interest rates on Government bonds.

This is the basic source of inflation and high prices that are hitting us from all sides. Interest rates are raised to primary borrowers, who, in turn, raise rates to secondary borrowers; eventually, the bank rates become too high and less and less money is borrowed for purposes of plant expansion and new products, with the result that new jobs do not open up, new products are not made, and the gross national product is thus arbitrarily limited to approximately what is being produced at the time. But, since the population continues to grow and the demand is consequently ever greater, the price of existing goods goes up and up while profits rise fantastically, the rich get richer, the poor get poorer, and the pensioner has to sleep under a bridge.

My friends, it's time to wake up. This is a bad administration, the like of which we haven't seen since the twenties and which will inevitably wind up in the same place the Coolidge-Hoover regimes did, because it is traveling the same road. When a government pursues a steady policy of squeezing the small businessman and the worker and beating the unions over the head in order that the banker may sit on bigger

and bigger bags of money and charge more and more for the use of some of it, that government is going to wind up in an economic crash, no matter how loudly it means while screams about an inflation that it is itself creating and tries to blame it on unions and spenders. We're heading that way fast. Fortunately, 1960 isn't far off, but even so, I sometimes wonder if it will get here in time. When it does come, we'd better not fumble it.

Since my last letter, the housing bill has been vetoed, as I said it probably would be. It was perfectly logical that it should be vetoed because it would have helped a considerable number of people and it was not written for the exclusive benefit of the bankers. So it got the ax, with the routine explanation that it was "inflationary." The charge was so preposterous and the veto so indefensible that when Senator SPARKMAN held hearings on it, he couldn't even find a member of the executive staff who would admit having written the veto message. We've gotten pretty well used to government by proxy since 1953, but this was the first time anybody had heard of government by pixie.

I have been appointed by Chairman SHEPARD of the California congressional delegation, to head a bipartisan delegation committee which will look into the matter of the flood of narcotics which is apparently coming over the Mexican border. Our duties will consist of determining the areas of responsibility so that the proper committees may conduct the necessary investigations and see to it that the necessary liaisons are effected with the proper Mexican officials. We are getting excellent cooperation from both State and Federal officers, all of whom are as anxious as we are to solve the problem speedily. The first hearings will probably be held this month.

Congress is expected to adjourn before too long and it will be good to get home and see you again. Meantime, all best wishes.

Sincerely,

JAMES ROOSEVELT.

Establishment of a National Fuels Policy Is of Utmost Urgency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, a number of Members of the House who represent coal-producing areas have introduced identical concurrent resolutions calling for the establishment of a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy.

Those of us who introduced the resolutions are convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the establishment of a national fuels policy is a matter of utmost urgency.

This is a matter which does not concern coal only. Rather, it vitally affects all of the other fuels upon which this great industrial nation depends. Also, it directly concerns our national security.

I strongly believe, Mr. Speaker, that the responsibility for the establishment of national policy in a field as important as that concerning energy fuels should rest with the legislative branch.

In the resolutions introduced in the House, the sponsors seek to have Congress carry out this responsibility.

I trust that in the closing weeks of this session of Congress this tremendously important matter will not be overlooked. We need to get on with this job. By passing this resolution now, Congress can empower the joint committee to organize during the recess and be ready to get down to serious business in January.

I urge this House to act upon the resolution before adjournment.

Progress Toward Weather Modification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the honor of acting as moderator of a panel of outstanding scientists and experts who discussed "Weather Modification and Space Exploration" at the 46th Annual Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, meeting here in Washington.

I consider the information provided by the three speakers so important and timely that I would like to make summaries of their remarks more generally available.

One of these papers is presented herewith. It summarizes the address of Capt. Howard T. Orville, U.S. Navy, retired, whose long career in meteorology includes his chairmanship of the important Advisory Committee on Weather Control, and whose report of this Committee is the Nation's basic document in this field.

Captain Orville's summary follows:

From time immemorial man has dreamed of controlling the weather. His efforts have encompassed three principal areas: religious ceremonies, mysterious rites and rain dances, and scientific research. Scientific research has yielded some potentially important findings during the past 12 years in particular. Weather modification using these techniques promises to be one of our most important sources of water supplies in the future. Small scale cloud-seeding efforts are already producing limited but important increases in snow pack in the western States.

Progress reports of research now underway at the University of Chicago, the Institute of Atmospheric Physics in Arizona, and the Santa Barbara project in California are most encouraging. Increases in precipitation of 10 to 25 percent with new and improved techniques for observing the results are not uncommon. The Navy's effort in developing new techniques with the use of carbon black are indicative of the importance of weather modification, military as well as economically.

The new research program developed by the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Weather Bureau, both of which we will hear about at this meeting, are of the greatest importance to the field of weather modification. Basic and applied research programs which will be undertaken, improved instrumentation, and new engineering techniques hold promise of substantially increasing our knowledge of weather modification, and eventually providing an important new source of water supplies over the entire United States.

More than likely research now being started will lead to successful large scale periodic seeding of entire weather systems which will be of greatest potential economic and military value.

The availability of great sources of energy derived from thermonuclear devices and the possible use of earth satellites may lead to eventual suppression or diversion from their tracks of hurricanes, tornadoes and other destructive storms, becomes a real possibility in the future.

Cancer, Not Guns, Sent Doctor From Jungle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the following AP story was in last night's Evening Star. From time to time in world history a really good man passes across the space of time. Dr. Albert Schweitzer is one of these. So is Dr. Thomas Dooley. The somewhat tragic turn of events in an already sacrificed life made me more than pause in the busy day. I think it will have the same effect on you:

CANCER, NOT GUNS, SENT DOCTOR FROM JUNGLE

NEW YORK, August 25.—Dr. Thomas Dooley, 32, is the sort of man who thinks treating 100 patients a day in a remote hospital in Laos is more important than the treatment of one cancer patient named Thomas Dooley.

He is the kind of fellow who chose to overlook it when the U.S. Government suggested that he had better leave his hospital because the Communists were shooting too close.

He is a member of the generation known as beat, who can say "I feel great," and talk about going back to resume his work in the jungles—right after he has told you that tests show a tumor on his chest is "all loaded" with cancer.

Dr. Thomas Dooley is, in other words, the classic young man with a mission.

And he seems angry at his own condition only because it may cut short the mission.

Five years ago Dr. Dooley was a medical officer on a Navy ship that was assigned to help hundreds of refugees fleeing from Communist North Vietnam. Touched by the sufferings of the Indochinese, he made up his mind to do something to help.

When he left the Navy he helped to found Medico (Medical International Cooperation) and build a three-building hospital at Muong Sing, near the China-Laos border.

The 30-mat hospital ("we don't have beds") now in handling 100 patients a day "and babies day and night." Some of the funds for operating it came from a book the doctor published, titled "The Edge of Tomorrow."

He started another book for the same purpose, and several times came back to the United States to lecture and appear on television—always hunting more money for Medico and the Lao.

His mission was helped along by the fact that Dr. Dooley is not only dedicated—he is also charming, boyishly handsome, witty and outgoing.

In recent weeks the Communists stepped up their offensive in Laos and intermittent action broke out near Dr. Dooley's hospital.

The U.S. Ambassador sent a message to the doctor suggesting he leave. He refused.

But 2 weeks ago a surgeon was visiting his hospital, and Dr. Dooley asked the visitor to remove a lump on his left chest. A sample of the tissue was flown here and analyzed. It was malignant. Dr. Dooley received an order he couldn't ignore, from Dr. Peter D. Comanduras, secretary general of Medico.

Dr. Comanduras, who lives at 4512 South 31st Street, Arlington, and Dr. Dooley are old friends whose conferences helped lead to the organization of Medico. Dr. Dooley lived at 4301 Massachusetts Avenue before returning to the Far East in 1956.

Last week Dr. Dooley flew back to the United States. He visited his mother in St. Louis, then flew back to New York for further diagnosis and treatment.

Yesterday he was settling down in his room at the Sloan-Kettering Cancer Research Center at Memorial Hospital.

"This is the most elegant hospital room I ever saw," he commented. "Not a single mat on the floor."

Almost gaily, he described what the doctors had done and planned to do. Tuesday morning, he said, the surgeons would "go in and take a look and see what's there," the first in a series of surgical procedures.

"Then they'll decide on the treatment—whether it will be radiation, or nitrogen mustard, or something else," he said.

As a doctor he has guessed that he may have 5 or 6 years to live with this capricious type of cancer.

As a missionary, he has decided that whatever the other doctors say, he's going to spend the time he has left at the hospital in Laos. He plans to return there in November.

As he relaxed in the big shining city hospital to wait for the ministrations of other doctors, he was asked how he was feeling.

"I feel great," he said with a laugh. "As great," he added, "as anyone feels who has cancer."

Ominous Change in Soviet Activities Based on Shifting of World's Balance of Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LeROY H. ANDERSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, a searching analysis of the world's military balance of power is contained in an article by Joseph Alsop, columnist for New York Herald Tribune, Inc., which appeared in this morning's Washington Post.

I think the article is so vitally important to our national destiny that I strongly urge every Member of Congress to read it and ponder the dangers which many of us see facing America in the immediate future if the Red masters in the Kremlin decide the time is favorable for military aggression of their own choosing.

The article follows:

EN ROUTE TO VIENTIANE

(By Joseph Alsop)

These words are written amid the bustle and confusion of homely things that always rise, in any household, when a long journey has to be prepared. This reporter is off to

Laos, to have a look at the new Communist aggression there.

Since this country has been fed so long on patented, government-issued tranquilizers, the trouble in Laos has as yet caused hardly a ripple. Maybe the aggression will soon be repelled, although it seems more likely that the key city of Sam Neua will soon turn into another Dienbienphu. In any case, what one will see in Laos probably will not be dramatic, if only because looking for jungle fighting in those particular jungles is usually far worse than searching a haystack for a needle.

Nonetheless, just as a symptom, this trouble in Laos is really dramatically serious. It is very much worse as a symptom of the ill-concealed contempt for the strength and will of the United States and its President that is plainly felt by the President's prospective guest, Nikita S. Khrushchev.

To prove this shocking point, a comparison offered in a previous report may perhaps be repeated. In brief, when Khrushchev first wanted a meeting with President Eisenhower, in 1955, he willingly paid for the meeting with the liberation of Austria and the restoration of normal relations with Yugoslavia. This time, threats to Berlin have got Khrushchev what he has always wanted most of all—an invitation to meet alone with the President, with no bothersome allies at the table. And this time, the invitation to meet was hardly extended by Eisenhower when the Communist attack on Laos was launched with Khrushchev's blessing.

What, then, is the explanation of this enormous and ominous change in the manners and methods of our enemy? In part, perhaps, the explanation lies in Khrushchev's consolidation of his personal power. Yet even in 1955, he needed very great personal power, in order to persuade Vyacheslav Molotov and the other Stalinists to agree to the ostentatiously "peaceful" Austrian and Yugoslav gambits.

Nine-tenths of the explanation of the change in Khrushchev must therefore lie elsewhere. It lies, beyond doubt, in the massive, unfavorable shift in the East-West balance of power that has occurred since 1953. In the Kremlin, the prevailing estimate of the power-balance is always the mainspring of policy. Nothing less than a great change in this Kremlin estimate can explain the great change in Khrushchev.

The stark fact of the change in the power balance is daily drowned, in this country, in floods of official soothing-syrup. Less than a year ago, the then Secretary of the Navy was happily denying that there were any indications of Soviet missile-launching submarines. Now Adm. Arleigh Burke has announced that the Soviets are building a serious force of these vessels.

Our Polarise submarines, Admiral Burke added, will of course surpass the Soviet submarines when we finally get them—several years from now. The admiral did not add that the program that could have given us extremely useful missile-launching submarines now was canceled because of the administration's budget mania. But Khrushchev then gleefully boasted with all the politeness of an oncoming house guest, that the new Soviet underwater craft, which he has now, would cover any target in the United States from the waters of Hudson Bay.

By the same token, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Nathan Twining, was telling all and sundry only a few months ago that the Soviets probably did not have a true intercontinental ballistic missile, because no Soviet ICBM had been tested at full range. With his usual hearty bluntness, General Twining brushed aside the scientists' warnings that the Soviets were using special instrumentations to test their ICBM's over reduced ranges.

But now the U.S. Government has undisputed and, of course, unannounced evidence of at least two full-range Soviet ICBM firings which ended in the Pacific.

These recent ugly surprises for the administration's professional (one might even say careerist) optimists by no means convey the true extent of the shift in the world power balance. It would take a book to tell that story in full. It is an ominous but not yet quite fatal story—a story of diminution of our striking power and weakening of our deterrent balanced by Soviet gains in the same crucial areas.

Much can yet be done to give this story a better ending than now seems likely. But if Berlin and Laos mean anything, they mean that the needed action should not be delayed for another year, or another month, or even another day.

Friendship Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it is an elementary proposition, universally acknowledged, that "justice delayed is justice denied."

The delays implicit in the judicial process were primarily responsible for the rise of administrative agencies. But today these administrative agencies are guilty of the same offense they were created to alleviate—delay in deciding cases.

As one of the elected Representatives from the great city of Baltimore, I rise to enter a vigorous and official protest concerning the unusual delay respecting the matter of Washington-Baltimore Adequacy of Service Investigation by the Civil Aeronautics Board, Docket No. 8148.

On May 3, 1956, a petition was filed requesting that the Civil Aeronautics Board investigate the inadequacy of service to the Greater Baltimore metropolitan area in accordance with sections 404 (a) and 1002 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended. The hearings in this matter were concluded on September 18, 1957, and I submit that there can be no justification for the continued delay of the issuance of an order from the Board. It is a well-known fact that in the period of over 3 years since the institution of an investigation for adequacy of service in the Baltimore area, this area has continued to receive far less service than it is legally entitled to. This condition continues in spite of the institution of jetplane service to the west coast by two airlines. By no stretch of the imagination can the institution of this service be construed as providing a pattern of service which is necessary to meet the test of "adequacy."

On July 31 of this year, I wrote to the Civil Aeronautics Board about this matter, so vital to the interests of the large population of Greater Baltimore. In reply the CAB stated:

We agree wholeheartedly with your statement in your letter of July 31 as to the need for a prompt decision in our Baltimore-Washington adequacy-of-service case. Let us assure you that we are striving to make our findings, based on a very ponderous record, as quickly as possible.

As you are aware, and as the record before us makes so clear, the issues in this complex proceeding are of considerable economic consequence to the airlines and to the public. We feel that the fairness and soundness of our decision are equally as important as its promptness.

In addition, scores of matters of many types must be given attention by the Board so that we do not find ourselves able to devote the continuous hours to this case which would be desirable. We have had, for instance, the Northeastern States area investigation before us in which we recently voted tentative approval for service between Washington, Baltimore, and Boston via Allegheny Airlines.

Acknowledging that the record may be ponderous, certainly sufficient time has elapsed since November 7, 1958, when oral arguments were completed, for a decision to have been reached.

As to the "scores of matters of many types [which] must be given attention by the Board so that [they] do not find themselves able to devote the continuous hours to this case which would be desirable," does the Board expect its case-load to lighten? Is it hoping for a slack period in order to devote time to this case? Or is the Board merely offering weak excuses for failure to have performed its function?

Obviously the reasons ascribed do not justify the delay.

The people of Baltimore erected a truly magnificent airport in 1950. The Friendship International Airport was immediately hailed as one of the truly excellent facilities in the world, especially due to the fact that when this airport was planned, the use of fast jet planes was clearly envisioned.

I should like to point out that the CAB's own examiner estimated that well over 75,000 Baltimoreans are obliged to travel to and from Washington's National Airport each year. This proves conclusively that Baltimore does have the present potential of adequate numbers of passengers that desire to travel by air. Also, recent figures of passenger service at Friendship reveal a 36 percent increase over last year—additional and conclusive proof that when the service is here, the passengers are, too.

On August 14, 1959, I again wrote to the Civil Aeronautics Board that I could not understand the reason for the long delay in reaching a decision in this particular case. As a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives, I feel that if a decision is not reached by the CAB within a reasonable time, an investigation and searching inquiry would be indicated respecting this matter. The urgent needs of almost 2 million of our citizens must be given due and proper recognition.

The Workmen's Benefit Fund: Providing Mutual Help in Time of Economic Crises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUDWIG TELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, 75 years ago, a group of German-American immigrants founded the Workmen's Benefit Fund of the United States of America, to provide mutual help in times of economic crises. This year, this organization celebrates its 75th anniversary. Under leave granted I include an address by Mr. Morton B. Lawrence before the 24th National Convention of the Workmen's Benefit Fund of the United States of America, in Atlantic City, N.J., on June 14, 1959:

DEMOCRACY IN ACTION

The history of the Workmen's Benefit Fund to work for the common good. It is a familiar story for Americans, but it can never be told too often. For it repeats in its own special way the pattern of America and its growth.

The story begins—like the American story—with a group of men who sought political asylum. With their families they fled the oppressive laws of Germany under Bismarck, the Iron Chancellor, in the 1880's. They came to the United States. They came as freemen—machinists, cigarmakers, and other skilled craftsmen, to work and to raise their families in freedom. A major part of that freedom is the right of men to organize to protect themselves—from political tyranny, from economic exploitation, from the poverty which follows upon the sickness or death of the family's provider.

Wage earners in the 1880's could not fall back upon savings, as their paychecks were small. Neither was there any aid from the Government, or organized charity to which they might turn. On September 24, 1884, a group of those exiled German workers met for the purpose of forming an association which would protect its members in times of sickness or death. Scandals had brought the established profitmaking insurance companies into disrepute. "Order of the day" (the minutes of that meeting read): "self-help." Less than a month later, on October 19, 1884, that association was founded—the General Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund of New York and Vicinity.

The beginnings were modest enough: payments to begin when the organization had 75 members; weekly sick benefits of from \$6 to \$9; a death benefit of \$75. These payments seem insignificant in the light of today's wages and the cost of living, but it should be remembered that 70 years ago \$7 a week was the salary of a skilled working man. Only a few months after the establishment of the society, it was faced with a dramatic challenge. Two members died. The \$150 needed in death benefits had not yet been collected in the treasury. Had the society failed its members in that crisis, it could not have survived. But the enterprising treasurer raised the money by borrowing from friends. The death benefits were paid, and the society's reputation for honesty and reliability was thereby established.

The membership rolls expanded. By 1887 there were 4 branches with 527 members. By the end of 1888 there were 733 members and 15 branches in 3 States—New York, New Jersey and Massachusetts. Growth was so rapid and so extensive that the society's name had to be changed to include the wider territory; it was now called—Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund of the United States of North America. (The designation "North" was later dropped. After 1888, sick benefits were extended to 26 weeks, with another 25 weeks at half benefit, and death benefits were raised from the original \$75 to \$150 in 1888 and \$250 in 1891.

With such rapid growth, there was a sharp need for new administrative machinery. The small group of German workmen who founded the society had provided a completely democratic organization, and the organization proved flexible enough to meet the needs of expansion. Headquarters were expanded too—from a small office on East Fourth Street at \$6 a month to a store at \$12, and by 1889 the society leased larger quarters in the Metropolitan Savings Bank Building on Third Avenue, which remained its home until 1930 when it moved into its own building at 714 Seneca Avenue in Brooklyn.

The problem of coordinating the activities of the member branches with the main administration was met and solved by holding a convention. The first was held in November 1892 and there all branches were represented. A second convention met in 1895 and a third in 1898. In 1898 the national executive board applied for incorporation of the society. There were now 161 branches in 21 States and over 20,000 members. Eminent personalities began to join the organization, among them the genius in the field of electricity, Charles Steinmetz, who for a time was the financial secretary of one of its branches, Daniel Hoan and Jasper McLevy, many term mayors of Milwaukee and Bridgeport, respectively.

By 1905, the society had grown so large that it needed its own publication to spread news of its activities to its membership. At the convention of that year, a motion was passed authorizing the publication of a paper, *Solidarity*. Its first issue appeared in April 1906 and it has since been published regularly for half a century as the official organ of the society. Its policy was stated clearly in that first issue: "Our paper shall be a means of enlightenment and conciliation. Its best efforts will be given to that great work of culture: the winning of the workers to the goal which we must set for ourselves. * * * Enlightenment, teaching, education are the prerequisites."

The Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund had been founded by German immigrants, and in its early years it remained essentially German in composition. The convention of 1910 proposed, among other things, the organization of English-speaking branches. During World War I the society, like all German-American groups of the times, was subjected to a certain amount of harassment by self-styled superpatriots. Its loyalty to America, however, was never questioned, and the society grew in strength during the war. Soon after World War I, the U.S. Department of Labor asked the society for permission to scan its records for statistical purposes, because the organization's sick benefit figures were at that time practically the only source of health insurance statistics. The society gladly cooperated with various Government agencies, for it had been an early advocate of a system of Government-run social security. Even to-

day, the society is urging broader coverage and higher benefits under the social security laws.

The postwar period was one of expansion and consolidation for the society. In 1928 the organization adopted new additions to its benefit structure: women could now join the sick benefit group, and children were also admitted to the society. Membership rose to a new peak in 1929. In 1934, when it celebrated its 50th anniversary, it could look back with satisfaction over its half-century with the knowledge that it had survived war, labor unrest, and the great depression. During the period of great unemployment, its relief fund had helped thousands of members to survive. No person was dropped from membership for nonpayment of dues, so that regardless of the members' economic condition, they were eligible for benefits in times of sickness and distress.

In a new era, which recognized the rights and duties of men to organize in their own interests for their security and protection, the society moved ahead steadily. In 1939, at the 18th convention, its name was officially changed from Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund to Workmen's Benefit Fund. Once again, as it had done many times before, the Workmen's Benefit Fund asserted its firm opposition to fascism, nazism, and communism, with their intolerance, hatred, persecution, and destruction of culture, freedom, and peace. At this convention, too, the medical care and hospital plan was adopted on a national basis, following the institution of similar services by local branches a few years earlier.

The Workmen's Benefit Fund continued to expand its activities and its services to members. The 20th national convention of 1943 set up a life insurance program of regular and endowment policies. The emergency relief fund had been greatly strengthened and is constantly being used to help member families that suffer from unemployment or other financial distress, such as that caused by floods or other disasters. District committees were set up to coordinate the activities of the many branches. These include not only the insurance and health benefits, but such varied services as camps for children in various parts of the country, homes for the aged and convalescent. Local branches are, of course, also engaged in social and educational activities and support national and community drives for charitable and health purposes. Many branches provide general practitioner care and, in metropolitan areas, an excellent medical specialist service.

By 1959, the membership had greatly expanded—embracing all economic groups, ethnic and national backgrounds, and religious faiths—with branches in 26 States and the District of Columbia. Its economic strength was reflected not only in the reports of its activities by the Insurance Department of the State of New York which carefully supervises fraternal societies, but in such increased services to members as providing life insurance policies up to \$25,000 and the addition of major medical coverage.

With its membership a representative cross-section of American citizens, the organization continued its opposition to all forms of totalitarianism. Publication of a photograph of a 14-year-old Hungarian Freedom Fighter on the cover of *Solidarity*—soon after the Soviet suppression of the Hungarian rebellion—reflected the membership's violent disapproval of Communist imperialism and the subjugation of free peoples. Many of the new members were refugees from Communist oppression and they needed no reminder that democracy was still the finest form of government.

Over the years of growth there have been many changes, but the fundamental struc-

ture of the Workmen's Benefit Fund has remained unchanged. At the 70th Anniversary celebration in 1954, guest speakers Mayor Robert F. Wagner of New York and U.S. Senator Herbert H. Lehman, praised the society in glowing terms for its years of dedicated service to democratic ideals and to the enactment of forward looking social reforms and legislation. The editor of its magazine, *Solidarity*, reiterated briefly just what their organization means to its members: "In itself, the society is a very sober-minded affair, a purely protective institution, organized for self-help on a nonprofit basis. The very purpose gives the organization its idealistic aims. For this reason, progressive thinking men and women of all national origins, and of all occupations, can be active in the Workmen's Benefit Fund as they are active in political, educational and economic organizations."

Release of Rabbi Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. DORN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Max Hendler, of Brooklyn, has brought to my attention, a letter published in the *New York Times* of August 6, 1959, concerning Rabbi Alexander Zissu Portugal. If calling the attention of my colleagues to the plight of this self-sacrificing and dedicated man can help in some measure to bring about his release, I do so with earnest hope:

RELEASE OF RABBI URGED—FEAR VOICED FOR HEALTH OF CLERIC IMPRISONED IN RUMANIA

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

A large concern for man's fate begins with empathy with one man's fate. It is in this belief that we feel impelled to call attention to the tragic situation of a remarkable religious figure now under detention in Rumania, and to voice a public appeal of conscience in his behalf.

His name is Rabbi Alexander Zissu Portugal. Since April 23, when he, his son and several friends were arrested on suspicion of "treason," he has languished in prison under investigation by the Rumanian authorities, and without trial. Anyone who has ever known this dedicated man, or who has been touched by his charisma, even at a distant remove, can only regard the charge against him as a tragically grievous error.

During World War II Rabbi Portugal was deported by the Nazis to Trans-Dniestr. His first act at the end of the war was to gather orphaned Jewish children and provide a home for them. When the authorities would not let him keep "his" children, he simply proceeded to make them his literally—he adopted them.

He then took a large group of the children with him to the city of Czernowitz, then under Soviet occupation. His fame as a father to children spread widely in the immediate postwar years. At one time he had as many as 40 boys and girls sharing his living quarters. At another point a group of Jewish children in a Russian orphanage in Odessa left that institution to join the rabbi in Czernowitz, as a result of which the Soviet authorities detained him for a few days.

FURTHER ARRESTS

Following this, the rabbi removed to Bucharest, where he taught the children of

the Jewish orphanage. When the Rumanian authorities undertook in 1948 to dissolve this institution, the younger children especially pleaded that they be permitted to remain with the rabbi and not be transferred to the State orphan asylums. In consequence, the rabbi was once more arrested and confined for investigation for a period of 4 months.

In recent years Rabbi Portugal traveled from town to town in Rumania, visiting the Jewish communities, dispensing what alms he could gather, counseling the troubled and himself living a life of poverty. He was twice warned that he must cease this activity and stay at home. It was after he had complied with the second warning that he was suddenly arrested last April.

This time he is far less able than before to cope with the harsh circumstances of imprisonment and investigation. He is 65, frail, and sickly; his weight has reportedly dropped to 90 pounds, in part, probably because he has been unable in prison to obtain the kosher food which his faith enjoins upon him.

His very survival, then, may depend on his being released. And this letter is written in the prayerful hope that the Rumanian authorities, aware of the profound concern felt for Rabbi Portugal and mindful of the most elementary demands of humane charity, will be moved to release him and so to spare him the rigors which he cannot withstand in his enfeeblement and advanced years.

REINHOLD NIEBUHR,

Professor of Theology, Union Theological Seminary.

LOUIS FINKELSTEIN,

Chancellor, Jewish Theological Seminary.

New York, July 30, 1959.

Lambert E. Broad Has Served 25 Years as President of Mining and Mechanical Institute, Freeland, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the *Hazleton, Pa., Plain Speaker* of August 19, 1959, disclosing that Mr. Lambert E. Broad has served 25 years as president of Mining and Mechanical Institute, Freeland, Pa.:

LAMBERT BROAD OBSERVES 25TH YEAR AS MMI PRESIDENT

Lambert E. Broad, president of the Mining and Mechanical Institute, Freeland, today marks his 25th anniversary as head of that educational institution.

Broad, who became president of MMI in 1934, graduated with high honors from Lehigh University with the degree of bachelor of arts. He became a member of Phi Beta Kappa National Honor Society while at Lehigh.

Graduating from the University of Pittsburgh with the degree of master of arts, he became a member and was a former officer of Phi Delta Kappa Graduation Education Honor Society.

A member of the American Association of School Administrators and Secondary School Administrators, he is also active in civic, industrial and church affairs in the Freeland-Hazleton area.

Among these are: president, Freeland Industrial Development Corp.; past president, Freeland Rotary Club; vice president Community Concerts Association; director, Anthracite Motor Club, director, Freeland Chamber of Commerce; past president and director, and chairman of trustees, Freeland YMCA; chairman of trustees, St. John Reformed Church, Freeland; officer and past officer of various Masonic bodies; and member, Valley Country Club.

Before coming to Freeland, Broad was head of the Science Department and director of visual instruction at Aliquippa schools from 1927 to 1934.

Broad's 25th year as MMI head coincides with the school's 80th anniversary. Founded in 1879 by the late Eckley B. Cox, pioneer coal operator, its initial objective was to make better miners and mechanics out of boys and men, who had little or no primary schooling.

Started as a night school, it evolved into a fully accredited, full-time college preparatory school under Broad's leadership and has received excellent ratings since that time. Over 700 young men have received their diplomas during Broad's tenure.

Hallmarks of Our Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following attached article which appeared in the July 1959 issue of the Tulanian:

[From the July 1959 issue of the Tulanian]

HALLMARKS OF OUR SOCIETY

(By Dr. Rufus C. Harris, president, Tulane University)

American education today should strive to impress young people more with our country's basic freedoms than with its high standard of living.

I refer generally to our civil liberties and particularly to our freedom of thought, expression and assembly. We should show what these mean, and how they apply in daily living.

As a people we have, I suspect, made a mistake in our international posture by boasting too much of our high standards of living and our exciting achievements in technocracy, instead of reflecting the image of a people whose daily life cherishes the exchange of ideas, the give and take of debate, the freedom of learning and the liberty of conscience.

These are more the hallmarks of our Western culture than anything produced from stone, steel, or technocracy.

Our more important efforts in foreign aid should be to strive to assist all peoples, of all tongues and of every race to find the secrets of freedom as well as the secrets of science and technocracy. That could be our best example of world leadership. But it must stem from a basic educational philosophy.

The world today makes it necessary that education produce men of character and principle for it is obvious that our safety cannot reasonably be entrusted to men merely of skill. Skills are neutral and may be employed for good or evil.

How do schools and colleges best build character?

They do so when they require the best academic performance. The conditions conducive to high performance in teaching and learning are precisely those that are chiefly conducive to the development of character and principle. Large or small, wealthy or poor, each educational institution can be such a force if it really wants to.

The principal determinate is the level of performance expected.

The sad part is that on most campuses it is low and only a few persons are performing to full capacity. Where trustees, officers, faculty and students live by the conviction that learning demands excellence, and nothing short of high performance will be settled for, character is strengthened, principle is exalted and students will reflect it.

In fact, all worthwhile ingredients of the college experience flow from this, including good teaching, the satisfactory curriculum, student responsibility and effective religious responsibility and practice. Where there is firm commitment to academic excellence, college courses gain meaning and relevance, and students today have a greater concern for finding meaning in life than this century has heretofore seen.

We must produce all the superior trained young people we can find to see to it that a historical review of these times does not record that actually we were an immature, irresponsible, and confused people; that revolutionary changes occurred in our generation to which we never really became awakened; that our Nation was propelled into a new educational era to which we did not wisely respond; that there was a convergence of powerful and even marvelous forces on a worldwide scale, which produced an unparalleled necessity for uncompromised excellence in education, but that we lacked either the imagination, the courage, or the maturity to provide it.

Most of the Tulanian readers reside in the great southern portion of the United States. It is the section from which we stem and which we wish to advance. It has our earnest thought and labor and solicitude. It is proper that we ask: Are our youth in this area being educated with proper regard for the needs and opportunities that await them in adult life in the world as it now is, with all of its stresses and competition?

Are the cankers of trivia and materialism which in so many ways are eating at the heart of American society today similarly gnawing at the vitals of our educational standards and vision?

Our solemn purpose must be to liberate the mind and to broaden and deepen the sense of tolerance, personal usefulness and responsibility; to provide this area with the best possible educational institutions; to educate and morally develop its youth; to move them away from prejudice, ignorance, and absorption with self and community trivia toward noble dedications to the great religious and social endeavors; to inspire lofty pursuit in superior learning; and to assure generous and unselfish public performance.

This constitutes our chief, if not our only, obligation to this area.

It constitutes the best measure of our duty to Mr. Tulane and Mrs. Newcomb. It constitutes the South's best promise for advancement; and indeed, it constitutes the best way that our time may be made one of peace.

Everything we do in education for this, experimentally or otherwise, must be measured by high quality levels if we really wish to raise the sights and the performance of southern endeavor.

There can be no compromise with standards and integrity in this.

The integrity of character we strive for within ourselves is dependent upon the measure of our own inner quality. The integrity of any system of education we embark upon

inevitably will be the result of the same ingredient.

No educational program can be any finer, deeper, more humane, more qualitative than those who are its architects or those who are taught according to its ways.

In the last analysis the quality of our southern performance in education or anything else is the quality of each of us in the South.

Protest on Khrushchev Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the Letters to the Editor column of the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of August 19, 1959, submitted by Mr. James J. Walsh, of Wilkes-Barre, regarding the upcoming visit of Nikita Khrushchev to this country:

PROTEST ON KHRUSHCHEV VISIT

EDITOR, TIMES-LEADER NEWS:

The announcement that Nikita Khrushchev and President Eisenhower will exchange visits has stirred the entire Nation.

Only recently, President Eisenhower remarked about the apathy of so many Americans concerning the dangers of communism. And yet, it is this same Mr. Eisenhower who has invited the very leader of this deadly menace to visit the United States.

Just a few weeks ago our Congress adopted a resolution denouncing the enslavement of the captive nations. Perhaps Congress should have added the United States to the list of nations under Red domination. Our leaders have been taken in by the Communists so often, figuratively speaking, we are a captive nation. It would appear the United States is being used as a doormat by the Kremlin.

By dealing with this man of treachery, doublecrossing, mass murders, etc., we are automatically putting a stamp of approval on the status quo in Europe, China, Tibet, etc. Have our leaders lost sight of what happened in Hungary, Poland, Korea, etc? What of those 450 Americans still being held in Communist prisons in Red China? Try to picture the heartache of those boys' parents. I wonder if any of those parents have ever been invited to the White House, and been given the assurance that everything possible is being done to bring about their release?

It is shocking, to say the least, to read in our newspapers that Governors, business leaders, and the like are extending invitations to Mr. K., while in this country.

Khrushchev made this statement to Western diplomats at a Moscow reception on November 18, 1956:

"If you don't like us, don't accept our invitations and don't invite us to come to see you. Whether you like it or not, history is on our side. We will bury you."

So we invite our self-announced undertaker to call.

As an American, I strongly protest this mass murderer coming to the United States. I fail to see where he has made the slightest concession in the interests of justice and peace in the world to warrant a visit to this country.

Several years ago Marshal Tito, of Yugoslavia, sought an invitation to the United States, but he was denied such a visit be-

cause the American people flooded the White House with letters of protest. The American people can do the same regarding Khrushchev. We can take him at his word, "if you don't like us don't accept our invitations, and don't invite us to come to see you," by writing to the President urging him to cancel the invitation.

I'm in agreement with Senator THOMAS DODD (Democrat, Connecticut) when he says: "It's a national disgrace."

Dr. Carl O. McIntire, who heads the International Council of Christian Churches, calls Khrushchev the chief spokesman of the devil who repudiates God. Dr. Clyde Kennedy, president of the American Council of Christian Churches branded the Red tyrant "the bloody butcher of Hungary."

Pope Pius XI and XII warned: "Communism is intrinsically evil and no one can cooperate with it in any manner whatsoever. The fight between the forces of God and anti-God must be fought to a finish."

These are wise words and worth heeding.

JAMES J. WALSH.

WILKES-BARRE.

Oakridge's One-Woman United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, communication may not lead to understanding but understanding cannot come without communication.

The peoples of this earth do not want war. They want peace.

These are propositions to which we all can subscribe. With them in mind we certainly commend my constituent, Mrs. W. H. (Hazel) Walwyn, of Oakridge, Oreg., who corresponds with 200 persons in 41 different countries all over the globe and has been doing this for more than 40 years.

Under a previous consent, I am now including an article from the Eugene Register-Guard for August 5, 1959, written by Ruby Lund, the Register-Guard correspondent at Oakridge, about this remarkable woman and her important hobby. What a different world this would be if we had a Hazel Walwyn in every community.

LETTERWRITER SEEKS GOOD WILL

(By Ruby Lund)

OAKRIDGE.—This upper Willamette Valley community has its own "United Nations" trying to create good will in many foreign lands.

It is a one-woman organization—Mrs. W. H. (Hazel) Walwyn.

She corresponds with more than 200 persons in 41 different countries all over the globe.

Mrs. Walwyn writes long letters to all these people, describing the American way of life. In return, she receives descriptions of the ways of life in the many foreign lands.

Her friends-by-mail include people from many different walks of life—a teacher in Australia, a businessman in Iraq, a professor on the Ascension Island. Among her many correspondents are native North and South Africans and the people on Ascension Island.

To many of these people, Mrs. Walwyn sends magazines depicting America. Many

of her friends have hobbies to which she contributes, adding to their collections American examples of the items in which they are interested. Among the things she has sent to the foreign nations are view cards, snapshots, salt and pepper shakers, cups and saucers.

Her home, in turn, contains examples of arts and crafts from all over the world.

Mrs. Walwyn began her unique letterwriting some 40 years ago when she began to collect first issue stamp covers. Her hobby has grown so much since then that now she maintains businesslike records to keep it going.

She has rows of metal filing cabinets which contain all of her correspondence and a large looseleaf notebook which serves as an address record.

In these alphabetical files, she keeps a record showing the interests of each of her friends and data on their families.

Mrs. Walwyn says her hobby isn't an expensive one. All her letters are sent by surface mail. Often it takes them from 6 weeks to 3 months to reach their destination. The same time often elapses before she receives a reply.

The magazines she sends are those she buys anyway as well as some her friends give her to send to one of her correspondents. The gifts are small, inexpensive items representative of the country.

Kennedy and Anfuso Honored by Morgenstern Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY and I were honored today by the Morris Morgenstern Foundation of New York which presented to us, at a special ceremony in Senator KENNEDY's office, parchment replicas of the famous letter written by George Washington in 1790 to the Touro Synagogue in Newport, R.I. These awards were presented to us by Mr. Morris Morgenstern, the founder of the foundation bearing his name, for "their inspirational efforts in combatting bigotry."

Senator KENNEDY and I were privileged to be the first to receive this award, which will be presented annually by the foundation to national figures for their efforts in combating bigotry and persecution. The award has as its text President Washington's statement in his letter of 1790 in which he assured the Jewish congregation of Newport that the United States will give "to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance."

In the summer of the year 1790, after the troubled years of the American Revolution, the first President of the United States made a tour of the country. He came to the little seafaring town of Newport, R.I., in the part of the country colonized by the great champion of religious liberty, Roger Williams. The people of Newport turned out to greet President Washington.

Moses Seixas, sexton of the Hebrew congregation of Newport, who was a

friend of Washington's, sent him a warm letter of welcome. Washington's reply to this letter of welcome, addressed to the Hebrew congregation of Newport, is today one of the Nation's most cherished historical documents. It is an eloquent expression of American freedom and religious harmony. In 1946 the Touro Synagogue in Newport, which is now about 200 years old, was dedicated as a national shrine.

The words "to bigotry no sanction" have played a vital role in the life of Morris Morgenstern, well-known millionaire financier, philanthropist, and realtor, who resides in Long Beach, N.Y.

Owner of the original letter by George Washington, in which this quote appears, Mr. Morgenstern is a firm believer that George Washington was the personification of the American ideal of freedom. As long as he can remember, he has been a crusader of the principles of tolerance expounded by our first President.

Through his efforts, the Washington letter has been seen by millions as part of the Freedom Train Exhibition and at universities in various parts of the country. It is now on display at the B'nai B'rith Building in Washington, D.C.

The 78-year-old president of Morris Morgenstern & Son is more anxious today to spread the word of George Washington than ever before.

Morris Morgenstern, as an individual, has probably financed more building than anyone else in the United States. But he is not happy being just a successful businessman. For years he has found time to help good causes and actively support various organizations, regardless of race or religion.

In 1949 he created the Morris Morgenstern Foundation, "to aid men and women of every creed, race, and ancestry to contribute their highest gifts to the development of our national culture."

Through his efforts, the Levittown Jewish Center was enabled to expand from its original facilities accommodating a handful of children to a synagogue of prime status in Long Island.

He was also drafted by the directors of the West Side Branch of the YMCA to be chairman of a committee to raise funds to provide decent recreational facilities for the boys living in Hell's Kitchen.

Judge Albert Conway brought to Mr. Morgenstern's attention the fact that although children of other faiths were provided with houses of worship at the Ten Mile River Boys Scout Camp, the Jewish boys were not so provided. Mr. Morgenstern made the necessary funds available for construction of what is now known as the Synagogue in the Pines.

The list of agencies which he helps is endless. They include the Brooklyn Hebrew Home and Hospital for the Aged; the Infants Home of Brooklyn; the Cathedral Club; Yeshiva University; Cardinal Spellman's Foundling Home, among others.

Born in Russia, Morris was brought to the United States at the age of 4. Because his family was poor, he had to give up school and start working. At 14, he borrowed some money and went into the business of manufacturing seltzer bot-

ties. Eventually he began dabbling in real estate and founded the finance firm he now heads.

Mr. Morgenstern — known affectionately as "M.M." by his friends — has been the personal guest of Vice President Nixon. Dr. Jonas Salk, the conqueror of polio, recently hailed Mr. Morgenstern for his humanitarian work. He has received citations from Presidents Roosevelt, Truman and most recently Eisenhower, for his invaluable efforts in behalf of the sick, poor, and needy of all races and creeds.

The text of the George Washington letter follows:

To the Hebrew Congregation in Newport, R.I.
GENTLEMEN: While I receive, with much satisfaction, your address replete with expressions of affection and esteem, I rejoice in the opportunity of assuring you, that I shall always retain a grateful remembrance of the cordial welcome I experienced in my visit to Newport, from all classes of citizens.

The reflection on the days of difficulty and danger which are past is rendered the more sweet, from a consciousness that they are succeeded by days of uncommon prosperity and security. If we have wisdom to make the best use of the advantages with which we are now favored, we cannot fail, under the just administration of a good Government, to become a great and a happy people.

The citizens of the United States of America have a right to applaud themselves for having given to mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy, a policy worthy of imitation. All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship. It is now no more that toleration is spoken of, as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people that another enjoyed the exercise of their inherent natural rights. For happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support.

It would be inconsistent with the frankness of my character not to avow that I am pleased with your favorable opinion of my administration, and fervent wishes for my felicity. May the children of the stock of Abraham, who dwell in this land, continue to merit and enjoy the good will of the other inhabitants, while every one shall sit in safety under his own vine and figtree, and there shall be none to make him afraid. May the father of all mercies scatter light and not darkness in our paths, and make us all in our several vocations useful here, and in his own due time and way everlastingly happy.

G. WASHINGTON.

The Late Ken Regan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to the late Ken Regan, who served in the House from August 1947 to January 1955. I had not met Ken Regan until he came to Washington as the Representative of the great 16th Congressional District, which joins on the south

and west the district which I have the honor to represent.

Ken Regan was a man of good will. As colleagues from west Texas we worked together on many problems for the public good. Ken was cooperative, understanding, and effective in his work.

Ken Regan had a big district. He had a big heart. He was big in his thinking. He loved his district and the people of his State and Nation. He served them well in Washington. I wish to join with others in paying tribute to a departed friend. I wish also to extend sympathy to his wife, Roberta Regan, who survives him, and who shared his interests during their years in Washington.

DAV Services in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, an exceptional record of vital rehabilitation services freely extended to thousands of Oregon citizens has recently come to my attention. These splendid humanitarian services are not sufficiently appreciated by those who have benefited thereby, directly and indirectly.

Among the several congressionally chartered veteran organizations, which have State departments and local chapters in Oregon, is the Disabled American Veterans. The DAV is the only such organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war. Formed in 1920, under the leadership of Judge Roberts S. Marx, DAV legislative activities have benefited every compensated disabled veteran. Its present national commander is another judge, David B. Williams, of Concord, Mass. Its national adjutant is John E. Feighner, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Its national legislative director is Elmer M. Freudenberger; its national director of claims, Cicero F. Hogan; and its national director of employment relations, John W. Burris—all located at its National Service Headquarters at 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Inasmuch as less than 10 percent of our country's war veterans are receiving monthly disability compensation payments for service-connected disabilities—some 2 million—the DAV can never aspire to become the largest of the several veteran organizations. Nevertheless, since shortly after its formation in 1920, the DAV national headquarters, located in Cincinnati, Ohio, has maintained the largest staff of any veteran organization, of full-time trained national service officers, 138 of them, who are located in the 63 regional and 3 district offices of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, and in its central office

in Washington, D.C. They have ready access to the official claim records of those claimants who have given them their powers of attorney. All of them being war-handicapped veterans themselves, these service officers are sympathetic and alert as to the problems of other less well-informed claimants.

The two DAV national service officers in Oregon are Mr. Gerald S. Kelsey and Mr. James W. Hudson, located at the VA Regional Office, 208 South West Fifth Avenue, Portland, Ore. The department commander is Mr. Dan Cole, 2520 J Street, Springfield, Ore., and the department adjutant is Mr. T. F. Van Laningham, 429 South West Fourth Avenue, Portland, Ore.

The three VA hospitals in Oregon are a 1,000-bed DOM hospital at Camp White, a 567-bed GM hospital at Portland, and a 670-bed NP hospital at Roseburg. VAVS representatives: Camp White, Patrick Graham; Roseburg, Charles T. McCoy; Portland, George Youmans.

During the last fiscal year, the VA paid out \$52,414,000 for its veteran program in Oregon, including \$13,730,806 disability compensation to its 17,408 service-disabled veterans. These Federal expenditures in Oregon furnish substantial purchasing power in all communities. Only about 11 percent—1,859—are members of the 27 DAV chapters in Oregon.

This 11 percent record is strange, in view of the very outstanding record of personalized service activities and accomplishments of the DAV national service officers in behalf of Oregon veterans and dependents during the last 10 fiscal years, as revealed by the following statistics:

Claimants contacted (estimate).....	31,357
Claims folders reviewed.....	26,131
Appearances before rating boards.....	12,892
Compensation increases obtained.....	2,634
Service connections obtained.....	792
Nonservice pensions.....	828
Death benefits obtained.....	430
Total monetary benefits obtained.....	\$933,996.15

These above figures do not include the accomplishments of other national service officers on duty in the central office of the Veterans' Administration, handling appeals and reviews, or in its three district offices, handling death and insurance cases. Over the last 10 years, they reported 83,611 claims handled in such district offices, resulting in monetary benefits of \$20,850,335.32, and in the central office, they handled 58,282 reviews and appeals, resulting in monetary benefits of \$5,337,339.05. Proportionate additional benefits were thereby obtained for Oregon veterans, their dependents and their survivors.

These figures fail properly to paint the picture of the extent and value of the individualized advice, counsel, and assistance extended to all of the claimants who have contacted DAV service officers in person, by telephone, and by letter.

Pertinent advice was furnished to all disabled veterans—only about 10 percent of whom were DAV members—their de-

pendents, and others, in response to their varied claims for service connection, disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, insurance, death compensation or pension, VA guarantee loans for homes, farms and businesses, and so forth. Helpful advice was also given as to counseling and placement into suitable useful employment—to utilize their remaining abilities—civil service examinations, appointments, retentions, retirement benefit, and multifarious other problems.

Every claim presents different problems. Too few Americans fully realize that governmental benefits are not automatically awarded to disabled veterans, not given on a silver platter. Frequently, because of lack of official records, death or disappearance of former buddies and associates, lapse of memory with the passage of time, lack of information and experience, proof of the legal service connection of a disability becomes extremely difficult, too many times impossible. A claims and rating record board can obviously not grant favorable action merely based on the opinions, impressions or conclusions of persons who submit notarized affidavits. Specific, detailed, pertinent facts are essential.

The VA, which acts as judge and jury, cannot properly prosecute claims against itself. As the defendant, in effect, the U.S. Veterans' Administration must award the benefits provided under the laws administered by it, only under certain conditions.

A DAV national service officer can and does advise a claimant precisely why his claim may previously have been denied and then specifies what additional evidence is essential. The claimant must necessarily bear the burden of obtaining such fact-giving affidavit evidence. The experienced national service officer will, of course, advise him as to its possible improvement, before presenting same to the adjudication agency, in the light of all of the circumstances and facts, and of the pertinent laws, precedents, regulations and schedule of disability ratings. No DAV national service officer, I feel certain, ever uses his skill, except in behalf of worthy claimants, with justifiable claims.

The VA has denied more claims than it has allowed because most claims are not properly prepared. It is very significant, as pointed out by the DAV acting national director of claims, Chester A. Cash, that a much higher percentage of those claims, which have been prepared and presented with the aid of a DAV national service officer, are eventually favorably acted upon, than is the case as to those claimants who have not given their powers of attorney to any such special advocate.

Another fact not generally known is that, under the overall review of claims inaugurated by the VA some 4 years ago, the disability compensation payments of about 37,200 veterans have been discontinued, and reduced as to about 27,300 others at an aggregate loss to them of more than \$23 million per year. About

eight-tenths of 1 percent of such discontinuances and reductions have probably occurred as to disabled veterans in Oregon, with a consequent loss of about \$224,000 per year.

Most of these unfortunate claimants were not represented by the DAV or by any other veteran organization. Judging by the past, such unfavorable adjudications will occur as to an additional equal number or more during the next 3 years, before such review is completed. I urge every disabled veteran in Oregon to give his power of attorney to the national service officer of the DAV, or of some other veteran organization, or of the American Red Cross, just as a protective measure.

The average claimant who receives helpful advice probably does not realize the background of training and experience of a competent expert national service officer.

Measured by the DAV's overall costs of about \$12,197,600 during a 10-year period, one would find that it has expended about \$3.50 for each claim folder reviewed, or about \$3.80 for each rating board appearance, or, again, about \$22.70 for each favorable award obtained, or about \$123 for each service connection obtained, or about \$54 for each compensation increase obtained, and has obtained about \$14.10 of direct monetary benefits for claimants for each dollar expended by the DAV for its national service officer setup. Moreover, such benefits will generally continue for many years.

Evidently, most claimants are not aware of the fact that the DAV receives no Government subsidy whatsoever. The DAV is enabled to maintain its nationwide staff of expert national service officers primarily because of income from membership dues collected by its local chapters and from the net income on its Identio-Tag—miniature automobile license tags—project, owned by the DAV and operated by its employees, most of whom are disabled veterans, their wives, or their widows, or other handicapped Americans—a rehabilitation project in thus furnishing them with useful employment. Incidentally, without checking as to whether they had previously sent in a donation, more than 1,400,000 owners of sets of lost keys have received them back from the DAV's Identio-Tag department, 3,538 of whom, during the last 8 years, were Oregon residents.

Every eligible veteran, by becoming a DAV member, and by explaining these factors to fellow citizens, can help the DAV to procure such much-needed public support as will enable it to maintain its invaluable nationwide service setup on a more adequate basis. So much more could be accomplished for distressed disabled veterans, if the DAV could be enabled, financially, to maintain an expert service officer in every one of the 173 VA hospitals.

During the last 10 years, the DAV has also relied on appropriations from its separately incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, aggregating \$3,300,000, exclusively for salaries to its national service officers. Its reserves hav-

ing been thus nearly exhausted, the DAV Service Foundation is therefore very much in need of the generous support of all serviced claimants, DAV members, and other social-minded Americans, by direct donations, by designations in insurance policies, by bequests in wills, by assignments of stocks and bonds, and by establishing special types of trust funds.

A special type of memorial trust fund originated about 3 years ago with concerned disabled veteran members of the DAV chapter in Butte, Mont., which established the first perpetual rehabilitation fund of \$1,000 with the DAV Service Foundation. Recently it added another \$100 thereto. Since then, every DAV unit in that State has established such a special memorial trust fund, ranging from \$100 to \$1,100, equivalent to about \$5 per DAV member.

Each claimant who has received any such rehabilitation service can help to make it possible for the DAV to continue such excellent rehabilitation services in Oregon by sending in donations to the DAV Service Foundation, 631 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. Every such serviced claimant who is eligible can and should also become a DAV member, preferably a life member, for which the total fee is \$100—\$50 to those born before January 1, 1902, or World War I veterans—payable in installments within 2 full fiscal year periods.

Every American can help to make our Government more representative by being a supporting member of at least one organization which reflects his interests and viewpoints—labor unions, trade associations, and various religious, fraternal, and civic associations. All of America's veterans ought to be members of one or more of the patriotic, service-giving veteran organizations. All of America's disabled defenders, who are receiving disability compensation, have greatly benefited by their own official voice, the DAV.

Prelude to Annual Report by Congresswoman Edna F. Kelly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, every year it has been my practice to submit a report to my constituents in the 10th Congressional District in New York on important legislation enacted during the session of Congress. In my report, which of necessity is brief, I try to be factual on key legislation enacted. The report this year will only cover the first session of the 86th Congress and should be sent out shortly after the adjournment of Congress. It is, of course, impossible to predict with accuracy when Congress will adjourn and, more important, what specific legislative measures

will be enacted into law. At this point I have, therefore, decided in a preliminary statement to describe to the people of my district the difficult and complicated atmosphere hovering over this session. This, then, is the prelude to my report.

The first session of the 86th Congress convened and will adjourn with war clouds engulfing the entire world. The density of the clouds fluctuated with the actions of the leaders of the Kremlin. As heavy and ominous as the clouds were with the appearance of the sputnik and lunik, they increased with the overt, aggressive actions of the "comrades" in the Middle East, the Far East, Tibet, Latin America, Central America, including Cuba, in Europe again with the Berlin impasse and once more in southeastern Asia, Laos.

A diminishing of the war clouds followed appeasement of the comrades in the Ministers' meeting, a pending but never accomplished summit meeting, and finally plans for an exchange of heads of state.

Thus, it can be said with no exaggeration that Congress met and will adjourn in one of the most trying times in the history of the United States.

The international outlook for the Democratic-controlled Congress was not made felicitous by the Republican-controlled executive branch of the Government. Congress convened labeled by President Eisenhower, in his role as leader of the Republican Party, as being controlled by "political radicals, spend-thrifts, and gloom-dogglers."

Bear in mind that when Congress convened, President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message, promised "a sensible posture of defense against the growing might of the Soviet Union," and in the next breath he warned we must "guard against feverish building up of vast armaments." The observing public saw Congress placed publicly between the horns of the dilemma.

Congress was faced with the problem of meeting the Soviet menace, of placating the administration in its request for the highest budget in "peacetime," of grappling with a \$9 billion interest on the national debt, of increasing the limit on the national debt, and of passing a Mutual Security Act. Domestic issues became secondary and/or dependent upon the cost of meeting the Soviet menace, balancing the budget and controlling inflation.

The entire policy of the Republican administration was in a state of fluctuation. A cooperative state of mind and action on the part of Democratic legislators was tried to the point of frustration. President Eisenhower requested legislation and then vetoed bills because they were too much or too little. Most of the bills passed to date have been cut below the President's recommendations.

A most astounding turnabout has been the long negotiations for exchange visits of Khrushchev and President Eisenhower. The same man who recently lamented the apathy of Americans in the face of the Soviet menace has invited the head of the Soviet regime to be

a guest of the United States. This appears to many to be a colossal swallowing of principle, a betrayal of our civilization, a quashing of the loyalty we owe to American youths who perished at the hands of Soviet treachery, and a gross insult to the millions of once free men enslaved by that dictatorship.

Adherence to the absolute moral principles upon which our country was founded should dissuade us from conferring respectability and legitimacy to the dedicated enemy of free men and free institutions.

This action, preceded by the humiliation inflicted upon the Western representatives at Geneva, makes it more difficult to understand. President Eisenhower predicated a summit meeting on progress made at Geneva. What progress? The West did not bring up the question of the captive nations. East German observers were given equal status with the observers of West Germany which conferred de facto recognition of East Germany. What happened to the demand that the Berlin and Germany problems be considered as one? The West capitulated and conceded them as separate issues. What happened to the challenge of the blockade of Berlin? This has been shelved. The United States now speaks of "rights of access" after proving that the West had rights of occupation since 1945. Now we are practically conceding that the Soviet has rights to terminate this agreement.

The intended visit of the Soviet Premier is repugnant to me because no credence can be placed upon the word of a Mikoyan, a Kozlov, or a Khrushchev. The gain, if any, does not outweigh the loss of trust by our allies, the creation of more apathy and misinterpretation by Americans, causing a quasi-insecurity among free people everywhere, and the propaganda use this visit will be made of in Moscow and other capitals inimical to the U.S.S.R. All of this created confusion in Congress on legislation without positive leadership from the executive branch.

The reversal of policy and the confused and confusing pattern of weak executive leadership has, in effect, pulled the rug from under the Congress. Despite this background, I predict that the record of the 86th Congress, 1st session, will make history on the positive side of the ledger, thanks to a strong and dynamic democratic leadership.

Dr. Condon's Review of "The Great Decision"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include a book review in Science

for July 3, 1959, by Prof. E. U. Condon, department of physics, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. He reviews "The Great Decision," which is subtitled "The Secret History of the Atomic Bomb," and which was written by Michael Amrine. It was published by Putnam's, New York, 1959:

This is a valuable and interestingly written contribution to a particular chapter of the history of atomic energy for military purposes. It begins with the afternoon of April 12, 1945, when Vice President Harry Truman was informed by Eleanor Roosevelt of the death of the President.

That evening Harry Truman was sworn in as President of the United States. Later there was a brief Cabinet meeting, and Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson lingered for a private word with the President. That was Truman's first official knowledge of the atomic bomb project, which at that moment had about 100,000 persons working in secret laboratories and factories. The great bulk of these persons were unaware of the overall objective of the factories in which they worked.

This was just 116 days before the whole character of war was changed by Americans when they dropped one atomic bomb on Hiroshima, Japan. This was followed 3 days later, August 9, 1945, by the dropping of another bomb on Nagasaki, Japan. During the afternoon of August 14, the Emperor of Japan announced his acceptance of the terms for ending the war contained in the Potsdam Declaration, and World War II was at an end.

Michael Amrine has given a brilliant synthesis of the peculiar circumstances of those less than 4 momentous months in history. He has searched carefully and told the story as well as anyone could in view of the fact that not all of the essential information has been made public. He is aware of the incompleteness of his narrative, for he says in the concluding chapter: "We look back, with troubling questions, at these events, which helped so much to set new limits and choices for man. Were the atomic bombings necessary for an early end to the Pacific war? Were the atomic bombs used in haste, without proper thought of the consequences?"

"This book was written to help people answer these questions for themselves. There is also a hope that if the available record is set down, as far as it can be, other people who have not yet spoken may tell the full story of their participation. There are official records that should be opened now. Some contain no official secrets. Others contain technical secrets now outmoded. It is time for these records to be opened, but, so far, the doors have remained shut to journalists, historians, and sometimes to former officials, even to famous American officials who lived through these events. A nation, like a man, cannot fully understand its future if it does not understand some of the secrets of the past."

As we begin to appreciate the vastness of the consequences of atomic energy with its millionfold multiplication of war's horrors which now threaten humanity, one of the most important tasks of scholarship becomes the writing of a really definitive history of atomic energy. This is not a project to be undertaken by one or two men; it calls for the coordinated efforts of a major group of physical scientists, social scientists, and historians. These scholars should subject the stories of the various groups to searching critical analysis so that men may know what a great change atomic energy has worked in every facet of their lives.

My part of the project was finished by February 1945 and, in any case, since I was

never associated with it at a level that could influence policy, I have little first-hand knowledge of the story that Amrine gives us. But what I do know confirms the essential accuracy of the story as he tells it. It may be useful to point up some comments on the parts of the story which seem most significant.

A complete history would tell how the project was born in complete and equal cooperation between the United States and Great Britain. We did very little on the project between 1939 and the fall of 1941 while the British accomplished a great deal in spite of the distractions caused by the disaster at Dunkirk and the German's mass-bombing of English cities.

Our scientists were indecisive and ineffectual in this early period. It was mainly the push afforded by the British scientists which led to the organization of a major project in the late fall of 1941. At that time it was agreed that the British would shift their work to this country and that we and they would work together on the project as equal partners.

In 1942 Gen. Leslie Groves was put in charge of the project. The full story has not yet been told of how he worked to hobble and frustrate this cooperation. Amrine mentions it briefly. He tells how, by February 1943, Sir Winston Churchill's irritation reached such a point that he cabled Harry Hopkins the following message: "I should be very grateful for some news about this, as at present the American War Department is asking us to keep them informed of our experiments while refusing altogether any information about theirs."

By August 1943 this had become a major issue and was discussed at the Quebec Conference between Churchill and Roosevelt. After this it was no longer possible for Groves to frustrate cooperation with the British. It was not until that time—but it happened with great speed immediately thereafter—that a large, able group of the best British scientists came to the United States to help in every phase of the project at the many different laboratories and factories.

It was about this time that Churchill, feeling that the Americans under General Groves, were intent on squeezing out the British, made the somber decision to go it alone by setting up an independent effort at Chalk River, Canada. This conduct on our part which, in my judgment, was clearly aimed at hampering Britain's development of atomic energy for industrial purposes after the war, put a severe strain on Anglo-American cooperation.

Another topic that needs fuller exploration, as Amrine indicates, is the kind of specific detail about the bomb that was available to our policymakers at the time policy decisions on how to use the bomb were being made. Amrine tells us (p. 132) that General Groves, in a memorandum to Gen. George Marshall dated December 30, 1944, vastly underestimated the power of the bomb. He estimated the power of the bomb at only 500 tons of TNT, whereas it was actually 20,000 tons when used on Hiroshima. As Amrine says, our military planners "were only given reason to think it was a spectacular improvement in bombs, not another kind of warfare."

Now I know that General Groves did not know enough physics to make his own estimate, and I do not believe that anyone at Los Alamos would have made such a low estimate. How, then, could Groves have erred by a factor of 40? Could it have been intentional, so that the top policy planners would not be aware of the horribly serious nature of the decision they were taking?

It would have been quite easy to mislead the White House, especially since Admiral Leahy, the staff military adviser, who had had a long experience with explosives, long

thought the project a gigantic boondoggle because "this bomb did not fit anything he knew about explosives" (p. 134).

Moreover, it would be natural for Leahy to discount the bomb because the thing, if a reality, horrified him. To use it, he believed, was to adopt "an ethical standard common to the barbarians of the Dark Ages. . . . I was not taught to make war in that fashion. . . . These new and terrible instruments of uncivilized warfare represent a modern type of barbarism not worthy of Christian men" (p. 170).

I believe that an erroneous view of the magnitude of their responsibility was planted in the minds of the Nation's leaders by the December 30, 1944, memo of General Groves, and that this erroneous view was not changed by the later brief coded messages. Truman learned of the Alamogordo test on July 17 by this message which was sent to him at the Potsdam Conference, "Babies satisfactorily born." This was certainly designed to minimize the seriousness of a new development of which the President had first become aware in sketchy outline just 3 busy months earlier.

At Potsdam it was decided that Truman should inform Stalin of the new weapon. We do not know exactly what he said when he did this. Truman has written (p. 187), "On July 24 I casually mentioned to Stalin that we had a new weapon of unusual destructive force. The Russian Premier showed no special interest."

But apparently, Truman had not used the key words "nuclear" or "atomic" and, perhaps because of the December 30, 1944, memo, may not have himself at that time fully realized the magnitude of the revolution in warfare that had occurred.

Amrine's account of this affair (p. 190) is fascinating: "No one at Potsdam had time to think much about the lack of reaction from Stalin to the news. Perhaps they thought that (like Admiral Leahy) Stalin found it hard to believe in these super-weapons." But had he really been told of a superweapon? "Perhaps, like James Byrnes, he found it hard to understand scientific matters."

The book tells in detail of the sustained efforts of the scientists on the project to get our Government to give some kind of demonstration or warning to the Japanese before actually using the atomic bomb against them. It has often been said that the Potsdam Declaration met this minimal moral demand. But one may very well ask whether it really did so, when this is all that it said that might be so construed (p. 191): "We call upon the government of Japan to proclaim now the unconditional surrender of all Japanese armed forces, and to provide proper and adequate assurances of their good faith in such action. The alternative for Japan is prompt and utter destruction."

The last chapter, "Conscience and Questions," is a searching analysis of the troublesome questions that still perturb the thoughtful, about whether or not the bomb should have been used.

Because the entire attack on Hiroshima involved only three planes, the air-raid alarm was not sounded and people did not take shelter. Amrine writes: "That accidental happening cost the lives of tens of thousands of women and children who were not military targets and whom we had no intention of killing" (p. 229).

Amrine says that his "personal observation is that many Asians and Americans thought differently about Western man's supposed respect for human life. These bombs did not improve our reputation and win us allies in Asia" (p. 233).

It is a sad story, one that many would like to forget or, if possible, never to learn. But it only involved two bombs of the type, now called conventional, which we stockpile by the hundreds or thousands and recklessly

issue to our ally, West Germany, where ex-Nazis get greater political power day by day. In the meantime hydrogen bombs, which are a thousand times more powerful than the obsolescent toys of World War II, are in the hands of Americans, British, and Russians, and the means to deliver them halfway around the world are being perfected by both sides.

Thus there is probably no exaggeration in the assertion by Congressman CHARLES O. PORTER, Democrat of Oregon, in his May newsletter to his constituents when he says: "Two very prominent authorities, one on disarmament and the other on science, stated in my presence the other day their belief that we would all be dead in 10 years and that the earth would be an incinerated relic."

There is no doubt whatever that the technical means of achieving such a goal do exist at the present. Amrine's story of a few months in 1945 gives one a foretaste of how this larger catastrophe may come about, and not as a result of a free choice by the peoples of the world.

Address by Maj. Gen. Rinaldo Van Brunt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening, August 15, 1959, I had the privilege of attending the reunion banquet of the 4th (Ivy) Infantry Division Association in the Benjamin Franklin Hotel, Philadelphia.

The guest speaker on this pleasant occasion was Maj. Gen. Rinaldo Van Brunt, deputy commander, Second U.S. Army. Because General Van Brunt's address was so timely and so well received, I am including it in the RECORD so that Members of Congress and other interested persons may have an opportunity to read it:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY MAJOR GENERAL VAN BRUNT AT THE FOURTH DIVISION REUNION, AUGUST 15, 1959, AT THE BENJAMIN FRANKLIN HOTEL, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

It is a real pleasure for me to have the opportunity to address this 41st annual reunion of the 4th Infantry Division Association. I am particularly pleased to share this occasion with you because I am proud of the Ivy Division, which I had the privilege to command a few short years ago. I know, too, that you are proud of the division because you have come to Philadelphia from all parts of the country for this annual get-together.

To me, the spirit of this gathering represents the spirit that has been a stimulating influence in the division from the time it was first organized in 1917 at Camp Greene in North Carolina. Your division, and mine, has performed meritorious service in combat for our country in World War I and World War II, and it has a fine record as a fighting outfit. For the past 12 years, it has been performing an equally important service to the Nation, and it continues to perform that service today as an element of the Strategic Army Corps.

As an example, I would like to tell you a little of the division's accomplishments during 1955 and 1956. Division headquarters was located in Frankfurt and the regiments were spread out through Butzbach, Friedburg, and

Gelnhausen. The engineer battalion was in Hanau, the tank battalion in Friedburg, and the artillery throughout the division sector. We had the job of manning an important sector of the 7th Army zone opposite the Fulda Gap, a critical avenue of approach from the east.

During this period our units distinguished themselves above all others in Germany through their esprit de corps which enabled them to succeed in every mission given them. The spirit of pride carried over into many fields.

Our division virtually walked away with top honors in every USAREUR sponsored athletic tournament. Our marksmanship teams led the list consistently and, gentlemen, this can only be attributed to an esprit which marks a division as a winner in peacetime or in war.

In the field of community relations, the regiments and battalions contributed much to the furthering of German-American friendship and cooperation which is so vitally important today in NATO. Each year at Christmas time, our units organized parties for orphanages where many hundreds of dollars were collected to buy German children gifts and food which otherwise could not have been provided to make the holiday memorable.

In times of civil disturbance such as is caused by fire or flood, the 4th Division was always prepared to aid a stricken community with engineer or medical assistance, and when it gyroscoped in 1956, the entire city of Frankfurt turned out to honor the Ivy Division. The mayor and his staff gave a reception and each unit was represented in a parade through the center of town.

You men who have experienced combat, and you men who are serving with the 4th Infantry Division, do not have to be told why the United States finds it necessary to maintain STRAC and the other Army Forces we have today. You know that the expansion of international communism is the principal threat to the peace of the world and to the national security of the United States. It is a threat that makes use of military strength to promote its political objectives, and it extends its influence over a large part of the globe.

We know that the Communist bloc, led by the Soviet Union, is willing to expend unlimited effort in men, money, and materials to maintain armed forces to support its objectives. These are the formidable forces that exist in the Soviet Union, in Red China, in North Korea and in some of the Communist satellite states. No less an authority than Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, who retired as Army Chief of Staff just 6 weeks ago, has given us an idea of the development of the Communist military forces. In his final report, he pointed out that the Soviet Union has concentrated on improving its armed forces in the last few years. It has spent large sums of money to reequip its army with all types of modern weapons for ground combat. These weapons include a wide variety of atomic missile delivery systems and large tactical air armies. In addition, the Soviet Union has developed a substantial submarine fleet, and it has established a long-range bomber force that could possibly try an attack on the United States.

Furthermore, the Soviet Union has made major developments in intercontinental missiles, and it has acquired a significant stockpile of nuclear weapons. With this development, the Soviet Union has acquired a roughly equal atomic parity with the free world that could only result in destruction of both sides in case a general atomic war should break out. At the same time, the Communist bloc continues to follow its technique of military and political aggression to achieve limited objectives. All this adds up to a dynamic military threat that requires

the free world to maintain armed forces as a deterrent to war.

The national policy for the deterrence of war has been fundamental in shaping the philosophy and actions of the Army. It is the Army's philosophy that our national deterrent forces operate at two integrated and concurrent levels of effort. One level of effort is directed at the deterrence of general atomic war. The other is intended to cope with the piecemeal type of aggression that could seriously affect our national position if it could not be successfully curtailed.

Those elements of the integrated deterrent to general war must have a range of capability that can make appropriate response to the nature of the threat. They must be so organized, equipped, trained, and deployed so that they can stand up under the first strike of an enemy and then strike back on centers of enemy power with a level of damage unacceptable to him. Of course, such a situation is not likely to occur except through miscalculation or blunder.

Those forces especially suited to deter limited war must be capable of rapid employment within a wide range of military operations. Such operations could vary in degree from small patrol actions to major combat operations of considerable duration and scope. These forces must have the ability for effective combat against limited war action before it can spread into a general atomic war. If deterrence should fail, despite all efforts, these forces must also be capable of reinforcing general war operations.

All the armed services have their respective roles and missions in this deterrent force. We have a powerful force which uses the strategic means of the Air Force and the Navy as visible evidence of our capability to destroy any aggressor who would start a general war. In turn, this striking force has a defensive counterpart in the air defense of the continental United States. Making up this defensive force are the interceptor aircraft of the Air Force and the Army's surface-to-air missile units with supplemental assistance from the Navy and our Canadian allies.

The third essential category of our deterrent forces is the land power we have deployed overseas. The Army is the principal element of this land power, which serves as a shield against Communist expansion on the ground. You all know that any enemy who wants to take control over free peoples will use his ground forces to move in and dominate the people. If we are to defend the free peoples, we, too, must have ground forces which can meet the aggressor's ground forces and defeat them. Their physical presence on the ground is much more effective than the threat of mass destruction weapons that may never be used.

In order to meet its responsibility in this area, the Army keeps forces deployed in strategic areas overseas. These forces serve a double purpose. They show our friends in the collective security system that we stand ready to assist them in defense against an aggressor. At the same time, our Army deployments overseas are a clear sign to any prospective enemies that we will hold firm against attack and that we will fight to keep the aggressor from seizing the land and the people we are obligated to defend.

At this point, I want to mention the splendid work being done by the Army for collective security aside from the Army's operational forces overseas. This is the work being done by our Army advisory groups and military missions in the 42 countries throughout the world. They are performing a vital service by helping our allies to develop their own military resources to the fullest extent. These Army groups and missions not only help the allied armies to expand their effectiveness, but they also make a contribution to a basic element of

government stability in allied countries. Stable governments which have capable and well-equipped armies are not open to successful attack by such Communist techniques as subversion, infiltration, or revolution.

Our overseas forces must have strategic mobile reserves to back them up if they should be attacked or to move quickly to other areas of the world that may be threatened by Communist aggression. The Army element of these reserves is the Strategic Army Force in the United States. It consists of units which provide a base for expansion in case of mobilization and which also supply trained unit and group replacements to support the Army forces we have deployed overseas. The combat-ready striking force of this strategic mobile reserve is the Strategic Army Corps, which consists of the 4th Infantry Division and two other divisions together with some combat and administrative support units.

Backing up these forces are the civilian components which the Army trains as a source from which it can draw qualified units and individuals to meet general war requirements or to replace STRAC units that might be called overseas in an emergency. These requirements are met by the Army National Guard and the United States Army Reserve. The primary emphasis throughout the Reserve Program is to attain increasing standards of quality. Considerable progress has been made in this area during the past two years. A major step in this progress is the reorganization of the reserve components to the pentomic concept, which was started early this year. This reorganization gives the reserves the same divisional structure as the active Army, and it seeks to modernize nondivisional reserve units to meet possible mobilization requirements.

Finally, in the fifth category of our deterrent strength are the air and naval forces which must have the capability to keep the air and sea lanes open for deployment and support of the other categories of forces in the event of war.

What I have told you shows that modern military operations are not restricted to any particular element. Instead, our deterrent military operations are an integrated team effort which employs the special capabilities of each of the services. As a member of this team, the Army has the overall mission of providing forces for prompt, sustained combat on land in any type of war. It also has the mission to furnish surface-to-air missile defense of the United States and our forces overseas.

In order to perform its share of the military mission with proper effectiveness, the Army must be as modern in its functional area as the other services. It must have maximum effectiveness in the essential areas of firepower, mobility and communications. If it is to be fully effective in these functions, the Army must first of all have modern weapons and equipment.

The Army's firepower must be versatile and it must have the range of capabilities to deal with those of the enemy which may be directed against it. Army weapons are intended to be used selectively and with discrimination against all types of targets. Weapons ranging from small arms to tactical missiles have been developed which would provide the Army with the ability to meet any degree of force desired or necessary to meet various conditions. However, some have not yet been put in the hands of troops while others are being produced slowly because of funding problems.

The second essential characteristic of a modern Army is mobility, which derives from modern weapons and equipment. Mobility is necessary, both for the protection of our own installations, and for getting the best results from our firepower potential. This mobility is present in our Army weapons, which have the built-in ability to oper-

ate in the field without elaborate installations or launching sites. They are precision weapons which can employ firepower exactly appropriate to the need, and their mobility enables one unit to do the job of several units.

The modern Army's mobility has strategic and tactical aspects. In the area of tactical mobility, it has various types of aircraft which make up Army aviation. These are an important new development in ground force operations. In the past, land forces were limited in their freedom of action by the barriers of the terrain. Now, with the considerable development in Army aircraft, we can look forward to the time when mountains and rivers and terrain features will no longer be obstacles to the Army in the performance of its ground combat mission.

With modern firepower and mobility, we must also have modern communications. The increased ranges and effectiveness of firepower, combined with increased mobility, would involve wide tactical dispersion on any modern battlefield. Consequently, the great dispersion of tactical forces increases the requirement for efficient, reliable and extensive communications. The increased range capabilities of our weapons require that our communications be equal to the job of locating targets at the greater distances our weapons can reach.

In line with firepower, mobility and communications, the modern Army must have adequate logistical support. This is a problem which must be met under modern conditions of extensive tactical dispersion and the complexity of modern weapons. If the Army is to be fully modern and effective, it must meet the specialized requirements of materiel and personnel, and it must overcome the increased danger to logistic operations that can be expected from nuclear weapons.

I have covered the more important requirements of the modern Army, but there is also the most important requirement of personnel. We have all sorts of modern weapons from missiles and rockets to airborne guns and tanks, but they cannot be any more effective than the men who operate them. Man still is the indispensable element who must use these modern weapons and operate this equipment. It is man who must meet the enemy on the ground, defeat or destroy him and occupy his territory before the victory can be a reality.

We all know from history that there have been times when groups of determined, dedicated and well-trained forces have won victories over much larger and much better equipped armies. In the present time, man is just as important in warfare despite all the advances of the nuclear and space age. In fact, he is more important than he ever was before in the history of war because he must be more equal to the challenge of the weapons and equipment he is given to use.

Problems of training Army manpower have increased tremendously as weapons have become more complex and as nuclear-age warfare has revised tactical concepts. A major problem is to find and keep the manpower which has the skills and aptitudes to handle the weapons of the modern army. There is a great need for the development of small unit leaders who are needed to command the type of units of modern warfare. The Army has made considerable progress in attracting, training and retaining the people on whom it must depend to discharge its responsibilities for national security. While the progress in this area has been gratifying, there must be continuing successful efforts to build and maintain a professional force, which is essential to a modern army.

While I stress the need for a highly trained professional force, I do not mean to overlook the need for Reserve component units to be so equipped, trained and organized that they

can take their places side by side with Active Army units after only a minimum of additional training. I can say that our Reserve components, both the National Guard and the Army Reserve, are doing very well and that they have achieved the highest state of readiness they have ever had in our peacetime history. In this respect, the Reserves fulfill their mission in the modern concept of one army which is united in its effort to serve the Nation to the utmost.

In summary, I want to emphasize that land power is an indispensable element of our national military strength and that it is increasing in importance despite nuclear-age weapons development. I also want to repeat that, if the Army is to be fully effective in modern warfare, it must be fully modern in its weapons, its equipment, its organization, its doctrine and its outlook.

The Army depends on the efforts of our civilian leaders and our patriotic organizations throughout the country to support its objectives. Many of our civilian leaders and organizations are doing an excellent job in this regard. One of these organizations is the Association of the United States Army which speaks with a single, strong voice on behalf of the Army and its proper role in our national defense. Every citizen owes it to himself to promote the interests of the Army, and I can think of no better way in which he can do so than to add his voice to the thousands of other friends of the Army who have joined forces in the AUSA. Coming together here is strong evidence of your continuing interest in the Army and representing as you do, the entire country, it is appropriate that I urge you, upon return to your homes, to give the Army your support through active participation and membership in the AUSA.

The Army has achieved significant success in meeting its requirements as a modern Army. It is modern in its outlook and in its thinking. It is modern in its doctrine, in its tactics, and in its organization. It is forward-looking and diligent in preparing itself for whatever it may be called upon to do for the country. The Army faces the future fully determined to perform its service to the Nation with the competence and energy that its essential role in the national defense team demands from it.

World Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to note the meeting of the second World Congress of the Sodality of Our Lady which was recently held in the Archdiocese of Newark. It was a significant and historic event—for here many thousands gathered to reaffirm their faith and dedication to the highest principles of Christianity.

Delegates to the World Congress have come from all over the world, and many of them have fled from countries behind the Iron Curtain. Their meeting serves as a poignant reminder that all the peoples of the Christian world must constantly be alerted and aware of the Communist danger. We must not permit ourselves to be deluded by Mr. Khrushchev's Communist sophistry. It is a tribute to the great ability and leader-

ship of the Episcopal host of the congress, Archbishop Thomas A. Boland, that it was marked with such acclaim and success.

I am privileged, Mr. Speaker, to insert the following editorial from the Newark Evening News in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WORLD CONGRESS

Catholic delegates from 24 countries, some of them exiles from behind the Iron Curtain, are gathered in the archdiocese of Newark for the second World Congress of the Sodality of Our Lady, with Archbishop Thomas A. Boland as Episcopal host.

Theirs is a movement designed, in the words of Pope John XXIII, to hasten the inevitable victories of the King of Peace, victories which are to be achieved by striving together to excel in virtue.

The chosen means are the invocation of faith, hope, and charity, the giving of thanks for benefits received, the offering to God of the labors of the day, and the seeking of forgiveness for transgressions.

The universality of the movement is reflected in the faces and voices of the delegates. The Pope's message had to be recorded in five languages. In a world where strength is falsely measured by arms and material possessions, the congress speaks for the greater power of the spirit, that force with which even the most potent of dictatorships must ultimately reckon.

Poison in Your Water—No. 159

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Little Rock (Ark.) Democrat of March 21, 1959, entitled "Biggest, Worst Drainage Channel":

BIGGEST, WORST DRAINAGE CHANNEL

Dumping of raw sewage into the Arkansas River doesn't cause serious problems now, said G. T. Kellogg, chief sanitary engineer of the State health department, but he warned that sewage treatment will be necessary when the river is converted into a commercial waterway.

Then, from Catoosa near Tulsa, down to the Mississippi, the Arkansas will be a chain of lakes. Raw sewage discharged into the pools between locks and dams would create sanitation hazards.

With regard to waste disposal, the river now is the biggest and worst drainage channel in Arkansas. On the river in our State, only Mulberry, Russellville, Morrilton, and Conway already have sewage treatment plants, and Little Rock is building one.

It is incongruous that the papermills at Pine Bluff treat their waste before discharging it into the river, yet the city which has made great industrial gains and hopes for more, has not got around to treating its sewage.

Desiltation units of the U.S. Corps of Engineers projects for the comprehensive development of the river will clear up the stream. Clean looking water will make the stream more desirable for recreation.

High salt content keeps Arkansas River water from being suitable for irrigation and industrial purposes. However, the U.S. Pub-

Health Service regional office at Dallas is working on that problem, along with a similar one in the Red River basin, and the day may come when waters of these two streams can be made great assets to agriculture and industry.

A Memo on Mismanagement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include herewith a reprint from the August 1959 issue of Armed Forces Management entitled "A Memo on Mismanagement," written by Leland B. Kuhre, director:

A MEMO ON MISMANAGEMENT

To: Armed Forces Management.
From: Leland B. Kuhre, director, Academy of Organizational Science.

Your May 1959 issue reads to me like the bewildered confession of an old craft admitting its shortcomings under the pressure of advancing new systems all around it. The articles on the mismanagement of time in the Army, the Navy's big reorganization debate, and the random flow of information in a naval ordnance test station—all tell the same story.

The ominous part is that such confessions continue to appear, unabashed, as they have appeared since the military was overtaken by the swift onrush of science, technology, and specialization after World War I. And the insidious thing is the fault-free attitude with which the confessions are made; they appear to have no chargeable responsibility because they are tacitly agreed to be "the nature of the beast."

Starting about the mid-19th century, craft has been steadily overtaken by system in all dynamic structures for using material energy. But, in collective human energy, the military is still using accumulated lore and the master-apprentice method of learning where the head of any collective is, ex officio, an acknowledged master craftsman. He often calls his maxims and proverbs principles even though each has its opposite; he calls his management scientific when the term is really limited to material-system accessories; and he calls his collectives organizations even though they do not contain the organic system which is implicit in the word.

The craft method for devising internal arrangements in a human effort collective has its earliest recorded model in Plato's 400 B.C. model, "one man writ large," and this is still the craft model today in different words, such as, "it's all a matter of leadership" and "there are no bad companies, only bad company commanders."

Leadership has always been the military starting point for internal arrangement in a collective of people. Leadership is a personal, and therefore, an unknowable and unpredictable thing. Its metaphorical referent acts are four: the whip, the carrot on a stick, personal magnetism, and the palliative. Leadership builds a network of personal tensions that is the so-called structure of the collective.

The network's stability is of the moment, and it has existence only in the minds of the people caught in it. As new functions evolve, they attach themselves at points in the network by evolution, by force of circumstance, or by personal attraction. The so-

called organization chart is formed with the rudimentary graphics of the craftsman, and it is limited to formalizing the authority of people over people. The chart cannot possibly, in its present stage, show how a network of personal tensions is supposed to work.

To try to systematize and control the flow of ideas in a network of personal tensions, and thereby really do something about the Army's self-confessed mismanagement of ideas—to do this has less chance of success than trying to systematize the flow of invisible electrons for a purpose in a spider's web.

Before internal-arrangement craftsmanship in collective human effort can become organizational engineering, and thus advance the military from dealing with the nature of the beast to dealing with system, we need a more solid starting point than leadership. We have to change the assumed relation of the force of personality to the force of impersonal ideas. We have to recognize the flow of ideas as the flow of energy which develops organizational power. Then, from a governing law of idea flow, the organizational engineer can design a stable dynamic structure as a purposive systematic whole; and ideas can be formed, dispatched, and transmitted to the point of application for developing needed organizational power.

In such a dynamic system, personality and personal relations become subordinate to impersonal ideas and are adjusted to them. The source of power in the system is, of course, the fully contributing, free mind of each and every individual—executive and administrative, managerial and supervisory, generalist and specialist, professional and scientific, clerical and artisan.

Shall we change a 4,000 years-of-record unbroken tradition of leadership as the thing about which the military revolves, and from which it is supposed to draw its power? Yes, a fundamental change, when man is capable of handling it, is a prerequisite for vitalizing a tired past into a fresh future; and we need, obviously, a burgeoning future progress to overtake the 50-year head start that technology already has over craftsmanship.

Let's answer that question with questions: Can we afford to continue with craftsmanship when the best it has done to date is to bring us to an almost 2-to-1 disadvantage with Russia in the time it takes for an idea to grow to actuality in research and development? If that isn't enough reason, can we afford the man-hours and the money it takes to indulge in the periodic and sweeping reorganizations that take place every 2 or 3 years in the Department of Defense, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force? And if that still isn't enough, think of the loss due to the inefficient use of manpower, money and material that must go on for a long time before a situation gets so bad that only a drastic, sweeping, and expensive reorganization can palliate it, and then only for a few years.

The choice is clear: Continue with leadership and we continue with craftlore, craftsmanship, master-apprentice-learning, and the kind of structures we get when a craftsman is trying to build something he can't visualize. On the other hand, start with ideas as governing and we can have systematized knowledge, organizational engineering, applied-theory learning, and the kind of structures we get when the engineer designs the skyscraper that the master craftsman could not even visualize, much less build.

Inconceivable? No, I speak from experience. While in the Army I tried the change from leadership to idea flow as governing, and, with the help and participation of thousands of people, worked out the organizational engineering in the proving ground of actual organizations. For 13 years, the predicted results came true, time after time. It can be done.

Cardinal Cushing Alerts Yankee Division to Reds' Cold War Tactics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include Cardinal Cushing's stirring address given at Camp Drum, N.Y., on August 16, 1959:

CARDINAL ALERTS YANKEE DIVISION TO REDS' COLD WAR TACTICS

During the past 75 years, warfare as we know it, has been revolutionized three separate times: First, by the machinegun, the trench, and the long-range artillery of World War I; second, by the 1,000-plane raid, the amphibious assault, and the armored spearhead of World War II; third, by the missiles, electronics, and nuclear weapons of today.

We are now embroiled in a third world war—although by past standards it is an unconventional, highly irregular, and undeclared type of war. It is called the cold war. In this unorthodox war, Reserve officers are on the forward edge of the battle area, while Regular officers, in a sense, are on the flanks.

SIX MEN

Because of six men, those trained in psychological warfare, or in any of the tactics of a cold war are on the frontline of defense; while many officers on full-time active duty are barred from some of the most violently contested sectors of the protracted conflict.

Thus the order of battle has been reversed. Who did it? Six men, none of them Americans.

Two Germans—Hitler and von Clausewitz; three Russians—Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev; and one Chinese—Mao Tse-tung.

Those six men have so revised the rules of warfare that a cold war can bring about victory whereas a war of bullets and bombs, thanks to scientific progress, could wipe out all the contestants.

Today, in the cold war that is worldwide in extent the masters of ideology, psychology, and every type of deceit are the shock troops in the only battles that may be fought in our lifetime. In the arena of economics, public opinion and the underground wars are now fought and won. If these wars are lost by citizen-soldiers, any shooting war will certainly be defaulted in advance to the enemy.

In the cold war the Communist leaders have forced us to believe that the traditional battlefield is only a small part of modern warfare. To them conflict between nations is not limited to an artillery duel, or a clash between naval vessels and aircraft. The struggle for power is waged in politics with propaganda, fifth column, intelligence agencies, intrigue, spies and ideological stockpiles.

SPECIALISTS

From this arsenal the battle is three-quarters over when the guns begin to fire. The truly modern military genius must labor to break his opponent's will to resist, or fight, in advance of any formal declaration of war. Communists try to frighten freemen into inaction and divide all sectors of society into hostile, suspicious groups who cannot stand together.

The masters of the Khrushchev style of warfare cloak their own preparations for conquest in peace offensives or tempting offers to expand trade. They practice subversion and economic infiltration so subtly that honorable men have difficulty in recognizing these threats as aggression.

For the Communists, the front is everywhere; anything goes; whatever advances their cause is legitimate—whatever obstructs it is false. That's the thinking behind the visit of Khrushchev to the United States. He has desired to come here for a long time to further the cause to which he is dedicated. The moral of all this, my friends, is the necessity of thousands of specialists trained in the techniques and methods, the thought and ideology that goes by the name of the cold war. Every foreign visitor of any rank who has come or will come to this country from behind the Iron Curtain is a master of deceit. He is by long and thorough training the best equipped soldier for a warfare of words and treachery and anything else short of the firing of atomic weapons. Hundreds of thousands of Communists in Russia, in the captive nations, in Africa and Asia, everywhere are mastering all the tricks, some of them diabolical, for success in this type of warfare. Their teachers have the know-how. In the Korean war our soldiers were seemingly helpless under their varied form of brainwashing.

It is for that reason that I have been advocating the teaching of communism with a moral directive, and why I urge you to know not only the weapons of a shooting war, but also those of the war in which we are now engaged; the cold war. If we continue to lose this cold war we will lose our Nation. We will be so softened by this enemy of our civilization that their military weapons could find us an easy prey for conquest. The preservation of this Republic must be our ambition and the objective of those worthy of public office and trust.

It is for civil leaders, experts in every lawful phase of propaganda and international leadership to take the initiative in this cold war. For them our greatest weapon is the truth. But they have failed to spread it. Our propaganda programs have been ineffective to say the least. We have lost the initiative. We must attain it.

It is for me to urge you to aspire to moral and spiritual leadership by following the pathway of virtue marked by the Laws of God. The one thing feared by the Communists is Religion. Let me urge those of the Christian faith to duplicate in their lives the life of Christ. A Christian should be a follower of, a double for Christ. Live in accord with the teachings and the precepts of the Gospel. Rich and poor—capital and labor, each one of us must do that and become free men in a nation under God. Otherwise we shall inevitably become slaves in a totalitarian state. Not until we live what we believe about God and His laws shall we assume moral leadership; not until then shall we give the multitudes behind the Iron curtain the hope and courage that they will never get from our boasted material power and wealth.

Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin-Khrushchev have made the Communist Man. Christ and His Gospel have made saints; the only ones who have conquered the world and every false ism that ever blighted the world. If we follow Christ and His teaching we will create a revolution more fundamental, constructive, and extensive than Communists ever contemplated. Communism is a revolution trying to change man from a creature of God with dignity a little less than the angels to a creature of the state with the status of a slave. Christianity is a revolution capable of elevating man to the image of the Creator.

As we face the future it is Christ or chaos. Freedom under God or survival under a slave state. Capitalism must reform itself under a program of charity and justice. Communism must go. Every good system must take the road chartered by the laws of nature and of God. It may take 1,000 years to reach the desired goal but let us begin. Man is hundreds of thousands of years old.

The Gospel is less than 2,000 years old. We are still in the sowing, the planting season. Let us sow the good seeds of justice and fraternal charity and stop cultivating by our apathy, our ignorance, our lack of security laws, our cultural exchanges, our red carpet invitations to murderers and liars, the sowers of evil seeds that will result in a harvest capable of destroying this great country and civilization as we know it.

Interesting Angles on the New Ohio Fair Trade Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter sent out by the American Fair Trade Council, Inc., questioning the constitutionality of the Harris fair trade bill, H.R. 1253. Some language in that communication, which is signed by Mr. John W. Anderson, reveals the very interesting fact that even staunch fair-traders question the constitutionality of H.R. 1253 in the following words:

Federal fair trade legislation as proposed in the Harris bill carries even more serious doubts as to its ability, if enacted, to withstand court tests as affecting intrastate transactions—comprising about 90 percent of all retail sales.

The letter follows:

INTERESTING ANGLES ON THE NEW OHIO FAIR TRADE ACT

AMERICAN FAIR TRADE COUNCIL, INC.,

Gary, Ind., August 18, 1959.

To All Members of and Contributors to American Fair Trade Council, Inc.:

Although the record indicates otherwise, some fair trade attorneys give hope that the new fair trade law in Ohio may be upheld when tested as to constitutionality by the courts of that State.

A new statute in Florida, with major substantive changes and a 7-point legislative "Findings of Fact," convinced fair-traders 10 years ago that the State supreme court's objections to previous fair trade legislation had been overcome. The Florida court considered the new statute—then reaffirmed its holding that fair trade legislation as applied to nonsigners was invalid.

Another part of the pattern was Georgia. After the State supreme court's ruling as to invalidity, fair-traders went back to the legislature and a new fair trade law was enacted—one that, in the opinion of most competent attorneys, answered each previous objection of the Georgia Supreme Court.

Hopes were short-lived. A quick court test followed and again the Georgia Supreme Court struck down the fair trade statute as applied to nonsigners. The Georgia Supreme Court said:

"It is argued that this court cannot hold the Georgia fair trade act unconstitutional without questioning the motives of the legislature and imputing dishonesty to that body. We reject this fallacious argument in its entirety. We simply disagree with the general assembly for the reasons pointed out in this opinion."

Obviously fair-traders should have believed Chief Justice Duckworth of the

Georgia Supreme Court. When the Georgia fair trade act was held invalid the first time, Chief Justice Duckworth rendered a nonjudicial opinion to the newspapers in which he was quoted as saying that each time the legislature passes a fair trade law the Georgia Supreme Court will hold it unconstitutional.

Thus fair-traders have been left with partially or wholly invalid legislation in Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oregon, South Carolina, Utah, and West Virginia. No fair trade legislation has been enacted in Alaska, Missouri, Texas, Vermont, or the District of Columbia.

In the light of language used by State supreme courts in decisions adverse to fair trade, experienced fair trade lawyers say they believe amendments to State constitutions would be necessary to perpetuate the State-by-State contract system of fair trade. Such amendments are regarded as virtually impossible to achieve.

Federal fair trade legislation as proposed in the Harris bill carries even more serious doubts as to its ability, if enacted, to withstand court tests as affecting intrastate transactions—comprising about 90 percent of all retail sales. Therefore, recent strong shifts—to the quality stabilization concept—in congressional opinion become more and more understandable. Such shifts are evidenced by increasing congressional resistance to the Harris bill.

Reports indicate a growing conviction in Congress that enactment, perhaps in the next session, of a quality stabilization bill, based upon the Madden bill, H.R. 3187, would end, once and for all, costly failures of fair trade litigation and legislation—at both State and National levels.

The State-by-State fair trade system unquestionably has added great strength to our national economy since the enactment of the first State fair trade law in 1931. Except for the ability of leaders of a single industry to dictate, to their particular taste, faulty provisions in Federal legislation affecting fair trade—the institution of fair trade might have grown stronger instead of weaker—over the years—greatly to the benefit of resellers, labor, and the public.

Fair trade proponents in Ohio were undaunted by the case histories of Florida and Georgia. A new fair trade bill was passed by the Ohio Legislature, then vetoed by the Governor. The legislature then overrode—most convincingly—the Governor's veto. Leading the fight for the new legislation which becomes effective October 22d of this year was the Ohio Small Business Committee, a diversified group of resellers.

Some lawyers point to the Ohio constitution itself for hope that the story of Florida and Georgia will not be repeated in Ohio and that the new Ohio statute will survive court tests. They look to article XIII, section 2, particularly the last sentence, of the Ohio constitution, which reads:

"Corporations may be formed under general laws; but all such laws may, from time to time, be altered or repealed. Corporations may be classified and there may be conferred upon proper boards, commissions or officers, such supervisory and regulatory powers over their organization, business and issue and sale of stocks and securities, and over the business and sale of the stocks and securities of foreign corporations and joint stock companies in this State, as may be prescribed by law. Laws may be passed regulating the sale and conveyance of other personal property whether owned by a corporation, joint stock company or individual."

Perhaps the language of the Ohio constitution emphasized in the quote does give a glimmer of hope in that State. Even so, in view of fair-traders' experience in Florida

and Georgia, the situation in Ohio appears, at best, unique.

Cordially,

JNO. W. ANDERSON,
President.

P.S.—Enactment of quality stabilization legislation by Congress, as provided in the Madden bill, H.R. 3187, would avoid all uncertainties as to the validity of State laws. Quality stabilization legislation would also avoid the grave uncertainties of a Federal Fair Trade Act based upon the Harris bill, H.R. 1253. Federal quality stabilization legislation, in the opinion of outstanding leaders of diversified industries, offers the only clear and permanent solution of the problem of price stabilization for top value trademarked quality products, not only for Ohio but also for all other States, including States now with disabled fair trade legislation and States with no fair trade legislation.

Hatred, Revenge Cannot Win

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following communication with our enemies may not lead to peace—but lack of communication certainly cannot lead to peace.

Many of our colleagues and other citizens outside of Congress are deploring the President's exchange of visits with Khrushchev. They interpret this as softness either of the heart or the head or both. It is neither. It is common-sense.

This point is well made in an editorial "Hatred, Revenge Cannot Win," which appeared in the Oregon Journal, August 17, 1959, included here by unanimous consent previously granted:

HATRED, REVENGE CANNOT WIN

An elderly, white-haired gentleman of Polish extraction visited our office the other day.

His faded blue eyes could not hide the depth of his feeling against the Russian beasts who enslaved his fatherland and murdered countless numbers of his former countrymen and against Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev, the symbol of aggression and brutality.

In broken English, he related details of mistreatment and enslavement suffered by members of his own family.

Yet his manner was gentle, and his words did not speak of revenge. They appealed rather for some kind of settlement between East and West on the basis of peaceful negotiation. His purpose in coming, he said, was to ask us to write something in approval of the manner in which Vice President Nixon conducted himself in Russia and Poland, and he expressed hope that visits of this kind would have some real influence for good on the Russian people and Russian leadership.

While not overjoyed at the prospect of Khrushchev's visit to the United States, he nevertheless thinks the Soviet Premier ought to be shown common courtesies and ought not to be subjected to ugly incidents. He expressed the hope that Polish-Americans, whatever their feelings, would not create them.

His visit was followed by a telephone call from a man who had come to America from

one of the Baltic States with vivid memories of the brutal crushing of those tiny nations. His tone was harsh and bitter. He spoke resentfully of Nixon's performance and of the plan to have "that murderer" Khrushchev come to America. He implied that U.S. leaders have lost their senses in even talking to that man. He hinted that the hatred which millions in this country feel for Khrushchev would find ugly expression when he comes here.

The bitterness which all these people hold is understandable. But if their hope for ultimate redress lies in the violent removal of the Russian oppressors from their fatherlands, they are on the wrong path, for in this kind of upheaval, the civilized world would be destroyed, and nobody would win.

To be willing to talk to the Russians is not to surrender to them or to accept as a permanent condition their occupation of the lands we have mentioned. U.S. policy is based on the hope that gradual changes will come within Russia itself which can lead to freedom for these peoples, not that perfect justice for all past wrongs can ever be won. In this most imperfect of worlds there is no such thing as perfect justice.

The elderly Polish gentleman has thought this matter through a little better than some of the others. Time and wisdom have given him a philosophy which tempers hatred and the thirst for revenge. These passions by themselves are poor answers in an age of nuclear weapons.

John A. Burns, of Hawaii, Great Statesman and Good Friend

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, our association with the Delegate from Hawaii over the years has been warm and pleasant, and it is with sadness that we bid him farewell. I have high hopes, however, that his absence from the Halls of Congress will be only temporary, and that we soon will welcome him back as a member of the legislative branch—the next time with a right to vote as well as to speak.

While JOHN BURNS served in this House as Delegate, he could not vote. Yet no man did more than JOHN BURNS to bring into reality those statehood dreams of Alaska and Hawaii. Had it not been for the energy, the dedication, the statesmanship, and the facing of political realities by JOHN BURNS, it is quite likely that neither the people of Hawaii or Alaska would now have gained their deserved status as first-class citizens of the United States. That the 48 States are now 50 will forever stand as a tribute to JOHN BURNS.

As I extend my warmest wishes and the best of good fortune to JOHN BURNS, I want also to welcome with all my heart the first Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Hawaii, DANIEL INOUYE. We know his great record of service to the United States and to Hawaii, and that he will continue this fine record in the House of Representatives.

America's Greatest Fishing Hole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, Center Hill Lake, a Corps of Engineers reservoir, on the Cumberland River, in the district I have the honor to represent, has acquired a national reputation for the number and size of the fish it has yielded to fishermen from every part of the country. When, on occasions, I have mentioned some of the experiences of fishermen at Center Hill Lake, my remarks and fishing stories are sometimes suspect. As evidence of their truthfulness, however, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to the article in This Week magazine for August 2, 1959, entitled, "America's Greatest Fishing Hole." This article points out that Center Hill fishermen do not need to lapse into the traditional exaggerations of angling—the article gives the literal truth about fishing in Tennessee. I ask unanimous consent to have this article inserted in the Appendix of the Record. The article follows:

AMERICA'S GREATEST FISHING HOLE—50 TONS OF FISH IN 30 DAYS—THAT'S NO FISH STORY (By Robert G. Dunderfer)

CENTER HILL, TENN.—Not long ago a Tennessee doctor traveling through northern Wisconsin came upon a jubilant fisherman loaded down with a string of 2- and 3-pound bass. It was the sort of catch you like to talk about—with pictures. And yet the visiting physician was impressed not at all. "Doesn't seem right to break up a family by hooking only the babies," he said. "Why, down home around Center Hill we use these little fellows for bait."

The doctor was kidding—but not much. He was talking about Center Hill Reservoir, a great sprawling Government waterway of 23,060 acres, puckered with draws, coves, and rocky inlets. It is the consensus of experts that this is America's greatest fishing hole.

DEEP-SEA FISHING IN A FRESH-WATER LAKE

As anyone who ever developed a backache pulling whoppers out of Center Hill knows, it comes by that reputation honestly. The deep-dredged Tennessee lake yields practically everything. Inventory figures show small-mouth, large-mouth, and spotted bass. The crappie, bluegill, sunfish, sauger, and walleyes are beyond any number, not to mention the muskellunge, brook, brown, and rainbow trout from the feeder streams.

Men, women, and children by the thousands fish the great bulge on the Caney Fork River with everything from flyrods to bows and arrows. What's more, the few hardy sports who bring out deep-sea tackle have just cause. The supply of giant catfish, red horse, carp, buffalo fish, alligator gar, sturgeon, and paddlefish produces an occasional 150-pounder.

Under the circumstances, it isn't surprising that visitors to Center Hill rarely lapse into the traditional exaggerations of angling. The literal truth is hard to improve upon.

Despite those awesome credentials, any number of America's 20 million fishermen have their own favorite spots. Dozens of prize-winning lunkers have come out of neighboring Dale Hollow Lake, the Eagle River country in Wisconsin, Maine's picturesque Rangeley Lakes, the White River

washing through the Missouri Ozarks—just to mention a few.

But with authorities who know dorsal fins best it's Center Hill by 2 to 1. "There isn't any doubt about it," says Tackle Manufacturer Billy Burns, dubbed America's best fisherman by several outdoor magazines. "Center Hill offers more big buster fish of different kinds than any lake in the country."

Bill Padgett, of Paris, Ky.; Shorty Groom, of Nashville; James Long, of Cincinnati; Bob Dykes, of suburban Chicago; and countless others echo that testimonial. Why shouldn't they? What other lake has yielded 50 tons of assorted game fish during an official 30-day audit?

ALL THE LAW ALLOWS

A skillful Carlisle, Ky., addict named Stanley Feedback recognizes the staggering potential of Center Hill. One afternoon last year he started casting a feathered 4-B pork-rind combination toward a rocky ledge along shore. He hadn't spun the reel long before the rod quivered furiously. Up boiled an angry bass, husky as a fullback, spraying water, walking on its tail, flashing in the sun. Moments later Feedback scooped his first fish into the net.

At dusk he returned to Hurricane Dock near Silver Point with 10 whopping bass, all the law allowed. But in spite of his enormous haul, Feedback wasn't happy. His grumpy irritation casts a revealing light on the bonanza at Center Hill. What upset him was the fact that his biggest fish didn't scale much more than 9 pounds.

Plainly, hippy old bass, the dimensions of a man's daydreams, are fairly easy to come by in Center Hill. Young Jim Sarvis, of Cincinnati, established a "believe it or not" of some sort in June of 1957 when he took 10 large bronzebacks in 35 minutes. And a dock owner, intrigued by volume, counted 621 bass between 7 and 11 pounds brought into his pier one season.

The glandular cases aren't confined only to bass. Succulent, sweet-tasting crappie and bluegill grow to outrageous sizes—2, sometimes even 2½ pounds. In Pine Creek and in the tailwaters below the hydroelectric dam anglers hook 5-pound rainbow trout without causing any public demonstrations. The walleyes average 8 pounds, topped by a magnificent 21¼ pounder, an American record at the time.

Catfish—well, it's like this: One misty morning in April, Bill Duke of Silver Point was hauling in his trotline, shucking catfish and bluegills off the hooks. All of a sudden a monstrous thrashing shook the line. For 30 minutes Duke and his partner tugged and strained before a vast flatheaded, whiskered fish turned in the water. Even Duke said the 103-pounder was a fairly respectable catfish.

The secret of all that size and plenty is easily explained. The deep, cold water simply offers an ideal combination of what fish need—good oxygen supplies at various depths, limitless quantities of plankton and soft, bony gizzard shad. Besides, little pollution or erosion muddies the waters at Center Hill.

THE FISH DIE OF OLD AGE

As yet the pressure of heavy year-round fishing and generous daily limits haven't had any effect. The fish are still there waiting to be caught. Just a few weeks ago an experienced Center Hill angler named Ben Winecke, of Columbus, Ohio, hooked a 10-pound bass. What is the cause of all this plenty? It just seems to be that the fish keep right on breeding at a dizzy rate. After studying tables of harvest, a TVA ichthyologist remarked, "We are forced to conclude that most of the fish never sample an angler's lure, but die of old age."

Not enough of them die of old age as far as the resident wardens are concerned.

While wardens in other parts of America get sore arms writing tickets for offenders who take undersized fish, the usual violations at Center Hill show an oddly different picture.

"Too many people get so excited they forget how to count, or so it seems," one young warden told me. "Then we have to go around and pick them up for exceeding the daily limits."

Progress Toward Weather Modification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the honor of acting as moderator of a panel of outstanding scientists and experts who discussed "Weather Modification and Space Exploration" at the 46th annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, meeting here in Washington.

I consider the information provided by the three speakers so important and timely that I would like to make summaries of their remarks more generally available.

One of these papers is presented herewith. It summarizes the address of Dr. Richard W. Porter, chairman of the technical panel of the earth satellite program for the International Geophysical Year.

Dr. Porter's summary follows:

INTRODUCTION

A first step toward the exploration of space has now been taken by mankind in the form of high altitude sounding rockets which carry his instruments well beyond the earth's atmosphere for brief periods of time, and earth satellites which can sustain instrumentation packages at distances all the way from the upper fringes of the ionosphere out to many times the earth's radius. One of the major scientific achievements during the International Geophysical Year, which could not have been accomplished without the use of rockets or satellites, was the discovery of the presence of intense zones of radiation in the vicinity of the earth which consist of rapidly moving charged particles, trapped in the earth's magnetic field. This type of radiation is sometimes referred to as Van Allen radiation after Dr. James Van Allen, of the State University of Iowa, under whose direction the instruments carried by the first U.S. satellite were designed and constructed, and who first provided the correct interpretation of the rather startling measurements transmitted back. Rocket and satellite experiments made during the International Geophysical Year also provided additional data concerning the meteoric dust which pours into the earth's atmosphere by the thousands of tons per year. They made possible significant refinements of our knowledge and understanding of the ionosphere and the fluctuations of the earth's magnetic field and especially of their relationship to the great solar disturbances which occurred frequently during the International Geophysical Year, and they contributed to a better understanding of the interrelation of all these effects with variations in the intensity of cosmic rays, best described as "stripped down," "hot rod" atomic nuclei that seemed to come mostly from the very deep reaches of space outside our galaxy.

A Russian satellite apparently demonstrated the ability of highly organized forms of life, such as a dog, to endure and function effectively for long periods of time without the normal acceleration of gravity. The rather crude space probes successfully launched by both the United States of America and the U.S.S.R. during this period proved our ability to escape the earth's gravitational field and yielded invaluable knowledge about the radiation environment and the magnetic field at greater distances from the earth.

Important though these results may be, the rocket and satellite experiments conducted during the international geophysical year are only a beginning. Plans for the next few years will carry the work much further, and it is difficult to talk about the decade ahead without sounding like science fiction. It is my intention today, however, to limit my remarks to the existing and potential use of earth satellites for scientific experiments in the fields of geodesy and meteorology.

GEODESY

Geodesy is primarily concerned with measuring the size and shape of the earth and deducing from these parameters some facts about the physical structure of the earth. One could theoretically achieve these objectives by carrying out a high precision survey connecting selected points all over the earth's surface. If it could actually be carried out, this process would result in a map of the earth's surface as a many faceted polygon, approximating a spherical figure. The points of the figure, of course, would not be at the same level.

The first complication of geodesy is introduced by this word "level." It implies the existence of a reference figure whose surface is all "at the same level," that is, one which is everywhere perpendicular to the combined force of gravity and the centrifugal force arising from the earth's rotation. Two prominent geodesists, Heiskanen and Melnes, in their book "The Earth and Its Gravity Field," divided the history of geodesy into three periods according to the shape of the reference figure in current use. The first period was the spherical era dating from around the third century BC. The second or ellipsoidal era began with Newton and merged finally with the third or geoidal era of this century.

The geoid is defined as the equipotential surface of the earth's gravitational field at sea level. It is a somewhat wavy or bumpy surface that approximates a mean ellipsoid, the deviation from it being not more than 50 meters upward or downward. For convenience, the location of the geoid is specified by its height above or below the ellipsoid as a function of spherical coordinates. Although the geoid is simple in concept, and although you can actually see it at the seashore, it is quite another matter to tell its actual location with respect to the ellipsoid, or any other standard coordinate system in midocean where there are no triangulation points, or to trace its position under the surface of continents.

Among the principal problems of geodesy to which the use of earth satellites can contribute are the following:

1. The tying together of widely separated geodetic datums.
2. Fixing of the various datums with respect to the gravitational center of the earth.
3. Determination of the shape and size of the earth.
4. Determination of the gravity field of the earth both broadly and in detail.

Perhaps the most straightforward way in which satellites may be used is as a moving triangulation point whose coordinates with respect to each separate geodetic datum may be observed more or less simultaneously. It should be noted perhaps that high alti-

tude rockets can also be used for this purpose, and also have a slight advantage in that they do not move so rapidly, with respect to the earth's surface. However, a single satellite may be used for many repeated observations, thus improving the precision of the observations to any desired extent, whereas the rocket can be used at best for only a small number of observations. A satellite can be observed and photographed against a star background during twilight periods, as was done during the IGY, or it can carry a suitably instrumented flashing light, as had been suggested by a number of people, which will aid in identifying corresponding observations and have the obvious additional advantage that it can be observed at any time during the night. The addition of some sort of precise radar ranging system would, of course, greatly strengthen the fixing of the three dimensional position of a satellite by methods which essentially amount to trilateration.

By an extension of these methods it should be possible to determine the displacement of the geoid from the reference ellipsoid at any desired spot on the earth's surface. This could be accomplished, at least theoretically, by determining the space coordinates of a ground station by precise observations, or back sights, of a satellite whose position is precisely known in a coordinate system defined by a minimum of three standard stations. If the field station is also connected by a geodetic net and precise leveling to the same three standard stations, then its known geodetic coordinates can be compared with its space coordinates to yield the desired transformation from the ellipsoid to the geoid. This procedure will, of course, demand observations of the highest possible accuracy inasmuch as the geoid height is only a few tens of meters at most.

One of the most effective ways in which an earth satellite can be used in geodesy is by careful observation of the perturbations of its orbit. If the effect of the earth's atmosphere can be eliminated, either by selecting an orbit far enough away from the earth to make the effects negligible or by applying appropriate corrections, and the gravitational influences of the sun, moon, and other planets are either corrected for or found to be negligible, it is possible to derive exact mathematical relationships between the motion of the satellite and the earth's gravitational field expressed in spherical harmonics. Thus by careful measurements of a satellite orbit, it is possible to determine the deviation of the geoid from a sphere. This procedure has actually been carried out using the tiny Vanguard test sphere known as 1958 Beta or Vanguard I. One of the startling results of this analysis is the discovery of a third zonal harmonic in the earth's gravitational field having an amplitude on the order of .0047 cm/sec². This gravity variation implies some 15 meters of undulation in the geoid, or mean sea level shape of the earth, in the form of a 15-meter rise at the North Pole, 15 meters of additional flattening at the South Pole and flattening on the order of 7½ meters in the middle latitudes of the Northern Hemisphere balanced by an equivalent bulging in the middle latitudes of the Southern Hemisphere. Thus the shape has been referred to in the newspapers as somewhat resembling that of a pear.

This finding is in conflict with the basic hypothesis of geodesy of Helmskenen and Menesiez which assumes that the earth's gravitational field closely approximates that of a fluid in equilibrium and the deviation from such an ellipsoid may not exceed .0030 cm/sec² over an area 1,000 kilometers on a side, a number sometimes referred to as 30 milligals per square megameter. According to 1958 Beta, however, each of the polar areas has a deviation of about 120 milligals per

square megameter and each of the equatorial belts deviate more than twice as great. Hence there must be a very substantial force acting on the surface of the earth which would create stresses down to the core of the earth, which implies that the core is solid rather than liquid, or alternatively requires the assumption of stresses in the crust and mantle beyond the mechanical strength this material is usually assumed to have. Another alternative explanation might be large-scale convection currents in the interior of the earth. In any case, I think you will agree that the geodetic value of this minimum satellite has been very great indeed.

METEOROLOGY

Meteorology is one of the more important branches of applied science. It involves the application of knowledge and understanding of the fluid dynamics, thermodynamics and chemistry of the earth's atmosphere to the prediction and eventual control of weather and the climate. The end result to most of us is, of course, weather analysis and forecasting. But progress in the accuracy, dependability and span of forecasts will depend on our ability to extend our knowledge and understanding of all of the processes which go on in the atmosphere. This will require scientific work of the most basic kind.

It might be well to remember that meteorological observations were first plotted on a map for the purpose of obtaining a synoptic picture of weather events only a little more than a century ago. These first weather charts covered an area of only a few thousand square miles. Although the charts were gradually expanded to cover many land areas and oceanic shipping routes, they still cover only a small portion of the earth's surface and until recently failed to depict what was happening above the surface except as it could be deduced from clouds and precipitation. The introduction of balloon-borne, radiosonde equipment has extended the upward reach of the meteorologist; however this marked upward thrust has not been accompanied by a similar expansion laterally into the vast island-free oceanic areas, except along principal airplane and shipping routes. Thus even today somewhat less than one-fifth of the total atmospheric mass is adequately probed by conventional meteorological sounding techniques, so that large storms can reside undetected for days in oceanic areas, deserts, or polar regions.

With a proper distribution of meteorological satellites orbiting about the earth and looking downward at the cloud pattern, it should be possible to keep track of each major storm on earth, to note the birth of new storms, and the death of old ones. Furthermore, such cloud observations from satellites will be valuable in meteorological research after they have fulfilled their immediate function in forecasting. For example, they can be used to establish a truly global cloud census for the first time, and to prepare average charts of world cloud cover for studying long-time variations in amount and distribution. No less important will be the contribution of earth satellites to basic knowledge of atmospheric physics, for example, through the measurement of global distribution of net radiant energy absorbed and emitted by the earth-atmosphere system. The effects we know as weather result from winds that are attempting to equalize the nonuniform distribution of energy received from the sun or radiated back into space. It is highly important, therefore, to keep an accurate account of the global distribution of this basic radiant energy which drives the atmospheric heat engine. As our understanding of the way this engine operates is improved it may be possible to formulate a new system of long-range forecasting based on the availability of such information. For example, it is known that Poleward transport of excess energy from the Tropics can vary considerably. When meridional energy flow persists

it gives rise to prolonged spells of the same general weather type, such as fair weather, drought, floods, or storms, depending on the location of the stalled weather pattern with respect to a particular geographical region. Thus radiation balance measurements from a satellite, by enabling meteorologists to note the space and time variations in energy storage and transport, will provide an opportunity for a new quantitative approach to extended weather prediction.

Other types of satellite measurements of immediate importance in meteorology will include:

(a) Radiation measurements in the infrared spectral window in the vicinity of 8 to 11 microns (water vapor) to yield surface temperature and extent of nocturnal clouds.

(b) Measurements of water vapor emission in the 6 to 7 micron region to yield temperature of upper levels of the troposphere.

(c) Frequency of lightning discharges at various portions of the earth's surface.

(d) Radar measurements of precipitation, atmospheric turbidity, and the like, and

(e) Observation of unusual solar radiations, energetic particles, or meteoric dust from space which may be correlated with unusual weather behavior.

The very elementary meteorological satellites were included in our plans for the U.S. IGY satellite program. The first of these, actually launched on February 17, 1959, contained two infrared sensitive photocells looking out from opposite sides of the satellite at an angle of 45° with spin axis. The primary objective of this experiment was to record the distribution of cloud cover over the daylight portion of the sphere's orbit. It was expected that the spinning motion of the satellite would enable the field of view of each photocell to scan a narrow path from horizon to horizon on the earth below. As the satellite progressed in its orbit these paths were expected to be traced side by side in such a way that during one complete orbit the two photocells together would view a belt from 1,600 to 100 miles wide on the surface of the earth below. The output of the photocells was stored on magnetic tape in the satellite for a period equivalent to one complete orbit and telemetered in compressed form as the satellite passed over an interrogation station. A special device was constructed to translate this telemetered information into continuous strips of film which could be fitted together in the manner of an aerial photograph. Unfortunately, as a result of unanticipated dynamic effects associated with the separation of the satellite from the third stage booster rocket, the satellite acquired a motion drastically different from that expected. Thus, although the satellite went into the orbit successfully and telemetered data were recovered, it is now extremely difficult to derive meaningful cloud pictures from the recorded signals. Work is still progressing on this data reduction but it is not certain at present whether satisfactory results can be achieved.

The second IGY meteorological satellite is intended to measure the three significant components of radiant energy seen by the satellite, namely, the total radiation received from the sun, the radiation reflected from clouds and the earth's surface, and the energy which has been absorbed and reradiated as longwave length thermal energy from the earth and its atmosphere. These measurements are made by recording the temperatures of four small spheres placed at the ends of the four satellite antennas. Different coatings and radiation shields make it possible to determine the three components of radiant energy from these four temperature measurements with 1° of redundancy. This satellite should be launched by the NASA in the very near future. We hope for its success.

A third and post-IGY meteorological satellite known as Tiros will carry two television cameras and several infrared sensors in one

package. One of the cameras will cover a path of about 800 miles wide and several thousand miles long with a ground resolution of approximately 2.5 miles. Another camera with a smaller field of view will simultaneously photograph the centers of the larger photographs with a higher degree of resolution. The infrared sensors are designed to measure the infrared radiation from the earth, the total albedo of the earth, water vapor emission in the 6.3 micron belt, and temperature at the earth's surface or at the top of dense clouds by measurements in the water-vapor spectrum "window."

The ultimate meteorological satellite system might include as many as six polar satellites in circular orbits 4,000 miles high and oriented 60° apart. These satellites would be synchronized in such a way that three of them would be moving northward at the same time that the other three were moving southward on the opposite side of the earth. With such a system, no important cloud cover may remain unobserved for more than about 1 hour. In order to obtain more details of fine structure for identification of smaller weather systems, such as fronts, squall lines, thunderstorms or even winds (by tracking the motion of identifiable cloud elements), it might also be desirable to add one or more low-flying satellites at say 600 miles altitude in an equatorial orbit. One such satellite could observe the earth's surface along a belt 30° to 45° in width centered around the equator.

These are but a few examples of the new horizons in meteorology and in meteorological research which will be opened up by the availability of satellite data. The great flow of data which will pour forth from even a small number of satellites will pose many additional problems in communication, data reduction and interpretation, which have not yet received adequate attention. However, it is expected that the satellites themselves will contribute to the overcoming of our limitations in communication capability and the advent of high speed electronic digital computers are making possible the reduction of data in quantities and at speeds heretofore undreamed of.

CONCLUSION

It might well be asked why space vehicles should be used to study the Earth; one might expect perhaps that space research would more probably be directed toward the planets or the stars. However, at the present state of our technology it seems to be easier for us to send our instruments far out into space than it is to penetrate deep into the crust of the Earth. Therefore, if we want to learn more about the inside of the Earth, paradoxically, we must send our instruments out in a satellite in order to gain the synoptic information about the Earth's gravitational field from which we can deduce what we would like to know about the interior of the Earth. Furthermore it is apparent that the disturbances of the Earth's atmosphere which we call weather are caused by external effects, primarily the radiant energy from the Sun. What better means could we find for measuring these external effects on a synoptic basis than the Earth satellite? In fact, as we look more closely, it appears that most of the questions posed by space science affect the Earth and its inhabitants in an important way. A few such questions are: How old is the Earth, the Sun, the galaxy, the universe? How were they created? What is happening to them? Is there other life in the universe? How did life come into being? I think you will agree that scientific explorations into space, like those into the nucleus of the atom are not only of interest or concern to a few scientists, engineers, or military experts, but rather to all of us who live on Earth because they can so profoundly affect our lives and our thinking.

The Specific Issue at Stake in the Sullivan Amendment—Comment on Washington Post Editorial on Food Stamp Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post carried an editorial today under the heading "Surpluses for the Hungry" discussing the food stamp amendment which I submitted here last Thursday to the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, known as Public Law 480, governing the disposal of surplus food here and overseas. While endorsing generally the idea of getting more of our huge surplus of farm produce to the needy in our own country, the Post raises some questions about my amendment which I am glad to try to answer, and which I think should be answered.

Otherwise, in view of the prestige of the Washington Post and its reputation for fairness, accuracy, and humanitarianism, many of the Members of the Congress who voted for my food stamp amendment last week may begin to wonder whether it was they rather than the editorial writer of the Post who misunderstood what it was we were voting for.

COMMITTEE REPORT COVERED ALL CRITICISMS

All of the reservations about the bill made in the editorial, particularly those quoting opponents on the Republican side, were, I thought, fully answered in the debate which preceded passage of the bill, as well as having been answered thoroughly, I thought, in the report of the House Committee on Agriculture on H.R. 1359, the bill which I added to the surplus disposal bill as an amendment. The committee views are stated in House Report 907.

Taking the statements in the editorial one by one in order, however, might be a good way to set the record straight. The editorial starts out as follows:

SURPLUSES FOR THE HUNGRY

It is easy to see why the House added to the surplus disposal bill the amendment by Congresswoman SULLIVAN authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to set up a food-stamp plan for distribution of surplus commodities to needy families in this country. There is a strong sentiment in Congress behind the use of crops that bulge Government warehouses to help friends abroad. Along with this goes a general feeling that surplus food should also be going into empty stomachs in this country. So the House voted by a large majority to let the Secretary of Agriculture distribute such food, preferably through commercial channels, along with stamps that would entitle needy persons to obtain the food, up to the value of a billion dollars a year.

We think the general principle on which the House acted is unquestionably sound. So long as there are hungry people in the United States, surplus food held by the Government ought to be used to relieve them. It would be strange, indeed, to subsidize the shipment of unneeded farm crops

abroad to relieve hunger and deny similar relief to American people. But that is not the specific issue at stake in the Sullivan amendment.

FOREIGN DONATIONS OF FOOD FAR EXCEED DOMESTIC

Mr. Speaker, I interrupt the editorial at that point to say that it is exactly that fact which is and was a specific issue at stake in the Sullivan amendment. We have spent over \$5 billion since 1954 in gifts and "sales" of food to nations overseas whereas in the same 5-year period the total of all domestic donations of food—including the school lunch program and food given to State institutions, and so forth, as well as the total value of all food given to needy persons—has come to less than one-tenth of the value of the food given away or "sold" abroad.

I place the words "sales" and "sold" in quotation marks because, as we all know, foreign "sales" under title I of Public Law 480 are sales for foreign currency which is then given or lent back to the country "buying" the food.

To be scrupulously fair about donations as opposed to "sales," the record shows that the Federal Government spent \$1,232,419,000 on outright donations of food to the peoples of other countries under title III of Public Law 480 in the 5-year period, and an additional \$546,130,000 under title II—famine and similar emergency relief—and in the process we spent \$100 million on ocean freight charges alone. This was to help feed the needy of other countries—a very worthwhile cause. But in that same period, of 5 years, we have given away only about \$400 million worth of food to all recipients in this country—and the preponderant share of that went to the school lunch program.

In the 1958 fiscal year, \$272 million worth of food was given to needy persons overseas, and \$75 million was given to needy persons in this country, outside of the school lunch program. They received \$76 million worth of surplus food. State institutions received another \$33 million. Obviously, therefore, we have not done, and are not doing, enough to help our own needy, compared to what we are doing for those of other countries. The record shows it. This, therefore, was very definitely one of the specific issues at stake in the Sullivan amendment and one of the reasons why 232 Members of the House voted for it.

Now, to continue with the Washington Post editorial, Mr. Speaker, it said:

Representative LAMB pointed out that 20 million school children and needy persons, in this country, are already benefiting from Federal surplus food. The Government packages food and ships it to the States free of charge, leaving the distribution to local agencies. According to Congresswoman MAY, the Sullivan amendment would do nothing more than relieve the States of the expense of distributing these surplus foods.

REACHING THE NEEDY ON PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Mr. Speaker, to say that we do not need any expansion of the surplus food distribution program in this country because 20 million school children and needy persons are receiving some of the food now is to lump more than 14 million school children into the category of

"needy." This figure includes all the children now participating in the Federal school lunch program. Many of them are indeed from needy families. As the Washington Post's own Eve Edstrom pointed out in her series of articles on hungry children in the District of Columbia, a school lunch would be the only hot and nourishing food some children would get. But most school children participating in the school lunch program in the Washington area or in any other area of the country are not hungry children from substandard homes.

Furthermore, out of the 5 million or so needy people now receiving surplus food under the Department of Agriculture program now in effect, the preponderance are not people on public assistance, but are workers temporarily unemployed in the hard-hit distressed areas. They and their families need the help of this surplus food, that I do not dispute. But less than half of those receiving food are the people on public assistance for whom the food stamp plan is most necessary. Furthermore, the 2½ million people on public assistance who now receive surplus food, usually because they live in the distressed areas, make up only about one-third of the total of Americans on various forms of public assistance. As I pointed out in the debate, if you are on public assistance, you can be just as hungry in a city which has low unemployment as in one which has unemployment of a high enough level to justify the expenditure of large amounts of local funds for surplus food distribution.

LOCAL DISTRIBUTION COSTLY AND INEFFICIENT

The food stamp plan would not only save these huge and burdensome local costs—so high as to prevent about two-thirds of the Nation's counties from participating—but would also allow for a more orderly method of distributing the food through the stores, rather than on a once-a-month basis at some central depot. And the Federal Government, in utilizing the regular stores in this plan, could save many hundreds of thousands of dollars in packaging and processing and storing the commodities and shutting these surplus foods around the country.

Primarily, however, we would get away from this grim spectacle of poor old people once a month being called to line up at a central depot for a great big package of dried and powdered food items for them to lug home however they can. A food stamp plan operating through the stores would permit them to obtain food items as needed, weekly or oftener, and in fresh rather than powdered form.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post editorial then adds:

One other factor has been emphasized by Secretary Benson. The Commodity Credit Corporation, he says, is not a giant supermarket. More than 85 percent of its surpluses consist of corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco. Since the CCC could distribute only surplus crops, obviously it could not provide a well-rounded diet. It is not clear how much actually would be gained by a food stamp plan to make the products of a few surplus commodities available in commercial stores.

NOT JUST STORABLE BASIC COMMODITIES

I interrupt the editorial at this point, Mr. Speaker, to say that here the Washington Post has apparently completely misunderstood the purpose of the food stamp proposal and the suggested mechanics of such a plan. The committee report on H.R. 1359, House Report No. 907, went into this whole question in great detail. I included relevant excerpts from the House committee report as part of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 20, prior to House passage of the bill.

Let me acknowledge that Mr. Benson does not want a food stamp plan, or any other plan for expanding the present food distribution program. He has said he does not want it because it would involve some additional expenditures. But on this point quoted by the Post editorial, he cannot be speaking of the food stamp plan contained in H.R. 1359 and agreed to by the House last week as part of Public Law 480. For under my amendment, not only storable items in surplus but all agricultural commodities, including the perishables, in periodic surplus and eligible for removal by use of section 32 funds, could be included in the food distribution. Right now, this could include, in addition to the cornmeal, flour, rice, and powdered milk now being given out, and the butter and cheese previously donated, such items as poultry, fresh—rather than powdered—eggs, pork products, fresh—rather than powdered—milk, other dairy products, and any fresh vegetables in such temporary surplus as to depress the market. In other words, all of the items the Secretary can now legally donate to the school lunch program under section 32 or sell for foreign currencies under Public Law 480 could also be included in the food stamp plan.

He has limited his use of section 32 funds almost entirely to foods which can be used in the school lunch program. The farmer complains about this, pointing out that section 32 has much broader powers than that Members of Congress from areas now participating in the surplus food distribution program also complain, pointing out that section 32 funds can be and should be used to provide a greater variety of surplus foods for the needy. Under the food stamp plan, the market for these additional items of surplus foods would be ready made. The need is certainly there from the standpoint of both the farmer and the needy.

Mr. Speaker, the Post editorial states in conclusion:

Probably the flow of these commodities into consumption by needy families ought to be stepped up. But there are substantial advantages in letting the States choose their own means of distributing help to their needy citizens. From the national point of view the important thing is making the food available—not a particular method of distribution.

In reply to that, Mr. Speaker, I might say that nearly all of the Senators who recently testified before the Senate Agriculture Committee on the surplus food disposal program in their areas made the point that adequate help is not getting to the people who need it most because

of the deficiencies of the present distribution program. And they nearly all urged a food-stamp plan be adopted.

WASHINGTON POST DEMONSTRATED GENUINE CONCERN

The Washington Post has been an active and effective proponent of feeding our hungry in this country out of the great abundance of our harvests, and I want to make clear that in making these comments on the editorial which appeared today I am in no sense implying any lack of sympathy by the Post for the people who would benefit from a food stamp plan. The newspaper has proved its humanitarianism in many, many ways.

But I know the Post likes to present its case accurately, and in this instance I think it made a mistake in taking as its text for the editorial the casual and inaccurate statements of a Secretary of Agriculture who sees in this surplus food only a big storage and budgetary headache, not the blessing it could be in meeting poverty and want in our midst. His objections to the food-stamp plan were fully reported to the House Agriculture Committee. All of these issues were brought up in the hearings.

The report of the House committee fully explains why the Secretary's objections were rejected. I recommend to anyone interested in knowing both the good and bad things about the present distribution program and the good and bad of the proposed food stamp plan that he read the report of the House Agriculture Committee on H.R. 1359, House Report No. 907.

There is one big fault with the food-stamp bill as reported by the committee and as included as an amendment to Public Law 480. It is that it merely provides discretionary authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to initiate such a program. As I introduced the bill, it would have directed and required him to institute it.

Agriculture: The GOP's Most Expensive Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, for 6 years, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson has been saying that lower farm prices will discourage production of crops, eliminate inefficient farmers and leave the rest with a larger share of farm income, to the benefit of farmer and consumer alike.

Because I have come to the conclusion that some more realistic programs must be sought if we are to deal with the farm problem I am introducing today a resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the reduction of Federal expenditures and calling on President Eisenhower to develop sound proposals for reducing subsidies to big business and big farmers by

25 percent and applying the resulting savings to reduction of the Federal income taxes.

One of the leading spokesmen for the Eisenhower administration, Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, of New Jersey, in a recent speech to a group of Republican women, urged reform of the Nation's farm program which he termed "fantastic." According to the New York Times he asked:

How much longer will the American people tolerate a net expenditure of \$4,500 million a year for an unfair and self-defeating farm program which constitutes a major obstacle to a balanced budget?

And, he added:

Only a quarter of American farmers benefit from this program. The average American family is beginning to realize, too, that it is hurt as a consumer of foodstuffs by our high price-support program.

Recently the distinguished Prof. Sumner H. Slichter of Harvard University, in a letter to the New York Times, suggested that we stop paying subsidies for farm products and use the savings to reduce taxes. He made the valid point that we are paying to subsidize the overproduction of wheat, cotton, corn, rice, and tobacco. The Government then takes the surpluses off the hands of the producers and stores them at a cost of about a billion dollars a year.

I include as part of my remarks the text of Professor Slichter's letter as well as some information compiled by the Democratic Digest of August 1959, which shows how the Republican farm program has failed, and how it has become the Republican's most expensive failure:

TO CURTAIL FARM SURPLUSES—ENDING SUBSIDIES WITH ECONOMIES USED TO CUT TAXES PROPOSED

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Five of the most overproduced commodities in the United States are wheat, cotton, corn, rice, and tobacco. And yet we persist in paying large subsidies to keep up the overproduction of these goods.

The Government takes the surpluses off the hands of the producers and stores them at enormous expense—at the cost of about a billion dollars a year. So large are the accumulated surpluses that the problem of finding physical facilities in which to store them has become acute. And yet the payment of the huge subsidies to induce still more production of the overproduced commodities still goes on.

What should be done? It is obvious that the United States is losing an important opportunity to raise its standard of consumption. The amount of labor and capital now devoted to finance the production of surpluses could be devoted to increasing the supplies of goods that are scarce and that people would consume in larger quantities if the goods were produced and were available for consumption. How can this diversion of resources from producing unwanted wheat, corn, cotton, rice, and tobacco be brought about?

A simple way to accomplish the shift would be for the Government simply to stop paying subsidies and to use the money thus saved to cut taxes. Consumers would then decide how the released production power would be used because tax cuts would enable them to step up promptly the buying of a vast variety of goods.

The additional demand by consumers would pull workers and capital out of the wheat, cotton growing, corn, rice and tobacco industries into more productive uses. In order to mitigate the problems of transition it would probably be desirable to eliminate the subsidies by gradual steps over a period of about 4 years. In order to provide new sources of demand to pull resources out of the excessively expanded industries, the tax cuts should be timed to coincide or slightly precede the subsidy cuts.

But though tax cuts could provide alternative demand for that now supplied by subsidies, the Government would not need to use all of the savings from the termination of subsidies in this way. The country has enormous public needs. It needs more schools, low-cost housing, better roads, flood control, pollution control, more hospitals, more recreation areas with roads to them, its cities need much replanning and rebuilding.

Hence, the Government would be wise to divide the savings from terminating subsidies into two parts—one part going to individuals in the form of tax reductions, the other part going to the public in the many forms of public works that the country badly needs but cannot now afford.

SUMNER H. SLICHTER,
Lamont University Professor, Harvard.
CAMBRIDGE, MASS., August 10, 1959.

AGRICULTURE: THE GOP'S MOST EXPENSIVE FAILURE—HOW THE REPUBLICAN FARM PROGRAM HAS FAILED

WHAT THEY PROMISED ON FARM INCOME

"The Republican Party will create conditions providing for farm prosperity and stability." (GOP platform, 1952.)

"I am for programs to put a firm foundation under farm prosperity and to strengthen the family farm as the mainstay of our agricultural production * * *." (Eisenhower, Columbia, S.C., Sept. 30, 1952.)

"The Republican Party is pledged to work for improved farm prices and farm income." (GOP platform, 1956.)

WHAT THEY PROMISED TO FARM INCOME

	1952 (mil- lions)	1958 (mil- lions)	Percent increase or de- crease
Gross farm income.....	\$37,016	\$38,000	+2.6
Farm expenses.....	22,600	24,900	+10.0
Total net farm income.....	15,337	13,000	-15.5

N.B.—The \$13.1 billion farm income in 1958 was \$2.3 billion above 1957, \$1 billion over 1956, and \$1.6 billion above 1955. In the last 4 Benson years (1955-58), farmers' net income has averaged \$11.9 billion, compared to the \$14.15 billion average in President Truman's last 4 years—a decline of 19 percent.

WHAT THEY PROMISED ON FAMILY FARMS:

"We will seek that improvement boldly, in ways that protect the family farm." (GOP Platform, 1956.)

Commodity	Unit	Amount (thousands)		Percent increase	Value (thousands)		Percent increase
		January 1953	January 1959		January 1953	January 1959	
Wheat.....	Bushel.....	132,000	777,000	+588.6	\$352,000	\$2,192,000	+622.7
Corn.....	do.....	279,000	1,167,000	+418.2	447,000	2,637,319	+455.7
Cotton.....	Bale.....	236	1,582	+670.0	32,000	226,133	+706.6
Grain sorghum.....	Hundredweight.....	194	161,000	+82,989.6	582	407,700	+70,061.5

Source: CCC Commodity Stabilization Service.

WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO FAMILY FARMS

	1952 (mil- lions)	1958 (mil- lions)	Percent decrease
Farms under the plow.....	5.4	4.7	-12.9
Farm population.....	24.2	20.8	-14.0

WHAT THEY PROMISED ON PRODUCTION

"Farmers increase production of a commodity when the demand for it is strong and just as logically they reduce the output when prices soften." (Ezra Taft Benson, Hearings, Senate Agriculture Committee, March 5, 1954.)

"Does a lowered price reduce production? The answer is 'Yes.'" (Benson, Hearings, Senate Agriculture Committee, February 17, 1955.)

WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO PRODUCTION

Farm output (1947-49=100):

1948.....	104
1949.....	101
1950.....	100
1951.....	103
1952.....	107
1953.....	108
1954.....	108
1955.....	112
1956.....	113
1957.....	113
1958.....	123

Source: Farm Output Index, Agricultural Marketing Service.

WHAT THEY PROMISED ON SURPLUSES

"This program [the soil bank] is a sound aid to removing the burdens of surpluses which Democratic programs placed on farmers. It is now moving into full operation." (GOP platform, 1956.)

"What this administration has proposed is a direct and effective attack on the surpluses themselves * * *." (Benson, Chicago, March 6, 1956.)

"Our major agricultural problem is now surpluses * * * we can lick this problem if we have the sound program the President has proposed" (Benson, Tucson, Ariz., April 4, 1956.)

"We have passed the peak of our surplus accumulations * * *." (Benson, Fifth Annual Republican Women's Conference, April 2, 1957.)

WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO SURPLUSES

The value of the inventory of the Commodity Credit Corporation has increased 5½ times between January 1, 1953 and January 1, 1959—from \$1,053,429,000 to \$5,448,400,000. It is estimated that 1960 will show another increase of about \$3.6 billion (figures from CCC monthly reports).

"* * * there is no positive assurance that he [the farmer] will produce substantially less if price supports are sharply reduced" (Senator AIKEN, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 13, 1959).

Amounts as well as values of surplus commodities have increased alarmingly, in spite of Mr. Benson's claims:

The total cost of administering the price support program alone—the total CCC interest, administration, and other general costs—has increased from \$34.6 million in fiscal 1952 to a staggering \$364.9 million in fiscal 1958 (figures from Senate Agriculture Committee hearings, Feb. 16, 1959, p. 40).

"He [Benson] has not solved the problem of the surplus * * * The surpluses are getting larger despite decline in farm population and the decline in the number of farms under the plow" (Washington Post and Times Herald, Sept. 2, 1958).

"He chose the device of reducing the support price—the percentage of parity on which the loan is based. The idea was that it would discourage production and encourage consumption. It did neither * * * It did not discourage production because most farmers had no alternative but to keep on producing—in greater volume, if possible, because they got less return per bushel or per bale. The problem became, if anything, worse * * *" (New York Times, Aug. 24, 1958).

"Crop production in 1958 reached an all-time high—11 percent larger than the previous record" (Crop Production, 1958 Annual Summary, USDA).

WHAT THEY PROMISED ON INCREASING USE OF FARM PRODUCTS

"To me, the answer to this problem suggests itself in letters of fire a mile high: Eliminate as rapidly as practicable ineffective controls and use price supports at levels that will preserve and build markets." (Benson, Senate Agriculture Committee, Feb. 16, 1959.)

THE SQUEEZE IS ON FOR THE FARMER

Cost of farm necessities in bushels and pounds

Item	Cost in bushels of wheat		Cost in bushels of corn		Cost in pounds of cotton	
	1952	1958	1952	1958	1952	1958
Self-propelled combine, 12 foot.....	2,671.7	4,451.7	3,057.8	5,381.3	142.8	296.3
Power takeoff combine 5- to 6-foot cut.....	737.3	1,109.7	843.9	1,512.3	39.4	53.1
20- to 29-horsepower tractor.....	1,090.0	1,408.5	1,144.5	1,957.6	53.1	75.0
2-row tractor cultivator.....	127.7	192.0	136.2	296.9	6.8	10.2
1-ton truck.....	818.1	1,164.6	930.4	1,618.6	43.7	62.0
Wringer-type electric washer.....	66.6	87.1	76.3	121.1	3.5	4.6
4-burner gas stove.....	82.3	107.3	94.2	149.1	4.4	5.7

Source: Crops and Markets, 1953, USDA; Agricultural Prices, July 1958.

"The farmer cannot indefinitely accept higher cost and lower income at the same time." (Representative FRED MARSHALL, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 18, 1959).

THE SQUEEZE IS ON FOR THE CONSUMER

"Consumer prices in U.S. cities rose 0.2 percent between March and April 1959, according to the U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics. Prices were higher for transportation, medical care, recreation, and personal care, due largely to advances in service rates. Commodity prices were unchanged on the average, despite a slight decline in food prices." (Consumer Price Index for April 1959.) "In short, food alone has kept the Consumer Price Index from leaping from peak to peak during this phase. If food is lifted out of a city family's market basket, the stability disappears." (Sylvia Porter, Washington Star, Apr. 29, 1959.)

"Only the fact that some surpluses are produced holds retail prices for foods as low as they are today." (Senator GEORGE ARKEN, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 13, 1959.)

	1952	1958
Consumer Price Index on food.....	114.6	120.3
Parity ratio.....	100.0	85.0

son, Senate Agriculture Committee, Feb. 16, 1959.)

WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO INCREASING USE OF FARM PRODUCTS

Civilian per capita food consumption (1947-49—110):

1951.....	98
1952.....	100
1958.....	101

Source: National Food Situation, July 1958.

WHAT THEY PROMISED ON CUTTING COSTS

We have streamlined the operations of the Department of Agriculture—have cut away much costly deadwood and inefficiency—through a major reorganization. (Benson, Boston, Nov. 20, 1953.)

WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO CUTTING COSTS

The number of employees at USDA has been increased from 87,406 as of December 31, 1952, to 85,543 as of January 1, 1959—an increase of 26.9 percent.

"Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson seems destined to go down in history as the spendingest Secretary in the Department's history."

"A Library of Congress study shows that Agriculture Department appropriations from 1862 to 1931 totaled \$2.4 billion. From 1932 to 1953 expenditures were \$25.2 billion. Since Benson took over in 1953 net budget expenditures have reached \$31 billion."

"In other words, the present Secretary has spent more than all his predecessors combined." (Washington Post and Times Herald, June 1, 1959.)

"Retail food costs have risen 20 percent in the last 10 years, the House Agriculture Committee reported Monday, but the prices received by farmers have fallen 8 percent." (Associated Press, the Denver Post, June 1, 1959.)

Anti-Communist Confederation of Polish Freedom Fighters Voice Opposition to Khrushchev's Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include two open letters directed to President Eisenhower by Mr. Jozef Mlot-Mroz, president of the Anti-Communist Confederation of Polish Freedom Fighters in the United States of America, 18 Boardman Street, Salem, Mass., in opposition to the Khrushchev visit:

OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

AUGUST 2, 1959.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The bondage of the enslaved nations of central Europe is one of the reasons causing the international conflict and the real reason for failure of bringing about world peace. As long as the enslaved people will be forbidden to decide about their own fate, so long will last the great war tension in the world. Such was the opinion of the world and that of you Mr. President, just a few months ago.

Your statements on behalf of the enslaved nations at different times, especially your proclamation of the Week of the Captive Nations was an assurance that the miracle of obtaining freedom for these nations among which is found Poland must and should come from the West.

Unfortunately the news, radio, and television announcers for the past few days remark about the cordial invitation extended to Khrushchev to visit the United States. This invitation breaks up the hope of the Polish as well as other nations enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

Just at the moment when the Polish people are preparing to celebrate the 20th anniversary of losing their freedom, when Khrushchev wishes to succeed in breaking up this feeling of hope, the eyes of Poland are turned at the United States of America with the hope that it will become their defender. To confirm this we see no better picture than the hearty welcome of Vice President Nixon in Poland.

That is why the visit of Mr. Khrushchev in the United States of America will be a vivid expression of breaking up the hopes of the people as well as the nail added to the coffin of Poland. The hearty handshake with the murderer Khrushchev, the smiles of both leaders will naturally break up the spirit and morale of the people of central Europe and certainly will rule out any American doing in obtaining their peace and freedom.

Therefore as the president of Anti-Communist Confederation of Polish Freedom Fighters in United States of America, I permit myself on behalf of the organization to ask you Mr. President not to invite Mr. Khrushchev to the United States of America.

We, the people of Poland, found in all parts of the world, betrayed Yalta, begrudged a native land, loyal to God and country, beg of you:

It is not proper and permissible to invite Mr. Khrushchev to the United States to break up the spirit and hope of the enslaved nations, to go into partnership with communism, the menace of the 20th century, it is not permissible to join in any work for the coexistence of communism.

It is therefore our duty to safeguard the enslaved nations and bring forth their day of freedom, we must bar the way of communism in their plans of possessing the entire world, embedding within them the communistic ideas, ideas which cripple and destroy the health of the nations.

Only on sound principles will grow up an idea of freedom among the enslaved nations and upon such principles will there evolve a stable world peace and once again will return the peace and happiness for which American people yearn.

These are our pleas which we send to the leaders of the American people.

We, the Polish people of America do not wish that Mr. Khrushchev be invited to the United States. If necessary I will give my life on the altar for the love and freedom of Poland.

Seven days before the arrival of Khrushchev to the United States and in defense of freedom I will go on strike of dry starva-

tion and continue it until I offer my life for my country and freedom.

With respect,

JOSEF MLOT-MROZ,
President, Anti-Communist Confed-
eration of Polish Freedom Fighters
in United States.

AUGUST 13, 1959.

SECOND OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT
OF THE UNITED STATES

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The sun of freedom shines the same to all countries, and we must understand the meaning of this motto. There will be no peace at home where harm and misfortune is brought about to our neighbor and friend. Therefore, your friendly clasp with Khrushchev, the Poles may well compare to the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact of 1939, when symbols of communism, nazism, and fascism embedded itself in the hearts of Poland.

The President of the United States should consider that those who now are the enemies of God are also our enemies and therefore there should be talk or even thought of co-operation and unity.

The invitation of Khrushchev to the United States brought about an unfavorable reaction in Congress. The bill of Congressman LANE, who demands public opinion on inviting Khrushchev here, is the voice of a wise and intelligent politic as well as a defender of enslaved peoples.

President Eisenhower should be convinced and aware that communistic Khrushchev through his visit is trying to ease the tension and probably the carefulness of the American people and in this way build up a cradle of peace and bring about an initiative of communistic politics.

Through his visit Khrushchev is trying to lower the morale of the people as well as their desire of courage and firmness in opposition to communistic designs.

The psychological approach for many years taken step by step was a success for Khrushchev, and the last resort an invitation to the communistic leader to visit the United States is the most unfortunate step in the career of the great fighter, leader, and politic, our President, Mr. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

President Eisenhower must remember that Khrushchev is a murderer who with cold blood sacrificed the lives of millions of innocent people just to build up communism. To Khrushchev a human being is nothing more than an animal, a machine, less valuable than modern invented apparatus. Therefore this human being, machine, must be sacrificed for the victory of communistic ideas.

Khrushchev admits that there is no God, he laughs at our feelings and belief, he laughs at the American slogan "We trust in God." Just as Governor Harriman admitted Khrushchev is more dangerous than Stalin.

Khrushchev attempts to possess the world by epitaphs. The first being to force the West to admit the up-to-date communistic ideas of capture, thus to liquidate cold war. Second, to bring about communistic revolts in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Third, the gradual overcome of Western Europe and complete preparation to rule the whole world. The fourth, to break down the carefulness and the morale of the American politics during his penetrations into the various countries, that is why Khrushchev so willingly accepts the American invitation.

The invitation is also a sign of our agreement to the continuation of the sufferings of the millions of people behind the Iron Curtain.

It is wrong to believe that the Kremlin has changed its tactics in reference to politics

and that in the future it promises to live in accordance with the different pacts made. The Soviets only wish to have peace as mentioned by His Eminence Cardinal Cushing, a peace that will give them entire possession of the entire world, and each word of Khrushchev is only an empty phrase. Therefore, there can be no talk of real peace, without freedom granted to the enslaved nations.

O Misery, to this fire of enslavement behind the Iron Curtain President Eisenhower inviting Khrushchev added fuel, therefore further comments are fruitless.

Therefore I call to the conscience of all Americans: America awake, the Red Curtain enfolds you, and the fire of enslavement awaits thee, and you with your Ike dream only of your happiness and success and peace, dream only of clear skies and eternal fairness. Awake America, before it is too late. Khrushchev told you: "We will bury you." This threat can hold only one moral for us: Wake up America—facing Communist danger.

That is why President Eisenhower has no authority to invite and entertain Khrushchev and he cannot confer with him for as history teaches us every such conference is a victory for communism and defeat for freedom. This was affirmed by no one else but Khrushchev who stated that he places the victory of communism above freedom and peace. Khrushchev has the ability and slyness of a fox.

That is why in the name of the Polish people in this country and in all other countries I am not begging for grace or alms but for that what is just and ours. Poland is an alpha and omega of happenings in the world. Help Poland America it was betrayed by you. It is your duty. Helping the suffering nations you defend the future and success of your own country.

The kingdom of this world suffers now, and you wish entertain the greatest enemy of peace? Be ashamed America.

As protest I feel that I must use the only alternative left. As I have stated in my first letter to the President. Seven days before the arrival of Khrushchev I will go on a hunger strike and I will not break it even if I have to give my life on the altar as a sacrifice for the love of my country.

Even though some will consider this a foolish idea, that will not hinder any of my intentions. Only this way and in the face of opposition and foolishness my demonstration is a protest of the feelings of the enslaved nations and the sacrifice of my life is nothing compared to the sufferings of the millions of murdered and being murdered in the Communistic regime.

I place forth the call of all those who are still suffering in defense of their own country, for they cannot do so themselves. I speak on behalf of those murdered by the Communists, the Americans who gave their lives in Korea and those still alive in Communistic prisons. I believe in the justice of truth for which I will sacrifice everything even that what is the dearest worldly happiness, health and life.

My protest in the form of a hunger strike, let it be a verdict for Khrushchev and warning to America. My death on the altar of sacrifice for the love of country may it be an awakening of the Americans who in luxury and success forget the sufferings of others especially the enslaved nations among which is Poland.

With respect,

JOSEF MLOT-MROZ,
President, Anti-Communist Confedera-
tion of Polish Freedom Fighters in
U.S.A.

The Costly Vegetable Pest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS F. JOHNSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an article published in the Vegetable Growers Messenger, edited by Mr. Max Chambers, Preston, Md.

Mr. Chambers is one of Maryland's most vigorous and articulate editors. I commend the article to the attention of all.

COSTLY VEGETABLE PEST

One of the biggest and most dangerous problems vegetable growers, and vegetable processors will have to contend with, until controls are found, or some more reasonable attitude is adopted by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, is the tiny vinegar gnat, officially known as *Drosophila* (*Drosaphyll-ill-ah*).

The *Drosophila* is a tiny flylike insect which has a life cycle of about 8 days. It's the same little so-and-so that lights on your new paint as well as your peaches and apples and occasionally gets up your nose or in your throat.

During a mid-June game this year "Howie" Wilhelm, Baltimore Oriole baseball pitcher, had to stop the game for 16 minutes while umpires fanned and sprayed and finally set off a smoke bomb to get rid of pesky gnats which were swarming in the pitcher's box. Wilhelm is a right hot tomato with eight straight pitching victories.

No one wants to purposely or dangerously adulterate food. It is believed that a great majority of the food processors are anxious to pack a high quality product of which they can be proud. Even Dr. William V. Elsenberg, Chief Microanalyst of the Food and Drug Administration, USDA, Washington, has stated that there is no danger to the public health, welfare and safety, from the insignificant, and up to now, noncontrollable tiny vinegar gnat or its eggs.

Processed foods in cans and jars are automatically heat sterilized which kills any organisms that might accidentally get into the container.

Drosophila's favorite abode is in the crack or skin of a ripe tomato, cucumber and other vegetables. Yet the grape, peach, and wine people in California have much trouble with this pest whose eggs or fragments are difficult to discover without a microscope.

As far back as 1930 the University of Maryland (Dr. Lewis P. Dittman is a national authority) was trying to find a solution to this problem which many feel is highly exaggerated since no one has ever been reported to have been made ill by these microscopic parts, sometimes found in canned foods, no matter how carefully packed.

The Food and Drug Administration has been campaigning hard to keep waste material breeding places from accumulating in the vicinity of the processing plants. Most canneries now have screens but the size mesh screen that would keep out a vinegar gnat would also keep out the air and most of the light. Are the Food and Drug Administration demands leading to air-conditioned fields and processing plants, and the boiling and dehydration of all waste? Most processors feel there must be some better

way and they have high hopes of finding a solution that will give them peace of mind before the 1960 season.

Canners say the old and unintelligent rule of "guilt by association" started this whole problem in the Food and Drug Administration which erroneously thought (and it has been proved to them many times since that they are wrong) that the presence of fly eggs, maggots, and fragments was a positive indication of rotten fruit.

The most troublesome *Drosophila* month is September, when the swarming gnat invasion hits the East and Middle West. It's October in California. And a cantaloup field half a mile away from a cannery might be the worst breeding area.

It is believed that the problem is not so much one of insanitary conditions as it is one of an uncontrolled and so far uncontrollable insect.

The USDA Beltsville Plant Industry Station has done some research on *Drosophila* control but some believe the subject has not been allocated sufficient research funds to start a real program to swat this ornery little one.

The USDA 1958-59 budget for investigating *Drosophila* (which cost one canner \$10,000) was a paltry \$35,000. It is estimated that for 1959-60 research \$100,000 allocation would be sufficient to get an intensive USDA program started to study the gnats' biological aspects (sex life), feeding habits, and reaction to insecticides. Some canners advocate a minimum of \$200,000 to get the program into high gear, now.

This year the Government is spending an additional \$2 million on fire ant control and \$157.8 million on overall agricultural research.

The Food and Drug Administration's total enforcement budget for 1959 is \$10,597,000. The President's budget request for FDA for 1960 is \$11.8 million, an increase of \$1.2 million. And Congress could increase the allocation.

The National Canners Association has been actively engaged in attempting to find *Drosophila* controls for years. Dr. Charles Mahoney, states that some NCA investigators and its special committee feel the only sure way to control vinegar gnats is by insecticide spray treatment in the fields and around processing plants, but no spray yet tried will do the job. However, several agricultural chemicals are showing promise.

One NCA report states that the majority of gnat eggs are laid in ripe tomato cracks between the hours of 6 to 8 a.m. and from 4 to 6 p.m., during the dull light and low temperature periods. NCA is urging all canners to put into practice the best known field and plant control methods.

Vegetables processed the same day picked show much lower infestation. Harvested vegetables should not be allowed to remain in the fields overnight. Processing plant refuse dumped in fields should be spread thinly on the surface for rapid drying. All farm baskets, hauling and processing equipment inside and outside the plant should be carefully cleaned daily. Raw stock should be thoroughly culled and washed.

Since this insect does not have any effect on yield, or production in the field, many growers feel that this is a processing rather than a production problem. In several areas last year processing plants were forced to close down several weeks ahead of schedule because they wouldn't take the chance of handling tomatoes infested by the vinegar gnat, or tangling with the FDA. This caused heavy loss to the growers.

It appears that FDA hangs its authority and zealous enforcement attitude on sections 402 and 704 of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act. Some inspectors are reported to be young and immature, some of

them apparently having little acquaintance with vegetable processing.

FDA inspectors are required to leave written reports with processors, but it has been observed that some of their reports and recommendations have all the earmarks of trying to pick flyspecks out of pepper.

Most canners are reluctant to admit a brush with the FDA or to discuss complaints, or actions filed against them. They are scared to death of this Federal agency because they know it literally has the power to put them out of business, which certainly is not the intent of the congressional act and the opinion of at least one Federal court judge.

In every business there are a few who skirt the law and try to skin the public. For those no defense is intended here.

It has not been possible to get FDA *Drosophila* tolerances, though court cases indicate that FDA does show a fragmentation go-no-go allowance.

Several tomato canners are believed to have been financially hurt by recent FDA confiscation of 69,000 cases of several canned foods which inspectors said were adulterated with gnat eggs and fragments. Twelve thousand seven hundred cases were destroyed. November is top month for seizures. Pennsylvania leads seizures with 8; New Jersey, 4; New York, 4; 25 seizures were made in 14 plants in 18 months since January 1, 1958.

Federal courts, with two exceptions, have consistently upheld FDA inspectors in their charges. It is estimated that many vegetable canners and cucumber processors across the Nation have been heavily fined, or took the loss without contest (by default) feeling they had no chance to win.

There is reason to believe that most of the seizures and prosecutions have been in the eastern half of the country. This is depriving growers of markets for their vegetables and creating a scar condition.

Processors in several parts of the country who have felt the sting of the Federal court decisions and fines are reported hesitant about opening their plants for the 1959 season.

A caustic example is provided by the closing last year of one of the largest tomato products plants in the East. After spraying fields and plant and operating on short season basis trying to control the vinegar gnat and meet the rigid FDA requirements this national brand packer gave up. It was uneconomical to operate such a large plant on so short a season. A conservative estimate of the loss to the rural and urban community is \$1 million a year.

It is interesting to observe that a processing plant spending \$100,000 for raw stock also spends another \$100,000 for labor and supplies, therefore, making its operation one of extreme economic importance to the agricultural as well as the urban community.

FDA is the government's guarantee to the American public and housewife that the products on the grocer's shelf are good for human consumption.

When an American housewife goes into a store to buy a can of spinach, or tomatoes she knows little about the quality of the product she is buying except to take the word of the canner. On July 1, 1927, Congress established the Food and Drug Administration for the purpose of administering the small group of statutes intended to secure freedom from adulteration, and to require truthful labeling of certain commodities.

Of all the FDA charges filed in the U.S. Federal courts against canners only two have been won, both since 1954, by Marion A. Hoy, a prominent Oak Park, Ill., attorney.

During one of Mr. Hoy's cases, defending an Indiana canner charged with *Drosophila* violation, in a Federal Court sitting at Chicago, Judge Honorable John P. Barnes said:

"This is not any light charge to make against a food processor. You (FDA) can put them out of business so quick it will make your head swim. I think you ought to keep that in mind. I think a warning (to canners) would have been all right, but I think you are insisting upon an impossibly high standard." "Take this last evidence that came in here. Take all the cases * * * 110. And the average got down to * * * 3.3 vinegar gnat eggs and on the maggots * * * 2. When you (FDA) look at that evidence you know we must be silly; you must not ask us (the court) to be silly. You must not ask me to destroy an industry and approve zeal which I think is misguided."

"And don't ask me to say that flies and maggots are not filth. I think they are, but it is said we all have to eat some dirt. Of course, we don't have to eat it all in tomatoes."

"I don't say these people (canners) should not have been warned; maybe they should be; maybe you (FDA) have to keep warning people (canners) in order to keep up to standard. But this kind of a case can break them, oh so easily."

Serious consequences could result from the growing practice of this kind of bureaucratic power. There is no such thing as a benevolent despot. And there is no denying the FDA is a tough adversary. One related industry observer and bitter critic suggested that *Drosophila* provides an almost perfect setting for bureaucratic operation and will continue until a more attractive subject is found.

One canner has asked if there is any reason why the FDA (or the Government) shouldn't reimburse a canner for damages which he has suffered because of legal action wrongfully brought against him by the FDA?

In some cases canners' merchandise has been held off the market for 2 years, all the while deteriorating. Canners have had expensive legal fees, gotten a bad name, had working capital tied up, which hampers the purchase of raw stock, factory operation and improvements and community economics.

Congressman THOMAS F. JOHNSON of Maryland (House Office Building, Washington, D.C.) is now actively engaged in investigating some of the actions of the FDA since several Maryland processors are reported to have been seriously handicapped by confiscation and "persecution" and fear of future citations.

Drosophila is an area in which growers and processors could well spend time discussing how to work with researchers and their Congressman, and then the FDA. Something can be done about it. Something has to be done about it.

The Maryland Congressman has suggested that the first step toward a permanent solution could well be a series of carefully planned and prepared high level conferences between canners, growers, and Congressmen. This should lead to constructive planning like a real research program and perhaps even an agreement, a moratorium period, effective until control measures can be discovered and put into practice, or a new crack-free gnat resistant tomato can be found.

Relief for canners, growers and communities from this total problem is long overdue.

Our Government does startling things. Here's a new challenge.

The call is for more research, less fear and pressure.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]
Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbott, Watkins M., Va.-----
Abernethy, Thomas G., 6278 29th St.
Miss.
Adair, E. Ross, Ind.-----4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., N. J.-----
Albert, Carl, Okla.-----5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., N. C.-----
Alford, Dale, Ark.-----
Alger, Bruce, Tex.-----
Allen, Leo E., Ill.-----University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, Minn.-----4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., Mont.-----911 Beverly Dr.
Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., Ala.-----3108 Cathedral
Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., N. Y.-----
Arendo, Leslie C., Ill.-----4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., Ohio-----
Ashmore, Robert T., S. C.-----
Aspinall, Wayne N., Colo.-----Arlington Towers,
Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., N. J.-----113 S. Lee St.,
Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., Kans.-----
Ayres, William H., Ohio-----
Bailey, Cleveland M.,
W. Va.
Baker, Howard H., Tenn.-----
Baldwin, John F., Jr., Calif.-----
Barden, Graham A., N. C.-----2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., Nev.-----
Barr, Joseph W., Ind.-----Tulip Lane and
Glen Mill Rd.,
Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., Pa.-----
Barry, Robert R., N. Y.-----3019 Norman-
stone Drive
Bass, Perkins, N. H.-----
Bass, Ross, Tenn.-----
Bates, William H., Mass.-----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., Ohio-----
Becker, Frank J., N. Y.-----
Beckworth, Lindley, Tex.-----
Belcher, Page, Okla.-----
Bennett, Charles E., Fla.-----1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., Mich.-----3718 Cardiff Rd.,
Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., Mich.-----
Berry, E. Y., S. Dak.-----118 Schotts
Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., Ohio-----
Blatnik, John A., Minn.-----
Bilch, Iris Faircloth,
(Mrs.), Ga.
Boggs, Hale, La.-----
Boland, Edward P., Mass.-----
Bolling, Richard, Mo.-----3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Ohio.
Bonner, Herbert C., N. C.-----Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., N. Y.-----
Bow, Frank T., Ohio-----4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, Conn.-----
Boykin, Frank W., Ala.-----The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., Ill.-----
Brademas, John, Ind.-----
Bray, William G., Ind.-----
Breeding, J. Floyd, Kans.-----
Brewster, Daniel B., Md.-----
Brock, Lawrence, Nebr.-----
Brooks, Jack, Tex.-----
Brooks, Overton, La.-----4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S.,
Mich.
Brown, Charles H., Mo.-----3723 N. Oakland
St., Arlington, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., Ohio-----Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, Ga.-----Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., Va.-----
Buckley, Charles A., N. Y.-----
Budge, Hamer H., Idaho-----
Burdick, Quentin, N. Dak.-----
Burke, Frank W., Ky.-----
Burke, James A., Mass.-----
Burleson, Omar, Tex.-----2737 Devonshire
Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., Pa.-----
Byrne, James A., Pa.-----
Byrnes, John W., Wis.-----1215 25th St. So.,
Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., N. J.-----

Canfield, Gordon, N. J.-----
Cannon, Clarence, Mo.-----
Carnahan, A. S. J., Mo.-----
Carter, Steven V., Iowa-----
Casey, Bob, Tex.-----
Cederberg, Elford A., Mich.-----
Celler, Emanuel, N. Y.-----The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E.,
Mich.
Chelf, Frank, Ky.-----
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, Colo.-----
Chipperfield, Robert B., Ill.-----1713 House Office
Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt
(Mrs.), Ill.-----2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., Pa.-----3735 Gunston Rd.,
Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, Iowa-----
Coffin, Frank M., Maine-----
Cohelan, Jeffery, Calif.-----2820 Ordway St.
Coiller, Harold R., Ill.-----
Colmer, William M., Miss.-----
Conte, Silvio O., Mass.-----
Cook, Robert E., Ohio-----
Cooley, Harold D., N. C.-----2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., Pa.-----
Cramer, William C., Fla.-----6714 Joallen Dr.,
Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, Nebr.-----4920 Yorktown
Blvd., Arlington
Va.
Curtin, Willard S., Pa.-----
Curtis, Laurence, Mass.-----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., Mo.-----
Daddario, Emilio Q., Conn.-----
Dague, Paul B., Pa.-----
Daniels, Dominick V., N. J.-----
Davis, Clifford, Tenn.-----4611 Butter-
worth Pl.
Davis, James C., Ga.-----
Dawson, William L., Ill.-----
Delaney, James J., N. Y.-----
Dent, John H., Pa.-----
Denton, Winfield K., Ind.-----
Derounian, Steven B., N. Y.-----
Derwinski, Edward J., Ill.-----
Devine, Samuel L., Ohio-----
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., Mich.-----
Dingell, John D., Mich.-----
Dixon, Henry Aldous, Utah-----1817 N. Quinn St.,
Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, N. Y.-----
Donohue, Harold D., Mass.-----
Dooley, Edwin B., N. Y.-----
Dorn, Francis E., N. Y.-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, S. C.-----
Dowdy, John, Tex.-----
Downing, Thomas N., Va.-----
Doyle, Clyde, Calif.-----3877 30th St. N.,
Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., N. Y.-----
Durham, Carl T., N. C.-----The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.),
N. J.
Edmondson, Ed, Okla.-----
Elliott, Carl, Ala.-----
Everett, Robert A., Tenn.-----
Evins, Joe L., Tenn.-----5044 Klinge St.
Fallon, George H., Md.-----
Farbsteln, Leonard, N. Y.-----
Fascell, Dante B., Fla.-----
Felghan, Michael A., Ohio-----
Fenton, Ivor D., Pa.-----3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., N. Y.-----
Fisher, O. C., Tex.-----Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., Pa.-----The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., Wis.-----
Flynt, John J., Jr., Ga.-----
Fogarty, John E., R. I.-----1133 House Office
Building
Foley, John R., Md.-----
Forand, Alime J., R. I.-----4108 Dresden St.,
Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., Mich.-----514 Crown View
Dr., Alexandria,
Va.
Forrester, E. L., Ga.-----
Fountain, L. H., N. C.-----The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., Fairfax Hotel
Tenn.
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., 3014 N St.
N. J.
Friedel, Samuel N., Md.-----
Fulton, James G., Pa.-----
Gallagher, Cornelius E.,
N. J.
Garmatz, Edward A., Md.-----
Gary, J. Vaughan, Va.-----

Gathings, E. C., Ark.-----6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., Pa.-----
George, Newell A., Kans.-----
Giaino, Robert N., Conn.-----
Glenn, Milton W., N. J.-----Arlington Towers,
Arlington, Va.
Goodell, Charles E., N. Y.-----
Granahan, Kathryn E.
(Mrs.), Pa.
Grant, George M., Ala.-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., Ill.-----
Green, Edith (Mrs.), Oreg.-----
Green, William J., Jr., Pa.-----
Griffin, Robert P., Mich.-----
Griffiths, Martha W.
(Mrs.), Mich.
Gross, H. R., Iowa-----
Gubser, Charles S., Calif.-----
Hagen, Harlan, Calif.-----
Haley, James A., Fla.-----
Hall, David M., N. C.-----
Halleck, Charles A., Ind.-----4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, N. Y.-----
Hardy, Porter, Jr., Va.-----
Hargis, Denver D., Kans.-----
Harmon, Randall S., Ind.-----
Harris, Oren, Ark.-----1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., Va.-----
Hays, Wayne L., Ohio-----1323 Barger Drive,
Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., N. Y.-----
Hébert, F. Edward, La.-----26 Cockrell St.,
Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, W. Va.-----
Hemphill, Robert W., S. C.-----
Henderson, John E., Ohio-----
Herlong, A. S., Jr., Fla.-----
Hess, William E., Ohio-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., Calif.-----
Hoeven, Charles B., Iowa-----100 Maryland
Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., Mich.-----100 Maryland
Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., Ill.-----
Hogan, Earl, Ind.-----5211 Flanders
Ave., Garrett Pk.,
Kensington, Md.
Hollifield, Chet, Calif.-----
Holland, Elmer J., Pa.-----
Holt, Joe, Calif.-----
Holtzman, Lester, N. Y.-----
Horan, Walt, Wash.-----
Hosmer, Craig, Calif.-----
Huddleston, George, Jr.,
Ala.
Hull, W. R., Jr., Mo.-----
Ikard, Frank, Tex.-----
Inouye, Daniel K., Hawaii.-----
Irwin, Donald J., Conn.-----The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., Calif.-----
Jarman, John, Okla.-----
Jennings, W. Pat, Va.-----
Jensen, Ben F., Iowa-----2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., Mich.-----
Johnson, Byron L., Colo.-----
Johnson, Harold T., Calif.-----
Johnson, Lester R., Wis.-----
Johnson, Thomas F., Md.-----
Jonas, Charles Raper, N. C.-----
Jones, Paul C., Mo.-----1111 Army Navy
Dr., Arlington,
Va.
Jones, Robert E., Ala.-----
Judd, Walter H., Minn.-----3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., Mo.-----
Karth, Joseph E., Minn.-----
Kasem, George A., Calif.-----
Kastenmeier, Robert W.,
Wis.
Kearns, Carroll D., Pa.-----Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.),
W. Va.
Keith, Hastings, Mass.-----
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), N. Y.-----
Keogh, Eugene J., N. Y.-----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., N. Y.-----
Kilday, Paul J., Tex.-----3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., Tex.-----4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., Calif.-----
King, David S., Utah-----
Kirwan, Michael J., Ohio-----
Kitchin, A. Paul, N. C.-----
Kluczynski, John C., Ill.-----
Knox, Victor A., Mich.-----
Kowalski, Frank, Conn.-----
Lafore, John A., Jr., Pa.-----
Laird, Melvin R., Wis.-----
Landrum, Phil M., Ga.-----

Appendix

Address by Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas, to the National Convention of the American Legion, at Minneapolis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the very thoughtful and penetrating address delivered today by the capable majority leader of the U.S. Senate, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] before the national convention of the American Legion, in Minneapolis. I commend a reading of the address to my colleagues, and I urge that they give it their most serious consideration.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEEPING THE PEACE

Commander Moore, officers of the American Legion, delegates, and distinguished guests, I come to you today fresh from an inspection trip through the heart of America's counterattack forces—the SAC base in Omaha.

It is unfortunate that I cannot describe to you all that I saw. I cannot. There are considerations of military security. And, like most of you, I am not a professional military man. I am a "citizen soldier."

But there is one impression I carried away with me that is unmistakable. It is that I will stake the finest bull on my Texas ranch that the best Nikita Khrushchev has cannot match what I saw yesterday.

The heart of America's striking force is strong—because of organization, men, and determination.

I wish I could say—in good conscience—that everything in America could be described in these terms. The unfortunate fact is that there are many fields in which we must "catch up"—a term that is unfamiliar with most of our people.

STRENGTH OF UNITY

But there is something even stronger than SAC itself. It is the unity and the will of the American people themselves. And that is why I am here to visit with you today.

The American Legion is held together by a common bond. Comrades all, we have shared in the experience of wearing our country's uniform.

I put on that uniform and went to the Pacific. That was in 1941 when, because we were not sufficiently prepared for an attack, we were taking a heartbreaking beating that—if I can help it—will never happen again.

The Legion is composed of men who did not stop serving their country when they took off their uniforms and put on civilian clothes. You realized that freedom—up to this point—has never been won by a single struggle.

And to that end, you banded together 40 years ago in memory of past comradeship and in anticipation of serve to come.

In the intervening years, you have welded together the unity and purpose of your Legion members and the inspiration and aid of the fine women of the Legion auxiliary. The caliber and stature of your commanders—past, present, and, I am confident, in the future—exemplify the Legion itself.

A VOICE FOR A STRONG AMERICA

Men such as Comdr. Preston Moore are, have been, and will be an effective voice for a strong America. They have worked for a strong America. And they have worked for a strong Legion. Victory and success are their hallmarks. History will record the full accounting of their achievements.

In this connection, I'm happy to recall the majority support given by the U.S. Senate to the Kerr amendment to the Veterans Pension Act—for which I voted and which was strongly backed by the American Legion.

I am here today largely because of Preston Moore. He thought—and I knew—that I could learn something by this visit. It is our opportunity to exchange views on the most important issue before our people—the survival of freedom in this country.

Although both you and I have a direct interest in our Nation's defenses, I am not here to talk about military preparedness today.

It seems to me that there is another kind of strength which must be considered by Americans. And that is the moral and spiritual strength of our form of government and our order of society.

THE MAJOR ISSUE

All of us know the major issue in our world today: It is whether societies of free-men can maintain themselves. Such societies are faced by the greatest threat to Western civilization since John Sobieski raised the siege at Vienna and Charles Martel crushed the Saracens at Tours.

America is confronted by a brutal power, a totalitarian power, a supremely confident power whose chief spokesman boasts openly that my grandchildren—and your grandchildren—will be Communists. And this same chief of government brags openly that missiles can be delivered on this Midwest city from submarines in Hudson Bay.

If that Hudson Bay threat was intended to scare this Minneapolis Legion meeting, I suggest it was a mistake. Someone fed the brainwashing computer the wrong card.

Within a few weeks the present chief of communism—Nikita Khrushchev—will visit our shores. He will be the official guest of the President of the United States—and in the field of foreign relations that means the American people.

THE BEST INTERESTS

There have been strong expressions of concern and doubt about the wisdom of this invitation. There are those who feel that Mr. Khrushchev's visit is simply an elaborate facade for a two-man summit conference—which has been his publicly expressed goal since he attained power. Mr. Khrushchev's planned itinerary certainly does nothing to dispel this feeling.

But at this point, the wisdom of the invitation is academic. Khrushchev will be here. The issue remaining is whether we

conduct ourselves in such a way as to serve the best interests of America.

On this, we must—and shall—stand behind our President.

Personally, I have no fears that Mr. Khrushchev can contaminate the American people. We can take in stride the best brainwashing he can offer, Marxist propaganda, threats of economic competition, limited war in the Far East, subversion in Latin America, submarines in Hudson Bay—or any other fine points of Soviet diplomacy.

In our lifetime, we have been through three wars, depressions and the ravages of cold war. Americans have been hardened to the realities of this world.

Our problem is how to see to it that Khrushchev will have a true picture of our country, a true picture of our people—and a true picture of our purpose.

PRISONERS OF HOPE

I hope that can happen. Because if it does happen that way, Nikita Khrushchev will return to the Soviet Union with his eyes wide open—and we will gain. We will gain because this Nation has no fear of the truth.

Within the satellite nations are millions of people, most of them prisoners of hope. And that hope must be sustained until the day of freedom becomes for them an actuality.

Mr. Khrushchev has objected to the resolution of the U.S. Congress concerning captive nations. In my opinion, the biggest captive nation in the world today, next to Communist China, is represented in the brainwashed people of Russia. And I strongly suspect that, included among the captives is the ruling class of the Soviets—that keep the rest of the people captive. For we tend to forget that a slave state puts shackles on its masters as well as its subjects. Those who rule are in turn ruled by the channels of information which are open to them.

It is doubtful whether a man in Mr. Khrushchev's position can have a true picture of the United States.

He may know about our military strength. He may know about our economic power. But there are many other things he can learn only by coming to our country and talking to our people.

UNITED DETERMINATION

I want him to know about America's willingness to fight for its freedoms.

I want him to know about America's united determination to preserve our independence.

And I want the Russian people to know about America's desire for peace—the Russian Army which fought so bravely as our ally in World War II; the Russian scholars, such as the Pasternaks and the brilliant Russian scientists; the ordinary Russian people who want, rather than an armaments race, only a few of the everyday consumer goods shown at the U.S. exhibit in Moscow. These are the ones who must ultimately feel the pulse and the heartbeat of America's deep desire for peace.

There are, of course, dangers in this visit to which we must be alert. But I believe our country can withstand exposure to those dangers. Americans are kindhearted; but they are not sotheaded.

THE MARKED DECK

It would be tragic if we fell into the illusion that Mr. Khrushchev is coming here with a deal that would mean peace with honor or peace in our time. Because another man—a kindly, good man—once suffered that illusion, you and I had to spend many years in uniform defending our country and millions of people died.

Of course, Khrushchev would like to make a deal. Every dictator would like to make a deal—with a marked deck.

He would probably like to divide the world into two spheres of influence—with a nice, big slice marked out for the Soviet Union.

But the American people are not going to make such a deal. We do not believe in a world divided into spheres of influence. We believe in a world in which the people have freedom of choice.

And so long as there is a Soviet sphere of influence which includes Hungary, Poland, East Germany and other satellites, no one can say that this is a world of free choice.

It would be tragic if we suffered from the delusion that Mr. Khrushchev can be charmed into changing his course. I do not know whether he would be amused or insulted by such a suggestion.

I do know that any Soviet official who has survived the Communist blood purges of the past 25 years is not to be beguiled like a schoolchild.

THE GREATEST TRAGEDY

But the greatest tragedy would follow if we came to the conclusion that this visit meant a thaw in the cold war. This is the delusion that could lead us into letting down our guard.

I believe in visits between the American and the Soviet peoples. I am a firm advocate of talking instead of fighting—where possible.

But I think the advice given to our ancestors to "keep your powder dry" was good advice—and applies with especial force today.

We should meet Khrushchev or any other Soviet official in good faith. We should listen to any proposals that are made. We should not permit Communist bad faith or Communist bad temper to tempt us into bad faith or bad temper.

But we should, we must, remember that a few kind words will not release Berlin. A few kind words will not free Hungary. A few kind words will not unite Germany. And smiles and quips—however pleasant—will not bring us the peace we desire nor change Khrushchev's determination to bury us.

The day of true peace can and must arrive. We have devised weapons of such fantastic destructive power that we must either live together or perish together.

That realization will come eventually to the Communists—as it has come to our people already.

THE JOB AHEAD

Until that day arrives, however, we cannot relax America's strength.

We must maintain adequate strategic striking power.

We must maintain adequate capacity to fight limited wars when they are forced upon us in remote corners of the globe.

And we must continue to help other people to remain free.

We do not ask other nations to come under our rule. We ask only that they remain independent.

But no nation will remain independent if we permit the balance of military power to shift to the Soviets. We cannot afford to be second best—even in weapons which we pray we never have to use.

This is the one field in which "second best" means last—and lost.

MAINTENANCE OF STRENGTH

We need not only be sure that we have adequate deterrent power to avoid nuclear war. We must also be sure that we have effective deterrent power against limited war—which might easily become a nuclear war. And this requires that we maintain our Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force in such strength that we can land at Beirut if we have to land at Beirut; that we can patrol the Straits of Formosa if we have to patrol the Straits of Formosa; that we can keep the NATO shield intact; that we can deny enemy control of our sea lanes by submarines whether in Hudson Bay or the Caribbean, or on the convoy route to our overseas bases and overseas allies.

We do not live, merely to build weapons. There must be more to life than that.

The day must come when even the most fanatical Communist yields to the pressure for peace. And there are roads to that goal.

There have been a number of Soviet officials parading through our country during the past few months. They have made visits which have been reciprocated.

CRACKS IN THE IRON CURTAIN

Little has been gained from these visits in terms of specific proposals to relax tensions of the cold war. But much may have been gained in opening chinks through the Iron Curtain.

This is the direction in which true peace lies. If Khrushchev can visit the United States, it will be difficult to persuade other Soviet citizens that they cannot visit also.

And at every turn, we should confront Khrushchev and his fellow Communists with a demand to break through the Iron Curtain and let in the light.

We should beset the Soviets at every turn with demands to bring the Russian people the facts about us that have been kept from them. They may respond, if they wish, by presenting their propaganda to Americans.

RAYS OF TRUTH

In a land like ours where speech is free, our citizens are armed against propaganda. But in a nation where the ruling group controls not only speech but thought itself, a few rays of truth are devastating.

We are a people of basic beliefs.

We are a people of basic desires.

For our children we desire a better life than we have lived.

We believe in our country. We believe in our form of Government. We fought for it before and we will fight for it again, if necessary.

We will talk and we are prepared to negotiate, for we are a reasonable people.

But we will not talk surrender. We will not negotiate away freedom—for ourselves or others, now or ever. We never have; we never will.

This has been true of America's past.

It holds true today and forever.

These are the truths for which our forefathers died. Trusting in God and keeping our powder dry, these are the truths by which our children and grandchildren shall live.

Statement on Death of Elizabeth A. Smart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, a few days ago death came to a good friend

of mine—Elizabeth Allen Smart—the very effective and respected legislative agent of the National Temperance and Prohibition Council.

Dr. Charles X. Hutchinson, Jr., president of this fine organization, so capably summarized the story of Elizabeth Allen Smart in the statement which he issued to the members and friends of the national council that I believe his statement should be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON THE DEATH OF ELIZABETH A. SMART

To the members and friends of the national council, the notable career of Elizabeth Allen Smart came to a quiet end on August 16 at the Washington Sanitarium. The victim of cancer, she had battled for almost a year to win her fight with the disease. Immediately following the 1958 convention of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union held in Washington, she entered the hospital with no idea of her precarious condition. She lingered between life and death for several weeks, and with great courage and infinite patience won her way back to partial health. Returning to her apartment, she took up her work with surprising energy in spite of her apparent weakness. After a period of weeks, she recognized that her condition was deteriorating, and made her plans to return to the hospital. She did not go until Bishop Hamaker had gone to his summer home and Mrs. Hutchinson and I had sailed for Europe. She did not want to give us any uneasiness. We found a beautiful bouquet from her in our stateroom when we boarded the *Queen Elizabeth*, and did not know that she had reentered the hospital that very day. On our return, there was only time for a few precious conversations with her at her bedside. Her strength was gone and she spoke in a whisper. She awaited in faith her blessed release.

Elizabeth Smart was the daughter of the parsonage. Her father, the Reverend John Gardiner Smart, was a minister of the Dutch Reformed Church in Schoharie, N.Y., when she was born. She attended Smith College, graduated cum laude, and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa. She decided to enter the law and matriculated in the New York University Law School. She was admitted to the New York State bar in 1915 and was a practicing attorney in that State. Her special interest at that time was in "Business Law" which was the title of a book of which she was coauthor. She became interested in journalism as the medium through which public opinion is molded and motivated and launched a career as editor, and publisher, and later owner, of the oldest weekly in New York State, the Washington County Post of Cambridge, N. Y. In law and in journalism her concern was the direction in which our society was drifting, and she supported every movement for moral and social betterment. It was during that period that the conviction crystallized that beverage alcohol was at the root of most of our social ills, and from that time Elizabeth Smart's name became synonymous with temperance reform.

In 1940 Elizabeth Smart came to Capitol Hill as the director of legislation for the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union. Her legal and journalistic background had prepared her for her public relations task as she made her approaches to

the Members of the Congress in behalf of pending moral and social, particularly temperance, legislation. She looked upon herself as the voice of the thousands of women in her organization. She had a sense of calling that few, if any, lobbyists have ever had. Her penetrating mind and judicious temper won the respect and confidence of congressional leaders. She was far removed from the doctrinaire reformer. She had an understanding of the difficulties of the legislative process in a democracy. She used her power to persuasion in urging the Members of Congress to move in the direction she was convinced we had to go for the sake of the moral health of the Nation. She kept her constituents informed as to what was happening in Congress through her Washington Letter in every issue of the Union Signal, the national journal of the WCTU. She never wearied. She was always patient. She took her defeats in her stride as temporary setbacks. She lived and died in the faith that her cause would ultimately triumph because it is right.

Elizabeth Smart was related to many organizations including the League of Women Voters, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the American Bar Association, the National League of American Pen Women, and the American Academy of Political and Social Science. Her most active interest apart from the WCTU was given to our National Temperance and Prohibition Council which includes 23 organizations working in the field of temperance reform. She was the secretary for many years, and was chairman of the legislative committee at the time of her death. She has been the key person in our organization for so long that her passing is almost an irreparable loss.

Above all and through all, Elizabeth Smart was a good woman. No finer or truer thing could be said. During the years we worked together my regard for a gallant lady grew, and my affection deepened. For she was great as a person. We shall miss her sadly, but we shall carry on in her faith that "Though the wrong seem off so strong, God is the Ruler yet."

The value of the life and work of Elizabeth Smart during her many years on Capitol Hill is suggested in the tributes of many Members of the Congress. I close with a few of the testimonies.

"It was my privilege to know Miss Elizabeth Smart personally. I had frequent conferences with her and was greatly impressed with her dedication to the cause of temperance. For nearly 20 years she faithfully and consistently served as director of legislation in the National WCTU and never failed to advance its purposes at every opportunity. She was courteous, intelligent, considerate, and of unimpeachable character. Her memory will live long in the minds of those who knew her as a fine Christian woman, devoted to a righteous cause."—Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia.

"It was with great sadness that I learned of the passing of Miss Smart. She and I have worked together ever since I have been in the Senate, and I have had the highest regard for her. The cause of temperance has lost a great champion, and Miss Smart will be sorely missed by all those who felt as she did." (Senator WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota.)

"I knew Miss Smart personally and talked with her on numerous occasions regarding her work. I found her to be most energetic in urging legislation which she considered to be of great benefit to our young people particularly, and the country in general. She will be greatly missed, and it will seem unusual here not seeing her testify before congressional committees on matters of moral and social importance." (Senator FRANCIS CASE, South Dakota.)

"May I express my deep regret of the passing of Elizabeth Smart. She was not only one of the most effective legislative agents in Washington, but she was a good friend of mine. It was a pleasure to work with her on the most worthy objectives she championed. She was intelligent, reasonable, and cooperative. I shall miss her." (Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Maine.)

"It was with much regret that I learned of the passing of Miss Elizabeth A. Smart, and I paid my respects at the funeral home because of the high esteem in which I held her. Miss Smart was a fine Christian lady who rendered an outstanding service. I had the pleasure of working with her in our efforts to win passage of my airline safety bill and the Langer antiliquor advertising bill. She was a very able and diligent worker for the cause of protecting the public against the evils of alcohol. She will be missed on Capitol Hill and by all those she so ably served throughout the country." (Senator STROM THURMOND, South Carolina.)

"I was greatly shocked and saddened when I learned of the passing of Miss Elizabeth A. Smart. Miss Smart was a welcome visitor to my office during my entire service in Congress. She had a most gracious personality, and was able to present her cause in a convincing and effective manner. The passing of Miss Smart is an irreparable loss to the temperance movement, and she will be sadly missed by her many friends on Capitol Hill. It was indeed a great privilege to have had her as a friend, and my life is richer because of our acquaintance." (Congressman J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, Third District, Colorado.)

"No exponent of a worthy cause in Washington, during the entire quartercentury of my experience here, has done so much—so quietly and effectively—as Elizabeth Smart. Her devotion to the cause in which her faith never wavered was equaled by an acumen and balanced judgment that never failed to amaze even those who had learned to know how effectively she worked. She lived her beliefs, as well as preached them. When she came into an office, she put fresh vigor and higher level in the whole day's work. I shall miss her sorely; her judgment, her dedication, and most of all, her personal friendship." (Congresswoman MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, 13th District, Illinois.)

"I was deeply distressed at the passing of Miss Elizabeth A. Smart for whom I had a high regard. I am placing your statement concerning her in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today (August 21)." (Congressman EDWARD H. REES, Fourth District, Kansas.)

"Miss Elizabeth A. Smart was a woman of great usefulness and capacity and she will certainly be missed by her friends and all those who came in contact with her. She was zealous and relentless in pursuing the cause of temperance, and yet she was never hostile or vindictive. Certainly she was one of God's great women and we will miss her and her good counsel and effective efforts in the great cause of temperance in the days ahead." (Congressman EUGENE SILER, Eighth District, Kentucky.)

Funeral services for Miss Smart were held in Washington on Wednesday morning, August 19. Bishop Wilbur E. Hammaker was in charge as Miss Smart had requested. He was assisted by Mrs. T. Roy Jarrett representing the National WCTU and the writer. Interment was in Cambridge, N.Y.

APPENDUM

The following tribute to Miss Smart appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 25, 1959:

"I doubt if I ever met an advocate of a cause who was more fair, more understanding or more gentle and kindly than Miss Elizabeth A. Smart of the WCTU, who died last week of cancer. Miss Smart was an

educated woman of infinite patience, who represented the temperance movement with dignity, integrity, and fairness. She was never intolerant or antagonistic of those who disagreed with her. She never threatened, bullied, or attempted belligerence. A person of brilliance, she made no effort to display her learning ostentatiously. * * * She rarely touted her own prowess. I counted her as my friend. * * * Members of the WCTU are fortunate, indeed, to have been represented in our Capital for nearly two decades by this woman of refinement, education, and compassionate motives. All who knew her will continue to honor and respect her memory. Miss Elizabeth A. Smart was a remarkable and gifted person." (SENATOR RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Oregon.)

Restoration of UNICEF's Tax Exemption Status

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement containing information relative to the restoration of the tax exempt status of the United Nations Children's Fund, a status which has been denied by a recent ruling of the Internal Revenue Service.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILLS TO RESTORE UNICEF'S TAX EXEMPTION STATUS

PURPOSE OF THE BILLS

On July 23, 1959, Senators JAVITS and DOUGLAS introduced S. 2426 which was referred to the Senate Committee on Finance. Two identical bills have been introduced in the House (H.R. 8355 by Mr. LINDSAY and H.R. 8583 by Mr. METCALF). The House bills are before the Ways and Means Committee of which Mr. METCALF is a member. These bills would restore to UNICEF donations the same classification they held prior to January 1, 1959. The bills provide that contributions by individuals and private groups in the United States made directly to UNICEF shall receive the same Federal tax exempt status now accorded donations to charitable organizations operating in the United States.

BACKGROUND OF TAX LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

The need for legislation proposed in these bills has grown out of the following developments. On February 6, 1959, Mr. Dana Latham, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, notified UNICEF that contributions made to or for UNICEF are not deductible under the provisions of section 170 of the 1954 code. Bequests, legacies, devises or transfers to or for UNICEF are likewise not deductible for U.S. estate tax purposes as provided by sections 2055 and 2106 of the 1954 code. Gifts of property are also not deductible in computing taxable gifts for the U.S. gift tax purposes as provided in section 2522 of the 1954 code.

This ruling reversed the original interpretation of UNICEF's tax status as established July 10, 1947, by Internal Revenue, a ruling made shortly after UNICEF was created (in

December 1946). At this time contributions made to UNICEF were determined to be deductible by donors in arriving at their taxable net income in the manner and to the extent provided by section 23 (o) and (q) of the Internal Revenue Code as amended. Bequests, legacies, devises or transfers to or for UNICEF were deductible in arriving at the value of the net estate of a decedent for estate tax purposes in the manner and to the extent provided in sections 812 (d) and 861 (a) (3) of the code. Gifts of property were likewise provided for in section 1004 (a) (2) (B) and 1004 (b) (2) and (3) of the code.

The reversal of the ruling concerning UNICEF's status for tax exemption purposes comes as a result of the decision that the United Nations Children's Fund is an integral part of the United Nations itself which was designated as a public international organization under the International Organizations Immunities Act (Public Law 291, 79th Cong.) and therefore its tax status must be determined under such act. Internal Revenue concluded from its analysis of this act that UNICEF was exempt from income tax under section 892 rather than section 501 (c) (3) of the code of 1939 which made no provisions for the deductibility by donors of contributions made to public international organizations. (This code was amended by Public Law 7, 80th Cong., to allow deductions for contributions or gifts to the United Nations during the period from January 1, 1947 to December 1, 1947, but only if used exclusively for acquisition of a headquarters site in New York City. The 1954 code contains no provisions similar to those added to the 1939 code by Public Law 7.)

Mention should be made of the fact that the provisions of the Revenue Code affecting UNICEF have not changed since the establishment of the Children's Fund, nor have the functions and operations of the Children's Fund changed in any fundamental respect.

AMOUNT OF MONEY INVOLVED

From the Treasury's point of view, the amount of money involved in contributions to UNICEF, whether the taxes are collected or not, is too small to have any effect on the Federal budget. From UNICEF's point of view, however, the importance of the contributions is twofold:

1. They afford an important, even though relatively small, source of income;

2. More important than the matter of actual financial support, such gifts represent evidence of effective voluntary participation by private citizens. UNICEF has made possible a broad program of aid by which over 100 countries have been able to provide food, medicine, and disease-destroying chemicals to benefit over 50 million children and nursing or pregnant mothers. This humane program has undoubtedly saved the lives of countless children. To remove this sense of direct participation by American citizens in such a program by the deliberate handicap of withdrawing tax deductibility of contributions to it would be a serious mistake in public policy. By its leadership in encouraging nations to learn to help themselves, UNICEF offers charity in the broadest and most enlightened sense of the word.

Since January 1, 1959, when the Internal Revenue ruling took effect, the report for the first 6 months of this year indicates that donations to UNICEF have dropped by more than 30 percent below the figures for contributions for the first 6 months of 1958. Although governments are the principal support of UNICEF, the continuation of individual participation through contributions by private citizens is vitally important and should be encouraged through appropriate tax law provisions.

SUPPORT OF THE BILLS

There is no evidence of opposition to this legislation from any source—State, Internal Revenue, the Congress, or the public.

The Citizens Committee for UNICEF, along with a number of other national organizations interested in the work of the Children's Fund, is deeply concerned for the enactment of such legislation before Congress adjourns. The fact that these bills were not introduced earlier in the session is intensely regretted. However, until very recently the hope remained that Internal Revenue could be induced to reverse again its position and restore UNICEF's previous tax status. A number of tax lawyers seem to uphold the correctness of the Internal Revenue interpretation as it now stands, however, and, therefore legislation showing the intent of the Congress in this case is urgently needed before adjournment in order that the Children's Fund not lose the benefit of possible contributions during the remainder of 1959. Unless action is taken immediately, the impact of the present ruling would inevitably continue well into the calendar year 1960.

A way to insure prompt action would be for the Finance Committee to attach this legislation as an amendment to H.R. 8725, or other bill reasonably sure of passage, now pending before the committee. May we have your support for such action?

Moving Migrants From Overpopulated Countries to Countries Where Manpower Is Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the publication of the *George Washington University Federalist*, fall 1959, there appeared an article, entitled "An Episode in My Political Career of Which I Am Especially Proud: Moving Migrants From Overpopulated Countries to Countries Where Manpower Is Needed," written by our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]. There is no man in the Congress of the United States or elsewhere who is better qualified to discuss or write about the subject matter of his article than my close and valued friend from Pennsylvania. In my remarks, it is a pleasure for me to include therein the article written by Congressman WALTER:

AN EPISODE IN MY POLITICAL CAREER OF WHICH I AM ESPECIALLY PROUD: MOVING MIGRANTS FROM OVERPOPULATED COUNTRIES TO COUNTRIES WHERE MANPOWER IS NEEDED

(By FRANCIS E. WALTER, Representative from Pennsylvania)

When the victorious Allied armies liberated Western Europe and entered Hitler's Reich, they found over 8.5 million displaced people. Part of that mass of humanity were slave laborers conscripted into Hitler's war machine. Part were the wretched inmates of concentration camps. Part were refugees from bombed cities and villages milling aimlessly around the countryside and camping under the open skies.

UNRRA (United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration), with the active assistance of the military forces of the Allies, provided food, shelter, and assisted those who could be sent to their countries quickly. By 1946, the number of displaced persons who could not be sent home due to the fact that their homelands were overrun by Soviet forces and Soviet-installed regimes, was

close to 1.3 million. It soon became evident that these people would have to be resettled outside of Germany and Austria.

IRO (International Refugee Organization) took over where UNRRA and the military left off. By the summer of 1951, over 800,000 displaced persons found new homes in countries which offered them resettlement opportunities.

However, in 1951, it was realized that with the expiration of IRO scheduled to occur at the end of that year, the problem of resettlement of refugees and displaced persons would not be fully and successfully resolved. More than that, another problem was facing the free Western World: "surplus population," an ugly definition, meaning that there were too many people in Western Europe for whom work and opportunities for a decent livelihood could not be found.

At the same time, many overseas countries—Canada, Australia, and several of the Latin American Republics—indicated their interest in acquiring new settlers in order to increase their agricultural and industrial productivity.

In the late summer of 1951, I gathered in my office a few officials representing various agencies of the U.S. Government and submitted to them a tentative plan calling for the creation of an organization designed not only to take over the functions of IRO with respect to the resettlement of refugees and displaced persons, but also build an efficiently operated machine which would stimulate and carry out migratory movements from Europe to overseas countries.

My idea was to create an intergovernmental organization, outside of the United Nations for the obvious purpose of eliminating Communist interference, and to offer to the countries of emigration and the countries of immigration efficient shipping services, as well as assistance in their selection of immigrants and their vocational preparation for migration.

In a series of sessions, which continued in my congressional office for about a month or two, my plan began to take shape and before the year 1951 was over, we succeeded in obtaining the cooperation of the Government of Belgium, which invited 27 governments to participate in an international conference which convened in Brussels, Belgium, in November 1951.

A provisional organization was created by the Brussels Conference for the purpose of "making arrangements for the transport of migrants for whom existing facilities are inadequate and who could not otherwise be moved from certain European countries having surplus population to countries overseas which offer opportunities for orderly immigration." It was further decided that the new organization would provide and arrange for land, sea, and air transportation, assume responsibility for the charter of ships, work out a shipping program and take over actions as may be directly related to these ends.

The name of the organization is the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM). Its headquarters are in Geneva, Switzerland, and its present director is Mr. Marcus Daly, an American industrialist and civic leader. He succeeded two distinguished American diplomats, the late Hugh Gibson and Harold H. Tittmann. I have served as the U.S. delegate at all of the semiannual sessions of ICEM's Council, the organization's governing body.

Since the Conference in Brussels established ICEM, 897,788 European emigrants (including 13,171 European refugees stranded in the Far East) went to 17 overseas countries where they were able to start a new life. In this figure are included both refugees and "surplus workers" who became useful workers in the lands which accepted them. Also included are 110,000 Hungarian refugees who fled Hungary in the aftermath of the 1956 revolution.

The emergency operation undertaken by ICEM in October 1956, in connection with the Hungarian revolution, and the ensuing exodus from Hungary has earned that organization recognition and praise of the entire free world. Practically overnight ICEM's machinery sprang into action, and its helping hand was extended without delay and with the greatest degree of efficiency when and where such assistance was most desperately needed.

ICEM now comprised a membership of 29 nations of the free world. Since its inception, ICEM has spent close to \$200 million, of which \$72 million was contributed by the United States. What did this money buy? In addition to a wealth of experience, which would permit ICEM to expand its activities in the future and in addition to an imponderable but easily detectable capital of international goodwill, ICEM has created in close to one million hearts the feeling of happiness and purpose in living where war and misery had planted the seed of despair and hopelessness. But these humanitarian achievements do not tell the entire story of ICEM's usefulness. It should be stressed that ICEM is not solely a relief organization. By moving migrants from overpopulated countries to countries where manpower is needed, it achieves three purposes:

1. It relieves pressures on the U.S. immigration quotas by permitting European immigrants to resettle in countries other than the United States.
2. It relieves economic, social, and political pressures in European countries contributing to their stability, thus strengthening the free Western World.
3. It contributes to the economic development of overseas countries by supplying them with European manpower in the most desirable age bracket.

Newsmen See President in Full Command of Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the column written by Roscoe Drummond, entitled "Newsmen See President in Full Command of Office," published in the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald, on August 26, 1959. I feel sure this article will be of interest to my colleagues. There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NEWSMEN SEE PRESIDENT IN FULL COMMAND OF OFFICE
(By Roscoe Drummond)

Veteran Washington correspondents—not given to overstatement—assessed Dwight Eisenhower's 169th presidential press conference Tuesday as a stirring moment of history.

To one whose White House reportorial experience goes back to the crackling, opinion-laden meetings with F.D.R. and the tense, explosive, yes-and-no hours with Harry S. Truman, this was one of the most moving and momentous press conferences of a quarter century.

If there was any lingering doubt that Mr. Eisenhower is in decisive and full-fledged command of his awesome office—in foreign affairs, in domestic matters, in congressional

relations—it was totally removed by this impressive performance.

But it did far more than that. It was moving and momentous—

Because it showed Mr. Eisenhower irrevocably intent upon using his "last atom of strength"—there appeared to be plenty of it—and his "last atom of prestige" to try to bring about a more peaceful world.

Because it revealed the President speaking with such depth of feeling and conviction that few, if any, of the 233 reporters had any doubt that, in the bold peace moves he is now making, there is not a partisan or personal motive in his whole being.

Because it made clear that Mr. Eisenhower is not going to let small-minded arguments of protocol and propriety sway him from his venturesome diplomacy with Premier Khrushchev since, as he put it, the issue is "too tremendous"; it is the survival "of the human race."

Because it disclosed that the President's unabated determination is to find a way to reduce the crushing burden of armaments before they explode in Soviet hands and that, without yielding ideals or principles he will spare nothing of himself to bring it about.

Because it showed that Mr. Eisenhower is zestfully wielding the presidency as at no other time since his first inauguration.

Yes, Mr. Eisenhower still got his syntax a little tangled. Occasionally he would stop a sentence in midstream and then start over. But his ideas didn't get tangled; his clarity of purpose stood out and there was never any doubt about what he meant.

When a correspondent asked whether Mr. Eisenhower thought that his trip to the Soviet Union might "erode the prestige of the President," it was obvious that this question stemmed from Mr. Truman's latest newspaper article in which he advised Mr. Eisenhower not to make the trip lest "it dissipate" presidential leadership.

Mr. Eisenhower's instant response was that while his personal prestige might or might not be eroded, the prestige of no future President would be eroded by anything but his own actions.

Mr. Eisenhower was completely in charge of his press conference all the way. It was clear that he knew what he wanted to say and why he wanted to say it; what he intended to do and why he wanted to do it.

The reason there is no doubt in the President's words is that there is no doubt in his mind and this stems from three factors: (1) The loss of Secretary of State Dulles; (2) the resignation of Sherman Adams; (3) the visible and continued improvement in his health.

All of these factors have contributed to making Mr. Eisenhower a full-length participant in the development of administration decisions. For months now he has had to be part of the staff which does the staff work on major policy decisions. He no longer comes in only at the end.

He did not want to lose Mr. Dulles. He didn't want to lose Mr. Adams. But my impression is that he thoroughly likes the kind of harder work he now has to do.

For the first time Dwight Eisenhower seems to enjoy being President.

Medical Care, the American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in recent years the citizens of

our Nation have given increasing attention to proposals and plans that would ease the impact upon the family budget of major medical expenses.

With its jurisdiction over tax and social security legislation, the Committee on Ways and Means is devoting more and more time to the study of this problem. It will be recalled that the Republican 83d Congress authorized a significant liberalization of the medical expense deduction available to our citizens in computing their income tax liability. In addition, the 83d Congress, approved legislation protecting the social security benefit entitlements of persons who sustained disabilities. Congress has also provided for the payment of disability benefits and dependency benefits where the primary provider in a family has become disabled.

The Committee on Ways and Means recently concluded public hearings on a proposal to provide medical and hospital care benefits under the social security program for OASI beneficiaries. This proposal has created considerable controversy. It has been criticized on the ground that it is discriminatory in that it would impose on the present working population the cost of medical care for the present aged, on the ground that it would result in bureaucratic Government intervention in the practice of medicine and on the ground that it would interfere with the doctor-patient relationship that is such an important element in the medical care of our citizens. The proponents of medical and hospital payments under the social security program support their position by stating that their proposal represents the most feasible method of meeting this problem. They say that medical and hospital insurance programs are not adequate.

I disagree with this latter contention. In my opinion, our insurance industry and the medical profession are making tremendous strides in their endeavors to assure adequate medical care for all our citizens on a nondiscriminatory basis and within the framework of our free enterprise system. This progress is being made without subjecting the medical profession to domination by the dictates of Government bureaus and without launching our Nation on the discredited path of national health insurance. It is encouraging to me that we have made such remarkable progress in meeting our medical and health needs by individual and collective initiative without reliance on Government paternalism.

An article appearing in the Wall Street Journal today presents some very interesting factual information regarding the gains which have been made in this area. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks the text of this report.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 27, 1959]

HEALTH INSURANCE—MORE PLANS FIND WAY TO BOOST BENEFITS: IGNORE MINOR ILLS—GE'S PROGRAM SETS PACE, AVOIDS RISE IN PREMIUMS; 12,000 OTHER FIRMS FOLLOW BUT AFL-CIO DISLIKES IT

(By Jerry E. Blahop)

NEW YORK.—In the fast-changing field of health insurance, a new product is beginning to make spectacular gains at a time when

many of the older types of policies are beginning to run into trouble.

Like most successful new products, this one—called comprehensive coverage—has many features not found in the older health policies. But, in one sense, it offers quite a lot less. Under this plan, for example, if a person goes to the hospital for minor repairs for just a day or two he'll probably have to pay all the bills himself.

The theory behind this: By not paying the small claims—whose aggregate cost is very high because they're so common—the insurer can offer more extensive benefits to cover serious illnesses. And he can do this without the frequent, stiff premium boosts which some insurance officials blame partly on a tendency by policyholders to go into the hospital for minor ills that would be treated at home if hospital care weren't free.

FIRST DOLLAR COVERAGE

The new policies are a radical departure from the old philosophy of first dollar coverage that has been the cornerstone of most of the major health insurance plans. First dollar coverage—providing payment of smaller as well as larger hospital bills—was one of the key attractions that enabled the Blue Cross to grow from a small, local experiment in Dallas in 1929 to a mammoth collection of 79 regional associations with more than 54 million members. Private insurance companies also relied heavily on the first dollar idea as they built their hospital and surgical coverage to more than 70 million people in the last 20 years.

Now, however, financial problems are increasing for plans which attempt to cover almost all their subscribers' hospital expenses up to an agreed limit. Last year the Nation's Blue Cross plans ran up a deficit of \$40 million after paying out some \$1.4 billion in benefits. New York's Associated Hospital Service alone plunged \$30 million into the red.

With the cost of medical care rising faster than any other component of the cost-of-living index (it was up 4.4 percent in July over a year ago and now is more than 50 percent higher than it was 10 years ago), employees who are covered in group health plans are being hit with wave after wave of premium increases. Blue Cross plans in Concord, N.H., Atlanta, Chicago, Cleveland, and Detroit have boosted their rates from 20 to 30 percent this year. Similar premium boosts are slated for Pittsburgh and New York City in the next few weeks. Insurance companies, which provide similar health coverage on both an individual and group basis, also have had to increase premiums or to quietly prune out some former benefits from their policies in order to balance dollar intake with rising claim payments.

A RISING BUSINESS COST

Many employers pay part or all of their employees health insurance premiums, so the rising premium rate is also becoming a rising cost of doing business. At the same time, there is growing pressure from unions for more extensive health coverage. Broader benefits are among the major demands being made on the steel and aluminum industries by the United Steelworkers, now on strike against the steel companies. And the big United Auto Workers union is reported to be preparing demands for more liberal health insurance at its next bargaining session.

Meanwhile, pessimism is growing about how present insurance systems can survive without further drastic rate increases. "Ten years from now, health insurance as we know it will be dead as a dodo," one leading insurance executive declared recently in an off-the-record talk. What he and an increasing number of other insurance officials envision as a substitute is a system of medical protection that covers the major expenses of a serious illness, but leaves the minor costs to be met by the individual.

The leader in this new trend is, strangely enough, not an insurance company, but the General Electric Co.—better known for such products as light bulbs, refrigerators and turbine generators.

In 1949, a group of G.E. executives organized a plan to insure themselves against the catastrophic costs of a major illness. The plan was the forerunner of what is known today as "major medical" insurance; it was quickly borrowed by other firms and is now the fastest growing type of health insurance, covering at least 13 million persons. The number of persons covered has doubled each year for several years.

The basic provisions of major medical insurance are: (1) High maximum benefits, ranging from \$5,000 to as much as \$15,000. (2) A deductible amount. This is a specified amount, \$300 to \$500 in early plans, which the individual must pay himself before reimbursement by the insurer starts. (3) Co-insurance. This applies to a percentage, usually 20 or 25 percent of covered expenses in excess of the deductible amount. The individual must pay this portion of the covered expenses himself. The plan does not provide reimbursement of this amount.

COMBINATION OF COVERAGES

While major medical insurance has the key advantage of softening the crippling financial blow that a catastrophic illness can deliver to a family, its weakness is that the deductible amount is so high that lower income workers still would be hard hit in case of a severe medical emergency, having to pay out \$300 or \$500 on their own before insurance payments are received. For this reason, many employers in recent years offered their employees a combination of coverages—Blue Cross and Blue Shield (surgical insurance) for basic medical costs and major medical insurance for the most serious and expensive illnesses, for which Blue Cross and Blue Shield benefits would be insufficient.

It was almost inevitable that an attempt be made to merge the two forms of protection into one. The first major experiment in this direction was attempted in late 1955—again by General Electric. GE sought to cover not just a few executives but all its 250,000 employees and an estimated 500,000 dependents. GE's lead has since been followed, in a variety of forms, by thousands of other firms.

The GE comprehensive plan greatly broadened the benefits formerly available under its employee medical care program. The new plan covers major bills running as high as \$7,500 a year or \$15,000 in a lifetime. In addition, it poses few restrictions on the kind of medical bills that will be covered. Besides the usual hospital and surgical bills, the plan also covers such items as drugs, nursing care, blood transfusions, anesthetics, X-rays, ambulance services, and iron lungs, which are often extra-cost items for persons with ordinary health insurance. The plan also provides that medical bills will be paid whether they are run up in a hospital, at home, or in the doctor's office.

However, GE requires the employee to shell out some money from his own pocket. Expenses are divided into two classes. On A expenses—hospital and surgical bills—the employee must pay the first \$25 himself; the plan pays the next \$225 in full and then \$85 percent of the balance. B expenses include physicians, nurses, drugs, and use of laboratory and diagnostic equipment. Here, the employee pays the first \$50 in a calendar year and the plan pays 75 percent of the balance. If both A and B expenses are incurred in 1 year, the total deductible amount for both is only \$50, much smaller than the usual deductible in major medical insurance.

This differs from basic plans which cover most expenses from the first day of hospitalization on, but which also set top limits

on the number of days of hospitalization for which they will pay and the amounts they will pay for specific operations. These payments frequently do not cover full costs.

"With our provisions, the individual takes a greater interest in the fees he's being charged and he's not likely to abuse the plan," says Russell Hubbard of GE's employee benefit department.

"Most existing plans force people into a hospital," says another GE executive. "For example, they provide that a \$15 diagnostic X-ray is not reimbursable unless the patient enters the hospital, so many doctors will stick him there for a day or so in order to qualify and thus run up a lot of extra costs. In our plan, we've tried to leave it so that a doctor can practice medicine as it should be practiced without prescribing such things as a hospital stay just so the patient's plan will pay the bills."

The \$25 and \$50 deductibles also eliminate many of the small \$5, \$10, and \$15 claims, which cost just as much to process as a \$100 claim. "It doesn't make economic sense for insurance to pay for bills that an employee can easily budget for himself," says the insurance specialist of another company, adding that it sometimes costs his firm \$8 to process a \$5 claim.

The "coinsurance" feature of GE-type plans, under which the employee pays a percentage of the total bill, also is helping to curb abuses, some companies say. "We know of any number of instances where doctors had two schedules of fees—one for patients with insurance and one for those without insurance," says Gordon Thayer, director of industrial relations of Vitro Corp. of New York, another firm which has embraced comprehensive health insurance recently.

Helping win employees to GE's new plan was the implied promise that the plan, by discouraging abuses of medical insurance, would prevent premium rates from climbing as rapidly as they otherwise would. So far at least, the promise seems to have held good. "Our premium rate hasn't gone up since 1956," comments GE's Mr. Hubbard. Claims, it's true, have increased in average size from year to year but only about half as much as the national average increase in medical care costs. And offsetting this has been a 30-percent decline in the number of petty claims—those under \$25.

The broader benefits available under the plan evidently appealed to GE employees right from the start. Given a choice between the new plan and the company's older "first dollar" type program augmented with expanded major medical type benefits, 99.2 percent of GE's eligible employees have switched to the new plan. (For a GE employee earning \$6,000 a year, the new plan costs \$154 a year, including all dependents, compared to \$95 for family protection under the previous plan. For single employees there is no difference, the annual premium being \$54 in both cases.) Handling the actual coverage are the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. and Aetna Life Insurance Co.

GE's experience is attracting a horde of other employers to comprehensive plans. The big electrical appliance manufacturer estimates that some 12,000 other companies have adopted comprehensive plans since it set up its program. 4,500 of the new additions coming in 1958 alone. American Cyanamid, Douglas Aircraft Co., the San Francisco Hotel Employers' Association, and Caterpillar Tractor are just a few of the newcomers into the field.

Equitable Life Assurance Society, one of many insurance firms which now are offering comprehensive plans, says it has issued such policies to 327,000 persons, 8 times as many as were covered in 1956. According to the Health Insurance Institute, 5,175,000 persons were covered by comprehensive plans at the end of 1958, compared with almost none 3 years earlier.

Khrushchev's Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that the pending visit of Premier Khrushchev to this country in the minds of our citizens across the country is a major consideration.

In itself, it marks a unique pattern of negotiations between nations with conflicts of interest—as strongly as freedom versus communism—when the leaders of two opposing camps exchange visits.

A big question before the American people is: Just how should he be received?

In view of the fact that Khrushchev is the No. 1 Communist—which represents the most serious threat to our security existing in the world—there are widely differing views on his reception.

Recognizing that the President, in agreeing to the exchange visits, felt that such an interchange might well contribute to solving some of the East-West differences and lessening tensions, the American people, I believe, have a responsibility—which I am confident they will meet—of acting in a way that will provide the best kind of climate for whatever results may be obtained from such an exchange.

Commendably, our mass media—publishing, radio, television—are assuming a fine responsible role in attempting to create the climate that augurs best for the visit.

Particularly, I refer to a splendid editorial recently published in the Janesville Daily Gazette, Janesville, Wis., entitled "Khrushchev's Visit."

Representative of constructive editorializing for the upcoming event, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Janesville (Wis.) Daily Gazette, Aug. 25, 1959]

KHRUSHCHEV'S VISIT

Khrushchev's visit to the United States next month will be one of the most extraordinary events of its kind in American experience.

Of all the famous foreign visitors, from Lafayette of Revolutionary War days right down to the recent visits of Baudouin of Belgium and Queen Elizabeth II, there seems to be no parallel.

The Russian leader comes as an official visitor, and the top man of the Russian Soviet, and is thus entitled to all the red carpet treatment accorded heads of state. He has talked like an enemy, but comes as a friend. He heads not only a state which operates under a political and economic system hostile to ours, but also is the nominal head of the entire Communist bloc.

The hostility of many Americans toward Russian communism, of which Khrushchev is the symbol, and especially of newcomers to America recently escaped from behind the Iron Curtain will make security arrangements for the visit particularly difficult. The impending visit has so baffled Congress that it has been tacitly decided to adjourn prior

to the arrival of the Russian leader, so that the customary invitation to any visiting head of state to address a joint session may be avoided.

Some Americans hope that the visit here, and President Eisenhower's trip to Russia will improve relations between the two countries. Others regard the exchange of visits as a mere formality, with Khrushchev having the edge of the bargain because of his obvious eagerness to see this country. Certainly it may be predicted that Americans will not change their views toward communism as a way of life because of the visit, and it seems equally certain that Russia will not change either. The gain may be in a degree of understanding on some special problems of today, rather than in basic philosophy.

How then should Americans treat a guest who comes without anything more than a surface and official welcome? The best course, it seems, is to follow the lead of Washington in extending a coldly polite reception, going no further than necessary to meet standards of international good conduct, but being certain to observe strictly the niceties and conventions usually extended to a visitor of his importance.

It will be a trying few days because impulsive Americans can be expected to show their active dislike for Russian communism before its foremost leader, or at the other extreme, react involuntarily with the usual warm greeting ordinarily extended famous visitors from abroad.

Self-control and a degree of reserve are needed because Khrushchev must not be permitted to go home in the belief that Americans are actively hostile toward himself and his country. But it is just as important that he sense the fact that America is completely opposed to those things which he represents, and that his visit here is tolerated rather than sought.

One Hundredth Anniversary of the Petroleum Industry

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 100th anniversary of the petroleum industry in the United States. On August 27, 1859, Col. Edwin L. Drake completed the world's first successfully drilled oil well at Titusville, Pa.

The petroleum industry has contributed more than any other single group to the evolution of man from the era of the candle and the horse and buggy to the supersonic jet.

Its achievements are legend; not the least of which was the event which we celebrate today. Although we cannot overlook the contributions of the refiners, the pipeliners, the engineers and technicians, this first 100 years in the petroleum industry shall go down as the century of the wildcatter.

Oil lay valueless in the ground millions of years before the wildcatter found a way to bring it to the surface for others to refine and develop into the thousands of commonplace items in our daily lives.

At the beginning of the second half of oil's first century, petroleum supplied less than 10 percent of the total energy of the United States. Today, less than

Now, the idea of doing away with full coverage of medical bills is creeping into Blue Cross-Blue Shield plans, formerly the stronghold of "first dollar" philosophy.

Late last year, Philadelphia's Blue Cross plan, known as Associated Hospital Service of Philadelphia, began offering a program which, in return for more liberal benefits, calls for the subscriber to pay the first \$5 of each day's hospital charges up to 15 days a year. So far, says a spokesman, more than 500,000 Philadelphians have switched to the new co-pay comprehensive plan, or about one-third of the Blue Cross subscribers who are eligible. Deductible provisions in various forms also have popped up in Blue Cross plans in Missouri, Texas, and Kansas.

Officials at New York City's big, deficit-plagued Blue Cross plan, known officially as Associated Hospital Service of New York, concede that they too are considering adding comprehensive features to their coverage. The New York program is under pressure to broaden its benefits, after receiving permission recently from State insurance officials for a 26.5-percent rate increase, which followed a 22.3-percent rate boost in June of last year.

Comprehensive health insurance, despite its recent breath-taking growth, is far from universally popular. "The deductible feature is a very sensitive point with unions," admits an executive of one big industrial company which has been trying unsuccessfully to persuade its employees to switch over. "The coverage of the \$6 or \$8 claim, because it turns up so often, seems to be more important to most people than coverage of the bigger but less frequent expenses."

Last month, members of the Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers Union turned thumbs down on a comprehensive plan offered by the Sinclair Oil Co.

The AFL-CIO on several occasions has leveled criticisms at comprehensive and major medical insurance. One charge is that the deductible provision might discourage prompt use of medical facilities and might become an incentive for letting minor illnesses become major ones. Another complaint is that comprehensive medical insurance takes away protection from the many and only seems to give additional protection to the few. According to the AFL-CIO, only 1 out of ever 100 families ever incurs medical expenses as high as \$1,000 in a year's time.

Insurance officials are quick to offer rebuttals. Says an official of New York Life Insurance Co., "Health insurance has become a means of spreading small payments over all employees. We have lost sight of the important principles of insurance. There is no point to insuring a cost which is apt to fall regularly on the people, because such an item should be allowed for in the family budget, and the cost of insurance administration merely adds to the inevitable basic cost."

General Electric, prior to introducing its plan, held hundreds of meetings with union officials (the big company bargains with more than 100 different unions), salaried employee groups, doctors, and hospital representatives. It still carries on intensive followup work to be sure that costs stay in line. In one mid-western town, it discovered that frequency and duration of weekly sickness and accident claims were more than double the company average. A meeting was held with the local medical society. "Following this meeting the frequency and duration of disabilities were so reduced that the cost was cut in half. Hospital and surgical rates also dropped," says a GE health insurance specialist.

On a national basis, the frequency of hospital admissions for GE employees, excluding maternity cases, is now 90 per 1,000 in a year, compared with about 112 for Blue Cross organizations. Surgical claims average 75 per 1,000 employees, compared to 125 per 1,000 in a typical Blue Shield large city plan.

50 years later, that industry supplies nearly 70 percent of all our energy needs. The opportunities open to this dynamic industry over the next 100 years are limitless, providing it remembers its birthright of individualism.

Yes, it was the century of the wildcatter. It was the wildcatter who made the petroleum industry the moving force in our lives today and it will be the same spirit of determination to overcome all obstacles, be they natural or manmade, which will lead the industry to the realization of those opportunities.

I am proud that I represent in our Nation's Congress the area in which the first great wildcatter showed the way to those who were to follow. Little did anyone in 1859 dream of the fountainhead of abundance which would spring from that one hole in the ground. Today there are more than 280,500 such wells which have been drilled in Pennsylvania alone. In each instance they contributed to the strength of the industry and the Nation.

In each instance those wells were drilled by men who were instilled with the spirit of the oilfinder, the "Man of the Century" in petroleum's first 100 years.

The assistance and inspiration received from those associated with this vital industry in the 23d District of Pennsylvania, which I represent, have helped to shape Federal policies which have encouraged the wildcatter to take the risks inherent in the development of our petroleum reserves. With this continued help to all in Congress, our Nation can be assured of an abundance of petroleum for peace and throughout any emergency.

I congratulate the industry on the success of its first century and I am confident that it will continue to meet its obligations as it continues to provide the Nation with the blood of its industrial economy and national defense.

Personal Income Gains in the Southeast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the Atlanta Journal of August 24, 1959, published an article concerning the national per capita income and the per capita income of the States in the southeastern region. The article points out that during the last 25 years the national advance has been 656 percent, whereas the increase in income in Georgia has been 843 percent.

I wish to point out that Florida, with a gain of 1,794 percent, leads every State in the entire Nation.

We are proud of the economic progress we are making in our State. We are proud of the economic progress we are making in our region. We are also

proud, Mr. President, of the economic progress we are making throughout the entire Nation.

While our per capita income in Georgia is still much lower than the national average, I wish to point out it is increasing relatively faster than the national average. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objections, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Atlanta Journal, Aug. 24, 1959]

DIXIE INCOME GAINS \$35 BILLION IN 25 YEARS—GEORGIA'S \$5.6 BILLION IS 843 PERCENT INCREASE; FLORIDA'S 1,794 PERCENT LEADS ALL OF NATION.

Personal income in the seven-State Southeast increased more than \$30 billion—from \$3,291 million to \$34,896 million—during the past 25 years, the U.S. Department of Commerce has reported.

The increase in Georgia was from \$602 million in 1933 to \$5,678 million in 1958, according to Merrill C. Lofton, manager of the Atlanta field office of the Federal agency.

Other increases were Alabama, \$40 million to \$4,364 million; Florida, \$440 million to \$8,334 million; Mississippi, \$266 million to \$2,302 million; North Carolina, \$678 million to \$6,297 million; South Carolina, \$305 million to \$2,929 million; and Tennessee, \$560 million to \$4,992 million.

Florida's increase of 1,794 percent was the Nation's greatest gain in personal income during the quarter of a century.

Included in the income computations were wages and salaries, proprietors' income, dividends, pensions, and income from other sources.

Comparing personal income estimates of the Commerce Department's Office of Business Economics for 1958 with those of 1933, Mr. Lofton said the past quarter of a century also brought almost unbelievable gains in per capita income, ranging from a 724 percent advance in Alabama down to 560 in Florida.

In Alabama per capita income went from \$165 in 1933 to \$1,359 last year; Florida, \$284 to \$1,878; Georgia, \$204 to \$1,487; Mississippi, \$131 to \$1,053; North Carolina, \$207 to \$1,384; South Carolina, \$174 to \$1,218; and Tennessee, \$204 to \$1,439.

In both total and per capita income, the gains made in the Southeast have not only been among the most impressive in the country, but substantially exceeded the average for the Nation as a whole. In total income, compared with a national advance of 656 percent, were Alabama's 892 percent, Florida's 1,794, Georgia's 843, Mississippi's 765, North Carolina's 829, South Carolina's 860, and Tennessee's 791 percent.

In per capita income in the 25 years, all of the gains made in the Southeastern States also forged ahead of that for the Nation. Compared with a U.S. uptrend of 448 percent were the 724 percent in Alabama, 560 in Florida, 629 in Georgia, 704 in Mississippi, 568 in North Carolina, 600 in South Carolina, and 605 percent in Tennessee.

In total income, 4 of the 7 Southeastern States have moved upward among the 48 States of the Nation in rank. Alabama climbed from 28th position in 1933 to 24th last year; Florida, from 28th to 12th; South Carolina, from 34th to 31st; and Mississippi, from 37th to 33d. Georgia, however, slipped back 1 notch, from 19th to 20th; North Carolina, 1, from 17th to 18th; and Tennessee, 2 places, from 20th to 22d.

None of the 7 did too well in change in rank upward in per capita income, however. Alabama remained in 45th position; Florida

advanced 1 place, from 29th to 28th; Georgia dropped back from 41st to 42d; Mississippi, from 48th to 49th; when counting the District of Columbia, North Carolina went from 40th to 44th; South Carolina, from 44th to 48th; and Tennessee, from 41st to 43d.

One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the Birth of Hannibal Hamlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the finger of fate points in curious fashions, for had Hannibal Hamlin of Maine been Vice President during President Lincoln's second, instead of first, term of office, he would have been elevated to the high position of President of the United States.

Destiny's dictate has not, however, served to diminish Vice President Hamlin's stature as a statesman, and he will hold in the future, as he has held in the past, a well-deserved place in our Nation's and the State of Maine's hall of fame.

Today, August 27, marks the 150th anniversary of the birthday of Hannibal Hamlin, and I was privileged to participate in today's ceremony when, in honor of this event, a wreath was laid at the base of Hannibal Hamlin's monument in the Capitol.

Maine newspapers have heralded this 150th birthday anniversary with special articles about Maine's truly great statesman, and because the following article has a political theme, I am commending it to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald, Aug. 22, 1959]

HANNIBAL HAMLIN LETTERS REVEALED—A FENCE MENDER EXTRAORDINARY (By Frank Sleeper)

Hannibal Hamlin was mending fences in 1847-48.

The man who was to become Maine's only Vice President of the United States had been defeated in his attempt at election as U.S. Senator in 1846. A deadlock in the State senate brought that result.

Hamlin's second term as a Democratic Congressman ran out as 1847 began—and he did not choose to run again.

Instead he ran for and was elected to the State house of representatives. From that perch, he marshalled the antislavery Democrats of Maine and, in May 1848, was elected to the U.S. senatorship he wanted.

There's no better day than Saturday—the day the 150th anniversary of Hamlin's birth is being celebrated in Paris Hall—to throw a little more historical light on the man.

Five letters from Hamlin to Hugh D. McLellan of Gorham are being made public Saturday for the first time. All are political in tone.

They cover the period January 25, 1847 to February 6, 1848. About 10 years ago, a customer gave the letters to barber Frederick L. Grant of 15 Morning Street.

"He was a cabinet finisher and found the five letters in a cabinet on which he was

working. He knew I collected old stamps and envelopes so he brought them to me," Grant explains.

"I can't think of a better time than the 150th anniversary of Hamlin's birth to reveal the contents of the letters publicly," the Casco Arcade barber says.

There's good reason for the political tone of the five letters. McLellan was a leading Democrat in Cumberland County in 1847. He aspired to be speaker of the House of Representatives—and was successful in that quest.

The final letter of the group was written to McLellan in Washington where he was a clerk in the Treasury Department.

That looked like a reward for a job well done. If it was, it's not to be wondered at. Hamlin speaks in these letters of rewarding McLellan for throwing his support to the future Vice President.

As the Maine historian, Dr. Louis C. Hatch, put it in his "Maine, A History," "He [Hamlin] had entered politics at the time of the triumph of the spoils system and, like most men of his day, including Lincoln, he accepted and used it."

The five letters build to a peak. The fourth is marked confidential. The fifth and last is labeled strictly confidential.

It's a blow-by-blow account of Hamlin's words to a politician whose support he felt was essential to his election as U.S. Senator.

The salient points of the first letter, January 24, 1847, written from Washington, are few.

"Well, we have finally got the House of Representatives in order after a close fight," Hamlin wrote McLellan. "Well, you will be Speaker, I hope. I will do what I can for you with all pleasure. You must work yourself and make your friends do so too," he concluded.

The second letter is dated March 16, 1847, written from Hampden, Hamlin's residence at that time. It was getting closer to legislature time (sessions started in May then) and the letter showed it.

"Charles Stetson of Bangor would like very well to be elected State treasurer if he can be as well as not," Hamlin said. "I write you at the request of his friends to learn what your views are and how you are situated. Will you do me the favor to give me your views and much oblige me by so doing?"

"How comes on the speakership?" the future vice president continued. "I am at home and ready to serve you to the best of my power. I will aid you all I can and you must be elected. You and your friends too must work. Let me know what I can do. I shall be at Augusta at the organization and will do what I can with our delegation and others."

The third letter is dated 8 days later, March 24, 1847. Again it's from Hampden and, again, goes deeper into the Maine political scene of the times.

"I trust you will be finally so situated that you will join with us in electing Stetson State treasurer. You and — and a few others can do it," Hamlin wrote. (Apparently, they were not successful or McLellan held with a man from his area because one Moses McDonald of Limerick was named State treasurer in 1847).

"I have written to Johnson of the Age (a newspaper or magazine), Bradbury (U.S. Senator James Bradbury, elected as a compromise candidate in 1846) and Parker, urging them all to go in for you," he continued. "I will do all I can. When I hear from them, I will let you know the result."

And then the future Vice President moved to one of his pet opponents:

"I did suppose that there was no doubt but Governor Dunlap (a four-term governor, ardent Bowdoin man and a friend of Hamlin's) would be appointed collector at Portland (he eventually was). I think he will

yet but Mr. Anderson, I learn, will press hard for a reappointment." (This was Gov. Hugh J. Anderson of Belfast, the man with whom Hamlin had deadlocked for U.S. Senator in 1846, probably a proslavery Democrat and one of Hamlin's opponents for U.S. Senator in 1848).

"I trust he will be defeated and that Governor Dunlap will be the man. He will fulfill his promise to me in your behalf, I have no fear," and thus Hamlin put McLellan more in his debt.

"Shall meet you at Augusta. Don't be backward in calling on me. Make the demand and it shall be answered if I have the power to do it," he concluded.

The fourth letter—marked "confidential"—is dated May 5, 1847, and was written from Hampden. The legislature was about ready to begin.

"You will have most probably learnt before this reaches you that I have been elected to our legislature. I trust I shall meet you on Monday at Augusta. You shall have my support for speaker," Hamlin declared. (Good support—McLellan was elected speaker.)

Then came a twist—but one which politicians have used before.

"For reasons which I will state when I meet you, I will now say that I should like well to be nominated for that office (speaker) and then decline it. I think too that it might help you. (Hamlin had been speaker early in his political career. Perhaps he wanted the publicity that such a move would bring or perhaps he wanted the eyes of the legislature focused on him by the move.) But let it all be in confidence until I see you when we will fully understand each other and will pull together," the letter ends.

The legislature ended. Hamlin continued mending fences. U.S. Senator John Fairfield suddenly died at the end of 1847. McLellan went to Washington as a clerk in the Treasury Department. Hamlin was backed by the antislavery Democrats in Maine for the senatorship.

There were four against him—Anderson, Nathan Clifford, attorney general of the United States from 1846 until March 1848, Samuel Wells, a former Whig, and John D. McCrate, a persistent officeseeker who liked Hamlin.

On February 6, 1848, Hamlin wrote the following "strictly confidential" letter from Hampden to McLellan in Washington:

"I was pleased to hear from you and to learn that you were not committed to anyone. I was also quite sure I should have your good wishes," he said.

"I hold truly to the doctrine that a representative should follow the wishes of his constituents. That is sound doctrine but the dicta of politicians are not always the will of constituents."

"For some reason, and really I cannot tell what, the office-seeking politicians opposed me in 1846 and will do so now, I presume. All the customhouse influence was against me in 1846, so I suppose it will be now. I suppose it may nearly all go for Clifford, on the ground, in fact, that he will go for them."

"That may be for the personal interest of the officeholders but not for the mass of the party. I have not time to go into an extended review of the subject but I think you will see fully the tendency of the suggestions which I have made."

"So far as I can learn from different sections of the State, my success looks better than it did in 1846. We have no Pillsbury in our delegation this year and I can carry a large majority of the East overall."

"I shall have or may have some of your friends in your county as well as in other sections of the western part of the state. If you shall be willing to give me your influence, you can secure my election and, if elected, I should be in a situation to reciprocate your favor."

"It is said that Clifford talks with all confidence of success. But let me tell you it is all * * *. He does it for effect. He cannot be elected. I may not be but he cannot," Hamlin asserted.

He emphasized that even if someone else were elected U.S. Senator it would not be Nathan Clifford.

"Your position will be such that, with such of the friends in your county as I have, yours can secure me a majority of your county and I secure my election. I think you will rely upon my good faith to you from my past acts. Upon that you may rely with full confidence," the letter ended.

Hannibal Hamlin mended Maine fences well in 1847-48.

He built so well that—with the shift to the Republican Party which he made—he became Vice President and, eventually, one of the most powerful Members of the Senate.

Lack of Public Access to the Nation's Shores

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Capital Times, of Madison, Wis., protesting the lack of public access to the Nation's ocean shorelines.

Because I think the story in the Capital Times contains an eloquent quotation from the Saturday Review, I want to take the time of the Senate just for a minute or so to read what the situation is on public access to our ocean shorelines at the present time.

The Saturday Review writes:

If any explorers landed on our shores today, the way they did several hundred years ago, they'd have a difficult time making their way inland. It's private property. Almost every attractive seashore area on the Atlantic, Pacific, and gulf coasts has been taken for private or commercial development, according to the National Geographic Society.

The spectacularly beautiful Pacific shoreline of the United States stretches 1,700 miles from Mexico to Canada. In a recent survey, the National Park Service found that 1,448 miles of it are privately owned and not available for public recreation.

Only 240 miles of the Atlantic and gulf coasts—3,700 miles long—are owned by the people as a whole. More than half of that 240 miles is in three places: Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area (North Carolina); the Acadia (Maine); and Everglades (Florida) National Parks.

Fortunately, the property lines stop at the high water mark. Once you're in the water it's all yours—and the jellyfishes' and the planktons'.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times, Aug. 25, 1959]

STATE BETTER OFF THAN NATION IN ACCESS TO LAKE WATERS

It is just possible that Wisconsin is better off than the Nation in public access to shore areas. A recent survey of ocean shorelines of America shows that if one of the great

explorers like Columbus or Hudson arrived now, he would have to pinpoint his landing with great accuracy, not to land on private property.

Governor Nelson, a champion of greater access by the public to Wisconsin lakes, has estimated that fully 35 percent of Wisconsin's 8,000 lakes do not provide access to the general public.

That's a lot of lakes closed to the public, but many of them are small. Most big lakes have some access, though more is needed.

Here are the figures on the ocean shores, as reported in the August 22 issue of the *Saturday Review*—appropriately, in the *Trade Winds* section:

"If any explorers landed on our shores today, the way they did several hundred years ago, they'd have a difficult time making their way inland. It's private property. Almost every attractive seashore area on the Atlantic, Pacific, and gulf coasts has been taken for private or commercial development, according to the National Geographic Society.

"The spectacularly beautiful Pacific shoreline of the United States stretches 1,700 miles from Mexico to Canada. In a recent survey, the National Park Service found that 1,448 miles of it are privately owned and not available for public recreation.

"Only 240 miles of the Atlantic and gulf coasts—3,700 miles long—are owned by the people as a whole. More than half of that 240 miles is in three places: Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area (North Carolina); the Acadia (Maine), and Everglades (Florida) National Parks.

"Fortunately, the property lines stop at the high-water mark. Once you're in the water it's all yours, and the jellyfishes and the planktons."

Voice of Government Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Connie B. Gay by name, has instituted a service worthy of note at this time. Mr. Gay, a man formerly in Government and more recently a well-known figure in the entertainment world, purchased a Washington radio station on June 1, 1959. This station, bearing the call letter identification of WGAY, has been in service since 1945. Up to its purchase on June 1, other than playing phonograph records and an occasional announcement of public interest, the station did little to distinguish itself from the 13 other stations in the area.

On June 1, Mr. Gay instituted an idea and format that should be of particular interest to all of us. Every day this station broadcasts announcements called "Voice of Government Reports." These reports are approximately a minute long and are broadcast every 15 minutes. In addition, Mr. Gay calls his station the Voice of Government People, and as such relays Government news and information to the over 400,000 Government workers in the Washington area. Mr. Gay's thinking is outlined and reviewed in the June 1 edition of the *Washington Post* and the *Evening Star*. The results of just 2 months of pro-

gramming Government reports and exceptionally fine music are reviewed in the *Washington Daily News*, July 21. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include excerpts from both articles in the Appendix of the Record:

[Excerpts from the *Washington Post* and the *Evening Star*, June 1, 1959]

A WIDE OPEN WASHINGTON LETTER TO AMERICA'S 5,697 IMPORTANT RADIO ADVERTISERS AND TO THE WASHINGTON AREA'S MOST IMPORTANT MILLION CITIZENS: OUR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S EMPLOYEES, THEIR FAMILIES, AND FRIENDS

FOREWORD

This is the first personal message I have ever addressed to—and in behalf of—the tremendously important Washington area consumer market * * * in many ways the most important of its kind in America today. Seldom, if indeed ever, in this country's brilliant advertising and marketing history, has a radio station been planned so completely to surround, saturate and sell a market so rich in potential, as the 250,000 Government Employees whose listening ear this station now specifically serves. Those who fail to read the following statement will miss a business message of inestimable value.

CONNIE B. GAY,

President and Chairman of the Board
Radio Station WGAY (Now With
Studios in Maryland, Virginia, and
the District of Columbia).

With the publication of this announcement, there comes to you the first news of an entirely new technique in shaping an advertising medium to exactly, specifically fit a rich, and vitally important consumer market.

It is (so far as is known) the first successful attempt to apply to the great field of radio broadcasting the only basic principle ever found successful in designing a primary consumer advertising medium of any kind.

Nowhere else in America (so far as is known) is there a radio broadcasting station beamed so directly and exclusively at—and for—a large prosperous group of free-spending consumers and their families and friends, as the Washington's new radio station WGAY.

With a specialized broadcasting service that includes news of, and for, the Federal Government and its dedicated Washington area workers, WGAY announces the final triumph of years of careful planning.

Planning which now makes this station—alone of all advertising facilities available to those who wish to advertise in this rich, important consumer market—the finest and most profitable selling medium available.

But nowhere in the entire Washington market area has there been a radio station or broadcasting facility which is designed specifically and exactly to select, reach, interest, and sell the U.S. Government employee, and his or her circle of family and friends.

No city on earth, no matter where, is quite like Washington, D.C.

Advertisers and marketers who judge it by other markets, or try to sell in Washington by generally accepted marketing procedures, sometimes miss this fact.

It is the Government employee, at all levels, who makes this so. Washington is a city of government, and of the men and women who make good government in this country possible.

It has been a challenge to me to find a way of providing constant, scheduled, tailor-made broadcasting news and comment of and for this market within a market, within the

Washington area. The all-important people who help run the U.S. Government.

Recently, with the purchase of station WGAY, this challenge became an opportunity.

We are concentrating specifically on the men and women of Government, and through them, their families and friends, who comprise the market within a market of our great Washington Community.

It is the calculated policy of the new radio station WGAY to broadcast Government news bulletins each quarter-hour throughout the broadcast day.

Plus the kind of good music that has been responsible for the sale of millions upon millions of albums and single records. Records by such great artists as: Perry Como, Percy Faith, Frank Sinatra, Patti Page, Doris Day, Peggy Lee, and scores of others.

In this way, the entire area of governmental activity will become public knowledge.

And employees of Government will, themselves, keep abreast of the activities and decisions of their own agencies, departments, divisions, and offices—whether at home or in the car—by staying tuned to WGAY.

The opportunity of giving function, life, and significance to an idea that has long occupied my time and thought.

By publishing this announcement, I want to pledge the facilities and abilities of station WGAY and its staff to genuine, heartfelt service.

While we hope to entertain and inform many thousands of others * * * our first consideration, and our dedication of service, is to those who serve our Government.

CONNIE B. GAY,

President, Chairman of the Board.

[Excerpts from the *Washington Daily News*, July 21, 1959]

WGAY PIONEERS IN MAJOR PROGRAMING BREAKTHROUGH

WASHINGTON, D.C.—WGAY, maintaining studios in Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia, has pioneered in two major breakthroughs in present-day stereotyped programming. All newscasts are presented without commercial interruption, and the station features "Music-Casters" playing a wide range of music—from Mantovani to Crosby.

Nearly a million Government employees and their families now have their own "Voice of Government" radio station in this rich Metropolitan area, according to WGAY president and chairman of the board, Connie B. Gay.

Verified figures already obtained from home interviews and car-pool drivers show that over 62 percent of these high income Government people turn first to 1050 on their radio dial (WGAY's better music frequency) to find out what goes on in their own departments. As a result, sponsors are experiencing results unheard of in Washington area merchandising.

Forthcoming Visit of Premier Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD

an open letter to the President of the United States from the Paterson Evening News. The letter is concerned with the forthcoming visit of Premier Khrushchev and the President's later visit to the Soviet Union.

The letter rightly calls attention to the importance, whatever one's regard for the individual, of courteous treatment of an official guest of our country. For, as this forceful editorial points out, the American people surely expect that the President will be accorded respectful recognition in the course of his state visit to Russia.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Paterson (N.J.) Evening News, Aug. 24, 1959]

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: A PERSONAL MESSAGE TO GENERAL EISENHOWER ON THE EVE OF INTERCHANGE OF VISITS WITH KHRUSHCHEV

Gen. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, President of the United States, White House, Washington, D.C.

You are about to launch the greatest and most far-reaching peace-seeking program in the history of modern man.

Greater than the peace of Versailles, vastly more encompassing in its universality than the treaty at the end of the last war to end all wars.

You were the civilized world's man first in war, first in the hearts of all allied countrymen. You summoned millions of men to battle, you led the forces which crushed the totalitarian dictator who had menaced the free world. You trod the bloody battlefields and suffered with the boys who were your very own from America, fighting at the side of other soldiers who were the allies.

Now you are the civilized world's man of peace.

You are about to launch a new Battle of Armageddon, but this time not on the field of military strife but in tenuous diplomacy, the outcome of which may decide the fate of the universe.

You have invited to our midst the Premier of Soviet Russia, Nikita Khrushchev, who in his world dealings has been anything but our ideal of a statesman or humanitarian.

In turn, you have accepted an invitation to visit in Russia and to bring to those people a message of peace from America from our own man of peace.

Now, there are many, many people in this country who sincerely oppose presence in this country of Khrushchev. To some he stands for the inherently abhorrent communism with which he has threatened to engulf the world. To others, he represents the horrors of oppression, the mass killings in Hungary—hated totalitarianism. For these people and their attitudes we have a complete sympathy. We don't like him, either.

Still others declaim against Khrushchev in America because they are platform hams looking for headline space and playing on the sympathies of minority groups embittered by past Soviet indignities. Add to this a fringe of pinheads with no genuine concept of reason but with an eye to sensationalism.

We believe with you as America's man of peace that anything that can be done to throttle the murmurings of international strife must be essayed. You have decided that an interchange of visits with Khrushchev may help still the storms of world dis-

cord and perhaps establish a more ordered existence between nations.

You are our Commander in Chief, in peace as in war. You have decided to receive Khrushchev and in turn, to go to Russia. That's good enough for us, and it should be good enough for all Americans.

We know that certain phases of such an interchange must be distasteful and almost intolerable to you. And yet, in your dedicated desire for peace, you are willing to undergo all the rigors of Mr. K's visit here, your own trip to see our allies in Europe to keep them happy, and finally, the trip to Russia.

That's an ordeal, especially for a man who less than 2 years ago was gravely ill, not once but twice.

Under the circumstances do the malcontents, sincere or hypocritical, have a right even to whisper their dissent from what you have planned? For shame.

We in America do not have to stew Mr. K's course with archbishops, nor shout our huzzas of delighted camaraderie.

But we must be respectful, we must accord him the recognition due him as a head of state.

And above all, we must remember this: As we do to him, his people will do to our President.

Mr. President, we agree with you that it is better that our leaders meet on the field of friendly interchange than on the bloody battlefield of war.

So we respectfully suggest to you, sir, that:

1. You are the man who will be dealing with Khrushchev. You'll inspire more respect and confidence in the man and his people than all the others who visited him combined, and we say this with full deference to the splendid performance of Vice President Nixon. Don't permit politicians or needling newspapers to persuade you to pop off in advance about how and what you're going to tell Mr. K. Keep that to yourself and for your own conversations. In other words, don't make the fellow angry with advance notice of your own toughness before he is able to get it firsthand from you.

2. Before Mr. K. arrives, we earnestly and respectfully urge that you summon all America to sit around their television sets for 5 minutes of a given evening to have a chat with you. And in this chat, we suggest, Mr. President, that you call on all your people to receive Mr. Khrushchev in the spirit in which you have invited him; that he is a guest of this country; that people don't have to love him but that they must not under any circumstances commit an overt act; that they must bear in mind the truth of the commandment that what you want done to yourself, do unto others. That if we want Russians to be cordial to our President, we must respect their head of state.

This personal message from you, on every television set, on every radio, in every newspaper, will hold off the malcontents, will stay the hands of those who may secretly be plotting some nefarious scheme. Heaven forbid a crackpot should attempt an assassination.

You, Mr. President, are our man of peace. The Lord bless you as you prepare to sail for Europe to meet our allies. May He bless, as well, your deliberations and return you safely to our midst as the man to whom we look, with devout prayer on our lips, for the great peace which has through the ages so tragically eluded us.

Respectfully yours,
THE EDITORS,
Paterson Evening News.

Hope Deferred: Public Welfare and the Blind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, many of us have introduced bills during the present session of Congress dealing with our social security and welfare system. I wish to take this opportunity to call the attention of the Members of this House to a book which I have just read and which I believe every Congressman concerned with these issues will want to read.

The book is "Hope Deferred," written by Prof. Jacobus tenBroek and Floyd W. Matson, of the University of California, and published recently by the University of California Press.

Although its subtitle, "Public Welfare and the Blind," indicates the specific subject matter with which the book is concerned, "Hope Deferred" goes far beyond that special province to shed light on many of the most critical and vexing problems of government today. It deals directly, for example, with the issue of federalism: with the question of what in truth the relationship is—the respective rights and powers—of the State and National Governments under our system. The book deals no less directly with the sensitive issues of congressional-executive relations, which are more than ever in the forefront of our attention. Congress now possesses various committees, such as the Committee on Legislative Oversight, for the purpose of reviewing the work of executive agencies; still others of our committees are empowered to seek information from the executive. Most recently of all, the courts have made a renewed effort to define the role of congressional committees generally in relation to the executive branch. On all of these pressing and perennial problems "Hope Deferred" has a close and instructive bearing—not least of all in showing how Congress has come increasingly to exercise a reviewing and supervisory, rather than an initiating, role in developing our public programs and seeking to hold them to responsible account.

On still a different level, this book also casts new light on the relationship of the individual citizen, whether organized or unorganized, to the great programs of welfare and security which have been erected in our country in recent years—as well as his relationship to the executive agencies which administer those programs and the legislative machinery which enacts them.

Perhaps the most signal service provided by this book lies in its demonstration that our entire system of social se-

curity, ever since its adoption in 1935, has been the storm center of a continuous struggle between Congress and the executive branch of the Federal Government, in which two theories of the nature of social security have been in direct conflict. On the one hand officials of the social security administration have adhered to a policy of subordinating public assistance to the preferred concept of social insurance, on the assumption that those receiving public aid are a residual element to be minimized and disparaged: a policy utterly barren of any constructive element. This policy is the direct descendant of the medieval poor laws and workhouse, and has preserved that outmoded spirit through the imposition of a rigorous means test—a virtual pauper's oath—which effectually discourages the blind and the disabled from rising above the poverty and dependency that have been the requirements of eligibility for the program. Moreover, the executive theory has sought to enforce absolute Federal control over the assistance programs of the States and to disallow any departures, however legitimate and progressive, from its own administrative precepts—while at the same time permitting the Federal administrator the broadest latitude of discretion in ruling upon the programs. By contrast, Congress has consistently expressed a very different and opposed theory of public assistance, and moreover has held to it despite repeated reversals and opposition by the executive agencies: a theory which has sought to introduce constructive elements into the program, which while placing a floor under relief permits the individual States complete freedom in devising liberal provisions of their own, and which above all is conscious of the need to maintain firm legislative control over the system.

In specific terms, "Hope Deferred" is a study of the most significant social provisions established for the blind over the past generation, most notably the programs of public assistance and vocational rehabilitation. The harsh point of the title is that, despite a number of genuine advances, the hope of the blind men and women of America for a recognition of their real capacities and needs is still deferred in both of these crucial areas. And I may add that there is another deferred hope which emerges from this book: the hope of Congress to have its will and intent, as expressed in some of the most important legislation of our time, carried out in the face of persistent hostility by appointive administrative officials.

Just as significant, I believe, is the evidence this book provides of the pressing need for legislation such as that contained in H.R. 14, which I introduced in the present session, and which was subsequently contained in some 60 bills submitted in the House, along with a similar bill introduced by Senator KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, and 33 other Senators: legislation expressly designed for the purpose of protecting the right of the blind to organize and to be consulted by Federal agencies in the conduct of programs for their welfare. Our bill

recognizes the fact that independent organizations of the blind, as opposed to agencies for the blind, have in the past been systematically excluded from consultation in the development and administration of such programs, and indeed that these organizations have found themselves the targets of harassment and threat on more than a few occasions by officials of public agencies making use of Federal funds in their programs. The right to organize, in the case of such disadvantaged groups as the blind, is practically tantamount to the right of free speech and self-expression; and, by the same token, the right to consultation for the blind constitutes a right to be heard in the expression of their needs.

Although "Hope Deferred" does not deal directly with this legislation, it furnishes a convincing argument for it by exposing the negative and backward policies of aid and rehabilitation for the blind which might easily have been avoided if representative organizations of the blind themselves had been brought in for consultation in the formative stages.

On the same score, the opening section of the book in particular should be required reading for all administrators and workers in programs for the blind; for it clearly exposes the false stereotypes about the nature of blindness which have been largely responsible for these mistakes in policy and administration. More affirmatively, the authors draw upon the extensive literature of medical science and social science for a realistic appraisal of blindness and of the capabilities of blind persons. Their conclusion is "that the blind as a group are mentally competent, psychologically stable, and socially adaptable; and that their needs are therefore those of ordinary people, of normal men and women, caught at a physical and social disadvantage." Like other persons the blind "have a need for shelter but not a need to be sheltered: a need for adjustment and acceptance but not a need for toleration or patronage." The authors propose that every social program and institution for the blind be judged by the straightforward test of "whether it meets or defers meeting these needs; whether it presupposes the normality and equality of persons who are blind or presumes their abnormality and inferiority." It is a shocking commentary on the state of our welfare system that few if any of the numerous programs described in "Hope Deferred" come off with a passing grade when put to that test. This is notoriously the case with the sheltered workshops presently supported by the public rehabilitation program, wherein neither the goals of vocational rehabilitation nor the standards of fair employment are remotely approximated. The situation is not much improved in the remaining areas of rehabilitation, and is only beginning to be reformed in public assistance—where the existence of the means test and other onerous conditions of eligibility continues to frustrate the objectives for which the system was devised by Congress.

The authors of "Hope Deferred" are particularly well qualified to undertake such broad examination of public welfare as it affects the blind. Professor tenBroek—who is well known to Members of both Houses for his many articulate appearances in committee hearings—has been for nearly 20 years the president of the National Federation of the Blind, which represents affiliated statewide organizations of the blind in all but four of our States and is almost certainly the largest voluntary association of blind people in the world. Having lost his own sight in childhood, Dr. tenBroek began to play a significant role in organizations of the blind while still a very young man. He helped to organize the California Council of the Blind in 1934, and was the principal founder of the national federation 6 years later. In 1950 he was appointed to the California State Board of Social Welfare, a position in which he still serves and which has given him a solid background of administrative experience in all aspects of public welfare. What is most remarkable about all this is that these manifold activities are only avocations for Dr. tenBroek, whose main career is that of a scholar and teacher. At present he is chairman of his department at the University of California, where he has built a national reputation as a constitutional scholar. He has earned five degrees, most of them in law, and in addition to the present book has written two other substantial volumes and more than 50 articles on various problems of Government and welfare. It would indeed be difficult to find a man anywhere in the land more qualified to write on the particular public issues with which "Hope Deferred" is concerned.

Mr. Matson, who is also a member of the faculty of the University of California, is himself experienced in government and administration as well as broadly trained in the social sciences. He served as a Government analyst under General MacArthur during the occupation of Japan, and later was the administrator of a University of California educational program conducted for our military services in the Far East. He has been closely associated with the National Federation of the Blind for several years, and was a coauthor with Professor tenBroek and E. N. Barnhart of an earlier book, "Prejudice, War, and the Constitution," which 5 years ago won the highest award in political science, the Woodrow Wilson Foundation prize, as the best book on democracy and government.

"Hope Deferred" is, in my view, an equally significant contribution to our understanding of democracy and our knowledge of government. It is my earnest hope and belief that the book will serve to fortify Members of Congress in their efforts to create and maintain a sound system of public welfare; that it will bring an end to the opposition of professional and public welfare administrators to these constructive purposes; and finally that it will be instrumental in giving the general public a true picture of the capabilities of our

blind citizens for normal lives and productive careers in the mainstream of American society.

Stop Fine-Tuning the Economy; Editor of Construction Equipment Magazine Writes Boldly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I believe, as the editor of Construction Equipment magazine, Michael A. Spronck, has written in an editorial for the September 1959 issue of that publication, that "Congress and the administration must stop using construction as a panacea for its fiscal headaches and political bellyaches."

In fact, there is so much that is right and sensible in the editorial by Mr. Spronck that I bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STOP FINE TUNING THE ECONOMY

(By Michael A. Spronck)

We said it before and we'll say it again: Congress and the administration must stop using construction as a panacea for its fiscal headaches and political bellyaches.

Public works are not patent medicines. They cannot be prescribed when business slides into a doldrum, then be withdrawn at the first sign of financial recovery. Nor are they bromides to be dispensed by politicians who seek to still irate voters.

Government officials are ill advised when they listen to economic quacks who tell them that by "adjusting" construction programs and appropriations they can "regulate" the economy. Contrariwise, these shifts induce chaos. They disturb the clockworklike balance necessary in engineering and building public works.

The Federal highway program is a classic example. Virtually every segment of our economy will benefit from a stable long-range highway program. It is vital to our military defense. It will save thousands of lives and prevent hundreds of thousands of crippling injuries. It will stimulate commerce. And through reduction of auto, truck, and bus operating costs will repay more than half of its cost immediately.

Yet just as the program rolls into its productive stage and the benefits begin to accrue the economic adjusters propose we turn it off. Why? It lacks funds, they say. The truth is they are attempting to fine tune the economy, which they now think is moving ahead too fast.

I question their ability to gauge our economy with any degree of accuracy. Certainly any significant reduction in the highway program would have a disastrous effect on the construction industry.

The highway trust fund does lack money. But this can be remedied. Congress can stop the diversion of existing highway-use revenues and, if necessary, increase some taxes. Motorists are already paying for modern

highways they don't have through needless loss of life, property damage, and high operating costs on obsolete roads. They will not tolerate proposals to sack the interstate program.

At the time I write this Congress has not passed necessary corrective legislation. I am certain, however, that it will do so.

Unfortunately, the protracted debate and threats to the stability of the program has already caused irreparable damage: A halt in new contracts and in right-of-way acquisition. Unemployment. Reduction in capital investments for new plants and equipment. General lack of confidence. And loss of momentum in prosecuting the work. This will impair the efficiency of the program and increase its cost.

It is an expensive lesson—exposing the dangers inherent in a "planned" economy.

As the Nation's leading industry, construction requires judicious, stable public policy. Assured that Government will not default in its public-works programs, construction will continue to contribute to the Nation's prosperity.

It cannot, and will not, serve as the instrument of would-be social planners attempting to fine tune or govern the Nation's economy.

Playing Politics With the Public Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress have a responsibility, as members of various congressional committees respectively, to colleagues and to the people of this Nation to do their work which includes understanding, exploring, and solving problems confronting us. The interest rate ceiling removal as an issue before the Ways and Means Committee needs such understanding and exploration. For the information of colleagues and the people throughout this Nation I want to present an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune concerning the interest rate:

PLAYING POLITICS WITH THE PUBLIC DEBT

The question of lifting the 4½-percent ceiling on interest rates for marketable Treasury bonds, according to SAM RAYBURN, is a dead issue in this session of Congress. But he did leave the door open yesterday for a possible boost in the ceiling on series E and H savings bonds from the present 3¼ percent to 3½ percent.

The Democrats have hoped to use the bond issue to tag the Republicans a "high interest rate" party. But it would be politically ticklish to oppose a clearly merited rise in interest rates on savings bonds, which are held by 40 million Americans, most of them voters.

The 3½-percent rate now makes these bonds a poor buy; for the past 12 months, in fact, sales have lagged behind redemptions. In July \$350 million were sold, \$507 million redeemed. Not only is the Treasury over a barrel but the small investor isn't getting a fair shake.

Action to provide an equitable rate on these bonds is needed, but action to free rates on regular Treasury bonds is equally urgent. Bonds already issued are selling in the open market at prices yielding more than 4¼ percent, so that new long-term

issues (the only ones to which the ceiling applies) can't be sold. Sound management of the Nation's \$290 billion debt is one of the pillars of fiscal stability and is impossible without long-term borrowing. Within the next 12 months the Treasury will have to borrow \$85 billion to cover maturing securities, redemptions and seasonal cash needs. Unless Congress acts, this will have to be done without access to long-term funds. Speaker RAYBURN knows this. Senator JOHNSON knows it. It's up to them to put politics aside, and act promptly to free the Treasury from artificial and fiscally dangerous restrictions.

Professor's Salmon Crops Migrate to Sea, Return to Washington State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, when my Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee was considering the National Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, we consulted many recognized leaders in the field of conservation.

One of these was Dr. Lauren Donaldson of the University of Washington. I knew firsthand the work which Dr. Donaldson had done in restoring salmon runs in the State of Washington.

Now Dr. Donaldson's achievements have been saluted in an article published in the Tuesday, August 18, edition of the Seattle Times.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROFESSOR'S SALMON CROPS MIGRATE TO SEA, RETURN HERE

(By Stanton H. Patty)

Dr. Lauren R. Donaldson, of the University of Washington, has proved that man can grow crops of salmon.

Donaldson said today that over a 10-year period he has established runs of choice Chinook salmon that migrate to the high seas and return in quantity to his laboratory ponds at the University of Washington.

This is a major breakthrough in the effort to establish fish farms to produce unlimited numbers of salmon, Donaldson said.

Donaldson is a professor of fisheries and director of the university's laboratory of radiation biology.

STATE GETS FINGERLINGS

The State fisheries department has received 100,000 of Donaldson's surplus fingerlings for planting in the State's new fish farms.

By 1961 some 10 million excess Chinook salmon eggs will be available to the fisheries department from Donaldson's experiments.

"This has been a team operation with Milo Moore, the State fisheries director," Donaldson said.

"Once we get the seed that is needed for fish farms, it becomes the State's job. The university cannot go into the fish farm business."

PROJECT BEGUN IN 1949

Donaldson's project began on a modest scale in the spring of 1949, when he released

40,000 fingerlings in Portage Bay near the Seattle Yacht Club.

Three years later, 42 of the marked salmon returned—a recovery of one-tenth of 1 percent.

Donaldson plugged ahead year after year, multiplying the returns with each cycle.

Last November, 440 of 26,240 chinooks that had been released in the spring of 1956 splashed into Donaldson's ponds.

FISH BIG FOR AGE

But these were no ordinary salmon.

The usual cycle for Chinooks is 4 years. But because of Donaldson's selective breeding, the 1958 returns were 3-year-old adults averaging more than 18 pounds each—larger than full-grown 4-year-olds.

Donaldson expects still more of the "class of 1956" Chinooks to return in the coming fall as 4-year-olds.

Dr. Lauren R. Donaldson, like any cautious scientist, waited several years before announcing results of his experiments at the University of Washington, with Chinook salmon.

Like many another scientist, Donaldson was the target of considerable scoffing as he sought to prove that selected laboratory salmon will return in volume to their birth-places to spawn future runs.

Success in fisheries research is nothing new to the blunt-talking director of the university's Laboratory of Radiation Biology.

Earlier, Donaldson had toiled patiently for 28 years to develop supertrout weighing many times more than their natural-hatched cousins.

Here is the chronology of Donaldson's Chinook-salmon experiments:

Spring 1949: 40,000 fingerlings were released in Portage Bay near Donaldson's university laboratory.

Fall 1952: 42 of the salmon returned as adults. Donaldson cross-bred these fish and recovered 48,000 eggs—more than his original seed.

Fall 1955: 48 salmon from the 1952-year eggs returned to the university as 3-year-old adults. Forty more returned the next year as 4-year-olds.

The 3-year-olds were the key fish. They included 40 males and 8 females. Donaldson inbred them and selected 26,240 of the offspring for release.

Spring 1956: The 23,240 fingerlings were released as migrants.

Fall 1958: Surprisingly, 52 of the 1956-year fingerlings returned as 1-year jacks weighing about 1½ pounds each.

Fall 1957: 228 more returned as 2-year jacks.

Fall 1953: 440 Chinooks returned as 3-year-old adults. The normal cycle for chinook salmon is 4 years. The 3-year-olds averaged 18 pounds each—larger than most 4-year-olds.

Meanwhile, in the 1956 through 1958 period, commercial and sports fishermen caught about 4,000 of the university salmon released in the spring of 1956.

This meant a total recovery for the cycle of 13 percent.

Donaldson said 16 Chinooks were caught last fall in the Seattle Milk Fund derby. Nine of the 16 were Donaldson's products.

Spring 1959: Donaldson released 261,154 chinook fingerlings.

Fall 1959: Donaldson expects still more of the salmon released in 1956 to return as 4-year-old adults.

The returning salmon last fall included 188 females. They produced 650,000 eggs. "We had fish everywhere," Donaldson recalled.

About 100,000 of the fingerlings from the 650,000 eggs were given to the State fisheries department for fish-farm plantings. Others were turned over to the Army's Corps of Engineers and the Hanford Atomic Works for experiments.

The 261,154 fingerlings released from the university last spring are about 10 times as many as were turned out in the spring of 1956.

In the fall of 1961, Donaldson expects 4,000 to 5,000 chinooks to return to his ponds. Sports and commercial fishermen should catch 20,000 to 30,000 more of this crop.

Donaldson is enthusiastic about the projected 1961 return.

"That is the first year of the Century 21 Exposition," he said. "If the salmon come back as we expect, there will be thousands of visitors at the university each day to watch them."

FIFTEEN MILLION EGGS EXPECTED

The 4,000 or so Chinooks due home in the fall of 1961 will produce 15 million eggs.

Donaldson plans to keep 500,000 and from that number and select the best 250,000 for release.

"We will keep doing this and build up to the point where we can take 15 million eggs as seed stock each year," he said.

Some 10 million excess eggs from the 1961 return will be made available to the State fisheries department for fish farms.

Donaldson said preliminary studies indicate a survival rate of 60 percent in the fish farms.

"So if 6 million fish can be released from the fish farms, at least 10 percent should survive at sea," Donaldson said. "That would be 600,000 fish for the sports and commercial fishermen to catch."

MONEY GAINS CALCULATED

"Figuring the value of chinook salmon to fishermen at \$10 apiece, that means \$6 million worth of fish."

Donaldson said the fish farms can be prepared by cleaning out weeds and predators from ponds, lakes, and lagoons. The next step is to add fertilizers to supplement the fingerlings' diet.

The magic of atomic energy can increase the productive capacity of fish-farm waters.

"This is what we call trace-mineral metabolism," Donaldson explained. "Radioactive materials will serve as tracers to tell us what fertilizers should be added to the waters."

Donaldson is talking in terms of fish-farm lakes producing 300 pounds of fish for each surface acre of water.

"In other words," Donaldson said, "you would need only 200 acres of (fish farm) water to produce the 6 million migrants that will return as 600,000 fish to be caught."

"This is all excess, so let them be caught. No escapement is needed. We will have more seed for the future coming to the university."

PLANS WORLD TRIP

Donaldson will leave Thursday for a 4½ month world trip to study fisheries management and the peacetime uses of atomic energy in fisheries.

His itinerary includes Iceland, England, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Germany, Italy, Turkey, India, Thailand, the Philippines, Hong Kong, and Japan.

Tunkhannock (Pa.) Church Observes 75th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

include the following newsstory from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of August 18, 1959, which reports the 75th anniversary observance of the Church of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary at Tunkhannock, Pa.:

CHURCH TO OBSERVE 75TH ANNIVERSARY—TUNKHANNOCK CATHOLIC PARISH TO CELEBRATE EVENT SUNDAY, AUGUST 23

Parishioners of the Church of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Tunkhannock, will celebrate the 75th anniversary of the dedication of the first Catholic Church in that community on Sunday, August 23. Joining them in the celebration will be members of the congregations at the missions at Lake Winola and Lake Carey.

A high mass at 11 will be followed by a jubilee banquet at 1 p.m. in the Tunkhannock Elementary School. Reservation applications, mailed to all parishioners, must be returned by August 20. Others may secure tickets from Mrs. Robert Gaughan or Tony Talerico, Tunkhannock; Mrs. Helen Matalav, Lake Winola, or Joseph Langan, Lake Carey.

The jubilee will commemorate the dedication of the Church of the Nativity on September 7, 1884, by the Right Reverend William O'Hara. The church building dedicated at that time was constructed by the Presbyterians in 1833 and was used by them for 34 years. It then was acquired by the Baptists, who worshiped in the church until 1884, when it was purchased by the Catholic society. Moved to the rear of the church property when the present church was constructed in 1954, the structure still is used for many parish activities and has served the community as a teen canteen.

RECORDED HISTORY

Recorded history of Catholicism in Tunkhannock dates back much further than 1884, however. In the early 1850's, mass was celebrated in the home of John Code—a contractor on the canal then being built along the Susquehanna River. There also are records of mass being celebrated in Tunkhannock at irregular intervals from 1870 to 1873.

In 1873, there began a cycle which ultimately resulted in the establishment of the Church of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary and the Wyoming Catholic Missions, as they are constituted today. At that time, the first regular series of Catholic religious services was inaugurated, as Father Patrick J. Murphy came from Auburn to Tunkhannock to celebrate mass in the home of Patrick Boyce. These masses were attended by about 15 people, and in addition to the sacrifice of the mass, the Boyce home was the scene of baptisms, marriages and confirmations. The affiliation with Auburn continued through the pastorates of Fathers Felix McGuckin, Michael Shields, Thomas J. Rea and Edward J. Lafferty, until the first Catholic Church was dedicated in Tunkhannock.

In 1876, a hall was rented on the second floor of the building which now houses the Billings Furniture Store, Bridge Street. Mass was said there until 1879, when the congregation became so large that arrangements were made to celebrate mass in Platt's Opera House, which was located where the A. & P. store now stands. After 5 years of this arrangement, with Father Lafferty traveling over primitive roads from Auburn to Tunkhannock, the church building was acquired from the Baptists.

BECOMES SEPARATE PARISH

Some time later, the Tunkhannock church became a mission of Nicholson, and continued as such until 1931, when Bishop Thomas C. O'Reilly purchased the Joseph Wood Platt estate, located next to the church. The Platt home became the resi-

dence of the first resident priest of the Church of the Nativity—the Reverend James J. Reilly—and Tunkhannock became a separate parish.

With the separation of Tunkhannock from Nicholson, the Wyoming Catholic Missions came into being. On June 28, 1931, Father Reilly and his newly-appointed assistant, Rev. Gerald F. Cannevan, began conducting masses at Lake Carey, Falls and Lake Winola.

Rev. James P. Holleran became pastor of the Church of the Nativity in 1932, serving in that capacity until 1944. He was succeeded by Rev. Harold T. Kennedy, who remained in Tunkhannock until 1948.

At that time, the present pastor, Rev. Joseph J. Nallin, was assigned to the Church of the Nativity. During Father Nallin's pastorate, three new churches have been built—the present Church of the Nativity in Tunkhannock; St. Mary's of the Lake, Lake Winola, and the Chapel of the Blessed Sacrament, Lake Carey.

Working with Father Nallin and assistant pastor Rev. Patrick D. Healey on arrangements for the celebration are: Charles Charles and Robert Dempsey, co-chairmen; Frank Friedel and Mrs. George Kukucka, program; Mrs. Vincent Bishop and Cecil Krewson, Jr., publicity; Mrs. Eugene Corbett and Mrs. Murray Flak, entertainment; Mrs. Robert Gaughan and Tony Talerico, tickets.

Mr. Truman's Comment on the Eisenhower-Khrushchev Discussions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Getting Into the Act," from the Washington Evening Star of August 26, 1959, relating to the comments by ex-President Truman on the Eisenhower-Khrushchev discussions.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

GETTING INTO THE ACT

The President obviously was annoyed, and justly so, by Harry Truman's unsolicited contribution to the Eisenhower-Khrushchev discussions.

One might think that Mr. Truman, as a former President whose own ventures in dealing with the Russians were something less than spectacularly successful, would hesitate, especially in advance of the event, to pour cold water on the Eisenhower undertaking. But that would be out of character. If the spirit moves him, and it generally does, Harry S. Truman is going to speak his piece.

In this instance, Mr. Truman, on the eve of the President's departure for important preliminary talks with our allies, let it be known in an article written for the North American Newspaper Alliance that he thought it was all right for Mr. Khrushchev to come to the United States, but all wrong for Mr. Eisenhower to go to Russia. The power and leadership of the Presidency, according to Mr. Truman, should not be dissipated in ceremonial visits.

This brought a sharp retort from Mr. Eisenhower when he was asked about it at

his news conference. He didn't mention Mr. Truman by name, but he said he was getting a "little weary" with "facile critics" who are fretting about "this terrible blow to Presidential prestige." He made it clear that he intends to use every bit of his prestige and all of his energy in trying to thaw out the cold war. What is at stake, he added, is the future of the human race, not prestige, and he thinks that any President who does less than his utmost in such a situation would deserve to be condemned by the American people.

We think that Mr. Eisenhower is right. Of course, his visit to Russia may not produce any tangible result. But the effort should be made, and if it is made in the right spirit and with eyes open there will be no harmful consequences. Mr. Truman should stop worrying about Presidential prestige—and also should stop tossing monkey wrenches into the works.

Assistance in the Construction of Fishing Vessels

SPEECH

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5421) to provide a program of assistance to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels and to enable the fishing industry of the United States to regain a favorable economic status, and for other purposes.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, during the past week we have witnessed in this body the growing decline of the free enterprise system in America.

When we consider that the economy of the Nation consists solely of the production and removal, the processing, transportation, reprocessing and disposal of the basic raw materials which come from the fields, the mines, or the sea, we understand how important these basic raw materials are.

Within the past week the House has acted upon three bills, either enacting, extending, or anticipating a subsidy program to prevent domestic production of the three basic raw materials from being completely destroyed by cheap foreign imports.

First, Thursday of last week we extended Public Law 480 by which the U.S. Treasury through gift, barter, or exchange for foreign currencies which are then spent in that country, disposes of domestic farm production acquired under the so-called agricultural subsidy program. This is a program carried on to purchase domestic agricultural products displaced by cheap foreign imports.

Second, Monday we had on the floor a resolution in which Congress asked the executive branch to submit a program for the solution of the domestic mining industry, which industry has been displaced through cheap foreign imports.

Third, Today we are considering a subsidy for the fishing industry, which

is the first step in an overall subsidy program to save the fishing industry from being completely displaced through cheap foreign imports.

THE PATTERN

In order that we may have a clearer picture of what is shortly in store for the mining and fishing industries, let us look at the purpose and operation of the agricultural program. Last year we imported \$3.9 billion worth of agricultural commodities. These commodities were placed on the domestic market and went directly to the dinner tables of the homes across the Nation.

Those basic raw materials coming from the fields of the Nation were made surplus by the displacement of millions of acres of domestic production through these foreign imports. The Nation was faced with two alternatives, either to stop imports or to buy up the displaced domestic production. The Federal Treasury purchased this displaced farm production, which we term surplus. It is surplus only because it has been supplanted by imports.

In order to dispose of this mounting surplus, the taxpayers through Public Law 480 gave away last year, either directly or indirectly, \$1.5 billion worth. Through the International Wheat Agreement and other such programs, the taxpayers subsidized the sale on the world market of another \$1.2 billion. This was subsidized at the rate of about 50 cents per bushel on wheat and a related figure on other grains. The rate has been 6 cents per pound on cotton; it has now gone to 8 cents per pound.

In other words, \$2.7 billion of the \$4 billion agricultural exports from the United States last year were either given away or the sale was very highly subsidized in order to make room for the \$3.9 billion of agricultural imports.

OTHER BASIC MATERIALS

The domestic mining industry is in much worse shape than the domestic agricultural industry because foreign mineral imports can be indefinitely stockpiled. If, however, the domestic industry is to be preserved, even on a standby basis, the taxpayers must buy the domestic production at a cost of production subsidized price and then arrange some program similar to Public Law 480 to give away that which is produced in this country.

The fishing industry faces the same fate. Cheap foreign imports have supplanted the best efforts of the domestic industry on both coasts. Either the taxpayers step in or the fisheries step out.

THE PROBLEM

You ask why a great industrial country like America, with the best means of production that modern science can produce and with a class of labor that is the most efficient in the world, cannot meet competition from abroad.

The first answer is that the American farmer the American miner, and the American fisheries are given a serious handicap before they can even enter the race of free world competition.

The American taxpayer, which includes every farmer, every miner, every one engaged in the fisheries, every processing industry and every laborer, must first pay his pro rata share of defense, not just the defense of America, but the defense of the entire free world. This defense is the first handicap placed upon domestic industry and labor.

The bill for the defense of the free world is approximately \$40 billion annually. Broken down on a per capita basis, this annual expense amounts to \$800 for every family in America. This \$800 must be added to the production cost of every pound of food, every ton of mineral, and every item of clothing or product of industry which is produced domestically.

The foreign producer and foreign laborer has no defense item to add to his product—we defend them.

The domestic producer must raise another \$3 to \$3.5 billion annually for foreign aid. This amounts to from \$70 to \$75 annually for every family in the Nation. This amount is not only given to our agricultural and industrial competitors to maintain their defense, but to their governments as well to help keep them solvent, to help run their schools, to build roads, powerplants irrigation projects and every other item of their national expense.

Certainly these people can work for lower wages when the American taxpayer not only foots the bill for their defense but contributes toward the operation of their governmental functions and then puts \$1.5 billion worth of food on their tables free of cost.

Can any degree of efficiency, can any technical development met this kind of competition?

THE SOLUTION

In 1936 the Congress of the United States passed a minimum wage and maximum hour law so that one section of the Nation would not have an unfair advantage over the other in trade moving in interstate commerce.

The countries of the world are closer today than were the States in 1936. If wage-and-hour legislation was necessary then for fair interstate trade, worldwide wage and hour standards are just as important today in international trade.

This, you say, is not possible. You likewise contend it is not possible to require the other nations of the free world to contribute their proportionate share of the cost of free world defense. But, Mr. Chairman, it is possible to require them to make their proportionate contribution at least on the products they export into the United States.

Call this an equalization tax or a defense tax, or call it what you please; if they expect the American taxpayer to be their consumer, then they must contribute toward the terrific burden being carried by that consumer as a free world taxpayer.

I do not advocate a punitive tariff; I do not advocate a destructive tariff; I do not advocate a tariff which would place an import wall around the Nation, but I do contend that the Treasury of this Nation cannot long continue to

defend the free world, raise their standard of living by subsidizing their governments, financing agricultural, mining, and industrial development in competition to ours, place free food upon their tables, and then subsidize American agriculture, American mining, American labor, and American industry when these foreign products, produced through these unfair competitive means, idle the domestic producers.

The defense of their countries is as important to them as it is to us. Trade with us is vital to them. I see no other means of requiring them to carry even a portion of their share, except to place an import tax upon food, goods, and products imported in competition with domestic production.

The patient is dying with a malignant import cancer. Congress continues to treat the patient by placing bandages over the open sores, but does nothing about the malignancy. It is Congress and Congress alone that is to blame for this condition. When will it face up to the facts and assume the responsibility required of it by the Constitution?

United States Lags in New, Economic Phase of Cold War, McCormick Warns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Charles P. McCormick, chairman of the board of McCormick & Co., and an outstanding businessman and civic leader of Baltimore, Md., was one of the delegates to the Atlantic Congress.

The Atlantic Congress, which was held in London last June, was attended by 650 delegates from the NATO countries, to discuss the future of NATO.

The Baltimore Sun of August 5, 1959, carried an interview with Mr. McCormick, who is also a member of the Business Advisory Council of the Department of Commerce, in which he points out that we must realize that we are entering a new era of competition in the world, in which we have reached a stalemate militarily but during which we are going to be battling for our lives economically.

I ask unanimous consent that this thoughtful interview be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

UNITED STATES LAGS IN NEW, ECONOMIC PHASE OF COLD WAR, MCCORMICK WARNS

(By Louis R. Rukeyser)

The cold war has entered a new phase—and America is not winning it, Charles P. McCormick warned today.

"We must realize that we're entering a new era of competition," he declared. "We're not winning the cold war. We've

reached a stalemate militarily, but we're going to be battling for our lives economically."

Mr. McCormick, an international businessman and civic leader with headquarters in Baltimore, said industry and labor no longer can afford to be complacent about American technological know-how.

BACK FROM EUROPE

The rest of the world is catching up, he said.

Mr. McCormick has returned from a crowded European trip that included a world food convention, the commencement exercises of the University of Maryland's overseas branch and the first Atlantic Congress in London.

The last-named meeting, a gathering of 650 delegates from 14 NATO nations, was designed to make the Atlantic group something more than just a military alliance.

While the week-long congress ended with only a vague communique about closer cooperation (military, economic, political, and cultural), Mr. McCormick feels that it was a valuable first step in what he considers the new cold-war phase.

"I think we aroused a great many people who had been thinking that NATO militarily was enough to win the cold war," he said.

As for the possible importance of the Atlantic Congress, in the free world's future, Mr. McCormick says: "The average American will not think that this is as important as NATO. But is religion more important than a battleship?"

"If you already have the battleship, it may be."

His belief that the cold war is increasingly an economic conflict was intensified at the food convention, where the merchant says he found that the United States no longer has an automatic advantage in packaging and advertising.

He adds: "Five years ago I found Europe very backward. On this trip I was shocked at the activity, the intensity, and the modernization of European industry."

Some products produced by Germany and Switzerland in particular, he said, are well made, well packaged and manufactured and distributed locally at lower cost than in the United States.

UNITED STATES NEEDS BLUEPRINTS

America needs new blueprints if it is going to hold its own in the economic competition, Mr. McCormick maintains.

"Labor and business must realize that foreign manufacturers are getting to the point where they can beat the United States in product, in package, and in price," he adds.

"Otherwise, we are going to have vast unemployment, leading to the creation of a superstate in which we would be even more out of the market."

"Labor must be conscious that strikes are not always good, and business must be wary of excessively high profits. American prices must be lowered—and the interest of the employer and the laborer is exactly the same."

Seeds of Destruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Ap-

pendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lancaster News, Lancaster, S.C., of August 24, 1959:

SEEDS OF DESTRUCTION

What is the future of the United States of America? For more than 100 years it has been a generator of wealth and public prosperity. Has it now reached its peak with only a downhill prospect ahead? Quite a few sensible people have begun to wonder if this is not so.

No nation in all the history of civilization has ever embarked on such a giveaway program as this country undertook after World War II. In the heyday of her empire, Great Britain policed and financed a large part of the world. She furnished the money for development of her colonial possessions and even supplied the bribes for recalcitrant trouble-makers. But all her efforts were devoted to keeping the British Isles top dog in military, naval and commercial.

The United States took over this job after World War II with no clear-cut program in mind. Instead of following the British pattern of enlightened self-interest, the United States encouraged independence and self-development in every geographical and racial subdivision of the world. We have tried, and often vainly, to sell democracy in areas where democracy is an alien philosophy. To make it work, we have provided financial aid, factories, manufacturing know-how and raw material without stint or consideration.

The result has been a Pandora's box of political and economic troubles. No nation has ever applied the Golden Rule more consistently in its international affairs. No nation has ever received less return for this effort. We are receiving in payment, not the grateful thanks of cooperative nations, strong in their democracy, but the strident demand that we open markets in this country for their slave-labor products.

If we follow through on our global do-gooder policies, as the State Department seems determined to do, these low-wage products will shortly replace every major item of American industry in the domestic market.

The Rockefeller Family and Wyoming— How Grand Teton National Park Has Benefited a State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article by Tracy S. McCracken of Cheyenne, Wyo., entitled "The Rockefellers and Wyoming."

In this article Mr. McCracken, who is a distinguished resident of Wyoming, cites the vast benefits brought to his State by the eleemosynary donations of John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and his family toward the Grand Teton National Park and the very outstanding lodge and cabin facilities provided there on Jackson Lake.

I am particularly eager to call to the attention of my colleagues the article by Tracy S. McCracken for one reason.

Thirty years ago there was voiced against the Grand Teton National Park much of the same argument now used to oppose national seashore parks on Cape Cod, in the Oregon Dunes and Indiana Dunes, and elsewhere along America's scenic shorelines.

Yet, today, an eminent citizen of Wyoming heralds the Grand Teton National Park and the Rockefeller family, whose generosity and public-spirited donations of land helped to make possible not only the Grand Teton National Park but also the exemplary accommodations available there for travelers and tourists.

I ask unanimous consent that this informative article, "The Rockefellers and Wyoming," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROCKEFELLERS AND WYOMING

(By Tracy S. McCracken)

It's the contention of our Mrs. that all during our married life, which really constitutes a spell of time, we've rushed back to home and office from a vacation in advance of the time we'd promised to stay. The allegation is not without some semblance of fact. But there are exceptions. We never abbreviate the time we contemplate spending on our annual trek to Jackson Hole.

That's where this is being written—in our cabin at Jackson Lake Lodge. We came here for the yearly summer meeting of Wyoming University's trustees, a 2-day affair. A desk full of work at home notwithstanding we reluctantly said we'd stay an extra day. Now it's 3 days later and we're not leaving till the morning—and then will prolong the safari by 2 days more for a couple of days in Jackson.

Great wealth, as we suspect someone may have said before us, can be a wonderful and fortunate thing for others—if it is used wisely and beneficently, which, as we might superfluously add, it always isn't. However, it's impossible to escape the observation of what wondrous things private wealth can do when one sees first-hand what we have today, including not just the several million dollar Jackson Lake Lodge, but the vast Colter Bay development a few miles down the highway toward Yellowstone.

Between these two places are accommodations and cuisine to fit most anyone's pocket-book. The Colter log cabins (about 100 of them) are excellently, but not plushly furnished. The decor is distinctly western. For a family of four the cost is about \$12 a day. We lunched at the Colter cafeteria yesterday. Like the cabins it's spotlessly clean and the food fine. The price of our much too big luncheon which featured chicken livers: \$1.10. The trailer park at Colter is something to behold. In it are sites for 112 trailers. Cost per day: \$1.50, which includes electricity, running water and sewage and bathing facilities. No less interesting are the camping grounds with 112 sites. There is no charge to campers. Although they must supply their own tents, there are water hydrants and rest rooms within a stone's throw of every site, and a cooking grill for each.

Of course there is divided reaction as to the Grand Teton National Park taking over so much of Teton County. Nor are the adverse comments confined to the fact that by removing so much taxable land from tax rolls the county faces a difficult financial situation. In years past many fine private homes had been built in the area, especially around the lakes. But there's no more of that now; fact is, those there when the Park Service took over (including the late Wal-

lace Beery's) either have been or will be taken over from private ownership.

Which, in a way, seems to bad. Yet it is only by preservation of the domain which is the Jackson Hole that its majesty and its grandeur in its native state can be saved for all the people to enjoy in perpetuity. At least it will never be defaced by countless shacks and hot dog stands such as is the case in the otherwise beautiful Big Thompson Canyon of Estes Park.

The Jackson Hole Preserve, Inc., the non-profit organization endowed by the Rockefellers, as you know, originally bought up and gave to the National Park Service, most of the area now embraced by Grand Teton National Park. It also owns the Jackson Lake, Jenny Lake, and Colter Bay lodges and trailer park facilities. No one dislikes more than do we to see private lands or private business pass to Government control. But only by such procedure and by the untold millions that few if any outside of the Rockefellers could supply in gift form, could this area be preserved in its virgin state. And if in the long run countless millions of people from all over America and, indeed, the world are better for it we too must subscribe to its long-range desirability and feasibility.

Following through in their thinking that the area and its facilities must always be made available for the enjoyment of the greatest possible number of people, the Rockefellers have seen to it that their lodges are open to conventions only in the spring and late summer. So enticing a convention site is Jackson Lake Lodge that it could be booked solidly with conventions all summer long. But that way fewer people could be accommodated. Hence, the restrictions.

Frequently one hears that Jackson Lake Lodge is not the imposing looking structure, exteriorly, that would be expected of a \$7 million layout. But that is on purpose. Its benefactors insisted it be so designed as to blend into the landscape. The same principle has been applied to the spacious grounds. For its cooling and restful attributes about half of the grounds are of rich, green well-manicured grass. But the other half is still in its native condition with an abundance of wild flowers and shrubs.

Not only has a lot of money been put into this huge project, but so has an awful lot of thought. Of both, millions of people have been and everlastingly will be the beneficiaries.

On Air Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial on air safety deals primarily with the problem of mid-air collision. It brings to our attention an important point, namely that even with the development of mechanical devices, the human element, the pilot, remains the most significant safety factor. And this is likely to be the case for many years to come. It is important that the public realizes this, and of course, that our pilots know it. The editorial follows:

VISIBILITY AND VIGILANCE

In March of this year Mr. E. R. "Pete" Quesada, Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, solicited the cooperation of the Air Force in his continuing crusade against mid-

air collisions. In a letter to the Honorable James H. Douglas, Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Quesada, himself a noted Air Force pilot, points up the need for pilot vigilance. We quote: "I feel compelled to call your attention to the increasing number of reported near-misses of recent weeks. I know that you are well aware of this problem and the responsibilities we all share relating to it and feel certain that the Air Force, by constant emphasis on the importance of vigilance, can materially assist us in their prevention."

"The current rash of near-miss incidents forcibly points out that all pilots must be more vigilant to the presence of other aircraft in the airspace. This is particularly true when operating IFR under VFR conditions. An IFR flight plan, as has so often been indicated, in no way reduces the necessity for continual visual surveillance."

"We must all candidly recognize the existing limitations of our control system and cockpit visibility, as well as the vast mixture and speeds of modern aircraft. We must also recognize that there is no substitute for maintaining a thorough and vigilant watch for other air traffic at all times."

"I am convinced that beneficial results will be obtained from again enlisting the support of the Air Force in a program designed to bring forcefully to the attention of all pilots the necessity for constant vigilance and continuing awareness of this pressing problem."

"While I fully realize that pilot vigilance alone is not the entire answer to the near-miss problem, I am confident that it will serve to lessen the hazard until the positive and constructive program we now have under way to expand and improve our air traffic management facilities becomes effective."

"I want to point out that a similar letter has gone to the other military services and civil aviation organizations to insure that this message reaches all users of the airspace. I am sure that we can reduce the exposure and alleviate to a considerable extent the near-miss hazard."

In answering Mr. Quesada, the Secretary says, in part, "The Air Force is in full agreement with the need for increased pilot vigilance by all users of the airspace. Your letter complements the strong measures, including continual emphasis of pilot vigilance, currently in effect throughout the Air Force."

"While your correspondence is primarily directed toward air operations in the United States and possessions, the Chief of Staff has directed that your letter will be brought to the attention of all Air Force aircrew members and air operations personnel worldwide. You may be assured of continued Air Force emphasis on this subject, and of our full cooperation in your efforts to reduce air collision potential."

In passing the word to Air Force personnel worldwide, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Vice Chief of Staff, notes that, "The see and be seen concept has recognized limitations. This concept, despite these limitations, will remain a fundamental means of collision avoidance in the foreseeable future of world aviation. Constructive progress is being made in air traffic management; however, the most sophisticated system of air traffic control and airspace management will never entirely replace the requirement for maximum aircrew vigilance."

"The primary responsibility for vigilance rests with the pilot at the controls of the aircraft. Equally important, to offset cockpit visibility and aircraft control limitations, is the vigilance support given to the pilot by his crewmembers and the air operations personnel who control and advise him."

As General LeMay points out, all the concern and emphasis in high places will go for nothing if the individual crewmember doesn't conform. As usual, pilots, it's up to you. To be vigilant is to be awake and on the alert to insure safety or to discover and ward off danger.

The Atlantic Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, one of the delegates to the recent Atlantic Congress, held in London last June 5-10, was Paul Van Zeeland, the distinguished former Premier of Belgium. Mr. Van Zeeland has written an article in the August issue of *Western World* magazine, pointing out the significance of the Congress and calling for the growth of NATO into more than just a military alliance—into a "smoothly running community."

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Van Zeeland's article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

UNITED WE STAND

(By Paul Van Zeeland)

Two main ideas emerge from the meetings of the Atlantic Congress.

The first is that the Atlantic Pact, which up to now has in fact been merely a military organization for European defense, must expand in all directions. It must first be extended to various other fields: political, cultural, economic and social. It should become more than an alliance; a smoothly running community.

The second is that the Atlantic nations are actually related to the other nations of the free world by ties of interdependence which should be taken into account both materially and morally. More specifically, it is their duty to aid the underdeveloped countries.

THE ATLANTIC COMMUNITY

The countries known as the Atlantic nations each have their own customs, distinct regions, widely differing languages, different living standards. Yet, they all share the deep conviction that they belong to one great family of nations. The ties between them are so many and so strong that it may truly be said that culturally and morally a living and striving Atlantic Community exists.

The first of the five great committees constituting the Congress was devoted to the study of the basic elements of this common cultural community. Its conclusions were clear and unequivocal. The Atlantic cultural community is mainly based on a set of moral values, on an ethical code, on a certain way of life, on similar reactions to the fundamental concepts of life and happiness.

One of the most urgent and the most glorious tasks which lies before the Atlantic nations is to point out to the world what exactly is their ideal, their way of life, to restore its dynamism and its prestige of old; to present their way of life to the world, and particularly to the younger generation as a course of action, as a hopeful answer to the destructive, specious and dangerous communist propaganda.

The Congress met to celebrate the tenth anniversary of NATO. On this occasion, NATO wanted to summarize what it had done so far, and especially to discover the new lines along which the Atlantic community should develop in the future.

It can thus be acknowledged in all fairness that NATO did the free world a great service; but it will be admitted at the same

time that the present situation cannot last: It is impossible for a military alliance of a defensive nature to maintain its efficiency indefinitely if it remains unaffected by the profound changes undergone by circumstances. It has to grow and adapt itself.

A military alliance like NATO must, if necessary, be able to rely on general and trustful cooperation in political matters. The military alliance had to be completed by a political alliance. Here again, events should determine the extent of such an alliance and the structure that will assure its success.

Extended to the political realm, the alliance urgently needs sound and basic economic foundations. This already was the opinion of those who set up the important groundwork represented by the Atlantic Pact.

As they were all following a hardy and generous social policy, the Atlantic nations could not separate social and economic aspects of the various problems. And that is why in London it was decided that Atlantic cooperation should be extended without delay to the greater aspects of social life. The final declaration contains some very important advice:

"The time has come to set up an Atlantic Community whose responsibilities are to extend to many fields, military, political, economic, social, and scientific."

The Congress studied another aspect of the problem: the necessity of tightening the bonds between member nations. It is with this in mind on all occasions that the Congress used the expression "Atlantic Community." No attempt was made to define this term and this very abstention appears to me a proof of wisdom. Actions alone will tell: it rests with the old organizations or with the new institutions that will actually direct the first steps of this community to determine the rules of its functioning and to apply them with realism to changing circumstances.

In any case, it is obvious that the community is superior to the alliance; it contains the foundations and the principles of a tighter, more intimate cooperation.

AID TO LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

Having dealt with the main lines of the cooperation which from now on was to exist between them, the Atlantic nations turned towards the outside world. They immediately stressed their interdependence with the other nations of the free world. Each year the Atlantic nations have taken new steps on the road of economic and social progress. But can this gradual enrichment, this rise in the standard of living of the Atlantic countries continue as we wish, if, beyond our borders, other nations of the free world continue to live in poverty, and even in misery? Can the Atlantic nations facing the Communist world be expected to continue in their course if the underdeveloped countries which still believe in liberty are left without help, to struggle alone with their difficulties? Certainly not.

Aid must be given, not only efficiently, but in such a way that what we give will be gladly accepted; we must give, but give without neglecting the cultural and moral aspirations of those who receive and carefully protect their right to make their own decisions.

In the last resort, it is up to these peoples themselves to conduct their affairs as they see fit. The responsibility for their actions lies with them. But we can and we must help them, on a basis of complete equality, by resorting to forms of association convenient and profitable to both parties. This is the meaning of an expression which came up very often during the Congress: what we can and must do is to enable them to solve their own difficulties, in other words, we must "help them help themselves."

We must succeed in reestablishing the general conditions that will induce private capital to invest in foreign countries, however poverty-stricken or remote.

On the other hand, time is an essential factor in the maturing of everything that lives. This is true for mankind as it is true for civilizations and their growth as groups. There are no miracles in economics and politics. The standard of living reached by the countries of our ancient Western civilization is the result of the efforts of millions of men of good will over hundreds of years.

Lastly, and this needs to be emphasized, Western civilization consists not only of capital and techniques, but also of moral values, of conceptions of life and happiness, duty and right, and ethical rules, which are far more important than the purely material level and without which it is impossible to explain the Atlantic nations' strength and progress.

Such an undertaking demands a great deal of good will, mutual understanding, and time. This is no reason why we should delay in putting the most powerful means to work: the time to act is now.

Personally, I had hoped that the Congress would show more daring, more dynamism, more originality particularly in its final recommendations. It seems to me that it could have done this without going beyond the limits of what could reasonably be expected. The Congress could have further developed its mission as a source of inspiration.

We should not forget that it was a gathering of individuals acting on a purely personal basis, on their own responsibility, who had been asked to open the way to new hopes for the Atlantic peoples. In fact the Congress brought together exceptionally eminent men who practically all held or had held positions of considerable public responsibility. They acted and talked with prudence and reserve, which was quite understandable in view of the gravity and urgency of the questions on the agenda. But surely more enterprising and original attitudes would have made a greater impression on public opinion and on governments.

WHAT THE CONGRESS ACHIEVED

However it would be a great mistake to minimize the results obtained during this Congress.

First of all an atmosphere prevailed which was surely far ahead of average government opinion.

In the committees the discussions were keen, even impassioned, they bore evidence of the conscientiousness with which the participants tried to accomplish a task that they had freely set themselves, but they also showed how convinced they were of the gravity of the moment and of the necessity of rapidly promoting the Atlantic community.

That is particularly true of the final declaration voted at the last minute by the Congress in plenary session. The debates of the Declaration Committee, made up of the principal chairmen of the large committees, were long and arduous. More than anywhere else, one could sense in this committee the oppositions which arose as soon as it was necessary to get down to brass tacks.

Besides it would be a mistake to believe that the final declaration represents the sum total of the Congress's efforts. It is but an echo; it attempts to briefly summarize some of the essential points by giving some important examples of what has been achieved. But in order to evaluate what the Congress actually wanted, and summarize the main points, it is essential to take into account the resolutions of the five main committees.

Among the conclusions reached by the political committee, there are some which go as far as one could hope under present circumstances.

Resolution I takes up again the recommendation published by the experts in their report of 1956. The final declaration summarizes this recommendation in these terms: "National governments should not take important decisions affecting the unity of NATO without previous consultation."

If all the governments of NATO, big and small, were strictly to apply this rule of conduct, a real political community between nations would soon ensue. Indeed, from then on, not one of the members of the alliance could by itself take any decisions that might endanger the policy, the security, or the cohesion of the group of Atlantic nations; even if this decision clearly fell under its authority.

On the level of economics, new ways have been opened up which can lead as far as will prove necessary.

Let us take, for example, resolution C of the Economic Report. It is clear enough: not only should governments refrain from any protectionist practices, but they should do all they can to remove the obstacles to trade between Atlantic Nations. Likewise, they should do everything in their power to maintain monetary stability.

The resolution in question gives its blessing to the various organizations which resort to multilateral economic cooperation. Amongst the examples that are mentioned are both the OEEC and the European Economic Community. The text is careful to place on the same level any other economic organizations which might be formed in the future, as long as they strive toward multilateral cooperation. This is a direct and obvious allusion to the free trade zone. The declaration takes its real character from the use of the very clear expression, "economic integration."

It could not be more clearly stated, in the eyes of those who approved the resolution—and it was approved unanimously—that the choice has been made: the Atlantic countries should move in the direction of growing economic integration.

We should also point out the significance of another resolution which would imply that the United States and Canada, which up to now have been simple observers with the OEEC, would become full members sharing the same responsibilities of the European members. This modification would make the OEEC the economic instrument of the Atlantic community, a role to which it seems naturally destined.

On the military level, the opposition of views which exist between the members of NATO naturally found their echoes and repercussions. When the Congress was meeting in London, the French Government reached some unilateral decisions which led to surprise and criticism. Obviously it was not the Congress duty to try to resolve the difficulties which had appeared, nor to set itself up as a judge. As always in such cases, the best policy lies in mutual sincerity.

What the Congress tried to do was to set the bases for an eventual solution; it used some formulas which, interpreted and carried out by men of good will, can lead to rapid agreement.

In any case, the Congress continually stressed that all the Atlantic powers must work toward integration, in a spirit of true equality; none of the members can expect to draw a unilateral advantage from its position, its strength, or its advance in any particular field.

CONCLUSION

If I interpret it correctly, the position adopted by the Congress as regards cooperation on an Atlantic basis appears to me most wise and most realistic.

The Congress takes cognizance of the many organizations of economic cooperation already existing and notes their main achievements. It hopes that new organizations will be set up. One preoccupation seems to un-

derlie all the committees' efforts: to pool more and more closely the resources, the means of action, the ideas, the knowledge, and the resolution of the several Atlantic countries.

But while recommending strengthening the ties between the Atlantic nations, the Congress was careful to point out that the organization set up must remain liberal and that it must remain attentive to the outside world. This appears to me to be a sound position. We should persevere in the organization of Europe. In our eyes the Common Market was and remains a great step forward, and should eventually lead to the creation of a Greater Europe.

Personally, I hope that a free trade area will be created which will work closely with the six countries of the Common Market. Such a wish is far from utopian. It would only take a minimum of good will to find a way that will allow all the nations to work together without either of the two groups losing face or being penalized in any way.

As Scripture says, there are many mansions in our Father's house. That is still true. But we must remember to keep the doors of each open wide to the outside world.

The 6 of the Common Market cannot withdraw into themselves any more than the 16 or 17 of greater Europe. Neither can Europe withdraw within itself. And the Atlantic community too must keep, in its freedom to act, all its contacts with the outer world.

Alas. We are forced to admit how slowly the integration of Europe is proceeding: we are being overtaken. The increase in production is still lower in Europe than in the United States and, with all due allowance, than in Soviet Russia.

Perhaps the creation of the kind of Atlantic community that the committee has been striving for may well short-circuit some of the difficulties which now oppose the Common Market and future free trade area.

In any case, what matters at the present is that the advice given by the Congress should soon be followed by results. The Congress was addressing itself to individual governments and to international organizations; and most of all it was speaking to world opinion.

Representatives to the Congress will warn their respective governments of the urgency of the resolutions passed in London; public opinion will surely support any government that undertakes clear and decisive action aimed at the strengthening of the West.

It is for others to carry on the good work. Henceforward, the immediate responsibility for action along the lines proposed rests fully with the governments concerned. But the latter only act when obliged to do so. Herein lies the particular responsibility of all those who are in contact with public opinion. If the general public were to assert their fears, hopes, and aspirations more forcefully, how much more energetic and lively the Atlantic Alliance would soon be. If only this could be so. Every opportunity should be taken and not lost like many of the others.

Before concluding these comments, I should like to mention the hospitality shown by Great Britain to the congress. Its kindness was beyond bounds, cordial, great, comprehensive, and understanding. Some of the ceremonies were impressive. The congress was officially opened in Westminster Hall by Her Royal Highness Queen Elizabeth II with a dignity and simplicity which were both regal and charming.

This was done in keeping with the highest traditions and was so impressive that none could remain indifferent.

Finally, it does seem that the London congress did attain several of its main aims. It served the cause of civilization. Through its work, it has prepared and facilitated the

necessary integration of the Atlantic powers. It has brought new hopes of peace and progress not only to the peoples of the Atlantic nations, but also to all men of good will throughout the world.

The Interest Ceiling Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. PELL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from this morning's New York Times dealing with the interest rate on Government bonds.

Again I remind the House that we have a responsibility to face up to the interest ceiling issue.

The above-mentioned editorial follows:

THE INTEREST CEILING ISSUE

President Eisenhower at his news conference Tuesday renewed—and in the most emphatic manner—his request first made to Congress on June 8 that the existing ceilings applying to interest rates on Government bonds be removed or liberalized.

The ceiling on marketable securities is 4½ percent, and applies to issues with maturities of 5 years or longer. This legislation is in the nature of an anachronistic accident. It has no logical relationship to present conditions in the bond market. It was enacted in 1918 in connection with the second Liberty Loan financing of World War I, and was based on conditions then contemporary but today purely history.

What makes this legislation imperative is that the Treasury must raise vast sums in the months ahead in order (1) to fund a constant procession of maturing obligations, and (2) to raise new money to pay for the appropriations voted by Congress and not covered by taxes. As much as possible of such financing should take the form of securities designed to appeal to savers, since, when money is raised through savings, it has no inflationary effects. In practice this means that, broadly speaking, it should be raised through the sale of long-term securities. But with business in a boom phase at present, the demands of borrowers of all categories in the money market are extremely heavy. These demands, competing for a comparatively limited supply of funds, have driven interest rates sharply upward. With the market rate on comparatively long issues above 4½ percent, the Treasury finds itself in a position in which it has no alternative but to raise its funds through the sale of short-term paper, a procedure inflationary in its implications because it involves the creation of bank credit or expansion of the money supply.

The present ceiling on savings bonds, from which the President has also asked relief, is roughly 3½ percent, a rate that makes it impossible for the Government to compete actively with other available outlets for savings. This is not only a grave injustice to the 40 million patriotic holders of savings bonds in the Nation, but it is a potential threat of the most serious kind to the whole Government savings bond program, itself a major bulwark against monetary inflation.

Savings bonds outstanding total \$50.5 billion. That figure exceeds by \$2 billion the total of all publicly held marketable issues

of the U.S. Treasury with maturities of 5 years or longer. Every dollar that is withdrawn by a savings bond holder is a dollar that the Treasury will have to replace, and that, so long as present interest limitations remain in effect, it will have to replace by raising the money through methods highly inflationary.

Prison Plight Poses a Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, in my capacity as chairman of the Senate's Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries I have come to know and admire James V. Bennett, Director of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons.

For many years Mr. Bennett has urged the Congress to ease the explosive situation facing our overcrowded Federal correctional institutions by authorizing and providing the funds for construction of new prisons. Congress has been reluctant to meet this mounting crisis and only this year, after five annual requests, was the Bureau of Prisons granted \$2 million to begin construction of a maximum security prison at Marion, Ill.

The danger of overcrowded prisons, Mr. President, is the prison riot and the loss of life and destruction of property which go hand in hand with such riots. Prison riots, unfortunately, have become almost regular events in our Nation's overburdened prison system and they illustrate the need for more penal facilities.

The rehabilitation of prisoners is seriously hampered by overcrowding in our prisons. Without new prisons and with our Nation's prison population increasing annually rehabilitation will soon be a thing of the past. Prison officials simply will not have the time to carry out rehabilitation programs.

This crisis facing our prison system is well documented in an article prepared by Congressional Quarterly. I ask unanimous consent that the article, which appeared in the Kansas City Star, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Aug. 19, 1959]

PRISON PLIGHT POSES A CRISIS—RISING CRIME RATE STRESSES NEED TO ALLEVIATE CROWDED CONDITIONS—FEAR OF RIOTING GROWS—FACILITIES MUST BE EXPANDED TO HEAD OFF THREAT, OFFICIALS SAY

WASHINGTON, August 19.—The problem of overcrowded prisons is approaching crisis proportions, according to James V. Bennett, director of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons.

And public apathy handicaps penal officials in their efforts to obtain larger budgets to ease the problem.

RIOTS IN 38 PRISONS

A Library of Congress survey of prison riots for 1954-59 reveals that 47 riots occurred in

38 prisons, reformatories, and jails in 24 States.

During this period four prison riots occurred at the Nebraska State penitentiary, three at the Montana State prison, two each at the Washington State penitentiary, the New York women's house of detention, the Bexar County jail in San Antonio, Tex., and two at two Massachusetts State prisons. More than 100 prisoners participated in 18 of these prison riots.

Representative THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, Democrat, of Illinois, has said that if additional prison facilities are not provided Uncle Sam is going to have a major prison riot on his hands like that which occurred at Alcatraz in 1946. At that time nearly 300 prisoners attempted a mass escape from "the Rock." Since then two flareups have occurred in Federal institutions, at the Chillicothe, Ohio, reformatory in 1952, and at the U.S. Medical Center for Federal prisoners, Springfield, Mo., in June of this year.

Overcrowding of prisons is due to three main factors: Increased U.S. population, the higher crime rate, and the failure of the States and the Federal Government to build new prison facilities.

CITE CRIME RISE

Preliminary FBI figures indicate a higher increase in crime in 1958 than in 1957, when an 8 percent increase in major crimes occurred. The FBI reported an alltime high of 2,796,400 major crimes were committed in 1957.

Then there's the problem that not enough new prison facilities are being built. After 5 years of making annual requests, the U.S. Bureau of Prisons this year finally got \$2 million in its appropriation to build a \$10 million 600-man maximum security prison for hardened criminals at Marion, Ill.

A major problem with prison overcrowding is that prison officials have less opportunity to rehabilitate young prisoners. At the end of the 1958 fiscal year the number of prisoners 21 and under comprised a record 18.9 percent of the total Federal prison population.

In recommending expanded prison facilities for young offenders, Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., Democrat, of Missouri, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries, points out that commitments of youthful offenders aged 18-24 already comprise 28 percent of Federal offenders. And he adds that commitments in the 18-24 age group are expected to increase 52 percent by 1956 and 87 percent by 1970.

White House Text on Flag Lists Its Use and Background

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. MUMMA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a citizen of the United States, a nation that takes so much pride in displaying the flag. In the Washington Post for Sunday, August 23, 1959, there appeared an article which is a statement issued by the White House, giving background on the history of the flag.

On occasion, I have supplied a flag that was flown over the Capitol Building of the United States, to various indi-

viduals for some church, civic, or social function in my congressional district.

Over these years I have become deeply impressed by the closeness of our people to our flag and I thought this article which appeared in the newspaper would therefore be very interesting. So I am taking this opportunity of asking that it be printed in the RECORD in order that others who may have missed it might now have the opportunity of reading up on it.

The article follows:

WHITE HOUSE TEXT ON FLAG LISTS ITS USE AND BACKGROUND

In connection with the admission of Hawaii as a State of the Union, the President today issued an Executive order adding the 50th star to the Union of the flag. The new flag will supersede the 49-star flag which was prescribed on the admission of Alaska as a State of the Union.

By law, the new 50-star flag will become the official flag of the United States on July 4, 1960, the birthday of the Union. Display of the new flag before that time would be improper. However, it would not be improper to display the 48-star flag or the 49-star flag after that date; with limited exceptions agencies of the Federal Government will continue to display the 48-star flag and the 49-star flag so long as they remain in good condition and until existing stocks of unused flags are exhausted. It is appropriate for all citizens to do the same.

Following is certain information with respect to the historical and symbolic aspects of the national flag.

HISTORY OF NATIONAL FLAG

Before we became a nation, our land knew many flags. Long ago the Norsemen probed our coastal waters sailing under the banner of the black raven. Columbus carried a Spanish flag across the seas. The Pilgrims carried the flag of Great Britain. The Dutch colonists brought their striped flag to New Amsterdam. The French explored the continent under the royal fleur-de-lis. Each native Indian tribe had its own totem and insignia. Immigrants of every race and nationality, in seeking a new allegiance, have brought their symbols of loyalty to our shores.

During our Revolution, various banners were used by the not-yet-united colonies. A green pine tree with the motto, "an appeal to heaven," was popular with our young Navy. The rattlesnake's warning, "Don't tread on me," was displayed by aroused colonists along the Atlantic seaboard. The Moultrie "liberty" flag, a large blue banner with a white crescent in the upper corner, rallied the defenders of Charleston, S.C., in 1776. The Bunker Hill flag was a blue banner with a white canton filled with a red cross and a small green pine. The flag of the maritime colony of Rhode Island bore a blue anchor under the word "Hope." Strikingly similar to the Stars and Stripes was the flag carried by the Green Mountain Boys of Vermont at the battle of Bennington on August 16, 1777.

When Washington took command of the Continental Army at Cambridge, Mass., in 1776, he stood under "the grand union flag" which continued to show a dependence upon Great Britain. The canton of this flag was filled with the crosses of St. George (England) and St. Andrew (Scotland).

The first Stars and Stripes was created by the Continental Congress on June 14, 1777. This date is now observed nationally as "Flag Day."

In this flag the 13 stars, representing a constellation, were arranged in a variety of designs. The most popular, with the stars in a circle so that no State could claim precedence over another, is known as the Betsy

Ross flag, in honor of the seamstress who is supposed to have sewn the first one.

As the American frontier expanded, two new States were added to the Union, and these were incorporated into the flag. This meant that two stars and two stripes were added to the design, making a total of 15 each. It was this flag that withstood enemy bombardment at Fort McHenry, Md., September 13-14, 1814, and inspired Francis Scott Key to write "The Star Spangled Banner."

Later, when other States were added to the Union, the Congress, feeling that more stripes would blur the basic design, returned to the original 13 red and white stripes.

Since 1818, each new State has brought a new star to the flag. This growing pattern of stars could be said to reflect the growing dimensions of America's responsibilities, as the 13 stripes reflect the constant strength of our country's traditions.

The 50 States and the dates of their entry into the Union:

Alabama, December 14, 1819.
Alaska, January 3, 1959.
Arizona, February 14, 1912.
Arkansas, June 15, 1836.
California, September 9, 1850.
Colorado, August 1, 1876.
Connecticut, January 9, 1788.
Delaware, December 7, 1787.
Florida, March 3, 1845.
Georgia, January 2, 1788.
Hawaii, August 21, 1959.
Idaho, July 3, 1890.
Illinois, December 3, 1818.
Indiana, December 11, 1816.
Iowa, December 28, 1846.
Kansas, January 29, 1861.
Kentucky, June 1, 1792.
Louisiana, April 30, 1812.
Maine, March 15, 1820.
Maryland, April 28, 1788.
Massachusetts, February 6, 1788.
Michigan, January 26, 1837.
Minnesota, May 11, 1858.
Mississippi, December 10, 1817.
Missouri, August 10, 1821.
Montana, November 8, 1889.
Nebraska, March 1, 1867.
Nevada, October 31, 1864.
New Hampshire, June 21, 1788.
New Jersey, December 18, 1787.
New Mexico, January 6, 1912.
New York, July 26, 1788.
North Carolina, November 21, 1789.
North Dakota, November 2, 1889.
Ohio, March 1, 1803.
Oklahoma, November 16, 1907.
Oregon, February 14, 1859.
Pennsylvania, December 12, 1787.
Rhode Island, May 29, 1790.
South Carolina, May 23, 1788.
South Dakota, November 2, 1889.
Tennessee, June 1, 1796.
Texas, December 29, 1845.
Utah, January 4, 1896.
Vermont, March 4, 1791.
Virginia, June 25, 1788.
Washington, November 11, 1889.
West Virginia, June 20, 1863.
Wisconsin, May 29, 1848.
Wyoming, July 10, 1890.

CUSTOMS AND USAGE AS TO FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES

Laws have been written to govern the display of the flag and to insure a proper respect for it. Custom has decreed certain other observances in regard to its use. As a symbol of the Nation, standing for our heritage of liberty and justice, the flag is naturally held in highest honor by all citizens.

In recent years, the Congress of the United States of America has drawn together "the Existing Rules and Customs pertaining to the Display and Use of the Flag." These can be found in Public Law 829 of the 77th Congress and in Public Laws 107 and 396 of the 83d Congress. Copies may be obtained from the Government Printing Office.

Oregon State College Agricultural Specialists Discuss Farmers' Plight, Possible Solutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the most pressing domestic problems of this decade is the economic condition of American agriculture.

U.S. farmers are being drowned in a flood of goods created by their own efficiency.

In 1958 a third fewer farmers produced 55 percent more farm products than in 1938, and accomplished this feat with 30 percent less work and the smallest planted acreage in 40 years.

But net farm income has exhibited a downward trend for the last 10 years and farm production costs have increased almost fourfold since 1940. Hardest hit are small farms.

This situation is of crucial importance to my State. Oregon agriculture ranks as the State's second industry. Our 54,000 farms raise everything from alfalfa to zucchini. Most of the crops produced are not eligible for price support payments.

Mr. President, recently Dr. A. L. Strand, president of Oregon State College, and a group of that school's agricultural analysts, outlined in some detail conditions plaguing farmers in Oregon and throughout the Nation and advanced suggestions for long-range solutions to these problems.

Of particular interest to me was the recommendation that the price support program be re-evaluated. As I have frequently pointed out in the past, the present price support program does little to aid the Nation's small farmers. A complete overhaul of our Federal agriculture program is long overdue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there appear at the conclusion of my remarks, in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article written by Joe Bianco, agriculture editor of the Oregonian, of Portland, Ore., and which appeared in the August 23, 1959, issue of that daily newspaper.

I think that Mr. Bianco's presentation of the thoughtful comments of President Strand and his associates represents a very concise and cogent summary of the farm situation today, not only in Oregon, but in many other parts of the country as well. I hope that Members of the Senate will have an opportunity to read this article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland Oregonian, Aug. 23, 1959]

OREGON STATE COLLEGE AGRICULTURAL SPECIALISTS DISCUSS FARMERS' PLIGHT, POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

(By Joe Bianco)

Oregon is in an agricultural maelstrom that will continue to wipe out small farms, but, when the turmoil is over, a sound farm

economy will emerge in keeping with the time.

This is the opinion of Dr. August Leroy Strand, president of Oregon State College, and some of the college's highly respected agricultural analysts.

The group met with the Oregonian in a 3-hour conference and outlined a recovery program expected to direct farmers through what has been described as an "agricultural revolution."

The program is a reply to an appeal made earlier this week by H. D. Rolph, Sr., president of the Oregon State Farmers Union, who asked the college to investigate the "depressed conditions of agriculture" existing in the State.

Strand issued a brief answer to the OSFU president Tuesday, but enlarged upon it during the conference.

Present with Dr. Strand during the explanation of the school's long-range farm program.

Dr. Grant E. Blanch, professor of agricultural economics; Marion Daws Thomas, extension agricultural economist; Wilbur Tarlton Cooney, associate dean of the school of agriculture; James Ralph Beck, Assistant Director of the Federal Cooperative Extension Service, and Robert M. Alexander, assistant director of the agricultural experiment stations.

Some of the existing conditions plaguing farmers, and not only in Oregon, were presented in the opening phase of the interview. They are:

1. A trend toward fewer farms and the disappearance of smaller farms.
2. Only 36 cents of the consumer dollar goes to the farmer, compared with 45 cents 10 years ago.
3. Change in eating habits from high calorie diet to low calorie foods, thereby reducing per capita consumption.
4. Dearth of nearby markets for goods.
5. Local markets invaded by outside competition.
6. Increase in cost of operation.
7. Overproduction.

ANSWERS SUGGESTED

Here are some solutions:

1. Retire more land to meet future needs. This should be applied nationally.
2. Oregon farmers should grow more trees, primarily alder and fir, because of the potential in the wood industry.
3. Small land farmers in the latter years of life who are unable to compete should liquidate, lease, or obtain part-time work. Young farmowners having small farms should increase holdings, improve efficiency or try for off-farm jobs.
4. Greater emphasis should be on Oregon specialty crops to eliminate outside competition and ease burden of rising freight rates.
5. Apply new farm technologies.
6. Reevaluate the price support program.

TECHNOLOGY BOOSTS OUTPUT

Blanch explained that the overproduction throughout the country has been brought on by forces growing out of an improved farm technology.

Unfortunately, the demand for agricultural products is inelastic and the surplus can't be absorbed by the consumer. Today's consumer is using his increased buying power to purchase nonagricultural commodities, such as television, cars, boats and other new goods.

"And while we are overproducing, which is required in order to exist in an agricultural economy, we are doing so with fewer farms because of tremendous strides in scientific farming," he added. In 1910, there were 12 million persons working on farms; today, there are 6 million.

Oregon must produce more than it consumes locally because half of the State's agricultural income is derived from products shipped out of the State.

FREIGHT COST ADDITIONAL

The State must maintain these markets and in so doing becomes involved in a highly competitive industry. Our products shipped to outside markets must compete in price with products from the market's local areas.

In addition, the Oregon farmer must pay freight costs to reach the outlets.

It is this situation, which Strand explained, is reason for Oregon farmers to concentrate on crops such as seeds, pears and timber that will not meet so keen competition. No other State is able to produce these products in equal quality or quantity.

The group expanded on its proposal to increase farm land retirement, a major factor in the growing agricultural problem.

Nationally, at least 50 million acres should be retired, and included in this would be 500,000 acres of Oregon farm lands. The States are so interdependent that one State can't solve the problem alone, they said.

ACCEPTANCE DOUBTED

The national figure includes the 22 million acres already in soil conservation. A decrease in land production will not increase farm prices, but allow the fruits of agriculture to be distributed more evenly among farmers.

Whether the farmers will accept this is something else. Too much effort and capital has been invested in the land, it was pointed out.

A major cause of this critical situation seems to have originated with the support price program.

Thomas said that "in an effort to ease the adjustment or impact of the economic forces we (Congress) devised support price programs and other forms of subsidies. From the standpoint of the farmer caught in the light of the line (wheat farmers and others), it was needed because he was threatened with sharply declining prices as competition increase.

"These programs in effect have conflicted with the technological developments that have made it possible for fewer and fewer to produce the needed food and fiber," he explained.

"The supports have tended to keep people in farming who might otherwise have turned to production of other food and services. We might have had a program that would have given the farmers a chance to go into other fields or combine agriculture and industry.

The group concluded by saying that despite these prospects there will be room for good farmers for a long time, perhaps forever. Those able to put new farm technology to work in time, before the rank and file, will be rewarded for their efficiency.

TV Petition Is Opposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues know, there is presently quite a controversy over the pending allocation of VHF channel 12 in Wilmington, Del. Although this is a local problem, in a certain sense, it has ramifications of Federal import for it serves to illustrate some of the underlying complications in the ETV struggle raging in many areas of the country.

I have been greatly pleased to see the increasing enthusiasm among my constituents for the educational allocation of Wilmington's channel 12. One of the most encouraging aspects of this whole allocation debate occurred during a legislative session of the Delaware Boy's State. The young men of the Boy's State lawmaking body overwhelmingly passed a resolution in favor of operating channel 12 as an educational telecasting unit.

This has been a long and complicated battle, and one which will undoubtedly continue for some time. I have been informed that the Federal Communications Commission will not take up the channel 12 question officially until at least the middle of September, if then. There are four petitions before the FCC at this time for the rights to operate channel 12. Three of them are applications filed by persons who would operate the channel commercially, and one has been submitted by WHYY, Inc., a Delaware-Pennsylvania-New Jersey group which would broadcast only educational programs over the channel.

The most recent petition before the FCC is the one filed by Benedict Gimbel, Jr., of the WIP Broadcasting Co., in Philadelphia. Mr. Gimbel's is an interesting proposal and is one which will be given a great deal of thought by the ETV enthusiasts. Since most of us who are in favor of educational television are approaching this situation realistically, we are aware that the FCC rarely allocates a VHF channel for strictly educational use. If channel 12 were to be operated by a commercial group, Mr. Gimbel's offer is certainly the most attractive of that kind. He has indicated that he would, after obtaining operating rights, delegate 3 percent of the time of the air to educational programs.

I feel it necessary to say, however, as I have said many times before, that a commercial channel which grants a portion of its time to educational use is by no means a substitute for the full-time educational television channel. Commercial channels cannot broadcast educational programs in the evening when these programs would be beneficial to the vast number of adults who would like to watch educational programs. Since many of the TV watchers of the evening hours prefer to be entertained; and since a commercial station, in order to sell the products which sponsor its shows, must give the greatest number of people what they want when they want it; the educational shows are usually relegated to only morning hours.

I do not stand alone with these feelings pertaining to ETV in Delaware. It has been heartwarming to see the effort which is being expended by many Delawareans, Pennsylvanians, and New Jerseyites who feel the need of an educational television channel in the Middle Atlantic States. These public-spirited people have raised \$863,000 so far, to support the channel, according to Alexander Greenfield, president of the Delaware Educational Television Association. Again I offer my support to this project and urge that the ETV proponents keep up the good work in the hope that an

educational channel 12 may become a reality.

Inserted here is an article from the *Wilmington Journal-Evening* of August 12, which describes in more detail some of the local feelings on this matter. [From the *Wilmington (Del.) Journal-Evening*, Aug. 12, 1959]

TV PETITION IS OPPOSED—PHILADELPHIA'S WIP TRY FOR CHANNEL 12 DRAWS CONTESTING STATEMENT

The Delaware Educational Television Association board of trustees today issued a statement opposing the application of Philadelphia station WIP for channel 12 in Wilmington.

The statement given by DETVA president Alexander Greenfield said: "The application of station WIP, which commits 30 percent of its broadcast time to education, does not meet the needs of education in the Delaware community. DETVA maintains that adult education requires a large portion of the broadcast hours between 7 p.m. and 11 p.m. If educational TV is to grow and continue to be creative, participating organizations, and the schoolteachers must have access to studio facilities at all times.

"DETVA is happy to see a recognition of a commercial organization of the necessity and marketability of education on TV, but it does not believe that a grant of channel 12 to WIP would serve the best interests of the State of Delaware."

Others interested in getting channel 12 are the Rollins Broadcasting Co., Wilmington, a midwestern group, and WHYY, Inc., an educational corporation representing Delaware, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey. The latter is a nonprofit organization trying to obtain the channel to air education programs in the evening.

DETVA's proposal would have broadcasting from 9 a.m. to 11 p.m. From 9 a.m. to 3 p.m., there would be programs into the schools.

Mr. Greenfield announced that hearings in Washington before the Federal Communications Commission, probably will not be held before October. At the hearing, Mr. Greenfield said, he, and Delaware educators and leading citizens will testify in behalf of WHYY.

Mrs. Yvonne De Valenger, secretary, reported that the association has already received more than 1,000 signed petitions favoring WHYY's application.

The drive for the petitions will continue until the FCC hearing, Mr. Greenfield said.

Georgia Bankers Honor Representative Paul Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, no Member of Congress has served with greater distinction to himself or with truer devotion to his constituents and Nation than has the Honorable Paul Brown of the 10th District of Georgia. In deserved recognition of Representative Brown's long and outstanding service in the public interest, particularly in the field of banking and currency, the Executive Council of the Georgia Bankers Association recently adopted a resolution expressing its appreciation. I ask unan-

imous consent, Mr. President, that the text of that resolution be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Executive Council of the Georgia Bankers Association has noted with pride:

1. That Representative PAUL BROWN of the 10th District of Georgia has served with honor for many years as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives.

2. That Representative PAUL BROWN as chairman of Subcommittee No. 2 of the Banking and Currency Committee, first established early this year, has demonstrated outstanding ability for constructive leadership.

3. That Representative PAUL BROWN introduced H.R. 5237 in the 86th Congress, a bill to amend the legal reserve requirements applicable to member banks of the Federal Reserve System to permit, among other things, the Federal Reserve Board to authorize member banks to include vault cash as a part of their legal reserves and that under his skillful direction this bill passed the House of Representatives and was subsequently enacted into law as Public Law 86-114.

4. That Representative PAUL BROWN has introduced much needed amendments to the national bank laws as bills H.R. 8159 and H.R. 8160 and has guided these bills to approval by his subcommittee and the full Banking and Currency Committee and thereafter to passage by the House of Representatives.

In view of the foregoing, the Executive Council of the Georgia Bankers Association hereby expresses its great and sincere appreciation of the notable service which Representative PAUL BROWN has performed in an effort to modernize the banking laws so that the banks of the country may more effectively serve their communities and assist in the economic growth of the United States and instructs the secretary of the association to make this resolution a part of the permanent records of the association and to transmit a copy to Representative BROWN, to the other members of the Georgia congressional delegation, and to the American Bankers Association.

Humanitarian Stricken

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following news story and an editorial from the *Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader* of Monday, August 24, 1959, announcing and commenting upon the illness of Dr. Thomas A. Dooley, who is characterized as "America's Dr. Schweitzer" for his great and humanitarian work in the field of medicine in the Far East, specifically in Laos:

DOCTOR DETERMINED TO RETURN TO LAOS
ST. LOUIS, August 24.—Dr. Thomas A. Dooley says cancer may let him live only 5 or 6 years, but he is determined to return to embattled Laos. He operates a hospital near the frontlines of Laos battle against Communist rebels.

The 32-year-old physician said a growth removed from his chest has been diagnosed as malignant melanoma.

"The outlook for this type of cancer is bleak," he said, as if he were talking about a common cold. "It usually means you have 5 or 6 years."

"I don't care what the outlook is. If it's 6 months or 18 years, I'm going back to Laos in November."

"The fate of Laos is more important than the Berlin crisis. The future of all southeast Asia rests with the outcome of the situation in Laos."

Dr. Dooley, who visited his mother here, flies to New York today for further diagnosis at the Sloan-Kettering Cancer Research Center.

He expressed concern over Communist reports in Laos that the American doctor had ducked out in "typical American" fashion.

HUMANITARIAN STRICKEN

The Associated Press dispatch from New York, appearing in this newspaper on Saturday, telling of the return of Dr. Thomas Dooley to St. Louis to visit his family before entering a hospital for treatment of cancer in the chest, will be cause for concern in this community, as it will be in many places, particularly in Laos which is taking up a great deal of space on the front page these days.

Dr. Dooley is America's Dr. Schweitzer. Whereas the famous French humanitarian labors in Africa, Dr. Dooley has been conducting a hospital and traveling clinic in the Far East, close to the border of Red China.

Dr. Dooley lectured at College Misericordia in January 1958 before his return to his post in the Orient where he was stricken recently. His moving recital of his experiences made a deep impression on his audience at Dallas.

Only 32 years of age and a former U.S. Navy officer, Dr. Dooley returned to Indochina where he and four fellow Americans, constituting a mobile medical unit, treated villagers and built a bamboo hospital where he looks after at least 100 patients daily and provides natives with an inspiring example of American brotherhood. His only compensation, apart from the honors he has received and the satisfaction of doing a good deed, consists of eggs, fruit and poultry which he shares with the needy. It has been estimated that he has served more than 600,000 refugees from China. He also has trained hundreds of natives to serve as midwives and in other capacities. He has used royalties from two books, as well as contributions from admirers, to buy medical equipment and supplies for his mission of mercy.

And now this unselfish man himself has been stricken. He will have the prayers of millions of his fellow countrymen and of orientals he has befriended for a speedy recovery and a return to his post. The world cannot spare, at this crucial period, one Dr. Dooley or one Dr. Schweitzer.

Hector Says Regulatory Agencies Try To Do Impossible—And Fail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Hector Says Regulatory Agencies

Try To Do Impossible—And Fail" written by Carroll Kilpatrick, which appeared in the Washington Post of August 26, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article sets forth quotes from a speech made by the Honorable Louis J. Hector, a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board before the convention of the American Bar Association in Miami, Fla., pointing out that our regulatory agencies are failing to achieve their purpose by virtue of the out-moded procedures which they are following today.

Commissioner Hector who hails from the great State of Florida leveled sharp, objective and constructive criticism at the present procedures followed by our regulatory agencies and expressed the view that a major overhauling of these procedures is vital if they are to serve the purpose for which they have been established by the Congress. I am pleased to state that the Transportation Study Committee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will look into matters of this nature. I hope we come up with a solution. Solutions to these problems are hard to come up with these days.

What Mr. Hector has said is what many of us have felt for some time. In my opinion, he has performed great public service. The views stated by him deserve the urgent and serious consideration of the Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 26, 1959]
HECTOR SAYS REGULATORY AGENCIES TRY TO DO IMPOSSIBLE—AND FAIL

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

A sharp criticism of the practices of Federal regulatory agencies, together with an indictment of the basic premises on which they were established was made yesterday by one of the leading regulatory officials in Washington.

The critic was Louis J. Hector, a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, who said in a speech before the American Bar Association in Miami that the regulatory agencies are trying to do the impossible.

His remarks were regarded as especially significant because of their source and because they reflect a growing criticism, from academic sources and from industry, of regulatory agencies and the role they are supposed to play.

Criticism of the agencies since they were created in the New Deal days has been muted. But of late they have been under increasing attack, partly because they have the effect of stifling economic freedom and because they attempt to do two opposing jobs: regulation and adjudication.

CALLS FOR OVERHAULING

"If we tried to make our foreign policy or plan our national defense in this way, we would still be a third-rate power," Hector said.

"And if we keep on trying to plan our national transportation system this way, we will wake up in a national emergency one day and find that it won't do the job."

"Clearly these procedures must be overhauled."

Hector indicated that he was not proposing minor reforms but major surgery. Agencies like the CAB, the Federal Power Commission, and the Federal Communications Commission are trying to combine policymaking and

adjudication—in other words, be both Congress and the courts, he suggested. The basic premises are wrong, he charged.

Under growing criticism from Congress and the public and from the businesses they are charged with regulating, Hector said, the agencies have tried to protect themselves by insisting that they are acting more and more like courts of law.

"The paradoxical result," Hector said, "has been not a greater amount of real judicial process but a lesser amount—more judicial trappings, perhaps, but less of substance."

"As an organization tries to give the appearance of full judicial procedure in every matter, both big and small, inevitable compromises and subterfuges are required to get all the work done. These compromises inevitably spread throughout the organization and in the long run there is less true judicial process in any matter, big or small."

Hector recited the history of what is known as the Seven States case recently before the CAB. In 1955, it became apparent that railroad passenger service in the Dakotas, Nebraska, Iowa, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota was becoming so inadequate that new local air service was essential.

THREE YEARS FOR CASE

In December 1955, the CAB ordered an investigation to develop a new air program for the area. Because of what Hector called "the built-in inefficiency" of the CAB's process of reaching a decision in a matter of this kind, it took it 3 years to conclude the case.

Many witnesses were heard, but "neither the Board nor the examiner had specified just what sort of information they wanted," he said, so a number of witnesses "did not provide very much useful information."

"The Board never went out and actively sought the facts," he said. "Anyone who was interested just came in and brought whatever data he thought might be useful."

In the beginning, the Board gave the examiner "no real policies to guide him in the formulation of a major new local service plan," Hector said. The result was that "he floundered around for 2 years formulating his own plan only to have the Board disagree with him on basic policy and do the whole job over."

BASIC FLAW NOTED

The basic flaw is the belief that administrative agencies can combine policymaking and adjudication, Hector said.

"Administrators and judges have such completely different codes of ethics that a commissioner who tries to act like a judge is accused of trying to regulate in an ivory tower, while one who tries to act like an administrator is accused of becoming too friendly with the litigants," Hector said.

The CAB is now and for 2 years has been engaged in another major case. It involves an overhaul of airline fares. Possibly because he is still sitting as a judge in that case, Hector did not refer to it, but it promises to make the Seven States case seem brief and clearly managed by comparison.

Millions of words of testimony already have been taken in the fare investigation, while the traveling public and the airlines wonder whether one or both is being cheated in the meantime.

Hector urged the critics and defenders of the administrative agencies to recognize the need for major changes.

HE POINTS OUT NEED

"All the critics agree, I think, that adjudication must be performed by men occupying basically the position of judges, and that the executive and Congress must keep their hands off," he said.

"But policymaking is a different thing. This should be made by the executive, it is increasingly felt, within the broad policy determinations of Congress."

He indicated he agreed with critics who say:

"Give to the executive the functions of rulemaking, policy formulation, planning, and routine administration. Give to a special expert tribunal or group of tribunals the task of deciding major litigated cases and of hearing appeals from administrative decisions. If there is a job of prosecution, give it to a separate agency."

Brilliant Address on Maritime Policy by Mr. Ralph E. Casey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a very able, penetrating address by our valued and esteemed friend, Mr. Ralph E. Casey, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., before a panel discussion of the National Security Commission at Minneapolis on August 22, 1959.

I am inserting this learned address in the RECORD with the hope that all Members of the Congress may read it.

Obviously, we have every reason to be deeply concerned by the marked decline in the vigor and vitality of American shipping. Both our economy and our national security have been and are being adversely affected by conditions developed in our great shipping industry since the end of World War II.

To my mind, few things confronting the Congress are more important than the status and strengthening of our great maritime industry.

Truly there is great need today not only for studying America's maritime policy but for taking prompt, effective action to insure that our shipping industry is adequately protected, maintained, and improved to meet our economic and maritime needs in international commerce, to bolster the national defense, and make sure that our prestige in this area is not further impaired.

I congratulate Mr. Casey upon this thoughtful, outstanding address and hope that its contents will be taken to heart and acted upon by the Congress before it is too late. A greatly strengthened and revitalized American merchant marine is one of our most compelling national needs.

The address follows:

THE UNITED STATES—EUROPEAN SHIPPING TALKS AND THEIR AFTERMATH

(Address by Ralph E. Casey, president, American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., at National Security Commission panel discussion, August 22, 1959, Minneapolis, Minn.)

There is one phase of the merchant marine picture to which I should like to devote the few minutes allotted to me here today. I refer to the intergovernmental shipping talks which were held in Washington this past June between representatives of Eu-

European shipping nations and our State Department.

Now, some may feel that the crisis to which these talks gave rise is over and that we need worry no longer about this particular threat to American shipping. In my opinion this kind of thinking is not only wrong but dangerous. There is no doubt in the world but that the Europeans are just marking time; waiting for a new and more favorable opportunity to press their case. Before I point out why I know this to be so, let me give you a sketchy background and review of these June talks.

Through the years, the maritime Nations of Western Europe have competed for the great and expanding foreign trade of the United States. They have competed among themselves, and they have competed with merchant vessels under the American flag. During the 20th century the disparity in building and operating costs between American and European shipping has put us at a tremendous disadvantage. As a result the American merchant fleet dwindled to almost nothing twice in a period of less than 40 years, first in 1916 and again in 1939, times when our freedoms and our very institutions were at stake. These lessons convinced each President and each Congress for the past quarter of a century that a strong American merchant marine is absolutely essential to our health and welfare as a nation.

When World War II ended, the maritime fleets of Western Europe were shot to pieces. Over here we had hundreds of comparatively new ships built at the cost of some \$19 billion to the American taxpayers. However, so instead of retaining the monopoly over world shipping which this situation gave us, we offered our foreign friends these excellent vessels at the same prices we were asking of our own citizens. In this way, the United States rehabilitated the merchant fleets of every country in Western Europe.

In this postwar period the subsidy program initiated by the 1936 act, became even more essential to the survival of American-flag shipping. In fact, we found that by reason of the strong nationalistic flag preferences and stringent currency restrictions prevalent over there, we were still fighting a losing battle in competition with the merchant fleets of Western Europe. Subsidy is no good without cargoes. So, it was established as only fair and equitable that one-half of all Government-sponsored cargoes—in other words, these goods which were, in effect, being given away to foreign nations—should be carried in American ships.

Well, the Europeans didn't like our subsidy laws and they liked our 50-50 law even less. Foreign shipping journals constantly sniped at these two phases of our shipping policy. The governments of Western Europe got together in a group called the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, known as OEEC, and the sniping became more formidable. They did, however, stay on their side of the Atlantic.

Late last year, they decided to take the gloves off and have it out with our Government face-to-face. A formal request was presented on behalf of the Netherlands, later joined by the other maritime countries, for a series of talks with U.S. Government officials in Washington to discuss certain phases of our shipping policy. It became apparent that these phases were subsidies, the 50-50 law, and the flags-of-convenience or necessity question. Our State Department agreed to these talks, and they were held on June 8-12.

This was a conference in which the United States had nothing to gain and everything to lose. Every segment of our industry was affected—passenger ships, cargo vessels, and tanker companies.

With the storm clouds brewing I went to London for the annual meeting of the Inter-

national Chamber of Shipping in April. This is an international group of shipping trade associations similar to the American Merchant Marine Institute. By a fortunate coincidence, Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER was on the same ship going over and we arranged to have joint discussions with labor leaders, shipping men and Government officials concerning the purpose of the forthcoming talks in Washington. Not only did we learn the precise nature of the points that would be made in Washington, but even more importantly, we came to appreciate what a serious mistake it would be to take these discussions lightly.

Anyone who knows how these diplomatic conferences are set up and carried out must realize that generally whole Government delegations do not travel 3,000 miles merely to chitchat; generally, there is reasonable assurance in advance that the mission will be successful. That was the case in this instance also; the European governments fully expected to make headway in their long fight to reduce our merchant fleet to rockbottom. Perhaps they were given some measure of hope by the fact that the President of the United States had just ordered a new study of transportation policy. Or perhaps, the intelligence received from their representatives stationed in this country was misleading. At any rate, shipping was down all over the world, cargoes were hard to get, and it was thought abroad that this was the time to strike.

As the time for the talks approached, the chairman of the two congressional committees having cognizance over merchant marine matters warned the State Department against making any concessions in the areas under discussion. The industry, speaking through its associations, asked for representation at the table. This was refused, but arrangements were made for briefing industry representatives during the course of the meetings. I can now tell you that we agreed to confidential briefings very reluctantly. Some thought it better to stay away altogether but, on the whole, we felt that would be taking too great a risk. If any weakening of the U.S. position developed, we wanted to be in a position to know about it.

That no such weakening did develop and that the European delegations went home without anything to show for their efforts to undermine, or at least water down, our basic national maritime policies is greatly to the credit of our Government's representatives and of the congressional leaders who strengthened their hand. In particular, we owe a debt of gratitude to my fellow panelist Clarence Morse, Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board, whose blunt reassertion of the principles under attack set the keynote from which our side of the talks never deviated. Great credit is also due Under Secretary of State Dillon, whose firmness won the applause of an industry which has seldom had occasion to applaud the State Department.

Toward the conclusion of the talks, perceiving that they were not going to make any immediate progress toward changing our merchant marine policies, the European spokesmen proposed setting up a permanent international consultative body before which their objections to U.S. policy could be aired on a continuing basis. When informed of this proposal in the regular briefings, the American shipping industry strongly and vigorously opposed the scheme. Our position was that acceptance of such a plan would imply a lack of conviction as to its own policies on the part of the U.S. Government. It would further expose the welfare of our industry, and indeed the security of the Nation itself, to the fluctuations of intergovernmental debate by diplomats—a game in which we constantly lose our shirts.

Despite our opposition, the idea of such a continuing forum was incorporated in the

final communique issued when the talks adjourned. It was considerably diluted and couched in diplomatically vague terms. The participating delegations "agreed to recommend to their governments that favorable consideration be given to informal arrangements which would facilitate discussion and consideration" of the issues before the conference. Our interpretation of this language, based on explanations given by the State Department itself, is that the arrangements in question were to consist, at most, of an agreement under which further discussions might be held at the shipping attaché level in Washington.

There is ample evidence that the European version of what the arrangement was to be is entirely different. On the day the talks ended, the London Daily Express said that Mr. Harold Watkinson, leader of the British delegation, would "report an American agreement to set up a committee sitting in Washington and Paris to consider grumbles about the West's maritime policies, government cargoes, and flags of convenience." Later, the London Financial Times quoted Mr. Watkinson as saying the committee would be on a "reasonably high level" and that if this committee made no material progress within "perhaps a year" another intergovernmental conference with the United States should be proposed. And, the London Daily Mail in spelling out the plan in some detail stated, "The first meeting of the group will probably be held in Washington some time soon to settle organization arrangements and afterwards it is hoped the headquarters will be established in Paris."

This seems rather fantastic, doesn't it? Imagine, an organization set up for the prime purpose of reviewing U.S. shipping policy would be located in Paris. How ridiculous can you get?

And yet very recently the president of the British Chamber of Shipping, Sir Nicholas Cayzer, issued a report calling upon the United States to fulfill the promise, allegedly made during the June talks, to set up machinery for continuing the examination of the matters previously discussed. You will understand now, I am sure, why I consider this threat to our maritime policy to be far from extinct. It could become very real again on short notice.

We vehemently deny the need or, in fact, the propriety of establishing an intergovernmental organization to study America's maritime policy. Our own Government has never hesitated to make such studies whenever they seemed timely or appropriate and indeed more often in the past 15 years than has seemed justified. However, that is our business and we need no help from foreign competitors.

Protests from abroad with respect to merchant marine matters should be submitted through regular Government channels and given no more fanfare and no more special treatment than protests with respect to any other aspect of national policy. We hope the American Legion will stand with us on this as it has in the past on questions of vital concern to the American merchant marine.

The Deceptive Mouse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, between June 5 and 10 of this year 650 delegates from the NATO nations including

130 from the United States, met in London in the first Atlantic Congress. The congress was sponsored by the NATO Parliamentarians Conference.

I have just read an article in the summer European-Atlantic Review by Earl Jellicoe, member of the House of Lords, who served on the United Kingdom delegation and acted as rapporteur for the United Kingdom at the Atlantic Congress.

Lord Jellicoe's description of the work of the congress, as it points to developments for the future, is the most perceptive as well as complete that has come to my attention.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DECEPTIVE MOUSE

(By Earl Jellicoe, United Kingdom rapporteur at the Atlantic Congress)

An objective reader, confronted with the final declaration of the Atlantic Congress, 1959, may be forced to the conclusion that the congress mountain, having labored mightily, managed in the end, to produce only a rather small mouse.

Such a conclusion would not be entirely false. The declaration is a poor, weak, thing. It has little punch and absolutely no sex appeal. Reading it, one would not suppose that it was the product of a congress attended by 650 representative and distinguished—on the whole I was one of them—delegates from 14 of the 15 NATO countries, addressed by some of the most eminent of the citizens of those countries. Reading it, one can find little echo of the meticulous preparation and careful planning on which the congress was based. In it there is not the clear lead for which Her Majesty the Queen, in an admirable speech at the impressive opening ceremony, called. In it there is little reflection of the urgency of the challenge of our times.

That challenge is indeed urgent and grave. Something—a great deal—has been achieved in the 10 years since the Atlantic Treaty was signed. Global war has been prevented. The NATO defense structure has been brought into being. Political consultation between the members of the alliance has been developed. The economy of Europe has been restored. In a material sense both North Americans and West Europeans have never had it so good.

But those successes mask grave shortcomings and insistent dangers. On the military side the NATO nations have still to find in a joint atomic strategy an adequate response to the Soviet achievement of atomic parity. In many other vital respects the NATO defense structure is fragile and inadequate. Politically, the increasingly astute, flexible, and resourceful conduct of Soviet foreign policy since Stalin's death has not been matched by an effective, integrated, and positive Western foreign policy. Rather, the NATO nations have tended to dance, belatedly and often out of step, to Moscow's tune. Moreover, with the growing upsurge of nationalism on both sides of the Atlantic, the NATO nations have shown a regrettable and possibly increasing tendency to fall out among themselves. Economically, although the achievements have been real, the West has not proved its ability to match the rate of growth of the Communists' economies; nor has it solved the problem of continuing steady and rapid economic progress with stable prices.

These are some of the challenges of our times. The Declaration of the Atlantic Congress contained little affirmative response to them. Does this mean that the Congress was a failure? I do not think so.

I feel this for at least two reasons. The first is that a valuable part of the work of the Congress was done before the Congress even assembled. This work included the preparation of the papers to be submitted by the various national committees to the Congress. Many of these papers—and I am glad to say that not a few among them were British—are of a very high standard. It is a pity that most delegates had little time to read them, let alone digest them, since they embody, in concise form, recommendations which merit the attention of the NATO governments and peoples.

The second reason is that very little of the real work of the Congress really emerges in the final declaration. The donkeywork was, of course, done in the 5 main committees and the 18 subcommittees where discussion was often prolonged and sometimes passionate. It is, accordingly, to the reports of the committees, and subcommittees, that one must turn if one wishes to form any real idea of the ground covered.

Of these committees, three—the Atlantic Spiritual and Cultural Committee, the Atlantic Political Committee, and the Atlantic Economic Committee—were concerned with the problems facing the NATO countries in their relations with each other. These were the inward-looking committees, and each of them had three or four subcommittees. There were also two outward-looking committees—the Free World Committee, and the Communist-Bloc Committee. These, too, had three subcommittees each.

These committees and subcommittees achieved, in the way of solid resolutions and specific proposals, quite a lot—as will be seen from their reports which were later debated and adopted by the Congress as a whole.

In the first place the Spiritual and Cultural Committee produced an admirably short and pithy restatement which owed much to the mind and pen of Father Daniélou, of France, of the fundamental credo of the member countries. In words which the Secretary General of NATO subsequently quoted, this statement emphasized that: "Respect for human dignity is the inalienable basis of civilization. The purpose of a political and economic society is to create conditions enabling every human being freely to fulfill his destiny. The guarantee of this dignity is, first the recognition of objective spiritual values which cannot be altered by any human agency but are the expression of a natural or transcendent law governing communities and individuals alike."

Significantly, this statement made it clear that not only must the Atlantic community be outward-looking but also that civilization was by no means the prerogative of the hitherto materially favored West: "Civilization is the common product of all peoples. In particular, Asia, Africa, and Oceania have a part to play side by side with the Western peoples. It is important to realize that the common values of civilization are differently expressed by different peoples according to their various traditions."

This committee also proposed a number of practical means by which the information and educational activities of NATO and the member countries should be reinforced in order that the purposes of the community should be projected more effectively to its own and other peoples. As a nonexpert in this field, these proposals have struck me as eminently sensible and, given the will, quite practical. What is more important, they have for the most part, commended themselves to the NATO experts in these matters. They are varied in scope. For

example, they included definite suggestions as to how the role and responsibility of the NATO Information Division should be strengthened and broadened—a request to member governments to devote more funds toward facilitating student and teacher exchanges, and proposals designed to increase the number of Asian and African students studying in western universities and to bring about in 1960 a conference of university teachers from NATO countries concerned with international questions.

In addition the Spiritual and Cultural Committee recommended that a Studies Center for the Atlantic community should be set up in the near future. This proposal, which had strong and well-organized support, was criticized, I gather, by a number of the delegates, especially those from the United Kingdom, who felt that it might involve unnecessary duplication with existing research work and that the project in general was overambitious. They would have preferred a foundation on the American model with more restricted terms of reference. However, the larger project carried the day. It remains to be seen if the scheme has sufficient steam behind it to attract the necessary private and public support. If it has, this Studies Center may well have a valuable role to play as an intellectual focus for the Atlantic community.

The Political Committee dealt with both the political and military aspects of the alliance. In the main the debate on the political side centered around the proposals sponsored by certain of the signatories of the Declaration of Atlantic Unity who acted throughout the Congress and in every committee, as a well-organized lobby. In the end the Committee adopted two of their proposals. The first was that meetings of the NATO heads of government should be held annually. The second was that member governments should be requested to convene not later than the spring of 1960 a conference of 100 leading representative citizens charged with examining and recommending ways and means of developing greater cooperation and unity within the alliance.

It was, moreover, suggested by the Committee that this special conference of 100 wise men should, *inter alia*, specifically consider three more of the signatories' proposals, namely, the development of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference into a fully fledged advisory assembly, the adoption by the North Atlantic Council of the principle of the weighted vote, and, finally, the possible establishment of a small advisory panel of qualified men of wide experience attached to the bureau of the general secretariat. In addition, the Committee, after noting with satisfaction the growth of political consultation between the member countries, emphasized the need for still greater coordination of NATO governments with the North Atlantic Council on "all questions of common concern." They also drew attention to the desirability of further enhancing the authority of the Secretary General and proposed that a special study group should be set up to examine new methods of conciliation between member states, including the possible creation of a NATO court of justice—an idea which had been strongly canvassed by Mr. Charles S. Rhyne, the former president of the United States Bar Association.

On the military side the military subcommittee, on which representation was exceptionally strong, produced, after considerable discussion, a carefully drafted and delicately balanced resolution. This compromise resolution was designed to pay some regard to the French desire to participate, together with the other NATO powers with worldwide responsibilities (e.g., the United States and the United Kingdom) in the

formulation of an agreed global strategy. It was also meant to take account of current French susceptibilities about the control of nuclear weapons and the exchange of atomic secrets. However, on French initiative, the Committee finally presented to the Congress a much emasculated resolution which the Congress, after a spirited debate, rejected in favor of the original. The resolution, because of its careful balance, should be read as a whole. But among its salient points are the following: the urgent need to bring the European "Shield" forces up to the levels laid down in MC-70; the need for reexamination of the structure and control of NATO's atomic forces; the need for a common NATO armaments funds and the widest possible interchange between the member governments of atomic information and the implied need for a drastic overhaul of NATO's air and naval command structures. All this—and more.

I am no economist and I shall therefore deal briefly with the work of the Economic Committee—more briefly than it deserves. The philosophy behind its resolution was expansionist, derestrictive and cooperative. It called for governments to adhere to policies designed to promote higher levels of employment and living standards. It stressed the need for governments to avoid restrictive economic practices and called upon governments wherever possible, to reduce tariffs and other trade barriers. Above all it stressed the need for closer economic integration within the Atlantic Community and drew attention to the gaps that exist in the existing arrangements for economic, scientific and technological collaboration. With this in mind the committee suggested that governments should consider the possibility of transforming the Organization for European Economic Cooperation into an Organization for Atlantic Economic Cooperation in which not only the West European but also the North American countries would be full members. The proposed new organization would have wide functions. It would be designed to form an economic bridge between the European Economic Community, the economies of the rest of Europe and those of the remainder of the free world. It would promote coordinated policies for the expansion of the North Atlantic economies without inflation or recession. It would also coordinate national policies and develop cooperative policies for accelerating the economic development of the underdeveloped areas of the world.

Before the Congress it had generally been anticipated that much attention would be focused on the relations between the countries of the Atlantic Community and those of the remainder of the free world, many of which are underdeveloped and most of which are uncommitted in the world struggle. This expectation was not disappointed and most committees of the Congress, in fact, dealt in one way or another with this problem. But the report of the Free World Committee itself is rather a disappointing document. This does not mean, however, that the committee, and the Congress as a whole, did not recognize that possibly the most crucial problem confronting the Atlantic Community over the next decade was that of establishing a mutually satisfactory relationship with the new and emerging countries. Speaker after speaker—from the Archbishop of York at the first plenary session to Mr. Gaitskell and Mr. Macmillan at the special plenary session—emphasized this. It was also clear to the Congress that not only was it necessary for the Atlantic countries to adopt the right political stance toward the newer countries, based on a frank and full recognition of their right to political independence, but also that this political independence would be an empty concept unless it was based on solid economic foundations. Because of this

massive and sustained aid from the West would be needed over a long period.

There was a general feeling that such aid should be given on its own merits, since we in the Atlantic Community have "a duty to help less-developed countries to help themselves." But there were many who also felt that a massive effort was required to offset the Soviet challenge in this field, given the fact that the new countries are a primary target for Communist penetration.

There was also widespread agreement as to the forms which aid should take. First, the need for a steady, and probably increased, flow of long term capital to stimulate capital investment and growth. (It was recognized that, of necessity, the bulk of this investment would be public investment but there was a strong feeling that steps to stimulate private investment in developing countries should be taken.) Second, expanded technical assistance programs. Third, as Mr. Cahan, the Deputy Secretary General of OEEC put it in a notable speech: "It is very necessary, if we are honestly to develop these underdeveloped countries, to give them an opportunity to sell what they can best produce in our markets. There is no other long-term solution. It is no use pouring money in, it is no use giving them technical help if the resultant product simply has to be burnt or thrown away. I think in this—as perhaps in other things—it is worth looking at what our Russian friends are doing. Our Russian friends, when they give technical assistance and financial aid, do not stop there. This is a very important difference between what the Russians have done and what we have done. The Russians are prepared to take the exportable product of the countries which they wish to help and to take them at almost any price, any quantity and any quality. I do not suggest that we go as far as that, but I think we ought to do a little better than we do now."

There was also widespread agreement that in a program of this nature there was a clear need for greater coordination between the NATO members. Such coordination, it was felt, could well be advanced through quiet consultation within NATO, although there was little support for the idea of converting NATO itself into an agency for channeling aid to the underdeveloped countries. There was less unanimity over the need for new agencies for aid, and if so, what form such agencies should take. Some felt that the proposed new organization for Atlantic Economic Cooperation should play a role in this field. Others that private participation in aid programs should be stimulated by the creation of a World Development Corporation. Others again (i.e. the Free World Committee, in a resolution adopted by the Congress) that an International Development Association should be established, broader than and independent of NATO, open to all nations and working "either directly or through existing international and regional associations, including the World Bank and other organs of the United Nations." (It was not clear whether this agency should be designed to encourage the provision of long-term, low-interest loans, as a counterpart to the World Bank's "bankable" loans, or whether it would be wider in scope.) And a strong minority felt that, although increased aid was needed, it should be channeled through existing institutions, especially those linked with the United Nations.

The Communist Bloc Committee reached, with little difficulty, unanimity in their diagnosis of the scope of the Communist challenge. And they were unanimous, too, in their proposals. On the political front, they called for perseverance in negotiations with the governments of the Communist coun-

tries, for an increase in East-West contacts and exchanges, and for a proclamation by the Atlantic Powers of their continued determination to do all within their power by peaceful means to enable the satellite countries to achieve self-determination. They pointed out the inadequacy of the West's response to Communist ideological warfare and called for more effective measures, within the NATO framework, for matching it, and also for the creation of an international, unofficial, organization designed to serve the same end throughout the world. Finally, on the economic side, the committee proposed that, to counter the growing Communist economic offensive, a NATO Economic Council should be created as a policymaking, planning, and coordinating body.

What emerges from this plethora of paper—of reports and resolutions and recommendations? It is sometimes a little difficult to see the wood for the trees, and others who have fought their way through the paper jungle of this Congress may have somewhat different ideas as to what constituted the real hard core of the Congress. But, as I see it, these were the four main underlying themes:

(a) The first was the universal recognition of the continuing need for the alliance, coupled with the conviction that if the alliance were to endure, let alone prosper, the concept of the interdependence of the countries of the Atlantic Community must somehow be given real flesh and bones. But beyond that there was divergence. On the one side there are the adventurous spirits who feel that the time is now ripe to give the embryo Atlantic Community an institutional framework, moving toward some form of Federal structure. And they have influential support—M. Spaak, for example, came down personally in favor of the principle of Atlantic institutions taking decisions by a weighted majority vote. On the other side are the more cautious spirits—with whom, I am sure, the majority of our governments are at present in sympathy—who feel that progress toward the greater integration of the Atlantic Community must be cautious and pragmatic and functional. For the present, a meeting ground was found in the recommendations of the Political Committee (which may, of course, lead to a meeting of 100 wise men next spring) and in their expressed belief that the demands of the alliance and our times make some further erosion of our national sovereignties inevitable.

(b) The second theme, to my mind, was the very evident dissatisfaction of the Congress with many aspects of NATO defense—in particular the failure to achieve the force targets laid down in MC-70, to weakness of political control over the "philosophy and practice of war," the failure to achieve any rational interdependence in arms research and production, the holes in the European air defense system, the ramshackle air and maritime command structures, and the weakness of our antisubmarine defenses. The support which the Congress gave to Mr. George Brown's strong words on the subject was significant. It is perhaps more doubtful if significant action by governments will necessarily result.

(c) The third theme (and perhaps the most important) was the universal recognition that the Atlantic Community must be outward looking, that it cannot, and should not, constitute itself a self-regarding club of the rich, white, free nations. With this went a recognition that our countries must speedily create a clear, consistent, and long-term policy toward those countries which lie outside both our community and the Communist bloc, and that such a policy will call for a long-sustained effort on all our parts. But there was some considerable wooliness as to how such a policy should be

applied and how best the efforts of the member countries should be concerted.

(d) Finally, there was an equally clear recognition that all our efforts would be stultified unless our community was able, in concert, to achieve something which has so far eluded it—the combination of sustained economic growth without inflation. With this went a recognition that, possibly, new economic institutions, and, most certainly, a more effective coordination of our economic policies and a greater awareness by our peoples of the issues at stake were essential.

But, all said and done, it can still be asserted that the results of the Congress were rather pedestrian and unimaginative, that the delegates took refuge behind their proposals for a mass of new institutions, and that the Congress, unlike its predecessor at The Hague, sounded no brave, new note. All this is true in part. But the Congress was concerned with the affairs of a going concern—the Atlantic Community—and the affairs of going concerns are usually rather terre-à-terre. True, the delegates did suggest rather a bellyful of new institutions. But, if they had not, they would have been accused of lack of imagination and there are admitted gaps, which need filling, in the economic structure of the free world. It is also true that the Congress sounded no clarion call for action. Partly this is the fault of an unnecessarily mute declaration. But it is also an echo of the times in which we live. If we are honest we must admit that leadership in the West is lacking—and lacking most where it is most needed—in and from the United States. It would have been to ask too much of a Congress of this nature to bridge these gaps in leadership. But it may have pointed a way.

Ultimately, of course, this Congress will not be judged by the paper it produced. A stirring declaration may be a good thing. So are imaginative and practical proposals. But the followthrough is the thing. What is really significant is the seriousness of purpose of the delegates and their determination, on their return home, really to push with their own peoples and with the appropriate national and international organizations and with their governments the proposals which they have backed on paper. This is the yardstick by which this Congress will in the end be judged.

The Captive Peoples Pray for Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, on July 17, the White House issued a proclamation designating the third week in July as Captive Nations Week, and urging the people of the United States of America to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of these captive nations.

This was an inspiring declaration that raised the hopes of the oppressed peoples within the Communist empire.

Yet, within 2½ weeks, there occurred the most amazing reversal of policy in American history.

On August 3, the White House announced that it had invited Soviet Dictator Khrushchev to visit the United States, and to enjoy the hospitality of the American people.

And the captive nations were plunged into despair.

Would the United States and Soviet Russia agree to noninterference in one another's domestic affairs?

If so, that would mean the end of hope for millions in the captive countries.

What had happened to the United States which, from the days when it had won its own independence, had been loyal to the principle of liberty with justice for all?

Who can trust the United States after "Desecration Day," when the officials of the U.S. Government welcome the Red dictator who is responsible for so much of the world's misery?

The victims of Russian communism pray, not in the churches that have been closed to them by atheistic despots, but from behind the locked doors of their homes.

Praying that the unpredictable behavior of the U.S. Government does not represent the freedom-loving American people who would never compromise with evil.

Praying that the voice of the American people will be heard above the vague and vacillating pronouncements of its Government.

"Dear God, we know that the American people are not afraid of the truth. We know that they do not worship materialism, closing their hearts to the cry of humanity. We have seen their courage and their generous spirit. From our own relatives who left our homeland to seek a better life in America and found it there, we have heard how they live up to the responsibilities of freedom.

"Washington, Lincoln, Wilson, Roosevelt, these were the leaders who spoke up for human rights.

"But where is the conscience of America, now, when the Government opens its arms not only to our oppressor, but to the Red tyrant who is also determined to destroy free America?

"The policy of the American Government cannot represent the true beliefs of the American people because they would not change so overnight.

"Father in Heaven, intercede for us.

"Help our pleas to break through the rigid barriers which enslave us, so that they may reach and touch the conscience of the American people.

"We do not ask them for the charity of material things, because we know they would be quick to give it.

"We do not ask them to risk their security and their lives to effect our liberation.

"But we do ask for their moral support, which is the soul of America and its greatest strength.

"When Khrushchev, the master of deceit is visited upon the American people, we ask them to protest in an orderly manner.

"So that firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right will prevail

over the counsels of those who seek an accommodation with tyranny.

"When all seems lost, we have faith in the power of prayer.

"Help us to reach the hearts of a great, free people so that they may speak up for liberty with justice, and repudiate the shameful spectacle of 'Desecration Day' that is being thrust upon them.

"We pray for universal freedom under God."

There's a Lack of Interest in the Interest Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, the lack of action by this Congress on the extremely important problem of Treasury bond interest rates is a disgrace. Without a realistic increase in interest rates the Treasury will be put in a nearly impossible debt-management position and the blame will lie squarely with the Congress.

I include three opinions highlighting the great need for action. One is a column by the objective and nonpartisan financial writer, Sylvia Porter, published in the Washington Evening Star of August 26, 1959, an editorial from the New York Times of August 27, and an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of August 27.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Aug. 26, 1959]

WARNING TO CONGRESS ON BONDS

(By Sylvia Porter)

Warning to the 86th Congress: Before you adjourn, pass a law permitting the Treasury to raise the interest rate paid U.S. savings bonds holders or you will:

Invite an avalanche of cash-ins of savings bonds by little investors who have bought these bonds with the idea of keeping them to maturity, but who are now aware that the top rate they can earn on the bonds is far below what they can get on a deposit in most-savings banks;

Drastically curtail the sale of new bonds to wage and salary earners who know that the pay scale on the bonds has become glaringly out of line with the general level of interest rates;

Risk forcing the Treasury to borrow cash via expensive short-term loans in order to get the money needed to pay off bonds presented for redemption by disillusioned holders;

Give corporations which never liked the job of maintaining employee payroll savings programs a perfect excuse to cut off the program;

Undermine the reputation of the Treasury among financiers the world over who are fully informed about our debt management problems.

FORTY MILLION HOLDERS

Over 40 million Americans now own more than \$42 billion of these riskless, nonmarketable bonds which pay 3 percent interest if held for 3 years, 3½ percent interest if held to maturity in 8 years, 11 months. Over

8 million are buying them under payroll savings plans.

The program has been the most successful of all the Treasury's debt management operations since World War II. But it has become increasingly endangered in recent years as interest rates have climbed across the board and the pay scale on savings bonds has become progressively less attractive. Last month redemptions of the bonds totaled \$507 million against new sales of only \$350 million. For 12 months redemptions have been topping sales—meaning the program has been going in reverse.

In recognition of the interest rate realities, the Treasury in early June asked Congress to permit it to boost the pay scale so the bonds would pay 3½ percent if held to maturity. The request was included in a package also asking that the Treasury be allowed to sell new marketable bonds with coupons above the legal ceiling of 4½ percent.

OPPOSITION INTENSE

The opposition to the removal of the 4½ percent ceiling has been intense—reflecting a combination of honest doubt about the economic effect of rising interest rates and pure politics—and Congress has turned down this request. As a result, the Treasury will have to do all its multibillion dollar borrowing in coming months through new short-term loans. That will be expensive, fundamentally unsound debt management—but apparently that's the way it will have to be.

Despite its "No" on removal of the marketable bond ceiling, though, Congress still can pass a separate bill permitting the savings bond rate increase. The Treasury doesn't want to settle for this, but it will to avert a flood of cash-ins and keep the program alive.

If Congress does this? Then a recommendation of the bonds for basic savings nest-eggs again will be justified.

If Congress does not? Then no one can forecast what might happen. A calling of a special session might be necessary to rescue the program from slaughter.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 27, 1959]

THE INTEREST CEILING ISSUE

President Eisenhower at his news conference Tuesday renewed, and in the most emphatic manner, his request first made to Congress on June 8 that the existing ceilings applying to interest rates on Government bonds be removed or liberalized.

The ceiling on marketable securities is 4½ percent, and applies to issues with maturities of 5 years or longer. This legislation is in the nature of an anachronistic accident. It has no logical relationship to present conditions in the bond market. It was enacted in 1918 in connection with the Second Liberty Loan financing of World War I, and was based on conditions then contemporary but today purely history.

What makes this legislation imperative is that the Treasury must raise vast sums in the months ahead in order (1) to fund a constant procession of maturing obligations, and (2) to raise new money to pay for the appropriations voted by Congress and not covered by taxes. As much as possible of such financing should take the form of securities designed to appeal to savers since, when money is raised through savings, it has no inflationary effects. In practice this means that, broadly speaking, it should be raised through the sale of long-term securities. But with business in a boom phase at present, the demands of borrowers of all categories in the money market are extremely heavy. These demands, competing for a comparatively limited supply of funds, have driven interest rates sharply upward. With the market rate on comparatively long issues above 4½ percent the Treasury finds itself in a position in which it has no alternative but

to raise its funds through the sale of short-term paper, a procedure inflationary in its implications because it involves the creation of bank credit or expansion of the money supply.

The present ceiling on savings bonds, from which the President has also asked relief, is roughly 3¼ percent, a rate that makes it impossible for the Government to compete actively with other available outlets for savings. This is not only a grave injustice to the 40 million patriotic holders of savings bonds in the Nation, but it is a potential threat of the most serious kind to the whole Government savings bond program, itself a major bulwark against monetary inflation.

Savings bonds outstanding total \$50.5 billion. That figure exceeds by \$2 billion the total of all publicly held marketable issues of the U.S. Treasury with maturities of 5 years or longer. Every dollar that is withdrawn by a savings bond holder is a dollar that the Treasury will have to replace, and that, so long as present interest limitations remain in effect, it will have to replace by raising the money through methods highly inflationary.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 27, 1959]

THE WAYS OF FOLLY

Figures may be dull things, but as every family man knows they sometimes tell grim stories.

The other day the Treasury borrowed some money to tide it over for the next 13 weeks. For this short-term loan the Treasury had to pay 3.8 percent interest, the highest it has paid since that dark March of 1933 when all the banks were closed.

At the same time, the Treasury issued some I O U's for 26 weeks, and for this loan it had to pay 4.2 percent interest, the highest ever for this series of Government bills.

It is against the background of these hard figures that the country must view the renewed appeal by President Eisenhower for congressional action which will permit the Treasury to borrow more on long-term bonds. This it cannot now do because of the unrealistic restrictions on the interest rate the Treasury is permitted to pay on such bonds.

The story that is told in these figures is one of the Government of the United States, seemingly the richest in the world, getting itself into a financial fix as senseless and as full of folly as the most prodigal of its citizens who cannot manage to live from paycheck to paycheck and finds himself slipping week by week into a deeper financial pit.

Consider:

Within the next 12 months the Government must borrow at least \$85 billion. It cannot borrow this with long-term bonds because the law says it mustn't pay more than 4½ percent whereas the going market rate is much higher than this. So it must try to borrow \$85 billion by juggling 13-week bills or 26-week bills or 12-month notes, coming back over and over again like the improvident householder, hat in hand, to the finance company.

Now, it is true—and this is the only thing some Congressmen can see—that the interest paid on long-term loans is usually higher than that on short-term loans; a good borrower can normally get money from the bank cheaper on a 90-day note than on a 20-year mortgage. Hence the reluctance of Congress to permit the Government to pay more than 4½ percent in order to borrow on long-term bonds.

But the Government of the United States is dealing in mammoth figures. The Government's demand for money to support a debt now approaching \$290 billion is the major factor in pushing all interest rates

upward. They rise not because the President or the Secretary of the Treasury or anyone else wishes it but from inexorable pressure.

What is happening now is that all this demand—the whole \$85 billion that must be borrowed this year alone—is concentrated on the available supply of money for short-term loans. Thus, from the same inexorable pressure the interest rates on short-term money as well as long-term money are climbing sharply.

Thus, it is not inconceivable—indeed, it is likely—that if the Treasury is forced to do all its financing in this fashion then the short-term interest rate will itself rise well above 4½ percent, thus defeating the purpose of interest ceilings anyway. This prospect is sped when Congress serves notice it will not change the law and in effect announces that all future borrowing will perforce be for short-term money.

One consequence of all this, as the President noted, is that the heavy short-term borrowing increases the inflationary pressure that helped force interest rates up in the first place. It does this because holders can treat a 13-week Treasury bill as almost the equivalent of cash and because when commercial banks acquire these short-term securities the effect is an increase in the total money supply.

Another consequence of the reliance on short-term borrowing is that it makes the problem feed upon itself. People are cashing in their savings bonds at a rising rate, and the need for money to repay them increases the size of the demand by the Treasury for short-term loans. So, too, does the fact that old maturing bonds cannot be refinanced with new bonds. The \$85 billion the Treasury must juggle now will grow bigger by the passing months.

And a third consequence is that it keeps the Government of the United States, just like that improvident householder, at the mercy of fortune. Like any man borrowing from debt to debt, the Treasury faces the fact that someday—and that someday may be soon—it will not find enough real money in the marketplace to meet its needs. When that happens the Government will have no recourse but to manufacture money, to run the printing presses, in a desperate and surely futile effort to disguise from the world what is happening.

Frankness must acknowledge that this prospect is not wholly banished by the President's proposal to let the Government put a larger part of its debt into long-term bonds instead of constantly recurring I O U's. For the root of the problem is still the size of the spending.

But every man knows there are sensible and foolish ways of managing the burden of debt. And only an irresponsible Congress will force the Nation of which it is caretaker further along the ways of folly.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, before leaving on an official trip to London where I am scheduled to address the Congress of the International Astronautical Federation early in September in my capacity as chairman of the Subcom-

mittee on International Cooperation and Security of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I want to reiterate my views on labor legislation as considered by the House.

During the discussions on the floor of the House, I stated that it was most unfair to strike at legitimate unionism and to foreclose the rights of working people which required many years of hard work and determination to achieve. It was my feeling that enactment of the Landrum-Griffin bill would be a decided step in the direction of outlawing or controlling labor because many of labor's rights are denied in that bill. For that reason I voted against the Landrum-Griffin bill.

It was also my view that political motives were behind the effort to adopt the Landrum-Griffin bill, and I could not see the logic or reasoning in making a political football out of the bread-and-butter problem of millions of Americans.

I also opposed the bill because it was a piece of legislation which struck blindly at labor, the guilty and the innocent alike, the racketeers and those seeking to eliminate racketeering. This is a wrong approach. We must not throw all of labor into the discard or cast shadows of doubt upon all of organized labor. The racketeers are a small percent of organized labor and they must be weeded out.

The Landrum-Griffin bill, for example, outlaws all types of picketing, except where a plant or factory is on strike. Organized picketing has been established and recognized over the years as a peaceful and democratic method. By eliminating or outlawing such picketing we actually empower employers to exploit those working for them, paying them low wages, and forcing them to work longer hours. The only type of picketing I would oppose would be in instances where it is used as blackmail or abused for racketeering purposes.

Thus, the Landrum-Griffin bill affords no protection for the working people, but actually opens up possibilities for their exploitation and the denial of their rights which they have gained over the past half century or more. It will only help to depress the working conditions and the standard of living of the laboring masses of this country. In so doing, we shall not bring about a higher standard of living, but we will lower it for huge segments of our population and this will have a tremendous effect on our whole economy. When labor will not be able to buy the things we produce, when its purchasing power will drop, the whole Nation will feel it.

The Landrum-Griffin bill also bans the so-called "hot cargo" provisions, which is nothing more than a device to maintain nonunion conditions. This is an unfair labor practice for it denies unions the right and the opportunity to protect themselves against ruthless employers.

Finally, the Landrum-Griffin bill is hurting legitimate union organization which is seeking to establish the same pay for the same work for all working people in the country.

I hope and trust that when the conference report on the labor bill is brought back for final consideration by both Houses of Congress, all or most of these objectionable features will have been deleted or so amended as not to hurt legitimate labor unions. We must not turn the clock back. The people of America want to see reform in the ranks of labor, not revenge or the destruction of labor's achievements.

Merit Appointment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the President has acted wisely in selecting John O. Henderson, of Buffalo, a U.S. attorney since 1953, for the vacancy as Federal judge in the western New York district. This is a merit appointment which has the gratifying support of our entire community.

John Henderson is a dedicated public servant who has acted in the highest tradition of his profession and fully warrants the promotion to the Federal bench.

This is the third time that President Eisenhower has nominated him for Federal office. The Senate twice has confirmed him for U.S. attorney and I am hopeful that the Senate again will act promptly on his nomination.

The Buffalo area recognizes this as an excellent appointment as is well stated in an editorial appearing in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., on August 24, 1959, as follows:

MERIT APPOINTMENT

Although it was preceded by altogether too much high-powered political maneuvering among New York State Republicans, President Eisenhower's nomination of U.S. Attorney John O. Henderson to a lifetime seat as a U.S. district judge is a clear-cut recognition of merit and experience. It is, in the best sense, a promotion, and we hope that the Senate will so regard it in confirming the appointment before it adjourns next month.

Mr. Henderson has given outstanding service as Federal district attorney throughout the Eisenhower years. His prosecutions of income tax violations have been handled without fear or favor, in the highest traditions of the Justice Department. He has had other exceedingly complex matters before him, not the least being the still-pending Buffalo paving scandal with its tax-evasion angles complicated by a prolonged grand jury inquiry into the possible antitrust law violations.

In fact, this heavy run of pending business in the U.S. attorney's office, which Mr. Henderson will now have to turn over to others as he steps up to the Federal bench, makes a careful and prompt selection of his successor almost as important as was the filling of the judgeship vacancy. We hope that the President will lose no time in getting this office as capably filled as it has been—and that the Senate Judiciary Com-

mittee, which has been stalling all too many judicial appointments, will recognize the nomination of Mr. Henderson to succeed the late Judge Justin C. Morgan as so clearly meritorious and nonpolitical that it will recommend swift and unanimous Senate confirmation.

New York Philharmonic Symphony Orchestra in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, among the many things of which the 17th District of New York is justly proud, the New York Philharmonic Symphony Orchestra has always been one of the first. We in New York are especially proud of this orchestra and its talented conductor for the splendid performances they have given on their current international tour. The excellence of this orchestra is another demonstration to peoples of the world, and in this instance to those behind the Iron Curtain, that America is continuing to provide cultural leadership.

I should like to include at this point an editorial appearing in this morning's New York Herald Tribune:

MR. BERNSTEIN CONQUERS MOSCOW

The acclaim which has greeted Leonard Bernstein and the New York Philharmonic in Moscow is gratifying, but not particularly surprising. Without exception, every American musician visiting the Soviet Union has been received enthusiastically—and, for that matter, Russia's musical ambassadors have done right well here, too.

But there are extraordinary aspects to the Bernstein-Philharmonic success story. Mr. Bernstein, whose parents were born in Russia, is himself American-born, bred, educated and trained. He is the most eloquent and exciting spokesman American music has had in many years. And his current excursion to Russia is more than just a tour, it's an education—for the Russians, that is.

For in Moscow on Tuesday night Mr. Bernstein gave his Russian listeners an opportunity they have not had for a generation. He and the Philharmonic played Igor Stravinsky's "Le Sacre du Printemps"—music of worldwide fame since 1913, but proscribed by Soviet cultural censors as "bourgeois" and "decadent." Stravinsky, who was born in Russia, hasn't been back there since before World War I, and has often expressed his dislike for all things Soviet, including music. But the Moscow audience greeted Mr. Bernstein's performance of the Stravinsky work with shouts of acclaim, and it's just possible that one of these days a Soviet orchestra may suddenly be playing it.

In any case, Mr. Bernstein has certainly given Moscow something to remember. Some people—Russians no less than any others—judge a civilization by the way it makes autos; others by the way it makes music. In regard to the latter, the Philharmonic concerts have been an eye-opening experience for the Russians. And it's ironical that part of the revelation should

stem from a composer of their own blood, whose art they have been deprived of by their cultural commissars.

Resolution by Junior Chamber of Commerce on Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, our great city of Buffalo was host to the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce when it held its national convention there in June of this year.

As a Representative from Buffalo, and a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I would like to include, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the junior chamber of commerce at this convention concerning veterans' benefits:

Whereas the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce has, in convention assembled, passed a resolution endorsing benefits to veterans, their families and dependents for service-incurred disability or death; and

Whereas the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce has, in convention assembled, opposed by resolution payment to veterans of pension benefits based solely on previous military service and pensions or other benefits based on non-service-connected disability; and

Whereas the nature and extent of the Government's obligations to war veterans should be clearly defined: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce, a vast majority of whose members are veterans, through its delegates in convention assembled in Buffalo, N.Y., on June 17, 1959, commends to the leadership of this country the following principles as a guide for establishing current and future programs:

1. Military service is an obligation of citizenship. It should not in itself be considered a basis for special privilege and benefits.

2. Veterans' benefits are a means of equalizing significant sacrifices that may result directly from military service.

3. The Government should maintain a positive policy of meeting fully and promptly the needs of veterans resulting from service.

4. Service-connected death or disability benefits should be accorded the highest priority. Readjustment needs are almost equal in importance. Veterans' non-service-connected needs should be met when possible through programs for the general population; the non-service-connected veterans' programs retained only to meet minimum needs not covered by general programs.

5. Veterans with equal handicaps should have equal treatment.

6. Benefits for veterans with similar needs should, in most programs, be uniform throughout the country.

7. We must bear our own responsibilities. We should not burden a future generation with obligations we ourselves are not willing to shoulder.

8. We should keep the whole range of our national needs in perspective so our veterans' programs will be in balance with each other and with other general programs.

9. Our national veterans' policy should be developed in the open forum of public discussion. The people should be given complete factual information on the economic and social status of veterans and their needs; be it further

Resolved, That the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce opposes any legislation and programs which violate the principles previously stated herein; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each member of the Congress of the United States.

Yardstick of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. INOUE. Mr. Speaker, Hawaii has been justly famed as a land where all men, regardless of their ethnic origin, freely intermingle in a cosmopolitan society. The vigorous Americanism of Hawaii's people is best attested by your endorsement. "The people of Hawaii deserve statehood. They will be an asset to the Nation."

To the native Polynesian, whose ancestors inhabited Hawaii, must go the credit for this harmony between the races, for the native Polynesian welcomed all, regardless of their race, color, or creed. All of Hawaii's people have inherited this spirit of "Aloha."

It should be understood that we are not perfect. Since our society is composed of humans, we, of Hawaii, err as do other humans. Conscious of the fact that our social failures in this regard can only be corrected if identified, Hawaii encourages and welcomes objective appraisals on frequent intervals.

In this connection, I include an editorial from the Honolulu Advertiser, of August 22, 1959, which comments rather well upon a recent appraisal and reports the findings, which, in my opinion, will be of interest to the Members of this Congress.

YARDSTICK OF PROGRESS

During the past several days, and concluding today the Advertiser has reprinted the full text of a report on island race relations prepared by the social research laboratory at the University of Hawaii.

The report is a serious inquiry into the claim that in Hawaii racial equality is an accomplished fact.

While this is not yet entirely true, the report says, great progress has been and is being made.

Briefly, these are the major conclusions:

1. There is a strong sentiment for racial equality. The postwar decade saw a further closing of the gap between actual practice and the unwritten code.

2. Before the war a disproportionate number of Caucasians occupied preferred jobs in business and the professions. While they still enjoy an advantage in some areas, the Caucasians are being overtaken rapidly by non-Caucasians. Many of the latter now sit on the boards of major corporations, are

preferred for key positions by mainland firms opening island branches.

3. The postwar rise of organized labor has assisted greatly in spreading more widely the fruits of Hawaii's stepped-up economic activity. The labor movement itself is surprisingly interracial.

4. Where Caucasians and Hawaiians formerly dominated the government, now the ethnic composition of the territorial and county offices tends to approximate that of the territorial population. Representation on appointed boards is decidedly more equitable (more) on the basis of personal merit and party affiliation.

5. There is strikingly little interest in fair employment practices legislation. The general public is either unaware of any serious problem of racial discrimination in employment, or there is general distrust of legal methods for correcting such discrimination.

6. Undoubtedly there are violations of the unwritten code, but they become more difficult to verify, the evidence is far less convincing than formerly.

Meantime, intermarriage and fraternization on the social and civic levels are increasing.

The report concludes:

"Thus in one area after another . . . Hawaii's professed ideals of racial equality are being translated into reality."

The report has two great values. It shows us where work is yet to be done in tearing down racial barriers so that we may in truth one day square practice with our ideals. And it encourages us for this work by highlighting the remarkable progress we already have made.

Restrictions on Federal Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. PELL. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower has sent up a message requesting legislation to remove the limitation which the law now imposes on the rate of interest at which the Federal Government is allowed to borrow money for more than 5 years.

If such legislation is not enacted, the Democratic leadership of Congress must take full responsibility for their failure to heed the President.

The Treasury can pay whatever rates are required by security market conditions for short-term loans, but the 4 1/4 percent ceiling on 5 year or more maturities handcuffs the Treasury in its debt management responsibility.

Seventy-six billion dollars' worth of Federal securities will come due within the next year. Unless the Government is able to sell long-term bonds, the under 1 year Federal debt will climb to \$100 billion. No responsible official would allow such a huge short-term liability to be created which in a crisis the nation might be asked to meet. It is a dangerous situation and fiscally irresponsible for such a condition to be forced on the Treasury. Congress should face up immediately to the debt problem.

It is particularly desirable to adjust the rate on savings bonds. This form of government loan is anti-inflationary and the patriotic citizens who invest their savings in this security in all fairness should be paid a rate of interest equal to that paid by private savings banks.

Mr. Speaker, I realize the political implications, but here is a case where President Eisenhower says the administration is willing to assume full responsibility for managing the Government debt if allowed to do so free from artificial restrictions.

Operation Bootstrap—Reservation Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the McLaughlin Messenger, McLaughlin, S. Dak., on my program, "Operation Bootstrap—Reservation Style." The editorial, written by Merle E. Lofgren, reads as follows:

Uncle Sam is currently engaged in projects all over the world helping underdeveloped areas. We are spending millions of dollars to start factories, build irrigation projects and subsidize other industries to help people develop these areas so that they can become self-sufficient.

Maybe we are right. In the long run it is probably better to help people to help themselves than to condemn them to either permanent poverty or perpetual dole. People who have a chance to make something of themselves are hardly likely to fall for the Communist line.

While we are helping to get these people on the path to better things it might be well if we would take a little better look at some of our own underdeveloped areas. One of these is the Indian reservations of South Dakota.

Here you find some 35,000 people, largely unemployed and with hardly a goal in life except to live.

No matter how you look at it there is not enough work to make jobs for these people. Agriculture is the only industry and the large scale farming and ranching operations that exist do not take a large labor force.

For that reason we see merit in a bill E. Y. BERRY has introduced in Congress. It is a self-help measure, a "lift yourself by the bootstraps" operation. It would provide that the Federal Government spend money for establishing industry on the reservation and to explore the possibilities of creating jobs for the large labor supply of Indian people.

We are not fond of starting new Government projects or of asking for Federal aid. In this case we think BERRY is justified because tax money is now being spent on the reservations in large amounts for relief, welfare, ADC and for law enforcement. Our Government has spent millions on the reservations.

Yet we are little further ahead, perhaps worse off, than we were when the Great White Father took over the Indian destinies.

We think BERRY's line of thinking should be pursued by the Indian Bureau and the

Congress. With a little resourcefulness an "operation bootstrap" might be put in effect in this area at but little greater cost than that of our present multitude of welfare programs. Certainly the cost would not be as great or as hard to justify as is the amount we are now spending in areas with similar problems overseas.

Declaration of Santiago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, much has been published about the mounting tensions in the Caribbean area and the efforts of the governments of the Western Hemisphere to allay these threats to peace and political stability. Culminating in the 10th Inter-American Conference at Santiago, Chile, which was finished on August 18, 1959, this major attempt to restore normal conditions merits wide study.

A summary of the results of the Santiago Conference by Bertram B. Johansson, staff writer on Latin American affairs for the Christian Science Monitor, also the text of the Declaration of Santiago were published in the August 19, 1959, issue of that well-known international newspaper.

The indicated summary and declaration follow:

SANTIAGO WATERS FREEDOM'S ROOTS

(By Bertram B. Johansson)

Veteran delegates to the American Foreign Ministers Conference in Santiago, Chile, are under no illusions that the Santiago Declaration immediately will end Caribbean tensions.

They are hopeful, however, that the Santiago conference, which finished August 18, has at least defined objectives more clearly and strengthened hemispheric resolve that the Caribbean shall not continue as an area of ferment.

Ten thousand words were written into the Declaration of Santiago, issued August 18 by the foreign ministers. The declaration: Condemns dictators;

Reasserts the principle of nonintervention;

Approves of democratic systems;

States that democracy cannot be forced on a country, especially from the outside, but must come as a natural growth from within a nation;

Revives an Organization of American States peace committee to bring the glare of publicity on tension areas which, in the current Latin American context, means the Caribbean.

U.S. Secretary of State Christian A. Herter said at the end of the meetings he believed the conference will have a long-range effect that will have great significance.

The deliberations, he said, brought into clearer light the problems that face us and have offered a means for their solution.

REBELS HUNTED IN HAITI

In the course of his stay in Santiago, Mr. Herter talked privately with all of the foreign ministers of the 20 Latin American republics. This was of enormous help, he said, in giving him a greater understanding of the hemisphere.

As if to illustrate the problems confronting members of the peace committee which will begin immediately to investigate Caribbean tensions, two "invasions" occurred in the area while the Foreign Ministers Conference was in progress in Chile.

Premier Fidel Castro charged that the Dominican Republic and/or former dictator Fulgencio Batista had launched an invasion effort from the Dominican island against Cuba.

In Haiti, troops still are attempting to ferret out some 30 rebels, allegedly from Cuba, who made a landing early this week.

The Dominican Republic announced it would come to the aid of Haiti, if necessary. Cuba countered and said that though the invaders may have come from Cuba they had been sent by Dominican President Trujillo to embarrass Cuba's position at the OAS Santiago discussions.

Days before the Santiago conference opened, the foreign ministers said they did not plan to umpire the crosscurrents of invasions in the Caribbean. Rather, they hoped to create a climate of opinion that would keep would-be invaders inactive.

COMMITTEE'S ROLE

With the military success of the Castro revolution still fresh in peoples' minds and producing effervescent invasion attempts around the Caribbean, this will take some doing.

It was for this reason that the Inter-American Peace Committee of the OAS was revived to keep watch on the trouble spots, study ways to prevent attempts from abroad to overthrow legal governments, and report to the Quito, Ecuador, conference in February.

The committee may make investigations either at the request of a victim country or on its own initiative. But the committee will have to obtain consent of the country it wants to investigate if it desires to make an on-the-spot check.

The conference resolution did not say what would happen if a country refuses consent to an inquiry, but the foreign ministers could call a hemispheric conference to throw the floodlight of publicity on the refusal.

The peace committee also could make its investigation from the outside and then publicize its report. This, it is hoped, would bring the matter before the people of the Americas and bring public opinion to bear on the troublemaker.

The conference produced one change. Maj. Raul Castro of Cuba, arriving in Santiago after the conference had ended had some kind words for the OAS discussions.

Earlier, in Lima and Caracas, while en route to Chile, Major Castro had said the Santiago conference was farcical and useless, repeating terms his brother, Fidel, had used last week.

Major Castro said in Santiago, however, that after reading reports on the meeting he felt it accomplished something positive by giving serious consideration to dictatorship and poverty in the Americas.

OAS NATIONS RELEASE DECLARATION OF SANTIAGO

SANTIAGO, CHILE.—The text of the Declaration of Santiago adopted by the American foreign ministers in their special conference on Caribbean tensions:

The fifth meeting of consultation of ministers of foreign affairs, expressing the general aspiration of the American peoples to live in peace under the protection of democratic institutions, free from all intervention and all totalitarian influence, and considering:

That the faith of the peoples of America in the effective exercise of representative democracy is the best vehicle for the promotion of their social and political progress

(Resolution XCV of the 10th Inter-American Conference), while well planned and intensive development of the economies of the American countries and improvement in the standard of living of their peoples represent the best and firmest foundation on which the practical exercise of democracy and the stabilization of their institutions can be reestablished (resolution of the Special Committee to Study Formulation of New Measures for Economic Cooperation):

That in Resolution XXXII, the Ninth International Conference of the American States, for the purpose of safeguarding peace and maintaining mutual respect among states, among other things, resolved to reaffirm their decision to maintain and further effective social and economic policy for the purpose of raising the standard of living of their peoples, and their conviction that only under a system founded upon a guarantee of the essential freedoms and rights of the individual is it possible to attain this goal; and to condemn the methods of every system tending to suppress political and civil rights and liberties, and in particular the action of international communism or any other totalitarian doctrine;

In Resolution XCV, 10th Inter-American Conference, resolved to unite the efforts of all American states to apply, develop, and perfect principles of the inter-American system so that they would form a basis of firm and solidary action designed to obtain in a short time the effective realization of representative democratic system, rule of social justice and security and economic and cultural cooperation essential to the mutual well-being and prosperity of all peoples of the hemisphere;

That harmony among American Republics can be effective only insofar as human rights and fundamental freedoms and exercise of representative democracy are a reality within every one of them, since experience has demonstrated that failure to adhere to such principles is a source of widespread disturbance and gives rise to emigration that causes frequent and grave political tensions between the state any émigrés leave and the states that receive them;

That the existence of antidemocratic regimes constitutes a violation of the principles on which the Organization of American States is founded and endangers peace and harmony of the hemisphere; and

It is advisable to enounce in a general way a few principles and attributes of the democratic system in this hemisphere so as to permit national and international public opinion to gauge the degree to which political regimes and governments conform to that system, thus helping to eradicate forms of dictatorship, despotism, or tyranny without weakening respect for the right of peoples freely to choose their own form of government, declares:

1. The principle of the rule of law should be assured by separation of powers and by control of the legality of governmental acts by competent organs of the state.

2. The government of American Republics should be derived from free election.

3. Perpetuation in power and exercise of power without a fixed term and with the manifest intent of perpetuation is incompatible with the effective exercise of democracy.

4. Governments of American states should ensure a system of freedom for individual and social justice based on respect for fundamental rights.

5. Human rights incorporated into the legislation of various American states should be protected by effective judicial procedures.

6. Systematic use of political proscription is contrary to American democratic order.

7. Freedom of the press, of radio, and television, and in general freedom of information and expression are essential conditions for the existence of a democratic regime.

8. American states, in order to strengthen democratic institutions, should cooperate among themselves within the limits of their resources and the framework of their laws so as to strengthen and develop their economic structure and achieve just and humane living conditions for their peoples;

Resolved, This declaration shall be known as the Declaration of Santiago de Chile.

Sale of Commemorative Soil Conservation Stamp Promoted by Radio Station KWHI, Brenham, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on August 26, 1959, over radio station KWHI, Brenham, Tex., a very splendid radio program was presented promoting the sale of the new U.S. commemorative postage stamp featuring soil conservation in our Nation.

Participating in the program were Mr. T. A. Low, the very fine postmaster at Brenham, and Mr. W. H. Prenzler, vice chairman of the Austin-Washington Soil Conservation District of Burton, Tex. Working with these two gentlemen to make the program so successful was Mr. E. P. Krueger, work unit conservationist of the Soil Conservation Service. This program was made possible through the courtesy of Mr. Tom Whitehead, Sr., publisher of the Brenham Banner Press and owner of the KWHI radio station.

It is significant that two of the important departments of the executive branch of the Federal Government cooperated in this special stamp program to recognize and honor the soil conservation farmers and ranchers of America.

Because of the interest the Members of Congress have in the importance of the soil conservation program, I include the transcript of that program in the RECORD:

ANNOUNCER. A new U.S. commemorative postage stamp featuring soil conservation has been placed on first-day sale at Rapid City, S. Dak. today, August 26. Tomorrow, August 27, the stamp will go on sale at all post offices in the country and in this area. We've asked Postmaster T. A. Low of Brenham and Soil Conservation District Supervisor W. H. Prenzler of Burton to tell us about the new stamp. Let's hear from our postmaster first. Mr. Low, just what is a commemorative stamp?

POSTMASTER. A commemorative postage stamp is a very special kind of stamp. These stamps are used to commemorate national events, such as statehood anniversaries, pay tribute to our national ideals, and mark important national achievements. The stamps remain on sale for a limited time, usually 6 months to a year, or until the supply is exhausted. Normally, we print 120 million stamps of a commemorative issue. In the case of the soil conservation stamp this is \$4,800,000 worth. When these are gone, there will be no reprints, and the stamps will become stamp collectors' items.

ANNOUNCER. You told me an interesting fact about stamp collecting—that it has become the Nation's No. 1 hobby. I wonder

if you could tell us something about this, and why it is such a popular hobby.

POSTMASTER. It has been estimated that there are upwards of 20 million stamp collectors in the United States. This easily makes stamp collecting the most universal hobby in the country. There are more stamp collectors than there are dog owners. Stamp collecting actually began in 1840 when the first adhesive postage stamps were issued in England. The United States issued adhesive stamps for the first time on July 1, 1847. Incidentally, Washington County had five post offices and Austin County had six post offices in that year. They were surpassed in all of Texas only by Brazoria County.

ANNOUNCER. I sure would like to have a set of these first cancellations from our oldest post offices, some of which are now only names in the history of the county and Texas. How many of these commemorative stamps does the Post Office Department issue nowadays?

POSTMASTER. In recent years the Department has been issuing 12 to 15 a year. You might be interested to know that commemorative stamps are fairly new. They were introduced at the Columbian Exposition in Chicago in 1893. If Grandpa has any of these old Columbian Exposition commemorative stamps around that he bought back in 1893, they have increased a good bit in philatelic value since the time they were first issued.

ANNOUNCER. Does the Post Office Department get many requests for new stamps each year?

POSTMASTER. Yes, we receive hundreds of requests each year, and we now have a backlog of approximately 2,600 suggested subjects. Obviously, since we only issue a dozen or so commemoratives each year, we cannot begin to comply with all the suggestions that come in. But, I want to say right here, that in my opinion, the selection of soil conservation as the motive for a special edition postage stamp is a very befitting and worthy move, and this stamp is very pretty.

ANNOUNCER. Thanks, Mr. Postmaster. Now let's turn to our other guest Mr. Prenzler, as a leader in soil conservation I'm sure you feel honored about the new soil conservation postage stamp.

SUPERVISOR. I certainly do. You know, issuance of this commemorative stamp is actually a salute to farmers and ranchers, their local soil conservation districts, and to the professional conservationists and other agricultural workers who have helped make the United States a world leader in soil conservation. As one of five supervisors of the Austin-Washington Soil Conservation District and as one of the first farmers to cooperate with the district, I feel very proud over this nationwide recognition of the effort which we and others are making in the soil conservation cause. I also would like to say here that as an auxiliary rural mail carrier for many years, I feel very proud over the soil conservation stamp issued jointly by the Post Office Department and the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

ANNOUNCER. Have you seen the new stamp, Mr. Prenzler?

SUPERVISOR. I've seen them and I will buy some as well as selling, I hope, many of them. And it certainly is an attractive stamp. It's in three colors, yellow, green, and blue. It portrays a modern farm showing that conservation farming brings beauty as well as bounty to rural living. The stamp shows contour strip cropping, terracing, pasture improvement, tree planting, and a farm pond. In addition, the silhouette of a city in the background symbolizes that urban as well as rural people are highly dependent upon the care and wise use of land as a principal source of food, water, shelter, and clothing.

ANNOUNCER. I suppose you have some local observance planned when the stamp goes on sale?

SUPERVISOR. That's why the postmaster and I are here, to kick off the sales of the conservation stamp in Washington County. The soil conservation district has also published an article and a reproduction of the stamp in its weekly news column in the Brenham Banner Press.

ANNOUNCER. Well, I hope the new soil conservation stamp is a big success, Mr. Low and Mr. Prenzler, and that lots of them are sold. By the way, which post offices in this area are offering the special soil conservation stamp? How about it, Mr. Postmaster?

POSTMASTER. We at the Brenham Post Office have ordered \$2,000 worth of the soil conservation postage stamp, as a starter. I am informed that all other post offices in Washington County are also handling a limited supply of this commemorative stamp.

ANNOUNCER. I understand that at one time we had quite a number of post offices in the area, but several have closed down in recent years. Would you tell us briefly something about this and which post offices are now in operation here?

POSTMASTER. The present-day post offices in Washington County and postmasters are: Washington is the oldest post office, Edwin Dickschat is postmaster; next is Brenham, with more than 113 years of postal service, and I am the postmaster here; Old Gay Hill and Chappell Hill are other old post offices with nearly 110 years of service to the public. Mrs. Smith is postmistress at Chappell Hill; and Walter Werchem is postmaster at Gay Hill. The Burton Post Office is a mere youngster, but it too has serviced its area about 88 years now. Mr. E. O. Oslmeyer is acting postmaster there.

There used to be numerous post offices in the past. In 1904 we had 22 post offices in the county, but with the coming of the R.F.D. routes in that the need for some of the offices was eliminated. With the coming of the automobile, better roads, and relatively fewer people left on the land, there followed a steady reduction in the number of post offices.

By the way, this makes me think that the farmers and ranchers still on the land, not only have a greater job of feeding 176 million people in this country alone, and others, but also that their care and conservation of the land is of the greatest importance to all of us and is even more important in 1959 than in former years.

ANNOUNCER. Well, thanks very much gentlemen, for all the good information about the new soil conservation stamp that goes on sale here tomorrow, August 27, and the great cause it sponsors. Our guests today were Will Prenzler, a supervisor of the Austin-Washington Soil Conservation District and T. A. Low, postmaster at Brenham.

Foreign Firms Plague U.S. Firms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, competition from foreign industrial firms, employing cheap labor, low prices, and American know-how, is plaguing more and more U.S. companies. Finally, the problem is on the very doorstep of Congress itself.

Just recently, I discovered that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, our own medium for recording debates, expressing views, and printing much of the data from which American history will be written, is being stitched with British wire.

Mr. Speaker, I grant that this is a relatively small matter in terms of money, but it illustrates how far foreign competition with American products has gone. In the first 6 months of 1959, all seven awards for CONGRESSIONAL RECORD binding wire appear to have gone to Holdwire, Ltd. During the second half, the Holdwire firm continues to obtain contracts. Some recent awards to the British company were as follows: July 23, 2,200 pounds; July 29, 3,000 pounds; July 29, 2,200 pounds.

Of course, our friends in London purport to favor the reciprocal lowering of trade barriers. It is interesting to speculate, however, on how soon we shall find that the proceedings of the British Parliament are stitched with foreign-produced wire or printed on American newsprint.

Mr. Speaker, the rate at which our manufacturers are losing markets, both at home and abroad, is truly alarming. I might point out that this result was foreseen by many Members who have sought to change our present foreign trade policies. Perhaps this small example in "our own living room," so to speak, will illustrate why the import problem calls for constant vigilance on the part of Congress.

Poison in Your Water—No. 160

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Omaha (Nebr.) Morning World-Herald of March 24, 1959, entitled "Purer River Is Safety Aid."

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) Morning World-Herald, Mar. 24, 1959]

PURER RIVER IS SAFETY AID—TRESTER TESTIFIES ON SIOUX CITY SEWERAGE

(By Gabe Parks)

SIOUX CITY, Iowa.—The treatment of Sioux City sewerage before it is dumped into the Missouri River would be "an added safety factor" for Omaha's water supply.

Ralph Trester, general manager of the Metropolitan Utilities District, testified Monday before a special eight-man board of water pollution officials.

PURITY IS IN EXCESS

The hearing is part of a Federal procedure being invoked by the Public Health Service to get Sioux City to quit polluting the river.

Mr. Trester stressed that the purity of Omaha's drinking water, after treatment, is "far in excess" of State and Federal requirements.

But the risk connected with a possible human or mechanical failure in the purify-

ing process "is in direct proportion of the increased pollution of the raw water supply," he said.

OMAHA COSTS CITED

Omaha Public Works Director George Fisher reported Omaha is spending \$5,100,000 for sewerage treatment projects now either in the construction or planning stages.

"The wonderful big Missouri should not be polluted by anybody, including ourselves," Mr. Fisher said.

George Davis, attorney for Sioux City, cross-examined Messrs. Trester and Fisher closely on Omaha's water and sewer programs.

DENISON PLANT BLAMED

Mr. Davis also said the packing plant at Denison, Iowa, is dumping untreated refuse into the Boyer River which empties into the Missouri.

"This is at least twice as close to Omaha as Sioux City," he said.

Mr. Davis said Sioux City is 117 miles above Omaha and "there should be a certain amount of natural purification" in that distance.

Industrial Peace or Conflict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the controversy over labor-management reform legislation has degenerated into a conflict that threatens future labor-management relations and cooperation.

These serious and troubled times call for understanding, good will, and cooperation between these two great forces in our economy. When the spirit of cooperation gives way to bitter strife and hatred, the public and the Nation suffer as well as management and labor.

My opposition to the Griffin-Landrum bill was to its punitive provisions which were deliberately designed to weaken or destroy labor unions and to make impossible the formation of new unions, particularly in backward southern areas. This is the road to a corporate state with the destruction of basic and fundamental rights of American citizens.

It is more than a threat to free unions. It is a challenge to all good citizens who abhor totalitarian tyranny. It is a danger to American democracy.

To reverse this ugly trend calls for the best in both labor and management. It calls for recognition of their own common interest and concern for the public welfare and national unity and strength.

The powerful propaganda drive for a strong labor reform bill, if successful, can be of no real value if such legislation contains unjust, unworkable, and punitive provisions which will lead to widespread strife, disunity, and discontent.

In the past decade labor unionists have worked with leaders of industry and other civic leaders in community projects which have contributed much to the progress and welfare of citizens in towns,

cities, and rural areas throughout the Nation.

It would be a tragedy if this good will and teamwork would be destroyed by ill-considered, unwise, and unworkable legislation designed to fight unions rather than corruption.

The reaction to punitive legislation as contained in the Landrum-Griffin bill is already evident in bitter comment from publications representing the views of decent union men and women. They know and understand the objective of Landrum bill sponsors who see unions as a greater evil than corruption and racketeering.

The following editorials and statements reflect the thinking of union members dedicated to justice and decency in both unions and Government:

[From current issue of the Machinist]

INFAMY

The history of the 86th Congress will be sad reading, for it will contain one of the most shameful chapters of lobbying activity in modern history. This issue of the Machinist gives some indication of how the screws were turned on Congressmen, of why a number of normally liberal legislators lost their nerve, of why they turned on their friends to vote for the Landrum-Griffin bill.

The big corporations, the chambers of commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers were well organized and well informed. They were better informed than those Congressmen who voted without having ever read or understood the bill.

That organized employers would pull every trick in the book to get Congressmen to vote for a killer bill could have been expected. They have the same right as labor or any other group to attempt to influence Congress by persuasion and by pressure.

The shocker was the extent to which the big corporations were able to get the highest officials of our National Government to do their work for them. Seldom in American history has the executive branch of our Government interfered so openly with the legislative branch.

Other Presidents have attempted to give leadership on legislation, true. Yet, never in the memory of oldtimers has the logrolling, the patronage promising, the threats of reprisals been applied so brazenly that they could be advertised on the floor of the House during debate.

Normally our press—the great free press of the United States—has been quick to defend Congress against encroachment by the White House and against undue pressures from any lobby. This time, however, many of our newspapers had become part of the lobby. Our largest TV networks were used by the lobby.

With the notable exception of the Atlanta Journal-Constitution, we know of no daily newspaper that attempted to expose the sordid spectacle of the Landrum-Griffin lobby. In our opinion, the Atlanta Journal deserves a Pulitzer prize, for exposing the pressures brought against one courageous Congressman who stood up against them all. The Atlanta Journal's reporting is the more remarkable because the newspaper itself editorially supported the Landrum-Griffin bill.

Unlike the big business lobby, labor's lobby is constantly exposed to the withering scorn and exaggerations of the editorial writers, antiunion columnists, and correspondents.

The report in this issue of the Machinist of pressures that pushed the Landrum-Griffin bill through the House of Representatives is only a partial report. It is not one to make Americans proud.

[From the New Era, Reading, Pa.]

FIGHT NEVER ENDS

Anyone harboring the quaint notion that management wants to get along with labor is suffering from delusions.

That myth disappeared into thin air last week when the true temper of big business emerged during debate on the Landrum-Griffin antilabor bill.

Washington was crowded with lobbyists from the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, who put heavy pressure on lawmakers with the argument that this is the time to "put labor in its place."

There used to be a time when labor was lulled into a false sense of security with the management argument that industry accepts labor as a partner on the national scene and that the days of strife are over.

Labor let its guard down—and wham, we got clobbered, but good.

What this latest episode proves once more is that down deep in its cold, calculating heart, corporate America has no use for organized labor. Unions are something that must be "tolerated," only as long as unions are strong.

And meanwhile big business is providing the money, the brains, the propaganda—and, yes, the votes in Congress—to weaken the trade union movement.

At every turn you find a stiffening of big business against labor—in the steel dispute where "inflation" is the propaganda word. In the railroad industry where "featherbedding" is the scare word; in Congress where "reform" touches off a tirade of antiunionism; in the Presidency where Ike Eisenhower goes on TV during the most costly time period to whack the devil out of workers and their unions.

What have we learned from the Landrum-Griffin vote?

In our humble opinion it signals an agonizing reappraisal of labor's attitudes and labor's goals. It calls for a return to militant unionism in which a fighting labor movement is willing to dramatize the issues through sacrifice and sweat.

This militancy on the economic front must be accompanied by organizing effort, more education, and then greater political action.

Anyone harboring visions of labor-management peace for licking the boots of big industry will go down in history as a Chamberlain-type appeaser who merely postponed the day of showdown.

As we said, "nobody gives labor nothing." History shows it's a struggle right down to the wire.

REFORM MANAGEMENT

(Letter to Washington Post editor)

With all the antilabor sentiment erupting from Capitol Hill and that place on Pennsylvania Avenue, it seems appropriate to remember that there is one and only one reason for the existence of labor unions in the first place—the shocking lack of conscience on the part of those who control production.

If industrial management were just, we would need no labor unions and all of us duespaying members would tear up our cards happily. Unfortunately, this is not the case, a fact fully realized by anybody who ever has tried to negotiate a fair contract with greedy, millionaire owners.

As far the gangsterism in unions, a history of labor-management relations shows positively that the door to this evil was opened by management, which hired goons to beat down workers looking for something better than a peasant's existence.

All honorable union men everywhere are in favor of getting rid of the gangsters, but no union man will buy legislation aimed at curbing honorable union activities.

A mere glance at the economic situation prevailing in this country today should convince even a schoolboy that something besides gangsterism needs correcting. While owners are stacking it away by the millions (look at last year's profits earned by the steelmakers), the average workingman still has to have two jobs or send his wife to work to enjoy a minimum of luxury such as a new home and a decent car.

All the idiots are buying that congressional and Presidential baloney about labor reform. Why doesn't somebody try to reform management?

WILLIAM FUCHS.

WASHINGTON.

[From the New Era]

PLACING THE BLAME

There's an axiom in politics that a defeated candidate blames his closest friends for his downfall—they didn't do enough for him. The same kind of thinking apparently has beset some of our top labor leaders since the Republican-Dixiecrat coalition clobbered us last week by passing the antilabor Landrum-Griffin bill in the House of Representatives.

Instead of putting the blame where it belongs—on the Republicans and southern Democrats, who are subservient to big business, big money interests—the disillusioned unionists are talking about taking a new look at the Democratic Party.

Now this is kid talk. When you look over the Landrum-Griffin vote, you find that 90 percent of the votes against the harsh killer legislation were cast by Democrats. On the other hand, 88 percent of the Republicans voted against labor and for the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. So, does it make sense to drop the Democrats when they were the only ones to give any support at all to labor's position?

Unfortunately, as long as there is a South and a civil rights issue, there will be Dixiecrats. And the Republicans will continue to sell the Negroes down the river by swapping, dealing, and trading with the Dixiecrats in Congress to control the Government. In this instance the Republicans agreed to duck the civil rights issue, and the Dixiecrats in turn voted for antilabor legislation.

I didn't realize, until Congressman GEORGE M. RHODES called it to my attention, that some southern Democrats really want to keep labor weak so that Southern States with their cheap, unorganized labor can continue to entice industry away from the industrial North. Many of the big corporations are building new plants in backward, right-to-work States, mostly in the South. They will reap tremendous profits until such time as unions do win a foothold and overcome the fear which employers are implanting in Southern workers' minds.

So the Dixiecrats sold their party once more for a few pieces of silver. But this is no reason for labor to desert the liberal Democrats just because Dixiecrats betrayed the party that has given them national prominence, prestige, and power unparalleled in American history.

Isn't it a tragic thing, when you stop to think about it, that right here in Reading some of the most outspoken advocates of the Landrum-Griffin bill were the most hostile union-haters in the community. What the devil do the managements of giant nonunion industries here in Berks County care about the welfare of union members employed in another plant? You'd think these moneybags employers were bleeding for the "little people," judging from the things they wrote and said while the labor fight was on in the House. The truth is that millions of unsuspecting union members were "used" and

"taken in" by corporate executives who demanded "labor reform" but really want no unions at all.

[From Public Affairs Institute weekly column]

LABOR PEACE?

All the time that Congress is feverishly debating what kind of legislation we ought to have to bring an end to labor-management malpractices and to curb the power of alleged union bosses what may be an infinitely more important story is going unnoticed.

That is the story of the steady increase in labor-management tensions as reflected in the number of complaints of unfair labor-management practices before the National Labor Relations Board.

Month after month the Board's business mounts. Month after month the bitterness of strife between union workers and their employers mounts.

Instead of labor peace as the authors of our labor-management legislation tells us is their goal, we are getting industrial warfare.

With 500,000 steelworkers out on strike and another 100,000 workers laid off in related industries in what is obviously one of the sharpest labor-management disputes that we have had in many years, it might be a good time to look at the more general picture and see what is happening on the labor front.

The NLRB has just issued its statistical summary of its activities covering the second quarter of 1959.

Here are some of the recordbreaking highlights:

The five-member Board issued formal decisions in 699 cases, an increase of 21 percent over the previous 3 months.

The General Counsel issued 297 unfair labor practice complaints—the greatest number ever issued in any one quarter.

Unfair labor practice cases filed by employers numbered 563; an increase of 126 percent over those filed during the same quarter a year ago.

Unions filed 1,021 unfair labor practice cases for an increase of 41 percent over those filed by unions during the corresponding period of 1958.

These increases are not something new. They are part of a pattern of increasing tensions and disputes that has shown itself clearly for at least the past year and a half.

Why? Any objective study of the attitude of many segments of industry during the past few years will show an obvious determination to crack down on organized labor.

Both the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce have been conducting a never-ceasing campaign against labor, constantly using the timeworn clichés of labor bossism, labor monopoly, and labor corruption.

In this the McClellan committee hearings have been a never-failing and convenient source of citable evidence to be used against all unions whether they are among those which have been investigated or not.

Right-to-work supporters, despite the setbacks suffered at the polls last November, have never ceased to press for harsher States rights legislation to weaken and perhaps even destroy unionism in the name of protecting it.

In Congress itself there is a group of Senators and Representatives who spend much of their time in the fight to enact legislation that would further restrict union activities and discredit labor.

The drive of business to enter the political field more actively and more openly is a reflection of business hatred of labor strength.

The NLRB itself had been accused repeatedly by labor spokesmen of showing bias toward business as against unions and certainly it had reversed numerous decisions made by previous Boards which, in turn, had been accused by business of being pro-labor.

The result in tension and tendency to rush to the Board shows itself in the statistics.

Employers, emboldened by proemployer decisions, have more than doubled their complaints to the Board as compared with the figures for 1958.

Unions in turn have upped their complaints by more than 40 percent for the same period.

The General Counsel issues a recordbreaking number of complaints.

It's all very well to keep pounding away on corruption within the labor movement.

But how about a little investigation into the reasons for the recordbreaking charges and countercharges that are overburdening an already overburdened NLRB?

HE'S THEIR BOY

[From the New Era]

The President's ability to doubletalk constantly amazes us.

When labor suggested he enter the steel strike situation Eisenhower said: "I couldn't think of anything more objectionable than to put the Federal Government constantly in the business of settling these major strikes."

Yet when it came to sticking his nose into the basic rules under which labor-management relations are supposed to function, the President didn't hesitate one moment to go on the air, read an anti-labor speech prepared for him by someone else, and arbitrarily put the Federal Government into the business of labor-management relations.

In other words, he was willing to use his high office for the benefit of big business, but refused to give up even 2 holes of golf to help 500,000 idle steelworkers.

Report on the U.S.S.R.—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the very able chief of the Los Angeles Times Washington bureau, Mr. Robert T. Hartmann, who was one of the newsmen accompanying Vice President Nixon on his tour of the U.S.S.R. and Poland, has written an outstanding series of eight articles on his experiences during the tour and his impressions of the U.S.S.R. and its people. The series appeared recently in the Los Angeles Times.

Mr. Hartmann has presented some very interesting comments and side-lights about his trip and a penetrating "what-makes-it-tick" analysis of the Soviet system which I believe will be of much interest to the Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting for inclusion at this time the first two articles of the series: NIXON IN RUSSIA: FUSION OF POLITICIAN AND STATESMAN

(By Robert T. Hartmann)

WASHINGTON, August 15.—RICHARD M. NIXON, not the Lenin which is being out-

fitted in Leningrad for October trial runs, may turn out to be the world's first atomic icebreaker. Or he may be merely the latest Western recipient of Mr. Khrushchev's uninhibited hospitality when the devil a saint would be.

It's a gamble, and nobody is more aware of it than the California-born Vice President. His final place in history may be a footnote relating the fact he told the Soviet Premier he didn't know everything and talked too much.

But Nixon is not under any illusions about this powerful, peasant-born dynamo of energy and Communist dialectic who bosses half the world. His report to President Eisenhower will make fascinating reading when the secret archives of this administration are someday published, like the Yalta papers.

Meanwhile, though the Vice President has kept scrupulous silence about his private conversations with Khrushchev, the American people and the rest of the free world already have a better picture of the U.S.S.R. than ever before through the words and pictures of nearly 100 newsmen who followed Nixon to Novosibirsk and back. They also have an enlarged picture of Nixon, who will be argued about during the next 12 months in the United States.

These last 6,000 miles of Nixon's amazing total of 150,000 miles of goodwill globe-trotting proved nothing entirely new. What they demonstrated most significantly was that he can combine his rough-and-ready whistlestop technique, heretofore seen only on the domestic campaign trail, with his undoubted but previously perfunctory talent for meeting the leaders of 53 nations he has visited. The old and new Nixons have fused; the politician and statesman were a single self-confident man in Moscow.

It's an ironic fact that the very traits which Nixon's critics have treated most scornfully, a certain icy ruthlessness in verbal battle, aggressive and agile counter-punching rather than direct defense, a lawyer's facility (or trickiness) with words, and the knack of swiftly seizing upon any advantage, served him and his country best in the public (and presumably the private) slug-fests he had with the Communist heavy-weight champ.

This reporter and others who watched the Vice President in action on this as well as earlier missions abroad are now thoroughly convinced that Nixon's great genius lies in an uncanny ability to size up strangers and situations almost instantly and to exploit them to his maximum advantage, often by shifting to an unexpected tack or darting through a surprise opening.

Whether his football coach or debate coach at Whittier College gets the credit for this, or whether they must share it with Duke Law School, the U.S. Navy, and the hard political road to reelection as Vice President, Nixon showed superb skill in taking the measure of the man who since Stalin's death has been the most worrisome puzzle to Western statesmen.

Only secondary, and rather surprising to everybody, including Soviet leaders (who moved swiftly to keep it within bounds), was the warmth of Nixon's reception by crowds of ordinary Russians. Everywhere except Venezuela his reputation as a crowd pleaser has been confirmed, but inside the U.S.S.R. there was no reason to expect cheers for an avowed anti-Communist American who had just told off their Prime Minister on Moscow radio and television.

Yet Nixon's primary task was not to win the affection of Russian masses in a fortnight, an obviously impossible task, though he lost no chance to plant a few question marks in Soviet minds which are not so much

closed as insulated from the world. He did this by stressing America's desire for peace and hope for higher living standards for the Russian people—standards which their leaders have promised but are slow in coming—and constantly urging more freedom of ideas and information for which they all seem to hunger.

KHRUSHCHEV REAL JOB

But the Vice President's real job was to treat with the man who matters, a point on which most statesmen of East and West now agree. Mr. Khrushchev is a self-made man extremely proud of his maker, much better informed statistically than might be expected but woefully wrong in his conclusions about the West—not so much about its power as about its will to use it.

Like all Russians since centuries before communism, he suffers from a well-founded inferiority complex, but this is not all. He really believes his dogma, and he is 64 years old and in a dreadful hurry to see it come true. Khrushchev knows that the West—even the United States alone—is currently stronger and more productive than the Soviet Union.

But he believes the discipline and the determination to surpass the United States which has spurred his society to such remarkable industrialization over the past 40 years will even the balance.

WANTS SUPERIORITY

Khrushchev wants equality—then superiority. This is the real reason he so desperately sought a summit meeting and an invitation to the United States.

Why, then, give him his way? History may call it a mistake, but this is the administration thinking which Nixon's trial run corroborated:

Khrushchev and his ruling elite (as lordly a class as ever existed though the premier and Kozlov show some signs of enjoying the cheers of the crowd, are somewhat like the chiefs and sachems of a warlike American Indian tribe in the old West. They have somehow gotten themselves guns and occasionally they get some firewater. They don't have any trousers or comfortable houses, they can't read or write, they are savages by the standards of cultivated paleface society.

SERVICEABLE GUNS

But they do have guns—not as many, perhaps, but their's are serviceable; they have firewater in the form of self-intoxicating speeches about their own superiority and virtue, and if they start shooting a lot of people are going to be killed.

It seems necessary, therefore, to send our scouts out ahead to powwow with the big chief, to treat him with respect shown an equal and to decide whether the peacepipe shall be passed around before the war drums sound. Any pact may not last long and treachery is to be expected. Still, the only alternative is massacre.

Nixon accomplished his difficult mission of pioneer scout but the powwow is out of his hands. Khrushchev started out by giving him the business exactly as he has every western caller since he disposed of his principal rivals and found out his missiles would fly. He sailed into Nixon after their first handshake but the Vice President, has, as he told his host, "been insulted by experts."

His rudeness Prime Minister Macmillan suffered with dignity. It silenced Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY for most of 8 hours and terrified ex-Governor Harriman. It merely caused Nixon to conclude, correctly, that Khrushchev's behavior was neither irrational nor inhospitable by Soviet ground rules. Thereafter, Nixon played by those rules.

BULLY CHALLENGED

Details of how the bully was challenged and then conned into showing it on his own television and publishing it to all his people

have been fully reported, but this conceals a somber warning. It could never have happened had Khrushchev any serious doubts about his own position, based on both popularity and police power. The relative (though strictly limited) freedom the Soviet Government gave Nixon and his huge American entourage was a demonstration of strength possibly more significant than the first Soviet sputnik, certainly more than any antiquated factory or unfinished project on the Vice President's super Intourist itinerary.

To appreciate this, Americans need to know more about the way the new society of the U.S.S.R. really works, perhaps as badly as Khrushchev needs to learn about the real America.

SOVIET OPEN CITIES NOT TYPICAL OF U.S.S.R.—DECEIVE TOURISTS, RUSS, TOO

(By Robert Hartmann)

WASHINGTON, August 16.—To understand the Soviet Union it is first necessary to understand Russia, and to understand Russia one must constantly remember that it is mostly in Asia.

These historic and geographic facts, far more than the theorizings of Marx and Engels about communism, make the U.S.S.R. what it is today. In the same category, the Pavlovian theory of behavior popularly associated with drooling dogs is a major key to what makes Soviet society work with ever-increasing efficiency.

CHURCHILL'S COMMENT

It would be presumptuous indeed to pretend to explain what Sir Winston Churchill called a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside of an enigma on the basis of the two short visits, 4 years apart, which this reporter has made to the biggest country on earth. But the second time, viewing things from the somewhat different angle of a semiofficial guest and seeing the forbidden areas of Siberia as well as revisiting the tourist centers, much became clear that was puzzling in 1955. (This is deliberate Soviet policy: the curtain is lifted a little for tourists not to enlighten but to deceive.)

MOSCOW NOT TYPICAL

Moscow, Leningrad, and the other open areas which a steadily mounting stream of American and other free world citizens are seeing each year are not even as typical of the U.S.S.R. as New York and Boston are of the United States. They are, in fact, vast museums—diabolic Disneylands—to impress not only foreigners but the much less sophisticated Soviet tourists from other parts of the U.S.S.R. and Communists or delegates from backward Asian and African lands.

One impression you get from Moscow is that of huge, if tasteless, new construction projects on every horizon; of massive monuments to Soviet "culture" such as the skyscraper university, the Ukraina Hotel and the spotless subway; of broad boulevards, beautiful parks, lavish exhibitions, and superbly staged theater and ballet. Another—equally essential to the deception—is the conviction that most Russians are incredibly slow, dense and maddeningly inefficient.

The European corner of the U.S.S.R., except for the Kremlin and its bombproof basements, was really written off by Soviet planners in World War II when the Germans nearly took it. Moscow is either the best of Asia or the worst of Europe. And so it impresses tourists from both worlds, exactly as planned.

Asians marvel that communism has produced such a capital in a mere 40 years and hurry home to try the same forced progress. Americans go away certain that any people who can't add up a hotel bill or serve tea in less than two hours are never going to "bury" us or convert our grandchildren to socialism.

POLICE DON'T "TAIL"

Western visitors also find, or think they find, a measure of freedom in Moscow and Leningrad which they had not expected. They are not "tailed" by the secret police; they freely criticize Khrushchev and company in their hotel rooms—sometimes in conversations with Russians—and nothing dire happens to them; customs is cursory and people are so honest it is virtually impossible to lose anything, let alone have it stolen. Very few Russians will accept a tip.

Yet, as for everything in the Soviet Union, there is a reason for this. The Communist hierarchy is now secure enough in its almost absolute control that it's a sheer waste of manpower to watch every foreigner, unnecessary, too, when every Soviet citizen is watched already. They have the most monumental indifference in what most foreigners do, say, think or bring, but they are fantastically sensitive to what their own subjects see, hear, think or covet.

STILL MENTAL STRAITJACKETS

Times publisher Norman Chandler concluded perceptively on his visit to the U.S.S.R. shortly after the first summit conference in Geneva that the Iron Curtain was not around the country but around the minds of its people. As the physical barriers have been lifted to travel since 1955, the mental straitjacket has been strapped tighter still. There are occasional signs of encouraging exceptions, such as Moscow students questioning the bloody reprisals in Hungary or the current scramble to see the American fair despite a vicious official campaign to discredit it, but they are very few.

NOT IN SIBERIA

The fact is that the biggest concentration camp in the Soviet Union is not hidden in Siberia today. It is Moscow itself, on display to the world. Most of its claimed 7 million people are the drones and dumbbells of Soviet society, the below-average in ability and ambition who have been rejected by the state, the incorrigibles and misfits who have resisted conversion to the new norm of behavior.

They are good enough as street cleaners, chambermaids, and ice cream vendors, and it makes no difference if some clever rascal from Redondo Beach slips them a forbidden paperback novel or French fashion magazine. Let them be impressed by Cinerama or other aspects of American living at the fair. It doesn't matter, they will never go there or anywhere.

POWER CENTERS SHIFTED

Having switched the penal camps from Siberia to old Russia, the Soviet planners completed the reverse play by switching the real producers and power centers of industrial society from Europe to Asia. The Kremlin and the official bureaucracy remains in Moscow to complete the illusion. But the things that really matter are out east, beyond prying foreign eyes and out of non-Communist earshot.

"Why, this is where all the efficient Russians are," was the frequent comment by members of Nixon's party within minutes after we landed at Novosibirsk, the Siberian boom town that's pushing toward a million people and won't stop there any more than Los Angeles did.

BETTER THAN MOSCOW'S

The airport is far better than Moscow's and its paved runway seems to go on for miles. The hotel, though small, was a model of brisk efficiency laid on for the rare visitors. The food, including the best beef Stroganoff we had in Russia, was infinitely better than anything in Moscow or Leningrad where bureaucrats, ruble millionaires and tourists pay as much as \$20 for a bad meal, sloppily served.

Most impressive of all were the people of Siberia. They were usually handsome—mostly Russian in race, for that's who is run-

ning things despite the fiction of 16 autonomous Soviet Republics. They were healthy looking, well fed, clean and as well clothed as any crowds seen in Russia. The ordinary folk on the streets of Novosibirsk and Sverdlovsk showed more consciousness of style—though still not in the class with Paris or Pasadena or Podunk—than a visitor to Moscow can imagine.

This is a new metropolis, one cell of a new society terrifying in its implications. For these Siberian people actually appear perfectly happy with their lives. They are working hard and creating something they can see. Their children will have a better life than they; and they know absolutely nothing of the world beyond what is piped in to them by their Government.

UNCONTAMINATED CULTURES

You fly over the barren wastes of Siberia at 500 miles per hour in a Tupelov jet, and all you can see are empty subarctic lands dotted with innumerable lakes. A doubt-tracked ribbon of steel connects these new cities, and now the airplane, but there is no other communication. A dozen cities of 500,000 or more are spotted across this vast continent, like islands in a land ocean. They are the sterilized and uncontaminated cultures where the new society really works.

For the Soviet society to work effectively, the same fundamental rules apply that prevail in any industrial nation. There must be resources, managerial ability, skilled labor and the saving or plowing back of some production into capital for expanding production. The U.S.S.R. is conceded to have the most and probably the most nearly self-sufficient resources in the world. Much managerial and organizing ability perished or was exiled in the 1917 revolution and succeeding Stalin purges, but a new generation of peasants' sons turned engineers is coming up. There still is not enough talent to go around, so it is rationed by the state like everything else, from rare space alloys down to a glass of water.

The Wrong People in the Wrong War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, it was clear at the Santiago Conference, as it had been clear many times before, that the Latin American nations do not like Trujillo. Their distaste is based on good reasons and it is not casual.

However, these nations also made it clear they did not want intervention—or filibustering in the earlier sense of that word. I personally advised Fidel Castro last February against any such expeditions against Trujillo. He has ample to do in Cuba. The OAS would be obliged to help Trujillo. Trujillo is on his way out anyway, so why bring death and heartbreak to many families?

The August 17, 1959, Life magazine published an article entitled "How Americans Were Duped Into Bloody Castro Fiasco." From the evidence it looks as though Castro or persons close around him cooperated in the enlisting and training of American citizens. I believe it is correct to say they were "duped" and, I will go further, exploited.

Why involve American citizens? Why but to involve the United States? We are involved because we are part of this hemisphere and because we believe in freedom, justice, and economic security. But we do not hold with the recruiting practices and the revolutionary operations described in the article which I am including here under a previous consent.

Trujillo is an apple ripe to fall any day. No need to shake the tree—the breezes are blowing and becoming stronger each hour:

HOW AMERICANS WERE DUPED INTO BLOODY CASTRO FIASCO

(By Keith Wheeler)

A flamboyant plot, inspired by Cuba's ever-ready Fidel Castro, to conquer the Dominican Republic with the aid of U.S. citizen soldiers of fortune was tracked down last week by a team of Life reporters.

The first clue to this weird and startling story was contained in a vainglorious report by the Dominican Republic's durable dictator, Gen. Rafael Leonidas Trujillo, that his army had repulsed and wiped out an invasion force in June. Giving weight to his words, Trujillo had named the "dead" attackers—among them seven New Yorkers.

Thereafter the Life team worked with fragments of fact scattered from New York to Havana. Last week they found four of the purported corpses alive in New York. Two had apparently died in the Dominican Republic. One was still unaccounted for.

From the living they uncovered a bizarre and brazen recruiting scheme in which, for months, freewheeling Latin Americans had been proselytizing some highly gullible U.S. citizens to fight in the Caribbean.

The story began, apparently, after Castro and his Cuban rebels had seemed to prove, to the satisfaction of the militarily unsophisticated, that the pure in heart could defeat a dictatorship with nothing but hope and a handful of heroes. A wave of euphoria for libertad swept the Caribbean. Its special target, understandably, was Trujillo's iron-fisted 30-year rule of the Dominican Republic.

Castro himself started the real recruiting on a visit to Venezuela after his Cuban triumph. When a crowd cheered him with shouts of "Trujillo next," he plunked his fatigue cap on the speaker's rostrum and started a war chest by dropping a 5-bolivar coin in it. That show alone yielded 500,000 bolivares (\$150,000). Soon, inspired with Castro fervor, the recruiters were shuttling back and forth across the Caribbean and up to Miami and New York.

In New York, it developed last week, they operated blandly under the noses of the authorities in the upper West Side of Manhattan, an area densely populated by Puerto Rican Americans. It is now possible to trace their activities, beginning last winter, to several known hangouts.

There were rallies in private apartments on 106th Street and Amsterdam Avenue and at 103d and Amsterdam. Another hangout was a safe run by a man named Hector Américo at 922 Amsterdam Avenue. They even made use of otherwise innocent gathering places, including the Club of the Good Star at 906 Columbus Avenue and the Hamilton Place Hotel at 138th Street and Broadway.

The chief activist and later leader of the ill-fated invasion, now reported dead in the Dominican Republic, was a former Castro guerrilla chief still spoiling for a fight, one Enrique Jimenes Moya. It is known that he moved freely in and out of New York, operating through two Dominican exile organizations.

Now merged under the title "Movimiento de Liberación Dominicana," they were controlled by one Alfonso Canto and a man

named Juan Diaz. Canto, too, was a peripatetic plotter, who shuttled back and forth between New York and Cuba on his devious business.

For bait, the recruiters used, first and foremost, the Castro mystic of the out-at-elbows conqueror and the appeal of "the chance to be a hero, too." They made it sound easy. A fortnight of guerrilla practice, a short hop across the Caribbean, then, wham, Trujillo would collapse.

The recruiters also used money—not actual money, but the talk of it. To many a hard-pressed Puerto Rican, condemned to dreary menial jobs in New York, the promise of support for wife, child, or parent proved a powerful incentive.

There is evidence that perhaps scores in the New York area "fell for this guff." It is certain that at least these seven did:

Daniel Chervony, 23, clerk.

David Chervony, 17, delivery boy.

Moises Agosto, 23, odd-job man.

Santiago Carbonell, 27, pants presser.

Pablo Vélez, 23, packer.

Manuel Costa, 29, laborer.

Eugenio Román, 24, handyman.

It was astoundingly easy for the susceptible to fall into the recruiters' hands. On March 1 Moises Agosto, whose natural tendency to somber brooding had been accentuated by his inability to keep a job since leaving Puerto Rico 5 months earlier, was out for a Sunday stroll with his girl.

Moises and Irma Villanueva, who called him "Ruben" because she liked that name better, idly drifted into a basement meeting at the Hamilton Place Hotel. Almost before Irma had noticed, someone had pinned a three-pointed card (blazoned for peace, liberty, and democracy) on Moises' lapel. Before they left, Irma saw him sign something. Two days later, after a series of telephone talks, she was present when he signed what she thought was a contract. On the fifth day he was gone. He said he might be away a year or two.

Irma later recalled sadly that Moises desperately needed money for his mother and two small daughters back in Puerto Rico, and she believed he had been promised \$90 a month for their support. Significantly, a relative recalled that Moises, the broody one, had "always wanted to do something big someday. He always wanted to be a hero."

It was the beginning of a fantastic trail. But, although she received 10 letters from him, Irma never learned much of Moises' progress along it. Moises' letters were deliberately vague. Only occasionally did he hint that he was engaged on desperate business. Once he wrote: "I hope, if God wills it, to return soon and bring in my conscience and heart the happiness of a free people. And if I die, I will die content."

Others set off on the same strange journey with equal offhandedness. For Pablo Vélez, who is called "a crazy character" even by his family, it began in a neighborhood bar. Santiago Carbonell fortuitously met the recruiters just when he had been laid off from his pants-pressing job and no longer had means to support his wife and three children. Both of them were fired by a lot of loose talk about the iniquities of Trujillo and boasts that Castros' bravos could bring him down with fewer than 100 men.

Vélez, a former soldier, and Carbonell, an ex-marine, soon found themselves in the 106th and Amsterdam apartment at rallies of Dominican exile patriots who called themselves the "February 27th movement." They were signed up by Juan Diaz, one of the recruiters, and off they went.

The Chervony brothers, Daniel and David, found their way to disillusionment for the one, death for the other through Hector Américo's café—since burned down—and grocery store. Américo recruited them on a promise that their family would be supported, according to Daniel Chervony.

He roped another gullible innocent, Eugenio Román. "I will get \$10,000. Wow!" Eugenio told his patroness, Dona Amanda Douchkess Lindberg, who had been supporting him as a helper around the Club of the Good Star.

The long and idiotic trail to nowhere has now been blazed by Daniel Chervony and Vélez and Carbonell. In March each of the suckers was given an airline ticket to Havana. Daniel Chervony traveled among a group of 7 recruits, Vélez with a batch of 11.

"We very happy," Vélez recalls. "We going to stay only 15 days in Cuba, make a lot of money and shoot down Trujillo. We laughing all the way. I don't feel bad; I like go fight."

From Havana they were taken to the mountains, installed in training camp in the hills at Mil Cumbres in Pinar del Rio. They were given logs and thatch and told to build their own huts. And they were issued weapons, a motley collection of M-1 Garands, Dominican-made carbines and machine-guns.

At first it was fun. They went on conditioning hikes and played soldier learning to fire the weapons. Their training officers were Dominicans and Cubans and occasionally they were visited by Jiménez Moya. Although Moya was a glamorous figure, they eventually resented the fact that he apparently spent most of his time living it up with the girls in Havana.

But the promised limit of 15 days passed and there was no action. The weeks began to stretch into months.

"They gave us almost no food—only a little coffee," Vélez laments. "We killed a cow and we eat it but it's no good. We just boil it and we have no salt. But snakes were all right. You cook snake right and it taste like chicken."

"We were treated worse than dogs; we were like slaves," Daniel Chervony says. "I didn't have a bath for 6 weeks."

Eventually, out of disgust and sheer boredom, some of the camp's 200 inmates tried to run away. These efforts came to nothing for they would always run into Cuban army patrols who good-humoredly but firmly herded them back to Mil Cumbres. Gradually, as the time passed, it began to dawn on them that they were prisoners.

The worst of it was when word seeped in from home that the promised payments to families had failed to materialize. It was then that the Americans at the camp staged a rather ridiculous gesture of defiance. Many of the recruits had grown beards in idolatrous emulation of Castro's legendary barbudos. The Americans shaved their beards as an open protest.

Oddly enough this charade seemed to have some effect on the camp bosses. Alfonso Canto, the MLD's suave New York operative, appeared in the camp and promised to go back to New York and pay up. Indeed, some of the families there did receive small sums.

Finally Benigno Chervony, a New York building superintendent, blew the whistle on all this revolutionary hocus-pocus. He wrote the U.S. Embassy in Havana to say that his two sons were in Cuba on some kind of nefarious enterprise and he wanted help getting them out. Shortly thereafter six of the by-now disconsolate buccaners—Daniel Chervony, Carbonell, Vélez, Román, Agosto, and Costa—sent a letter to the U.S. Embassy in Havana saying they were being held prisoners and wanted to be sprung.

A dogged but frequently obstructed investigation in Cuba got nowhere; besides, it was too late to save those who were doomed. On June 14, the expedition finally got underway in as slapdash a manner as any invasion that was never planned. First to go was an ancient C-46 cargo plane camouflaged—inaccurately as it turned out—with Dominican Air Force insignia. Jiménez Moya

led this first wave—after a long argument with the pilot who eventually turned out to be a spy for Trujillo—to an airstrip in the Dominican mountains called Constanza. Jiménez Moya had 63 men aboard the plane. In a 3-week series of ragged running fights with the Dominican Army he and most of his men were killed—apparently including Agosto and young David Chervony.

The second wave consisted of a couple of antique landing craft which sailed from Cuba with about 200 men. One boat made it all the way to the Dominican Republic at a north coast beach. Its luckless crew also apparently died to the man under the guns and bombs of Trujillo's defenders.

The second boat had the incredible good fortune to be even less efficient than all the rest of this haphazard adventure; it ran out of gas 30 miles off the Cuban coast. After wallowing around without food or water for 4 days, its company of seasick braves were rescued. Many of them, including Vélez and Carbonell, had a belated attack of good sense and refused to go out again. Finally they were given tickets home.

A few others among the would-be Castros did even better. They simply said they wanted no further part of revolution and, after a few days in a Cuban prison, were disgustingly turned loose and sent home with a warning to keep their mouths shut.

Last week, mourning his brother lost in a reckless adventure, Daniel Chervony was still harassed by fear. His wife had been getting mysterious threatening telephone calls and a group of seven sinister strangers were, from time to time, haunting his home. He was afraid to go outside.

The last act of this never-never-land melodrama may be written this week. Seeking to set its own house in order, the Organization of American States convenes in extraordinary session to consider what to do about unrest in the Caribbean—most of which, quite obviously, originates in Castro's Cuba.

Report on the U.S.S.R.—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting for inclusion in the RECORD the third and fourth of a series of eight articles which appeared recently in the Los Angeles Times written by Mr. Robert T. Hartmann, chief of the Los Angeles Times Washington Bureau. Mr. Hartmann accompanied Vice President Nixon on his recent tour of the U.S.S.R. and Poland.

The articles follow:

RUSS RULED BY CONTROL OVER MIND
(By Robert Hartmann)

WASHINGTON, August 17.—The Founding Fathers of the American Revolution, a rather radical affair in its day, boldly proclaimed that government rests on the consent of the governed. And this is true even in a police state like the Soviet Union, though the means of obtaining consent are quite different.

That's where Dr. Pavlov comes in.

In his experiments with dogs, rats, and other animals, Pavlov sought to prove his thesis of the conditioned reflex as the key to human behavior. This is a psychological

concept premised on the atheistic Communist belief that man is merely a mentally superior animal but an animal for all that.

PAVLOV THEORY

According to Pavlov, people do things in response to external stimuli and will automatically do the same things under the same stimuli.

Further, by deliberate switching and confusion of the natural pattern of stimulus and response, it is possible to make men do exactly what the manipulator of the stimuli wants them to do.

Not only will they do it—and this is practically important—but they will want to do it. They will truly believe they are doing it of their own accord. Thus, by the influence of Pavlovian thinking on virtually every process of Soviet life from the toddler's day nursery to the brainwashing chambers of the MVD, the Russian masses are slowly coming—as George Orwell predicted in his book "1984"—to the point where they really do love Big Brother.

For the young, the Communists call this free education, for adults, rehabilitation.

There's many a slip in the Pavlovian conditioning. The past ways are not quite dead, and the Kremlin has had to back-track on some points, notably the perpetuation of the family unit which passes many troublesome folkways along. Religion persists, though in a strictly limited and suspect way. Also, later researchers have shown that conditioned reflexes tend to fade with time and must be constantly recharged.

But in isolated central Asia the experiment is working under optimum conditions. Romantic writers may liken Siberia to the rippling spirit of the old American frontier, but nothing could be more wrong. That was, if anything, a bit too much freedom for the individual with the fastest draw. The Soviet east is a prison so vast and secluded those within it mistake it for the world. They not only have no real freedom but no conception of it and probably do not long for it.

OTHER EXTREME

Poland and the other European satellites, of course, represent the other extreme of Communist conditioning. Even so dyed-in-the-wool a Communist as Gomulka, as dogmatic as Khrushchev, probably cleverer and certainly more worldly wise, doesn't expect to win his battle with the Catholic Church and the 1,000-year-old nationalism of the Polish people in anything short of generations.

The success of 40 years of Pavlovian conditioning on the peasant masses of Central Asia—which were always used to obedience and never much aware of anything beyond the horizon—has been such that Khrushchev is now bold enough to take a few western visitors among the subjects of the experiment. From a boat on the Moscow River he taunted Vice President Nixon (twisting, as usual, the "captive nations week" controversy which applied to enslaved nations and not Russians) by asking "Do these look like slaves?"

CALLS TO SWIMMERS

Then the premier called out to the swimmers "Are you slaves?" and they called back in unison: "Nyet, nyet." Conditioned reflex, not fear, accomplished this, though there's still a large reserve of fear left over from the Stalin terror to reinforce any shaky reflexes.

Once this psychological system is understood, the absolute necessity of Soviet censorship, radio jamming and control of all incoming information is apparent. To keep conditioned reflexes in working order there must be no interference from extraneous stimuli; the word "America" must always evoke a spontaneous link with the word "warmonger" in the Russian mind, not an

image of a land of peace and plenty with no designs at all.

JUST CHIPPING

The word "capitalist" must be coupled with "exploiter"—"Negro" with "lynching"—"foreign bases" with "aggressive designs on the U.S.S.R.," and so on. And this must happen automatically so that the Soviet citizen actually feels he is thinking it out for himself.

Against this massive iceberg (not the thinning ice President Eisenhower spoke of in announcing his invitation to Khrushchev) Nixon's appeals to open up and don't be afraid of the truth and trust the people and read both sides and reach your own conclusion, were just chipping with an icepick. He knew it and hoped only it might strike one or two unconditioned ears. He also knew everyone in the Kremlin would hear it, where some high-ranking Soviet intellectuals are a bit annoyed with the uncouth manners and crowd-pleasing proclivities of Mr. K.

Members of Nixon's party, including the newsmen who took their cue from the Vice President and resolutely argued every inch of the journey with Soviet critics and questioners, ran into the same hemispheric mentality.

The Russians are not dumb, nobody could make sputniks, run the world's most efficient secret police and produce a supercolossal stage spectacle like Khachaturian's "Spartacus" and be called stupid. But they live in only half the world, and like our medieval ancestors they have no idea what lies beyond the dropping-off place.

Their kings and priests aren't about to tell them, either.

GET FACSIMILES

However, as the Russians are no less intelligent than any other race, the state must maintain the colossal fraud that the Communist hemisphere in which the Soviet people live is actually the whole world. Thus there exists in the U.S.S.R. a facsimile for everything which free peoples take for granted, such as free communications and a free press.

The curious university-trained Soviet scientist who will live and work in the new "community of scientists" near Novosibirsk, for example, will be able to buy at any street kiosk and freely read newspapers and periodicals from all parts of the world, if he knows the languages.

"What do you mean when you say we cannot get the truth?" a Sverdlovsk journalist demanded at a party given by the local press for the newsmen accompanying Nixon. These vodka-toasting affairs were always scheduled at the same time or immediately after Nixon's most important activity of the day; as far as I know, Soviet journalists never write or else they do it very leisurely.)

PAPERS AVAILABLE

He went on to insist that even in the Ural Mountains papers are readily available from New York, London, and Paris flown in daily by Soviet jet from Moscow along with Pravda and Izvestia. This is true, but they are the London and New York Daily Workers, L'Humanite and Communist Party papers from other free-world capitals. (This explains why obviously costly Communist organs are kept alive in places where there is virtually no chance of converting anyone or subverting the free government.)

The Russians readily admit all these are Communist papers but, since they believe the Communist Parties in foreign countries actually reflect the aspirations of the common people, what's wrong with that? Only false and misleading papers published by the ruling capitalist circles are, quite properly, kept from poisoning the peace-loving Russian people.

Of course, the Communist papers published in Western Europe and America are vastly more objective than Pravda and Izvestia, though one has to rely on them for news in Russia to appreciate this.

FOLLOW PARTY LINE

They follow the party line, but they must compete with a free press and be plausible enough for free readers. They slant and sneer but cannot utterly ignore or invent the way Soviet papers can and do. For example, in the famous fiction of Nixon trying to tip, bribe or otherwise corrupt a poor Soviet workman on his first day in Moscow, the Belgian Communist paper Le Drapeau Rouge added the explanation of the vice-president's press secretary, Herbert Klein, that what the market workers really wanted was tickets to the American Fair. This was utterly ignored in the Soviet press, as was all advance mention of Nixon's plan to visit Poland.

The average Soviet citizen, even the Soviet educated, thinks he is getting word of what's going on in the world, or at least most of it. He reads news telegraphed by Tass from Washington, New Delhi, Peking and all parts of the U.S.S.R., and he has his choice of a score of different newspapers in which varying vehemence, brightness of typography, make-up and literary style are substituted for any very profound difference of opinion.

BOSS OF BOTH

He knows, of course, that Pravda is the official organ of the Communist Party while Izvestia speaks for the Government of the U.S.S.R. These are mostly the same people and Khrushchev is boss of both, but the distinction is useful. Izvestia, for example, which recently acquired as its new editor Khrushchev's son-in-law, generally took a more friendly tone toward father's official guest than Pravda.

Pravda sniped constantly at Nixon, whose anti-Communist sentiments are well known at world headquarters. It may have gone too far, for after the 100-ruble fiction appeared on the back page (where sophisticated Russian readers habitually look for items which might have escaped the editor, though they seldom do) the principal Nixon stories carried the byline of Pravda's former editor, Yuri Zhukov, now director of cultural exchanges and the Vice President's ranking escort on his Siberian journey.

Thus the heckling by planted loyal Soviet workers at the doorways of each plant or project on the Nixon schedule and the letters to the editor which showed up contradicting the Vice President and his claim of American prosperity for all probably were not all rehearsed or written by professional party editors.

NATURAL RESULT

In many cases they were Soviet citizens reacting as they have been conditioned to respond to American claims by years of reading Pravda and listening to Moscow radio.

The heckling had a dual purpose: It refuted what Nixon said and the uttering and publishing of it contributed to the grand illusion that free expression exists in the U.S.S.R. as anywhere else.

But for Khrushchev to permit really free intercommunication of ideas and information, as Nixon urged in the shadow of the Soviet Union's most powerful radio jamming transmitters near Novosibirsk, would really wreck the system which has been so carefully erected to permit the Kremlin to control even the subconscious thoughts of its 208 million subjects.

This much, however, may be hoped. If a divine spark does exist within the human soul—as communism denies and we affirm—it will someday burst into flame. As Khrushchev & Co. gain confidence they may relax the reins a bit more, as they have in

the economic and agricultural areas already. But there is no sign of any such trend in the intellectual area today.

RUSS OPEN UP VAST NEW LAND

(By Robert Hartmann)

WASHINGTON, August 18.—The unprecedented invasion of Siberia by some 130 Americans with Vice President Nixon undoubtedly made quite an impression on the isolated Soviet residents of this long-closed area. It also made quite an impression on the Americans.

As a second-time traveler in the U.S.S.R., this reporter was not especially surprised by returning to Moscow and Leningrad on the regular intourist circuit. He noted many changes in 4 years: Hundreds of massive apartments teeming with people stood where only skeletons of stone and cement were before; quality of consumer goods appeared better and more were seen in use as well as in store windows, but prices were still very high and waiting lists long for many items.

WEATHER GOOD

Because it was summer (the weather throughout Nixon's 11-day stay in the U.S.S.R. was uniformly perfect, cool and sunny) instead of the drab winter of his previous visit, this reporter had difficulty comparing the dress and demeanor of the crowds of Soviet citizens. They seemed more carefree and colorfully clothed, there were more smiles and friendly helpfulness toward foreigners, but in 1955 any foreigner was a rarity. Now even Americans are fairly commonplace.

But seeing Siberia and the Urals redoubt was quite a different and memorable experience. Here is a land where fertile black soil stretches for thousands of miles, of virgin pine forests and vast north-flowing rivers, where the new Communist society has placed its bet for future world supremacy.

Not that the Uralmach, the machine tool "mother of factories" or the steel pipe works near Sverdlovsk or the copper mine exactly halfway around the world from Los Angeles were particularly impressive.

PLANTS FAIR

They are evidently fairly good plants, according to the industrial experts in the Nixon group, but to western newsmen they looked old-fashioned and grimy. (The new steel mill shown Nixon in Poland was far more modern.) Despite Soviet pride, a length of red-hot pipe rolling down to a conveyor belt by gravity is not quite what we mean by automation. John L. Lewis miners generally live better than the management of a Siberian mine.

What impresses you, and must have impressed Nixon, is the potential of this vast land and the bustling energy of its people. They are the producers and pioneers of this new order, encouraged to move eastward by such Marxist heresies as the right to own their own homes and state loans to build them, by opportunity for rapid advancement which a society starving for technical and managerial talent must offer.

MANY SHORTCOMINGS

It would be easy to catalog the shortcomings of these Siberian boomtowns, to belittle the plumbing of the ancient hotel or spotlight the clusters of crumbling wooden shacks which are slums in any language.

This is what a Soviet journalist would see visiting a fast-growing American industrial city; in fact, it is exactly what most condescending British and European writers saw when they ventured west of tidewater in the United States during the 19th century. Most of them found the Yankees to be lawless, ill bred, and unwashed bores whose experiment would never amount to much.

The difficulties faced by the 100 American newsmen covering Nixon were incredible

and unending; no problem ever stayed solved; each battle with the bureaucracy had to be refought daily. It seemed part of the Soviet system to take up every minute of everyone's time so that none remained for mischief or meditation.

BREAKFAST IMPORTANT

This was applied to the Nixon party from start to finish. We soon took to rising extra early to eat all we could stuff down for breakfast; very often it was the only meal of the day. Not that the four daily menus for which we paid cash in advance were not available; but at best it took 1 hour to be served and another to settle one's bill.

Communications were also a problem complicated by constant moves. The Soviet authorities promised that Nixon's dress party could file "freely and without delay." With some mysterious exceptions impossible to explain, it is this reporter's opinion that they tried to keep their advance bargain.

STORIES DELAYED

There were long delays, partly because every word had to be read (and probably photocopied) by Soviet censors even if not tampered with, but also due to the heavy load of outgoing traffic requiring operators familiar with the Latin alphabet, who probably are not numerous in such spots as Sverdlovsk and Novosibirsk.

Often I found myself the only person moving on the empty city streets as I directed a sleepy taxi driver to the central telegraph office, which stays open around the clock. Always, after my name was located on "the list" of Nixon newsmen, which was the password for every privilege, my copy was accepted courteously and only three times failed to reach Los Angeles on time.

RUMORS RIFE

There was one nerve-racking day when the rumor spread around Moscow that the Soviets decreed only 12 of the 80-odd American reporters accredited to the Vice President's party could accompany him through Siberia—the key portion of the journey U.S. editors had paid thousands of dollars to have covered. The reason given was the usual Soviet quid pro quo; only a dozen Soviet journalists had accompanied Deputy Premier Kozlov around the United States. This was argued all day, when suddenly the Soviets gave in and said: "We'll take 100." Though only about 80 were signed up, enough resident Moscow newsmen and wives were rounded up to force the Soviets to make good for the full quota.

This was Herbert G. Klein's finest hour, among many. A San Diego editor, Klein became Nixon's press spokesman in July. Always a calm, quiet-spoken man, his baptism of fire in the U.S.S.R. absolutely inoculated him against any minor difficulties which may arise in the future.

While Klein waged a continuous battle with second-string Soviet officials on behalf of the Western press (including several British, French, and West German correspondents on an equal basis) his two assistants helped newsmen over many a minor hurdle. They were Richard Bean of North Hollywood, Lockheed public relations manager, and Richard Davies, a State Department officer formerly stationed in the U.S.S.R. and Poland who spoke both languages. Davies knew very little at the outset about newspapermen, and Bean very little about Russians, but between the two Dicks most crises were eventually surmounted.

Ordinarily, veteran American reporters and photographers have little need of chaperons. But they are indispensable in the Communist world because there are only two kinds of people recognized in the "classless society": somebodies and nobodies. Any official, especially of a guest delegation, must be listened to and obliged if possible. An official is a somebody. But any nonofficial,

like a newsman, is less than dirt and his protest might as well be shouted into the wind. Therefore, every major problem had to be taken up through Klein, and a few required Nixon's personal intervention with his hosts.

The astonishing thing was not the many niggling difficulties and roadblocks placed in our way by lower echelon Soviet officials, but the fact that we operated with as much freedom as we did. The regular Moscow correspondents remained under strict censorship rules all the time. The Soviet authorities arbitrarily held up all unprocessed film for several days and decreed that thereafter only Soviet or East German brands could be used—though tourists freely take U.S. film in and out of the country. But for the most part the Nixon story got told to the world and the invaders retreated from Moscow without a serious incident or any lost luggage.

HOSPITALITY ON TRIAL

Here again, however, there was a reason. Khrushchev knew very well his hospitality was on trial, that if things went reasonably well with Nixon he would get his invitation from President Eisenhower. We were the guinea pigs for the pampered White House press corps; we learned a lot about news coverage in the U.S.S.R. and the Soviets learned a lot about our demanding ways.

There is a sinister postscript to this. At this moment in some Moscow bureau there is a dossier on every American reporter or photographer among the Nixon group. It contains a minute record, possibly augmented by infrared photographs of everything each visitor did during his stay in the U.S.S.R. It may also contain a transcript of everything he said.

The elevator never stops at the 12th floor of the new Ukraina Hotel which was built primarily for foreign visitors to Moscow. This is the tape-recording master control room where any suite in the huge edifice can be monitored through built-in microphones.

The secret police by no means bug every visitor around the clock. But they do know whom to watch, and they can tune in on you any time.

The Nixon newsmen were all given single rooms—a mark of luxury but also keeping them apart. Nobody gives out room numbers in Soviet hotels and ours were scattered all over.

On all group movements we were never out of earshot of an English-speaking Intourist guide or a so-called Soviet journalist, who seated themselves in an obviously prearranged pattern in every bus and plane.

Chances are nothing will ever come of these dossiers, but if anyone made a misstep in Novosibirsk under the illusion they were free and undetected, embarrassing evidence could turn up. It might be used for espionage blackmail, to deny future entry or in reprisal for a hostile account after leaving the country. All Western newsmen permanently in Moscow live under this sword, part of the psychological pressure which never lets up and is inexorably directed toward one goal proclaimed on every hand: "Victory for communism."

REALITY MASKED

"If you tell the truth about this place," one American warned me, "nobody back home is going to believe you. It's too utterly incredible, like life on another planet. But the Russians look like us and it's all wrapped up to look like a somewhat backward form of our society."

"It won't do you any good to try and explain this isn't so, because these guys are so smart they are sending home 5,000 Americans this year who'll tell their friends the Russians are really nice, sweet, somewhat inefficient people who like Americans and want peace. These Americans will even authenticate their accounts by saying some things are bad in the U.S.S.R., that while freedom

for the Russians isn't anything like ours, they're getting more all the time. So don't waste your time trying to tell how it really is, they'll tag you for another McCarthy."

Panama Canal Zone: "Peaceful Occupation" Proposed for November 3, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, a revealing news story about projected political plans now being agitated in Panama for November 3, 1959, the 56th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Panama, was published in the July 14, 1959, issue of the Star & Herald, Panama, Republic of Panama.

The news story follows:

[From the Star & Herald, Panama, Republic of Panama, July 14, 1959]

"PEACEFUL OCCUPATION" OF CANAL ZONE
PROPOSED FOR NOVEMBER 3

Two opposition politicians sounded a call this weekend for the "peaceful occupation" of the Canal Zone by Panamanians on November 3, 1959, Panama's independence anniversary.

The proposal came from Aquilino Boyd and Ernesto Castillero Pimentel, who also were the first to call for a 50-50 split of the gross income of the Panama Canal between the United States and Panama. Boyd is a former Foreign Minister; Castillero, a former Vice Foreign Minister.

Boyd, featured in a Sunday night radio program "Meet the Press," first broached the occupation idea, saying Panamanians should move into the Canal Zone on November 3 to plant flags. This would be a repetition, on a larger scale, of the "Operation Sovereignty" carried out on May 2, 1958, by university students.

In a prepared statement, Castillero furnished additional details yesterday. He said:

"We can imagine the spectacle. Once the (Nov. 3) parade is over, students and citizens, rather than devoting themselves to the usual festivities and diversions, will walk toward the Panamanian territory known as the Canal Zone, entering through the various streets and avenues, in good order, perhaps carrying national flags, and will occupy the zone symbolically (and effectively). They will sit down on the curbs of all the sidewalks, on the benches of all parks, on the steps of the Administration Building, under the palm trees of the Prado, under the shadow of the banyan trees, at portals, at churches, and in the stadium. Those with automobiles also will go, silently, scrupulously obeying all traffic regulations, without interfering with traffic. This cannot be an act of physical force nor of material violence. It will be a transcendental manifestation of national reaffirmation, a massive demonstration of the unbreakable unity among all Panamanians, without partisan distinctions, in support of the longed-for adjustments."

Castillero compared such a move to the passive resistance movement in India before World War II.

"The independence of India in those days was as utopian and remote as, for example, the ideal of the recovery of the canal by the Republic of Panama is at present. And I call it recovery because the canal once was ours, materially and juridically, from November

3, 1903, to February 26, 1904, the date of the exchange of ratification of the fateful Hay-Bunau Varilla Treaty."

Castillero added that after 56 years of negotiations, Panama has gained nothing. "It is necessary to open a new front—the front on the street, on the public park, on the zone . . ."

In his radio appearance Sunday, Boyd castigated Governor Potter for the latter's pronouncements on U.S. policy in the zone, saying the interpretation of treaties was not within the Governor's function. He added that he resigned as Foreign Minister in President Ernesto de la Guardia's Cabinet because his idea for the 50-50 split of the Canal's gross income was termed "not too realistic" by the administration's newspaper.

Pollution Problem Acute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, my compliments are extended to the Evening Journal, East St. Louis, Ill., for the timely and provocative editorial which it carried in its edition of Tuesday, August 25, 1959, on the subject of our water resources.

The editorial searches wisely for a more appropriate description of what is happening to the Nation's and world's supply than the inadequate word "pollution."

It predicts, and I feel compelled to agree with its prediction, that it is entirely possible that our civilization will drown in a sea of poisonous slime long before it perishes from the effects of radiation.

I have long been interested in the problem of meeting this very serious threat. I have, in the past, been among the original sponsors of legislation dealing with the subject. I have a strong feeling that we are not dealing with it seriously enough, and a far more extensive program should be encouraged by the Federal Government in this area.

The editorial follows:

POLLUTION PROBLEM ACUTE

While public health, government and civilian defense authorities ponder the dangers of radioactive fallout, and old problem poses an ever-increasing threat to our burgeoning population.

Water pollution is not a dramatic or agreeable subject. It is hard to get excited about sewers when there are more exotic dangers to worry about. But "pollution" is getting to be an inadequate word to describe the enormous quantities of detergents, pesticides, and industrial wastes being added to the sewage and garbage flow of cities, small and large.

For lack of adequate facilities, cities dump raw or only partially treated sewage into the nearest convenient river or lake, regardless of the fact that other communities also draw their drinking water from the same body of water.

Even the broad oceans are not free of the menace, and the problem is approaching crisis proportions on many of our major waterways. The Federal Government is

pressing for control of pollution on several rivers, particularly the Missouri. Sioux City, Iowa, was enjoined last April from dumping raw sewage into the Big Muddy above Omaha, Nebr.

A Federal sewage control program, in effect since 1956, has stimulated construction, starts or authorization of more than 1,400 sewage treatment plants. A modest authorization of \$50 million a year is allocated for Federal aid to community sewage treatment projects. Even this amount is not usually appropriated each year, partly because of the Eisenhower administration's hostility to Federal activity in this field.

Eastern rivers already are largely sewage and industrial waste conduits, devoid of marine life and too dangerous for swimming, boating, and other water sport. The Great Lakes, especially Erie and Ontario, are becoming more polluted each year as cities and rivers pour wastes into them.

Fishing has been wiped out in the Mississippi River for miles below St. Louis, because of sewage, garbage and industrial wastes from the metropolitan area. The pattern is repeated on most of the major rivers.

Usually any city located on a river treats polluted water it receives at a point below the water intake. The communities yet further downstream pay for this—with interest—in the form of still more elaborate water treatment projects.

The problem is becoming acute all over the world. Civilization's effluence destroys the aquatic food cycle on which sea animals depend—and seafood is still the staple diet of much of the world's population.

Radioactive fallout is a potential menace to mankind. Wastes from atomic reactors already contribute in no small measure to water pollution. But it is entirely possible that our civilization will drown in a sea of poisonous slime long before it perishes from the effects of radiation.

Report on the U.S.S.R.—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting for inclusion in the RECORD the fifth and sixth articles of a series of eight articles which appeared recently in the Los Angeles Times written by Mr. Robert T. Hartmann, chief of the Los Angeles Times Washington bureau. Mr. Hartmann accompanied Vice President Nixon on his recent tour of the U.S.S.R. and Poland.

The articles follow:

BIG BROTHER NEVER SLEEPS

(By Robert Hartmann)

WASHINGTON, August 19.—Will it do any good for Premier Khrushchev to see the United States as it really is, in all its awesome industrial and farm productivity and widely distributed prosperity and political power? Neither Vice President Nixon nor anybody who accompanied him in the Soviet Union really knows.

But it would do every American good to see what Nixon saw in the U.S.S.R. though it was only a carefully controlled peep show into the forbidden cities of Siberia. At the very least, every American who has a re-

sponsibility for foreign policymaking or informing the U.S. public should go to the Soviet Union not once but several times.

STATE MANIPULATION

Difficult as it is to convey the incredible police authority and all-pervading manipulation of people by the Soviet state to anyone raised in a relatively free climate, it is worth trying. The key to the system is the same Pavlovian concept mentioned earlier in this series, a deliberate and systematic confusion of illusion and reality.

Thus in the Soviet Union one must always operate on suppositions, deductions, and educated guesses. It is never possible to check it out, or establish anything absolutely as truth. Even events within one's own sensual observations, and even they are deliberately distorted by chronic fatigue. When, like a rat in a maze, one gets weary of this unrewarding search, Big Brother takes over and shows the way. It is, even for a foreign visitor, almost a relief.

Let me relate two versions of an incident which happened to me firsthand in Siberia, first the way I believe it happened; then the way I think the Soviet manipulators hoped I would conclude it happened.

HOW IT HAPPENED AS I SAW IT

Throughout the time the Nixon party was in the U.S.S.R., because of high-level orders to all cognizant officials, American newsmen were permitted to photograph freely anything they saw without interference.

In Sverdlovsk, where Soviet heavy industry was moved behind the Ural Mountains during World War II, the MVD is extremely sensitive, not about the rather antiquated machinery but because of a complete quarantine of the population from foreign contamination, not possible in Moscow.

After emerging from the tiresome trek through the pipe foundry, waiting for the press bus for Nixon to get in his Zis limousine I spotted a knot of Soviet workers standing a block from the crowded doorway where the Vice President was saying farewell to the plant officials. They were not trying to get any closer, so I walked over to try and talk with them and show some friendship.

CARDS CHECKED

As I got closer, I noticed that one man of obvious authority in civilian clothes was shaking down this group of workers, making each of them produce his red covered identification card which every Soviet citizen must carry at all times.

I was so curious about what was going on I forgot about the camera slung open around my neck until the plainclothesman swung around and saw me. The red cards instantly vanished and the group rapidly broke up.

As the MVD sauntered past me with studied casualness, I remarked: "We may not use our cameras, but we have eyes."

At the next stop, I used the last shot in my camera and reached in my coat pocket for one of the three rolls of film I had put there before leaving the hotel that morning. My pocket was empty.

"Somebody's swiped my film," I muttered, then remembered I had left two more rolls in a Pan American flight bag on the bus. Rushing to the bus, I unzipped the bag only to find the two rolls (which had never left that bag since New York) were also missing though lenses worth several hundred dollars were undisturbed. This all happened within 10 minutes after the MVD man checking unreliable workers thought I had snapped him in action. This is an area in which the Soviets are especially sensitive, and they can move fast when one of their own secret agents is concerned.

Knowing I was in danger of losing the remainder of my film supply or having it all fogged, if not in worse trouble, I at once loudly and publicly protested to Nixon's

assistant and the AP and UPI reporters, saying the story that nobody steals in the U.S.S.R. is all propaganda. Though I had previously believed it. Then I sat down to lunch.

PROTESTS USELESS

Georgi Bolshakov, former Tass bureau chief in Washington, came over and asked me what was the matter. I told him. I also told him that I knew very well nothing is stolen in Russia except on purpose, certainly not simultaneously from pocket and flight bag. I said I thought I knew why it was gathered up but truthfully denied that I took the MVD agent's picture.

"Perhaps you left it in your room," Georgi suggested helpfully. He had no immediate ideas about the two rolls that disappeared from the bus, however.

On the long ride back to the city our press bus was under strict orders not to stop. But there's a common humanity that defies rules, and at the urgent request of some passengers we did halt momentarily by a thicket of trees in the Siberian forest, almost exactly on the watershed that divides Europe and Asia.

FILM PASSED

Screened by foliage and 1,000 feet from the nearest Russian "guide," I swiftly passed the finished film from my camera to another American we shall call Jones. I didn't want to lose it, too, and sooner or later they'd discover it was the one they wanted, not my unused cartons.

Rushing to my room, I unlocked the door, and there on the bed were three rolls of film, apparently unopened. Perhaps I had forgotten to tuck them in my coat pocket when I left hurriedly. Maybe some of my American friends did help themselves to the two rolls on the bus.

I saw my Tass friend and thanked him for his quick work, saying I was willing to forget about the other two, as I might have been mistaken.

Two days later we returned to Moscow. There, some time during the night, two somewhat battered boxes of film turned up in the Pan American flight bag under my hotel bed.

My friend Jones was somewhat cold. He informed me that while in Sverdlovsk someone had stolen all the color film in his hotel room, but missed my exposed roll in his pocket.

HOW RUSSIANS HOPED I WOULD SEE IT

There is just as much freedom for visiting foreigners in the U.S.S.R. as anywhere else; amateur and news photography is permitted anywhere except in specific closed defense areas, for the Soviet people have nothing to hide.

In Sverdlovsk, as in some U.S. defense areas, guests are asked not to make photographs, but nobody seizes visitors' cameras as they do in America. They simply trust the guests not to take pictures inside the pipe foundry (the dumb Russians being unaware that it is at least 50 years behind the times and one couldn't care less about copying it).

While many Soviet workers crowded around to see the American visitor, they were not ordered to do so. Some were so little interested they simply stood apart talking among themselves and didn't particularly care about getting pushed around in the crowd just to say they had seen Vice President Nixon. After all, they were free to do as they liked on their guaranteed lunch hour, with pay.

SLANDEROUS LIE

Eager to find some evidence that would prove the slanderous lie written by American journalists that the loyal Soviet workers introduced to Nixon were selected "plants" primed with party-line questions, one of the visitors quit watching Nixon to snoop around behind the scenes.

The American journalist (who is not even a photographer, but has taken far too many pictures in the hope of discrediting Soviet progress) attempted to secretly photograph a plant security guard.

Ignorantly assuming that the security guard could not understand him the American cursed obscenely in English.

He used up his film and had forgotten to bring any more, having left it on his hotel bed while dressing. The Americans think they are very efficient, but they are not.

Instead of blaming himself, he at once sought to impugn the honesty of hardworking Soviet workers, who never steal anything because they have everything they need.

COLLEAGUES BLAMED

If anything was lost from the bag on the bus it was, after all, full of Americans (including many with 35-millimeter cameras who were running out of color film and begging it from their colleagues). They could have borrowed it even while the bus was under guard and nobody else allowed aboard. When the bus returns to the Bolshoi Ural Hotel, there will be the other three rolls, right where the journalist left them.

Not content to spread his fantasies and lies in the reactionary Los Angeles Times, he tried to spread them to the U.S. wire services and poison the good impression Vice President Nixon had received of Soviet hospitality and desire for peace and friendship with the United States.

WANTED TO BE HELPFUL

As a former Washington colleague and despite the allegation of many Americans that all Tass correspondents are spies and informers, Mr. Bolshakov merely wanted to be helpful when he saw the journalist in distress. He seemed tired, and Mr. Bolshakov diplomatically suggested that perhaps he planned to put the film in his pocket but never actually did so. At any rate, he said he would do what he could to help locate the missing film.

By now suffering hallucinations of persecution brought on by a guilt complex, the American journalist attempted to pass his film to another of his countrymen. This ruse did not accomplish anything since the Soviet authorities were not interested in the slightest in his fumbling amateur photographic efforts. The bus had been ordered to hurry back to the hotel so as to permit the correspondents time to file freely and without delay, as the Soviet authorities promised, and at the request of the Americans themselves, who were in a hurry to return.

Rushing to his room, he unlocked the door, and there, on the bed, were three rolls of film, quite untouched. They were just as he left them when he left hurriedly, and, as for the other two, either they were taken by other Americans or never existed.

JOURNALIST'S SNEERS

The American journalist apologized to his Soviet colleague but was unable to restrain himself from sneering about the two films stolen by his countrymen.

Upon returning to Moscow, where the American group had ample stocks of all kinds of U.S. film, the person who borrowed the two rolls on the bus returned them secretly to avoid embarrassment.

Clearly, this was nothing more than a coincidence, certainly not proof that thievery exists in the U.S.S.R., since none of the other Americans lost any film.

I may never know for certain which of the above versions is true. For one thing, the film has not been processed to see if anything is on it or if it has been fogged by X-rays, a favorite Soviet device. Even if it isn't, what does it prove? That one's imagination runs wild in the U.S.S.R.? Or that big brother is always watching you?

ASIAN-WESTERN CLASH AGE-OLD

(By Robert Hartmann)

WASHINGTON, August 20.—Ivan Ivanovitch is supposed to be the Russian counterpart of John Smith, just the plain ordinary guy who typifies his country regardless of passing regimes.

But there is a vast gulf between Ivan and his American and European brothers which romanticists—some in high places—seem to ignore when they say what we must do is reach the real Russian people in spite of their wicked government.

Ivan Ivanovitch, though he may be Tovarish (Comrade) Ivan today, is no less a product of Russia and Asia than John Smith, perhaps unknowingly, is the heir of Athenian philosophers, Semitic prophets, Viking pirates, Roman legionaries, Davy Crockett, and the Barons of Runnymede. Unfortunately, Asia (except for its peninsulas) is not as well known as Latin America to most American students.

The big conflict in the world today goes far deeper than communism versus capitalism or freedom versus regimentation. It is not a new conflict at all but a very old one magnified to global dimensions.

AGE-OLD BATTLE

It is the age-old battle of the land people against the sea people.

The land people have to scratch harder for existence than those who can, at least part of the year, farm the sea. They become tougher, hungrier, more indifferent to human life. To survive, to plunder and to protect what they have, the land people tend to think and act collectively, to follow a strong leader like a herd of sheep.

Historically, the human masses of Central Asia are known as hordes, but until one is swept up in the crush of a few hundred garlic-soaked Russian laborers—all headed for a single doorway—he doesn't really get the picture of what Genghis Khan's golden horde must have been.

It is no accident that the present borders of the Communist world from the China Sea to the "gates of Vienna" are substantially those of the Mongol hordes' greatest expansion from their central Asian homelands. That was the best the land people have done in history, but Khrushchev is out to do better with mechanized, industrialized, nuclear-armed horde of his own.

INDIVIDUAL EFFORT

The sea people, on the other hand, have developed along continental coasts and offshore islands and from the beginning their ways have called for individual and small group effort. Seafaring in tiny vessels and hunting with crude weapons cannot be done by a horde. The sea people have also lived by commerce and/or sea raiding, both of which contribute to cross-breeding of ideas, tools, cultures, and techniques. NATO is the current name for the community of the sea people just as communism designates the new horde.

Since the sea civilizes and invigorates human communities, the technically superior sea-people (except while fighting among themselves) have not been seriously threatened by the land-people since the Middle Ages produced spectacular advances in weaponry. The horde, however, has an effective defensive capability which has resisted and exhausted successive attacks on the land-people of Russia and China, though at fearful cost. As late as World War II and Korea the tactics of Communist armies were essentially those of the horde, augmented by tanks and artillery.

LATEST ATTEMPT

Communism as it works today in the U.S.S.R. shares little except its name with the economic analysis of history written by a German-Jewish atheist living in London 100 years ago. It is nothing more than the

latest and most systematic of many attempts by a ruthless and intelligent elite to hold the lid down on the surging masses of Asia, to organize and control the horde and direct its irresistible force toward global conquest.

Soviet communism differs from the rules of the Tartar Khans and the Russian Czars only in thoroughness; instead of depending primarily on terror and fear it seeks to penetrate and change the very minds of members of the horde so they will become manageable without losing their mass power.

Soviet communism disdains the dilettante efforts of Peter the Great and his successors, who wanted to be Europeans in architecture, court manners, and power politics. It aims to organize Asia with the industrial and military know-how of America. From this synthesis will come a unique new order, the Soviet society, to dominate the world.

This is what Khrushchev means, and what the Russian workers in Siberia mean when they cry, "Mir y mira" (peace to the world), and boast of Soviet cultural achievements. Their peace is like the peace of Islam—non-resistance to the will of the all-powerful (not Allah, but the Kremlin). Theirs is not the culture of the Acropolis, the Louvre, or Hollywood Bowl, but something akin to Herr Goebbels' "Kultur," in which the basic ingredient is not genius but conformity.

GRAVE ERROR

It would be a grave error to underestimate this latest surge of the silent, long-isolated land people, for Communist planners know the history of Asia far better than we and have studied the weaknesses of the sea people which they believe will lead to our undoing.

The individuality and free will instilled in the small boats, family cottages, and forest hideaways of the sea people from prehistoric times are to their mass-conditioned minds, evidence of undisciplined weakness. What we call liberty they regard as anarchy, and because of their isolation from the realities of the Western World, they see this as fatal disunity both within and among the free nations.

Khrushchev and his top associates cannot ignore the evidence of the recent past that free peoples and free alliances are capable of determined and united action in time of war. But they believe we are incapable of acting beyond individual self-interest in the absence of immediate and obvious peril. This is the key to the current peaceful coexistence campaign which will, like the cynical Ribbentrop-Molotov nonaggression pact which Khrushchev recently defended, give the Soviet Union more time to become both invulnerable and invincible.

TWO-STAGE PROGRAM

The Communist method of managing the horde is a two-stage program. The first step is "crowd control," which has been perfected to an amazing degree in the U.S.S.R. The second is "thought control," and the apparent relaxation since Stalin's death indicates that this much subtler and more sinister method of disciplining the mind rather than the body is being gradually substituted for sheer terror and police power. At the present stage both methods are used, but in such insulated and uncontaminated areas as Siberia, thought control is much more relied upon than in European Russia and the minority areas to the south.

Crowd control involves the effective management of the unmanageable horde by compartmenting it and by reinforcing official surveillance by indoctrinating everyone to watch everyone else. Thus Soviet planners are pushing their mass housing program

with high priority everywhere; not only to satisfy the people with more modern and sanitary accommodations, but also to collect them in easily controlled increments. Collective farms, collective apartment houses with common bathrooms, kitchens, and restaurants, collective recreational facilities, collective educational and scientific institutions discourage individual thought and attempts to differ from acceptable group behavior.

When this reporter was in Russia 4 years ago he never saw as many as a dozen people idly assembled in public. They were always working, going somewhere, sitting in pairs in well-lighted parks, or attending scheduled events such as athletic meets or theater performances. The main idea seemed to keep moving.

MORE FREEDOM

This time there was more seemingly spontaneous and informal gathering, partly because of the balmy summer weather, but also because the ordinary Russian does feel more freedom and is less fearful of chance conversations or overhead complaints.

But with large assemblies the science of crowd control is still very much in evidence. For each of Vice President Nixon's appearances, the numbers of cheering Russians were carefully regulated in advance—as they are for all visiting dignitaries and for Khrushchev's own public appearances. This is done in part to achieve the precise degree of welcome desired, and also because of the ever-present fear that too large a crowd will become unmanageable. (In Warsaw, the same technique was attempted, but didn't work.) This, rather than a sly effort to sabotage, probably accounts for the Soviet authorities limiting attendance at the American exhibition to 50,000 per day. Even at this rate, there is danger of the displays being slowly carried away by the human anthill hungering for knowledge and novelty.

READ DISPATCHES

The nearly 100 Western newsmen accompanying the Nixons provided the Soviet authorities with a day-by-day consensus of the success or failure of their efforts to create the desired crowd reaction. If they did not censor our dispatches, they certainly read them carefully and reacted swiftly.

On July 27 in Leningrad, our 5th day in the U.S.S.R., most American correspondents reached that breaking point of exasperation which comes to all first-time visitors. Their cables home were full of angry accounts of frustration and Soviet inefficiency. In 24 hours, from the time the party landed at Novosibirsk, everything suddenly took a turn for the better. Press buses were waiting, hotel assignments were prearranged, telegraphic facilities were on all-night standby a block away, food was good, refreshments were lavishly provided, there was even a pressing and shoe-shining service "while you wait" at a tiny Siberian hotel where such a crew of Americans had never been seen before.

Similarly, when news stories sent to the United States the following day complained that Soviet journalists and "loyal workers" were crowding so close around Nixon, assisted by his MVD security guards, that American newsmen couldn't get within earshot, we were astonished the next day to find manhandling MVD agents smilingly stepping back to let us walk alongside the Vice President while they held the Russians back.

There was even a "spontaneous public demonstration" in the central square of Novosibirsk in which the press bus was mobbed by several thousand Russians to show how welcome was the free American press.

Can We Set "Safe" Tolerances for Cancer-Inducing Agents?—Comments by Dr. Harold F. Blum of National Cancer Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the Senate, on a routine call of the calendar, and without a record vote, passed a far-reaching bill on the use of coal-tar colors and other coloring substances in and on food. It is S. 2197, the proposed Color Additives Amendments of 1959, to authorize the establishment by the Food and Drug Administration of safe tolerances for coal-tar or other coloring substances which are not harmless under the terms of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938.

Demands for such legislation have been increasing among food manufacturers as a result of a combination of court decisions on the one hand and of new testing techniques which now disclose that a number of coal-tar colors used for years under the impression they were harmless no longer can meet that requirement.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has urged enactment of legislation such as contained in S. 2197, and experts from the Food and Drug Administration, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and representatives of the food and chemical industries sat down to draft mutually acceptable amendments to the bill as originally introduced. I am informed no hearings were held on this legislation, however. Now that it has passed the Senate, I understand efforts are being made in behalf of the food and chemical industries to have it scheduled for early action by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

CONGRESS NEEDS TO BE INFORMED ON TECHNICAL MATTERS INVOLVED

Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that all of us who are interested in the issues this legislation presents should inform ourselves on the details of this legislation. I am reminded that only last March we had a prolonged debate and rollcall vote on special legislation on the use of an other-than-"harmless" coal-tar color, Citrus Red No. 2, on the skin of oranges. Many of us had strong misgivings about the authorized use on a food product of a coloring substance which is not harmless, even though we were assured it is safe in the manner and in the volume used on oranges.

Mr. Speaker, although I took an active role in the legislative drive which led to the Food Additives Act in the last Congress, and although I spoke on and voted against the Citrus Red No. 2 bill we

passed in March, I am the first to acknowledge that I am not a scientist, not a chemist, not a physiologist—and that on these complex technical issues we who are not scientists must weigh and balance the conflicting views and statements of people who do have technical competence.

I am always trying to find reliable scientific information in this field of food chemistry but the difficulty is to be able to understand it when it is available. In this connection, a good friend of mine from St. Louis recently suggested that I look into the studies of a physiologist of the National Cancer Institute who had, she said, published an outstanding paper on the cumulative effects of certain carcinogens.

For the information of the Members, Mr. Speaker, I now include as part of my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the letter which I wrote to Dr. Harold F. Blum of the U.S. Public Health Service's National Cancer Institute and his reply, both of which are self-explanatory and, in the case of Dr. Blum's letter, well worth reading, I believe:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 17, 1959.

Dr. HAROLD F. BLUM,
National Cancer Institute, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md.

DEAR DR. BLUM: A friend of mine in St. Louis, who is a very active member of the St. Louis Consumer Federation, has written me that she thinks your article in the June issue of *American Scientist* is the best answer to the question of whether tolerances should be set for coal tar colors in foodstuffs. She warned me, however, that the article is very technical.

Could I have a brief statement in as non-technical language as possible on the dangers of allowing continued use in or on food—of even very low amounts—of coal tar colors found not in fact to be "harmless." I am interested in this from the standpoint of overall color legislation and such special bills as the one to permit continued use of Yellow 3 and 4 in butter, etc.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEONOR K. (Mrs. John B.) SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress, Third District of Missouri.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
Bethesda, Md., August 25, 1959.

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: This is in answer to your letter of August 17, in which you refer to my article in the June issue of *American Scientist*, and its bearing on the question of tolerance for coal tar colors in foodstuffs with regard to cancer.

The article (Quantitative aspects of cancer induction and growth; as illustrated in carcinogenesis by ultraviolet light) is based on experimental studies of cancer caused in mice by repeated doses of ultraviolet light. It permits certain conclusions to be drawn regarding the origin and growth of cancers induced in this way. Since comparable studies have not been made using coal tar derivatives or other substances as cancer inducing agents, I cannot say with complete certainty that the same conclusions apply. But what evidence exists, suggests that continued dosage with such agents produce similar results, and I think that until fur-

ther evidence is forthcoming we are justified in assuming the cases to be parallel.

If this point of view is adopted, cancer induction is to be regarded as a cumulative process which begins with the first dose of the cancer-inducing agent. Whether the cancer will reach detectable size within the lifetime of the animal in which it is induced, must depend upon how fast the cancer grows. Thus, a cancer induced by a single or a few doses of the agent may grow so slowly that it will never be detected, and of course will not seriously affect the animal. If the dosage is continued, however, cancer growth will speed up, and the cancer will reach detectable size before the animal dies. In the case of cancer induced by the more effective chemical agents, a single dose, if large enough, will result in a detectable cancer; but we do not have adequate knowledge of the effect of repeated small doses.

It is probable that there is a "threshold dose" for every cancer inducing agent, that is, a minimum dose below which no cancer is produced; but you can see that it would be very difficult to determine such a threshold if it exists. All one could hope to say would be that a given small dose did not produce cancers in a given kind of animal—say the mouse—within the lifetime of that animal. But one would be without any basis for assuming that this minimum dose applied to any other kind of animal—say man. Thus I cannot see how we have any sound basis for assigning tolerance doses or tolerance levels for cancer-inducing agents. I think this must be the case, whether or not the agent in question produces results exactly comparable to those produced by ultraviolet light.

Viewed in this way it would seem that the only practical answer would be to keep any substances known to induce, or suspected of inducing cancer at as low levels as feasible. The assigning of tolerance limits—which must necessarily be arbitrary—can only give a false sense of security.

I must point out again that these conclusions are, for the most part, based on studies of an agent other than those to which you refer specifically in your letter, and hence may not be completely justified. But until experimental studies have shown that similar relationships do not hold for chemical substances of the kind in which you are interested, I think one is justified in assuming that they do.

I hope that this brief statement will have made my point of view clear. The details of the argument, summed up only briefly in the article you mention, are too technical to present in short space. What I have said here, follows, I think, the experimental data, without bringing in theoretical points that might be more open to question.

I hope that this brief discussion will have answered your questions satisfactorily, but if there are points which I can help to clarify further, I shall be pleased to in so far as I am able.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD F. BLUM,
Physiologist, National Cancer Institute.

Report on the U.S.S.R.—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am sub-

mitting for inclusion in the RECORD the concluding two articles of a series of eight articles which appeared recently in the *Los Angeles Times* written by Mr. Robert T. Hartmann, chief of the *Los Angeles Times* Washington Bureau. Mr. Hartmann accompanied Vice President Nixon on his recent tour of the U.S.S.R. and Poland.

The articles follow:

KHRUSHCHEV HAS LIMITED HORIZON

(By Robert T. Hartmann)

WASHINGTON, August 22.—Nikita Khrushchev, Chairman of the Presidium of the U.S.S.R. and first secretary of the Communist Party, has good reason to feel he is riding the wave of the future.

He got his invitation to the United States, for which he has been angling since his London visit with Marshal Bulganin (what-ever became of him?) in 1955, and he is going to get his second summit meeting after outliving the late John Foster Dulles, who thought the first one a bad mistake.

At 64, his tanned, robust appearance belies rumors of ill health. I watched him drink toasts in vodka, whisky, and California champagne, but he showed no signs of the babbling alcoholic part he once played. Vice President Nixon found him sufficiently blunt and outspoken while cold sober, and less impetuous than many observers suppose.

HAS SEEN BOOM

Khrushchev has seen his country boom, as all backward societies boom at the point in their industrialization when making machines to make machines begins to give way to making machines to make useful products. He takes the credit for it, being a superb politician, and in return appears to have won a measure of real popularity with the Russian people which Stalin never sought or got.

Now he is going to see the United States—including Los Angeles—since he discussed his itinerary with a prominent southern Californian—and he is going to be President Eisenhower's host in the Kremlin. What will this momentous exchange accomplish, and why was it agreed to so suddenly?

TO KEEP RUSS TALKING

In part, it is simply an effort to keep the Soviet Union talking instead of taking one-sided action over West Berlin. The Geneva foreign ministers' talks dribbled off to an inconclusive end, as everyone expected—especially Mr. K., who never intended to let Gromyko settle anything except the time of tomorrow's meeting. Moreover, the invitation is an attempt to impress Khrushchev—the real decision maker in all important matters affecting the Communist hemisphere—with the realities of American power as well as its peaceful intent.

President Eisenhower and his advisers evidently feel that the Mikoyan and Kozlov visits—especially the latter—did break down some Soviet misconceptions about the only nation in the world they regard as really a rival.

But in the consensus of many Americans who have watched Khrushchev closely in his swift consolidation of Stalin's power there is only a very, very long chance of making a very, very small dent in his diametrically different mind.

TRUE BELIEVER

Khrushchev is not using communism as a means to power, as did Lenin, or for the cynical perpetuation of personal despotism, as Stalin did. He is a true believer in the system which brought him success but he is not a Marxist intellectual devoted to sterile dogma that cannot be altered. He has already made sweeping reforms in decentralization of bureaucracy and in agricultural planning. He has a practical peasant's

shrewdness and limited horizon. He is quick-witted and extroverted, but utterly without a sense of sportsmanship or compassion.

Most Western visitors have been struck by Khrushchev's unbelievably inaccurate picture of the United States, though he is thoroughly aware of its industrial and military potential in a statistical way. He has, after all, one of history's most extensive intelligence networks; he is not above learning or asking advice from such close subordinates as Kozlov and Mikoyan, though probably his inner circle is quite limited.

UNAFFECTED BY TALK

Khrushchev is totally unaffected by "sweetness and light"—the kind of international small talk which has been President Eisenhower's long suit since World War II. There is not much evidence after Nixon's 11 hours of hot-and-heavy debate in public and private that he is any more affected by argument.

What he wants is a trade, in which he gets the best of it if he can. Nobody is likely to get anything from Khrushchev—which is to say from the Soviet Government—unless they give him something he wants. Pure self-interest, not in the vain personal sense that drove Nero and Hitler mad but the interest of his own and the world Communist goal (which must be identical in the fully conditioned Soviet man), is all that counts with Mr. K.

Quid pro quo, the direct trade by which all transactions between hostile camps must be made, is the only way to do business with Khrushchev.

BASES BIG ISSUE

What does he want the United States to give? The most frequently heard topic on the Nixon journey was American bases in foreign countries. "Why do you keep such bases if not to attack us?" the Vice President and every American with him was asked by everyone from Khrushchev down. The Premier, in fact, put it this simply: Anyone who favors bases wants war, anyone who is against bases (American bases, that is) is on the side of peace.

While the Captive Nations Week resolution also upset the Soviets, who seized upon it as a convenient needle for Nixon, Khrushchev is well aware that the United States is not going to liberate the Eastern European satellites by force. Hungary proved this fact and pretty well fixed the line between the two worlds, though the Communists are still pushing for something like the Rapacki plan (advanced by Poland's foreign minister) to pull back military forces on both sides of the borderline—which gets right back to the "U.S. bases must go" business.

AT BIG DISADVANTAGE

Nixon was at a severe disadvantage in his encounters with Khrushchev because it had been publicly announced in advance that he had no authority to negotiate and the President had privately opened negotiations on an exchange of top-level visits before Nixon arrived. The Vice President did give Khrushchev a preview of the kind of arguments to expect in America and took home a fair sample of the line the Soviet leader is likely to be peddling over here.

It can be reasonably assumed that neither man changed his mind much on any major East-West difference; both, however, probably modified their impressions of each other. An extra bonus was Nixon's opportunity to get some of his views across to the Soviet people via Khrushchev's own network and newspapers, but this was essentially a long-range and longshot endeavor.

FIRSTHAND LOOK

Khrushchev's firsthand look at the United States, in the judgment of those who helped counsel such a step, will be most effective if it convincingly demonstrates America's

will to stand firm for its principles and power positions. Khrushchev frankly doubts that such will exists and unfortunately there is much corroborating evidence in each day's Western newspapers. He is quite respectfully aware of U.S. power—of the NATO sword—but he doesn't think the flabby arm will ever be strong enough to wield it.

Nixon countered that view with straight talk which Khrushchev repeatedly objected to as "threats". But the Vice President deliberately made it clear the United States will not be pushed around and said both publicly and privately that no nation should ever be put in a position where it has no choice but to fight. He didn't use the word "Berlin," but it was understood.

On the other hand, the Vice President tried to assure Khrushchev that the United States has no designs on the U.S.S.R. itself; no plan to liberate adjacent Communist-dominated areas by force. He tried to appeal over his head for more consumer goods for the Soviet people and a sort of Russia-for-the-Russians development under communism if that's how they want it. Such an appeal runs directly counter to the dynamic nature of doctrinaire communism, but there is a bare chance that Mr. Khrushchev might settle for a century of internal development if actually convinced the alternative is nuclear devastation without a moment's moral hesitation and regardless of reprisal.

COEXISTENCE ISN'T ANSWER

(By Robert T. Hartmann)

WASHINGTON, August 22.—Despite the apparent thawing of the cold war beginning in 1955 and climaxed by Vice President Nixon's ice-breaking mission to Moscow and the forthcoming Eisenhower-Khrushchev visits, the United States and the Soviet Union are still the polar centers of two completely different worlds.

In seven preceding articles this reporter has not attempted to detail the superficial contrasts between Communist life and what we call western civilization. Instead he has tried to show the deep and fundamental gulf between the mentality of the human horde—the land people of Central Asia—and the individualistic sea people who up to this time has dominated the world.

This prehistoric difference, amounting almost to a division of species, is obscured by such surface affinities as similarity of clothing and skin color, by words which in translation appear to express the same concepts and by the deliberate efforts of the Russian Communists to pattern their productive plant and material achievement after those of America.

HASN'T PROVED SUCCESS

The Soviet system of managing the mass manpower of Asia has not yet proved a total success; in four decades, however, it has achieved such impressive and visible results as to intrigue kindred land people seeking a shortcut to economic equality with the sea people, some of whom have been their masters. This is why Moscow impresses the unending stream of delegates and students from Asia and Africa far more than it does a sophisticated European or American tourist. It makes Lenin's prophecy that "the road to Paris runs through Peking" take on new and fearful meaning.

When this all-pervading difference of thought, tradition, aim, and action is understood—even half-appreciated—many questions as to why the Soviet Union behaves as it does answer themselves. It explains the almost insurmountable barrier to even the most elementary communication which exists between the inhabitants of the two worlds from the humblest level all the way to the summit. The summit itself embraces quite opposite ideas of political power

vested in a constitutional president or prime minister and a Soviet boss.

Yet, we do live on one and the same planet and must therefore answer the ultimate question: Is it large enough for both of us?

It would be a neat and comforting conclusion to be able to answer this question with certainty. The Communists, who have an absolute answer for everything, have already composed theirs. Our planet—and perhaps other planets eventually—will one day be organized into a single Soviet society. In the meantime, until the inevitability of Socialist truth is everywhere recognized, a period of peaceful coexistence may be required.

In short and simple English this means "it's us or you and it's going to be us." The only possible response to it is the same resolution.

ONE OR OTHER

Either the free way of life will encompass the earth or there will be no life left on earth to worry about. When jets fly non-stop from New York to Moscow as we did in less than 9 hours this is just as true as Lincoln's declaration about a "house divided" was on the eve of the American Civil War.

In this reporter's opinion, there is only one line to take toward the Soviet Union, as the guiding center of an historic upsurge of hordes of land people which has communism as its current name. We must either lick them or join them. Coexistence is at best an interim truce and never a solution. Khrushchev & Co. know this, but do we?

We must lick them, without war if possible, exactly as they are determined to lick us without war if possible, but lick us in any case.

MUST UNDERSTAND PROBLEM

How do we go about this? First of all, we need to understand what we are up against. Let me be the first to confess that when it was announced Vice President Nixon was going to Novosibirsk and Sverdlovsk I—and I am sure many of my colleagues who write important foreign policy news daily from Washington—had to look on a map to locate these places. Yet both are cities of more than 750,000 people, laboring mightily to build a new society on the ruins of ours.

There has been much talk recently about foreign languages—Russian is being introduced in a few more U.S. high schools and colleges. But the U.S.S.R. is turning out thousands of students annually trained to speak English—and Urdu and Indonesian and Spanish and Arabic and Zwahili and Japanese.

NOT PREPARED

Americans are not only colossal ignorant of Russia. They are not properly prepared to uphold their own way of life and to preach it to others. Every Communist gets this militant indoctrination from childhood. The newsmen in Nixon's party found themselves unofficial defenders of the faith of free men in almost every conversation with Soviet citizens. But the right words at first were hard to find, since these concepts are taken so much for granted by all of us and, fundamentally, throughout most of the world we know.

We must make a massive effort to leaven Soviet society with at least a touch of the spirit of free inquiry in the hope that someday it will leaven the whole lump. It may not, but we must believe in the triumph of human intelligence as thoroughly as the Communist mass managers believe in the triumph of Pavlovian psychology.

PREPARE INTELLECTUALLY

There isn't any other choice but to prepare ourselves intellectually as well as militarily for years and decades and perhaps even centuries of tough conflict and compe-

tion with these vigorous people who are resolved to bury us. Our aim must not be to bury them but to raise them from their living graves.

Americans who travel to Russia or anywhere else where the battle may be joined must know what they are talking about, must know what to say, must never yield a foot of ground to the superbly prepared Communist or Communist-influenced adversary. We have been sending too many patates with U.S. passports to see the Kremlin.

In the U.S.S.R., it's plain that the war on men's minds has as high a priority as intercontinental missiles; indeed, the missiles' primary purpose may be their effect on our minds rather than upon our cities. The Communists never send a soldier into the idea war without thorough training and full equipment, while we are still mustering minutemen to return their fire with muskets.

As Nixon demonstrated effectively, it is not enough merely to answer the kind of questions which are fired as bullets—not to elicit information but to destroy. Americans must return fire without falling back, must counterattack with even more devastating questions about the new order of Communist conformity. There are channels of "scuttlebutt" and word-of-mouth transmission throughout the Soviet empire by which some of these questions will be relayed.

All of this is more easily said than done, to be sure. But having seen a little of it done by our Vice President, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, Admiral Rickover, and most of the other Americans who invaded Siberia for a few days, I know it can be done and must be done.

Mr. Khrushchev doesn't think we care that much. He could be right.

Congress Sideswipes the Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in *Business Week* of August 22, 1959, entitled "Congress Sideswipes the Treasury."

This is as clear a statement of the political aspects of the fiscal fiasco into which the leaders of the 86th Congress have permitted the relatively simple question of interest ceilings for Federal bonds to fall as I have read. The leaders of this Democratic controlled Congress should take heed and take corrective action before more damage is done to the fiscal integrity of the Federal Government.

The article follows:

CONGRESS SIDESWIPES THE TREASURY

The House Ways and Means Committee has turned down, for this session at least, the administration's request to lift the interest rate ceiling on sales of new Treasury

This move came after the committee had passed a compromise bill that would have given the Treasury what it wanted. The trouble was that Congress would not accept the compromise. A large group of congressmen—in both the Senate and the House—are critical of the Federal Reserve Board and its Chairman, William McO. Martin. They balked at passing a bill that did not contain some sort of stricture on the Fed; unable to get their way, they worked to have the bill shelved.

This hurts the Treasury more than it does the Fed. For with the Fed pursuing a tight credit policy, outstanding Government issues are selling to yield well above the 4½-percent ceiling on interest on bonds. If it must confine itself to selling short-term securities, the Treasury will not only force up interest rates but create a potentially inflationary situation.

Congress refusal to act emphasizes the Treasury's subordination to the Fed—rather than giving it greater flexibility and independence. As long as their hands are tied by the ceiling, the debt managers lack the freedom possessed by the money managers.

Thus, the Treasury has become the unwitting and unhappy victim of Congress pique with the Fed. This is the worst kind of politics, because the end result is tighter money and higher interest rates than ever. The Fed can feel justified in going to an even more restrictive policy on the grounds that demand for short-term funds will now be stronger than ever; and the Treasury has no other choice than to float short-term issues. At the same time, investors in U.S. savings bonds are likely to cash them in if short-term rates rise above long-term rates.

There is no doubt that Martin's stubborn attitude has a great deal to do with creating the impasse. But he feels, understandably, that the independence of the Fed is threatened. And he has made one telling point. He has challenged his critics in Congress to make clear the kind of directives that they want the Fed to abide by and proposed that these should be offered as an amendment to the Federal Reserve Act, thus giving Congress as a whole a chance to vote directly on the issue. This would not involve the Treasury but would be a separate fight.

Martin's critics, however, have not taken this challenge. Instead, they have vented their displeasure by turning down the Treasury.

Congress should reconsider the whole problem. Most Congressmen favor giving the Treasury greater flexibility, and should do so. If the attitude of the Fed, which is an agent of Congress, is not all it should be, then Congress can address itself to this problem separately. But for Congress to penalize the Treasury because it is displeased with the Fed is neither politically wise nor economically sound.

Now more than ever, the Nation needs a searching review and reappraisal of our fiscal and monetary system. In the meantime, Congress should consider a minimum program, one that would help the Treasury rather than hurt it.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting re-

ports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]
Vice President, Richard Nixon

Alken, George D., *Vt.*-----Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*-----Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., 6 Wesley Circle
N. Mex.
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*-----
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md.*-----
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*-----
Bible, Alan, *Nev.*-----
Bridges, Styles, *N. H.*-----
Bush, Prescott, *Conn.*-----
Butler, John Marshall, *Md.*-----
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va.*-----The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va.*-----
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev.*-----
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind.*-----The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.*-----Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo.*-----
Case, Clifford P., *N. J.*-----
Case, Francis, *S. Dak.*-----4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex.*-----2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*-----
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa.*-----
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky.*-----
Cotton, Norris, *N. H.*-----
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*-----
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*-----
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn.*-----
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill.*-----
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*-----
Eastland, James O., *Miss.*-----5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La.*-----
Engle, Clair, *Calif.*-----3840 Lorcom Lane,
Arlington, Va.

Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C.*-----
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*-----
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del.*-----
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark.*-----
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz.*-----
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*-----
Green, Theodore Francis, University Club
R. I.
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*-----
Hart, Philip A., *Mich.*-----
Hartke, Vance, *Ind.*-----
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*-----
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr.,
Mo.
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., 5511 Cedar Park-
Iowa-----way, Chevy Chase,
Md.

Hill, Lister, *Ala.*-----
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.*-----Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*-----
Humphrey, Hubert H.,
Minn.
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*-----
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y.*-----
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex.*-----
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C.*-----
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C.*-----
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y.*-----3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn.*-----4929 Hillbrook
Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass.*-----
Kerr, Robert S., *Okl.*-----
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*-----
Langer, William N., *Dak.*-----2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*-----
Long, Oren E., *Hawaii*-----
Long, Russell B., *La.*-----
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*-----2930 Chesapeake
St.

McClellan, John L., *Ark.*-----
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo.*-----
McNamara, Pat, *Mich.*-----
Magnuson, Warren G., The Shoreham
Wash.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*-----
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*-----4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike,
Okl.
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.*-----4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thurston B., *Ky.*-----
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*-----
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak.*-----122 Schotts
Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont.*-----The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*-----
Neuberger, Richard L.,
Oreg.
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., Sheraton-Park
Wyo.

Pastore, John O., *R. I.*-----
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*-----
Proxmire, William, *Wis.*-----
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va.*-----
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va.*-----
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*-----
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass.*-----2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoepfel, Andrew F.,
Kans.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*-----
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*-----
Smith, Margaret Chase
(Mrs.), *Maine*.
Sparkman, John, *Ala.*-----4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss.*-----
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*-----
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga.*-----
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C.*-----
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis.*-----2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr.,
N. J.
Williams, John J., *Del.*-----
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex.*-----
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak.*-----Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Oio.*-----

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman),
Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington,
Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon,
Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin,
and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of
South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Hum-
phrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan,
Young of Ohio, Hart, Alken, Young of
North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams
of Delaware, and Schoepfel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell,
Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson,
Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of
Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible,
Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges,
Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt,
Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel,
Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Vir-
ginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington,
Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett,
Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith,
Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and
Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright,
Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire,
Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey,
Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and
Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear,
Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and
Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr,
Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas,
Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams
of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Cotton,
and Curtis.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green,
Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse,
Long, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley,
Hickenlooper, Langer, Alken, Capehart, and
Carlson.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson,
Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt,
Curtis, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson,
Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Car-

roll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Dworshak,
Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, and Martin.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore,
Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche,
Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee,
Schoepfel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey,
Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver,
Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, Mc-
Clellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd,
Hart, Wiley, Langer, Dirksen, Hruska, and
Keating.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy,
McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Ran-
dolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater,
Cooper, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits,
and Prouty.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chair-
man), Monroney, Neuberger, Yarborough,
Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Langer, and Morton.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNa-
mara, Neuberger, Randolph, McCarthy,
Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Case of
South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, and
Prouty.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden,
Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis,
Morton, and Keating.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel
Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St.,
Alexandria, Va.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts,
3018 Dumbarton Ave.

Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852
Hutchins Pl.

Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut
Ave.

Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037
Dumbarton Ave.

Mr. Justice Whitaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van
Ness St.

Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 3013 Q St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey
Ave. SE.

Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823
Reservoir Rd.

Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St.
Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.

Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.

Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.

Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice

Warren. *District of Columbia.*

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frank-

furter. *Maine, Massachusetts, New Hamp-*

shire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan.

Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan.

Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin

Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice

Warren. *Maryland, North Carolina, South*

Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black.

Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia,

Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart.

Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark.

Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whit-

taker. *Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri,*

Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas.

Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana,

Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whit-

taker. *Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Okla-*

homa, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Nationwide Demand To Limit Postal Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I introduced H.R. 8433, a bill to place an annual limitation on publishers' second-class mail subsidies. The bill has since been introduced by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] as H.R. 8603 and is cosponsored in the Senate by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER] as S. 2536.

The purpose of this measure is to require that the annual postage paid by second-class publications be equal to the Post Office Department's annual cost of handling, processing, transporting, and delivering of the publication to its mail subscribers, subject to a 5-year sliding-scale subsidy limitation formula. A maximum \$5 million subsidy per publication would be permitted during the first year of operation, a \$3 million subsidy the second year, a \$1 million subsidy the third year, a \$500,000 subsidy the fourth year, and during the fifth year and thereafter a maximum \$100,000 a year subsidy per publication.

As I explained in my introductory remarks—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 28, 1959, pages 13275-13279—profitmaking newspapers and magazines are now incurring an annual postal deficit of more than \$200 million. The administration proposes to reduce the size of the tremendous postal deficit, estimated at close to \$500 million for fiscal 1960, by raising first-class mail from 4 to 5 cents an ounce, despite the fact that this type of mail is more than paying its own way. If the Post Office Department is genuinely concerned with reducing the postal deficit, it will support our bill and submit a favorable report to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee so that hearings may be held early in the next session.

Mr. Speaker, since the introduction of H.R. 8433, I have been overwhelmed by mail from all parts of the country in support of postal subsidy limitation legislation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a representative group of news stories, editorials, and mail support for this measure:

[From the Reading, Pa., Eagle, July 28, 1959]

RHODES BILL WOULD CUT MAIL SUBSIDIES FOR PUBLICATIONS

WASHINGTON, July 28.—Representative GEORGE M. RHODES, Democrat of Pennsyl-

vania, proposed legislation today to cut postal subsidies to large newspapers and magazines. He said they now cost the taxpayers more than \$200 million a year.

Rhodes' bill, being introduced today, calls for a gradual reduction in subsidies over a 5-year period.

It would put a \$5 million limit the first year on the subsidy to any newspaper and magazine over and above the Post Office Department's cost of handling the publications.

The limit would drop to \$3 million the second year, \$1 million in the third, \$500,000 in the fourth, and \$100,000 in the fifth and all succeeding years.

Rhodes compared his proposal to limitations placed on soil bank payments and farm price support loans.

"These publications which benefit most from postal subsidy handouts have been extremely critical of the cotton, wheat, and other farm programs," he said in a statement. "Therefore, they cannot honestly and consistently oppose this legislation."

Rhodes cited Life Magazine as an example of the extent of subsidies to large publications using second class mail. He said post office figures showed that it cost the Department \$9,400,000 more to deliver the magazine than Life paid in second-class mail rates in 1956.

The House last year approved an amendment by Rhodes to limit second class mail subsidies to \$100,000 a year, but the Senate rejected it by a 57 to 33 vote.

The Pennsylvania Congressman said publishers objected then that the amendment would have too much of an immediate economic impact upon their businesses.

He contended that his new bill would overcome that objection through a gradual reduction in subsidies.

The Berks Democrat vigorously opposed the administration's request for another 1 cent increase in first-class mail, which he termed "an obvious attempt to hide the huge deficits resulting from subsidizing profit-making newspapers and magazines."

If the post office department is genuinely concerned with reducing the tremendous postal deficit, estimated at close to \$500 million for fiscal 1960, it will support this bill," Congressman Rhodes concluded.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, July 29, 1959]

BILL WOULD CUT POSTAL SUBSIDY TO PUBLICATIONS

WASHINGTON, July 28.—Representative GEORGE M. RHODES, Democrat, of Reading, Tuesday introduced legislation in the House to place a 5-year sliding-scale limitation on mail subsidies to large magazines and newspapers, which now cost taxpayers more than \$200 million a year.

Citing a Philadelphia Inquirer editorial of June 25, 1959, which urged an end to magazine subsidies by the Post Office Department, RHODES called for a limit of Government handouts to publishers.

Under the Rhodes bill each magazine and newspaper using second-class mail would be limited to a maximum subsidy of \$5 million in the first year over and above the Post Office Department's cost of handling and delivering the publication.

The maximum second-class mail subsidy would be \$3 million for each publication during the second year, \$1 million during the third year, \$500,000 during the fourth

year, and \$100,000 during the fifth year and each year thereafter.

When the subsidy limit is reached by any publication during any year, the full rate necessary to cover the Post Office Department's costs for that publication would go into effect.

Ten magazines listed by RHODES have received subsidies exceeding \$32 million in 1958. The largest was \$9,494,000 and the smallest \$1,130,000.

The Inquirer editorial labeled as unfortunate the Eisenhower administration's proposal to again raise first-class mail and air rates. The Inquirer also opposes subsidies to newspapers.

[From the Yuma (Ariz.) Daily Sun July 29, 1959]

THE EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK

(By Jones Osborn)

This business of subsidies is a touchy one in many quarters.

The last time I mentioned farm subsidies, I was told to give my attention to airline subsidies instead.

But there is one form of subsidy that can be discussed without treading on local toes:

The postal subsidy to large newspapers and magazines.

Congressman RHODES, a Democrat, from Pennsylvania, says postal subsidies are costing the taxpayers more than \$200 million a year.

RHODES cited Life magazine. He said postal accountants have figured that it costs Uncle Sam \$9 million more to deliver the magazine than Life paid in mail rates in 1956.

So RHODES yesterday introduced a bill calling for a gradual reduction in subsidies over a 5-year period.

The first year, his bill would limit the subsidy to any newspaper or magazine to \$5 million.

The second year, \$3 million. One million in the third year. A half-million the fourth year.

And from the fifth year on, no publication would be allowed more than a \$100,000 annual subsidy.

There's another side to this, of course. That is the wish of early Americans to disseminate information about this country's Government and affairs to all citizens, that they might govern themselves more intelligently. And so second-class postal rates for publications were kept low.

But I doubt if our early lawmakers ever expected to put \$5 million a year into anyone's pocket.

[From Editor and Publisher magazine, Aug. 1, 1959]

SUBSIDY ON SECOND-CLASS HIT

WASHINGTON.—A proposal to eliminate the subsidy on second-class mail through a 5-year sliding scale for increased rates has been made to Congress by Representative GEORGE M. RHODES, a former printer and labor union executive.

Mr. RHODES contends the larger magazines and newspapers enjoy a \$200 million gift from the taxpayers each year. He proposes that limitations be made on each publication to bring rates ultimately to the level of cost-of-service as determined by the Post Office Department. No publication would be carried in the first year for more than

\$5 million under the determined cost figure; the figure would drop to \$3 million, \$1 million, \$500,000, and \$100,000 in subsequent years. The full rate would apply to overage at each of these stages.

The House voted for the Rhodes "subsidy" reduction last year: \$100,000-a-year limit on any company's charges below cost-of-service. The Senate refused to concur.

Mr. RHODES contends increase in mass media and in travel and educational opportunity has obviated the basis on which subsidies were originally granted to printed matter. In any event, he told colleagues, publishers would pass the added costs on to subscribers instead of to the taxpayer public generally. The Pennsylvania Democrat has inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a tabulation showing costs of carrying certain second-class material, amounts paid to the Post Office Department, and losses allegedly sustained. All of the illustrations concern nationally circulated magazines.

[From the Lewiston (Mont.) Daily News, Aug. 2, 1959]

SAUCE FOR THE GANDER

Congressman GEORGE M. RHODES, of Pennsylvania, has proposed legislation to cut postal subsidies to large newspapers and magazines which he says now cost the taxpayers more than \$200 million a year.

The Rhodes bill would put a \$5 million limit the first year on mail subsidy to any publication over and beyond the Post Office Department's cost of handling. The limit would drop in succeeding years to \$100,000. We couldn't agree with Congressman RHODES more.

Some of the larger magazines in this country such as Life have been subsidized long enough. It is one thing for the post office to grant special rates to small weekly newspapers which are struggling to meet their costs and provide news and grassroots editorials to rural folk. It is something else to subsidize Life to the tune of millions annually when that publication is well able to pay its way.

Mr. RHODES in fact cites Life as a prime example. He points out that it cost the taxpayers \$9,400,000 in 1956 to help circulate this magazine giant.

Life has been extremely critical of the parity farm program and has consistently denounced Government payments to wheat farmers as handouts. But the so-called "handout" this powerful national magazine begrudges the farmers, it is more than willing to take for itself.

Here is but another dismal example of Government economy being a good thing for the other fellow.

The Rhodes bill deserves to be enacted into law, Life and Mr. Luce to the contrary notwithstanding.

[From Labor, Aug. 8, 1959]

TWO HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS IN HAND-OUTS—RENEW FIGHT TO CUT BIG SUBSIDIES TO MAGAZINES

A new drive to curb the huge mail subsidies enjoyed by big magazines and newspapers has been launched by Congressman GEORGE M. RHODES, Democrat, Pennsylvania. These subsidies exceeded \$200 million a year, RHODES told the House last week.

Life magazine alone gets a \$9.4 million yearly subsidy, RHODES said. That's based on the Post Office Department's latest estimate of how much the cost of delivering Life exceeds the second-class postage paid by the magazine.

RHODES cited the yearly cost of postal subsidies to some other big magazines as follows: Saturday Evening Post, \$6.1 million; Reader's Digest, \$4.8 million; Look, \$3.5 million; Ladies' Home Journal, \$1.9 million; Mc-

Call's, \$1.5 million; National Geographic, \$1.3 million; Good Housekeeping, \$1.3 million.

These figures date back several years, RHODES noted. Since then, he said, the magazines' circulations have increased, "thereby adding to the subsidy they receive."

RHODES introduced a bill providing that the mail subsidy received by any magazine or newspaper shall be gradually reduced to a \$100,000 yearly maximum. He noted that this would sharply cut the annual postal deficit.

In contrast, President Eisenhower has asked Congress to raise the postage from 4 cents to 5 cents on letter mail—which already more than pays its way. Ike's proposal, said RHODES, "is nothing more than an obvious attempt to hide the huge deficit resulting from subsidizing profit-making newspapers and magazines."

RHODES' bill was referred to the House Post Office Committee, where little action is expected. However, other ways may be found to bring the subject to the floor of Congress.

INCONSISTENCY CITED

Two years ago, a largely similar measure by RHODES passed the House. But it was then killed in the Senate, RHODES recalled, after "the magazine publishers' lobby conducted an intensive behind-the-scenes campaign against it."

RHODES noted also that the big magazines and newspapers have "carefully kept from their readers" information about their postal subsidies. Yet, he said, "these publications which benefit most from postal subsidy handouts have been extremely critical of the cotton, wheat and other farm programs."

"It is not easy," RHODES said, "to advocate the elimination of any subsidy, particularly one which affects the powerful newspaper and magazine industry. But the time has come, in fact it is long overdue, for Congress to show some courage."

[From the Publishers' Auxiliary, Chicago, Ill., Aug. 8, 1959]

RHODES ASKS END TO POST OFFICE SUBSIDIES

WASHINGTON.—That old song about you take the high road will be sung by the mass circulation magazines with some new lyrics if Representative GEORGE M. RHODES (Democrat, of Pennsylvania) has his way.

RHODES wants to take the subsidies for the large magazines and newspapers out of postal rates.

According to the new Rhodes bill, postal subsidies would be limited to large publications to \$100,000 a year after 4 years. Publications would be forced to pay their full cost of handling, as ascertained by the Post Office.

RHODES was unsuccessful in 1957 when he sought to pare publication subsidies. He did get his 1957 version adopted on the House floor, but it was killed by the Senate.

The present bill would be costly to the magazine industry. Life alone would be required to pay more than \$9 million a year in additional postage.

Representative RHODES told the House that "latest figures show that it cost the Department some \$9,400,000 a year to deliver Life magazine than the publication paid in second-class mail rates."

Life magazine, which several years ago made a study of the out-of-pocket cost to the Post Office of delivering each copy of the magazine, disputes RHODES' claim.

In the new Rhodes bill, amount of subsidy would be determined by data developed under the Postal Policy Act of 1958, which requires the Post Office to report to Congress every 2 years on the costs of handling various classes of mail.

RHODES said that it costs taxpayers \$200 million each year to make up the difference

between the cost of handling such publications and the second-class postage they now pay.

NEW YORK CITY, July 29, 1959.

DEAR MR. RHODES: At last. I wish you all success in your effort to make magazines and newspapers pay their own way. In the end we may even get decent mail deliveries in our cities.

MARION HART.

BROOKLYN, N.Y., July 29, 1959.

DEAR SIR: I want to thank you for your proposal on the mail rates for large magazines. I'd hate to think that I'm working for the publishers when I'm actually a letter carrier working for the Government.

Thank you.

EDMUND A. SAWKOWSKI.
OAKLAND, CALIF., July 29, 1959.

DEAR SIR: Hurray for you and here's to the success of your bill cutting subsidies to newspapers and magazines. The age of needed support to assure a free press has passed in the U.S.A. Good luck.

Just a little voter.

A. I. MCCARTHY.

MIAMI, FLA., July 28, 1959.

SIR: Have just read in today's paper about your proposal to gradually increase mail rates for large magazines and newspapers over a 5-year span.

As a mail carrier of 5 years and as one who believes the Post Office should be on a paying basis, I can only say thanks. Your proposal is the best single idea I have concerning the operation of the Post Office in the last 5 years.

Increased postal rates for magazines seem far overdue. I can assure you, sir, from experience that working with magazines and newspapers takes for more time, and thus money cost, than working with letters. There is no comparison. Of course, working with the larger size third-class flat mail is also much harder to work with than letters. The ordinary first-class letter is the easiest piece of mail to case (work) and deliver.

JAMES O. SHIVER.

HOUSTON, TEX., July 29, 1959.

DEAR SIR: I wish to congratulate you on proposing legislation to cut postal subsidies. I am always thankful when a Congressman thinks of a taxpayer. For the people who can't read or will not read, the "picture" magazines could be made smaller.

Mrs. ROBERT NORDIN.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., August 10, 1959.

DEAR MR. RHODES: I want to very sincerely compliment you on your worthwhile speech of July 28 on "Postal Subsidy Limitation."

Subsidies are right and proper for those who need help but the rich and powerful magazines need no Government help to stay in business.

JOHN T. MENDES.

JERSEY CITY, N.J., August 18, 1959.

SIR: I am informed through Labor, the railroad brotherhoods' newspaper, of your action to curb the huge mail subsidies enjoyed by big magazines and newspapers.

I understand the President wants to make [regular mail] 5 cents. With a mere post card at 3 cents, the trash, including that in magazines and newspapers, [is] a means of making money at reduced rates. I think it only fair that advertising be made to pay to clear the deficit and to bring down the rates on personal letters and post cards.

I appreciate your action and respectfully urge steps be taken to set things right, as in a democracy.

HENRY PETERSEN.

LINCOLN, NEBR., August 8, 1959.

DEAR SIR: In the Washington Labor weekly is an article telling of your effort to renew a bill reducing newspaper and magazine subsidies. Why not take them away altogether? What is the argument for granting them any? In an article in a recent Reader's Digest was a scornful attack on the farmer—the total amount of subsidies granted to them—it is a staggering amount. Yet, there are millions of farmers to share the subsidies—not nearly as many magazines and papers. A farmer is asked to stop producing; what would the papers do if they were told to quit advertising? If they were asked to do so, it is my opinion they would be eligible for subsidy.

Here's power to you and your worthy bill. Surely you have enough Democrats beside you to see this through.

Mrs. E. W. KOENIG.

SUNSHINE PRESS,

St. Louis, Mo., August 14, 1959.

DEAR MR. RHODES: Permit me to congratulate you on the introduction of your post office bill to limit subsidies to \$100,000.

As editor and publisher of community newspapers here and as an active member of the Pine Lawn Chamber of Commerce, we have been fighting for more just postal rates for several years.

We have repeatedly pointed out to our friends, readers, fellow members, Senators and Congressmen that second-class mail getting a free ride of about a million dollars a day is grossly unfair to other users of the post office.

We have written numerous editorials to the effect that Life magazine has been getting a \$9 million handout yearly.

We have urged our Congressman CURTIS and others to enact legislation as simple as this:

Those who use the post office for profit should pay at least break-even rates for service rendered.

When second class pays its just rate and we quit giving away \$300 million a year to gigantic magazine publishers, then perhaps we can put a fairer rate on third class, parcel post, and above all, first-class mail.

You are certainly to be warmly commended on your brave stand and I will be looking forward to news of what happens.

Thanks again,
Sincerely,

AL SONNENSCHNEIN,
Editor and Publisher.

SUNSHINE PRESS,

St. Louis, Mo., August 22, 1959.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RHODES: I have read carefully the tearsheets from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD about your views on H.R. 8433 and I am happy that you expressed yourself as you did. You are 100 percent right and deserve all the support the people of the United States can give you.

How true the comment: "the time has come for Congress to show some courage by standing up to the publishers who reap the big profits from postal subsidies at taxpayers' expense."

How true, too, Mr. Wolf's comment: "These magazines have grown fat and saucy because of their help—subsidy—from Uncle Sam."

I have been fighting this injustice, this subsidy to second-class mail, for several years. The Pine Lawn Chamber of Commerce of which I am a director sent a protest along lines of objecting to the huge handout to second-class mail (magazines chiefly) to every Congressman and Senator a few years ago. To no avail. Ed Murrow had a program on TV nationwide and that helped some.

If the Postmaster General and the postal officials do not back you up in your excellent bill, then they should be fired.

May I compliment you, too, on your analysis of postal receipts and average payments. Can anyone justify magazines paying 2½ cents a pound while first-class pays \$1.19? Carry this one point further. Weigh a pound of post cards. Multiply by 3 cents. You will note post cards are paying \$5.61 a pound—and they are the "poor man's letter."

Sincerely,

AL SONNENSCHNEIN.

Meeting the Challenges of Soviet Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 28, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today the Soviet economy is moving forward at a faster rate of progress than it has in recent times.

Regularly, Khrushchev, with an air of braggadocio, states that, before long, the Soviet economy will pass us by.

Frankly, I do not think this will happen.

We recognize, however, that Soviet progress is a real challenge.

These include, first, the military threat to our security; second, efforts at economic penetration of more areas of the world; third, the need for illustrating to the world's uncommitted peoples that a free enterprise system cannot only provide the highest standard of living, but also maintain at the same time the maximum degree of freedom for its citizens; and fourth, the demands of normal growth and the need for economic progress, themselves—discounting the Soviet threat—require constructive measures to stimulate economic progress. In the light of our own needs—as well as the threat to our security—we need to be economically aggressive and creative to meet the challenge ahead.

We have witnessed in Russia, as in other dictatorships, that state control, directing manpower and resources toward specific ends, can make impressive gains in any particular field.

In the long run, however, I am confident that it will be balanced economy—the one that will provide the most for its people with the least restriction on their activities, that will ultimately elicit the confidence of men and nations.

In view of the challenges, both externally and internally, we cannot afford to assume a lackadaisical attitude. It has been said that, for those who would preserve liberty, it must be won anew in each generation. This is true today, as it has been historically. We have been enriched by a heritage of a magnitude beyond understanding. Now, we must strive, with diligence and dedication to make our own contribution to that

great heritage—both in terms of progress and security.

Recently, the Janesville Daily Gazette carried an article by James Marlow entitled, "How to Spur Americans to Keep Up With Soviet Progress," representing a major challenge with which we, as a nation, are confronted. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBLEM: HOW TO SPUR AMERICANS TO KEEP UP WITH PROGRESS OF SOVIETS

(By James Marlow)

WASHINGTON.—American leadership is showing a growing concern about the ability of this country—at the rate and in the way we are going—to keep up with Soviet progress.

Time was when Soviet claims to achievement were taken with a grain of salt in the United States.

That attitude began to change when the Soviets showed how far advanced they were, industrially and scientifically, first by making the atom bomb, then the hydrogen bomb, and then beating us into outer space with their sputniks in 1957.

Earlier in the week this writer reported President Eisenhower:

1. Is concerned about the driving urge to get ahead which the Soviets 7-year plan is giving them.

2. Thinks this country needs an incentive toward harder work—something similar to the 7-year plan—which he believes is providing the Soviet people with the moral equivalent of war.

3. Feels Americans must be induced to work harder, think more of achievement, less of leisure and money.

ECHO BY COMMITTEE

Now comes the Draper Committee—a 10-man group headed by the investment banker, William H. Draper, Jr.—which sounds like a direct echo of the President.

Eisenhower created this Committee to study the U.S. program of military assistance to other countries. Its report, made public Thursday, urged even bigger aid and went much beyond talking in terms of weapons alone.

The 10-man group sought to look at the Soviet challenge from many angles—its progress, its productive expansion, its goals, and its tactics—plus the need it creates for American efforts to match Soviet efforts.

The Committee, noting the Soviets are maintaining a higher rate of growth than the United States in industrial production and in their technology and technical education, said:

"Their objective of equaling and exceeding the United States in selected areas of their own choosing has provided an unusual psychological stimulation to their people which we must more than match by dedication to our own cause."

"GREATER DEDICATION"

"These trends in the Communist world cannot be ignored. They suggest the need for real concern about our present and prospective rates of progress which will determine our future ability to compete with Communist states."

"All this requires a positive individual and national dedication, greater emphasis on hard constructive work and thought, less rather than more emphasis on leisure, more rather than less application to our tasks."

The similarity between Eisenhower's thinking and the Committee's statement may have been the result of the President having seen the Draper report before it was made public.

But he was concerned about this problem of competition and incentives many months ago. He announced in his State of the Union message last January he would create a committee to study and then propose national goals.

NATIONAL GOAL

The Soviets' 7-year plan is in their case a national goal. Eisenhower is ready to name his Committee as soon as he can find enough private organizations to finance its work. He doesn't want the Government to foot the bill.

But neither Eisenhower nor the Draper Committee has come up with an answer to the question they raise:

How can Americans—people in a free society—be induced to work harder and think less of leisure and money in order to compete with the Soviet people living under a dictatorship which can direct, control and compel them?

The dictatorship controls everything: People's lives; the work they do; where they work and on what and for how long; the luxuries they can have or must do without; their hours; prices; wages; and the means of production and distribution.

We may be entering a period of public breast-beating for our failures to do more and do without more. But self-flagellation is neither an answer nor a substitute for action.

Perhaps Eisenhower's Committee on Goals may produce suggestions for the old philosophical, but now very real, problem of how a free people, with all that means, can compete with a people controlled and centrally directed.

Landrum-Griffin Bill Held No Credit to Legislators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHESTER BOWLES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include an excellent article by the Reverend William J. Smith, S.J., which appeared in the Catholic Transcript for yesterday, August 27, 1959. The article is entitled "Landrum-Griffin Bill Held No Credit to Legislators." The text of the article follows:

LANDRUM-GRIFFIN BILL HELD NO CREDIT TO LEGISLATORS

(By Rev. William J. Smith, S.J.)

Politicians are supposed to know the mood of the people. It is an important part of their business. They not only keep a wet finger in the air to see which way the wind is blowing; they must also keep their ear to the ground. That is why they seem to assume such awkward positions at times.

The heated, high-tensioned debate which preceded the passage of the Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill reflected the current mood of the voting public. It is a long time since the country witnessed so tense and hectic a session of the House of Representatives.

The public was in an angry frame of mind about labor reform and the majority vote for the Landrum bill mirrored it. The resentment was not merely a reaction against the Becks and the Hoffas. An untold number of local incidents each added its mite to create an antiunion mood in the mind of the public.

An ironic feature of the debate as it was conducted and controlled by the supporters of the bill seemed to pass unnoticed. One

section of this bill deals with the democratic conducting of labor union meetings. Heavy criminal penalties are attached to the violation of that section of the law. The irony lies in this: If a union official were to conduct a union meeting and employ some of the tactics alleged against the congressional supporters of the bill at the session, the union official might find himself in violation of the law and be jailed because of it.

Even so inveterate an antiunion protagonist as Representative CLARE HOFFMAN, of Michigan, protested vigorously from the floor the dictatorial tactics of what he called the bloc in control.

I find it a little difficult, however, to express any strong sympathy for the northern Democrat-Liberal Republican bloc in regard to the point. If they had had as tight a grip on the majority as their opponents had, they would have done the same thing. This is "democracy in action" as it has been exemplified on many occasions in both Houses of Congress. Pressure politics reached a new high in this titanic tussle. The lobby laws of the Nation were shamelessly violated on all sides.

Arthur Krock, with a distinctly antiunion article in the New York Times, summed up the struggle as a battle between the labor monopoly and the industry monopoly. With the coming of F.D.R. and the New Deal, Krock contended, a labor monopoly evolved from the expansion of the trade union movement. The new labor monopoly eventually came to dominate the industrial monopoly which had prevailed over the country all the years before. The fight over the Landrum-Griffin bill was simply the industry monopoly again giving challenge and overriding the labor monopoly.

I do not concede Mr. Krock's parallel of what he terms the two monopolies. But I do recognize a conclusion which the noted columnist failed to state explicitly. The conclusion is that with the passage of the Landrum-Griffin bill, if it becomes law in its present form, the monopoly of industry is again in the saddle.

The Landrum-Griffin bill was promoted and passed in an atmosphere of ignorance and/or hypocrisy. Corruption in union-management relations was the basic point at issue. When the chips were down, however, the issue of corruption was bypassed. A determined effort to curtail some of the economic power of the labor unions crept into its place.

About 80 percent of the provisions of the Elliott bill and the Landrum-Griffin bill were almost identical. They contained hard and tough restrictions on the criminal and the racketeering elements that have infiltrated the labor movement. The administration forces simply ignored these similarities in the two bills. The Republican-southern Democrat coalition was in the saddle and it rode right through.

It cannot be denied that the practice of secondary boycotting and of organizational picketing have been abused by some union officials and some so-called labor leaders. This writer has pointed out these abuses on more than one occasion. But there have been thousands of union officials who have used both these economic weapons licitly and honestly, with the sanction of the Taft-Hartley Law and the interpretation of the Supreme Court. They are weapons of economic warfare used in an economic system which is based on a clash of opposing economic parties, if not on a principle of conflict.

It can be conceded that some reasonable restrictions should have been placed upon secondary boycotting and organizational picketing. To outlaw the practices totally and completely, however, without corresponding restrictions upon the employer, was a direct attack upon the traditional and court-sanctioned use of these weapons of

economic war. To make all secondary boycotts and organizational picketing synonymous with corruption and racketeering was to profess ignorance of the character of industrial relations in this country or a blatant surrender to hypocritical pretense. Certainly these two trade union practices were never made a major target of the McClellan Committee. How did they suddenly become the pivotal point for a labor reform bill?

In approving the Landrum-Griffin bill, the House based its vote on a "mood"—not on the objective realities of industrial relations.

The Houston Chronicle and Marquis Childs Favor Padre Island National Seashore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 28, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the ultimate authority in our democratic system of government comes from the people. And our Government and we, the Members of Congress, are here to serve the people.

I sincerely believe that one of the finest services which could be rendered to the American people in the field of recreation and conservation would be to preserve the 118-mile-long Padre Island, Tex., one of the few remaining examples of our Nation's rapidly vanishing virgin shoreline, in a National Seashore Area. And I believe the majority of the people favor this move.

People are living longer and have more years for leisure than was true a generation ago.

The natural beauty, abundance of fish and other wildlife, recreational potentials and rich and colorful historic beaches and dunes of Padre Island must be preserved for the enjoyment of future generations. If we do not act now to save this area, which could easily become a winter playground for our Nation, we may find it much harder and it will certainly prove more expensive to acquire it in the future, when private ownership has carved it into plots. There is some private ownership of the island's tips now, but quick action can preserve the greatest part of the island for the enjoyment of all as a National Seashore Area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle for Tuesday, August 25, 1959, entitled "Let Senate Group Know People Want Park at Padre Island." The Chronicle is one of the largest and most influential newspapers in Texas, and I believe the editorial expresses the opinion of the majority of the people of Texas. The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has been invited to conduct hearings in Texas later this year to see the great potentials of this area for themselves and learn firsthand the sentiments of the people.

In addition, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a very perceptive article by Marquis Childs, one of the most independent of America's newspaper columnists, which points to the need for action now to preserve the Padre Island shoreline as a recreation area. Delay will be costly and may forever take away the opportunity to save this area. Mr. Childs' article was published in the Corpus Christi Caller for Tuesday, August 25, 1959, and entitled "Powerful Lobbies Oppose Park Conservation Moves."

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle,
Aug. 25, 1959]

**LET SENATE GROUP KNOW PEOPLE WANT PARK
AT PADRE ISLAND**

Popular sentiment in Texas undoubtedly is favorable to Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH's bill to create a national park on 110 miles of the 118-mile-long Padre Island. The island should be preserved for public use, rather than letting it be developed privately to the exclusion of the average citizen. The Federal Government has operated a national park system for more than 70 years, so it would be logical to add Padre Island to the system.

But will this popular sentiment express itself if and when the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, which is handling the bill, holds a hearing in Texas on it? Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, a member of the committee, said his group wants to hold a hearing in the local area so the people there can have a say in the matter.

In cases like this, opponents usually are the ones who organize and speak most vociferously. Those in favor of it don't take the trouble to go before the committee and urge approval. Thus, to committee members, it appears that popular sentiment is against the project.

There is some small, but strong opposition to the Padre Island project generated mostly by persons who want the beautiful island left for private development.

Organized groups of citizens, like outdoor nature and sportsmen's clubs, should keep in touch with the congressional committee and make plans to produce a showing in strength when the hearing is held.

Citizens who favor making Padre Island a park can help the cause by writing Senator NEUBERGER at the Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

It would be unfortunate if private interests were allowed to take over such a splendid recreation spot and exclude the general public. Such places already are getting scarce for citizens who can't afford to spend a lot of money on recreation—and, as Abraham Lincoln said, there are many citizens in this category.

[From the Corpus Christi (Tex.) Caller,
Aug. 25, 1959]

**POWERFUL LOBBIES OPPOSE PARK CONSERVATION
MOVES**

(By Marquis Childs)

WASHINGTON.—This is the time of year when vacationers begin to take a last, long, loving look at the line of the surf and the generous expanse of sun and sand. They know that all too soon jobs, the city, the old routine will catch them up again.

The vanishing American seashore, source of pleasure, strength, relaxation for millions of Americans is currently the subject of a drive in Congress. Conservationist Senators are pushing measures to save the last remnants of natural shoreline. They are op-

posed by a powerful lobby of industrial and speculative interests.

The argument of the conservationists is that with America's exploding population there will soon be no shoreline left that preserves the natural beauty and the sense of solitude and lonely grandeur that were part of America's heritage. Unless national parks are created of what remains it will all go into overcrowded beach developments intensively exploited for industrial uses.

The argument of the opposite is simple—the right of private developers to go where they like and do what they please. That, too, is part of the American heritage, a privilege going back as far as the privilege to seek solitude and commune with nature; the right of a Thoreau to be alone on Walden pond.

But with an ever-more crowded America the conservationists are pressing to save a small part of the past so that later generations will have a glimpse of what the earlier America was like. Because it is threatened by imminent industrial development the most urgent pressure is on to save the Indiana Dunes.

The 25-mile expanse of duneland on Lake Michigan between the industrial center of Gary and Michigan City has steadily disappeared as industry, with smoking chimneys and mill towns, has spread. Today approximately 3½ miles remain, which Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, is trying to save as a national park.

He has, however, a powerful opponent in the Bethlehem Steel Corp., which has acquired much of the land for a projected \$350 million plant development. With it goes an industrial harbor and related housing developments. Bethlehem acquired the property from a company set up by Clint W. Murchison, one of the Texas billionaires whose speculation in land reaches into every corner of America.

Important political interests are also involved. While he fought the St. Lawrence Seaway, which has opened the Michigan lake shore to steel development, former Senator William Jenner, of Indiana, is now cashing in on it with a company to promote the harbor development. The entire Indiana delegation favors the project.

A Senate Interior Subcommittee failed to approve the Douglas bill. But it is believed that nevertheless the full committee may report it out favorably.

With the bipartisan support of Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, and Senator GORDON ALLOTT, Republican, of Colorado, a second bill would give the Secretary of the Interior authority to select three shoreline sites to become national parks. If this should pass, the sites selected are likely to be the Indiana Dunes, a stretch of untouched shoreline on Cape Cod in Massachusetts, and the dunes area and Sea Lion Caves in Oregon. These, with a fourth site, Padre Island off the south Texas coast, have been approved by the National Park Service Advisory Board.

Reported to have administration backing, this measure would cost an estimated \$15 million. Still a third bill with 18 sponsoring Senators, including such veteran conservationists as CLINTON ANDERSON, of New Mexico, and JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, takes in additional sites and the cost would be \$85 million.

Should all of these measures get caught in the jam now promising to develop, with major legislation held up until the end of the session, they would carry over to next session. This is the hope of their sponsors who insist that even if work is started on the steel plant for the Indiana Dunes site it will not be too late to take the land by right of eminent domain and preserve it for the use of the public.

Powerful as are the interests seeking to block any of these measures there are impressive forces on the other side. Out of the

great impetus that Theodore Roosevelt gave to the conservation movement, scores of organizations have continued to carry on the fight to stop the spreading blight of urbanism and industrialism that has left only a small remnant of the unspoiled beauty of what was once an almost empty continent.

**Address by Hon. Thomas H. Kuchel, of
California, at Ceremony Commemorating
the Death of Padre Junipero Serra**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 28, 1959

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] at the ceremony in Statuary Hall, on August 28, commemorating the death of Padre Junipero Serra.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REMARKS OF U.S. SENATOR THOMAS H. KUCHEL
AT THE CEREMONY IN STATUARY HALL COM-
MEMORATING THE DEATH OF PADRE JUNIPERO
SERRA, FRIDAY, AUGUST 28, 1959

These services commemorate the life and labors of a Franciscan friar whose intrepid Christian ministrations were spread throughout a great primitive area before the United States came into being. Junipero Serra, Franciscan missionary from Malorca journeyed to the North American continent in 1750, and in the last 1760's went northward to California.

In that northward trek, both he and his courageous, faithful companions sowed in the hearts and minds of men, the seeds of a new civilization under divine spirit. Father Serra brought with him the mission, which meant the spread of religion in these unknown lands; the presidio, which meant the expansion of the political and military control of Spain; and the pueblo, the town, which meant the establishment of orderly civil government. Here was a tripartite development, both secular and spiritual. The hard trails that his weary feet traversed from mission to mission along the El Camino Real continue today to be the royal road along which are strung great cities, great universities, great industries, and great agriculture—human progress in its every latest attainment.

One hundred and seventy-five years ago Father Serra departed this life. From a primitive unsettled land on the Pacific shore to which he came has developed a majestic center of cultural and economic life, rich in all the bounty of nature, our magnificent State of California.

While we honor Junipero Serra for the blessings of civilization he left in California, we shall not forget that his was a spiritual labor. The missions he built, the agriculture he founded—supported, incidentally, by irrigation systems which excite the admiration of the modern hydraulic engineer—were all means to an end. The sword was there to support the cross and so was the civil authority. But it was the cross which came first. Imbued with divine spirit, charged with an exalted mission, and sustained by an unflinching faith, Father Serra brought to the Indians the civilizing message of Christian teachings. Here was the solid foundation

upon which all other building rested. It is well to recall this simple fact in our own day. For we, too, have an exalted mission: To hold high the banner of man's freedom, to protect it from all assaults from the ungodly, and to advance it, by an unfaltering faith in the righteousness of our purpose.

U.S. Labor Leaders Can Handle Selves With Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 28, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the advent of Premier Khrushchev's visit to this country is stirring a wide variety of reactions among the American people.

Fortunately, our climate of freedom allows for such differences. Constructively, however, I am confident that the American people will demonstrate a unified spirit and conduct during the visit in order to show the real side of what we believe is America.

Views on the visit, of course, differ not only among individuals but among different groups in the economy.

We recall that, recently, the AFL-CIO, representing approximately 13½ million workers in America, decided against inviting Khrushchev to address this great and powerful labor organization.

We recognize that, in many lands around the world, communism has made its greatest inroads in labor.

Fortunately, I believe that America can be proud of the staunch anti-Communist spirit which has prevailed in the U.S. labor movement.

Regrettably, the occurrence of abuses and irresponsible actions among minorities in the labor movement has resulted in the need for reevaluation of our laws relating to the labor movement; as well as legislation to curb abuses.

However, this should not be allowed to reflect unfairly on the vast majority of honest, competent leaders—or the millions of rank-and-file members—who are doing a fine job—in my home State of Wisconsin, as across the Nation—in serving the interests of the working people of America.

Nor should this situation be allowed to, in any way, "hide" the staunch patriotism and loyalty which has so largely prevailed in the ranks of unionism throughout the country.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal published a constructive editorial entitled "U.S. Labor Leaders Can Handle Selves With Khrushchev."

The editorial, I believe, presents a thoughtful analysis, outlining in a well-justified way, the competence of our labor movement and its leaders to deal with communism.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. LABOR LEADERS CAN HANDLE SELVES WITH KHRUSHCHEV

President George Meany of the AFL-CIO and his No. 1 lieutenant, Walter Reuther, see eye to eye on communism. They both think it is an immoral and brutal force that suppresses human freedom and democratic rights. Where they differ—and differ vigorously—relative to the forthcoming visit of Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev is over the tactics the labor federation should adopt.

Meany, who opposed President Eisenhower's invitation in the first place, wants labor to snub Khrushchev, to boycott him completely. Reuther thinks that American trade union leaders should talk to Khrushchev "straight from the shoulder."

The other day the executive council of the labor federation lined up with Meany. A resolution was adopted, 22 to 3, declaring that it was "out of the question for the AFL-CIO to give recognition to the head of a government which does not permit its own workers to have free trade unions." But Meany emphasized that the resolution was not intended to stop union officers who wanted to from holding personal meetings with Khrushchev, and arrangements are going forward for such a meeting.

With considerable reason, Meany and other labor leaders were annoyed by hints from Washington that the State Department and White House would be "quite happy" if Khrushchev were invited to address the AFL-CIO convention opening in San Francisco September 17. Khrushchev is going to have ample opportunity to spout off during his 12 days in this country. There is no reason why the AFL-CIO should let him use their convention as a special sounding board.

On the other hand, there are very good reasons why trade union leaders should meet with the Soviet premier and let him know just where American workingmen and women stand. After all, the purpose of bringing Khrushchev to America is to educate him about this country and its people. Labor leaders like Reuther are well qualified to help act as teachers.

Last January, it will be recalled, Reuther and several other labor leaders played host at a luncheon to Anastas Mikoyan, Russia's deputy premier. They came away confident that Mikoyan was impressed with their arguments that there is no class struggle in America and that American labor has a major stake in capitalism and democracy.

Indeed the success of the luncheon and the demonstrated skill of the labor leaders to handle the slick talking Mikoyan—in contrast to the relative lack of success by businessmen—prompted Vice President Nixon to declare: "I would respectfully suggest that some of the business leaders in this instance could learn a lesson from our labor leaders, who had to fight to expel Communists from their unions and in the process learned how to deal with them."

Operation Bootstrap: Reservation Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the Tucson (Ariz.) Daily Citizen, under date of August 19, 1959, in which they endorse

the Indian self-help, dubbed "Operation Bootstrap: Indian Style."

The editorial follows:

BOOTSTRAP FOR INDIANS

The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, oldest territory under the American flag, is offering a helping hand to the Indians, oldest American inhabitants.

Representative E. Y. BERRY, Republican, South Dakota, is proposing a program to industrialize American Indian reservations patterned after Puerto Rico's "Operation Bootstrap," about which so much is currently being said and written.

Prior to the industrializing program launched in 1946, Puerto Rico's jíbaro lived in "the poorhouse of the Caribbean." Now he has the second highest standard of living in Latin America. The island has had 600 new industries locate there since 1946. It has risen from a burden on the U.S. Treasury to an economic asset. Puerto Rico now buys more from the United States, on a per capita basis, than Canada.

The American Indian occupies the same place in this country that the jíbaro did in Puerto Rico in pre-Bootstrap days. The 535,000 Indians are the poor country cousins living on remote agriculturally based reservations virtually untouched by America's industrial economy. A large number of these are on Arizona reservations; most Tucsonians are familiar with nearby reservations and the social and economic limitations under which Indians live there.

Representative BERRY, who lives with a similar Indian problem in South Dakota, estimates that 80 percent of the reservation Indians in this country have little or no job opportunities. Many are permanently on relief. The U.S. Government spent about \$180 million on Indian welfare programs in the last fiscal year, and the amount will increase as Indian population increases rapidly.

There is no logical reason why "Operation Bootstrap, Indian style," providing incentives for industrialization on the reservations, would not be successful and popular. It is a prospect which should command the interest of Arizonians and Arizona Congressmen.

Needed: More Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 28, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the August 7, 1959, issue of the Morning Call of Paterson, N.J., there appeared an editorial entitled "Needed: More Doctors," which points out that the United States faces a potential shortage of trained physicians in the next decade unless medical education facilities are expanded. The editorial discusses several suggestions which I have made to aid in solving this problem. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDED: MORE DOCTORS

It is commonly supposed that medical care in the United States is both the best and the most readily available in any large nation. In general, this optimistic picture is close to the truth. A shadow has fallen across the picture, however—the fact that we are not

producing enough doctors to keep pace with our population rise.

Dr. Howard A. Rusk, famous both as an authority on human rehabilitation, estimates that in order to have enough doctors to provide adequate treatment for our population by 1975 we will need an annual net increase of some 5,250 doctors. That figure compares with the present net increase of about 3,000 doctors per year.

One big reason why not enough doctors are being trained is that the cost of medical education has grown steadily and is still growing. Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, who has made himself an expert in this field, wrote recently that "medical education . . . is running an annual operating deficit of between \$10 million and \$20 million at the present time." This is despite the fact that tuition and other costs have risen until most families cannot see a medical student through school.

Senator NEUBERGER proposes a three-pronged attack on the problem. He wants Congress to appropriate \$500 million to build medical teaching and research institutions. He also wants Federal scholarships for qualified men and women, and he proposes an incentive plan to induce gifted medical students and other scientists to enter medical research. The Neuberger proposals may not be the answer, but they are worth thinking about. The longer we delay, the harder it is going to be to catch up with the growing need for more doctors.

The Rambler Looks Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 28, 1959

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, Tuesday's Washington Evening Star contained George Kennedy at his best as he looked back 20 years in the typical analytical and perceptive style of the Rambler.

I ask unanimous consent that this thought-provoking work be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RAMBLER LOOKS BACK 20 YEARS

(By George Kennedy)

A quiz question in a Sunday newspaper threw the Rambler.

It was, "What important treaty was signed 20 years ago today?"

He flunked it.

He had no excuse, especially with the covers of news magazines on the stands reminding everyone that World War II started 20 years ago.

It was the Ribbentrop-Molotov nonaggression treaty—the big surprise of the prelude to war. In it the U.S.S.R. and Germany agreed not to make war on each other, which made it "safe" for Hitler to invade Poland.

Plunking the question caused the Rambler to refresh his memory by putting the spool of microfilm containing the August and September, 1939, issues of the Star on the Recordak. As he turned the crank, the front pages of one momentous day after another came on the screen.

The issue of the 23d gave the startling news that Ribbentrop, Hitler's Foreign Minister, had arrived by air in Moscow to negotiate a nonaggression pact. His arrival broke up a British-French military mission's con-

versations with Red Army leaders on cooperation.

The Star's lead editorial the next day was entitled, "The Zero Hour." It was hard to believe. War had lost its glamour. Millions remembered the trenches and the mud and the senseless slaughter on the western front only 21 years before. British Ambassador Neville Henderson was telling Hitler that war would mean an "end to civilization as we have known it."

As in many a death watch, there were hopeful bulletins near the end. The headline of the 25th—20 years ago today—was "Hitler Parley Stirs Talk of Peace."

The Clifford K. Berryman cartoon showed Hitler rolling the world over the brink and Roosevelt trying to stop it was entitled "Doing His Bit."

Major wars always cause major changes in the economy. The supermarkets were advertising hams for 23 cents a pound; legs of lamb for 21 and porterhouse steaks, 39.

You could buy a new Ford, Chevrolet, or Plymouth for well under \$1,000, and the Pennsylvania Railroad was advertising a round trip to New York and the World's Fair there over the Labor Day weekend for \$4.

Washington was wild about the Redskins who had won the world's championship of pro football 2 years before.

The Yankees, sparked by the frequent hitting of centerfielder Joe Di Maggio, were leading the American League. Washington was in fifth place. Cincinnati was leading the National League. Ann Sheridan was starring in the film at the Capitol.

The headlines were giving hope and then snatching it away. On Saturday the 26th it was: "World War Averted, Berlin Reports"; on Sunday, "France Cold to Hitler's 'Peace' Offer." On Tuesday it was "Britain Stands Firm in Reply to Hitler."

Twenty-five years before, in August, Lord Grey of Fallodon, the British Foreign Minister, had seen the same thing happen, and said, "The lamps are going out all over Europe; we shall not see them lit again in our lifetime." At that time Americans found it hard to accept what was happening. This time they knew from experience that it was all too true: War was coming.

On Wednesday the headline was: "Peace or War Up to Hitler—Chamberlain."

The bad news came on Friday. The headline read: "German Planes Bomb Heart of Warsaw."

And on Sunday, September 3, the Labor Day weekend was made memorable by the headline: "Britain Goes to War as Ultimatum Expires."

Premier Pedro G. Beltran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 28, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news story, from today's issue of the New York Times, in regard to the Premier of the Republic of Peru, Mr. Pedro G. Beltran.

This article, written by one of the country's outstanding Latin American news experts, Mr. Tad Szulc, has to do with "a quick-tempered, plain-speaking newspaper publisher with a large background of public service," who has taken over the job of directing the destinies of Peru, under the direction of President Manuel Prado y Ugarteche.

Mr. Beltran is an outstanding friend of this country. He understands our people and our needs. After talking to him on several occasions, I know that he hopes that we, in turn, will understand better the needs, not only of his own country, but of all Latin America.

I believe the article written by Mr. Szulc is worthy of the attention of all Members of the Senate.

I certainly hope for the Premier of Peru all the best in the difficult times which confront him in the weeks, months, and years ahead. He is a good man; and if anyone can bring order out of chaos, I think Mr. Beltran will be that man.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW AND INDEPENDENT PREMIER BUILDS PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN PERU—BELTRAN, A CRITIC OF REGIME UNTIL APPOINTMENT, ATTACKS INFLATION VIGOROUSLY

(By Tad Szulc)

LIMA, PERU, August 27.—A quick-tempered, plain-speaking newspaper publisher with a large background of public service appears to be restoring confidence in Peru.

When President Manuel Prado y Ugarteche resolved in mid-July to appoint Pedro G. Beltran, his foremost critic, as Premier, the nation appeared to stand on the threshold of chaos.

Inflation was spreading, the economy was in disarray and there was talk of revolutionary attempts or military coups. Peru's 8-year-old democratic rule faced collapse.

A month earlier, Premier Luis Gallo Porras, unable to cope with mounting deficits, rising prices, constant strikes and increasing pressures from all sides, offered the resignation of his cabinet. President Prado finally turned to Senor Beltran to save the constitutional government.

APPOINTMENT STIRS HOPE

Senor Beltran was not identified with any national party. He was known for his independent views and his almost fanatic belief in sound money and orderly fiscal policies. His appointment was greeted with a surge of hope by most of the public.

But he found unrelenting opponents in the extreme Rightwing groups represented by the newspaper El Comercio and in the Communists.

The new premier, a wealthy landowner and London-trained economist, is an advocate of free enterprise as the basis for solving Peru's economic and social ills with state aid. The Comercio group and the Communists are propounding state control of economic activities, possibly leading to nationalization of the foreign-owned mining and oil industries.

Senor Beltran is also opposed by the small but influential Christian Democratic party and by the left-of-center Popular Action Party. His support in Congress rests on President Prado's Democratic Peruvian Movement and a powerful bloc identified with the left-of-center out anti-Communist APRA Party.

GASOLINE PRICE AT ISSUE

Tonight, the 62-year-old Senor Beltran may join this young Minister of Development and Public Works, Alfonso Rizzo Patron, in explaining to Congress last month's decision to almost double the price of gasoline.

He did so because under the old prices, which were among the world's lowest, foreign oil companies had halted drilling in Peru and the threat arose that production would eventually come to a standstill.

The former administration had refused to raise prices in fear of strikes and other disturbances. But Senor Beltran wasted no

time in acting when he took office. He suspended constitutional guarantees for a few days and broke a strike of taxi drivers here.

Now the opposition is hoping to use the gasoline price issue to force a new vote of confidence tonight, in an effort to defeat the Government. Communist deputies have charged that Senor Beltran "sold out" to U.S. oil trusts.

The 1960 Republican Presidential Nomination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 28, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate two articles which have appeared recently about Vice President Nixon. One is a long and very thoughtful analysis by Alan L. Otten about the situation with respect to the 1960 Republican Presidential nomination. The other article is an interview in the Christian Science Monitor.

I ask unanimous consent to have these two articles printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 27, 1959]
NOT 1952—THE TAFT-NIXON, IKE-ROCKEFELLER PARALLELS ARE MUCH LESS VALID THAN OFTEN CLAIMED

(By Alan L. Otten).

WASHINGTON.—After looking long, but not too hard, at the jockeying for the 1960 GOP Presidential nomination, some soothsayers are falling back on what is becoming a common political aphorism: "It will be 1952 all over again."

But this theory, while neat in its way, will not stand up under close examination.

Behind the assumption lies the belief that, regardless of the outcome, political events are casting Vice President Nixon in the role of the late Senator Taft, and New York's Governor Rockefeller in the role of General Eisenhower. Those who expect 1960 to be a repetition of 1952 state their case thusly: Mr. Taft, while commanding the loyalty of much of the GOP, also had the enmity of many party leaders, led by then Governor Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, who apparently now is masterminding the Rockefeller candidacy. The anti-Taft Republicans hitched their hopes to a bright new star with a nonpolitical aura, and put Mr. Eisenhower across by beating hard on the theme "Taft can't win."

Certainly there are strong similarities between the Taft-Eisenhower struggle and the Nixon-Rockefeller battle that's shaping up. Certainly the Rockefeller backers are getting set to try to torpedo the Vice President's White House ambitions with the same sort of "can't win" theme song they effectively used against the Ohio Senator. The differences, however, are equally striking, even if less well understood.

To begin with, Mr. Taft's opposition within the Republican Party was far more extensive than is the party opposition to Mr. Nixon. Or perhaps more accurately, the Vice President's following among GOP regulars is probably greater than that enjoyed by any other Republican, including Mr. Taft, in re-

cent history. It is true, to be sure, that much of the Vice President's support lacks the fervor that characterized the Taft backers of the early 1950's.

In 1951 and 1952, some Republicans looked upon Senator Taft as an old warhorse, respected and even revered, but suspected as a candidate as being too conservative on domestic economic policies, somewhat arbitrary and a little condescending in dealing with people he did not consider his intellectual equals. Moreover, there were those who sincerely questioned Mr. Taft's views on foreign policy as being "too isolationist" and his qualifications to deal with the overriding issues between the United States and Russia.

MATTER OF BACKGROUND

By contrast, Mr. Rockefeller patently lacks the background and experience on which was built another 1952 Eisenhower slogan, "He knows how to deal with the Russians." Mr. Nixon, to be sure, also lacks the Eisenhower reputation as a war hero and standing as a military-diplomatic statesman in world councils. But the Nixon supporters can and do claim his years as understudy to Mr. Eisenhower and the late Secretary of State Dulles have given him a background that no other Republican today can enjoy. Certainly no one has ever seriously questioned the Vice President's internationalist tendencies, which have been evident at least since his years as a freshman Congressman.

To many people in 1952 Senator Taft was identified with what's commonly called the Old Guard wing of his party, even though politically he was more liberal on some issues—housing and health legislation, for example—than Mr. Eisenhower. Here again by contrast, Mr. Nixon is part of and identified with a very popular President and Republican administration that has widespread support not only among Republican voters but, as well, among Democrats and Independents.

Nowhere can the contrasts be more drawn, however, than in the political alignments of 1952 and 1959-60. For one thing, nearly all the former Taft backers are now firmly in the Nixon camp. But so, too, are many groups and individuals who once supported Eisenhower.

Lined up with Mr. Nixon also is much of the former citizens for Eisenhower group including its cochairman, former Under Secretary of Commerce Walter Williams. These once-Eisenhower, now Nixon rooters also include such liberal Senators as HUGH SCOTT of Pennsylvania and JOHN SHERMAN COOPER of Kentucky, as well as large numbers of GOP House Members. It is also an interesting fact that the Vice President's three principal staff political aides were either actively for or sympathetic with the Eisenhower candidacy of 7 years ago. These are Mr. NIXON's top assistant, Robert H. Finch; his press secretary, Herbert H. Klein; and Charles K. McWhorter, a special assistant, who was secretary of the National Youth for Eisenhower in 1952.

Moreover, the bulk of Mr. Eisenhower's professional GOP support came from the Nation's 25 Republican Governors. Though there are now only 15 GOP Governors, most of them are lined up solidly with Mr. Nixon. The Vice President's widespread backing among lawmakers in Congress and the Republican Governors illustrates a fact that still is not fully appreciated.

Contrary to widespread impressions, the political "ins" supported Mr. Eisenhower in 1952, while much of the Taft support came from the "outs" who were trying to get "in." There were many exceptions, to be sure, to that generality. But with fewer exceptions now, the "ins" are backing the Vice President, while the "outs" are lining up with the New York governor in hopes of getting "in." Most any professional politician would tell you that this, indeed, is not the strongest political position.

Moreover, it would be difficult to estimate the number of Republicans throughout the country who are deep in Mr. Nixon's debt. He has spoken and campaigned for Republican candidates in nearly every State over the last 7 years. He has done favors in Washington for hundreds of GOP officials. While Senator Taft was primarily the philosophical leader of his party, functioning mainly through the Senate and only occasionally with grassroots contacts outside Ohio, Mr. Nixon has contacts and debtors everywhere.

And while Mr. Nixon seems to have a kind of party support that Mr. Taft never knew, Mr. Rockefeller would appear to have considerably less backing than did General Eisenhower. Whereas Mr. Rockefeller is largely unknown beyond the borders of his State, every American was familiar with the beaming smile of the World War II commander.

QUESTION OF THE POLLS

The public opinion polls, which were used with such devastating effect against Senator Taft before the 1952 convention, do not thus far seem likely to provide Mr. Rockefeller with similar ammunition. Mr. Nixon has been doing much better in the polls than did the late Senator, both with regular Republicans and Independents. And while Mr. Eisenhower started pulling away in the polls once he entered the race, the New York Governor actually slumped after his big post-election showing. Mr. Nixon would have to slump very hard indeed for the opinion polls to give the Rockefeller camp much support for a "Nixon can't win" campaign.

The Vice President, too, is in many ways a more astute political performer than was the Ohio Senator. Mr. Taft had a brilliant mind, but comparatively little finesse with people—and it was a rare moment that he stirred an audience. His speaking style was dry and pedantic.

Mr. Nixon, on the other hand, is almost flawless mechanically. There is much of the actor in him, not that he is insincere, but rather that he has cultivated a dynamic stage presence. He is at ease, he is sure, he is dramatic, and his most recent doings in the international spotlight would seem to attest to these qualities.

The Vice President's press relations are good. He works assiduously at keeping newsmen informed and is deliberately patient under pertinent questioning. Mr. Taft's relations with the press, however, were spotty and unsatisfactory.

Mr. Nixon rarely runs away from hot issues but usually handles touchy subjects with a diplomacy the late Senator could not match. It is difficult, for instance, to imagine the Vice President doing what Mr. Taft did during the 1952 South Dakota primary when he was asked his views on the price of gold. This was a vital subject in the gold-mining area of the State, but Mr. Taft stoutly proclaimed the current price too high. Later, an aid remonstrated with him, thought he had persuaded the Senator he had spoken too harshly, and arranged for the question to be put to the Senator again the following day.

"I answered that last night," Mr. Taft snapped. "The price is too high."

In 1952, it must also be remembered, other candidates were in the wings—Governor Warren of California, perennial hopeful Harold Stassen, favorite sons—who helped deadlock the convention and permit the Eisenhower maneuvering. By all present indications, if Mr. Rockefeller challenges in 1960—and there seems little doubt that he will—it will be a two-man race, with no room to use favorite sons and stalking horses to halt the big first-ballot Nixon strength.

ART OF COMMAND

On the other side, there are several areas in which Mr. Rockefeller does not come up to the 1952 Eisenhower as a candidate. The

New York Governor's newness on the political scene is not counterweighted, as it was in the general case, with a long period as a popular leader. His brief tenure in Albany has not provided Mr. Rockefeller with the time to demonstrate his ability fully. His move to raise State taxes immediately after taking office did him little good, politically, as he himself admitted. And while it indicated his willingness to command, the uproar the tax boost caused gave evidence the measure did not have wide understanding or support. The art of command is not quite the same as the art of leadership.

It should not be overlooked, also, that the Rockefeller name in many sections of the country does not arouse friendly feelings. The 1952 Eisenhower was a self-made man up from the Kansas cornfields. Governor Rockefeller has a less bucolic background.

After all the evidence is in, a man would have to be downright imprudent to guess who will carry the GOP standard next year. But that same evidence makes very clear how inaccurate is the aphorism: "It will be 1952 all over again."

It won't be. It will be 1960, for the reason that Nixon is not Taft and Rockefeller is not Eisenhower.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 26, 1959]

ELEVATING THE VICE PRESIDENT—A CAPITAL INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR HUGH SCOTT (By Courtney Sheldon)

WASHINGTON.—Republican Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, a veteran of eight terms in the House, national chairman of the Republican Party 1948-49, an early (1949) supporter of an Eisenhower candidacy in 1952, and today a supporter of Vice President Nixon for the GOP presidential nomination:

See no substantial difference between Vice President Nixon and Governor Rockefeller on foreign policy, but regards Mr. Nixon as the best qualified candidate in either party in the foreign-affairs field.

Anticipates Mr. Rockefeller would become the GOP presidential candidate and leader of his party after he has served another term as Governor and after a Nixon administration nationally.

Question: "Senator Scott, why do you feel Vice President Nixon is the best qualified man for the Republican nomination for the Presidency?"

Answer: "Well, I would say on the basis of experience and temperament, personality. Undoubtedly he is the best qualified candidate in either party in the foreign affairs field, one who has been singularly blessed with the opportunity to meet chiefs of state and of government. His experience and wisdom in handling difficult problems have been demonstrated by the Moscow trip, the Latin-American trip, by the way he conducted himself at the time of the two serious illnesses of the President, and by the degree to which his advice is valued by people experienced themselves in government; for example, in the National Security Council."

Question: "How do you feel Mr. Nixon compares as a votegetter with Mr. Rockefeller?"

Answer: "I think both have demonstrated they are excellent votegetters. They are both attractive personalities who grow in attraction as you have the chance to know more about them. A half hour before this interview I was talking with Governor Rockefeller. He is a most attractive man. I think if he is reelected Governor of New York—and I expect he would be—he would become the next candidate of the Republican Party for the Presidency, and I expect, too, that he would probably become the party's leader for a decade or more."

"There is a great place in the sun for Governor Rockefeller and I admire him without reserve. But the situation presently indicates that Republicans would be well advised to close ranks, as there is every indication they are doing, and really go to work along with independents and Democrats to elect a competent, experienced and wise and moderate man in DICK NIXON as their next President."

Question: "Then you don't feel Governor Rockefeller will formally become a candidate for the nomination?"

Answer: "It is my judgment that he probably will not in any real all-out down-the-line campaign. I think surveys among Republican leaders indicate that Vice President Nixon will be nominated on the first ballot, perhaps by acclamation. I hope that when they come around to talking about vice presidential candidates they will give very serious thought to Governor Rockefeller. I think it would be a dream ticket."

Question: "Since you were one of the original Eisenhower supporters, do you have indications from other early Eisenhower men as to their preference now?"

Answer: "Well, I have talked to many early supporters of President Eisenhower and to many Democrats-for-Eisenhower and the greater part of them favor Vice President Nixon as the Republican candidate. There are some who favor Governor Rockefeller and I think rather notably in one or two of the Southern States."

Question: "Would you say there is any substantial difference between Mr. Nixon and Mr. Rockefeller on international policy?"

Answer: "I can't see where such an area of difference would arise. Governor Rockefeller has some edge in South America by virtue of his experience in those countries, but the policy down there would be the same in either event, a good-neighbor policy of nonintervention and of friendly and benevolent cooperation. In the rest of the world, Nixon's experience counts more heavily. The policy of both of these gentlemen is the policy of Dwight Eisenhower."

Question: "What about domestic policy?"

Answer: "In domestic policy I would be inclined to say that the Nixon policy would be, in the future as in the past, adherence to the general Eisenhower program, a moderate, middle-of-the-road policy. Vice President Nixon has shown his convictions on the tough issues, such as civil rights, and in my judgment he has been right and proper in his attitude there. He has, if anything, shown an inclination to go a little beyond the Eisenhower program in some areas, such as housing."

"I think that Governor Rockefeller's record indicates he is perhaps somewhat more on the liberal side in meeting the necessities which the Governor of New York has to meet in the political world, but he is no wild-eyed radical by any means."

Question: "If there is a fight between the two for the nomination do you feel there will be any outstanding issues, or will it be over who is the best leader, over personality questions?"

Answer: "There are some differences on issues, but none that occur to me as the kind which appear in presidential campaigns. If it came to a choice between the two, it would be based on personality, experience, and ability to handle the job."

Question: "Any particular reason why you have made known your preference so early?"

Answer: "The main reason is that I don't want anything. I am sure that when I campaigned so vigorously for General Eisenhower there were many people in the entourage who may have harbored doubts on that score and wondered why I worked so hard and my wife worked so hard. I just wanted to keep on being a member of the House of Representatives. The same thing is true now."

"I am extremely happy; in fact, I am in something of a glow about being a Senator of the United States. It is something I have wanted since I was 13 years old. Why should I want anything else? Not having anything in my mind except the desire to get the strongest candidate for the Republican Party and the best qualified man for the Presidency of the United States, I can afford to come out early."

Contested-Election Expert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 28, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the August 26, 1959, issue of Roll Call, the newspaper of Capitol Hill. It was written by Mr. Marvin D. Resnick and is entitled "Contested-Election Expert." The article is about Mr. Samuel H. Still, Jr., a native of Blackville, S.C., who attended the Citadel at Charleston, S.C., and was graduated from the George Washington University School of Law. Mr. Still has been in Washington for a number of years and has distinguished himself as a research expert of the American Law Division of the Library of Congress. This article points out that while serving on loan from the Library as legal counsel to the House Elections Subcommittee of the House Administration Committee and as special counsel to the House Special Campaign Committee and the Senate Subcommittee on Elections, Mr. Still has probably learned more about election law than anyone else in this country. We, in South Carolina, are very proud of Mr. Still's record of accomplishment and his service to the Congress through the years.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTESTED-ELECTION EXPERT

(By Marvin D. Resnick)

At the time of the hectic controversy which surrounded Franklin D. Roosevelt's bid for a third-term election, someone posed an interesting legal question: If F.D.R. won the popular vote, were the presidential electors pledge-bound to elect him?

After much laborious research the answer to that question was clearly revealed—In some States the electors were bound to vote for F.D.R., but in some States they weren't.

At any rate, the question had been sent to the right man. The lawyer who "dug up" the information for that interesting and politically significant question was a man who has worked closely with election laws for many years, a man who probably knows more about election law than anyone else in the country. His name: Samuel H. Still, Jr.

Although Still is actually employed by the American Law Division of the Library of Congress, he has been loaned as legal counsel to the House Elections Subcommittee of the House Administration Committee almost continuously since 1946.

He has also served as special counsel to the House Special Campaign Committee and the Senate Subcommittee on Elections.

A 51-year-old, scholarly, gentleman-lawyer from Blackville, S.C., he has been concerned with important election law questions since the early 1930's.

In an area so complex that even a lawyer and most certainly the layman get lost in the maze, Still works with the patience of a saint and the perseverance of an impatient prospector.

As legal counsel to the House Elections Subcommittee, people seek him out with many questions. A Congressman wants to know just how much money he can use in a forthcoming campaign. A potential presidential candidate wants the dates on all the presidential primaries. And members want to know what procedures must be used to recount questioned ballots.

But that portion of Still's work which is most fascinating concerns contested elections. Often, Still travels to different parts of the Nation to make "spot-checks" of election records. A good deal of the time he pores over contested ballots with committee members in room G-53 of the Capitol building.

A contested election involves a very definite and serious procedure, Still points out.

"In an ordinarily contested election," he explains, "the contestant, the defeated candidate, files a notice of contest. This is served on the contestee, the elected representative, who answers."

"Then there are 90 days in which testimony may be taken by the two parties. This testimony is printed and goes to the Committee on House Administration. The elections subcommittee doesn't come into the picture until this testimony comes in."

When the elections subcommittee calls the parties in, a public hearing for both parties is held. Each party is entitled to \$2,000 expenses in conducting the contest and has an attorney.

The committee hears the arguments, studies the testimony and then renders a decision. Sometimes it is necessary for the committee to actually examine the ballots.

"As a general rule," Still says, "the committee asks the attorneys for the contestant and contested to stipulate on questionable ballots. The remaining ballots are then examined personally by the committee members and various markings or erasures are ruled on with respect to each ballot."

"Finally, the decision of the subcommittee is made to the full Committee on House Administration which in turn reports to the House."

"The report and resolution are privileged and may be called up at anytime but notice is usually given so that one side or the other may object."

How does the committee actually go about investigating the contested ballots?

"Where the investigation is authorized by House resolution," Still says, "or where an aggrieved candidate complains directly to the elections subcommittee, a hearing is held to determine whether an investigation should be conducted."

"If the Elections Committee decides, after a hearing, to investigate, it usually sends two or more members on the scene for a 'look-see' to determine whether a full investigation should be made."

"The subcommittee members, accompanied by the staff, make a spot-check of ballots, including absentee ballots, and registration books. If an appreciable error occurs, additional ballots and paraphernalia are examined."

Ballots are examined to determine whether they are marked according to State law and voters' qualifications are checked against State laws.

When checking the validity of a ballot the committee leaves no stone unturned. It looks into:

Registration lists or lists where persons are shown as having paid poll taxes in a State where poll taxes are required.

Registers of persons who actually voted, or a list of a register of voters.

The actual ballots cast.

And the ballot stubs or related material.

Also, it checks information relating to registration, including:

Change of address.

Payment of poll taxes.

Persons exempt from payment of poll taxes.

Maiden voters—those persons who have attained the age of 21 subsequent to the last registration date.

Military personnel voting.

Voting in precincts other than where the voter is listed as a qualified voter.

And if there is a write-in candidate who is a serious contender, the manner in which the name is written in is closely scrutinized; also use of stickers may be evaluated.

What are the most common types of election fraud?

"Absentee ballots are used most often to fraudulently defeat a candidate," Still explains.

"But a good many mistakes made in election returns are due to the time element. The voting and the counting take place the same day, with the same set of clerks and judges."

"Naturally, these officials are dead tired by the end of the day, and it is easy to make a mistake. In the old days—maybe as far back as 1875—the people who worked on the ballots had 2 or 3 days to count the ballots."

"The older method was better," Still feels.

But since he's been with the committee, Still points out, the majority of election frauds have not been attributed to the congressional candidates themselves.

"Since I've worked on the committee," he says, "most of the fraud has been attributable to the local candidates."

"For instance, a hot local issue may exist between the 'drys' and the 'wets,' or between candidates for a local judgeship. One of the local candidates may attempt to monkey up the ballots. Some of the ballots, which include the congressional candidates' names, are altered."

"But such fraud," Still concludes, "is disassociated from the candidate for or incumbent Member of Congress."

Because of his study and long experience with elections, Still has strong opinions about corrections which he feels have to be made to rectify the intentional and unintentional errors in election returns.

Still hopes there will someday be a uniform system of registration in every State. He feels that registration should be taken much more seriously than it is now. He feels that there should be a definite identification for a registrar, something like the definite identification necessary for a marriage license or a motor vehicle license.

"It should be a system of registration in which the registrant is clearly identifiable along with his legal residence. Many States don't have this."

"It might be possible to have a picture on the registration card, and the method of identification should be even more perfect in the case of absentee voting."

Still also feels that in the county or State there should be a department of elections which has certified public accountants available to count and audit election returns.

When Still visits an area for an investigation, he almost always receives the highest cooperation from officials, he claims.

"The State officials are most cooperative and I know most of the secretaries of state," he explains.

Of course, he has been in situations where officials weren't willing to cooperate. A city clerk in Battle Creek, Mich., once refused to let him see the materials of a senatorial election. The clerk said a telegram wasn't a correct subpoena.

Technically, the clerk was correct. But Still could have easily gotten a correct subpoena. Still decided not to press the issue for the moment, though.

But the fact that he was defying a congressional committee must have worked on the man. Shortly, the official visited Still and handed over the material.

While searching for a group of ballots after one election Still was told to visit a certain farm. There he found the ballots placed on top of a high silo.

It took a good deal of climbing but Still was finally able to place a Senate seal on the ballots.

On another occasion, Still opened the ballot box and discovered a most unusual specimen—a jug of corn whiskey. Before Still could decide what to do with it, the owner rushed into the room to assert his right of possession.

In 1958, at the suggestion of Still, the elections subcommittee broke the ice with a new procedure. It voted to go to Minnesota's First Congressional District to inspect a close special election.

Rather than get bogged down in formal procedures, the subcommittee took quick action by virtue of a House resolution which granted the House Administration Committee powers of subpoena. This enabled the committee to report directly to the House concerning an investigation's results.

Previously, redtape procedures blocked such action, and in the last case in which a House Member was unseated (the Jenks-Roy contest), the redtape prevented the legitimately elected candidate from being seated until the last day of the 75th Congress.

To fill the demand for information concerning election laws, Still has authored a number of studies printed by the Government Printing Office.

These include "Federal Corrupt Practices and Political Activities," "Information of Importance to Candidates for Office of U.S. Representative in the 84th Congress," and "Manner of Selecting Delegates to National Political Conventions and the Nomination and Election of Presidential Electors."

The latter work was compiled in collaboration with Richard D. Hupman, head of the Senate library. It grew out of the question concerning presidential electors when F.D.R. ran for a third term.

Working with contested elections always means controversy, but Still learned long ago how to deal with controversy.

Married now and the father of a 21-year-old daughter, Still attended the Citadel military college before he was graduated from George Washington Law School in 1933.

As a junior at the Citadel he wrote an editorial in the school paper which touched upon extremely volatile issues of the time—Al Smith and prohibition.

Still supported Al Smith as a candidate for president and also suggested that prohibition be repealed. He said this is a section of the country where both Al Smith and the "wets" were unpopular.

Talk about controversy. Still, a Baptist, recalls: "I received letters from some 30 Baptist ministers for my stand on prohibition."

Proposed Confirmation of Judge Forman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 28, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD

an editorial entitled "Confirm Judge Forman" from the Asbury Park Evening Press. It is one of many which have come to my attention urging action by the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONFIRM JUDGE FORMAN

The Democratic leadership of the Senate of the United States is not enhancing its prestige by the treatment it is according the nomination of Judge Phillip Forman to the third circuit court of appeals. As long ago as last February President Eisenhower offered the name of Judge Forman. The Senate promptly pigeonholed it.

It is significant that in all this delay there has been no suggestion that Judge Forman lacked either the character or the capacity to serve in the high post to which the President has named him. As long ago as June of this year the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee finally got around to interviewing Judge Forman but still, without explanation, it continues to withhold his name. This is not the way to interest capable men in service in the Federal judiciary.

Three days after Judge Forman's name was submitted, President Eisenhower offered the name of a Texas lawyer for a district judgeship. A few days ago the Texan wrote the President asking that he withdraw his name as the delay in confirmation was proving embarrassing. His view is understandable, for when a man is named for high office and the Senate ignores him it is inevitable that some persons will assume that the Senate has some good reason for its failure to confirm. The fact of the matter is that approval is being denied Judge Forman and some 1,800 other presidential appointments, of which 50 are to the Federal bench, simply because the Democratic leadership of the Senate is playing politics and hopes to extract some concessions from President Eisenhower in return for confirming his appointments.

Judge Forman is a competent jurist. He should not be subjected to the treatment he is receiving.

Proposed California-Pacific Northwest Transmission Intertie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 28, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has asked the Department of the Interior to conduct a study of the feasibility of interconnecting Federal power generating facilities of the Pacific Northwest with those in the Central Valley region of California. The committee took this action after holding hearings earlier this year, and the Department is expected to have a report completed before start of the next session of Congress.

Naturally, this proposal has created considerable editorial comment in newspapers of the Columbia Basin region. The able and knowledgeable editor of Northwest Ruralite, Mr. Henry Alderman, reviewed some of the problems con-

nected with the proposal in an editorial which appeared in the August 1959 issue of his publication. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Power Intertie," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POWER INTERTIE

The proposed California-Pacific Northwest electric power intertie reminds us of the proposal to unify Germany. It is obviously the right thing to do; but gosh, how everybody dreads it.

This intertie proposal has a long history. A number of years ago the Federal Power Commission, which has some statutory authority for power planning, recommended that the Columbia River power system (Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and other dams) be connected electrically with the California utilities including the big Federal Shasta Dam project on the Sacramento River.

At that time, the Interior Department undertook to implement the Federal Power Commission's suggestion by requesting funds from Congress for the construction of a 230,000 volt interconnecting line. Just at that time, also, the Interior Department was making a study of proposals to send surplus Columbia River water to water-shy California. The combination of these two proposals frightened Northwest people out of their wits. It looked as though the booming State of California was going to hob on to our water and power supplies for its own enhancement, leaving the Pacific Northwest short of two of its basic resources required for future population and market development.

Although it is doubtful that either scheme actually would have operated in this fashion, fears carried the day in the Northwest. The intertie was stopped cold.

Some time later Interior Department through its Bonneville agency managed to convince Northwest leadership and the Congress that a heavy circuit should be built from the Federal system as far south as Klamath Falls, primarily to serve the power market around Klamath Falls, but secondarily to be used sometime in the future to bring in excess California generated power to supplement Columbia hydro as well as to send surplus Columbia River power south to conserve oil fuel in steam electric generators there.

This proposal carried the Congress. Right-of-way was bought. Materials for construction of the line were laid out for use. Then Douglas McKay became Secretary of the Interior. Mr. McKay and the then Oregon Senator, Guy Cordon, promptly put their heads together with the California-Oregon Power Co. and sold out the Government line to that company. Copco didn't want any Federal system in its market territory as a possible threat to its high rate, profit position.

Following this sellout, nothing more was heard of the major line south toward California for several years. Then, last summer, the public utility commissioner for Oregon commissioned a private consulting engineering firm to look into some of the advantages which might accrue to the State of Oregon in the matter of power supply if there were an electric transmission tie between the Columbia River and California.

The consultant's report was published last November. Although cautiously worded it was, in the main, strongly favorable to the tie line.

With publication of this report, everybody in the power business jumped into the act. The California power companies, the big public agencies in the State of Washington,

the small public agencies in the State of Oregon and State officials of Oregon, Washington and California, all saw the possibility of considerable profit in the construction of the intertie. Even rough preliminary calculations on the value of such a tie demonstrate great possibilities.

Public power people in the State of Washington are still nervous about the possibility of a Federal intertie being used to export the Northwest power resource when it might be needed here. This is a legitimate fear. It needs to be answered.

The California private power companies obviously have taken a look at the figures and would like to control for their own profit any such facility. Their recent proposal to do so was very narrowly stopped by the U.S. Senate.

Some public agencies and the private power companies in the Pacific Northwest see virtue in controlling a tie line.

There has been some argument made in behalf of the State of Oregon owning and operating it as an insurance against control falling into the hands of California, and as a method for giving the State an equity stake in the Columbia River power resource.

With passing weeks, this ferment has steadily grown.

All these interests in the values of the intertie must be resolved by someone. Fears must be allayed, potential markets measured, and costs and benefits to all parties determined.

The U.S. Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs now has attempted to point to an answer to these questions by instructing the Interior Department to conduct a detailed study of the tie's values and of how they might be adjudicated.

But the Interior Department appears reluctant to do this. Interior has little choice in the matter, however, since the Senate committee has told it to do this; but it must be remembered that it is this Department which sold out the beginnings of the tie to a power company about 5 years ago.

To be truly effective, such a study should include a great many factors, not only of a technical and economic nature but of a political nature. A good study will require a great deal of initiative and imagination and an enthusiasm on the part of those making it for finding acceptable compromises among the groups which have interest in it. It is a job which, if handled in a routine and unimaginative manner, will be useless.

Now It's Up to the Russians and Mr. Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 28, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, just after President Eisenhower left for his highly successful European trip, the State Department announced that the United States will continue its unilateral suspension of nuclear weapons tests for the rest of this year. This, we all believe, is a testimonial to America's own desire for peace and nuclear disarmament.

It is now up to the Russians, in their turn, to prove their own sincerity by agreeing to an international inspections system which will protect the world against further dangerous nuclear weapons tests in all countries.

"It is for this purpose, that our negotiators have sat patiently through many wearying weeks of nuclear negotiations at Geneva," says the New York Times this morning. "And," it continues, "the hitch has always been to what extent Russia will consent to the presence of non-Russians on international inspection teams operating in Russia. If Russia really wants to put an end to the tests, the technical problem is not too difficult. Even today, such tests, in most cases, can be detected."

Let me go one step further: Since it is now up to the Russians to prove their sincerity, what better opportunity can they have than the occasion of Mr. Khrushchev's forthcoming visit to announce their willingness to join us in an effective international inspection system over nuclear tests? I am certain that there is no other subject that means as much to the people in this country, and in all other countries, as the subject of peace and freedom from the fear of nuclear extinction. If Mr. Khrushchev wants to demonstrate his actual good faith in peaceful coexistence, he will have the opportunity, before coming here or during his American visit, to announce Russia's willingness not only to talk about peace but also to do something about it.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial from the New York Times printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Now It's Up To The Russians

The State Department's announcement that the United States will continue its unilateral suspension of nuclear weapons tests for the rest of this year is a testimonial to our country's honest desire for nuclear disarmament.

It is now up to the Russians, in their turn, to prove their own sincerity, if they can summon such a quality, by agreeing to an international inspection system which will protect the world forever against any more nuclear weapons tests at all in any country.

It is for this purpose that our negotiators have sat patiently through many wearying weeks of nuclear negotiations at Geneva. The hitch has always been to what extent Russia will consent to the presence of non-Russians on international inspection teams operating in Russia. If Russia really wants to put an end to the tests the technical problem is not too difficult. Even today such tests in most cases can be detected.

There are those in this country who argue that nothing can be gained by any government by further experiments with nuclear weapons. From this point of view the weapons already possessed by the United States, by Russia and in lesser quantity by Britain are adequate to perform their terrible task. It is contended, on the other hand, that defense benefits can come from further testing, especially in the field of anti-missile weapons. This view is certainly present in the Atomic Energy Commission and in the Pentagon. It is difficult to discuss the merits of these arguments because the technical factors are not and cannot be accessible to the general public. No American, of course, would argue that if further tests contribute to our defense we should remain inactive while Russia moves. It is possible, too, that weapons tests may yield knowledge useful for peaceable purposes.

We must remember, however, that there is a growing worldwide danger of fallout from

atomic tests. Russia will suffer from her own tests if she carries them too far, and we will suffer from ours as well as hers if we are forced to continue.

We may profitably turn to a report issued last weekend by the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. The report is based in part on the testimony of some 30 scientific expert witnesses as well as upon statements presented by many other scientists.

The report, on the one hand, presents a generally reassuring picture of the fallout hazard from past atomic tests. On the other hand, it warns of potential dangers, particularly to generations yet unborn, if testing were to be resumed on the intensive patterns of the last 5 years. In 1958 the equivalent in explosive energy of TNT of more than 40 million tons of fission products alone was released in the world's atmosphere as the result of tests by the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union.

Significantly, the report contains no sweeping general conclusions about the damage that can be expected from the tests thus far. While it repeatedly emphasizes that the radiation received from fallout so far is still only a small fraction of that received from natural background radiation in the earth and in the atmosphere, it focuses new attention on the potential long-term genetic damage that could be caused by carbon 14, the radioactive isotope created from the nitrogen in the air by neutrons liberated in both atomic and hydrogen bomb explosions.

In short, the well-being of the human race for generations to come may be affected by the increase of radioactive material in the air and on the ground, and the very existence of humanity might be endangered by an all-out atomic war.

We do not argue that the way to avoid this catastrophe is to give way to tyranny and injustice, and to weaken in our defense. But this is the danger that all the peoples of the earth, the rulers of Russia especially included, must be made to understand.

Historic Harpers Ferry, W. Va., Faces the Nation—To Celebrate Centennial October 15-18

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 28, 1959

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, less than a month ago in this Chamber I issued an invitation with these words of injunction: Come to West Virginia and you will find a wonderland.

Then, as an example of but a fraction of the beauties and the attractiveness of our Mountain State, I referred to a historic and scenic area within 1 hour and 15 minutes driving time from Washington, D.C., to Harpers Ferry, W. Va.

It was my privilege, when a Member of the House of Representatives, to have been author of the 1944 act by which Harpers Ferry National Monument was established. This facility of the Federal Government, under the administration of the U.S. Park Service, has become a most inviting mecca for tourists. In 1956, the first year during which it was fully developed, 115,000 persons signed the guest book there, and the following

year the number grew to 170,000. During the past year the figure rose to 271,000, and I am informed officially that in the first 7 months of the present year the 12-month figure for 1958 had been exceeded, with 237,978 guests having placed their names on the U.S. Park Service roll of visitors. It seems to be a logical prediction that the total for 1959 will exceed 400,000.

But, Mr. President, historic Harpers Ferry, where the centennial observance of the John Brown raid will take place October 15, 16, 17, and 18 with pageantry and beauty on parade, was very appropriately displayed to the Nation Wednesday morning. The interesting and much appreciated showing was by means of the National Broadcasting Co.'s wonderful morning network show, "Today." Popular Dave Garroway presides over the program. Charles Van Doren has added much recently with his trips, scenes, and narration to overlooked vacation areas.

Through the courtesy of Mr. Garroway, Mr. Van Doren, and the "Today" production staff, as well as efficient personnel of NBC personnel in Washington and New York, the script of the Van Doren-narrated Harpers Ferry portion of the August 26 show has been made available. Because it is an accurate word picture of persons, events, and places which appropriately fitted the scenes of, and were associated with, historic old Harpers Ferry, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the portion of the script referred to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARLES VAN DOREN—HARPERS FERRY—BROADCAST AUGUST 26, 1959, OVER THE NBC TELEVISION NETWORK "TODAY" PROGRAM

DAVE GARROWAY. Charles Van Doren has been doing another of his overlooked vacation spots this morning. So let us take a trip with Charles down to the Blue Ridge Mountains and the historic old town of Harpers Ferry.

Mr. VAN DOREN. Harpers Ferry, at the confluence of two mighty rivers, the Potomac and the Shenandoah—Shenandoah: I think that's the most beautiful word in the American language. A town well remembered for what John Brown did there a hundred years ago. And, incidentally, in October, in and around Harpers Ferry, they'll be celebrating the 100th anniversary of that great event.

But I don't want to dwell on that story. I think it's familiar to all of you. Instead, I'd like to take my cue from a much more famous American than Brown—even than John Brown—Thomas Jefferson.

Standing on this rock, about a century and a half ago, Jefferson said this: "You stand on a very high point of land. On your right comes up the Shenandoah, having ranged along the foot of the mountains a hundred miles to find the vent, and on your left approaches the Potomac in quest of a passage also."

"In the moment of their junction they rush together against the mountain, rend it as under they pass off to the sea. The scene is worth a voyage across the Atlantic."

As you can see from the picture, Jefferson's words are still true today. It's a sight no one really should miss, a sight to which neither this picture or my words can do justice.

The past lives in Harpers Ferry, not only in its scenery but in the town itself. This is how Harpers Ferry looked when Jefferson

visited it, and it hasn't changed a great deal since.

As you can see from this picture, the main street of Harpers Ferry is just about as it was at the time of the Civil War and perhaps even prior to it. As you walk through the town you're constantly reminded of the past. For example, by ruins of an old Episcopalian church, and also by the cemetery that will evoke memories of an American and of sturdy pioneers of a long-dead period. Maybe not so long dead. I guess there are still pioneers around.

You'll come across the building where John Brown and his little band tried to hold out against the Federal troops commanded by none other than Robert E. Lee. Everybody remembers the John Brown raid of 1859, but we tend to forget that an important Civil War battle was also fought here in 1862, and another one around here in sixty-four.

Harpers Ferry was important for two reasons—its strategic location at the meeting of the Potomac and the Shenandoah, and because of the large arsenal that Brown had tried to take in 1859, seen here as it looked at the beginning of the Civil War in 1861. Well, as I say, history lives in Harpers Ferry, but I am not sure that's the most important reason why I love the city—the town. If you'll look at this picture, here, I think you'll see why I love it (shows picture).

Since the rivers make a cut through the mountains here, and it's the only place to go west, the railroads come through, too, and you can see two railroads coming across the river here. They cut through a great tunnel which follows the river right underneath this mountain on which these two people are sitting, and the rock walls are very high and precipitous around the rivers, both rivers here at the town of Harpers Ferry.

And when the trains come through there they blow their whistles and it makes the most eerie and mysterious, almost otherworldly sound as it echoes back and forth between those great cliffs. And if you love trains, as I do, I think it might be worth a trip just to hear the sound of those whistles.

You may not hear it much longer. Of course, the whistles are not really steam whistles any more. They're imitations, but they still sound pretty fine.

If you want details on hotel accommodations, meals and so on, write to the Conservation Commission, Charleston, W. Va., for details about Harpers Ferry.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentations be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than

six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbt, Watkins M., Va.-----
Abernethy, Thomas G., 6278 29th St. Miss.
Adair, E. Ross, Ind.-----4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., N. J.-----
Albert, Carl, Okla.-----5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., N. C.-----
Alford, Dale, Ark.-----
Alger, Bruce, Tex.-----
Allen, Leo E., Ill.-----University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, Minn.-----4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., Mont.-----911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., Ala.-----3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., N. Y.-----
Arends, Leslie C., Ill.-----4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., Ohio-----
Ashmore, Robert T., S. C.-----
Aspinall, Wayne N., Colo.-----Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., N. J.-----113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., Kans.-----
Ayres, William H., Ohio-----
Bailey, Cleveland M., W. Va.-----
Baker, Howard H., Tenn.-----
Baldwin, John F., Jr., Calif.-----
Barden, Graham A., N. C.-----2801 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., Nev.-----
Barr, Joseph W., Ind.-----Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., Pa.-----
Barry, Robert R., N. Y.-----3019 Normanstone Drive
Bass, Perkins, N. H.-----
Bass, Ross, Tenn.-----
Bates, William H., Mass.-----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., Ohio-----
Becker, Frank J., N. Y.-----
Beckworth, Lindley, Tex.-----
Belcher, Page, Okla.-----
Bennett, Charles E., Fla.-----1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., Mich.-----3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., Mich.-----
Berry, E. Y., S. Dak.-----118 Schott's Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., Ohio-----
Blatnik, John A., Minn.-----
Bilch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), Ga.-----
Boggs, Hale, La.-----
Boland, Edward P., Mass.-----
Bolling, Richard, Mo.-----3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), 2301 Wyo. Ave. Ohio.
Bonner, Herbert C., N. C.-----Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., N. Y.-----
Bow, Frank T., Ohio-----4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, Conn.-----
Boykin, Frank W., Ala.-----The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., Ill.-----
Brademas, John, Ind.-----
Bray, William G., Ind.-----
Breeding, J. Floyd, Kans.-----
Brewster, Daniel B., Md.-----
Brook, Lawrence, Nebr.-----
Brooks, Jack, Tex.-----
Brooks, Overton, La.-----4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., Mich.-----
Brown, Charles H., Mo.-----3723 N. Oakland St., Arlington, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., Ohio-----Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, Ga.-----Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., Va.-----
Buckley, Charles A., N. Y.-----
Budge, Hamer H., Idaho-----
Burdick, Quentin, N. Dak.-----
Burke, Frank W., Ky.-----
Burke, James A., Mass.-----
Burlison, Omar, Tex.-----2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., Pa.-----
Byrne, James A., Pa.-----
Byrnes, John W., Wis.-----1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., N. J.-----

Canfield, Gordon, N. J.-----
Cannon, Clarence, Mo.-----
Carnahan, A. S. J., Mo.-----
Carter, Steven V., Iowa-----
Casey, Bob, Tex.-----
Cederberg, Elford A., Mich.-----
Celler, Emanuel, N. Y.-----The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., Mich.-----
Chelf, Frank, Ky.-----
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, Colo.-----
Chipperfield, Robert B., Ill.-----1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), Ill.-----2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., Pa.-----3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, Iowa-----
Coffin, Frank M., Maine-----
Cohelan, Jeffery, Calif.-----2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., Ill.-----
Colmer, William M., Miss.-----
Conte, Silvio O., Mass.-----
Cook, Robert E., Ohio-----
Cooley, Harold D., N. C.-----2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., Pa.-----
Cramer, William C., Fla.-----6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, Nebr.-----4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., Pa.-----
Curtis, Laurence, Mass.-----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., Mo.-----
Daddario, Emilio Q., Conn.-----
Dague, Paul B., Pa.-----
Daniels, Dominick V., N. J.-----
Davis, Clifford, Tenn.-----4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., Ga.-----
Dawson, William L., Ill.-----
Delaney, James J., N. Y.-----
Dent, John H., Pa.-----
Denton, Winfield K., Ind.-----
Derounian, Steven B., N. Y.-----
Derwinski, Edward J., Ill.-----
Devine, Samuel L., Ohio-----
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., Mich.-----
Dingell, John D., Mich.-----
Dixon, Henry Aldous, Utah.-----1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, N. Y.-----
Donohue, Harold D., Mass.-----
Dooley, Edwin B., N. Y.-----
Dorn, Francis E., N. Y.-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, S. C.-----
Dowdy, John, Tex.-----
Downing, Thomas N., Va.-----
Doyle, Clyde, Calif.-----3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., N. Y.-----
Durham, Carl T., N. C.-----The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), N. J.-----
Edmondson, Ed, Okla.-----
Elliott, Carl, Ala.-----
Everett, Robert A., Tenn.-----
Evins, Joe L., Tenn.-----5044 Klinge St.
Fallon, George H., Md.-----
Farbstein, Leonard, N. Y.-----
Fascell, Dante B., Fla.-----
Feighan, Michael A., Ohio-----
Fenton, Ivor D., Pa.-----3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., N. Y.-----
Fisher, O. C., Tex.-----Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., Pa.-----The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., Wis.-----
Flynt, John J., Jr., Ga.-----
Fogarty, John E., R. I.-----1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., Md.-----
Forand, Alme J., R. I.-----4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., Mich.-----514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., Ga.-----
Fountain, L. H., N. C.-----The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., Tenn.-----Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., N. J.-----3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., Md.-----
Fulton, James G., Pa.-----
Gallagher, Cornelius E., N. J.-----
Garmatz, Edward A., Md.-----
Gary, J. Vaughan, Va.-----

Gathings, E. C., Ark.-----6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., Pa.-----
George, Newell A., Kans.-----
Gialmo, Robert N., Conn.-----
Glenn, Milton W., N. J.-----Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Goodell, Charles E., N. Y.-----
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), Pa.-----
Grant, George M., Ala.-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., Ill.-----
Green, Edith (Mrs.), Oreg.-----
Green, William J., Jr., Pa.-----
Griffin, Robert P., Mich.-----
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), Mich.-----
Gross, H. R., Iowa-----
Gubser, Charles S., Calif.-----
Hagen, Harlan, Calif.-----
Haley, James A., Fla.-----
Hall, David M., N. C.-----
Halleck, Charles A., Ind.-----4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, N. Y.-----
Hardy, Porter, Jr., Va.-----
Hargis, Denver D., Kans.-----
Harmon, Randall S., Ind.-----
Harris, Oren, Ark.-----1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., Va.-----
Hays, Wayne L., Ohio-----1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., N. Y.-----
Hebert, F. Edward, La.-----26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, W. Va.-----
Hemphill, Robert W., S. C.-----
Henderson, John E., Ohio-----
Herlong, A. S., Jr., Fla.-----
Hess, William E., Ohio-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., Calif.-----
Hoeven, Charles B., Iowa-----100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., Mich.-----100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., Ill.-----
Hogan, Earl, Ind.-----5211 Flanders Ave., Garrett Pk., Kensington, Md.
Hollifield, Chet, Calif.-----
Holland, Elmer J., Pa.-----
Holt, Joe, Calif.-----
Holtzman, Lester, N. Y.-----
Horan, Walt, Wash.-----
Hosmer, Craig, Calif.-----
Huddleston, George, Jr., Ala.-----
Hull, W. R., Jr., Mo.-----
Ikard, Frank, Tex.-----
Inouye, Daniel K., Hawaii-----
Irwin, Donald J., Conn.-----The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., Calif.-----
Jarman, John, Okla.-----
Jennings, W. Pat, Va.-----
Jensen, Ben F., Iowa-----2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., Mich.-----
Johnson, Byron L., Colo.-----
Johnson, Harold T., Calif.-----
Johnson, Lester R., Wis.-----
Johnson, Thomas F., Md.-----
Jonas, Charles Raper, N. C.-----
Jones, Paul C., Mo.-----1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Ala.-----
Judd, Walter H., Minn.-----3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., Mo.-----
Karth, Joseph E., Minn.-----
Kasem, George A., Calif.-----
Kastenmeier, Robert W., Wis.-----
Kearns, Carroll D., Pa.-----Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), W. Va.-----
Keith, Hastings, Mass.-----
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), N. Y.-----
Keogh, Eugene J., N. Y.-----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., N. Y.-----
Kilday, Paul J., Tex.-----3507 Albemarle St.
Kligor, Joe M., Tex.-----4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., Calif.-----
King, David S., Utah-----
Kirwan, Michael J., Ohio-----
Kitchin, A. Paul, N. C.-----
Kluczynski, John C., Ill.-----
Knox, Victor A., Mich.-----
Kowalski, Frank, Conn.-----
Lafore, John A., Jr., Pa.-----
Laird, Melvin R., Wis.-----
Landrum, Phil M., Ga.-----

Appendix

Analysis of Public Works Bill Veto Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, an analysis of the veto message on the public works appropriation bill for 1960—H.R. 7509—shows clearly that the basis of the President's objection to the bill is the unbudgeted construction starts. No reference is made to unbudgeted general investigations and preconstruction planning items. Items in these categories do not represent substantial dollar commitments and the absence of any reference to them in the veto message warrants the conclusion that the President has no objection to them. Unbudgeted items added by the Congress in these two categories are:

Rivers and harbors and flood control:	
General investigations	89
Advance planning	32
Subtotal	121
Bureau of Reclamation:	
General investigations	1
Advance planning	0
Subtotal	1
Total	122

The veto message makes no reference to increases or decreases made by the Congress on budgeted items. It can therefore be assumed that there is no objection on the President's part to the individual project figures in H.R. 7509 for all projects which were budgeted.

The only reference which the veto message makes to power facilities concerns the Trinity River project in California. The statement concedes that funds for starting Federal construction of these facilities are necessary unless partnership development with Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is authorized. In the absence of any other reference to power facilities, it may be assumed that there is no objection to other adjustments made by the Congress in the power program.

The following two lists indicate which unbudgeted items would remain in the bill and which would be eliminated if the veto is sustained:

Unbudgeted items remaining in the bill if veto is sustained

GENERAL INVESTIGATION ITEMS	
Arizona:	
Gila River below Painted Rock Dam	\$20,000
Gila River, Phoenix metropolitan area	30,000
Arkansas: Benton Dam survey	5,000

Unbudgeted items remaining in the bill if veto is sustained—Continued

California:	
Dry Creek resurvey	\$50,000
Napa River	5,000
Soquel Creek	3,000
Sweetwater River	40,000
Connecticut:	
Connecticut River at Essex	5,000
Popponock River, Groton	5,000
Delaware:	
Indian River Bay via Peppers Creek to Dagsboro	9,000
Broad Creek River, Sussex County	5,000
Florida:	
Pensacola Harbor	7,500
Tampa Harbor (Ybor Channel)	27,000
Georgia:	
Oostanaula River	25,000
Savannah turning basin	4,000
Tugalo River, Georgia and South Carolina	26,000
Illinois:	
Illinois River	25,000
Little Calumet River	10,000
Indiana: Michigan City	8,000
Kansas:	
Cow Creek	20,000
Three Mile Creek, Leavenworth	5,000
White Clay Creek, Atchison	8,000
Kentucky:	
Bunches Creek	15,000
Kentucky River	12,000
Licking River Basin	20,000
Louisiana:	
Bayou Bartholomew and tributaries	25,000
Bayou Bonfouca	10,000
Calcasieu River salt barrier	9,000
Maine:	
Kennebunk River	9,000
Monhegan River	2,500
Portsmouth Harbor, Piscataque River, Maine and N.H.	9,000
Searsport Harbor	9,000
Stave Island Harbor	8,000
Maryland: Wicomico River	15,000
Massachusetts: Town River survey	9,000
Michigan:	
Detroit metropolitan area	5,000
Holland Harbor: Lake Michigan-Lake Macatawa Channel	13,500
Kawakawin River	8,000
Ontonagon Harbor	8,900
Red Run-Clinton River	10,000
Traverse City Harbor or Refuge	5,000
Minnesota: Levee Wall at Winona	9,000
Mississippi: Okatibbe Creek	25,000
Missouri: Clarksville	6,000
Nevada: Las Vegas Wash	9,000
Nebraska:	
Missouri River slackwater navigation	10,000
Republican River	15,000
Missouri River bank, stabilization and navigation, Sioux City to Yankton	20,000
New Jersey:	
Newark Bay—Passaic River Channel	15,000
Sandy Hook Inlet (Shrewsbury River, N.J.)	25,000
New York:	
Buttermilk Channel	10,000
Cazenovia Creek	10,000
Hudson River siltation	114,000
Little Neck Bay	9,000
New York State Barge Canal	10,000
New York Harbor deepwater anchorage	10,000
Tonawanda Creek	32,000

Unbudgeted items remaining in the bill if veto is sustained—Continued

North Carolina:	
Rogue Inlet and Swensboro Harbor	\$15,000
Cape Fear River	10,000
Rollinson Channel-Hatteras Harbor	6,500
Shallote River	7,500
Wrights Creek	10,000
North Dakota:	
Missouri River bank stabilization, Garrison to Oahe	10,000
Souris River	10,000
Ohio:	
Chagrin River	10,000
Crab Creek at and in the vicinity of Youngstown	30,000
Mad River drainage basin	22,000
Sandusky River basin	60,000
White Oak Creek	10,000
Oklahoma: Oklahoma City floodway extension	6,000
Oregon:	
Rogue River	11,000
Umpqua River, north to Reedsport	11,000
Walla Walla River, Milton Free-water	13,500
Willow Creek	18,400
South Carolina: Santee River and tributaries	30,000
Texas:	
Arkansas-Red River pollution survey	75,000
Big and Little Vince Bayou	21,000
El Paso	20,000
Guadalupe River	11,000
Gulf Intercoastal Waterway Channel to Port Isabel	7,500
Lake Kemp	35,000
Neches River	10,000
Salt Fork and Prairie Dog Town Fork of the Red River	90,000
San Jacinto survey	15,000
West Fork, Double Bayou	2,000
Utah: Great Salt Lake (Saltair)	25,000
Washington:	
Ben Franklin Dam	20,000
Swinomish Slough	20,100
West Virginia:	
Deckers Creek	15,000
Twelve Pole Creek	10,000
ADVANCE PLANNING ITEMS	
Alabama: Holt lock and dam	150,000
Arkansas:	
DeGray Reservoir	150,000
Gilliam Reservoir	80,000
Illinois: Subdistrict No. 1 of Drainage Union No. 1 and Bay Island Drainage and Levee District No. 1	50,000
Indiana:	
Clinton (deferred for restudy)	5,000
Sugar Creek levee	15,000
Terre Haute-Conover levee (deferred for restudy)	2,000
West Terre Haute	30,000
Iowa:	
Green Bay Levee and Drainage District No. 2	75,000
Saylorville Reservoir	200,000
Kansas:	
Frankfort	50,000
Marion Reservoir	25,000
Kentucky: No. 2 Green Reservoir	50,000
Michigan: Hammond Bay Harbor	20,000
Missouri: Marion County drainage district	73,000

Unbudgeted items remaining in the bill if veto is sustained—Continued

New York: Herkimer.....	\$48,000
Ohio: Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia.....	125,000
Oklahoma:	
Lukfata Reservoir.....	50,000
Pine Creek Reservoir.....	80,000
Oregon:	
Willamette River basin channel improvement and major drainage: Coyote and Spencer Creek.....	50,000
Yaquina Bay and Harbor.....	100,000

Unbudgeted items remaining in the bill if veto is sustained—Continued

Pennsylvania: Turtle Creek.....	\$25,000
Texas: Matagorda ship channel: 36-foot channel.....	150,000
Virgin Islands: Christiansted Harbor (inactive).....	3,000
Washington:	
Columbia River between Vancouver, Wash., and The Dalles, Oreg.: (b) Blingen Barge Channel.....	10,000
Little Goose lock and dam.....	450,000

Unbudgeted items remaining in the bill if veto is sustained—Continued

Wisconsin:	
Bad River:	
(a) Mellen Channel.....	\$25,000
(b) Odanah, moving village and raising school.....	25,000
Eau Galle River.....	75,000
Saxon Harbor.....	31,000
FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	
Construction and planning:	
Greenville Harbor.....	60,000
Lower White River.....	107,000

Unbudgeted construction items to be eliminated if veto is sustained

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Project	Benefit-cost ratio	Total estimated Federal cost	Appropriation to date	Amount in H.R. 7509	Project	Benefit-cost ratio	Total estimated Federal cost	Appropriation to date	Amount in H.R. 7509
Arkansas: Beaver Reservoir ¹	1.1	\$36,100,000	\$1,291,000	\$1,500,000	Nebraska: Gering and Mitchell Valleys.....	1.8	\$1,400,000	\$45,000	\$350,000
Alaska: Dillingham Harbor.....	1.3	412,000	6,000	400,000	New Mexico:				
California:					Two Rivers Reservoir.....	1.2	6,900,000	300,000	75,000
Mill Creek levees.....	2.1	1,740,000	107,000	500,000	Rio Grande Floodway, Cochiti to Rio Puerco.....	N.A.	4,400,000	50,000	800,000
New Hogan Reservoir.....	1.7	19,300,000	740,000	1,500,000	New York:				
Redwood City Harbor: 30-foot depth San Bruno Shoal entrance and Redwood Creek channels.....	1.6	1,380,000	2,000	1,378,000	Buttermilk Channel ²	N.A.	1,551,000		1,500,000
San Jacinto River and Bautista Creek.....	2.1	5,770,000	215,000	225,000	Hudson River, New York City to Albany 32-foot channel.....	1.9	36,300,000	65,000	500,000
Connecticut:					New York-New Jersey pierhead line ²	1.4	1,311,000		500,000
Hall Meadow Brook Reservoir.....	2.4	2,210,000	20,000	250,000	Ohio Street Bridge, Buffalo River.....	N.E.	4,520,000		2,000,000
Mud River Reservoir.....	1.2	5,970,000	18,000	275,000	North Carolina:				
Florida:					Morehead City Harbor.....	1.9	1,382,000	12,000	600,000
Apalachicola Bay:					Wikesboro Reservoir.....	1.2	8,350,000	387,000	1,000,000
(a) Channel at East Point: Reimburse.....	N.A.	139,100		39,100	Ohio:				
(b) St. George Island: Reimbursement.....	N.A.	143,000		43,000	Muskingum River Reservoir ²	N.E.	615,000		500,000
Intracoastal Waterway, Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River.....	N.A.	6,590,000	370,000	600,000	West Branch Mahoning River Reservoir.....	1.3	6,940,000	261,000	525,000
Hawaii: Kahului Harbor.....	2.9	983,000	14,000	140,000	Oregon: Malheur River, Vale unit.....	2.3	423,000	70,000	250,000
Illinois:					Pennsylvania:				
Drury drainage district.....	3.7	1,520,000	84,000	540,000	Allegheny River Reservoir ²	1.3	113,000,000	2,733,000	1,400,000
Henderson River: Diversion unit.....	2.8	1,750,000	150,000	530,000	Brookville.....	2.7	1,340,000	87,000	500,000
Hunt drainage district and Lima Lake drainage district.....	1.8	5,420,000	174,000	1,000,000	Shenango River Reservoir, Pennsylvania and Ohio.....	1.7	28,000,000	374,000	500,000
Iowa: Red Rock Reservoir.....	1.5	71,400,000	1,717,000	1,113,000	Texas:				
Kansas:					Colorado River channel.....	1.5	1,310,000	54,000	400,000
Council Grove Reservoir.....	1.8	12,700,000	303,000	300,000	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, channel to Port Mansfield.....	1.1	3,446,000	15,000	150,000
Wilson Reservoir.....	1.2	18,100,000	259,000	500,000	Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, channel to La Quinta.....	5.4	1,959,000	5,000	954,000
Kentucky: No. 2 Barren Reservoir.....	2.3	23,500,000	214,000	1,000,000	Proctor Reservoir.....	1.4	17,100,000	325,000	300,000
Louisiana:					Virginia: Potomac Reservoir.....	1.2	17,700,000	331,000	2,500,000
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway:					West Virginia:				
(a) Algiers Cutoff, Jefferson-Plaquemine drainage district.....	N.A.	1,420,000		1,420,000	East Raccoon.....	2.0	840,000	58,000	500,000
Barataria Bay.....	3.5	2,400,000	85,000	1,000,000	Princeton.....	1.8	1,085,000	71,000	500,000
Massachusetts:					Summersville Reservoir.....	2.6	46,800,000	685,000	2,000,000
Boston Harbor: (b) 35-foot reserved channel.....	2.3	829,000	4,000	825,000	Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries:				
Westville Reservoir.....	1.1	7,430,000	328,000	1,800,000	West Tennessee tributaries.....	3.0	8,400,000	170,000	200,000
Michigan: Grand Marais Harbor.....	N.E.	1,020,000	5,000	300,000	Wolf River and tributaries.....	1.3	2,025,000	43,000	300,000
Mississippi: Pascagoula Harbor.....	1.8	1,218,000	6,000	1,212,000	Yazoo backwater.....	2.2	30,900,000	279,000	50,000
Missouri: Des Moines and Mississippi Levee District No. 1.....	2.7	1,600,000	103,000	500,000	Total, Corps of Engineers (52 projects).....		598,231,100	12,728,000	37,800,100

RECLAMATION

California: Trinity power facilities.....		\$59,607,000		\$2,415,000	Upper Colorado River:				
Idaho: Burns Creek.....		44,616,000		500,000	Colorado: Smith Fork.....	1.2	\$4,420,000		\$300,000
Washington: Greater Wenatchee Division.....	7.0	7,579,000		500,000	New Mexico: Hammond project.....	2.1	3,280,000		500,000
Missouri River Basin:					Wyoming: Seedskaadee project.....	1.5	37,885,000		1,354,000
Kansas: Cedar Bluff unit.....	2.02	4,625,000		400,000	Loan program (6 projects).....		17,089,500		6,016,500
Montana: East Bench unit.....	2.07	20,597,000		1,000,000	Total reclamation (15 projects).....		206,295,500	\$214,253	13,710,500
Nebraska: Red Willow Dam.....	1.87	6,597,000	\$214,253	525,000	Grand total (67 projects).....		801,526,600	12,942,253	51,510,600

¹ Reimbursements to local interests.² Resumption of construction.

Long-Range Study of Educational Policies and Problems by Texas Research League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, Orange County, Tex., will soon be the scene of a major, long-range study with regard to educational policies and problems. The study will be made by the Texas Research League.

Because of the novel and interesting approach being taken to educational problems in Orange County, and because of this firm evidence of cooperation at the local level, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Historic County Schools Study Starts Soon," published in the Orange (Tex.) Leader of August 23, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORIC COUNTY SCHOOLS STUDY STARTS SOON—TEXAS RESEARCH LEAGUE MAY SET PATTERN HERE

A historic survey of school district organization and related problems gets underway in Orange County in the near future.

It will be made by a nationally known and respected factfinding agency, the Texas Research League.

And it is expected to develop a pattern of approach which can be used by other Texas counties faced with similar school district problems.

Announcement of the official acceptance by Texas Research League of an invitation to make the survey was made yesterday by George D. Craft, chairman of a citizens' school study committee appointed some months ago by the county board of education.

Craft said a letter was received late last week notifying his committee that the large group of leading Texas businessmen and industrialists on the Texas Research League board of directors had unanimously approved the Orange County survey.

Executives of the research organization had advised earlier that the study would be made if approved by its screening committee and members of its board of directors.

The letter to Craft was signed by B. S. Sines, of Houston, chairman of the Texas Research League board.

It pointed out the understanding of the league that the purpose of its survey is to provide the facts on which the school boards and other school officials of your county may base a sound district organization plan which will assure a good system of education for your children in the most economical manner.

Sines went on to say that the favorable action of the league's directors was taken in the belief that the study will not only benefit the people of Orange County, but will also develop a pattern of approach which can be used by other Texas counties faced with similar school district problems.

He added, "An important factor prompting the league's acceptance of your study request was your committee's assurance that the undertaking has the sympathetic support of your county school board, the various local school boards, your school administra-

tors and the various official taxpayers and other citizen groups having an interest in the problems facing the schools of Orange County."

This was followed by the comment that the success of the survey will depend very importantly on the cooperation which these persons and groups will give the league's research team in its factfinding efforts.

A part of this cooperation will be the payment by Orange County interests of \$4,500 toward costs of the survey which are not included in the league's current operating budget. The citizens' committee will meet during the next few days to make plans for raising this money.

Texas Research League will finance an additional \$5,000 of the cost out of its own funds, which are provided by the Texas business and industrial firms that support the independent factfinding agency.

According to Sines, the league's research staff will begin the study in the near future. Details of the project are to be worked out by the organization's executive director, Alvin Burger, and the citizens' study committee.

In conclusion, the Texas Research League chairman commented, "The Texas Research League undertakes this survey as a public service. Our board of directors sincerely hopes that the results of the project will contribute to the solution of the financial problems facing your school districts and to the general improvement of public education in Orange County."

Texas Research League was organized by Texas businessmen and industrialists a number of years ago as an agency for doing research work necessary to good government. Its assistance has been officially requested a number of times by the legislature and State agencies and some of its reports have attracted nationwide attention.

The Orange County school study will be the league's first factfinding mission below the level of State government.

The survey was arranged for the committee by Clyde McKee, chairman of a subcommittee appointed for the purpose.

Immediate responsibility for coordination of the project will be in the hands of Jim McGrew, research director for the league at its Austin headquarters.

Fieldwork will be under the direction of Glenn Ivy, research associate. He already has considerable experience in this type of study gained from compiling in 1955 an exhaustive and widely read report on school district organization in the State for the Texas Education Agency.

Ivy also has had extensive experience in property taxes as a result of research work which he did last year while the league was working with the Texas State Tax Study Commission.

Americans Provided Best and Cheapest Food Anywhere in World While Farm Program Has Operated—Benson Works To Destroy This Program—Farmers Enter a New Depression—A Report on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, as the 1st session of the 86th Congress draws

to a close, I feel it is my duty, as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, to review for Members of the House the work of our committee and of the Congress in behalf of agriculture and to bring into proper perspective for the Nation the general circumstances of our farmers and their families.

In this session of Congress, as in past sessions, Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, the chief agriculture officer of our country, has placed roadblocks and obstacles in the pathway of progress.

The Secretary of Agriculture has not provided leadership commensurate with the responsibilities of his high office. On the contrary, he has continued his efforts to divide the agricultural forces of our country and to array consumers against producers and to bring the farm program into disrepute. He has not championed the cause of agriculture nor has he demonstrated a willingness to compose differences with those who do not see "eye to eye" with him. He has been stubborn and unrelenting.

Mr. Benson has not presented a single new thought nor has he proposed a single new program, nor has he been courageous enough to advocate the outright repeal of a single law or program which he has so constantly and consistently criticized. He says that he dislikes the production adjustment programs and the price-support programs but when challenged to do so he refuses to advocate the repeal of either. He seeks only to modify the price-support programs and to lower prices to starvation levels.

"Freedom" and bankruptcy for the farmers of America is Mr. Benson's program.

Unfortunately he does not understand the plight of our farmers nor does he understand their problems, and he is definitely not in favor of a Federal farm program for the farmers of our country. He believes in letting the farmer earn his living "by the sweat of his brow" and to live by the harsh and cruel law of supply and demand without any aid or assistance from the Government, such as are extended to other areas of our economy.

Certainly he should know that the farmers of America have mastered the techniques of production and are now capable of producing more food and fiber than the Nation can possibly consume. Unless our farmers are permitted to exercise some control over production our supplies will be abundant, our surpluses will accumulate, prices will deteriorate, and farmers will suffer. He wants the farmer to go it alone while every other great segment of our economy enjoys a high degree of Government protection.

Our Secretary just does not want to understand the farm program which operated successfully for 20 long years and under which our farmers and the people of our Nation prospered. He wants to destroy the program and to permit our farmers to bury themselves beneath the abundance they are capable of producing.

Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot of talk about the administration's farm program.

There is no such thing. I have challenged the Secretary, and I now challenge any Member of this House to tell us what the Eisenhower-Benson farm program really is. We know and we understand the program which operated so long and so well and we know that under that program America has been the best fed nation on earth and we know that the consumers of America have had more, better, and cheaper food than at any other time in all history.

THE CONSUMER

The average worker in the United States in 1958 spent only 25 percent of his earnings to buy the average amount of food consumed by a family of three. Thirty years earlier the same food would have cost the same worker 48 percent of his earnings.

Over the 30-year period, with farm price support programs in operation in worker's earnings has been released by ~~average up to quarter of~~ ^{average up to quarter of} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~same~~ ^{same} ~~food~~ ^{food} ~~prices~~ ^{prices} ~~for~~ ^{for} ~~other~~ ^{other} ~~uses~~ ^{uses}—to improve his home, send his children to college, buy an automobile, and in many ways to increase and dignify his standard of living.

Farmers in no other country of the world have lowered food costs, in relation to workers' earnings, so dramatically. Food costs, in spite of sharp increases in processing and marketing charges, are lower in the United States in terms of workers' wages than anywhere else in the world.

This has been made possible by the great forward strides in farmers' production efficiency, and we may credit the farm program as a dominant factor in bringing about this high level efficiency. With this farm program, the earnings of farmers were raised from the former low levels and they were able to invest in mechanization, in soil improvements, in chemicals, in new plant varieties, and in production methods which previously were impossible because the farmers were so poor.

Mr. Speaker, if all farm program costs had been added to the cost of food in 1958, the average worker would have spent only 26 percent of his earnings for food, as compared with 35 percent for the same food 10 years earlier, 41 percent 20 years earlier, and 48 percent 30 years earlier.

Yet, there is a movement abroad in this country to heap ridicule upon all farm price stabilization and production adjustment programs, and upon farmers as well. The movement aims to prejudice nonfarm people against farm people, and thus to destroy and foreclose a workable program aimed at economic justice for the people who produce our food and fiber.

Mr. Speaker, there are sly and insidious political calculations back of this movement, as some politicians bid for the vote of the cities, deserting our farmers because they now are so few.

THE BENSON PROGRAM

Mr. Benson has conjured up a program without real form or substance, which he glibly alludes to at every opportunity as the route to a free, prosperous, and ex-

panding agriculture. In fact, however, the Benson program is an incredibly inadequate proposal involving unlimited free production, higher Government costs, and lower prices to farmers. The nearer he has moved agriculture toward his philosophy, the poorer our farmers have become.

The Secretary during his tenure has spent more money than the accumulated total expenditures by all his predecessors in this office during the prior 90-year history of the Department of Agriculture.

Yet in these 6½ years the net income of our farmers has been almost \$20 billion less than in the 6½ years prior to his taking office. The earnings of our people in agriculture have been reduced drastically, while other areas of our Nation's economy have experienced unprecedented prosperity. Moreover, Government investments in surplus farm commodities have increased more than threefold, from \$2,452 million on January 1, 1953 to \$9 billion by the latest report.

And now the stage is set, as a result of Mr. Benson's dreamworld economic theories, for an even greater farm debacle within the next 2 years. Prices received by farmers are in a new downward swirl. They stand now at a level 17 percent below 1952. Hog prices have joined in the decline, falling in July to the lowest level for that month since July 1944. Economists are predicting a slide in beef cattle prices in the months ahead.

The situation demands action.

THE VETO

But, Mr. Speaker, the unyielding, uncompromising, negative position of Mr. Benson and this administration has brought about a paralysis in Washington where the interests of our farmers are concerned.

The veto power of the President, placed at Mr. Benson's disposal, has been raised as an absolute barrier between the farmers and their Government.

The President himself, in a special farm message shortly after this Congress convened, proposed further retreat of the Government from responsibility in the price stability of agriculture and from farm production adjustment undertakings. He called for outright repeal of the parity principle, which is the only means under law to determine a fair relationship of farm prices and costs to the total of the Nation's economy.

Notwithstanding the President's pronouncements, this Congress set out with earnestness and dedication to arrest the 6-year deterioration of our agricultural economy, and to return our farmers nearer to a parity position in our free enterprise society.

But, Mr. Speaker, it soon became crystal clear that no bill could become law unless it hewed to the line laid down by the President. Our efforts were scuttled by the President's negative power—the veto.

WHEAT NO. 1 PROBLEM

It was evident to the Congress and to the President, when this Congress convened, that the great accumulation of wheat surpluses presented the Nation

with its No. 1 farm problem. The Congress passed a bill cutting the wheat acreage in 1960 by 25 percent below 1959. It would have brought wheat plantings down to 41 million acres and would have reduced production substantially. This would have been less than half the 84 million acres our farmers seeded to wheat 10 years ago. The legislation represented a willingness of our farmers to assume great sacrifices to bring down the wheat surplus.

The President vetoed the bill.

He condemned the legislation because it included price supports which sought to prevent great hardships to wheat farmers while they were reducing their crops so severely. He did this in the face of a Department of Agriculture statement that the price support would not influence the price of bread, and despite a sound showing that the legislation would save the Government and taxpayers approximately a half billion dollars over a 2-year period.

By this action the President has assumed full responsibility for the future buildup in wheat surpluses and for the huge costs of financing these extraordinary supplies.

TABACCO BILL

The Congress passed a tobacco bill, the effect of which was to prevent increases in the support prices of tobacco, so that our tobacco might continue to compete price-wise in world markets. All interests in the tobacco industry supported the legislation.

The President vetoed this bill. I never have understood why.

Our Committee on Agriculture held hearings on long-range farm program proposals in an effort to bring general farm legislation before this session of the Congress. We sought to halt the dangerous decline in farm prices and to restore agriculture to an equitable position in the general economy. We would not accept the administration's proposals for agriculture. As a consequence, we were unable to develop legislation which would meet with the President's approval. The farmer does not now have, in the political alignment existing in the Congress, sufficient strength for a two-thirds vote in both Houses to override a veto of legislation in his interest.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, the deep concern of the Members of this House for the well-being of agriculture is spread vividly in the records of our committee. I have been especially impressed and pleased by the dedicated work in behalf of agriculture by the newly elected Members of this body. Our committee records show that Members of the House have introduced to this date in the first session of the 86th Congress 461 bills dealing with conditions on our farms.

Our committee held 113 sessions.

We reviewed these bills and sent 118 to the Secretary, to determine his position upon them. Mr. Benson approved only eight of these bills, and most of these were of a minor nature. He disapproved, proposed changes, or did not report at all, with respect to all the

others. He rejected all legislation proposing fundamental improvements in the operation of farm laws to increase the income of farm families.

In fact, Mr. Benson's predisposition to oppose everything would be comical, if it were not so tragic.

SCHOOL MILK

He went so far as to send his assistants before our committee to oppose an additional national authorization of \$3 million for the special school milk program, without which the program through which milk is supplied to children would have been closed down in many schools before the last school term ended. We passed the authorization bill, Mr. Benson notwithstanding and, not risking a chance of being overridden in the Congress on a milk-for-schoolchildren issue, the President signed it.

CORN GLUT

Early in the session it became evident that Mr. Benson's action drastically reducing the prices of oats, rye, barley, and barley and grain sorghums would severely aggravate the feed surplus situation, by influencing a shift from these small grains to the production of corn. To remedy this our committee developed a bill which would have balanced the price supports of the small grains to their feed value relationship with corn. The Secretary opposed this legislation. And now there is in prospect the largest corn crop in history, to add to the surplus and create graver problems for the livestock industry in the years ahead.

INDUSTRIAL USE RESEARCH

In the Agricultural Act of 1956 the Congress provided for the establishment of a Commission to examine the possibilities of new markets by increasing research in industrial uses of the products of our farms. The Commission made its recommendations. The administration opposed the legislation embracing these recommendations. Our committee worked throughout the session to develop legislation Mr. Benson would accept.

EGGS AND BROILERS

Our poultry industry suffered a price disaster in the spring of this year. It was ironic that the President, in his January farm message condemning the farm price support program, had singled out the poultry industry specifically as an example in agriculture where prosperity abided without the help of Government. Many hundreds and perhaps thousands of family enterprises in poultry were wiped out by the price debacle. The poultrymen appealed to the Congress and to Mr. Benson for help. Mr. Benson opposed legislation to deal with the long-range problems of the industry. He refused to ease the egg market glut by using funds which already were available to buy laying hens, although the product could have been used in a substantial way to improve the school lunch and relief food programs. He did inaugurate a modest egg-buying program, the effect of which came too late to aid many family poultry farms.

REA AND THE VETO

The Congress approved a bill to return to the Administrator of the Rural Elec-

trification Administration the full loan-making authority, so that such authority would not rest with an unsympathetic appointee of the Secretary of Agriculture. Mr. Benson opposed the bill. The President vetoed it. The Senate voted to override, but the House failed to cast the necessary two-thirds vote to set aside the veto.

FOOD FOR THE NEEDY

Many bills were presented to provide for more effective distribution of surplus foods, through a food stamp plan, among needy people. Mr. Benson opposed all these bills.

COUNTRY LIFE COMMISSION

The bill to establish a bipartisan Country Life Commission, to study the most pressing problems of the changing rural scene, drew a neutral report from the Department of Agriculture. This Commission would have been similar in its operations to one appointed by President Theodore Roosevelt in the early part of the century and which made recommendations which brought about substantial improvements in the farm economy and in country living.

HOGS

As the autumn marketing season approached, it became increasingly clear that a crisis was building up in farmer prices for hogs. When July prices for hogs dropped to the lowest level for that month in 15 years there no longer was any doubt that positive measures should be taken to forestall a price catastrophe which might bring grave consequences to the economy of the Midwest and in some other areas of the Nation. Several bills were introduced, proposing various ways of dealing with the situation. Our committee brought up for consideration the bills proposing a program of incentive payments to encourage the marketing of lightweight hogs and thereby ease market gluts. This approach was supported by the National Planning Association, a nonpartisan body. Mr. Benson opposed it. Our committee reported a bill embracing this approach to the hog price problem, but with the opposition of the administration it did not become law.

The Secretary of Agriculture has surplus removal funds already available to initiate a pork purchase program, with the pork to be used in schools and for relief food. It is my hope that he will use his authority and the funds the Congress has provided, in the manner and to the extent necessary, to maintain the maximum stability in the hog markets under the pressures of huge supplies during the impending marketing season. Our bill encouraging lightweight marketings would deal more effectively with the problem, at smaller expense, with the major benefits going to farmers rather than to meat processors; but the Secretary can do an effective job with the authority and funds already at hand, if he will use them wisely.

We have sent to the Secretary, in this and previous Congresses, bills proposing revisions in the present price support and production adjustment program. We forwarded to him bills proposing two-price or domestic parity

systems for various commodities which would let these crops move competitively into world markets while maintaining a reasonable price in our domestic markets. We sent to him proposals for production payments, compensatory payments, or marketing equalization payments to farmers. He has returned them with the Department's stamp of disapproval.

In these circumstances I have set forth, Mr. Speaker, we have been unable to put on our statute books the public policies so sorely needed to stop the piling of surplus upon surplus, reduce Government costs and to arrest the new and deeper depression that is settling upon our farms.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

We have, however, brought forward, with the prospect of Presidential approval, legislation to extend and improve Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act. This bill embraces a section calling upon the Secretary to initiate a food stamp plan for a more adequate distribution of surplus foods among needy people. It includes another section which should prevent the destruction of the extra long staple cotton production industry in the United States. I hope that when the President signs the Public Law 480 extension bill it will include these provisions, although his Secretary vigorously opposes any food stamp plan.

We passed and the President signed legislation important to cotton producers, in that it provides a sound base for making cotton acreage allotments.

Legislation was enacted to assure the operation of special school milk program throughout the last school term, and the authorization for this program was increased by \$6 million to \$81 million for the school term now commencing and by \$9 million to \$84 million for the 1960-61 school term.

We took steps to improve farm credit operations, crop insurance, pest control and several other laws important to agriculture.

We approved numerous watershed projects, for soil and water conservation.

Mr. Speaker, while our efforts to write general farm legislation have been thwarted by the administration, our studies and our work should be of substantial value in the development of sound farm policies when we have an administration sympathetic to the needs of the people who produce our food and fiber.

I would remind the House that before Mr. Benson became the Secretary of Agriculture we had a farm program under which for 11 consecutive years the average prices paid to farmers were at or above 100 percent of parity. I would point out that this program operated for two decades prior to 1953 at an actual profit of \$13 million on Commodity Credit Corporation price supports for the basic crops. CCC operations for all crops including perishables and nonperishables, cost only \$1,064 million over a 20-year period.

This program which worked so long and so well, at so little expense, now is a virtual shambles.

THE GOVERNMENT AND FARMERS

Mr. Speaker, our Government has given labor the minimum-wage and collective-bargaining laws. We have clothed industry with the corporate structure and the many Federal and State statutes which regulate competition. With the help of these Government aids and regulations, both labor and industry have built up a marketing structure which maintains price and wage rates at balanced levels while adjusting supply to demand. How, then, can the modern, highly mechanized farmer survive, when he must do all his buying in the protected market of industry and labor, and do all his own selling at auction, with no protection?

Surely our national interest requires that we have a farm program which will enable farmers to adjust their marketing to available outlets and demand—at prices in line with their costs, as is essential in any successful business.

Now, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I say this:

The well-being of agriculture is a matter of concern to all the people. Our Government research, conservation, and educational programs, combined with the intelligence and labor of our farmers, have given us the most efficient agricultural production in the world. They are giving consumers the cheapest food—in relation to wages—on record. Our farm marketing and pricing machinery, however, is woefully behind the times. Without governmental assistance in the marketing and pricing fields, the exploding production technology on our farms will surely proceed to create a disastrous economic situation for agriculture.

Government cannot now stand by while propagandists cry that all old programs have failed and all new programs are doomed to failure. This Government of ours, representing all the people, cannot say there is nothing it can do to avert the impending economic misery of the farmer. This Government can and must act to salvage some economic justice and stability for farmers—and protect everyone against the ruinous imbalance arising from the abnormal rate of technological advances in production, in relation to available market outlets.

This Government has a moral, an ethical, an inherent, and a constitutional obligation to establish public policies and programs that will open to the men and women of agriculture the opportunity for fair returns on their management, their risks, their capital investment, and their labor on a basis comparable with the workers in all other undertakings in this free enterprise economy and in this democratic society.

The safety, the health, the aspirations of all the people—the strength of our Nation—demand this.

Wisconsin "Tops" Soviet Union in Cheese Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 29, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during these days when the Soviet Union is experiencing growing pains, in the economic, military, scientific, and other fields, we receive repeated reports of bragging about their program.

Among these claims, for example, is that they have made a 500 percent increase in production over pre-World War years of a product for which my home State is famous, that is, cheese.

At this time I want to set the record straight.

Now, it may well be true that they have increased cheese production 500 percent. However, the real facts in cheese production illustrate that my home State of Wisconsin—with only about 2 percent of the population of the Soviet Union, far out-produces the Soviet Union in cheese.

In 1958 the Badger State output amounted to 280,000 metric tons of cheese; by comparison, the production of the Soviet Union totaled only about 150,000 metric tons, approximately 23 percent of the cheese production in the United States.

For a further comparison of cheese production—in which Wisconsin "tops" the Soviet Union—I ask unanimous consent to have the text of a release issued today printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY HAILS WISCONSIN CHEESE OUTPUT AS SYMBOL OF FREE ENTERPRISE TRIUMPH OVER COMMUNISM; WISCONSIN WITH POPULATION OF 3.8 MILLION PRODUCES ALMOST TWICE AS MUCH CHEESE AS SOVIET UNION, POPULATION 238 MILLION

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, ranking Republican member on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, today hailed Wisconsin's record of out-producing Russia in cheese as a symbol of triumph of free enterprise over communism.

"Currently, the Communist leaders brag about the stepped up production of consumer goods under their system. The Soviets are advertising the fact that their cheese production is up 500 percent since the pre-World War years. The fact is, however, that the State of Wisconsin, alone, now produces almost twice as much cheese as the whole Soviet Union. In 1958, the Badger State output amounted to 280,000 metric tons of cheese; by comparison, the production of the Soviet Union totaled only about 150,000 metric tons—approximately 23 percent of the cheese production in the United States. For further comparison, Russian cheese production amounts to 1.6 pounds per person, while the United States production amounts to 8 pounds per person—according to statistics

released earlier this month by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization.

"Globally, the production of cheese between the years prior to the Second World War and 1958 increased about 70 percent. During this same period, American cheese production more than doubled and the United States tops the list of cheese producers. Next in importance are France, Italy, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands, the Soviet Union, Denmark, and Switzerland.

"Although the United States is the world's No. 1 cheese producer," the Wisconsin Senator pointed out, "statistics illustrate that the consumption of cheese in some countries far exceeds that in the United States. Here the per capita consumption is approximately 8.5 pounds. This compares poorly with higher consumption of 19.5 pounds in Norway and 18.7 pounds by the Swiss (who were the pre-world war champions but are now outperformed by the Norwegians.)

"Consequently, the United States still represents a large untapped market for the cheese industry. If the challenge of increasing consumption can be met successfully and will result in a per capita increase, this should substantially brighten the outlook for the American cheese industry. This should be particularly important to Wisconsin since it produces about 44 percent of all American cheese.

"The cheese consumption figures for the United States illustrate that what may be considered a luxury in Russia is everyday diet in this country. In the United States, a pound of hard cheddar cheese sells for about 58 cents, which would mean that an average industrial worker would have to put in about 16 minutes of work to buy a pound of cheese. In Moscow, a pound of the cheapest hard cheese sells for 11 rubles, and comparatively, would require 2 hours and 34 minutes of work.

"In attempting to show that the lot of the Soviet workers is not inferior to that of the American working class, the Communist leaders have denied that the American automobiles, the American home, and the American goods exhibited in the Moscow fair can be afforded by the typical American workingman. As usual, the Soviets are unlikely to accept our superiority in production or our ability to better provide the people's needs. Therefore, although I am not in favor of an 'open arms' welcome for Khrushchev when he comes to this country, I would be happy to send him some samples of Wisconsin cheese, which any American can afford, to help him find out for himself what the advantages of free enterprise are, and what the life and diet of an average American are like," Senator WILEY concluded.

Rescue the World Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, last week, in a major speech which he delivered at the 82d annual meeting of the American Bar Association, the U.S. Attorney General William P. Rogers called

for repeal of the so-called Connally amendment.

Under this amendment the United States decides for itself what disputes it will put before the International Court of Justice.

It is this amendment, Attorney General Rogers said, which is partly to blame for the minor role the Court has taken in settling international disputes. In its 13 years of operation, it has decided only 17 major cases.

Those lawyers who heard the speech say it was the strongest plea to date by any top official of the Eisenhower administration for repeal of the amendment.

The Attorney General pointed out that France recently withdrew a similar provision and that now the United States is alone among 10 NATO nations to continue to insist on such a reservation.

President Eisenhower told the Congress in his state of the Union message that U.S. relations with the World Court should be reexamined "to the end that the rule of law may replace the rule of force in the affairs of nations."

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and I have introduced resolutions calling on the Senate of the United States to repeal the Connally amendment. The State Department has endorsed our proposal, but nothing much else had happened until the speech by Attorney General Rogers.

I am delighted that the Attorney General has now come forward to support this important step.

I include here the text of my House Resolution 267, an editorial from the Washington Post of August 24, 1959, and the text of the splendid speech by the Attorney General of the United States to which I have referred:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 267

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the determination of whether an international dispute to which the United States is a party involves matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States, and is therefore not within the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, should be made by the Court itself rather than by the United States; and that any provision of law or resolution to the contrary should be repealed or otherwise nullified.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 24, 1959]

RESCUE THE WORLD COURT

What has happened to the movement to rescue the World Court? A few months ago a considerable head of steam was built up behind the demand for repeal of the Connally amendment, which has gravely limited the usefulness of the Court. President Eisenhower had said in his state of the Union message that U.S. relations with the World Court should be reexamined "to the end that the rule of law may replace the rule of force in the affairs of nations." Vice President Nixon, Charles S. Rhyne, past president of the American Bar Association, and others stirred up a great deal of interest in the subject. Senator HUMPHREY introduced a resolution to repeal the Connally amendment. The State Department endorsed the resolution in a letter to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in April, and since then the proposal has not moved off dead center.

This is especially unfortunate because it leaves the United States in the position of holding back in the drive for substitution of judicial processes for force in the settlement of international disputes. This country can and does suggest that many international controversies be decided by the World Court, but it is an empty gesture. Through the Connally amendment the Senate asserted the right for this country to decide for itself in each case whether any dispute laid before the World Court is within its domestic jurisdiction. That gives every other country against which the United States may bring a case in the World Court a similar right to escape a judicial determination by asserting that the case is domestic regardless of what may be involved.

Every reason of justice and self-interest cries for removal of this court-crippling device. It would be especially salutary if President Eisenhower could inform our allies on his forthcoming visit and Premier Khrushchev on his September tour that the United States is accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court, without any strings attached.

Responsibility for the present inaction seems to be shared about equally by the administration and the Foreign Relations Committee (which reportedly is reluctant to move because of opposition mail). In any event, the President is in the best position to break the deadlock. Why doesn't he send up a rousing message asking for immediate passage of the Humphrey resolution as a means of striking a blow for world law.

ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM P. ROGERS, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, 82D ANNUAL MEETING, AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, MIAMI BEACH, FLA., AUGUST 26, 1959

It is a great honor and privilege again to address the annual meeting of the American Bar Association. This association is the largest and most influential group in the legal profession. What you think and do has a significant impact on the administration of justice and on public affairs.

We in the Department of Justice have a common objective with you in seeking constantly to improve our system of justice so that it may better serve the people of our Nation. In pursuit of this objective there may be, on occasion, an action taken or a statement made by this association, or one of its numerous committees, with which we are not in full accord. But I want you to know that I am well aware, particularly from reading some of my mail from you, that this occasional lack of togetherness is mutual.

Notwithstanding any infrequent minor differences, we in the Department know that the American Bar Association is earnestly and effectively striving to improve our profession and has made significant and important contributions to that end. The support you have given to the Department of Justice, especially in certain difficult and sensitive areas, has been of the highest order and I want you to know that I, and all of us in the Department, sincerely appreciate it. May I also commend the association for its splendid record of achievement this year under the outstanding leadership of your president, Ross Malone.

What is the responsibility of our profession in today's world? As I see it there are two broad areas to be considered.

First, the administration of justice in the United States is on display in every part of the world. When we talk about competing with international communism in the realm of ideas, we are talking in large measure about the ideas which are the basis of our legal system.

Second, in the long view the main hope for peace is that nations will be wise enough not to rely on sheer strength in dealing with each other but will move toward establishing systems based on considerations of law and justice in the resolution of international disputes. Nations have readily paid lip service to the soundness of this proposition but progress in this area has been tragically slow.

Dramatic events in the past few weeks and those indicated in weeks to come suggest that we are at a point in our international relations at which our profession will have new opportunities to serve our Nation in these two areas.

As to the first, although Soviet leaders are still firmly committed to the policy of world domination there is hope today that they may be willing to permit a freer flow of ideas between our two countries than they have in the past. For this reason I believe the time has come when we should act and speak more vigorously and effectively for those ideals and ideas which have given this country its strength. People throughout the world, even to some extent in the areas controlled by the Soviet Union, may have an opportunity to get a more accurate picture of America and the meaning of justice and freedom here as contrasted with the Soviet Union.

In this international competition we must not fall into the trap of emphasizing material considerations to the exclusion of all else. To some of the uncommitted nations of the world the Soviet system of state controls and planning may seem attractive. The Russians point to the fact that their economic system has been applied in a country which was initially very backward in technology, with a low standard of living compared to the West. Because a similar situation exists to some degree in several of the new nations of the world, they see a parallel that has some surface attraction.

But the situation is different when it comes to the appeal of ideas. Freedom under law is one of the most powerful ideas ever conceived by the mind of man. Its appeal will continue to grow in the uncommitted nations of the world. It has not been too long since many of these nations completed their successful struggle for independence. With national freedom there has arisen a great awareness of and interest in the concept of individual freedom. Thus the free world has an unusual opportunity in the years ahead to place in bold relief the weaknesses of the Soviet system compared with the strength of ours.

Why does the legal profession have a responsibility for this? Because we are daily involved in the processes of justice, and its administration is our business. We are officers of the courts of the United States and should be the leading spokesmen for presenting the case of freedom to the world. The merits of the case have to be articulated more effectively than has been done in the past. In the world in which we live it is not enough to be convinced that our system holds forth the greatest promise of individual liberty for people all over the world. We should present the true picture of a system of liberty under law to those who do not fully understand it or who may have been misled by Soviet propaganda. This must be done so that people will realize the importance of maintaining free governments and not succumb to the Soviet scheme for world domination.

These are a few of the truths which need to be dramatized:

1. We cannot rest our case on the size and productivity of our farms, factories, and mines, nor even on the excellent wages and working conditions of the American people. These are important, but they are the by-

product of freedom—not its source. The source of strength in a democracy is the freedom of the individual to think, speak, and do the things he decides to do as long as he does not transgress the rights of others. We must point out, too, that these freedoms are not a matter of grace but are guaranteed and protected by our legal system.

2. The land and the tools of production in our Nation are owned by the people, not by the Government as in Russia. It should be emphasized that our legal system protects this ownership against intrusion by any other individual or by the Government itself. Under this system in which the free initiative of the individual plays the major role the United States has achieved the greatest distribution of wealth among its people and has come closest to the ideal of prosperity for all.

3. We are a government of law, not of men. Regardless of wealth, power or station, no one is above the law in the United States. For this reason our people need never fear that they may become the victims of ruthless political leaders. Thus the fact, now generally conceded by everyone, that under Stalin thousands of innocent victims were killed and tortured in the Soviet Union, seems almost beyond belief to a free people. Yet, because the law in the Soviet Union is what the Communist Party says it is, many of those who acted in concert with Stalin in perpetrating these atrocities apparently have not been prosecuted nor has retribution been made for the wrongs committed.

4. We must constantly emphasize that the will of the people is controlling in the United States. Under our legal system public officials are responsive to the will of the people. Our Nation will never start a war because our people fervently want peace. Anyone who believes that our Nation might act in a manner inconsistent with the will of the people in maintaining peace is ignorant about how our system works.

These are merely a few ideas which can be emphasized. There are a great many others, of course, with which we are all familiar and with which you and this association will be concerned in the future. For the past several years this association has done an excellent job in awakening the public to the significance of the rule of law. I commend you particularly for the vigor and imagination with which you are planning to cooperate in the future with the legal professions of many other nations to intensify interest and support for the rule of law in resolving international disputes.

President Eisenhower expressed the thought well in his letter to Mr. Malone when he said:

"Peace cannot prevail until men and nations recognize that their conduct must be governed by respect for and observance of the law. The American Bar Association by seeking to promote this principle is helping to advance the cause of enduring peace in the world."

In this connection we should keep in mind that there is a good likelihood that the exchange programs between East and West will continue, and may even be expanded in the future. As you know, the exchange programs now in effect include representatives from industry, agriculture, medicine, student groups, the arts and sciences, athletics, and many other fields, but there has been little exchange between members of the legal profession.

It is my opinion that the legal profession should give its support to a carefully planned exchange program of lawyers and judges in order that the Soviets may study our constitutional system and the operation of our courts and that we be given an opportunity to study the system in effect in the Soviet Union. Because of fundamental differences the systems are in no sense similar but ex-

changes would provide a method for our profession to increase its knowledge of their system. At the same time there may be some value in having the Russians who come to our country judge for themselves the comparative merits of the two systems. In any event the exchanges would provide a means to dramatize more effectively to the rest of the world the contrast between a free system of government and a regimented system under Communist control.

Turning now to the second area, I believe we have a responsibility to work for the establishment of systems of law and justice to deal with international disputes.

In his state of the Union message this year, President Eisenhower said:

"It is my purpose to intensify efforts during the coming 2 years in seeking ways to supplement the procedures of the United Nations and other bodies with similar objectives, to the end that the rule of law may replace the rule of force in the affairs of nations."

The attainment of this high goal will not be achieved by any single stroke or by any single government. In fact, because the Soviet Union seems intent on world domination which is the antithesis of the rule of law, the concept is apt to seem illusory and of no practical importance in today's world.

The point to bear in mind is that there is no other way to travel which provides hope for peace. Despite the discouragements which may arise the United States must take the lead in an effort to make progress along this road. Certainly, in the foreseeable future, if it is necessary to live in a world in which the settlement of international disputes will depend principally on factors of terror rather than on justice, then we should make it clear that such an uncivilized stalemate is not of our choosing.

Following the state of the Union message, and as part of the intensification of effort referred to by the President, both Secretary of State Dulles and Secretary of State Herter supported a proposal in the Senate of the United States to strengthen the International Court of Justice by repealing the so-called Connally amendment.

This Court, as you know, was created by the United Nations in 1945 to decide legal disputes between nations. It sits at The Hague and is composed of 15 judges elected by the General Assembly and the Security Council of the United Nations.

When established, the Court appeared to hold great promise, but through no fault of its own it has played a minor role in the settlement of international legal disputes. In its 13 years of existence it has decided only 17 contentious cases.

The Court has suffered because some nations have refused to accept the Court's jurisdiction at all and as to many disputes it has no jurisdiction unless the nations agree that it has in the particular case. The blame—some might prefer to use the word responsibility—for this latter condition rests in some degree, at least, on the United States.

The United States accepted the jurisdiction of the International Court in 1946. The history of our declaration of acceptance is significant.

The resolution introduced in the Senate with bipartisan support contained a reservation excluding from the Court's jurisdiction "disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States."

Public hearings were conducted on the resolution in this form, and it was unanimously endorsed by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Its report stated:

"The question of what is properly a matter of international law is, in case of dispute, appropriate for decision by the Court itself, since, if it were left to the decision of each

individual state, it would be possible to withhold any case from adjudication on the plea that it is a matter of domestic jurisdiction."

Nevertheless, on the floor of the Senate the Connally amendment was adopted adding to our reservation the clause "as determined by the United States of America."

Thus, in the declaration of acceptance by the United States our reservation is that the Court shall not have jurisdiction of "disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States of America as determined by the United States of America."

We were the first Nation to provide that the jurisdiction of the Court should be determined not by the Court but by us. Following our example seven other nations made similar reservations.

Furthermore, the rule of reciprocity applies so that any nation may invoke the terms of the reservations of any nation with which it is involved in a dispute.

It is plain to see why the existence of this type of reservation has had an impact on the effectiveness of the Court. Imagine the impairment which would result to the court system in the United States if the defendant in a law suit had the right to determine for himself whether his case was within the court's jurisdiction.

The Court's statute explicitly limits its jurisdiction to international legal disputes. By the plain terms of the grant, it has no jurisdiction over domestic matters. So the "as determined by the United States of America" clause adds up, in the eyes of other nations at least, to a vote of no confidence that the Court will limit the cases it hears to those within its jurisdiction.

There are those who are concerned that the Court might exceed its jurisdiction. It is argued that our sovereignty might thus be impaired. As a practical matter the argument as to possible loss of sovereignty is not persuasive.

The International Court of Justice, in the final analysis, depends largely on world opinion for the enforcement of its decisions—in fact, for the participation of the nations. It has carefully stayed within the limits of its jurisdiction as provided by its basic statute. There is no reason to believe that the Court would invade areas properly reserved to domestic jurisdiction.

In July of this year, France, surely as sensitive as we are in matters of sovereignty, withdrew her reservation containing the equivalent of the Connally amendment.

Thus, today six NATO nations have not even deemed it necessary to make any express reservation with respect to domestic disputes. Three others—Canada, Great Britain, and now France—have done nothing more than make explicit the exclusion of domestic questions from the Court's jurisdiction. Hence, of the 10 NATO nations which have accepted the Court's jurisdiction, the United States is the only one which denies to the Court the right to determine its own jurisdiction.

For more than 50 years our statesmen have advocated an impartial international court to decide disputes between nations. In 1907, Secretary of State Elihu Root, in his instructions to our delegates at the Second Peace Conference at The Hague, said we should develop a permanent tribunal composed of judges who will devote their entire time to the trial and decision of international causes by judicial methods.

In 1925, President Coolidge, in his inaugural address, advocated the "establishment of a tribunal for the administration of even-handed justice between nation and nation." As he put it, "The weight of our enormous influence must be cast upon the side of a reign, not of force but of law and trial, not by battle but by reason."

Every President since World War I has advocated the submission of international legal disputes to a judicial tribunal.

A half century of debate has resulted in little progress. It must be obvious to everyone that action in this field is long overdue. That is why our profession should urge the Senate of the United States to act at the earliest possible time on this important matter of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

Finally, let me turn for a moment to the question of international agreements. The nations of the world today are in almost constant discussion and negotiation at the conference table. The purpose of the meetings is to arrive at agreements for the settlement of critical world problems.

From the standpoint of a lawyer, it is discouraging to see how often in important international agreements no provision is made for settling disputes which may arise about the interpretation of the agreement.

And an agreement, as every lawyer knows, may solve a lot of problems or may cause a lot of problems. It depends on how well the agreement is drafted and on the frame of mind of the parties to it.

Lawyers know, too, that it is not possible to draft an agreement to eliminate all possible future differences as to its meaning which might arise.

For that reason, even after exercising all possible care in drafting agreements, we know there must be a court—or at least some method agreed upon by the parties—to resolve disputes which may arise as to the interpretation of agreements.

The same principle, of course, applies to nations. For when two or more nations make an agreement, notwithstanding every effort to make the agreement as clear as possible, they know that disputes about the interpretation of it may arise. If no provision is made for disposition of these disputes, each nation will naturally insist on interpreting the agreement for itself. Thus, rather than resolving differences, the agreement may give rise to new tensions and recriminations.

Last April the Vice President in a significant address urged that the United States take the initiative in future agreements to secure the inclusion of provisions to the effect "(1) that disputes which may arise as to the interpretation of the agreement should be submitted to the International Court of Justice at The Hague; and (2) that the nations signing the agreement should be bound by the decision of the Court in such cases."

Certainly this basic idea deserves our support. A well-understood policy among nations to refer disputes with respect to the interpretation of treaties and other international agreements to the International Court of Justice, or some other impartial tribunal, would be a great step forward on the road to a rule of law among nations.

Knowing that an impartial tribunal would resolve any dispute as to meaning would strengthen the force of the agreement and cause less controversy about it.

The fact that we may not be successful in securing agreement to such a clause in all cases does not mean that we should fail to try. The fact that the Soviets, for example, might not agree to such a policy is no ground for not advocating it. The more often the Soviets oppose reasonable methods to solve world tensions, the more the nations of the world will come to recognize the significance of the Soviet policy of world domination.

For the reasons I have indicated, I hope that the American Bar Association will continue to give its vigorous support to the rule of law in the resolution of international disputes.

No one need point out that because of the present Soviet policy this seems less like a goal than a mirage. Nevertheless, we must

believe in it and we must believe it is possible to attain. More than that, we must make some progress along this road.

Our Nation has no goal of world conquest, no intention of infringing the liberties of any people, and no desire other than to deal justly with the other nations of the earth. But there are persons in the world who are skeptical about this. Thus I believe that the members of our profession should make clear beyond any doubt that the United States has but this single goal—that the family of nations may live together in peace under law.

Tendency To Merchandise Candidates Over Television and Radio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a good many thoughtful people fear that Madison Avenue, combined with television, may someday reduce the selection of political candidates not to merit and intelligence, but to superficial appearance and similar ephemeral qualities.

A very perceptive column has been written on this unfortunate trend by Mr. J. W. Forrester, editor of the *Pendleton* (Oreg.) *East Oregonian*, on his editorial page for August 21, 1959. Mr. Forrester not only voices some suggestions to prospective candidates, but he cites the fact that aspirants for some of the highest offices in the land already have been merchandized like shirts or gloves rather than as people who would lead the greatest democracy on earth.

I ask unanimous consent that this column from the *Pendleton East Oregonian* be printed in the Appendix of the *RECORD*, perhaps as a warning to us and to the American public.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

OF CABBAGES AND KINGS

(By J. W. Forrester)

"The time has come," the Walrus said, "to talk of many things: Of shoes—and ships—and sealing wax—of cabbages—and kings."

Another election year is just around the corner (enjoy this "breather" to the fullest) and with it comes resumption of the debate that swirls around the place Madison Avenue and television have preempted in campaigning.

Some are convinced the day is not far off when the clever men of Madison Avenue will "sell" a completely unqualified candidate by putting the right words in his mouth and restricting his campaigning solely to television. They will make him sound wise and by freezing him within the confines of television nobody will be able—because they won't be permitted to question him—to find out that he actually is foolish, uninformed and misinformed on all the issues that count.

This is a chilling prospect. We want to think that it can't happen. We want to think that energetic reporters will always be around to give the voters an accurate picture of all candidates.

But, let us not be deluded about the magic of television in politics. The candi-

date who uses it well can make a lot of hay with the voters. President Eisenhower set an example for candidates who want to use TV and we may be sure the lessons were not lost on them. Robert Montgomery was employed by the Republican Party to teach Mr. Eisenhower how to use TV properly and under Mr. Montgomery's tutelage and the President has shown constant improvement. He has become increasingly effective. If you will recall Mr. Eisenhower's first appearances on TV in 1952 you know that Mr. Montgomery started with a very raw recruit.

We got on this subject after reading a special issue of the *County Officer* magazine, devoted entirely to county public relations. Several phases of the subject are discussed. An entire section covers campaigning on TV. Because you are going to see and hear many candidates on TV next year we thing you'll be interested in one part of this section on campaigning on TV, as prepared by the National Association of Broadcasters. It deals with your television appearance and says this:

"Personal appearance is of vital importance to the success of your television talk. Your clothing and mannerisms must be pleasing to the eye but not distracting.

"In dressing for television, don't wear sharp contrasts. The male speaker should never wear a white shirt or a white pocket handkerchief, as white "washes out" on the TV screen. Pick a light blue or gray shirt. Avoid large-figured ties; these tend to distract the viewer. If you are bothered with dandruff, don't wear a dark blue or black suit as the camera will pick up the telltale flakes on your shoulders.

"The woman speaker likewise must avoid white dresses or blouses. Don't wear dresses with a large print and take care in selecting your jewelry. Too much glimmering jewelry will reflect the studio lights. You may feel like the breath of spring with a lovely corsage on your dress, but if the flowers are white your viewer will see only a blur on your shoulder.

"Most men do not require makeup for television. However, if your skin is exceptionally oily you may need to use a little powder. Pancake makeup may be required if you have dark shadows around your eyes or a heavy beard line. Consult with the station makeup personnel on this point. And don't forget that bald head. It's apt to shine under the lights, so soften it with a little powder.

"It isn't necessary for a woman to be made up by the studio professionals. You may use your own cosmetics, but avoid heavy makeup, lipstick, etc. Prepare your face as you would normally—the camera has X-ray eyes and heavy makeup looks unnatural.

"If you wear glasses, don't try to go without them during your television appearance. Your eyes are accustomed to the glasses and will react unnaturally without them. The station lighting crew will arrange the lights to avoid a glare from your specs.

"Posture is extremely important to your TV appearance. Generally you will be seated during your talk. Sit on the edge of your chair if possible (this will remove the temptation to slump), throw your shoulders back and keep your head high and chin out. When you drop your chin your hairline is accentuated and this usually is not an attractive feature. If you are seated at a table, rest your arms on the table, but don't rest your weight on your arms. This will throw your shoulders out of line.

"When standing, maintain a relaxed stance but don't look as though you are falling apart. Stand with your feet apart, your shoulders back and your head high. Move slowly, but naturally. You may even want to sit on the edge of the table at times—

this gives you a natural, relaxed air, but keep your back straight, don't slump.

"Keep in mind throughout your talk that no matter how far away the camera may be, it is still possible to take a closeup of your face. You will have no way of knowing when a closeup is being taken, so act accordingly at all times.

"Above all else—relax, be natural, be friendly."

Fiscal Irresponsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, here are three more editorial comments on the fiscal irresponsibility this Congress is exhibiting in failing to grant the necessary flexibility to the Treasury Department in managing the Federal debt by removing the interest ceiling on long-term Federal bonds.

These editorials are from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, August 25, 1959; New York Times, August 27, 1959; and New York Herald Tribune, August 27, 1959: [From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Aug. 25, 1959]

INFLATIONARY VOTE

President Eisenhower is reported in dispatches from Washington to be considering a public appeal in behalf of legislation to enable the Treasury to stimulate the Government bond market by raising interest rates above the 4.25 percent ceiling on long-term securities. Needed though the legislation is, such a move seems foredoomed to failure in view of the 14-11 party-line vote by which the House Ways and Means Committee turned it down.

Although we often disagree with Representative RICHARD M. SIMPSON, of Pennsylvania, the top Republican on the committee, in this case he is right in describing the committee action as "incredible folly." As he observes, the Government will be forced to borrow in the short-term money market in competition with State and local governments, business, and consumers. This is likely to force upward the cost of short-term money and to inflate the supply of credit.

The surprise action of the committee is difficult to understand, since it was a reversal of an August 12 decision to approve the measure. As part of that decision the committee included a directive which said, in part: "It is the sense of Congress that the Government shall take into account—the importance of achieving the maximum sustainable rate of economic growth, maintaining reasonable stability of the purchasing power of the dollar, and assuring that the cost of managing the public debt is kept to the minimum consistent with these vital objectives."

The 14 Democrats who voted to suspend action for this session on the legislation must know they voted against "economic growth." The Treasury should be enabled to compete with other borrowers in the money market. The discarded compromise bill would have permitted it to do so for 3 years, a reasonable period. The author of the measure, Democratic Representative HARRISON, of Virginia, joined the 10 committee Republicans in voting for the bill. It is too bad he could not have persuaded two additional Democrats to join him.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 27, 1959]

THE INTEREST CEILING ISSUE

President Eisenhower at his news conference Tuesday renewed—and in the most emphatic manner—his request first made to Congress on June 8 that the existing ceilings applying to interest rates on Government bonds be removed or liberalized.

The ceiling on marketable securities is 4½ percent, and applies to issues with maturities of 5 years or longer. This legislation is in the nature of an anachronistic accident. It has no logical relationship to present conditions in the bond market. It was enacted in 1918 in connection with the second Liberty Loan financing of World War I, and was based on conditions then contemporary but today purely history.

What makes this legislation imperative is that the Treasury must raise vast sums in the months ahead in order (1) to fund a constant procession of maturing obligations, and (2) to raise new money to pay for the appropriations voted by Congress and not covered by taxes. As much as possible of such financing should take the form of securities designed to appeal to savers since, when money is raised through savings, it has no inflationary effects. In practice this means that, broadly speaking, it should be raised through the sale of long-term securities. But with business in a boom phase at present, the demands of borrowers of all categories in the money market are extremely heavy. These demands, competing for a comparatively limited supply of funds, have driven interest rates sharply upward. With the market rate on comparatively long issues above 4½ percent the Treasury finds itself in a position in which it has no alternative but to raise its funds through the sale of short-term paper, a procedure inflationary in its implications because it involves the creation of bank credit or expansion of the money supply.

The present ceiling on savings bonds, from which the President has also asked relief, is roughly 3¼ percent, a rate that makes it impossible for the Government to compete actively with other available outlets for savings. This is not only a grave injustice to the 40 million patriotic holders of savings bonds in the Nation, but it is a potential threat of the most serious kind to the whole Government savings bond program, itself a major bulwark against monetary inflation.

Savings bonds outstanding total \$50.5 billion. That figure exceeds by \$2 billion the total of all publicly held marketable issues of the United States Treasury with maturities of 5 years or longer. Every dollar that is withdrawn by a savings bond holder is a dollar that the Treasury will have to replace, and that, so long as present interest limitations remain in effect, it will have to replace by raising the money through methods highly inflationary.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, August 27, 1959]

PLAYING POLITICS WITH THE PUBLIC DEBT

The question of lifting the 4½ percent ceiling on interest rates for marketable Treasury bonds, according to SAM RAYBURN, is a dead issue in this session of Congress. But he did leave the door open yesterday for a possible boost in the ceiling on series E and H savings bonds from the present 3¼ percent to 3½ percent.

The Democrats have hoped to use the bond issue to tag the Republicans a "high interest rate" party. But it would be politically ticklish to oppose a clearly merited rise in interest rates on savings bonds, which are held by 40 million Americans, most of them voters.

The 3½ percent rate now makes these bonds a poor buy; for the past 12 months, in fact, sales have lagged behind redemptions.

In July \$350 million were sold, \$507 million redeemed. Not only is the Treasury over a barrel but the small investor isn't getting a fair shake.

Action to provide an equitable rate on these bonds is needed, but action to free rates on regular Treasury bonds is equally urgent. Bonds already issued are selling in the open market at prices yielding more than 4½ percent, so that new long-term issues (the only ones to which the ceiling applies) can't be sold. Sound management of the Nation's \$290 billion debt is one of the pillars of fiscal stability and is impossible without long-term borrowing. Within the next 12 months the Treasury will have to borrow \$85 billion to cover maturing securities, redemptions and seasonal cash needs. Unless Congress acts, this will have to be done without access to long-term funds. Speaker RAYBURN knows this. Senator JOHNSON knows it. It's up to them to put politics aside, and act promptly to free the Treasury from artificial and fiscally dangerous restrictions.

Eisenhower's Trip to Europe: A Triumph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in a world torn by conflicts, it is always refreshing when events occur to illustrate understanding and good will between people and nations.

Currently, the mission of President Eisenhower to Europe for talks with the heads of the West German, British, and French Governments represent one of those heartwarming events.

Daily, our newspapers are carrying accounts of the accolades showered upon our President first by the citizens of West Germany, then in Great Britain, and we would hope, also, in the upcoming visit to France.

Rarely in history has the head of any nation been so beloved, not only by his own countrymen, but by people around the globe. Our Nation can, indeed, be proud that we have as Chief Executive a man so highly esteemed in the eyes of the world.

From all accounts, the trip may well result in a significant revitalization of the bonds of friendships for the American people, as expressed in the friendly greetings and receptions now being extended to him.

Perhaps this kind of communion between human beings may be successful in accomplishing far more in resolving differences and misunderstandings between nations than more formal conferences of heads of states.

Overall, the art of friendly diplomacy—for which President Eisenhower has a unique talent—will, I am confident, contribute much the world peace—to a lessening of conflict—to an era in which people around the globe can share proportionately of the benefits of the inventive genius of mankind and of the natural resources of the earth—dedi-

cated, not to destructive goals, but to benefiting mankind.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials: "Ike's Triumph," from the Milwaukee Sentinel, and "Eisenhower: Symbol of Peace," from the New York Times, reflecting the wonderful way in which the President has been received on his mission of peace.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel, Aug. 29, 1959]

AS WE SEE IT: IKE'S TRIUMPH

President Eisenhower has completed the German segment of his mission to Europe in a triumph of unity and purpose. He has begun the British segment in a spirit of warmth and friendliness.

The overwhelming welcomes he received from the West Germans and the English was matched by the accord he has been reaching with their leaders.

To Chancellor Adenauer he proclaimed American determination to bring to an end the tragic division of Germany and until such time to protect the freedom of West Berlin.

These are not new or startling affirmations, but they needed to be said. In this connection, it is our opinion that Premier Khrushchev did the West a favor by sending a note to Bonn, timed to coincide with the President's arrival.

He did not say anything new, either, and as usual the fist was clenched behind the smile. But by warning that Soviet power could crush West Germany and all its allies, including us, Khrushchev called attention to these truths:

That in this cold-war world neutrality is a deadly illusion (as Nehru of India is painfully finding out); and that weaknesses and festering differences among the allies abet the Communist design of conquest.

"Germans trust Eisenhower"—thus read signs that greeted the President.

Let us hope our other allies will be equally convinced they may trust him not to appease communism in his talks with Khrushchev, never to surrender principle to expediency, never to compromise his belief that unity of the western alliance is really the hope for salvation of the world.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 30, 1959]

EISENHOWER: SYMBOL OF PEACE

As the 20th anniversary of the outbreak of the Second World War rolls around this week another American President is being hailed in Europe as the symbol of peace and freedom in a manner comparable only with the great ovations accorded President Wilson more than 40 years ago. Like President Wilson, President Eisenhower is trying to cope with the problems resulting from a world cataclysm. His task is even more formidable because the issues go deeper, the stakes are higher and the menace to peace is greater and in the atomic age more terrifying.

But President Eisenhower can draw on the lessons of history to back him up in his enterprise and in the solutions he proposes. Europe blundered into the First World War mainly because of the rivalries of the European nation-states and the failure of European diplomacy to exert itself. Because of the same rivalries, President Wilson not only failed to realize his ideals but also consented to the Versailles Treaty, which Western statesmen today frankly indict as a mandate of unhappy consequences. It bred economic disorder. It gave unexpected aid to the rise of Hitler who, in conspiracy with Stalin and aided by Western appeasement, plunged the

world into a new war that enslaved even the nations Versailles had liberated.

It is in the light of this history that President Eisenhower's exertions must be viewed. He is throwing the powers of the American Presidency and his own authority and prestige into the scales in a supreme effort, first to rally the West against further Soviet aggression, and second to ease the cold war by persuading the Soviets to agree to a peace settlement on terms the West can accept.

For the same purpose he seeks to abate the remaining national rivalries in Europe by supporting, as he again emphasized in Bonn, the closer union of Western Europe. This has already led to the miracle of the French-German reconciliation and is also both the key to a solution of the principal outstanding problem, the reunification of Germany, and a herald of a future United States of Europe, in which rests the best hope for the peaceful liberation of the enslaved nations.

In short, he is working for a peace settlement that will rest not on a mandate but on the agreements of all concerned. And in keeping with both American ideals and enlightened self-interest, he is the most ardent exponent of the policy initiated under his predecessor which, instead of squeezing the vanquished to the ruin of all, extended massive aid to victors and vanquished alike and is still extending it to those in need of it to make this a better world for all.

These are the aims, purposes and policies he is presenting to Europe. In comparison with them all tactical or even selfishly national considerations become secondary. He has found full understanding for his endeavor in Bonn, seems to be finding like understanding in London, and should find it in Paris as well.

On Right Track

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York Journal American of August 21, 1959:

ON RIGHT TRACK

We congratulate Governor Rockefeller on the excellence of the three-man harness racing commission he has just named to supplant the former one-man czaristic rule.

This is the goal for which this newspaper campaigned vigorously for months until Governor Rockefeller called the legislature into special session to enact much-needed reforms.

The best-known member of the new commission is of course James A. Farley in whom the public has great confidence—and justifiably so. The chairmanship goes to Buffalo Sheriff Robert A. Glasser, a law enforcement officer of proven worth and experience. The third member is Public Service Commissioner Spencer B. Eddy, one of the best-informed men on racing in the country.

We hope the first act of the commission will be to see what unexpected moneys can be recovered from the old harness racing construction fund by which the State was obligated to use taxpayer dollars to refurbish the tracks. These funds, which run into the millions, could better be used for education, hospitals, cancer research, etc.

Bottleneck on Judgeships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two more recent items concerning the backlog of judicial nominations in the Senate Judiciary Committee. They are an editorial, "Congress and the Judges," from the New York Times of Sunday, August 30, 1959, and a column by Peter Edson entitled "Bottleneck on Judgeships," which appeared in the Washington Daily News on Tuesday, August 25, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial and column were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 30, 1959]

CONGRESS AND THE JUDGES

The failure of Congress to meet the urgent need for more Federal judges has become a national disgrace—one that works a grave denial of justice to the American people through delays in undermanned and overburdened courts. Congress has failed in two ways: by not creating new judgeships and by Senate slow motion in approving Presidential appointments to fill existing vacancies.

Long ago the Judicial Conference, made up of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and the chief judges of the circuit courts of appeals, recommended the creation of more than 40 new seats on the Federal bench in areas where calendars are the most congested. Each year for the past 3 years a bill to do this has been introduced in Congress which each year has gotten nowhere.

In the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, of which JAMES O. EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, is chairman, there lie buried by inaction more than 20 judicial nominations, one for as long as 7 months, while incumbent judges on the depleted benches struggle in vain to keep up with their calendars and litigants wait for years before they can be heard. Politics and personal pique have produced most of the gum in the legislature's gears—maneuvering for partisan advantage and resentment over favorite candidates ignored.

Facing up to the need for new judges, Attorney General Rogers has cited a sound principle and at the same time has proposed its violation—but, we must say, in a very good cause. He said that President Eisenhower has always thought "you shouldn't approach appointments to the Federal bench in a partisan way." Then Mr. Rogers pledged, with the President's approval, that if Congress creates additional judgeships the administration will fill half of them with Democrats.

Well, if party politics can't be divorced from judicial appointments in this imperfect world, it is obviously best to strike an even political balance—especially if it will spur Congress to action on the new judgeships measure. And action is what is needed now, both there and on the judicial appointments in the Senate.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Aug. 25, 1959]

BOTTLENECK ON JUDGESHIPS

(By Peter Edson)

Plain old politics of the low down variety is held responsible for holding up confirma-

tion of 20 of President Eisenhower's nominations for Federal Judges this year. Eighteen of the 20 nominees are Republicans.

The bottleneck is the Senate Judiciary Committee under Chairman JAMES O. EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi. But Republicans charge that this course of inaction has the approval of Democratic Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas.

This is SPOB—standard political operations procedure. Democrats hold up confirmation of Republican nominees in the hope they can block them completely or force deals to get a few more Democrats on the bench. If this delay can be extended to 1961, when the Democrats hope to have a President of their own party in the White House, then all Republican nominations can be dumped in the ashcan and Democratic substitutions made.

The Republicans played this same game in 1948, when they thought Gov. Thomas E. Dewey was a shoo-in for the White House. The GOP lost on that bet, but it now gives the Democrats a precedent to follow.

The monkey wrenches this throws in the Federal legal machinery, however, slows down the wheels of justice appreciably. When there are vacancies in any court, its docket becomes jammed with untried cases.

What these delays do to the nominees is even worse. A lawyer can't get new legal business if he is being considered for a judgeship. And when an appointment is held up for months by the Senate, it becomes a personal matter which damages the nominee's standing.

John C. Tucker of Beaumont, Tex., recently asked President Eisenhower to withdraw his nomination as judge for the eastern district of Texas because of delay in confirmation. This was a case where Senator JOHNSON, who was opposing Judge Tucker, won out.

Thirteen of President Eisenhower's nominations for the Federal bench have been pending 4 to 7 months.

Two were sent up last January. They are George L. Hart, Jr., of Washington, for the District of Columbia and Walter A. Gordon of California for the Virgin Islands.

Five more nominations were sent up in February. One that really hurts is the nomination of District Judge Phillip Forman of New Jersey to the Third Circuit Court of Appeals.

Others are Bailey Aldrich of Massachusetts to the first circuit, Anthony Julian to Massachusetts, Leonard P. Walsh to District of Columbia, Myron D. Crocker and Fred Kunzel, both of the southern district of California bench.

Three more nominations that went up in March and are still hanging fire are Harold K. Wood to eastern district of Pennsylvania, Lloyd F. MacMahon to southern district of New York, and Judge Henry J. Friendly of New York to second circuit. This last nomination may be cleared soon.

In April, two more nominations were sent up, while in July and August, the list was seven.

In the cases of some five other vacancies on the Federal bench, it is expected that recess appointments will be made after Congress adjourns.

Hon. J. Bayard Clark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. A. PAUL KITCHIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join my colleagues in paying

tribute to an outstanding North Carolinian and a truly great American who has passed to his reward. While it was not my privilege to serve in this body with the Honorable J. Bayard Clark, I know of his long and able public service and have been intimately acquainted with the Clark family through long friendship with his distinguished brother, Jim Clark, of my hometown. Mr. Clark sprang from an illustrious family, and throughout his life demonstrated a keen interest in the affairs of his State and Nation. The works he did in life remain as an imposing monument to his memory.

My heartfelt sympathy goes out to his beloved wife, daughters and sons.

"All or Nothing": Editorial on the Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a few days ago there appeared an editorial entitled "All or Nothing." It has to do with the housing bill that recently passed both Houses of Congress by an overwhelming majority and is now before the President awaiting his action on it.

I think it is a very fine editorial. It presents the problem in a very clear, understandable way. I commend its most careful reading to the Members of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALL OR NOTHING

It seems plain that if there is going to be any housing legislation in this session of Congress, including new FHA loan authority, the President is going to have to accept the pared-down bill now emerging from Congress. The House decision not to strip the bill of its college classroom loan features, and the refusal to separate the FHA provision as requested by Mr. Eisenhower, indicate that legislators are undeterred by the threat of another veto. It is scarcely conceivable that Congress would make a third attempt to pass a bill if a second failed to obtain Presidential consent.

The choice before the President thus may be an unlovely one from his standpoint, but it is a political reality. Administration representatives and Republican legislators cannot be blamed for seeking to follow Mr. Eisenhower's wishes, but they would be very unwise to advise him again to thwart the majority view. In point of fact, even though substantial parts of his program remain to be finally enacted, Mr. Eisenhower has fared very well with the Democratic Congress through cooperation of the leadership. His budgetary dilemma is a real one, complicated by the administration's reluctance to face the need for a general tax increase; but already Congress has been intimidated too much, we think, in its consideration of national needs by scare talk about spenders.

Neither the President nor Congress can afford to take an all-or-nothing position. Congress is going a considerable part of the way to meet the President on one of his three "must" items with the gasoline tax increase to finance highways. Mr. Eisenhower ought in turn to be willing to compromise on housing. For its part Congress could make the compromise easier by overcoming its pique about administration monetary policy and raising the interest rate on long-term Treasury bonds—something most legislators must recognize is necessary.

Laos and the Big Lie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks I include an editorial, "Laos and the Big Lie," appearing in the August 24, 1959 issue of the Washington Star. The editorial well states:

At a time when Premier Khrushchev is preparing to visit the United States for the avowed purpose of trying to effect a thaw in the cold war, it seems more than a little strange—to put it mildly—that the Soviet and foreign ministry has gone out of its way to give full support to Peiping's lie about American operations in Laos.

It is very evident that the attack on Laos is not desultory action, but is an organized military action.

It would be interesting to know, first, how many Soviet and Red Chinese air-men who have been integrated into the North Vietnam Air Force.

Second. How many Chinese Red Army and naval officers and men have been integrated.

Third. The number of planes that have been sent from the Soviet Union.

Fourth. How many jungle tanks.

If our intelligence has no knowledge, they should look into the actions and contributions of Red China and the Soviet Union in this respect and other respects at once.

The editorial follows:

LAOS AND THE BIG LIE

At a time when Premier Khrushchev is preparing to visit the United States for the avowed purpose of trying to effect a thaw in the cold war, it seems more than a little strange—to put it mildly—that the Soviet Foreign Ministry has gone out of its way to give full support to Peiping's big lie about American operations in Laos.

The lie accuses our Government of numerous villainies. These include (1) a conspiracy to stir up civil strife throughout the Buddhist kingdom, (2) the maintenance of military bases there, and (3) imperialistic control of the country's economic and military forces, with a view to undermining the security of Red China. In short, according to Peiping, the United States is using Laos in an aggressive way that menaces the peace of all Asia.

Actually, of course, the truth is that the little kingdom—which is supposed to be free and independent under the 1954 Geneva agreement ending the Indochina war—is in trouble solely because it is gravely infested with Communist rebels armed with modern weapons from neighboring Red China.

and Red North Vietnam. These rebels, who may launch an all-out military attack when the rainy season ends in October, have only one objective, which is simply this: To subvert the country and drag its 2 million people behind the Bamboo Curtain for the greater honor and glory of the Mao Tse-tung regime in Peiping.

As for our American position, the fact is that we have no bases of any kind in Laos. More than that, our military aid to the country involves merely light equipment, and only about 80 of our officers—in keeping with agreements altogether justified in terms of international law—serve there as advisers to the government. Accordingly, as our State Department has emphasized, Peiping's accusations against us amount to total falsehoods deliberately contrived to keep the pot boiling in southeast Asia.

Yet, even though it undoubtedly is well aware of all this, the Kremlin has chosen to echo the substance of Red China's lie. Americans must therefore be pardoned if they wonder about what goes on in Mr. Khrushchev's mind as he supports such mendacity in one breath and speaks glowingly, in the next, about how anxious he is to promote friendship and trust between his country and ours.

Business and Community Leaders, Such As Moe Lerner, Symbolize Our American System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, there has been much comment in the press concerning the forthcoming visit of Premier Khrushchev as to what we should show him and who he should meet.

It is generally agreed that he should see significant examples of our American way of life—our industries, our small businesses such as the corner drugstore, our homes on different economic levels and other illustrations of our concept which stresses the importance and dignity of the individual.

He should also have an opportunity to meet some of the people who symbolize the fact that it is not as important into what circumstances a man is born as where and how he goes from there.

Here in our beloved land there is almost unlimited opportunities for advancement. There are hundreds of thousands of men and women who have risen from humble and modest beginnings to positions of trust and leadership.

One of these active personalities is Moe Lerner. It has been my privilege to know this dynamic business executive and contributor to community progress for many, many years.

It has been a source of personal satisfaction to cooperate with Mr. Lerner in the Lafayette Square USO Club, Washington, D.C. He is now the chairman of its operating committee.

I wish that the schedule of the top Soviet spokesman would bring him into contact with the "Moe Lerner's", who are so typically representative of our country.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article, "Mighty Moe: Man on the Go," by Gusti Buttinelli from the Washington Daily News for August 28, 1959, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIGHTY MOE: MAN ON THE GO
(By Gusti Buttinelli, owner, Gusti's restaurants)

Those sleek, long limousines which haul you from the airport to your door, or vice versa, offer a whale of a bargain to those on the fly.

For a buck and a quarter or so, the tab depending upon where you live, the Airport Transport buggies hoist you home from the plane station 24 hours a day in rain or shine.

The outfit's smooth sailing isn't accidental. It is the result of hard work and know-how by Moe Lerner, the energetic guy who owns and operates the business.

Moe has a fleet of 300 vehicles going for him. These cover 7 million miles a year averaging 1,400 trips and 5,000 passengers daily.

The 300 drivers with the company feel their boss is a right Joe. He has set them up with insurance plans, vacations, Christmas remembrances, and many other pluses in their jobs.

Moe's interest in his men stems from the fact that he, too, came up the hard way. His story is the kind that Ike could tell Khrushchev—that of an American kid without a silver spoon in his mouth who made something of himself.

Here was a youngster who began earning his living at 10 selling newspapers in the subways of New York. His father died when he was 14, causing him to become the sole support of his family.

Moe kept himself in top physical shape at a New York Boys' Club. He won the group's bantamweight boxing championship and went as far as the finals in a tryout for the Olympic boxing team.

This recognition got him a job at Finchley's, a fancy men's shop on Fifth Avenue, where he served such people as the Prince of Wales, Jimmy Walker, and Woodrow Wilson.

Later a hobby and a natural skill working with metals led to a silversmith's position with a famous silver company. At 18 he took over the operation of a bankrupt garage in the tough waterfront area. Manager Lerner put in his licks 14 hours a day, 7 days a week and converted the enterprise into a profitable one for which he was given a half interest in the firm. During this period, he learned the ins and outs of truck and car maintenance—a knowledge which stood him in good stead for the future.

Moe eventually built the garage into a successful trucking, warehouse, and distribution business. He disposed of his New York holdings when he took over Airport Transport in 1946.

If you measure Moe by his legion of friends, you would run out of rulers. The great respect in which he is held here was indicated by the large turnout at a recent testimonial tossed in his honor.

The major factor in Moe's happy life is his sweet frau, Sis, who was his childhood sweetheart. They have two sons, Robert, 19; Joseph, 3; and a daughter, Phyllis, 9. Moe is a charitable and religious man whose creed

is best expressed by his actions in helping others.

Whatever he's doing, whether shooting par golf or hustling on the job, you can be sure that mighty Moe is a man on the go.

Maj. Gen. William P. Fisher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. PAUL KITCHIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, this seems to be the year for many changes in key command and staff officers in the armed services. Recently we were informed that Major General Michaelis was leaving his assignment as Chief of Legislative Liaison for the Army. Now, I have been told that Maj. Gen. William P. "Bill" Fisher, Director of Legislative Liaison for the Department of the Air Force has been assigned as Commander, Eastern Transport Air Force, Military Air Transport Service at McGuire Air Force Base, N.J. He will be leaving here about the 10th of September. He is a personal friend and one of my most distinguished constituents.

General Fisher has been the Director since March of last year and has done an outstanding job in handling the very difficult task of providing Congress with prompt and accurate answers to its many inquiries. He has rendered invaluable assistance to the Members of Congress and their constituents in efficiently and effectively helping to solve their innumerable difficult problems.

General Fisher has a long history as an enthusiastic pilot and as a highly respected commander. His impressive combat record is filled with repeated praise of his ability as an outstanding leader and his easy, sensible way of doing things. These attributes were recognized early in his career when he was given command of the 20th Bomb Squadron at Clark Field prior to Pearl Harbor. Wounded during the bombing there, he lead his squadron from Bataan to Mindanao where he became an infantry commander when his unit joined the ground fighting against the Japanese until we were forced to leave the Philippines.

After a short tour in the United States, he went to the China Theater in command of a B-24 Group. This was the beginning of a long series of assignments in strategic bomber operations, including duty with the Strategic Air Command. His duties included those of wing, base, and air division commander, Inspector General of the Strategic Air Command, and Deputy Commander of 8th Air Force.

He served for a year on the faculty of the Air War College and headed the Far East Air Forces Bomber Command during the Korean war. As a command pilot and command observer, General

Fisher has logged more than 6,600 hours in jet and conventional aircraft and flew 59 combat missions during World War II and Korea.

General Fisher's decorations include the Distinguished Service Medal, Legion of Merit with three Oak Leaf Clusters, Distinguished Flying Cross with one Oak Leaf Cluster, Air Medal, Purple Heart, and Presidential Unit Citation with four Oak Leaf Clusters.

I regret that he is leaving Washington, but know that he is looking forward to commanding another flying organization in one of the combat arms of the Air Force. I am certain that many of us will see more of General Fisher as this outstanding officer assumes positions of increasing importance as the continues his successful Air Force career.

Safeguarding Our Scenic Shorelines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] has been a leader in the field of conservation of natural resources ever since he entered the Senate in 1955.

True to his tradition, he is now a vigorous and effective sponsor of bills for national shoreline parks in such scenic areas deserving of preservation as Indiana Dunes on Lake Michigan, Oregon Dunes in his own State along the Pacific Ocean, and Padre Island beside the gulf coast.

In the New York Sunday Times for August 30, 1959, Senator NEUBERGER has written an excellent and comprehensive article entitled "Plan for Shoreline Parks," which summarizes the efforts of many of us in the Senate to preserve these lovely shorelines and seacoasts before it is too late. I commend the New York Times for publishing this splendid article. I commend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] for writing it.

The Senator from Oregon emphasizes what many of the rest of us know to be true: That this is a nationwide movement to protect our scenic shorelines, because Americans know that each has a heritage in the relatively few outdoor areas beside our oceans and lakes which still are susceptible of being established as national parks, monuments, or seashores.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 30, 1959]

PLAN FOR SHORELINE PARKS—U.S. SENATE BILLS WOULD SET ASIDE RECREATIONAL AREAS ON SEACOAST AND IN THE GREAT LAKES REGION

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER)

Nearly all the great national parks of the United States are in mountain ranges—

Grand Canyon, Yosemite, Crater Lake, Rainier, Shenandoah, Yellowstone, Zion, and most of the rest. In the process of setting aside these magnificent upland reserves, the Nation has neglected another realm which is equally alluring to the tourist and the seeker of outdoor recreation. This realm consists of the seacoasts and shorelines of the United States, which are among the most beautiful on earth. Indeed, the first settlers in America found pleasure and inspiration where white-maned breakers spent their strength on sandy ocean strands.

Today, a belated effort is underway in the U.S. Senate to add headlands and beaches to the gorges and alpine peaks which already are part of the national park system. This effort is expressed in an omnibus bill that would create some 10 waterside parks on four picturesque shorelines. The shores are those of the Atlantic, Gulf, Great Lakes, and the Pacific. No major coast has been omitted.

TEN PROPOSED PARKS

Principal authors of the bill are Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, chairman of the Senate Interior Committee; Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico; Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois; and the writer of this article. The 10 national shoreline recreational areas proposed for inclusion in the country's park network, with the maximum acreage of each, would be as follows:

Cape Cod, Mass., 30,000 acres.
Padre Island, Tex., 60,000 acres.
Oregon Dunes and Sea-Lion Caves, Oreg., 35,000 acres.
Indiana Dunes, Ind., 5,000 acres.
Point Reyes, Calif., 35,000 acres.
Cumberland Island, Ga., 25,000 acres.
Huron Mountains, Mich., 90,000 acres.
Channel Islands, Calif., 76,000 acres.
Pictured Rocks, Mich., 100,000 acres.
Sleeping Bear Dunes, Mich., 26,000 acres.

The four at the top of the roster—Cape Cod, Padre Island, Oregon Dunes, and Indiana Dunes—have been specifically recommended by the National Park Advisory Board as having qualities worthy of this recognition. It is these four areas around which most of the controversy revolves, because they probably will be reserved first. In fact, along with Senator GORDON ALLOTT, of Colorado, I also am sponsoring a bill at the request of the Eisenhower administration which would authorize three shoreline parks, to be selected administratively by the Secretary of the Interior.

THE OREGON DUNES

The three probably would be chosen from among the leading four in the omnibus bill, and the Interior Department has gone so far as to disclose that Oregon Dunes would have an excellent prospect of being among these.

The omnibus shoreline bill authorizes \$50 million for the acquisition of land for the parks. The administration bill is considerably more modest in this respect—\$15 million. Furthermore, the omnibus bill specifies 10 additional seashores or Great Lakes shorelines to be studied by the National Park Service "for the purpose of determining what action should be taken by the United States to save and preserve them." They are these:

Fire Island, N.Y., 3,540 acres.
Cape Flattery, Washington State, 16,000 acres.
Leadbetter Point, Washington State, 4,250 acres.
Mosquito Lagoon, Fla., 9,700 acres.
Pigeon Point, Minn., 6,400 acres.
Debidue Island, S.C., 8,400 acres.
Kiawah Island, S.C., 7,300 acres.
Popham-St. John, Maine, 1,100 acres.
Parramore Island, Va., 6,250 acres.
Smith Island, N.C., 11,900 acres.

Intensive congressional interest in this question dates from several years ago, when the National Park Service published, with funds given by an unidentified private bene-

factor, a brochure entitled "Our Vanishing Shoreline." It revealed that, while the Nation's conservationists had been guarding the mountains and hills, the seashore was being exploited and gobbled up.

This survey showed, for example, that of the 3,700 miles of shoreline in the Atlantic and gulf coasts, only 240 miles were in Federal or State ownership for public recreational uses. And it disclosed that time was running out. Where a lovely 30-mile beach could have been purchased for national seashore park purposes in 1935 at a total cost of \$260,000, the cost per mile by 1957 would have been \$110,000.

Specific National Park Service studies of the Atlantic and gulf coasts, and then of the Pacific coast, soon followed. These studies furnish the basis for the recommendations contained in the omnibus bill now before the Senate Interior Committee. Senator MURRAY already has ordered public hearings to be held on the Oregon Dunes and Sea-Lion Caves Seashore at Reedsport and Eugene, Oreg., during the first week in October. Hearings are expected slightly later at Padre Island, in Texas. A special Interior Subcommittee headed by Senator ERNEST GRUNING, of Alaska, recently toured the Indiana Dunes region and made on-the-spot observations.

"Our organization regards the rescue of America's majestic shorelines as the most compelling outdoor issue of this era," declares Joseph W. Penfold, conservation director of the Izaak Walton League of America. "It is almost too late now. If we delay for many more years, expenditures to purchase the land not only may be prohibitive but steam shovels and bulldozers will have torn away many dunes and beaches, which can never be restored to their former grandeur and solitude. This is a national problem of great and crucial importance."

Practically all the shorelines proposed as national parks have one essential element in common. They offer outstanding recreational opportunities where land and water meet. Otherwise, they are strikingly different in appearance and character. Padre Island and Indiana Dunes are gleaming white beaches which are comparatively flat as a contour.

By contrast, Oregon Dunes are among the highest billows of sand in the world, and timbered mountains loom in the background. The shorelines of the Great Lakes are caressed by fresh water, whereas the Atlantic and Pacific shorelines are rimmed and crusted with salt.

OPPOSING VIEWS

Controversy surrounds some of the national seashore proposals. Although they are 3,000 miles apart in location, both Cape Cod and Oregon Dunes have witnessed protests by cottage owners, who fear they will be displaced, and by taxpayers' groups, who claim that valuable property will be removed from the tax rolls in order to make room for the parks. In addition, at Indiana Dunes, there are claims by Indiana political leaders that the Lake Michigan strands and inlets might more profitably be made the site of a vast steel mill and ore dock.

Interest in the situation is so great that an enterprising newspaper near the Oregon Dunes, the Eugene Register-Guard, assigned a reporter and photographer to study the Cape Hatteras national seashore, on the opposite side of the continent, along the North Carolina coast. This is the only such shoreline reserve thus far established by Congress. It was set aside some 6 years ago. The writer for the Register-Guard, A. Robert Smith, discovered that many of the arguments then voiced locally against the Cape Hatteras Park were almost identical to those opposing Cape Cod, Oregon Dunes, and Indiana Dunes today.

Mr. Smith reported, however, that many original adversaries of the Cape Hatteras seashore had become its enthusiastic backers.

as the years have passed. He also noted that the 100,000 visitors a year who traveled to the area just before the national park was created, burgeoned to 348,000 last year.

A leading banker in the vicinity of the park told Mr. Smith that, while it was true some property had been taken off assessment lists in order to make the park possible, nearby property remaining in private possession had soared in value 50 to 100 times. This more than made up the difference to taxing authorities. "The fishing business is gone," this banker added. "If it hadn't been for the Hatteras Park, I don't know what we would have done."

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, who has been in the Senate since 1934, has been urging his Interior Committee to hurry in its action on the omnibus national seashore bill. He recently told us that, in the quarter of a century since he entered Congress, costs of acquiring some of this shoreline land actually have gone up as much as 3,000 percent.

"In 1935," Senator MURRAY said, "there was a magnificent 70-mile stretch of ocean beach on the Delaware-Maryland Eastern Shore which could have been acquired for \$2 a front foot. Most of this stretch is beyond preservation today. It has already been subdivided and developed." And the cost of the Cape Cod national seashore alone is estimated as approximately \$16 million, whereas it might have been purchased a few years ago for less than \$9 million.

Dr. Conrad L. Wirth, director of the National Park Service, and his associates hope that some private benefactions may help to ease the pressure on the Treasury in buying the land required to safeguard representative scenic sections of the Atlantic, Gulf of Mexico, Great Lakes, and Pacific coasts. Such a donation occurred in the towering Grand Tetons 30 years ago, when John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and his family bought up the land around Jackson Lake in Wyoming, which eventually became the citadel of one of our most stirring alpine parks.

Between 1916 and 1958, annual visits by tourists to the national parks of the United States soared from 400,000 to 58 million. If this rate of increase should continue, not even the 20 national shoreline parks sought in our omnibus bill will be sufficient to assure Americans of the future the travel opportunities which ought to be theirs.

Pothole Drainage Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the most important waterfowl production area remaining in the United States is localized in the prairie pothole sections of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota. Within some 140 counties in these States, over a million potholes totaling some 4 million acres of wetlands are concentrated. The potholes are water-holding depressions varying in size from fraction acre puddles to shallow lakes covering hundreds of acres. They vary in depth from shallow temporary areas containing a few inches of water in wet weeks of early spring to semipermanent and permanent water areas 6 feet or more in depth which retain water the year round

in seasons of normal precipitation. The deeper and more permanent potholes are the less numerous.

In recent years, the tristate area of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota has produced an average of 4 to 5 million ducks annually or nearly three-fourths of the ducks produced in the United States south of the Canadian border.

Because of its importance from a production standpoint, preservation of the U.S. prairie pothole region as a breeding area for waterfowl has been of major concern to the Fish and Wildlife Service. For over 10 years the Service has been concerned with loss of breeding habitat to farm drainage in this area. Studies conducted by the Service during 1949 and 1950 indicated that during those 2 years more than 32,000 water areas valuable to waterfowl were eliminated annually in this region. Estimates for the 12-year period 1943-54 are that about 350,000 potholes valuable to waterfowl were drained. Additional studies have shown that, while the rate of loss declined somewhat during subsequent years, substantial loss of valuable breeding acreage has continued. During the past year the rate of loss has again increased.

A major factor in sustaining the program of farm drainage in the pothole area has been the subsidy payments and the technical assistance provided by the Federal Government. For at least 8 years the Fish and Wildlife Service has studied this situation in an effort to find alternative uses for wetlands which farmers could adopt and other means of discouraging pothole drainage. To date this effort has not been successful. It appears therefore that as long as Federal subsidies and technical assistance without cost to the farmer are available, drainage of farm wetlands and loss of valuable waterfowl breeding habitat in the prairie pothole sections of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota will continue.

Faced with the above situation, the Fish and Wildlife Service, several years ago, began thinking in terms of a more positive program to preserve pothole wetlands as waterfowl breeding habitat. Additional field studies were initiated to determine which of the 140 pothole counties in the tristate area contained the most and best remaining habitat for waterfowl production. As a result of these studies, it was determined that there were 90 counties which contained the best remaining waterfowl production habitat. This total of 90 counties includes 22 counties in eastern Minnesota, and 34 counties each in eastern North Dakota and eastern South Dakota.

The enactment of Public Law 85-585 provided amendments to the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to acquire by lease, purchase or other means, small wetlands and pothole areas to preserve them for waterfowl production. The amendments also provided, through the increase of the duck stamp cost from \$2

to \$3, additional funds to finance the future acquisition of such areas. The Fish and Wildlife Service, through the field staff of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, currently is initiating a long-range program to preserve selected pothole wetlands within the 90-county delineated area in Minnesota and the Dakotas by lease and purchase.

This program of small wetland acquisition has not yet progressed to the point where the degree of its success in future years can be appraised. There is no question, however, that continued Federal subsidies and free technical assistance to the landowner for drainage of potholes will make acquisition of pothole wetlands by the Service for waterfowl breeding habitat more difficult and more expensive than would be the case if they were not available.

The overall problem of preserving wetland habitat for waterfowl breeding and for other wildlife is recognized and appreciated by the State fish and game agencies in the prairie pothole States. The Minnesota Conservation Department has acquired about 56,100 acres of land under its wetland preservation program since October 1951, at a cost of about \$1,770,000. The South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks has acquired about 30,100 acres using \$754,327 of Federal aid funds, and in the past 20 years has also purchased about 30,000 acres with its regular funds. North Dakota has acquired about 15,000 acres of wetlands at a cost of about \$212,000.

This year we all anticipate a drastic reduction in hunting seasons and bag limits for ducks and coots, especially in the Central, Mississippi, and Atlantic Flyways. These cutbacks may reduce the hunting season to 40 days in the Atlantic and Mississippi Flyways, and 50 days in the Central Flyways.

These drastic reductions will be necessary because of reduced waterfowl breeding this year in the prairie pothole region of the continent. The waterfowl reduction has resulted from widespread drought from the destruction of breeding areas by drainage and other factors. While widespread drought produces a sudden spectacular reduction in duck breeding habitat and in duck production, these losses are temporary and the naturally prolific birds can restore their populations to former levels when normal water conditions return to the prairies.

There can be no such recovery by waterfowl populations from extensive drainage programs. Insofar as breeding waterfowl are concerned wholesale pothole drainage is the establishment of permanent drought.

To those who may question this statement, the State of Iowa can serve as an example. In 1900 numerous potholes and sloughs in Iowa produced vast numbers of ducks, including nearly all of our important game ducks. Today the production of waterfowl in Iowa is but a fraction of that of a short half century ago. The difference in this production lies in the almost total con-

version for agricultural uses of the sloughs and potholes which once constituted some of the finest duck breeding habitat on the North American Continent.

There can be no question but that we must move quickly to preserve these pothole areas. Ducks and other migratory waterfowl need water—and they need it badly.

Wisconsin's Progressive Rehabilitation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, urbanization, population mobility, postwar restlessness, and other social changes have produced in recent years many problems which this country has not previously known. We have a growing crime rate, a juvenile-delinquency problem, and, in some places, unfortunate racial tensions. The newspaper headlines are often alarming, and at times the impression is conveyed that we are unable to effectively cope with the new problems. But what must be realized is that new problems require new remedies, and only creative thinking and action will produce the needed improvements.

It is, therefore, with great interest and satisfaction that I have recently read the reports on Wisconsin's program of crime correction. Wisconsin, as you know, has a very low rate of crimes of violence, and, in fact, many experts describe Wisconsin as having practically no organized crime in comparison with other States. Even so, there are about 8,100 persons under State supervision for crime, at this time. But it is the way these criminals are dealt with that shows the merits of advanced crime-correction programs.

Now we no longer talk about "crime and punishment," for what we are after is rehabilitation rather than punishment. Society is not any more interested in an "eye for an eye"; instead, it wants to concentrate on turning the criminal violator into a productive and law-abiding citizen. It is in this direction that Wisconsin has made tremendous progress.

Of Wisconsin's 8,100 offenders, only about 3,000 are in correctional institutions. About 2,550 are on parole and the other 2,550 are on probation. These violators are put on probation and parole because the authorities believe that is the best way to restore them to a position of good citizenship. We have learned from a long history of prisons and incarceration that long confinement does not stamp out crime—but quite often encourages recidivism. In putting as many of its violators on probation and parole, Wisconsin in fact demonstrates

its confidence in the theory that the best way to restore a man to good citizenship is by giving him another chance, under State supervision, naturally, but in free society rather than in a prison.

Of the total violators released on parole in Wisconsin, about 19 percent have their paroles revoked during the first 6 months and about 24 percent during the first 2 years of probation. Some of the revocations are for new offenses, but a great many are merely precautionary as in cases where parolees have been found in bad company or have given indications that they might be getting into trouble. Still, records indicate that at least three-fourths of those paroled are able to make their way for 2 years, and with that headstart there is a good chance they will be able to go all the way.

Wisconsin's high rate of probation and parole produces not only better results in terms of rehabilitation, but has also a good effect on Wisconsin's expenditures on prisons and prison maintenance. The Wisconsin director of the division of correction, Mr. Sanger B. Powers, says that if all 5,100 on parole or probation were to be imprisoned, the State would need three more institutions which would cost about \$51 million to build. The State, in addition, would have to provide \$9 million a year more to operate these prisons. The State enjoys an additional savings through the fact that those on parole and probation earn as much as \$16 million a year, with which they support themselves and their dependents. If they were incarcerated the State would not only have to provide the money to pay for prison maintenance but would also have to support many of the dependents of the prison population, who would undoubtedly be on relief in many instances.

That Wisconsin's progressive program for the correction of crime and the rehabilitation of criminals is a success has been demonstrated over the past few years. I believe that Wisconsin's parole and probation system is one of the things the State can well be proud of. I do hope that similar creative measures are made available and are applied, both in Wisconsin and elsewhere, in order to solve some of our society's other social ills.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published by the Green Bay Gazette on "Crime and Punishment in Wisconsin."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Green Bay Press-Gazette, July 29, 1959]

CRIME AND PUNISHMENT IN WISCONSIN

Wisconsin has a very low rate on crimes of violence. In fact many experts in this field describe Wisconsin as having practically no crime in comparison with other States. Even so, there are about 8,100 persons under State supervision for crimes at this time. Thus when people say Wisconsin has practically no crime they are referring to the flourishing rackets which make a business

of criminal activities in some other States. They are referring also to the collaboration of political figures with known criminals which is common in some States but practically unknown in Wisconsin.

In spite of the comparatively favorable record of Wisconsin the State prison at Wau-pun with a capacity of 1,200 prisoners is now accommodating 1,523. Likewise at the State reformatory at Green Bay 1,040 inmates are being cared for in an institution built for 678. Even so Wisconsin has fewer persons incarcerated as punishment for crime than most any other State would have under the same circumstances. The reason for this is the extensive use of paroles and probation as the means for rehabilitating persons convicted of crime. Of Wisconsin's 8,100 offenders only about 3,000 are in correctional institutions. About 2,550 are on parole and another 2,550 are on probation.

Thus Wisconsin has a double advantage in that it starts with less crime and it uses prison confinement in fewer of its cases than is the practice elsewhere. Sanger B. Powers, director of the State division of correction, points out that Wisconsin has a great financial advantage through its policy of using parole and probation extensively. He says that if all 5,100 of those on parole or probation were to be imprisoned the State would need 3 more institutions costing about \$51 million to build. In addition the State would have to provide \$9 million a year more to operate them. He says that the capital investment and the operating costs would pay for needlessly holding people in custody since they are now getting along very well under parole and probation. The State enjoys an additional savings through the fact that those on parole and probation are earning about \$16 million a year with which they support themselves and their dependents and on which they pay taxes. If they were incarcerated of course the State would have to provide the money to pay the costs of those in prison as well as to support their dependents who would undoubtedly be on relief in many instances.

Mr. Powers points out that persons convicted of crime are never put on parole or on probation with the idea of saving money. They are so treated because the authorities believe that is the best way to restore them to a position of good citizenship and it is purely incidental but nevertheless important that there is a substantial financial gain for the people of Wisconsin.

In addition to those put on probation before they enter an institution and those paroled because they have indicated they will be able to make their own way with some help, Wisconsin also has a group on mandatory parole. This group is made up of prisoners who have served their sentences less the time off for good behavior and therefore must be released but virtually none of them is released without being placed under supervision for a time.

Of the total released on parole about 19 percent have their paroles revoked during the first 6 months and about 24 percent during the first 2 years of probation. Some of the revocations are for new offenses but a great many are merely precautionary as in cases where some parolees have been found in bad company or have given other indications that they might be getting into trouble. All in all the record indicates that at least three-fourths of those paroled are able to make their way for 2 years and with that start there is a good chance that they will be able to go all the way. Wisconsin's parole and probation system is one of the things this State can well be proud of and citizens should insist that those in the welfare department be given every help possible in maintaining it successfully.

Walter L. "Bull" Durham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, the latter part of last week Walter L. "Bull" Durham, the dynamic voice of the Mid-south farmer for two fruitful decades, died in his sleep in Memphis, Tenn.

Mr. Durham was the agricultural editor of the Commercial Appeal, one of the Nation's leading newspapers.

In his passing not only the Eighth Congressional District of Tennessee, which I have the honor to represent, but Memphis, Tenn., and the Midsouth as well, have lost a great benefactor of all mankind and those who till the soil in our congressional district have especially suffered a great loss.

His work can best be extolled by a statement issued following his death by Mr. Frank Ahlgren, editor of the Commercial Appeal in Memphis, Tenn.:

Mr. Durham's death comes as a great shock to me.

Walter and I have worked together for 22 years now. I like to think of him as I saw him last night (Thursday) while we were both working on the election. He was a newspaperman to the last. There he was as interested, enthusiastic, and vibrant as in the past.

TOUCHED MANY LIVES

His impact on this area was tremendous. He was a good newspaperman, a friend, and a counselor.

I can think of no man who has touched so many lives with his helpfulness and sincerity of purpose. Since 1939, he had directed our plant to prosper program, bringing him into contact with hundreds of thousands—and he was always helping. Only a few days ago he was working on plans for the 16th plant to prosper program.

I have lost not only a close associate but a close personal friend.

Mr. Durham used to entertain his associates with stories of the year he represented Lauderdale County in the Tennessee General Assembly and his work in the Nashville and Jackson, Tenn., bureaus of the Commercial Appeal.

WAS LICENSED LAWYER

Mr. Durham's versatility was shown by the fact that in addition to being a newspaperman, he was a licensed lawyer and a member of the Tennessee Legislature when only 21.

He was born in Mineral Wells, Tex., where his father was superintendent of a hospital. A short time later the family moved to Ripley, Tenn., where his father became county register. They also lived in Henning, Tenn.

Mr. Durham attended school at Ripley, Castle Heights Military Academy at Lebanon, Tenn., the University of Tennessee, and Columbia University where he studied journalism and law.

After college he returned to West Tennessee and published a group of small newspapers. He was elected to the legislature in 1931. He published a weekly newspaper in Bruceton for a while and then worked on the Daily News in New York City.

Returning to West Tennessee again in 1935, he joined the Commercial Appeal and worked in the Jackson and Nashville bureaus before coming to Memphis in 1937. He served as trislate editor and general assign-

ment reporter before being named agricultural editor.

An editorial that appeared in the Commercial Appeal is attached hereto:

WALTER DURHAM

News of the death of Walter "Bull" Durham brought sincere regret to thousands on thousands of men and women in Memphis and the entire Midsouth for a variety of reasons. Unquestionably, the first and keenest reaction was the feeling that everyone who knew him had lost a true friend.

Walter Durham in his years of unselfish service did a great many things that were unusually worth the while and the value of his achievements was invariably enhanced by the great talent he had for sympathetic, kindly, understanding respect and affection for his fellows. We have never known a man from whom the spirit of good will emanated more genuinely and consistently.

The outstanding monument to Walter Durham's life is to be found in the contribution he made to the farm people and agriculture in the Midsouth as a whole and especially in the Arkansas, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee areas that took part in the Commercial Appeal's plant to prosper work. He was director of the plant to prosper bureau for 20 years and in that time touched for good no less than hundreds of thousands of lives. Added to that was the wide influence his farm program over WMC gained and held.

Not many men have come to any undertaking more fully equipped than was Walter Durham when he began his career as friend and mentor of Midsouth farmers. He had worked in high school and college journalism. He had been with a metropolitan newspaper in New York City. He had served a term in the Tennessee General Assembly. He had a license to practice law. He had owned and published smalltown weekly papers and he had some experience of his own on the land. On the Commercial Appeal he had handled a variety of responsible assignments.

Hardly any man of our acquaintance had more constructive curiosity than Walter Durham. He read omnivorously for years. He was interested in politics and in economics and in the social order. He was a good companion and an engaging conversationalist who loved a good story as much as anyone. His varied training and his diversified interests enabled him to see his own specialty in true relation to the community as a whole and to serve it the better on that account.

To Walter Durham had come a multiplicity of prized awards from farm organizations and publications and from civic groups for outstanding public service. He was greatly moved by each and every evidence of the esteem of his associates and friends, but he wore his honors with a modesty that was deep and real.

A stream of tributes has come to this office, testifying to Walter Durham's usefulness and goodness. He truly won and richly deserved them all.

Also attached is an editorial that appeared in the States-Graphic at Brownsville, Tenn., edited by Mr. Paul Sims:

"30"

The passing of Walter "Bull" Durham, Memphis newspaper man, who died in his sleep there last Friday morning, removes from the ranks of Tennessee journalism one of its best known and most beloved men.

For many years as director of the Commercial Appeal's plant-to-prosper program, he distinguished himself as a brilliant writer and a good friend of the farmers of the trisstates area. He loved to visit in the farm homes from year to year and to recount the progress that was being made.

Mr. Durham began his newspaper career on a small newspaper in west Tennessee, a profession he was destined to follow the remainder of his life. A dedicated newspaperman to the end, he spent Thursday night at his office aiding in the handling of the Memphis city election.

It was my good fortune to know him over a long period of years. I was always glad to count him as a friend. His passing is a source of genuine personal regret.

Also an editorial from the Crockett Times at Alamo, Tenn., edited by Mr. Leslie Sims, is included:

The passing of Walter "Bull" Durham, plant-to-prosper director and agricultural editor of the Commercial Appeal, is mourned by a legion of friends throughout the Midsouth.

We became acquainted with him over 30 years ago as a neighbor publisher of the Halls Graphic, one of his first newspaper ventures. He has been a very dear friend throughout the years and we are deeply grieved by his passing.

He was never too busy to assist us in any way or to do us some special favor throughout his long career.

Three times (1947, 1950, and 1953) he presented this newspaper the Commercial Appeal's newspaper trophy for outstanding editorial contribution to the plant-to-prosper program. These trophies are proudly displayed in our office.

The Steel Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials—one from the Boston Herald and one from the Boston Traveler—commenting upon the factual report issued by Labor Secretary Mitchell on the steel strike.

I have been impressed by the support which Secretary Mitchell has received from the Nation's press, including two Boston newspapers represented by these editorials.

Clearly Secretary Mitchell has performed a service to the Steelworkers Union, to the steel industry, and to the American public in releasing this statistical background.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Herald, Aug. 21, 1959]

WHAT THE STEEL "FACTS" DO

We have said that factfinding in the steel strike would settle nothing. And sure enough, both sides, union and management, endorse Secretary Mitchell's statistical findings, without, however, agreeing on what to do about them in the matter of a new contract.

This is because the difference between the two sides is now and has been right along a difference in philosophy and not a difference of factual information. Each side has presented its own version of the facts to win the support of the public. The actual basis of settlement is elsewhere.

The Steelworkers Union believes that the steel companies are prosperous enough to part with more of their profits to the employees; the steel companies do not believe profits should be a measure of wages. This cannot be settled by discussion across the bargaining table. This difference of philosophy can be adjusted only by the contest of economic strength now going on in the form of a strike.

If the factfinding does anything, it will be through the pressure of public opinion. Yet Secretary Mitchell has most carefully avoided any explicit recommendation that might guide the public to make a decision. If there is, as he says, an area of possible agreement marked out in his report, it is not easily discerned.

Have the steel companies been making such astronomical profits, as claimed by the union's president, that the equity of a wage increase is clear? The Mitchell report does not indicate so. Profits after taxes as a percentage of sales have been higher than for all manufacturing, but such profits must in general be higher in industries with high capital investment (like steel). And net profits as a rate of return on investment have been less than in all manufacturing during most of the postwar years.

Have steel prices been raised exorbitantly, as claimed by the union? Steel prices have indeed, the report says, risen higher and faster than wholesale prices in general and much more than retail prices. And the increase in steel prices has exceeded the rise in employment cost per ton of steel produced. But employment cost per man-hour has risen faster than steel prices. This apparent disparity is the result of increased productivity.

(And it might be pointed out that most of the increased productivity is the result of better tools and techniques made possible by the profits of the industry.)

And what of the comparative scale of pay in the steel industry? Measured in terms of average hourly earnings, steel wages are higher than those in most other industries. Steel wages plus fringe benefits have risen more than output per man-hour.

And what does it all mean? It seems to mean that in the battle of "facts," the steel companies have come out a bit better than the union; that though both sides carefully selected their facts, the union selection was the more unbalanced.

Perhaps this is why Union President McDonald makes his cryptic comment on the Mitchell findings. They show, he says, the ability of the industry to share a portion of its gains in productivity with the public, the workers in the industry and the stockholders. And the stockholders?

Omitted in the report is the factual approach to one problem that has piqued our interest: If steel prices have been increased excessively, what has happened to competition? Is there in truth a way of "administering" prices that escapes the competitive challenge of 250 domestic steel producers, not to mention foreign producers and producers of aluminum, copper, cement, lumber, plastics, and other rival materials?

Omitted also in the report is the problem of restrictive union rules which prevent management from operating with full efficiency. These are losses that everybody has to pay for.

The administration has acted to prevent the American people from swallowing the one-sided facts presented by the union and the industry. In this negative sense, the Mitchell report serves an important function.

But, alas, there remains the great unanswered question: Is the power to close down an entire industry a safe power to close trust to an organized group largely immune

from ordinary legal restraints, and does such power tend to favor such a group unduly as against the rest of the economy? It's a question that needs answering.

[From the Boston Traveler, Aug. 21, 1959]

FACING THE FACTS

The report just released by Secretary of Labor Mitchell on the statistical background of the steel industry is a strong argument for a quick settlement.

Mitchell does not take sides in his findings. But neither does he sugar his facts. He points to healthy conditions on both sides, labor and management alike, and leaves the public more than ever convinced that the strike should end without delay.

Steelworkers' average earnings already are well ahead of industrial earnings in general.

Steel industry's profits after taxes, in relation to sales, have been higher than for manufacturing as a whole.

Thus both sides have been economically healthy. So why the dispute?

Mitchell's impartial report, while drawing no conclusion, leaves the bystander feeling that there's no point in wasting sympathy on either side.

It's time for both parties involved in the strike to stop stalling and to negotiate a sincere approach to a settlement before the damage spreads.

What Tom Dooley Knows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks, I include an editorial relating to Dr. Thomas Dooley, M.D., entitled "What Tom Dooley Knows," appearing in the Boston Globe of August 24, 1959.

As everyone knows, there is no more living person dedicated to this cause of suffering mankind in practically a forgotten area of the world than Dr. Dooley.

The editorial well says:

Tom Dooley, whether he lives 5 months or 5 years or 50 years, has had a life more filled with accomplishments than most men.

How true.

It is the prayers and hopes of countless of millions that the health of Dr. Tom Dooley will improve enabling him for many years to do his great work in the service of God and of mankind.

The editorial follows:

WHAT TOM DOOLEY KNOWS

(By Uncle Dudley)

Tom Dooley says that he's going back to Laos—going back to southeast Asia and the 30-mat hospital, no beds—that he set up on the "edge of tomorrow," where he sought and found how to serve.

The missionary, Dr. Thomas Dooley, will be leaving the safe and comfortable womb of a great specialized New York hospital, where he learned the other day that at 32 he had cancer of the lungs. He'll be leaving to work as long as he can among people who go to bed hungry at night, live in grinding poverty, mostly never have seen a doctor.

(Yet, when he came back to this country last year he wrote never had he seen anyone out there with a neurosis.)

For Americans who have worked themselves into a state of fear about cancer, heart disease, and some of the other killers, Dr. Dooley's case is a horror story. Dr. Dooley himself obviously does not think so. Nor do many of his fellows in the profession.

Here they remember another surgeon, who underwent surgery for cancer in middle age and achieved an international reputation and honors for 17 years more, almost no one the wiser. They also recall the New York doctor, known throughout the world, who lived for years with acute heart disease, slipping off now and then to come to Boston for secret treatment, in the meantime establishing an institution that will be a living monument to his selflessness and courage. Or the Massachusetts octogenarian who was operated on for "inoperable" malignancy and has been blithely carrying on as a family doctor for years. And there's also the internist who faced surgery for incurable disease, was glad that he "had time to set his affairs in order," and then was found to have a harmless obstruction.

This is not to say that every story has a happy ending—to be a pollyanna about ravaging diseases of which we still know, with all our vast programs, far too little. It is to decry the kind of fear in which this Nation, with the most comfort, widespread luxury, the best food, the highest standard of medical care, has steeped itself.

The result too often is that we are living scared. We act as though the end all of life is to prolong life and in prolonging life to create insuperable new problems for ourselves.

Tom Dooley, whether he lives 5 months or 5 years or 50 years, has had a life more filled with accomplishment than most men. Perhaps that is why he could take bad news about his body with anger, because it might cut short his mission, and with the gaiety of selflessness and a quip for the irony of the situation in which he finds himself.

In his book, "The Edge of Tomorrow," with which he has helped finance the work of his medical mission, Dr. Dooley said that it is sometimes hard to see God "when you are plunged into bleating materialism." But because of the solitude in the jungle it is easier to see Him "in the tropic rain, in the monsoon mud, in the tangy sweet smell of the earth . . . the frangipani, the tamarind trees . . . the quiet and peace of the hills and valleys."

And he really lets us in on the secret when he concludes that "life can signify much. We must just listen to the voices which are inside each of us. . . . A man working in this world without tapping his own reservoir of spiritual strength is like a twin-engined plane flying with only one motor. He may get there, but it will be mighty difficult."

Agricultural Experiment Stations Contribute to American Life Through Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the launching of the first Russian sputnik

less than 2 years ago gave the words "basic research" special significance for Americans. Today the impact of research—both basic and applied—is manifested in every aspect of our life. We know that when man flies to the moon or conquers cancer or builds a better mousetrap, research will have played an important, if not the most important, role in that success.

Although it does not have the glamour of the launching pad and the countdown and thus has not received the spotlight given technological research, agricultural research has been an important part of American life for many years. The agricultural experiment stations, operated through the Department of Agriculture with the cooperation of many State agricultural colleges, are as significant to rural America as the mail order house or good harvest weather.

I was pleased that the Senate and House increased the 1960 appropriation for the Agricultural Research Service from the \$64,240,000 recommended by the administration to \$67,722,490.

The causes which these funds will serve are many, Mr. President, even in my own State of Oregon—where pears, peas, and potatoes are among the variety of crops that will be improved through agricultural research. Because it so well describes the value of agricultural experiment stations and their research contributions, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Pendleton East Oregonian for August 4, 1959, entitled "Work of the Experiment Stations," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORK OF THE EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Anybody who looks closely at the economy of Oregon concludes that it will be expanded according to efforts in the direction of full utilization of wood, doing a better job in all facets of agriculture, and putting water resources to full use. It is our opinion the greatest opportunity for expansion is in agriculture.

An obvious need in agriculture is to bring the crops-animal ratio into better balance. Oregon swings too far on the crops side. Another need is to do a better job with those crops we presently produce, to improve quality and boost quantity. And another need is to develop effective cures for the many diseases that attack so many crops.

The job is being approached from several directions and at several levels. The primary responsibility is upon Oregon State College and U.S. Department of Agriculture personnel at the State's experiment stations.

With the committee on agricultural extension service and experiment stations of the State board of higher education we visited four experiment stations last week, three at Medford and the other at Klamath Falls. We saw and heard of two projects that are ideal illustrations of the importance of experiment stations in the agricultural economy of Oregon.

The pear crop of the Rogue River Valley is worth many millions of dollars annually—latest estimate by the Jackson County extension office is that the annual return from the fruit crop in that county is about \$19 million. This immense resource is being

threatened by a condition that is called pear decline. Pear decline rapidly reduces the crop and finally destroys the trees.

An entomologist from Oregon State College has been working on the problem for about a year. He has reason to believe he may be close to an answer.

In order to increase production many orchardists have increased use of commercial fertilizers and irrigation. Because that seemed sound the entomologist looked in many places for the causes of pear decline before he had to come to the undeniable conclusion that pear decline was most prevalent in orchards that had been heavily fertilized and irrigated. Those orchards lightly fertilized and irrigated showed little or no signs of pear decline. So, he is about to say to the orchardists that the theory that if a little is good a lot is better does not hold true in the raising of pears. If he is right and pear decline can be eradicated the victory will be immensely important.

In Klamath County the potato crop is the county's greatest agricultural money producer. Throughout the county potato production has been dropping, both in quality and quantity.

Agronomists are not quite ready to say that they have the answer but they will tell you that they think they have it. There is a parallel to the pear problem in Jackson County.

For many years it has been thought in Klamath County that the best potato producer was the man who rotated potatoes with alfalfa and clover. It has been discovered that that wasn't true. Rotation of those crops with potatoes was exactly the wrong thing to do. The farmer who was thought to be lazy because he didn't practice rotation has not had the production and disease problems that have hit the fields of the "efficient" farmers.

These are examples of the tremendous importance of experiment station work in crops that are basic to the economies of Jackson and Klamath Counties. The same type of work is going on at experiment stations throughout the State on crops and animals.

Farmers who directly benefit from experiment station work are, of course, the big winners. But it would be shortsighted to look no further. Improving pear production and potato production goes far beyond aiding the economies of two counties and the farmers of those counties. It benefits every resident of the State of Oregon. If all who live in this State are to prosper agriculture must produce more and more.

Caution Needed in Applying for Public Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, correspondence reaching Members of Congress clearly demonstrates the need for caution in hiring "land locators" or "agents" to prepare applications for public lands.

A new Bureau of Land Management pamphlet, "Information on Public Lands," contains sound advice for veterans and others seeking a tract of pub-

lic land. Copies may be obtained from local Bureau officers or the Bureau of Land Management, Washington 25, D.C.

Extracts from the pamphlet follow:

See the land and examine it in person. Don't buy or apply for lands you have not seen. The Government usually requires it, and besides, it is good business sense.

Know the law and regulations. Even if someone else is handling the details for you, find out for yourself what he is doing and why. Don't pay anyone to do anything until you know the official requirements.

If you hire someone to locate the land for you, know exactly what services you are paying for. Do not pay for services you do not get or cannot use.

Land locators and filing services have offices in many western cities. For a fee they will examine the status of lands on the public land records, inspect the characteristics of public lands on the ground, fill out application blanks, and prepare supplementary information that may be required with the application.

However, be careful. None of the land locator services is licensed or regulated by the Federal Government. Some unscrupulous operators have led some people to believe that hiring them will result in obtaining Federal land, even though most of the applications they file will be rejected. Before you hire a land locator, you should be sure that you are dealing with a reliable person and that you understand fully the extent of the services which he will provide.

In the real estate business, realtors do not usually earn their fee until the final sale has been completed. Until that time, a person only makes a deposit of earnest money to show his good faith. If the realtor fails to complete the sale, he will return the money deposited. People doing business with land locators or filing services would do well to obtain similar agreements. A person then would not lose his money if his application is later denied. Such arrangements, of course, have to be worked out directly with the locator or filing service.

The Government does not require or encourage the use of land locator services. All applications received by the Bureau of Land Management are considered on their own merits. No one would receive any kind of special treatment or consideration simply because he had filed his application through a land locator. All BLM information, data, records, maps, and other materials which are available to land locators and filing services are also available to anyone who is interested in filing an application. Land locators receive no special or "inside" information that is not available to anyone else.

Buying public lands, like buying any real estate, is a serious investment. For your own protection, you should always see and personally examine the lands.

GTA Daily Radio Roundup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two issues

of the GTA Daily Radio Roundup, prepared by the GTA Public Relations Department, St. Paul, Minn., on Wednesday, August 19, and Friday, August 21, 1959.

There being no objection, the publications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP OF AUGUST 19, 1959

There's so much loose talk and misinformation being passed around about the farm situation and food prices that it is no wonder many city people are confused. So it is refreshing to pick up a newspaper that's giving out with the facts on this matter. We're talking about an editorial in the August 19, St. Paul Pioneer Press. It's titled "The Other Side to Farm Surpluses," and we thought you'd be interested in hearing some of what it has to say.

First, the editorial warns that the cost of living is not as stable as it looks on the surface. It hints that those national leaders who boast about how they've kept inflation under control have had the wool pulled over their eyes. What's actually been happening, the Pioneer Press editorial says, is a far different story. Here are a couple of paragraphs—quoted directly from the newspaper: "What made the price index appear stable was the fact that food prices were declining at an annual rate of 5 percent, but other non-food commodities and services rose 2 percent. Thus a major factor was the abundance and relative cheapness of food items, which offset the rise in the remainder of the items going into the index."

In other words, a farm subsidy to both consumers and business people. But let's read on:

"This is a reminder to the critics of the farm program that, whatever its shortcomings, taxpayers get something back. One of the favorite criticisms is against the payment of crop supports, which keep on adding to the surplus production of the farms," the St. Paul newspaper says. "But at any rate, the country has an abundance of food, and everyone in his capacity as a consumer gets a dividend in the relative cheapness of food. This was the dominant factor in keeping the cost of living from going up," it concludes.

Well, that's no secret to farmers. They've seen it going on since way back in 1952. But we're happy to see city people getting the story straight, at least in some of the big newspapers. It certainly is a contrast to the propaganda coming out of the Secretary of Agriculture's office, telling people that farm prices are too high and that makes food prices high. Neither statement is true, of course, but some people don't question what they read or hear.

And speaking of consumers "getting something back" for their tax money spent on farm programs, we notice in the Wall Street Journal that food surpluses are proving a big help in areas of heavy unemployment. With the steel industry shut down, Uncle Sam is distributing flour, rice, eggs and other abundant foods to workers who are broke. And that helps take quite a relief load off the local taxpayers.

So when the story is truly told and understood, the abundance produced by American farmers is indeed a blessing. Farmers have always been proud of their ability to feed the Nation, with some to spare. What they ask in return is legislative machinery to smooth out the highs and lows in production, and realize a fair return for their labor, investment, and management.

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP OF AUGUST 21, 1959

The harbor at Duluth-Superior, the largest inland port in the world, is bustling with new activity these days. Strange ships, with

salt-water crews, are sailing the inland seas all because the centuries-old dream of a St. Lawrence Seaway has finally been realized. For the first time, the grain farmers of the upper Midwest, through their giant GTA elevator at Superior, are loading grain into ships that sail direct to the salty seas.

The seaway is a mighty accomplishment. Some call it a magic wand of progress that will transform the economy of the Midwest, maybe even put farmers on easy street. But let's slow down here for a minute, and while we are hailing the seaway's benefits let's look at some of its shortcomings. First of all, the upper leg of the seaway, the part that reaches to the farmer's elevator at Superior, is icebound about 5 months of the year. And the channel is only 27 feet deep, which isn't enough for the big-sea ships so it is the smaller ones that reach Duluth-Superior. We've just been talking with some of our GTA people who handle shiploading at the big elevator and they say that the high-sided ocean ships take sometimes twice as long to load as the long, low Great Lakes boats. That means more expense, of course.

And here's another point. As more grain is being loaded out on the St. Lawrence Seaway, less is being shipped by barge down the Mississippi for loading into ships at gulf ports. It's too early to tell yet whether the St. Lawrence will mean a bigger market or just a shift in shipping points. We notice that southern and eastern Congressmen are concerned enough about this to take action. They're trying for a law to tie up certain Great Lakes grain shipments so their ports will get the business back.

There are other troubles along the big ditch too, but that's enough to give you the idea.

Here at GTA we're primarily interested in how the seaway can benefit the farmer and his family. If it will mean more markets, more total co-op savings, that's all to the good. But nothing of the sort has been proven yet. Researchers say it costs 12 cents a bushel less when grain is loaded in an ocean vessel at Superior, going direct to, say, Casablanca or Rotterdam than when it is shipped by rail to an east coast port before being loaded on a ship. But who gets the 12 cents? Not the farmer. He's already paid to get his grain to the terminal market. And the Seaway hasn't lowered those freight charges a penny.

So it looks like any benefit the farm families get from the seaway will be indirect. The big exception will be the savings that might be realized through the grain marketing businesses that farmers own themselves, their cooperatives. And it has always been true that farmers benefit the most when they do business with their local cooperatives and with GTA the co-op way.

Aid for Redevelopment of Depressed Economic Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to make one more plea before Congress adjourns for action by the the House on legislation to set up a program of cooperative Federal-State aid for the redevelopment of depressed economic areas.

Many sections of our Nation are suffering from persistent and substantial

unemployment. This is a serious problem that time will not solve. Nor will it go away if we simply close our eyes to it.

These depressed areas need help, Mr. Speaker. They must be given assistance in rebuilding their economy and in attracting new industry that will create permanent jobs.

The Senate has passed an area redevelopment bill. The House Banking and Currency Committee approved a bill last May. The bill is still pending in the House Rules Committee.

If Congress adjourns without acting on this legislation, Congress will have to face up to this problem next year. We cannot escape it.

Mr. Speaker, it is unthinkable that in times of unprecedented prosperity for the country as a whole we will permit large pockets of depression to exist.

The people in these areas are suffering. Hundreds of thousands of them depend upon gifts of surplus foods to feed their families. They need help—not handout—to keep their children from from starving but just which will enable them to support their families and lead useful, fruitful lives.

South Korea Skies Clear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Christian Science Monitor of August 19, 1959, by Robert T. Oliver entitled "South Korea Skies Clear" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

In this excellent article Mr. Oliver points out that never in the 4,300-year history of Korea have the people had such great hopes as are now known in the Republic of Korea. The advances that have been made since the formation of the Republic in 1948 have been most encouraging.

Mr. Oliver notes, for example, that whereas in 1948, 54 percent of all South Korean farmers were tenants on the land, today tenant farmers number less than 10 percent. Educational developments have also been most encouraging. Today 96 percent of all South Korea's farm children are in school from the ages of 6 to 11, and there is not a farm village in the land that does not have its elementary school.

I am confident that the progress that is being made in the Republic of Korea will continue and the people of that brave land will have a continually rising standard of living.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH KOREA SKIES CLEAR

(By Robert T. Oliver)

Like the dim glow that begins to show through heavy banks of black clouds after

a long spell of bad weather, there is promise in sight of a better day coming for South Korea's 15 million farm dwellers.

No miracle is going to bring sudden or substantial prosperity to the hard-working families that slough through the mud of the rice paddies to produce the principal wealth of that ancient and war-battered peninsula. But the upswing rests on solid economic facts. When harvest time comes in October, the month of "high skies and fat horses," Mr. and Mrs. Song Tai Ha (Korea's typical farm family) will be better off, and have better prospects, than ever before.

This summer has been a mixture of good and bad weather. Heavy rains that began on June 30 and lasted for 10 days brought 10 inches of rain to the Seoul area, and precipitated the worst floods in 26 years on the farmlands above Pusan. Damage amounted to 4 billion hwan (approximately \$8 million) with 7,000 people rendered homeless and 111 casualties (including 57 fatalities). Some 11,200 acres of farm paddies and other crop fields were laid waste, a tragic loss in a land where the average farm's size is 2½ acres.

KIMCHI BRINGS SMILES

Nevertheless, in a letter from an informed friend in Korea, dated July 16, the news is largely good: "Our rainy season is over and we are enjoying beautiful warm weather. The people are looking forward to a good crop. This year we had a bumper crop of barley and the rain has also been favorable for the round cabbage, squash, and other vegetables, as well as the watermelon. With cabbage so plentiful and cheap everyone can eat a lot of kimchi this year."

When kimchi is plentiful, Koreans, as every GI who has served in Korea knows, are all smiles. This pickled vegetable, heavily spiced with garlic and red pepper, is next to rice the staple of the Korean diet; and even many Americans have found it not only nutritious but also a tasty dish.

For the last 3 years the rice crops has exceeded the pre-1945 average, and it gets better each year. Results are flowing steadily from the repair of war damage, improvements in transportation, increase in the flow of fertilizer (and improved distribution), and steady progress in checking plant disease and improving seed quality.

An even greater impetus was given to the workers in the rice paddies by the sweeping land reform laws that were adopted in 1949, promulgated in 1950, and that have become increasingly effective through the better governmental administration accompanying the general recovery from the wartime conditions.

OWNERSHIP SPURS INTEREST

In 1948, when the Republic of Korea was inaugurated, 54 percent of all South Korean farmers were tenants on the land, and an additional 25 percent were part tenants. Rentals averaged 35 percent of the crop yield. Now tenantry on Korean farms is below 10 percent, and the annual payments-in-kind for the purchase of the land is about 20 percent of the annual harvest.

The difference not only in cash but also in satisfaction and in the release of initiative is enormous. Farmer Song Tai Ha nowadays works in the late fall and early spring to repair irrigation ditches and dikes that protect land that is his own, rather than leaving them to the dubious care of absentee landlords. He takes a new pride in fields that he can now leave to his own eldest son.

How much better off are the farmers of South Korea today than they were 2 or 3 years ago? On the land crops ripen slowly, and real progress has to be measured in decades, not in years. But the facts all point toward better times.

For one thing, over 96 percent of all South Korea's farm children are now in school from

the age of 6 to 11. There is not a farm village in the land that does not have its elementary school, with a middle school near at hand, and a high school not much farther away. And there are 78 colleges and universities in the Republic that enroll more than 80,000 students. No longer is the land (constantly shrinking in ratio to the population growth) the only outlet for Farmer Song's sons and daughters.

INFLATION CHECKED

For another thing, the inflation that raced ahead in South Korea for 12 years from 1945, averaging 219 percent per year, has during the last 2 years been brought to a slow pace of only 4 or 5 percent a year. This means lower prices when the rice is sold, but also lower prices for what the farmer must buy.

Moreover, better management of the grain-import program is now resulting in the grains reaching Korea from America in mid-winter, when they keep prices from reaching astronomical peaks, rather than coming in late spring or midsummer to compete with the sale of the ripening crops.

Farmer Song now has a small bank account, for 54 percent of all South Korea's extant currency is now on deposit. He may even have a life insurance policy; for renewed confidence in the stability of the hwan has revived the ancient and popular life insurance business.

As in all the developing countries of the world, South Korea's farmers remain among the last portions of the population to experience beneficial effects from our program of economic aid. First transportation and communication facilities must be repaired, then electric power developed, then mines and factories had to be activated. But fertilizer is flowing in; the new Chungju fertilizer plant is near completion and a second is abuilding and the new banking and cooperative developments are meshing Farmer Song into the pattern of general economic improvements.

For old Mr. and Mrs. Song Tai Ha the present rewards are small. But they can look to the future of their sons and daughters with greater hope than has ever been known in the 4,300-year history of their ancient land.

worked tirelessly, courageously, and successfully for Hawaiian statehood, should have been invited to the White House.

I am including herein two editorials from the newspapers of the new and sovereign State of Hawaii that eloquently express the concern of the people of the 50th State over this unfortunate incident:

[From the Hawaii Times, Aug. 22, 1959]

INSULT TO HAWAII

Somewhere in Washington as, amid happy White House ceremonies, a grinning President Eisenhower went through the motions that created the islands of Hawaii into the 50th State of the United States of America a gray-haired man sat ignored by official Washington.

He was John A. Burns, Hawaii's last Delegate to Congress.

Up until the minute that the final stroke of a Presidential pen brought an end to his official office, John A. Burns had represented and served all the people of Hawaii in the Halls of Congress.

That Burns represented and served his people well and with exceptional success is a matter of obvious facts and official records. He championed and fought for the inherent rights of the people of Hawaii. More than any other Delegate before him he made those who operate the U.S. Government realize and appreciate the importance of Hawaii and its people to the welfare of America. He spearheaded the final drive for statehood for Hawaii. And Hawaii, after almost half a century of effort, was granted statehood.

Yet, this man of Hawaii was not extended the simple courtesy of being invited to the White House ceremonies that created the Territory of Hawaii into the State of Hawaii.

This ignoring of John A. Burns—whatever the reason may have been—was unfortunate to say the least and inexcusable. It was a direct insult to all of the people of Hawaii, who twice elected him as their Delegate to Congress.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, Aug. 22, 1959]

NOT INVITED

Yesterday at the White House a group of invited guests watched President Eisenhower sign the proclamation admitting Hawaii to the Union.

Conspicuously not among the witnesses was John A. Burns, who with the scratching of the President's pen went out of office and into history as Hawaii's last Delegate to Congress.

He wasn't invited.

He should have been. Burns served Hawaii honorably and well through two terms, the only official under Territorial status elected by all the people.

He personally and the office he held deserved an invitation to attend the moment of triumph he helped to bring about.

Resolution of Loyal Lodge No. 252 of the Sons of Norway, Relating to Proclamation of Leif Erikson Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

Insult to Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. INOUE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, the 21st day of August 1959, I was privileged to witness the signing of the Executive proclamation by the President of the United States officially admitting Hawaii into the sisterhood of States as the 50th State of our Union. Many distinguished Americans, including our honorable Speaker, were present at this White House ceremony.

The absence of another distinguished American, the Honorable John Anthony Burns, the last Delegate to the Congress of the United States from the Territory of Hawaii, was painfully noted. I was shocked to learn that Delegate Burns was not invited by the White House to be present at this historical occasion. Many of those present at this White House ceremony sincerely felt that Delegate Burns, the gentleman from Hawaii who

the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting resolution recently adopted by Loyal Lodge No. 252 of the Sons of Norway, favoring the proclamation of Lelf Erikson Day. We in New York State have new and deeper ties with the great country Norway than we had a short time ago. I am very anxious that the resolution be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in RECORD, as follows:

LODGE LOYAL, No. 252,
SONS OF NORWAY,
St. James, Long Island, N.Y.,
August 7, 1959.

To Whom It May Concern:

Whereas Sons of Norway, Loyal Lodge No. 252, is a membership association duly incorporated under the laws of the State of New York, with its clubhouse and principal place of business or activity at Seventh Street and Fourth Avenue, St. James, Suffolk County, N.Y.; and

Whereas Sons of Norway, Loyal Lodge, No. 252, is an association composed of persons of Scandinavian origin and their descendants interested in preserving the history, customs, and traditions of their forefathers; and

Whereas this lodge wishes to cooperate in the movement to have Congress establish Lelf Erikson Day as a national holiday in honor of the many persons of Scandinavian heritage who have contributed and are presently contributing to the development of these United States: Now, therefore, be it Resolved, That Sons of Norway, Loyal Lodge No. 252, of St. James, Suffolk County, N.Y., respectfully petition the Congress of the United States for the establishment of a national holiday to be known as Lelf Erikson Day.

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and exact copy of the resolution duly moved and adopted at a meeting of Sons of Norway, Loyal Lodge No. 252, held at the meeting hall of said association at St. James, N.Y., on the 3d day of July 1959.

HARRY TABLASSEN,
ELVIDA THOMASSEN,
Secretary.

Interest Ceiling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a letter written by Prof. J. M. Culbertson to the editor of the New York Times and printed in the New York Times on Tuesday, August 18, 1959, under the heading "Interest Ceiling Opposed."

INTEREST CEILING OPPOSED—REMOVAL OF TOOLS TO MODERATE BOOM DEVELOPMENT CRITICIZED

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

We face now a problem of economic stabilization that is unusual and perplexing, one that could fall disastrously to solve. Since we are in the early stage of a cyclical upswing and the widespread inflation neurosis will tend to exaggerate expansive forces, main-

taining economic stability is likely to require in the near future a Government policy of restraint on total demands.

Therefore, this is an appallingly bad time to take away from the Government its tools for moderating boom developments. Yet this will be the outcome if Congress does not remove the 4½-percent ceiling on interest rates on Government bonds.

It should be understood that the existence of this ceiling is not a part of any rational system of Government economic policy, but rather is an historical accident. The provision stems from the Third Liberty Bond Act of 1918. It was passed by Congress with reference to particular security sales during the First World War. It has remained on the books so long because it has not mattered; market interest rates have been below the ceiling.

The intervening decades included the 1920's, when repayment of Government debt and price stability contributed to decline in bond yields, the great depression of the 1930's, the period of controlled war finance and the postwar period of supported Government bond prices.

CAPITAL DEMANDS

But now this is past. We have come to a time of high prosperity, strong capital demands and inflationary fears. Consequently interest rates are high. Now, the 4½ percent interest rate limitation does matter. It is an anachronism that may do serious harm unless it is removed.

Our only ready defense against excessive and inflationary expansion in total expenditures is the monetary policy of the Federal Reserve and the debt management policy of the Treasury. To restrain expenditures with fiscal policy by raising taxes or reducing expenditures can be done only by Congress when it is in session. The chances that timely action of this sort could be achieved are slim.

If the Treasury is debarred by law from meeting the market rate of interest on its bonds it has no choice but to replace its maturing bonds and meet all its other financing needs by selling short-term securities. Such securities are relatively liquid; they serve as a money substitute. This sort of shift in the composition of the Government debt tends to cause easy financing conditions and expansion of expenditures.

Just as the policy of supporting prices of Government bonds earlier made the Federal Reserve an "engine of inflation," so the interest rate limitation can make one of the Treasury.

No valid argument has been offered for permitting the 4½ percent limitation to become effective, but a variety of motives operate in this direction. Supporting cheap money and twisting the tail of the Wall Street bankers has always been a popular political game in this country. Some Congressmen are piqued at the Federal Reserve for its past actions or words. There is a school of thought that moderate inflation is harmless and Government policy should be less concerned with it.

But, surely, if the Nation is to be committed to some new approach or new theory of economic stabilization, this should be done only after open and conscientious discussion and after there have been established agencies with clear policy directives and adequate powers to carry out the policies.

For the Congress at this critical time simply to tie the hands of the Treasury by leaving the 4½ percent limitation on the books and then pack itself up and go home—this would be dangerous irresponsibility.

J. M. CULBERTSON.

MADISON, Wis., August 13, 1959.

Archer Fullingim Reviews Dr. Cotner's Life of Jim Hogg With Both Barrels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Archer Fullingim, who grew up on the American high plains, graduated from Stanford University and now is editor of the weekly Kountze News in Hardin County in the Piney Woods of east Texas. He is one of the few present day country editors cut in the bold, outspoken, courageous mold of Texas' great country editor, Jim Hogg. And Jim Hogg was Texas' greatest Governor.

Fullingim knows Texas and Texans of this and past generations. So by knowing Texans at the grassroots, he has special qualifications for reviewing a recent definitive life of James S. Hogg, one of Texas' four greatest statesmen. The others were Stephen F. Austin, Sam Houston, and John H. Reagan.

Dr. Robert C. Cotner, of the University of Texas history faculty, has written the definitive life of Hogg in the language of ivy towers, tireless research, and historic accuracy. Now Archer Fullingim, articulate and earthy, has reviewed Dr. Cotner's Hogg in his free-swinging, uninhibited style that Texans love. It is the type of frank, outspoken journalism that was prevalent in Texas in Hogg's day two generations ago, but is largely nonexistent now. Fullingim knows his contemporary Texas like Dr. Cotner knows Jim Hogg. Having grown up in the shadow of the Hogg tradition in those east Texas Piney Woods 12 miles from the place where Jim Hogg lived as a district attorney, I believe I can sense the feeling of the Hogg men, and I believe Fullingim catches the spirit of Hogg in this review.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Archer Fullingim's review of Dr. Cotner's life of Jim Hogg, printed in the Kountze News on July 30, 1959 under the title "The Printer Fires Both Barrels."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kountze (Tex.) News]

THE PRINTER FIRES BOTH BARRELS

It's been 70 years since James Stephen Hogg, the first native to be elected Governor of Texas, was inaugurated on a reform platform that promised to wrest control of the State of Texas from the corporations. And in reading the new biography of Hogg by Dr. Robert C. Cotner, history professor at the University of Texas, one becomes slowly aware that Texas in 1959 is in much the same shape as it was in the 1880's, except that then Texas was the ruthless, greedy grasp of nine eastern railroads, and now is in the merciless, greedy grip of petroleum and gas corporations—which are sending millions of dollars out of the State each

year, just as the railroad companies did in the 1880's, and are trying to saddle a sales tax on the people of Texas. In reading the Hogg biography one becomes acutely conscious of the parallel between the Texas of 1889 and the Texas of 1959. It is as if history were repeating itself with only the names changed to protect the innocent. The sad thing about it is that in 1959 there is no James Stephen Hogg around to protect the people and enforce the law. For the plain people of Texas do not control the wealth of this State in 1959. Theirs is not the ability to pay taxes. The petroleum and gas industry has the ability to pay taxes, as reflected by their huge profits, and through the industry's control of the legislature, particularly the Senate, has haughtily, relentlessly tried to force a sales tax through the legislature for 6 months, in the regular session and two called sessions. The railroads and insurance companies and daily newspapers that fought James Stephen Hogg (and lost) have their counterpart today.

This column has often said as a matter of fact that Hogg was Texas' greatest Governor but this writer has not been alone in hailing the greatness of Hogg. Every Governor for the last 40 years (except Farmer Jim Ferguson and Pappy O'Daniel) has mentioned Hogg in the same breath with Sam Houston and Stephen F. Austin. In 1951, Allan Shivers declared that year as the James Stephen Hogg Centennial Year. The same year, the Dallas State Fair set aside October 12 as James Stephen Hogg day. In 1958 Price Daniel said that "much of our State government as we know it today can be traced to the program of Jim Hogg."

But until Professor Cotner wrote this 617-page biography of Hogg (price: \$7.50) Texans did not know exactly why Hogg was such a great governor. Seventy years is a long time, and most of the people who were living and voting in 1890, are dead now, and from now on Texans will have to rely on history for their information about Hogg. The Texas history books touch on Hogg briefly, and his praises are not sung by the daily press for a reason.

The bitterest enemies of Hogg in 1900 were the Dallas News, the Houston Post, and the San Antonio Express, three papers which have always lined up with the corporations against the plain people. And one can make a safe guess as to how the piddling Beaumont papers lined up, just like the rest of the Republican press, for Hogg's enemies always carried Jefferson County. All of these papers, judging by their consistent failure to even mention the gigantic feats accomplished by Hogg, apparently want Texas to forget Hogg, or maybe now they are ashamed of the rascally, lying role they played in the Hogg career, and just as these papers lined up against Hogg in 1890 for the railroads, the trusts and corporations, so are they today lined up against the plain people and for the oil and gas industry and ever other domineering corporation. (If Hogg were attorney general or governor today, the Southwestern Bell Telephone Co. would not last 2 hours.) The same enemies Hogg had in 1890 are the same enemies Price Daniel has down at Austin—only the names have changed—in his battle to tax those who have the ability to pay. But the big difference is that Hogg, a 6-foot-3 giant of a man, weighing 280 pounds, carried the battle to the enemy, the railroads and corporations. He threw everything he had at them, because as he said over and over, "If Texas does not control the corporations, the corporations will control Texas." Hogg did not use diplomatic language. He called them scoundrels and scoundrels.

No governor has been elected in Texas since Jimmy Allred who was not the fair-haired lad of the petroleum and gas corporations.

At this point I am proud to say that I think if Ralph Yarborough were governor, like Hogg, he would not give an inch. He would have already taxed those most able to pay.

One becomes coldly transfixed in learning that back in the 1880's and 1890's, the Dallas News took the lead among daily papers in pinning a Communist label on Hogg. The News actually used the word "Communist." Hogg scarcely knew about communism then but it did not take him long to find out and squelch the Dallas News in his reply.

But why was James Stephen Hogg a great governor? Why is he still an inspiration to the plain people in this year of 1959? Why is it that politicians, bought and paid for by the petroleum and gas industry for 20 years, will hypocritically sing the praises of Hogg but are afraid to take one little timid step to emulate him? So here are some of the things you should know about James Stephen Hogg in 1959, the better to evaluate your governor, your legislators, your President, even your own conscience:

Hogg was born at Rusk in 1851. He was the son of a Confederate general who died in the Civil War around Shiloh. At the time the war started, Hogg's father owned a huge plantation, Mountain Home, 20 slaves and 20,000 acres of land. The Hogg family lost everything as a result of the war. James became a printer's devil on the Rusk Texas Observer and became an expert printer by the time he was 16. In his late teens, he worked on papers at Quitman, Cleburne, and Tyler. He farmed on the halves and then went back to printing. He established a triweekly paper at Longview. He studied law at Tyler and was elected county and district attorney of seven counties. He prosecuted the first man ever to be hanged in Van Zandt County. He won fame as a prosecutor. He attended the famous "car shed" Democratic convention in Houston and made a favorable impression. He gradually acquired a reputation as a reformer and as a man who believed in enforcing the law. In 1837, he was elected attorney general at the age of 36. As soon as he got to Austin, he took out after the railroads and fraudulent insurance companies, both of whom were robbing the people, to put it bluntly. Freight rates were so exorbitant that one marvels how the railroads got by with it as long as they did, but one must remember that a big man in Texas railroads at that time was one Jay Gould, of Wall Street fame, and Hogg took him on too and taught Mr. Gould to stay out of Texas.

The railroads were not only robbing the shippers, but they had seized more than a million acres of public lands illegally. You see, in order to get railroads, the State had given 40 sections of land (a section has 640 acres) for every mile of railroad built in the State, and 16 sections for every mile of switches and sidings. It was under the switches and siding category that the railroads really made a killing, but before Hogg got through with the railroads the State of Texas had recovered 1,300,000 acres of public land for the State.

Hogg established the railroad commission which regulated the railroads, their bonds, rates. Hogg appointed Mr. Reagan the first chairman of the railroad commission. Reagan had been in Jeff Davis' cabinet in the Confederate States of America. Reagan had been a frequent visitor in the home of Hogg's parents before the war—other visitors were Sam Houston and Texas revolutionary heroes. Before the railroad commission went into action, the railroads controlled Texas, but after Hogg and Reagan Texas was master in its own house.

Hogg ran the Waters-Pierce Oil Co., owned by John D. Rockefeller, out of Texas, and made it pay a fine of \$1,808,483, for violation of Texas' antitrust law, the biggest fine ever assessed and ever paid in the world.

Hogg sent a deputy to New York City to arrest him and bring him back to Texas, and the deputy almost did it, but in the end John D. stayed holed up in New York, but it was a good try and from then on John D. Rockefeller minded his p's and q's when it came to dealing with Texas.

Hogg forced insurance companies to invest 75 percent of their reserve in Texas, instead of taking it back to New York. In 1908, only about \$1 million of the \$40 million reserve was invested in Texas.

Hogg forced the big land and cattle companies in the Panhandle, including old Charles Goodnight, to give up land they had seized or fenced in illegally, and in doing this Hogg fought the land commissioner, Richard Hall, and the huge XIT (11 counties in Texas) ranch. Hogg refused to accept the capital of Texas from the XIT syndicate, the builders, because it leaked. Hall wanted to pay the syndicate off, but Hogg held out and made the builders fix the leaky roof. Hogg also uncovered the shady dealings of the land commissioner to the extent that Hall lost his office and was never elected to another. One of Hall's most mouthy defenders was the young editor of an Austin magazine, called the Rolling Stone. The editor was William Sidney Porter who later was to gain fame as a short story writer under the name of O. Henry.

(But before O. Henry became famous as a writer he was tried for embezzling funds from an Austin bank and was sent to the Federal pen for it. Some say O. Henry was guilty and some say he was innocent, but after bearing in mind the manner in which he maligned Hogg, I am now ready to believe that O. Henry was guilty.)

When 800 men from California rode a freight train into El Paso, en route to join Coxe's (jobless) army in Washington, D.C., they stopped in El Paso where they were welcomed, fed and feted. The Texas and Pacific railroad refused to let the men ride a freight train out of El Paso. Then all of a sudden the railroad announced it would let the men hop a freight. But about 100 miles out of El Paso, the freight stopped in the desert and put the men off without food or water. Hogg gave the railroad moguls the worst tongue lashing they ever got. He told them he would hold them responsible if any of the men suffered. He ordered the road to take the men back to El Paso or across Texas and be quick about it. The road never obeyed any orders so quickly.

But in view of the grip the railroads and land companies had on Hardin County political bosses of that period, it is understandable that Clark should carry Hardin County which has always had a hard core of conservative leadership that was wont to bend the knee to wealth and privilege. But of course not any more. For Hardin County, the county that voted for Clark, Pappy O'Daniel, and Jim Ferguson, also in the 1950's squelched Allan Shivers, Pappy O'Daniel, and P. Daniel, not to mention Ike, at the ballot box. But back in 1892, the railroads and the big land companies told their straw bosses in Hardin County what to do. Hogg carried Tyler and Liberty, as well as most of the counties in the piney woods.

If you have believed (as I have all my life) that Hogg had two daughters named "Ima" and "Ura," believe only the first half of it. He named his only daughter Ima from the heroine of "The Fate of Marvin," by Tom Hogg, of Scotland, an ancestor of Hogg. There was no sign of a daughter named "Ura." He had four sons.

Hogg was a poor man when he moved out of the governor's mansion in 1894 to a house in Austin, in which city he practiced law. But between 1894 and 1906 when he died James Stephen Hogg amassed a fortune of millions of dollars. He made his first mil-

lion at Spindletop when he and his associates established what later became the Texas Company. Then, before 1900, he bought the Varner plantation near West Columbia. It contained about 2,500 acres. Hogg believed so strongly that oil was under Varner that he put it in his will that the land could not be sold until developed for oil. In 1917, oil was discovered at West Columbia and gushed under the Varner plantation. It has been said that at least \$50 million of the estate Hogg left has been given to charity and educational institutions.

Did Hogg change in those 10 years after he left the Governor's office? No. He was until his dying day a sincere defender of the rights and liberties of the people. When he became a private citizen he used his own time and money to give leadership to the reform movement he had started and until the time was ripe for the transfer of the progressive leadership to the custody of his boyhood chum, Gov. Thomas M. Campbell. He had previously made another boyhood chum, Horace Chilton, U.S. Senator, not because Reagan, Chilton, and Campbell were friends of his boyhood, but because they believed as he did—they also believed that if Texas did not control its corporations, they would control Texas, as witness the eastern oil and gas lobbyists riding shotgun on the Texas legislature at Austin right this minute. Jim Hogg and John Reagan and Horace Chilton and Tom Campbell put them in their place and kept them there. In Jim Hogg's day, the corporation lobbyists did not have the nerve to ride shotgun on the legislature as the oil and gas lobby is doing now. It made Hogg want to puke to see their faces leering at the legislators and he did not stutter in telling them so, although Hogg was one of the most courteous, refined, and polite men who ever lived.

And when James Stephen Hogg died memorial services were held all over Texas and it was the greatest crowd that ever attended a funeral in Austin. This in contrast with the funeral of Joseph Weldon Bailey, at Gainesville some 20 years later. Bailey who was a villain in Hogg's life, was buried at Gainesville with a handful of people in attendance. Bailey had schemed to take over the senate seat of Horace Chilton, and had been accused of making a deal with Waters-Pierce Oil Co. Bailey lost out when the people of Texas began calling him "Coal Oil Joe."

Would that Price Daniel would read this book and take a leaf from it—it's not too late, Price. You can still make a name for yourself but you never will by being reluctant and hesitating. But you will have to start right now, Price, for time is running out on you. All you have to do is be like Hogg and accept no compromise and tell the lobbyists that. Or you can be reluctant and hesitant and go down in history with A. Shivers as the most meaningless governor Texas ever had.

The Coming Visit of Premier Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, there can be little doubt that the world can look forward to a series of sensational developments in the coming months. A few

weeks ago who would have thought that Premier Khrushchev of Russia would be invited to visit the United States as an official guest of the President? Or that Mr. Eisenhower would pay a return visit to Russia?

A large number of people in the United States are alarmed over this turn of events. They feel that by inviting Mr. Khrushchev to this country we will greatly dampen the hopes of people behind the Iron Curtain for eventual liberation.

Conduct of foreign policy is in the hands of the President. He made the decision to exchange visits with Mr. Khrushchev. He sincerely believes that by meeting Mr. Khrushchev face to face he can alleviate to some extent the tensions which threaten world peace.

Mr. Eisenhower is undoubtedly the most respected world figure now in public life. He is placing his tremendous prestige on the line in the hopes that he can bring about a settlement of some of the world's more serious problems.

I am sure the President recognizes the risks involved. We could be lulled into a state of false security and let up in our determination to counter the Russian's cold war plans. The visits could bring about a split among the Western allies. Mr. Eisenhower's present visit to Europe is an effort to prevent this from happening.

Now that the decision to launch a determined peace offensive has been made, Congress must support the President wholeheartedly. A division at home at this time could be fatal.

I believe the people also have the responsibility to see that Khrushchev is received politely and correctly. Nothing would be gained by insulting him. All of the things he stands for are abhorrent to the American people but let us remember he is a guest of the President and as such he is entitled to a polite reception.

I have stated that on the whole I believe some good can come out of the exchange of visits. Khrushchev's ignorance about America is appalling. He apparently honestly believes that large corporations in this country want war to increase their profits. He also seems to think that workers in this country are enslaved by the "bosses."

If these and other misconceptions can be erased by the visit, it will be worth whatever risks are involved.

Mr. Eisenhower is no babe in the woods at this sort of international diplomacy. Some people in this country have expressed fear that he will be "taken in" by Khrushchev, but there have been reports out of Communist China that the Chinese are fearful Khrushchev will be "taken in" by the President. So perhaps this could cut both ways.

It is important that the world be reminded of the total dedication of the people of this country to peace. Mr. Eisenhower's present trip to Europe and the exchange of visits later are dramatic proof of our desire to build a world in which people can live at peace.

If Mr. Eisenhower can make a breakthrough on this front, if he can reassure Khrushchev that our foreign policy is

based solely on a quest for peace, then perhaps some of the suspicions which cloud international relations can be removed.

Let us not kid ourselves that Khrushchev will leave this country a different person. He will still be the ruthless dictator of an aggressive, powerful nation. But perhaps he will understand a little better our hopes for peace and our determination to secure a just and lasting peace even at the risk of using the tremendous power at our command if necessary.

Perhaps he will be more convinced than ever that he cannot win by bluff and that further aggression will be costly to his country.

As patriotic citizens, all of us, I know, hope that Mr. Eisenhower's venture into personal diplomacy will be a resounding success.

Khrushchev Is Swayed by Power, Not Reason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate an article written by Henry Brandon, who is the Washington correspondent of the Sunday Times of London, and who has just returned from a visit to the Soviet Union.

This article, which appeared in the Washington Post of Sunday, August 30, 1959, is entitled "Khrushchev Is Swayed by Power, Not Reason."

Mr. President, it has been my contention all along that when Mr. Khrushchev comes to America for his visit, he should be shown not only the many advantages of our high standard of living, but that he should also be shown our military might. I am not of the school which believes we are second to Russia in military power, for I believe we are far superior to Russia. I believe the general feeling among some quarters that Russia is superior to the United States comes as a result of Russia not knowing exactly what we have, and also because of Mr. Khrushchev's own rantings about what he is going to do if we do not give in to him.

When Mr. Khrushchev comes to town, I hope the President will see to it that he gets an earful and an eyeful of what will happen to him and the Russians if they do not "come across" in negotiations. This is not a one-sided world, and it is time someone told Mr. Khrushchev. As this article points out, he is swayed by power, not reason.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 30, 1959]
KHRUSHCHEV IS SWAYED BY POWER, NOT REASON

(By Henry Brandon)

Shortly after my arrival in Moscow, a high Soviet official said to me: "Don't play political chess here; you can do that just as well in Washington and London. Speak to the people."

That was certainly good advice. I have spoken to as many ordinary Russian citizens as were willing to talk to me. A minority simply repeated what they had read in Pravda; an even smaller minority was afraid to talk at all, but encouragingly many, as I reported in my first article, were eager for thoughtful exchanges with a westerner.

One must ask oneself, however, how the international chess game looks from Moscow. Even the intelligent, well-read Russian cannot give you much guidance. He is well aware that he had no influence on the Government's decisions in that field, and he also senses that his newspapers do not give him enough factual information to judge for himself.

Questions such as "What is the truth about Britain's relations with India?" or "What goes on in Spain, our newspapers never write about it?" were a good indication of how spoonfed the thinking Russians feel.

A STATUS QUO FIRST

There is today, however, fairly general agreement among diplomatic observers in Moscow that Khrushchev has set himself three major aims:

1. To negotiate with the West the acceptance of a status quo in Europe which would enable him to seal off his Socialist camp against Western penetration and consolidate his control over it.
2. To weaken the rear of the capitalist countries in the Middle East, Africa, and Asia by encouraging neutralism and by trying to establish influence in the underdeveloped countries.
3. To promote the Soviet Union to the status of an important international trader, because nowadays the flag follows trade and this would help to reinforce Soviet influence abroad.

Khrushchev's first aim obviously made him demand a change in the status of Berlin. When he launched his diplomatic offensive he did not perhaps expect the West to put up as strong a resistance as it has, and, faced with the possibility that the conflict could lead to war, he trimmed his sails. He is sensitive to the charge of having presented an ultimatum, because he does not want to be accused of creating tension.

Russians are bitter about Western efforts to rearm Western Germany, while knowing little about the rearmament of the East Germans, but they seemed to me unsure who is right over Berlin. On the whole, they think that Khrushchev has a reasonable case in demanding a change in the status of Berlin 14 years after the end of the war, yet they don't think of it as something important enough to go to war about.

Khrushchev knows that the Soviet people are fed up with war; that it would need a massive propaganda campaign to condition them for it. Deeply ingrained patriotism is the most reliable basis of support the Soviet Government has among the people, but it is something the Kremlin can appeal to only in extreme circumstances, such as a direct attack.

NO PLACE FOR MEDIATOR

Khrushchev, calculating and toughminded as he is, is not a man who can easily be swayed by reason—only by the realities of power. In negotiation with him, it is therefore important to be as firm as he is, and as one's own power position allows, but at the same time no less flexible than he is willing to be.

And since the United States likes to be judge of her own power, and Khrushchev will be influenced only by that judgment, it is difficult for third countries to mediate. That is also the reason why Khrushchev wants most of all to negotiate directly with the United States.

Another difficulty in negotiating with the Russians is that they lack a logical mind. They have no difficulty in believing two contradictory ideas at the same time.

Here is one of the causes of disagreement among the Western allies, who cannot agree on what Khrushchev's aims are in the Berlin crisis and therefore have difficulty in framing a common policy, whereas Khrushchev can keep the initiative with or without logic.

Yet another difficulty the West has in negotiating with Khrushchev is that he is convinced that time is on his side, though this is somewhat mitigated by his being himself in a hurry. One high Soviet official I saw who is close to Khrushchev said: "The West has the choice of negotiating with us or eventually with the German People's Republic, and that would mean a loss of prestige for you."

However, the situation is not quite so simple as that. The West's problem is that its juridical correctness is pitted against a perilous strategic situation. Russia's problem, even if she concludes a peace treaty with East Germany, is that she remains nevertheless responsible for the actions of her most dependent satellite.

Khrushchev is said to be not very hopeful of finding some accommodation with the United States now, his theory being that President Eisenhower is the prisoner of his own administration, that he personally would like an accommodation, but not his advisers. This is one reason why Khrushchev is said to be so anxious to meet the President either at a summit or in Washington.

The same high official suggested to me that if only the United States would not tend to back right-wing governments round the world, it would be easier to come to such an accommodation. I retorted that it may be the existence of Communist parties abroad which has driven the United States to the other extreme, because Americans believe that Communists owe their allegiance to Moscow.

I then asked whether Communist parties abroad were likely to lose importance for the Kremlin now that Khrushchev is convinced the Communist system will triumph in any case because, he says, the world will recognize it to be the most successful system. But the answer was: "Communists all over the world are a community, just as the Arabs, for instance, feel that they belong together."

Yet, especially in the Middle East it seems that Khrushchev is more anxious to improve relations with the Arabs than to back his Communists in that area. In Iraq he has been careful not to rely too much on the Communist Party, and in Egypt he continued to give Nasser aid in spite of the latter's denunciation of communism. (Nasser, by the way, seems as unpopular in Moscow as he is in London.)

As one of the editors of Pravda put it to me: "It would be of no advantage to have only one or two Communists in Gen. Kassem's government. It would mean responsibility without power."

In India, it seems Moscow would much prefer the Communists to lie low, fearing that otherwise Nehru's policy of nonalignment might be jeopardized.

As to the basic question whether the Soviet Union would be prepared to use her military power for ideological purposes, all foreign observers agree that she will use it only to protect her national security. But with the growth of Soviet power, the Rus-

slans' concept of what engages their national security has also grown.

In the Syrian-Lebanese crisis for instance, Khrushchev used his military power to halt developments which he believed could have injured Russian national interests.

All this confirms the assumption that Khrushchev has modified two basic concepts of Leninism; he believes that war is no longer fatally inevitable, because of the total destruction involved in nuclear war, and he believes that Russia's growing prosperity and power will become sufficiently contagious to promote world revolution by peaceful means.

For this reason, it is his third great aim to make Russia into a major trading power. He has realized that international trade, as Britain well knows and the United States is reluctant to accept, is a major factor in extending political influence on a worldwide scale. It would also help his 7-year plan.

From the frank disclosures at the last plenum of the central committee, it would seem that Russia's industry needs far-reaching modernization—not an epochal change comparable to the industrialization in the thirties, but a major overhaul which, combined with the steady need for ever-greater expansion, will impose a serious strain on Russian resources.

Aristov's disclosure that in the 15 Russian Republics 400,000 machines have become obsolete and need replacing gives one an inkling of the problems involved. Add the complaint of the leader of Komsomol, the Communist Party's youth organization, that in the last 2 years Russia's institutes have graduated 24,000 historians and only 41 industrial electronic engineers, and it is clear that the manpower for this overhaul is inadequate.

Khrushchev's hopes for overcoming or by-passing some of these vast problems are pinned to what has become in Russia a magic word: automation. There is no doubt that automation of industry, in a centrally planned economy and with a relatively low standard of living, can help in leaping over many stages that other countries had to pass through one by one. The handling of this key problem may well decide the battle between the free enterprise and socialist economies.

Here is something that governments, industry, and trade unions in the West should study carefully before it is too late. The United States refuses to trade with Russia on a large scale in the hope that this will slow down Soviet economic development. But the answer must lie fundamentally in a constructive plan which will increase Western productivity rather than in a defensive action that is bound to fail in the end.

The cost calculations, I am told, radically change with automation to such an extent that Russia could not only satisfy her own needs in products to which it can be applied but also some of those of the underdeveloped countries at almost no additional cost.

The problem Russians are most reluctant to discuss is Communist China, partly perhaps because they sense it is an embarrassing one, partly because they are really quite unsure what to make of it.

The Soviet Government is said to be fairly confident that for the present it will be able to "handle" Peking. This is based on the conviction that Russia is bound to remain militarily and economically superior for some years to come. But beyond that no Russian seems to be very sure of the future.

The defeatism of some of the Russians about China's ultimately overtaking Soviet Russia was reminiscent of British forebodings late in the last century about the United States. I sensed the same feeling of inevitability among many Russians today that China one day would outclass the Soviet Union.

But as if to comfort themselves, they added: "But I don't think we will become

enemies." The optimists always said: "China is now going through her Stalin period."

The great problem in East-West power politics will be how to keep international tension on a low flame. It will not be easy, for Khrushchev is a bully, and bullies behave reasonably only when bullied back. His instruments are the bulldozer, the crane and the big earthmovers.

But Russia's need now is not for radical innovations. It needs cautious, patient diplomacy to bring Khrushchev's basic policies to fruition. That would enable her to concentrate on her economic development, on the race with the United States. But it is doubtful whether Khrushchev has the talent for patience.

For the West, a relaxation of tension is also the better alternative. Admittedly, the influence the West could have on developments inside Russia is extremely limited.

However increasingly thoughtful people may be in Soviet Russia, their influence on Government policies is nil except on minor domestic issues. Nor does history show that a higher standard of life is a special safeguard to peace.

There are, however, signs of evolution in the Soviet Union which the West should welcome. There is definitely a need to assure the Russian people of more and wider contacts with the West. Tourism, student exchanges, contact among experts, trade, exhibitions, all need to be extended.

These are small, limited steps but they have already contributed to a remarkable change of atmosphere in the Soviet Union. The changes in Russia will not come from the top, where a "club of vested interests" rules, but from below, however slow such a growing-up process may be. We must think not only of the present, but also of succeeding generations.

Mood Establisher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, many of you remember Velma Johnston, better known as "Wild Horse Annie," who recently came to Washington and appeared before the Judiciary Committee in behalf of my bill to prohibit mechanized roundups of wild horses and burros. I believe she won the hearts of every Member, not only the subcommittee but members of the full committee who were in attendance as well.

Certainly everyone who knows Velma loves and respects her. I thought you might be interested to know that in addition to risking her life to break up unlawful raids of our dwindling herd of mustangs, in addition to her love for horses she has championed for so many years, Velma has written prize winning articles and beautiful poetry.

In a recent letter "Wild Horse Annie" enclosed the following poem, entitled "Mood Establisher":

MOOD ESTABLISHER (By Velma Johnston)

The Roaring Twenties were giddy and bright,
Like a golden bubble of sheer delight,
And we who have lived them can recall
The years that were greatest of them all.

With a shimmy, a shake, and a razz ma tazz,
That sizzling decade gave birth to jazz,
And the songs that were written in Tin Pan Alley

Were nasally crooned by Rudy Vallee.

Gershwin gave us the "Rhapsody in Blue."
We danced to the band of Ted Lewis, too.
We had Texas Guinan with her "Hello, Sucker."

And the last of the Red Hots, Sophie Tucker.
Ours was an eat, drink, and be merry nation
Of flappers and shicks and the lost generation;

Of flagpole sitters and dance marathons,
Companionate marriages and a game called mah-jongg.

We wore ourselves out through the Charleston rage.

Mickey Mouse was born in that golden age.
If you played a uke, you were definitely in;
And a great movie star was Rin Tin Tin.

Tom Mix and Tony were a top western pair,
Our hand-cranked Fords always got us there.
A gum-chewing, rope-twirling guy named Will

Crept into our hearts and remains there still.

These things we recall with a sigh or a smile:
Sexy Mae West with her sensuous guile,
The "Big Parade" and "What Price Glory,"
Each one a poignant World War story.

If we had it we were sure to please,
And skirts were worn above our knees.
Raccoon coats and porkpie hats
Were all the go at college frats.

Valentino the Great rode fame to its peak
In a torrid drama called "The Sheik."
We had bootleggers, hip flasks, bathtub gin;
And thrilled to the novels of Elinor Glyn.

Al Capone ruled with a tyrant's hand.
There was Teapot Dome and the Ku Klux Klan.

Coolidge was President for a while.
Will you ever forget Jimmy Walker's smile?

To play at the Roxy on the Gay White Way
Was the dream of each actor in his day.
And income tax was a small donation
To pay the expenses of our own Nation.

From the silent films came something new:
The actors acted and spoke lines, too.
The splendor of color bursts onto the screen
And our eyes fairly ached with what they'd seen.

Lindbergh gained fame with his triumphant hop

From New York to Paris—nonstop.
In spite of predictions we'd all go to hell,
We turned out, it seems, remarkably well.

Sports were their best in this golden decade;
Titles were lost and new heroes were made.
There were Babe Ruth swatting his way to fame,

And the "Galloping Ghost" of the gridiron game.

The famous long count in the prize fight ring
Ended Jack Dempsey's reign as king.
Man O'War ran and won his last race,
Then sired sons to win in his place.

From its crude start as a crystal set
Radio emerged as the best thing yet.
In a mighty crescendo everywhere
Restless America took to the air.

It came to an end, this fabulous time,
With the crash of the market in twenty-nine;
And the era that lived in a glorious blaze
Has taken its place with our yesterdays.

Interview With the Honorable Dorothy McCullough Lee, Chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the outstanding public officials produced by my State of Oregon has been Dorothy McCullough Lee, former member of the Oregon State Senate and former mayor of Portland. At present Mrs. Lee is chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board. In the Oregon Daily Journal of Portland, of August 25, 1959, appeared a most informative interview with Mrs. Lee written by Alicia Hart of the Newspaper Enterprise Association. Mrs. Lee has described some of her views as chairman of the SACB, as well as some of her experiences which stem from 30 successful years in public life. I ask unanimous consent that this interview with the Honorable Dorothy McCullough Lee, a resident of my home community of Portland, Ore., be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FIGHT REDS IN HOME, SAYS DOROTHY LEE (By Alicia Hart)

WASHINGTON, August 25.—The best way housewives can combat communism is to see that the reputation of their communities is as spick and span as the inside of their homes.

Who says so? Dorothy McCullough Lee, Chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board, ex-mayor of Portland and one-time child prodigy. She believes women should tolerate no condition that degrades or denies anyone his constitutional rights, because the Reds are constantly on the lookout for such conditions to feed their anti-American propaganda machine.

"Women should do their best to make their towns shining examples of what our democracy stands for," she says. "They should make sure that nothing occurs in their communities that violates the democratic concepts on which this country was founded."

One way to put this communitywide housekeeping vigilance into action, she explains, is by organizing and joining responsible groups to correct abuses. "A lot can be done through organizing," she says, "but not everything." She feels that another effective combatant is to personally contact neighbors and alert them to undemocratic situations.

"The more shining examples that other countries can see of the United States and its people in action, the more persuasive we

can be in selling democracy to them," she says.

She regards her service on the SACB as one of the most important and challenging jobs of her life. SACB is a five-member group, appointed by the President. It determines whether groups accused by the Attorney General of conducting Red activities are actually Communist dominated.

Mrs. Lee insists that the job has no place for the so-called woman's intuition.

"The SACB is strictly an open court with all the constitutional safeguards provided," she says. "It's a very meticulous and legalistic operation. The closest thing you can compare my job to is being on the bench."

"In this type of work you can't use intuition. It's a factfinding job. You can't guess. You have got to listen to evidence and decide the case impartially."

Anyway, Mrs. Lee says that she seriously doubts that there is such a thing as woman's intuition, at least the way the term usually is used. "Actually," she explains, "intuition is not a flash out of the blue. I believe it's knowledge that's based on your past experiences in life."

If Mrs. Lee's definition is correct, friends say that she should be one of the most intuitive people in the world. For she has lived all over the globe and worked in a wide variety of important and interesting jobs.

"Since my dad was a naval officer," she says, "I spent most of my younger years globetrotting. I grew up in Hawaii, the Philippines, Japan, China, Guam, and all the European countries except Spain, Greece, and Turkey. I had little formal grade school education. We were never in any place long enough."

Mrs. Lee received most of her early education from tutors. Until she entered high school in Newport, R.I., her only classroom learning consisted of two brief grammar school enrollments in San Francisco, and Switzerland. Nevertheless, she was graduated in 3½ years when she was 16.

By the time she was 22, she had received her law degree from the University of California. In 1929, Mrs. Lee was elected to the Oregon House of Representatives where she served 3 years. Then she was elected to the State senate and served there until 1943.

During her years in the State legislature, Mrs. Lee was also chairman of the Oregon Crime Commission, a member of the Portland Traffic Safety Commission, and a municipal judge. In 1948, while serving as Portland's commissioner of public utilities, she was elected mayor. She stayed in office for the next 4 years.

In 1953, the State Department sent her to Germany as a civil and governmental affairs adviser to German city officials. Later, President Eisenhower appointed her to the U.S. Board of Parole. She joined the SACB in 1956 and became its Chairman the following year.

Mrs. Lee is married and has two adopted children.

program are today being used more extensively for recreation than any of us anticipated. Literally millions of people are visiting these reservoirs every year and benefiting from their recreational values. In my opinion, recreation should be considered a major purpose in developing the Nation's water resources. In this connection, I would like to include an excellent article from the August issue of the Reclamation Era discussing the tremendous recreation potential that exists in connection with the reservoirs to be constructed as a part of the Colorado River storage project:

RECREATION AND THE COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Today, more than ever before, the out of doors is providing the recreation opportunities people of this country are seeking for their increasing leisure time. In the past 10 years visits to national parks have almost doubled and visits to State parks have slightly more than doubled.

One of the major attractions is water—a lake for boating, fishing or swimming, or to provide a scenic setting for a picnic or a campsite. More and more, recreationists are looking for water where they may launch their boats. It is estimated that more than 7 million Americans now own recreational boats, about three times as many as 10 years ago. Rivers, the seacoasts, and natural lakes help to meet the demand for places to use boats, but in many parts of the country these resources are being supplemented, to an increasing extent, by manmade lakes.

Studies conducted for the National Park Service in various sections of the country have added to our knowledge of preferences affecting the demand for water-connected recreation. In the Southwest, picnicking, swimming, and fishing were found to be the three most popular forms of outdoor recreation. In the Northeast, these forms of recreation were included in the four most popular activities. In studies made in river basins in the Plains States and in the Middle Atlantic region, these activities were also found to be among the five top-ranking activities.

Each of the surveys contained questions designed to measure the extent of unmet recreation demand. Two of the studies provided an opportunity for the individuals reporting to indicate the number of persons not taking part in various activities who would do so if the activity were readily available. In both of these studies, boating was found to be the top-ranking activity in terms of the number of additional persons who would like to participate. Fishing was in second place, while other top-ranking activities were picnicking, swimming, hunting, and ice skating. These answers, and the answers to similar questions in the other surveys, show a consistent pattern of high popularity for recreational activities that required water areas.

Recognizing the popularity of water recreation and the public demand to use reservoirs for recreation, Congress authorized recreation as one of the beneficial uses of the Colorado River storage project. Here is an opportunity not only to enjoy water-connected recreation but to do so in a region of top recreational appeal.

The scenic and scientific values of the upper Colorado basin have been known since the days of the early explorers. In 1941 the National Park Service undertook an extensive study of the recreation resources of the entire river basin. The report of the survey states: "The Colorado River basin is one of the outstanding recreational regions in the United States because of its great variety of natural scenery, climatic conditions, areas, and objects of scientific interest, and abundant evidence of prehistoric occupation."

*** Here one may enjoy a large amount of sunshine and find perfect climates and settings for various types of outdoor recreation the year around *** The majority of the proposed reservoirs *** will create new recreational resources benefiting the basin."

The Colorado River Storage Project Act provides the broadest authority relating to recreation at reservoirs ever authorized by Congress to best promote recreational development and operation to serve the public interest. Section 8 of the act states:

"In connection with the development of the Colorado River Storage Project by the Bureau of Reclamation, including participating projects, the Secretary is authorized and directed to investigate, plan, construct, operate, and maintain (1) public recreational facilities on lands withdrawn or acquired for the development of said project or of said participating projects, to conserve the scenery, the natural, historic, and archeologic objects, and the wildlife on said lands, and to provide for public use and enjoyment of the same and of the water areas created by these projects by such means as are consistent with the primary purposes of said projects."

Following enactment of this legislation, the National Park Service began studies and plans for recreational developments and facilities at those reservoir sites where construction of the dams, by the Bureau of Reclamation, was underway or scheduled at an early date. For a number of the areas, only preliminary general development plans have been prepared, because of limited access to much of the area surrounding the larger reservoir basins.

A preliminary general development plan has been completed for the Glen Canyon reservoir area. This reservoir will lie in the heart of the canyon lands of southern Utah and northern Arizona. This area is one of the most rugged, roadless, and inaccessible regions within the continental limits of the United States. Lands on either side of the river canyons present a profusion of greatly eroded winding gorges, ridges, and hills. In the background, sheer cliffs and mesa-topped buttes, broken by an occasional mountainous uplift, complete a landscape of vivid color and awesome space. With the reservoir, relatively easy water access will be available to this outstanding canyon country.

The plan for recreation use of the reservoir area shows three major developments. The major sites, when fully developed, will provide facilities for activities directly associated with water and for camping and picnicking, as well as meals, lodging, and other services to the public.

First to be developed is the Wahweap site, an area a few miles northeast of the dam, in Arizona and adjacent to a new major highway. Adequate topographic data has made it possible to prepare a master plan for the area. The plan has been approved, and construction is underway and will continue as rapidly as funds become available.

Other major development areas are proposed in the vicinity of Warm Creek and the Colorado River and where Bull Frog Creek enters the river.

Minor development sites have been chosen at Hole-in-the-Rock and Shock Bar. These sites will serve the boat traveler and fishermen and offer limited accommodations and services.

The Bureau of Reclamation has provided vista houses and parking areas on each side of the river below the dam and has provided uniformed guides who can give information to visitors interested in the construction of the dam.

It is expected that the Glen Canyon Reservoir area will be administered by the National Park Service as a national recreation area, similar to the Lake Mead National Recreation Area. As a start toward

Recreation and the Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the reservoirs that have been constructed in connection with our Federal reclamation

that administration, Mr. James M. Eden was assigned, in May 1959, as project manager of the recreation area, with headquarters at the Wahweap site and residence in Page, Ariz. As funds became available, additional personnel will be assigned for administration, protection, and interpretation.

The Service estimated an expenditure of \$10 million as the cost of Federal recreation development at the Glen Canyon area. Concessioners will, no doubt, spend at least \$5 million on capital investments. It is expected that the recreational use of the Glen Canyon area will be well over a million visitor-days annually.

An outstanding point of interest for the recreationists who will be attracted to the reservoir is Rainbow Bridge. This unique natural feature, protected for future generations by establishment of Rainbow Bridge National Monument in 1910, is greater than any other known natural bridge in size, color, and in its almost perfect symmetry. The arch of salmon pink sandstone, curving in the form of a rainbow, rises 309 feet above the bottom of the gorge.

Concern over the possibility that the Glen Canyon Reservoir might actually damage the natural bridge has been based on such factors as the effect of a permanent body of water at the base of the abutments of the bridge, or of wave action against the abutments, the change in the water table, and the composition and porosity of the rock. Authority to take action to avoid the danger of gradual disintegration of the rock foundation of the bridge is contained in the Colorado River Storage Project Act. The act provides that as a part of the Glen Canyon unit the Secretary of the Interior shall take adequate protective measures to preclude impairment of the monument. Under the Secretary's direction, the Bureau of Reclamation and the National Park Service have made joint studies to determine the best means of providing adequate protection.

Among the other areas where general development planning has been undertaken are the Flaming Gorge and Navajo units of the storage project.

Flaming Gorge Reservoir will provide a large body of water in a semiarid region enhanced by outstanding scenic surroundings. Located near the Continental Divide, with its north-south belt of national parks, national forests and resorts, the reservoir will be located in a vacation area long of national interest. Existing recreation facilities in the reservoir area are limited, and recreation facilities will be needed on the shores of the reservoir to accommodate the many thousands of visitors to whom this outstanding scenic area will become accessible.

The Flaming Gorge unit is considered to be of national significance, and recreation planning includes two major development sites north of the national forest, on each side of the reservoir near the Utah-Wyoming State line.

Recreation development along the shores of the Navajo Reservoir will help meet the rapidly increasing needs for outdoor recreation in the San Juan River Basin, an area long known for outstanding recreational appeal. The dam is being constructed in a deep canyon on the San Juan shortly below the mouth of its tributary, Los Pinos, and the reservoir located primarily in northwestern New Mexico will extend into Colorado. Major recreation development are proposed on each side of the reservoir a short distance from the dam. Among these is the Currecanti, a main unit of the development located in Colorado, which will consist of two or three principal dams creating reservoirs for additional recreation.

The recreational opportunities to be afforded by reclamation reservoirs are discussed at only three such sites in this article. However, it is anticipated that the Colorado

River storage project will provide similar opportunities at an estimated total of 15 reservoirs ultimately. These will be located in the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

The phenomenal recreational use of reservoirs indicates that these recreation developments will result in significant monetary benefits to the surrounding area, as well as providing substantial recreation opportunities.

Generosity of Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, with all of the waste and extravagance which has been unearthed with respect to contracts entered into by the Pentagon, it is encouraging to read an editorial such as that contained in the *Kansas City Times*—the morning *Kansas City Star*—of August 24, 1959.

This newspaper is known for not holding any punches in its editorial columns. The writer of this editorial appears to be far more generous in commenting upon the Pentagon's contracting procedures and planning than are many Members of Congress.

One of the greatest wastes on the part of the Defense Department is its failure to utilize existing facilities, and an outstanding example is the one-half-billion-dollar Sunflower Ordnance Plant near Lawrence, Kans.

Evidently one branch of the service is not concerned with property, facilities, or equipment in the hands of another branch of the service which could be used to the advantage of the Government and at a saving to the taxpayer.

Since I have been extremely critical of the Pentagon for betraying the interest of the taxpayers, Mr. Speaker, I feel it is only fair that this editorial be included in my remarks and printed in the Appendix of the *RECORD* so that all Members may have an opportunity to read it:

A HOPE FOR FEWER ABANDONED DEFENSE PROJECTS

Within 10 days two defense projects that cost hundreds of millions of dollars have been dropped. The taxpayer is likely to wince and ask: Is this sort of thing necessary?

Well, it probably has been necessary in some cases. But certainly not in all. The well known enthusiasm of military careerists for their own service undoubtedly results in some ultimately abandoned projects which never should have been started.

In fairness to defense leaders, however, they are responsible for keeping the country out in front with new weapons, planes, and other equipment. As Rear Adm. John T. Hayward, the Chief of Naval Research and Development, said recently, the experts in his line of work can never afford to be satisfied. It is their job to prevent possible lags behind Russia, insofar as they have the resources. And they point out that even canceled projects usually contribute important knowledge for future projects.

Technical developments are bound to anticipate some programs. Two of those recently discarded illustrate the problem. Several years ago the Navy and the Air Force agreed on a need for high-energy aircraft fuel for future speeds of 2,000 miles an hour. Now, after 5 years of effort, the construction of five specialized plants and an outlay of \$200 million, the Pentagon has decided that it no longer has a requirement for a fuel of this kind. Advances in the field of ballistic missiles have reduced the needs for faster manned aircraft.

Achieving Price Stability as a Basis for Economic Growth in a Free Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted, I am glad to bring to the attention of all readers of the *RECORD* a significant and timely address delivered last week before the corporation, banking, and business law section of the American Bar Association, by the Honorable Raymond J. Saulnier, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. The title of Dr. Saulnier's address is "Achieving Price Stability as a Basis for Economic Growth in a Free Society."

In line with Dr. Saulnier's emphasis upon the importance of maintaining price stability, I am introducing today a bill to amend section 2, the declaration of policy, of the Employment Act of 1946, by adding at the end of that section the words "under stable prices."

Dr. Saulnier's address follows:

ACHIEVING PRICE STABILITY AS A BASIS FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH IN A FREE SOCIETY

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I am pleased to have this opportunity to talk to members of the American Bar Association. The brief remarks I have to make I shall direct to a problem in which I know you are keenly interested: How best to achieve stability of prices in our economy.

There are special reasons why this problem should be of particular concern to the Nation's lawyers. The avoidance of inflation is vital, not only to the achievement of orderly and balanced growth in our economy and to the progressive improvement of our economic well-being, but also to the permanence and vigor of the political and social institutions for which you have a kind of trusteeship responsibility.

A continuing upward trend of prices, even if it proceeds only slowly at first, would have the effect of quietly abrogating all contracts involving stated money sums. As lawyers, you know the variety and scope of such contracts, and the harm that is done when, for reasons beyond the control of the parties immediately involved, such contracts fail to work out as planned and as expected.

The erosion of contractual commitments which even a slow inflation brings about is bad enough; but there are other consequences that are worse. If we were to resign ourselves to the continuance of a moderate degree of inflation, the actual persistence of this condition would in time, and probably without long delay, have a

seriously adverse effect on confidence. What had started as a slow rise could then become a rapid upward sweep. We would see not just higher consumer prices, but also the assignment of unreasonable money values to equity interests of all sorts. I doubt that anyone seriously believes that such a surge of inflation, and the speculative excesses that would accompany it, could end in anything but a drastic corrective adjustment.

There is a grave danger, also, that an upward creep of prices, if it persisted for any length of time, and even before it turned into rapid inflation, would incite clamor for direct governmental intervention. No one should fall into the error of thinking that direct controls would succeed in controlling inflation. Instead, they distort and damage the economy without reducing the inflationary pressures which are the root cause of the trouble. And, if direct controls are carried far enough, they do critical and irreversible harm to our free institutions.

An inflationary trend also has consequences for our world economic position. The harmful effects of cost and price inflation on our ability to engage in the international competition—which, whether we like it or not, does exist—is increasingly clear. Whatever the possibilities of rigging our home economy with escalator devices in an effort to escape the differential impact of inflation, gadgetry of this kind is not available to us in our international economic relations. Nor can we find a viable solution by raising tariff walls or placing restrictive quantitative limitations on our trade with other nations. How could such actions do anything but harm to the free world community in which lies security and hope for the strengthening and further spread of freedom and democratic institutions?

Fortunately, the principal areas of policy to which we must look for the actions that will help prevent inflation are clear. So also are the approaches to policy that should be taken in each of these areas. What is needed most is a good public understanding of the problem and, based on that understanding, public insistence that the needed policies are in fact pursued. I welcome the opportunity to speak before this group on the broad approaches to policy which, in my judgment, are appropriate to the task of achieving price stability as a basis for economic growth in our free society.

There is no single area of policy on which we can place full reliance in a program to achieve price stability. Action is required in a number of areas and the only effective strategy is to harmonize policies in all of them, so that they reinforce one another. Let me begin with the area of monetary and credit policy.

Under our governmental organization, general monetary and credit policies are formulated and administered by the Federal Reserve System, established by the Congress as an independent agency. The continuing task of Federal Reserve policy is to see to it that the Nation's money supply expands sufficiently to facilitate the growth of the economy, but not so fast as to permit, let alone induce, an inflation of costs and prices and of money values generally.

It is not an easy task to tell, year in and year out, where the line is that divides the increase in money supply needed to help promote economic growth from the increase that will permit or, still worse, promote speculative excesses and an inflation of costs and prices. This is a difficult technical problem, and in a dynamic economy such as ours judgments will often differ, even among seasoned experts, as to what tactic is right and what tactic is wrong. But there is a more fundamental problem here. It lies in the fact that monetary policy questions assume a distinctive cast or form in a high-employ-

ment economy such as ours. It is absolutely vital that we understand this form of the problem if we are to fight inflation in ways that are consistent with our traditional institutions. Briefly, the problem is this.

When demands for credit and capital are high and rising, as they are in our economy today, they tend to outrun savings and, in consequence, interest rates tend to rise. This is not a contrived result, but the normal reaction of a competitive market. Yet it inevitably occasions protests against what is alleged to be an excessively restrictive monetary policy, or tight money. There are things that Government can and does do to make credit more readily available in areas of the economy where such steps are needed, but we must avoid like the plague the pseudoremedy of seeking to lower interest rates by permitting an inflationary expansion of credit. The problem cannot be solved by substituting more money and credit for an increased supply of real savings. This will only cause prices to rise and, by undermining confidence in the value of money, actually cause interest rates, so far as they are free to move, to rise still further.

This is the easy money solution to the savings shortage problem, and it will not work. It is the inflationary solution, and it must be resisted at every turn. The right way to resist an upward trend in interest rates, and the only way that is consistent with the avoidance of inflation, is to promote the higher rates of savings that are needed for accelerated economic growth. And this is a case in which we gain strength from success. By following a monetary policy that avoids inflation, we eliminate one of the major factors making for higher interest rates, which is the expectation by investors that the value of the dollar they lend will fall as prices rise.

The way we manage our Federal debt is the second major element in an adequate program for preventing inflation. The total of this indebtedness stands today at close to \$290 billion; on a net basis, Federal debt is equal to about half the net private debt in the United States. It is no wonder, then, that public debt transactions are the most significant single factor influencing capital and credit markets. In the fiscal year 1959 the public debt increased by \$8.4 billion, but the Treasury's refinancing requirements were, of course, much larger. In the fiscal year 1960, with a balanced budget there will be no increase in the public debt, but refinancing needs of publicly held securities, excluding regular weekly Treasury bills, are estimated to amount to around \$20 billion.

These large amounts of funds must be borrowed economically, of course, but they must also be borrowed with an eye to the effect of the financing on the inflation problem, and thus on our chances for achieving balanced and sustainable economic growth. It would be entirely false economy to borrow at artificially low interest rates today and, in so doing, to create inflationary pressures that would sooner or later increase costs and prices generally, including the costs of operating the Federal Government.

This can happen if Federal obligations are placed in excessive amounts in the commercial banking system, and the more so when they are placed directly in the central banking system. This so-called "monetization" of the debt, if it occurs on a scale that involves an increase in money supply by more than is warranted by the growth of the economy's real output, can create a serious inflationary potential.

In order to avoid this result, Government must be free to compete in the capital markets with other borrowers, public and private, at competitive interest rates. When there are effective limitations in the way of

its doing so, Government may be compelled to do excessive amounts of financing—whether new borrowing or the refinancing of maturing obligations—on a short-term basis through the banking system. This is not the way to hold back inflationary pressures. It is not the way to hold prices steady. It is not the way to promote balanced, sustainable economic growth. Our laws should not, as they do at present, put the Federal Government in the position of having to manage its debt in ways that may create inflationary pressures.

Third, I come to the Federal budget. I do not put this critical area of public policy in third place because it is less important than the two I have already discussed. Indeed, the importance of proper tax and expenditure policies is such that we may properly regard them as the sine qua non of effective public policy in preventing inflation and promoting economic growth. Their importance lies partly in the kind of taxes that are levied on individuals and business concerns, and the kinds of spending which Government does. It lies also in the relationship between aggregate revenues and aggregate expenditures.

For present purposes we need consider only the budget or fiscal policy that is appropriate to a period of high economic activity and rapid growth. Under such conditions—with the Nation prosperous, with production, employment, and incomes rising, and with capital and credit demands heavy—what is needed is a budgetary surplus. This would yield a number of significant benefits. Thus, when its budget is comfortably balanced the Federal Government avoids being an additional claimant on funds in the capital markets. Government becomes, on balance, a supplier of funds, thus tending to ease the pressure of demand on savings and moderating whatever tendencies there may be for interest rates to rise.

Furthermore, a budgetary surplus limits the Treasury's financing needs to the meeting of seasonal requirements and the refinancing of maturing obligations. This reduces the chances of Federal debt being monetized and creating a potentially inflationary expansion of the money supply. It also gives the Federal Reserve authorities a freer hand in the administration of monetary policy.

Finally, a budgetary surplus would bring closer to hand the opportunity for constructive tax reform and reduction. From such measures we can expect to gain a powerful stimulus to economic growth.

But a budget surplus at a time like this would have another, and in some respects even more important, beneficial effect. The budget is uniquely the mirror of government. We are judged in large part by our attitude toward fiscal questions and by the way we manage the financial affairs that are reflected in the budget. A balanced budget at this time would be a sign to the world that we not only know what the right fiscal policy is, but that we have the skill and the willingness to pursue the right policy.

These are the three areas of public policy most significant for the prevention of inflation. But there is a fourth that should be mentioned. I believe it is less well understood than the others.

Over the years, the Federal Government has developed a number of programs that have a more or less direct bearing on costs and prices. I shall not try to list them all, but let me mention a few.

For one thing, we limit the flow of goods into our country by tariffs and by other restrictive devices. By reducing supply and insulating domestic production from foreign competition, these measures keep prices

at higher levels than would otherwise prevail.

Also, the Federal Government is itself a very large buyer of goods and services. Indeed, in some parts of the economy its procurement, or that done by its various tiers of contractors, virtually dominates the market. Even apart from the magnitude of procurement demand, the methods which Government follows in letting contracts and executing purchases may also invite cost and price increases that could otherwise be avoided.

In addition, the Federal Government has, for various reasons, entered into large stockpiling programs. Beyond their direct budgetary impact, these programs have the effect of raising prices or of holding prices of many key materials at higher levels than would otherwise prevail.

Finally, the Federal Government has entered into enormously expensive programs for the support of agricultural prices.

This is not an exhaustive list, by any means, but it will suffice to illustrate what I mean by Government activities that have a bearing on costs and prices. The fact that much of the impact of these activities is inadvertent makes them all the more deserving of attention. The various programs were established to achieve specific purposes and they must continue to be operated with these goals in mind. But it is not also reasonable to expect that their cost and price increasing impact should be held to the minimum necessary for the achievement of program goals?

As you may know, a special group was organized recently within the executive branch—the Committee on Government Activities Affecting Prices and Costs—to study and follow these programs on a continuing basis. I would expect this group to be an increasingly important arm of governmental policy in seeking to achieve reasonable stability of prices.

So much for the major areas of Government policy that are important to the prevention of inflation. Let me turn now to some questions having to do with policies and practices in the private sector of our economy. I shall restrict myself here to two important matters: the pricing policies of business concerns, and the impact of wage increases on costs and prices.

In many manufacturing industries, companies are reputed to have a wide range of discretion in price setting, but this power to "administer" prices, as it is commonly called, may well be exaggerated. The initial or listed price is not necessarily the final or the actual one. This fact, however, does not diminish the importance of pursuing pricing policies that will help widen markets, help keep the cost of living steady, and help promote sustainable economic growth. True, prices cannot be set or changed without due regard to cost, but it is essential to the effective operation of an enterprise economy that business concerns explore and exploit the opportunities they have, within cost limitations, to reduce prices while maintaining a satisfactory profit rate. In this connection, pricing formulas that may be based on experience in a sellers' market that no longer exists, or on invalidated beliefs as to the habits and preferences of consumers, should be reviewed and, if necessary, revised. But as I have already noted, prices cannot be set, or reduced, without regard to costs. And, since labor is embodied in materials and equipment in addition to being used directly in production, it is idle to think that prices can be reduced significantly without due regard to unit labor cost (including the cost of fringe benefits).

This brings us to the important question of productivity, which inevitably arises when wages and prices are discussed in connection with inflation. The connection between productivity and prices is a simple

one. It is the concept of productivity that enables us to translate wages or average hourly earnings into unit labor costs, and it is the movement of unit labor costs (including the cost of fringe benefits) that is relevant to the trend of prices. If a rise in average hourly earnings (adjusted to reflect fringe benefit costs) occurs at the same rate as productivity improves, unit labor cost remains constant, and the opportunity to hold prices constant is enhanced. On the other hand, if this adjusted average rises more rapidly than productivity, unit labor cost rises, and pressure is created for prices to rise. Conversely, if this adjusted average rises less rapidly than the improvement in productivity, unit labor cost falls, and room for price reduction is created.

It is clear, then, that from the standpoint of inflation control the achievement of stable unit labor costs for the economy as a whole is a virtual necessity. This means that, for the economy as a whole, increases in labor compensation, on the average, should equate to productivity improvements, on the average. It does not mean that increases in the rate at which labor is compensated should match productivity improvements in every industry. Productivity gains vary a good bit from one part of the economy to another; and, since wage increases and fringe benefit improvements tend to be more uniform from one employment to another, stability of unit labor cost for the economy as a whole requires that increases that are almost certain to occur in some sectors should be offset by declines elsewhere. Clearly, these declines should come where productivity gains are especially rapid. And it is in these industries that it is most reasonable to expect the price reductions that are essential for the achievement of price stability over the economy generally. We should aim in these industries, not merely to hold prices steady, but to extend part of the benefit of productivity improvement to the general public in the form of price reductions.

When we consider the hardship that individuals suffer from inflation, it is not surprising that the case for a reasonably stable price level is frequently developed primarily on grounds of equity and fairness. But it is equally important to recognize that overall price stability is an essential condition for achieving steady and balanced economic growth. Far from being a goal that is competitive with economic growth, overall price stability provides the best framework for achieving sustainable growth. Could anyone believe that our chances of achieving a high and stable rate of economic growth in the months and years ahead would be improved if prices were expected to rise more or less continuously. Is it not clear that such an expectation, if widespread, would lead to even more rapid increases than were at first assumed? Is it not clear that it would tend to drive savings into speculative uses to the detriment of the more routine, but in the end more productive, uses of thrift? And is it not clear that an expectation of continual price increases would lead to imbalances in our economy which, while they might appear at first as an acceleration of growth, would lead in the end to severe economic reverses?

Fortunately, very considerable progress has been made in the fight against inflationary forces in the last year, and I think we can say that the outlook for price stability over the months ahead is favorable. We can be gratified that consumer prices have been relatively stable for the past year or more. But it would be a grave mistake to think that the threat of inflation has been permanently disposed of. The plain fact of the matter is that the threat has not been dispelled and that our vigilance respecting inflation must not be relaxed. If we are to achieve reasonable price stability we must

not expand Federal expenditures without regard to revenues and pile up new budgetary deficits. We must not permit excessive credit expansion. We must avoid public debt financing of a potentially inflationary character. And we must not indulge in a wave of wage and fringe increases that outrun the productivity improvements that we can reasonably expect to be sustained over any significant period of time. Indeed, the formula for effective inflation prevention in our country today is exactly the opposite. The right national formula is to live within our means, to follow a prudent monetary policy, to conduct our public debt financing operations on a noninflationary basis, to hold average wage and fringe increases within the limits of average productivity gains, and to promote still higher levels of efficiency and thrift.

No one can give guarantees as to the effectiveness of particular policies, much less than he can give guarantees that needed policies will in fact be adopted. But I do feel entirely confident in saying that, if we pursue policies such as I have outlined here today, we can be reasonably certain they will keep inflationary pressures in check. And I feel entirely confident in saying that success in this effort will be a powerfully favorable factor in promoting the growth of our economy and the progressive improvement of economic welfare.

I look for success. Public understanding of the inflation problem and of the policies needed to prevent a persistent upward drift of costs and prices has improved enormously of late. It is on this improved public understanding that I base my belief that right policies will prevail, and that through right policies we will go forward to still higher levels of economic welfare.

Critical Counsel for Hébert Inquiry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Special Investigations has been conducting hearings now for several weeks on the subject of "conflict of interests" as they affect retired officers of the Armed Forces.

One of the most perplexing problems which has confronted our committee is how to differentiate between "sales" and "technical liaison" activities of retired officers employed by defense industries.

Rear Adm. Chester Ward, Judge Advocate General of the Navy, has prepared a most interesting legal opinion on this question in which he concludes that—

Existing legislation expressly prohibiting retired officer participation in supplies and materials sales and sales contracting or negotiating activities, does not by implication prohibit their participation in the technical liaison process.

Admiral Ward's views have been brought to the attention of the Armed Forces and the farflung defense industries of the Nation in the August 29 issue of the Army Navy Air Force Journal.

Whether or not individual Members of the House agree with the Judge Advocate General's conclusions, they will find much food for thought in his comments on this complex matter, and I recom-

ment that they read his statement in the Journal.

I believe Members also will be interested in the Journal editorial on Admiral Ward's testimony. The editorial follows:

CRITICAL COUNSEL FOR HÉBERT INQUIRY

No single presentation, in our estimation, will provide the Hébert subcommittee with more effective assistance than the analysis which has been made by Rear Adm. Chester Ward, Judge Advocate General of the Navy. We are publishing his study at length in this issue and hope it will be read widely on Capitol Hill, at the Pentagon, and by industry.

Admiral Ward illuminates the difference between sales of consumer items—for example, beer—to Armed Forces installations and the development of weapons programs. He documents brilliantly the vital requirement for participation of retired military officers, with their matchless experience, in the technical liaison process to assure U.S. weapons supremacy.

There is no doubt that one of the major issues to be tackled by the Hébert group in its report early next year will be a definition of "sales" activity limitations of retired officers. At present, the regulations vary among the services.

The Navy Judge Advocate General's presentation will provide a solid basis for the Hébert report to provide unified safeguards against any "sales" activities that are deemed improper for retired military people, but at the same time to insure that the national defense effort will be provided with the continued service of retired officers in the technical liaison field, which is where the vast majority of retired officers are making their contributions to industry.

The comprehensive inquiry being conducted by the Hébert subcommittee points to publication of a report which could very well broaden—not restrict—activities of retired officers. Admiral Ward's report is certain to strengthen support for their effective use in defense industries. Beyond this, the Hébert hearings have brought to light the urgent need to repeal of outdated "dual employment" and "dual compensation" laws, which are hindering employment of retired officers by Federal agencies concerned with defense requirements.

Carey's Arrogance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the threatening letter written to Members of the House who voted for the Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill, from Mr. James B. Carey, president of the Union of Electrical Radio and Machine Workers, AFL-CIO, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a further excellent editorial on this subject appearing in the *Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram* of August 29, 1959:

CAREY'S ARROGANCE

The threat of political vengeance made by James B. Carey, AFL-CIO vice president, to 229 congressional supporters of the Griffin-Landrum labor bill passed by the House is remarkable for its arrogance and also its emptiness.

It is arrogant because it assumes that the House Members will reverse their votes for a measure designed to curb labor racketeering and protect the rights of rank and file union members. It is arrogant because Carey wrote that "we wish to assure you that we shall do all in our power to prove to the working men and women in your district that . . . they should take appropriate action at the ballot box."

Carey was one of the labor bosses who fought so bitterly the adoption of the Taft-Hartley law. He declared that it would destroy the labor movement. He called it a "slave labor" law. But that law has been tested by time without the dire consequences he foresaw. Indeed, the labor union movement has been protected by it.

Carey's threat of vengeance against those who voted for the pending Griffin-Landrum bill is empty. It is empty because it is yet to be shown that Carey and his colleagues are able at will to deliver the votes of labor union members. Certainly they were not able to in their effort to unseat the late Senator Taft in Ohio. Instead Taft was reelected. And in that strong labor State his election had to come from the votes of hundreds of thousands of union members.

Carey calls the Griffin-Landrum bill a "vindictive assault on the labor movement." Is the requirement that unions must hold periodic elections with secret ballots such an assault? Does Carey think union members are incensed by the provision making it a crime to steal union funds? Or does he think union members should not like the provision to prevent their being intimidated by union bosses? The facts are that the bill is designed for the protection of members from overbearing union brass.

Also included in the measure are protections for the public against some of the unsavory things which the McClellan investigation has revealed. And the public is deeply interested. That was shown by the response to the President's address calling for a strong labor control bill. The House knew that response. It voted for the bill. It voted for it because the public wants such a bill. And it is the people who elect the Congress.

Our New Diplomatic Policy: Desperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, following is an editorial which appeared in the August 28 issue of the *New World*, official newspaper of the Archdiocese of Chicago. I believe the author of this editorial raises an interesting question about our new foreign policy.

The editorial follows:

OUR NEW DIPLOMATIC POLICY: DESPERATION

(By W. F. Graney)

The reciprocal visits of Premier Khrushchev and President Eisenhower have drawn a great deal of crossfire criticism. The man who naturally must stand in its midst is the President for he was the one who extended the invitation. He must withstand criticism of his visit to Russia and of Khrushchev's visit here, even though the critics might think one side or the other of the reciprocity to be profitable.

But even his critics are caught in the crossfire for some others have blasted the

criticism of the President as negative and not in the best interests of the commonweal.

President Eisenhower made an executive decision which took him off the narrow path between right and wrong. The critics of the criticism seem to have an unrealistic appreciation of a democracy if they think all Americans are going to back all executive decisions, even those made by a popular President.

The question of Khrushchev's visit to our country touches upon our national honor. We can reasonably expect then that a great deal of emotion will be mixed into the criticism or defense of the President's invitation.

The President himself has responded with emotion to the criticism by stating that he was giving the last atom of his strength in the cause of world peace. Surely there should be no critic of the President who questions the nobility of his motives or his patriotism. His record is a living proof of these.

What is questioned is the prudence of his decision. Perhaps the President could clarify his views for the Nation and tell us what he hopes the exchange of visits will gain for our Nation and the cause of world peace.

Until then we are reduced to exploration of what others tell us are possible advantages. We hear that Khrushchev will come to know better our military and economic strength and so appreciate the power of our bargaining position in world affairs. We are told his visit will impress upon him the high standard of living which we enjoy in America; so he will better understand our willingness to defend our country.

These and similar hopes seem to be based on efforts to talk to the Communist in materialistic terms with which he should be familiar and willing to accept. Perhaps this is the only approach, but haven't we abandoned too easily our insistence on spiritual values, especially the one great political spiritual value of freedom?

Shouldn't we keep on insisting that we would fight for freedom even though it didn't bring so many of our material advantages? Shouldn't we be constantly bringing up the captive nations of the Communist empire who are deprived of freedom?

Even though our gullible Nation has been conditioned to publicity buildups, we can be fairly sure Khrushchev will not sell himself to Americans in 2 weeks. He has received too much adverse publicity to wipe it all out with 2 weeks of smiles and handshakes over vodka cocktails.

While our Nation may be able to withstand the propaganda, the other nations of the world are not in the same situation. The archbishop of Bologna, Italy, Giacomo Cardinal Lercaro, who has been a successful battler of the Communists in his See city and who is accustomed to the infighting, said here this past Sunday that the people of Italy, for instance, were left "sad and bewildered" by the invitation extended to Khrushchev to visit the United States.

Those people who are looking for a convenient peg upon which to hang the compromise of their conscience if they accept communism find it now in this invitation. They say, "Look, communism cannot be too bad if the President of the United States invites Khrushchev for a visit."

And who is able to measure the effect of this invitation on the morale of the people subjugated throughout the world to the Communist domination? Is this the last straw that will break their spirit? At least we can suspect many will be as confused as the Americans who do not understand the invitation.

If the Communists had ever given evidence of good faith, we could have hope that such an invitation could be of some help in preventing war. All the evidence, however, points to the fact that the Communists are not relinquishing their aim of world dom-

ination. If war serves their purpose, there will be war.

The invitation indicates a shift in our diplomatic policy that is confusing. For no apparent reason we seem to have stumbled back from the brink into a diplomacy of desperation.

No Logic in Politics, as TVA and Now Trinity Project Show

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, to quote a sentence from an editorial of August 5, 1959, which appeared in the Grass Valley (Calif.) Union, is to point up an unfortunate and tragic truth, which we have seen proved again in recent weeks:

That logic has no place in politics is made glaringly clear in a couple of matters that currently figure in national politics, one of which is of special interest and particular importance to the California economy, namely the development of the Trinity River's natural potentialities.

I feel that the expansion of this thought merits the consideration of each of us, and I ask that the editorial be printed in its entirety, as follows:

[From the Grass Valley (Calif.) Union, Aug. 5, 1959]

NO LOGIC IN POLITICS, AS TVA AND NOW TRINITY PROJECT SHOW

In most political conflicts it is usually futile to look for logic or even disinterested consideration of opposites.

That just isn't the way of politics, which is not a long-studied and hard-won science but more a game of skilled maneuvering when it doesn't descend to outright horse trading or temperamental fight of unyielding fanatic ideologists.

This is proven daily in different ways in the widely varied matters pertaining to contemporary life that came before the great legislative institution in Washington.

That logic has no place in politics is made glaringly clear in a couple of matters that currently figure in national politics, one of which is of special interest and particular importance to the California economy, namely the development of the Trinity River's natural potentialities. The other is whether the Tennessee Valley Authority should be allowed further uncontrolled expansion and be allowed to create its own debt outside the Federal budget by issuance of \$750 million of its own bonds.

To take this matter first. TVA was created in 1933 as a Government corporation to administer a navigation and flood control project. In the 26 years since then the Government has invested in this project \$2,047 million. But most of this has not been for the original purpose, flood control.

It was understood that TVA should generate some hydroelectric power as an "incidental byproduct." By skillful political maneuverings this incidental byproduct has been made the main purpose, and TVA is now primarily a power producer.

The "incidental byproduct," hydroelectric power, amounts in reality to about 10 percent of the activities of TVA. That is all the water will permit. But in spite of that another 70 percent of TVA activities is power production—by steamplants.

All this—\$2 billion worth—has been done by interest-free money taken from all the taxpayers of the United States and without giving back any taxes to the Treasury. And it has been done in direct competition with private power companies in the region who have to pay not only interest on working capital but also 52 percent taxes annually.

There is certainly not much logic in that. As to Trinity River:

In 1937 Congress authorized the Central Valley project. Trinity River was included in this to prevent its water from going to waste by diverting it through a tunnel system (now being constructed) into Sacramento River.

In the course of development of these plans, the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. offered to finance construction and operation of the Trinity power facilities and pay the Federal Government for use of the project's falling water: \$60 million for construction and \$4½ million a year for the falling water. Besides that, Pacific Gas & Electric would over the usual 50-year period pay \$145 million in Federal, State, and local taxes.

The Department of the Interior, on direction from Congress, studied this proposal, and 2 years ago Secretary Seaton, with reference to President Eisenhower's then recently published partnership idea, urged Congress to accept the Pacific Gas & Electric offer as not only financially sound in relieving the Federal resources to the tune of \$300 million but also advisable because it would speed up the completion of the entire Central Valley project.

This plan appears perfectly logical and full of plain commonsense. But, naturally, it meets political opposition from legislators that, come hell or high water, adhere to the tenet that public ownership and operation of productive facilities should be continued and expanded regardless.

What could be more sensible than a genuine get-together of governmental agencies and investor-owned business in a partnership to put the country in a sound and safe condition to go full speed ahead.

The President's Veto of the Public Works Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I was more than deeply distressed over the action of the President of the United States in vetoing the public works appropriation bill for fiscal 1960. In view of the fact that the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate appropriated funds for these flood control projects after full and complete study, and the fact that each project was found to be fully and completely justified, it is my earnest hope that the Congress of the United States will override the President's veto. Unless we are successful in our efforts, our American taxpaying citizens residing in these affected areas will continue to suffer unnecessary flood damages. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will continue to do all within my power to see that this measure is passed over the President's veto by the necessary two-thirds majority.

Little City, Dream Community for the Mentally Retarded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it gives me extreme pleasure today to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech recently made by my colleague, the Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT, at the dedication ceremonies of Little City, a dream community for mentally retarded youngsters, which is being built on the outskirts of Chicago's great Northwest Side.

I should like to associate myself with the penetrating remarks of Congressman ROOSEVELT and congratulate those wonderful people of Little City, Inc., who have undertaken this great project of mercy for the mentally retarded children of America. To these fine sponsors of this project go the heartfelt thanks of parents throughout this country who so frequently recognize the problems of a retarded youngster but tragically are unable to find adequate facilities for relief.

I am proud that Little City lies practically in the shadow of my district, and I am sure that in due time, from its humble beginning will rise an institution of mercy for the mentally retarded youngsters of America who need help so urgently.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman ROOSEVELT's remarks follow:

LITTLE CITY, DREAM COMMUNITY FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED

Ladies and gentlemen, Little City is a magic word for all of us here today. For some it represents weeks and months and years of planning and hard work. For many this community is a single avenue of hope in an otherwise gloomy landscape. For still others like myself, Little City represents a monumental achievement, a soul-lifting experiment.

Today we humbly dedicate this new community. I stress the word community for this is not merely a home, a hospital, a school, or a center, but a little city for mentally retarded children. This city will not limit its assistance to the 50 or 60 children who will enter this fall. Plans have already been made to expand the facilities to care for 500 children. The opportunities for research in this environment will extend the benefits of this community to countless numbers of mentally retarded children and their families in this and other countries.

These 60 acres of land on Algonquin Road will be a paradise for mentally retarded youngsters. Here they will be able to develop to the fullest extent their abilities in a sheltered and peaceful atmosphere. This community as part of the larger community will be a testimony to the shared responsibility of individuals in our society for this problem. Three out of every one hundred children in this country are born retarded, and the parents of these children will know that they now have the assistance and support of others. They have already accomplished so much through their own volunteer organizations, and I think it is high time that such a project be undertaken by the whole community.

I was very much interested in learning about a study conducted by the Public Institutions Committee of the National Association for Retarded Children. May I quote a passage from the foreword of this 1958 study. It states:

"It is bitter irony to tax parents for the unavoidable misfortune of having a retarded child. We must wonder if it is consistent with American social philosophy to require that parents of mentally retarded children pay taxes to support public education facilities which exclude their children, when there is a price tag on their attempts to obtain equal benefits for their children in public institutions."

This study revealed that only 3 States make no financial charge for the care, training and treatment of persons in State institutions; that 2 States allow for voluntary charges; and that the other 42 States having such institutions levy charges. The study further showed that most parents of handicapped children expect to assume financial responsibility for the basic support of their child. However, they need assistance in meeting some of the extraordinary demands created by the handicapped condition. Often the financial strain of meeting costs of needed services before placement in a State institution leaves the family resources well drained. Many feel that the care and training of a person in an institution should be regarded in lieu of public school education.

These facts are not new to those of you here today. I am sure you have struggled with these realities and attempted to put across your points of view to public and private groups. May I say that I am encouraged each year to find that the public awareness of these problems is constantly increasing. The very achievement of this dream community is an indication of greater understanding by the community as a whole of the needs of the mentally retarded.

One of the most inspiring aspects of Little City from my point of view is that here at last the total needs of the mentally retarded will be met. So many of the existing programs are what we have been accustomed to term "half a loaf" programs. That is they go part of the way in meeting a special problem, but then they stop. For instance, a family may be able to provide their mentally retarded child with a little education. But this is not enough if proper medical care and vocational guidance cannot be obtained. To turn to another example, much excellent research is currently being carried on in mental retardation. If this research is conducted in an ivory tower or does not reach the people who can use it, the efforts will have been largely wasted.

In Little City these problems will not be present. Here mentally retarded people of all races and creeds will have a home as long as they need or desire it. There will be no fear of expulsion upon reaching a certain chronological age which may bear no relation to individual development.

Every individual will learn at his own rate, will set his own pattern, will live in a community where his behavior is the norm. No longer the outsider, he will participate as a member of his own little city. Fields, orchards, and gardens for some to cultivate; schools for those who can benefit or a home tutoring service when this is more profitable; community church, movies, square dancing, playground—all these will make up a rich and full life for these youngsters.

Of course, these plans require financial support, and many of you have already been asked to contribute or have solicited others for funds. It is my belief that this is one project which sells itself. The ingenuity and intelligent planning of such persons as Mrs. Della White, Ben Sears, and the many others who have so carefully thought through every detail of this program, will be

rewarded, I feel certain, by the wholehearted support of the entire community.

Your Federal Government has also shown its special concern for the mentally retarded in a number of ways. Today I would like to discuss with you some of these programs. It seems to me that constant awareness and recognition of these activities are essential to their continued successful operation. Only through the enlightened experience of citizens and parents such as you who are present will we be able to judge whether the programs on a national scale are meeting the real needs of the mentally retarded, are being efficiently administered, and are generally available to those who need them.

The very existence of governmental programs to aid the mentally retarded is open acknowledgment by the national community of their responsibilities in this area. These programs are prompted by the same kind of civic spirit which has moved you to build Little City. There are nearly 5 million mentally retarded individuals in this country and they cannot and must not be ignored. To use the words of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in describing its various programs:

"From a number of standpoints progress is being made in the field of the mentally retarded as outgrowths of an increased public awareness and understanding of the problems both in Government and in private life with individuals and voluntary organizations and the increasing advances being achieved in medicine, welfare, education, rehabilitation and related fields. The cross-fertilization and collaboration of many disciplines are also bringing to pass the more effective knowledge concerning the prevention of the handicaps together with improved understanding, treatment, care, and prognosis of those who manifest the several difficulties in the functional sphere."

Responsibility for the Government programs aiding retarded individuals is lodged in the several agencies of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. You here in Little City are blessed with the opportunity of meeting nearly all the demands of the children who will come under your care. Unfortunately the Department can in no way approach this goal for all the mentally retarded children throughout the country. They have attempted to utilize their existing programs in the best possible way to assist these handicapped children. Legislation over the years has continued to increase the responsibilities of the Department in various areas.

The Department is most conscious of the need to have a balanced approach to mental retardation. They have formed a departmental committee composed of representatives from various operating agencies to cooperate in and coordinate their programs.

I, and a large number of my colleagues, have found these governmental programs most encouraging and we have continual reports of their fine accomplishments. Many of you have had direct contact with some of these programs and for you I hope that what I have to say will not be too repetitious. It is my hope that a description of the national impact of these programs may be of interest and that perhaps there will be some aspect of these activities with which you are not familiar and about which you would like to be informed.

The Federal Government has been especially active in five areas: education, vocational rehabilitation, medical research, Children's Bureau assistance to the States, and direct benefits under social security. These programs correspond to certain of the needs of the mentally retarded. Needless to say, it is difficult to categorize them, and it is perhaps more meaningful to talk about some examples of their activities.

The Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has performed a vital task in preparing, collecting, and distributing information on all exceptional children as well as mentally retarded and has prepared exceedingly valuable reports on curriculum and classroom methods as well as numerous other aspects of education of the mentally retarded. This is an attempt to aid the State and local school programs by making available to all the very latest developments in this rapidly growing field.

The second major responsibility of this department and one which is important in all phases of work with the mentally retarded is the securing of qualified personnel. No amount of knowledge on modern teaching methods, no increase in the number of facilities will compensate for the lack of qualified personnel. The closing days of the 85th Congress were exciting days for those interested in this problem, for with the passage of Public Law 85-926 came the authorization for a program to train personnel to teach the mentally retarded. One million dollars for this program was included in the President's budget for fiscal 1960 and this sum has been appropriated by Congress. The Office of Education has been actively engaged in preparing to administer this project and three conferences with interested parties have already been held. This program will go a long way in narrowing the glaring inadequacies in the provision of education for mentally retarded children in this country.

In another area, that of vocational rehabilitation, mentally retarded individuals have been eligible for Government services since 1943. It is estimated that in the next 2 years alone, over 2,600 persons will be rehabilitated into gainful employment. This is difficult task but the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation is constantly striving to meet the challenge of rehabilitating the mentally handicapped. Cooperative programs with State vocational rehabilitation agencies and public school systems have been important. In two States "halfway houses" or "rehabilitation houses" have combined rehabilitation with living arrangements. Of course the mentally retarded children who come to Little City will have all this and a lot more. Perhaps some of the results of your experience will be an inspiration to the Federal programs.

In the field of rehabilitation too, there has been a shortage of qualified personnel. To meet this problem, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation is granting funds to educational institutions all over the country for the training of personnel in this field.

Among the most encouraging activities in this field are those being carried on in Bethesda, Md., at two of the National Institutes of Health—the Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness and the Mental Health Institute. Here research scientists are struggling with the perplexing problem of what causes mental retardation. I feel certain that all of you in the audience today await a more complete answer to this question with bated breath.

Surgeon General Burney has recently announced a 5-year survey of 40,000 women to find the causes of mental retardation and kindred defects. Already investigators in Puerto Rico have recorded brain damages in monkeys cut off from a supply of oxygen at birth. This has prompted intensive study of the relationship between asphyxia and mental retardation. Scientists are also studying the effects of encephalitis and German measles in the causation of mental retardation. Geneticists are studying family records to determine the influence of congenital malformations.

The National Institute of Mental Health is conducting a valuable research program through the awarding of research grants to

qualified applicants. Approximately 50 different projects are now being supported. The Institute is also a central point for the collection of data on patients in resident institutions for the mentally retarded throughout the country. This information has been tremendously useful, and, as a matter of fact, formed the foundation of the study of the National Association of Retarded Children which I mentioned earlier. The Institute also carries on training programs and provides assistance to the States and communities through its Community Services Branch.

The Children's Bureau also aims to help the States and communities. Activities include public information, consultation, and the provision of grant-in-aid programs to encourage the extension of existing State and local service. Demonstration projects have been especially useful in showing the kinds of services needed for the preschool child. These have included casefinding, evaluation and diagnosis, followup care and home training.

Finally, I turn to a Federal program which has filled a desperate need for financial assistance for so many families. This is the protection available under social security for the mentally retarded. According to the provisions of various States, the mentally retarded receive assistance under the program of aid to the permanently and totally disabled under the public assistance program. Coverage under old-age and survivors and disability insurance is also an important source of assistance. The 1956 and the 1958 amendments to the Social Security Act broadened coverage to make childhood disability benefits available for seriously disabled persons whose disability began before age 18 and has continued without interruption since that time, and whose parents died insured or are receiving retirement benefits. Mentally retarded persons are heavily represented among those who qualify for these benefits. The importance of making the public aware of these provisions cannot, of course, be overestimated.

So at the national level, as in Little City itself, a variety of professional disciplines and resources are being used to meet the tremendously complex problem of mental retardation. For much of this century retardation was a wholly neglected field. Mental retardation was assumed to be a single disease entity largely determined by heredity and unresponsive to treatment. Today we know these precepts to be false. At last we are building up our community services, our institutions, our educational facilities. Little City is a bright star in this development. You are in the vanguard of progress, and let us hope that you will soon be followed by many others.

You have understood the message of Mrs. Pearl Hurwitz, a leader in the field of mental retardation, who, writing in the *Radcliffe College Quarterly* for February 1957, attempted to explain the great upsurge of popular interest in mental retardation. She said: "It is because the world is very much with us today. We know (many of us subconsciously) that if our way of life is to survive, every individual, be he handicapped or whole, be he white or black, be he a privileged American or an underprivileged peasant in India, every individual must be counted an individual and accorded his place in the sun."

"For every person who is discounted, by so much do we allow for the spread of discontent; for every person whom we help to attain his life stature, by so much do we prevent the spread of strife."

"We are becoming aware that preventive hygiene must expand beyond total inoculation from communicable disease to total service for every disabling condition, or we are liable to be afflicted by the consequence."

The social loss or the social gain is shared by all."

Today we dedicate Little City, a living example of the shared responsibility of many for the needs of the mentally retarded.

Address by Vice President Richard M. Nixon at American Legion Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, a current topic of interest, and of great debate throughout our good country, is the approaching visit of Nikita Khrushchev.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an excellent speech by Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON at the convention of the American Legion in Minneapolis, Minn., last week:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS OF THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AT THE 41ST NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., AUGUST 25, 1959

I recognize that there are a substantial number of Americans in this audience and throughout the Nation who are deeply concerned about the visit of Mr. Khrushchev to the United States. There are many who believe that no good and much harm can come from such a visit.

There is no question but that there are minus as well as plus factors in appraising the possible results of the Eisenhower-Khrushchev exchange of visits. On balance, I believe the decision to invite Mr. Khrushchev to come to the United States was correct.

In indicating my reasons for reaching this conclusion, may I first remind you of the background from which I speak. I have made a comprehensive study of the philosophy, tactics and strategy of communism as set forth by Marx, Lenin, Stalin and other Communist leaders. On the basis of those studies, I know that Communists throughout the world are united in working for one objective—Communist rule over all the people of the world.

I know from experience that the Communist Party in the United States, like all Communist parties throughout the world, is directed and controlled from Moscow and has in the past and will in the future engage in espionage and subversion in order to serve the interests of Communist governments wherever they are opposed to those of the United States or other free nations. And I can vividly recall that it was just a little over a year ago Communist-led mobs made an unsuccessful attempt on my life in Venezuela.

I have just returned from the Soviet Union where I have had the opportunity to speak at length with Mr. Khrushchev and to appraise the present tactics and strategy of the world Communist movement. On the basis of that visit, I can say unequivocally that the only significant change in Communist tactics since the death of Stalin is that Mr. Khrushchev and other Communist leaders now say they will accomplish their objective of world domination without resort to war.

Subversion and espionage in the United States and other non-Communist countries continue to be directed and supported by the

Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. The rigid positions of the Soviet Government on such issues as Berlin, disarmament, setting up an inspection system for prevention of surprise attack, and ending atomic tests, are the same now as they were before these visits were announced.

It would be naive and wishful thinking to assume that the visit of Mr. Khrushchev to the United States will result in any basic change in the Communist objective of world domination or their adherence to policies designed to achieve that goal.

We should be under no illusions that Mr. Khrushchev's belief in the superiority of the Communist system will be changed in any significant respect by his seeing the great productivity of the American economy. Everything he sees in the United States will be seen through Communist eyes and the picture will be distorted or magnified so that it fits into the rigid description of free societies which the Communist doctrine has painted for over 100 years.

Nor should we be under any illusions that better understanding between the Soviet leaders and ourselves is all that is needed to resolve our differences and to assure peace. There are some deep and basic conflicts of interest and ideology which all the good will and mutual understanding in the world will not settle. Charm, words of friendship, gracious toasts, are not going to have the slightest effect in deterring Mr. Khrushchev from his basic objectives.

What useful purpose then will this visit serve? Putting it in its simplest terms, while understanding alone will not bring peace, misunderstanding could provoke war. And it is because his visit can serve to reduce the possibilities of such misunderstanding that it could contribute to the chance that we can settle our differences without war and, therefore, deserves the approval of the American people.

What does Mr. Khrushchev really believe about the United States and the free world?

Based on my conversations with him and my analysis of the statements he has made, publicly and privately, through the years, here is a thumbnail sketch of a man who holds in his hands the greatest power any one man has ever held in the history of civilization—who by his decision alone could press the button which could start a chain reaction which would destroy civilization as we know it.

First, here are some things he believes which are true. He is aware of the fact that the United States has great military strength. While he constantly boasts of his superiority in the missile field, he has publicly stated in his speech at Dnepropetrovsk on July 28 that no nation today can initiate a war without suffering terrible destruction in return.

He knows the United States is a rich country economically with a high standard of living. He has paid us the compliment of setting as the Soviet goal, catching up with and passing the United States in the production of consumer goods.

I believe he is convinced that President Eisenhower is a man who wants peace and who insists that the United States remain strong only because he believes this is the way to keep peace.

But he also has some dangerous misconceptions about the United States and the free world which, in the mind of a man with such awesome power in his hands, constitute a terrible risk to the peace of the world.

Here are some of the things he presently believes about us and our policies:

"Freedom in the United States exists only for those who have money and power and not for the working people."

"Capitalists in the United States have turned the society in which they rule into a paradise for the rich and a hell for the poor—"

a kingdom of the dollar, of harsh exploitation of millions of people to enrich a handful of monopolists.

"In the United States and other free countries the working people are given the right to vote for various representatives of the ruling class but have no right to participate in the work of the legislative bodies.

"However, beautifully the ideologists of imperialism may dress up the capitalist system, it still remains a system by which millions of people are enslaved by a comparatively small handful of exploiters, a system in which poverty and mass unemployment reign."

The words I have just quoted are not mine but his, taken directly from his public statements. And these ideas he reiterated to me in my conversations with him. Because he believes these things he has reached other conclusions which he has stated to me and to others who have talked with him; that millions of people in the United States do not support the President in his firm stand against Communist aggression; that both of our major political parties are controlled by a few rich monopolists and are not responsive to the will of the people; that our economy has reached its peak and is on the way down; that the nations of the free world alliance are divided and when the chips are down will not unite in resisting aggression.

Put yourself in his place. If you possessed great military strength with uncontrolled and absolute power to use that strength to accomplish your purposes; if also you were fanatically dedicated to the philosophy that your economic and political system should and would rule the world; and if in addition you believed you were confronted by opponents who were divided and who lacked the will to resist aggression, would you not be tempted to be far more aggressive in your policies than if you had other ideas as to the strength and will to resist of those who might oppose your aims?

Mr. Khrushchev will be here for only a relatively brief time, but, in his conversations with President Eisenhower and in his trip across the country, there is no doubt in my mind but that he will see and hear some things which will change his preconceived notions about the United States and which in turn will give him pause before he embarks on a course of action in the future which might be contrary to our vital interests.

He will find that not only are we strong militarily and economically, but that the American people have the will to use their strength to defend our freedom or the freedom of others any place in the world. He will find that the overwhelming majority of the American people are as dedicated to our system as he is to his. He will find that we will no more tolerate being pushed around than will he.

In a nutshell, if we are to have a Soviet leader with such power in his hands, it is better to have one who knows the world than one who is isolated in the Kremlin.

But what about the dangers of such a visit? There are some who fear that the American people will be lulled into a false sense of security and trust by this exchange. I think that those who believe this to be the case underestimate the intelligence of both our people and our leaders.

It is true that throughout American history we have a record of being a trusting and forgiving people in our relations with other people, but it is also true that we are a people who do not like our trust betrayed and when it is we react accordingly.

When President Eisenhower meets Mr. Khrushchev, you can be sure he will have in mind: The record of major treaties and

agreements broken by the Soviet Government—50 out of 52 since 1933; the fact that subversive activities against the United States and the governments of other free nations continue despite Soviet protestations to the contrary. There will be fresh in his memory the fact that Mr. Khrushchev failed to carry out the commitments made at the last Geneva Conference and instead encouraged and stimulated Communist probing actions against the free world in the Middle East and the Far East. And if there was any doubt that we would go into this conference with our eyes open, the Soviet Government's support of the Communist forces in Laos provides a grim and timely warning of what we should expect.

I have had the rare opportunity of seeing both Mr. Khrushchev and President Eisenhower in action both publicly and privately, and I can assure you that the fears of those who believe that President Eisenhower may be taken in or bluffed by Mr. Khrushchev are completely without foundation. There is no doubt whatever but that the interest of the United States and the free world will be vigorously, firmly, and aggressively represented by the President in this meeting.

Another objection to the visit is the possible effect on our allies. The President's trip to Bonn, Paris, and London, provides a complete answer to this objection. As the President has made abundantly clear, it is not the American way to negotiate, in the absence of our allies, problems that vitally concern their future. We reject the concept that two great powers—the United States and the U.S.S.R.—should decide the fate of other peoples without consultation with them.

A major objection to the visit is the effect it may have on the captive peoples of Eastern Europe. You can be sure, however, that under no circumstances will this exchange of visits result in statements or actions on the part of the United States indicating our approval or acquiescence in the status of the peoples of Eastern Europe.

We do not question the right of the people of these countries, or any other for that matter, to have a Socialist or Communist government if they so desire. But we believe that all people should have a right to choose the kind of government they want. The people of the satellite nations of Eastern Europe have never had an opportunity to exercise that right since World War II. We recognize that their right of choice cannot be obtained by armed intervention on our part. A so-called war of liberation would liberate only dead bodies and ruined cities. But we will continue to support through peaceful means realization of the objective that the peoples of these satellite countries be given the opportunity to choose the kind of government they want.

I believe that the American people should give Mr. Khrushchev a courteous reception when he visits the United States. I do not suggest this because I believe a courteous reception is going to affect, one way or the other, his ideas about our system, but because this is the American way of doing things. Visitors in our country, regardless of how much we disagree with them, should not be subjected to the rowdiness and riots for which the Communists were responsible when I was in South America.

The discussions President Eisenhower will have with Mr. Khrushchev, involving as they do such basic differences and conflict of interest, will be difficult at best. In the cause of the peace with justice that we all want, let us by our conduct see that those discussions are conducted in the best possible climate.

Economic Statesmanship in the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, a significant statement bearing on the fundamental foreign policy of this country, recently caught my attention. I refer, in this instance, to a brief summary of a speech delivered by Mr. Herbert L. Barnett, president, Pepsi-Cola Co., New York, whose international operations extends to 81 countries. This company has opened 30 new plants in 21 countries in 1959, and plans additional expansion in nine countries in 1960.

As summarized and as highlighted, Mr. Barnett called upon and exhorted the business and industrial leaders of our country to exercise a higher degree of "economic statesmanship" in support of the foreign policy commitments of the United States to underdeveloped countries in Asia, such as our close friend and ally, the Republic of the Philippines.

While Mr. Barnett in his speech directly asked the business and industry leaders of our country to support the current efforts of our sister republic in Asia in her march toward national progress and economic prosperity, yet, the valid concepts that he developed, particularly on those relating to an active participation by our leaders toward the development of the so-called underdeveloped areas on a private-initiative basis, indicate his broad grasp of the fundamental bases of our foreign policy and marks him for that stature of an economic statesman. It is an enlightening statement, and the press release issued at that time follows:

PRESS RELEASE BY CONSULATE GENERAL OF THE PHILIPPINES

AUGUST 27, 1959.

Herbert L. Barnett, president, Pepsi-Cola Co., yesterday (Wednesday, August 26), called on American firms having business interests in the Philippines to take a more firm and positive approach toward contributing to the economy of that nation which is the bastion of democracy and freedom for the free world in Asia.

Mr. Barnett spoke yesterday at a reception at the Overseas Press Club of America where he received a Lions International Public Service Award "for his contributions toward fostering valuable Philippine-American relations" from Minister Raul T. Leuterio, Philippine Consul General in New York, on behalf of the Manila Lions Club.

Mr. Barnett proposed the formation of a committee of American business and civic leaders to assess the current Philippine economic situation and to provide the necessary cooperation in assisting the Philippines to bolster its economy.

Offering his own services and those of his company for such a committee, Mr. Barnett said:

"This form of economic statesmanship, the assistance of government by private enterprise certainly is no issue of politics or partisanship. It is a manifestation of the

democratic ideals that bind together the United States and the Philippines. The success that we seek is common and commonly beneficial. It will immensely bolster the position of the free world in Asia.

"Our organization has a big investment in the Philippines which started immediately after the end of World War II. We made that investment based on our faith in the Philippine people, its Government, and the Philippine economy. We are happy that we made it and plan not only to maintain what we now have but to add to it, through a planned program of expansion.

"Under this program we are anxious for Philippine nationals to continue to take an active part in the management of Pepsi Cola plants and distribution operations in the archipelago. We are in the Philippines for good because we feel that we belong there and are part of its growth and development as a young democratic nation."

Mr. Barnett further said that since the beginning of operations in 1946 in the Philippines there are now Pepsi Cola bottling plants in Manila, Bacolod, Cebu, Iloilo, and Tarsac with distribution points set up in strategic locations in the archipelago.

The Pepsi-Cola executive concluded his brief remarks by "reaffirming his faith in the Philippines." He exhorted "Americans to remember that the Philippines, who stood by the United States in our darkest hour in the Pacific, continue to be our best friend and ally in Asia." Barnett revealed that "his company was embarking upon a continuing international program of information and cultural exchange between the two countries designed to bring the American and Filipino peoples closer together." He expressed the hope that other American business firms should adopt similar programs along the line of public service. Such activities would not only contribute to better international understanding but is, from the practical point of view, good business.

Other recipients of the Lions International award included Public Relations Consultant Louis Weintraub of Louis Weintraub Associates; Newsmen Robert B. Conside of Hearst Headline Service; Ralph Teatsorth of United Press International; Robert I. Queen of Columbia Broadcasting System; Eddie Martelino, Philippine press attaché in New York; and Maj. Jose Ma. Guerrero of the Philippine Embassy in Washington.

Funny Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Washington Daily News of August 28, 1959:

FUNNY MONEY WINS

Stubborn refusal by Congress to consider the bond interest bill requested by the Treasury is a triumph for funny money and inflation.

Funny money because the Treasury will be forced to write up increasing billions on the books of the commercial banks, a process which manufactures credit and is little different from running the printing presses.

Inflation because this process waters down the dollar and raises living costs.

The people who say that, in refusing the Treasury request, they are holding down interest rates, know better.

Actually the Treasury must pay market rates, law or no law, and these rates now are above the 4½ percent limit placed by law on long-term bonds. The most recent Treasury issue of bonds went at 4½ percent. Even 90-day paper is up to 3½ percent, an increase from 3¼ percent in the last 10 days.

Reason for the rapid rise is the big demand for this kind of credit and the Treasury must borrow \$85 billion in the next year, mainly to refund older issues falling due.

If the Treasury can't bid for savings in form of long-term loans from such sources as pension funds, charitable foundations, etc., it must go to the banks with short-term paper upon which there is no interest ceiling.

Congress, under shadow of the veto, has done a fair job of holding down expenditures and thus counteracting inflation. Its failure to act on interest rates can neutralize all of the good effects of this saving, and more. There certainly must be, in the congressional leadership, enough understanding of simple arithmetic to get something done about this bill.

A Report on Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a portion of a letter received from one of my constituents as I feel that others should know of the conditions in Russia, other than those shown to the ordinary tourist, as reported by Mr. and Mrs. George Wheat, of Santa Ana, and Mr. and Mrs. Albert Launer, of Fullerton, Calif.:

I saw Mr. and Mrs. George Wheat, of Santa Ana, last evening. They had just returned from a trip to Russia in a party of 36 that traveled in a bus almost the total distance while in Russia and for a good many days. Several other from Orange County were in the party including Mr. and Mrs. Albert Launer, of Fullerton, whom I am sure you know because he is a fellow lawyer.

They recommend this type of travel for anyone wanting to find out what Russia looks like, instead of flying directly to the big cities and being shown the nicer spots. Of special interest was their observations:

That, outside of buses, trucks, and autos owned by the government, there is practically no motor vehicle travel outside the large cities and very little of it there.

In the Minsk area, for instance, the farmers had piled their grain on the roads, the only dry place, covering about half of the road; and nobody thought it unusual.

Sanitary conditions were very bad, except of course in the big hotels they stayed in. They were afraid to drink or eat along the road and sanitary facilities were very sparse.

The farmers on the collective farms lived in grass covered huts of very poor construction, with dirt floors and the only house that had a painted roof was that the party man in charge.

All goods were costly, but some of the services were cheap. George got a haircut for 20 cents and Mrs. Wheat a hairwash and set for 75 cents. But a pair of shoes was a month's wages, etc.

George said that some of the refrigerators in the American exhibit were not plugged in and that he thought the people just didn't know what they were. He was an executive with the Edison Co. for years. He looked at refrigerators in stores and found they were ancient models with a sort of open recess in the top for the machinery. Their electric ranges in the stores were the type that one turns a burner on or off with a hand-switch * * * like we had around 35 years ago. He also had a low opinion of the craftsmanship of Russian construction workers, especially on such things as tile work, stone work, plastering, etc. He told of a fine parquet floor in a fine hotel, newly built, where they apparently didn't treat the fine wood with anything, the dirt penetrated the floor, the workers scrubbed the floor and the finished faded and buckled.

This was really a very short conversation with the Wheat, but I thought it would add a mite to your knowledge of Russia. It did to mine.

I believe you know the Wheat; they retired some year ago; are wealthy enough to do extensive traveling and have been over a large portion of the world. But they are also very practical and observant people.

Sincerely,

C. J. MARKS.

Highway Carnage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an excellent editorial on the subject of highway safety, written by Sgt. J. R. Williams, and published in the Astorian-Budget of August 15, 1959:

HIGHWAY CARNAGE

(Guest editorial by Sgt. J. R. Williams, Oregon State Police)

During the past weekend the carnage on our Oregon highways approached the number killed in the recent explosion and fire at Roseburg that shocked the Nation. Little stir was caused by the traffic deaths. As of midnight August 12, there have been 30 deaths in Oregon as compared to 19 for the same part of August last year. For the year 1959 to date 277 deaths, 1958 to date 243. It's easy to see the death toll is running well ahead of last year and threatens to make this a record year. This alarming increase concerns all law enforcement personnel and every means is being used to stop this killing of our friends and neighbors.

A review of the primary causes of most fatal accidents reveals that there are three primary causes that result in this tragic toll. These causes are: (1) Speed too great for conditions; (2) Initial behavior; (3) delayed perception and faulty evasive action.

In explaining the three causes, the following might be noted:

Speed may cause an accident in three primary ways, such as making it impossible to follow the desired curve, making it impossible to take effective evasive action, and presenting an unusual element of surprise to other drivers or pedestrians by not allowing them their normal reaction time and stopping distance.

Initial behavior is that unusual or illegal action by an unthinking or careless person that creates a hazardous situation, such as

passing on the crest of a hill or suddenly stopping on the highway.

Delayed perception is failure to see the danger of the situation in time to avoid it even though it is obvious. This results from inattention or distraction.

Faulty evasive action or dodging technique usually results from a lack of driving skill or understanding of those defensive driving principles that permits a driver to avoid an accident.

Four objectives of the enforcement officer are to slow down the fast driver, correct the initial behavior of the nonconformist, attempt to alert the inattentive, and educate the unskilled. This can be done by vigorous, objective enforcement, with the cooperation of our courts and the public.

Travel on our highways will continue to increase until after Labor Day; therefore, our Salem headquarters has requested a continued review of the accidents and to keep every available patrolman alertly patrolling our highways during periods of high accident frequency.

Laos, Some Critical Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert an article in the Appendix of the Record by Paul Harvey. The article, entitled "Looking Into Our Guns," suggests that we had better reevaluate our policy in southeast Asia before it is too late. Our policy of "little thought and too little too late" is one which had better be replaced with a mature, responsible, and realistic foreign policy.

The article is as follows:

LOOKING INTO OUR OWN GUNS

(By Paul Harvey)

Most Americans don't know where Laos is, don't care. Khrushchev knows and cares. Laos is a country in southeast Asia. It was the "Berlin" of 5 years ago, caught in the vise between two worlds. The Communists demanded that the French get out of Laos, make it an independent state. As they now demand we get out of Berlin, make it a free city.

WE RUSH IN AID

So the French got out. And the United States rushed in with foreign aid. Forty million dollars a year. Your dollars. What happened?

The money we spent to "keep Laos' economy strong" and to "keep the Lao Army armed" had just the opposite effect.

The flood of money into Laos hiked prices (doubled the cost of living between 1954 and 1959), and led to profiteering by Lao Government leaders. This knavery, thievery, discouraged loyalty, encouraged communism.

LOSING ALL AROUND

Today, the Lao army which we armed and equipped is getting whipped on all fronts.

Our Joint Chiefs of Staff told the White House 5 years ago that no amount of money would make an adequate fighting force out of these lethargic Lao, but the Joint Chiefs were voted down by our State Department.

Our aid to Laos, economic and military (according to the House Subcommittee on

Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs), has been destructive of any stability, political, or economic.

Today, as elsewhere where U.S. dollars have been dumped on the inflation fire, Laos, desperate, is preparing to further devalue its currency.

COMMUNISTS ADVANCE

As I write this, Communist forces are active in 8 of Laos 12 provinces, are pressing to within 50 miles of its capital city. Strategic communications and supply routes are threatened. Laos will be split at least, doomed at worst.

And the \$40 million a year which Americans unwillingly paid because our State Department demanded it will end up in Communist hands. Our guns will end up in Communist hands, too.

We can write off Laos. Now what about Berlin. Similarly, the Communists are trying to talk us out of Berlin, to leave that city defenseless.

In 1954, Russia was using the identical arguments for getting us out of Laos. Accused us of "foreign interference in internal affairs," insisted that Laos "must become a free and independent nation."

And so Britain and the Soviet Union signed the infamous Geneva Agreement of 1954 and all our guns and all our gold have been unable to erase that tragic mistake.

Again the State Department has us looking down the muzzles of our own cannon.

Helping Reduce Waste—Watchdog To Eye Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from Glendale News-Press dated Monday, August 24, 1959:

HELPING REDUCE WASTE—WATCHDOG TO EYE FOREIGN AID

There is bound to be some monkey business when thousands of individuals in dozens of countries start dealing in billions of dollars of U.S. foreign aid.

This has been true ever since the United States got into foreign aid operations on a big scale with the Marshall plan in 1948.

Since then we have spent about \$50 billion on farflung and complex programs of military assistance and economic aid.

But this year Congress has made a foreign aid program by creating the new effort to tighten up the multi-billion-dollar job of inspector general and comptroller. The official in this job will be authorized to make audits on all operations of the International Cooperation Administration.

There is merit in placing a watchdog over the spending of such a large share of the American taxpayers' money.

Not only is colossal waste abhorrent to the thrifty, but there is a moral side to this business, too. In numerous cases, our outpourings of large sums of money into immature economies have had a corrupting influence on native leaders.

But however good on paper the idea of a general overseer appears, only time and practice will show whether it is a workable idea.

One area of our foreign aid operations, in which waste and bungling are just as

likely to happen as in any other, will be off limits to the inspector general. This is the arms aid program, where mistakes can be swept under the rug of military security secrecy.

There is another loophole through which waste and corruption could continue. In cases of wrongdoing, the United States can only take action against U.S. firms and citizens caught in the cookie jar. Many transactions are made by the governments to whom the aid is given.

In many instances, the native governments take a more lighthearted view of foreign aid shenanigans than we do.

Steel's Pyramid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, as the steel strike proceeds beyond the 48th day, the great debate continues over the relationship between steel profits and wages in the steel industry. Proponents on each side of the issue have endeavored to rationalize the circumstances surrounding the dispute.

Mr. Edward S. Byers, a Cleveland attorney, who has taken time and patience to express himself on public issues, submitted a splendid statement in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on August 27, 1959 entitled "Steel's Pyramid," in which he analyzes the annual reports of the United States Steel Corp., to show the true profit picture:

STEEL'S PYRAMID

EDITOR, PLAIN DEALER:

SIR: In your issue of August 14 you published a letter to the editor over the signature of Lewis E. Zender, district director of public relations, United States Steel Corp. Time and space will not permit detailed analysis of this letter but, as I read it, it was the kind of thing which has come to be known as Madison Avenue propaganda to mislead the public.

It discussed dividends and profits of the United States Steel Corp. and was undoubtedly calculated to convince that both have been very reasonable indeed. As matter of fact, the profits of the steel industry, as they have grown under the system of administered prices which made its open appearance under the Eisenhower administration, have been fantastically exorbitant.

The following facts and figures, the latter all from the steel corporation's annual reports, may be of some interest:

In 1949, just 10 years ago, United States Steel Corp. had 8,703,000 shares of issued common stock. In that year a so-called split of this stock was effected by corporate action, with result that certificates for three new shares were issued to the holders for each old share they had held.

When this ledgermain was completed the corporation had 26,110,000 issued shares of common stock, representing precisely the same equity in the assets and business of the corporation which had previously been represented by the 8,703,000 share original issue.

The highest price for which any of these new shares were sold in the market in 1949 was \$26.75. So we find that the highest value placed by the market upon the total number of the issued common shares of

United States Steel just 10 years ago was under \$700 million (\$698,442,000).

In 1955 there was another split of the common shares, and this time the shareholders received two new shares for each of the 26,110,000 shares outstanding after the first split in 1949. The corporation then had 52,220,000 shares representing the common stock equity in place of 8,703,000 shares as issued before the first split in 1949, and to holders of the original shares had 6 shares for 1. Again, all of this had not added \$1 to the assets of the corporation nor had anything whatever been added to the several interests of the holders of the original shares in the corporation's assets and business.

United States Steel presently has 53,930,000 shares of issued common stock. It has issued a considerable number of shares at favorable prices to executives and favored employees, this practice enabling them to avoid a considerable part of the income tax on their actual earnings.

Recently United States Steel common stock sold on the New York Stock Exchange for a fraction above \$105 per share. At this price, \$105, the total evaluation which this market price has placed upon the common shareholders' equity or interest in the business and assets of United States Steel Corp. is \$5,660,445,000 or more than 8 times the value placed upon this equity by the highest market price of the shares in 1949.

To have added nearly \$5 billion to the value of this equity in 10 years the corporation would have had to have earned an average of about \$57 per share per year, net after taxes, and have paid nothing out of such earnings in dividends.

Of course, it didn't have such earnings. But the corporation did earn in 1957 about \$44 net after taxes for each of the original shares, and for the first 6 months of 1959 it reports earnings which, if applied to the number of shares before either of these splits, would mean earnings at an annual rate of \$54 on the common shares outstanding originally in 1949 and for many years prior to 1949.

All of this should convince the reader, as Mr. Zender attempts to do, that our steel industry is just a patriotic, unselfish, public-spirited business, concerned only with the welfare of the country in its time of peril and that union labor, which knows all about all this and has participated in and profited by acquiescence in it, is unreasonable to ask for a bigger share of the take.

But be sure of this: No matter what the division is to be, for so long as Mr. Eisenhower is in office the consumer is going to pay administered prices, this being a polite term for illegal restraint of trade.

EDGAR S. BYERS.

CLEVELAND.

Unionist Carey Threw a Boomerang

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, it is utterly unfortunate that before Mr. James Carey wrote his threatening letter to all Congressmen who voted for the Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill, someone did not commend to his attention this tune that was popular just a few short years ago: "I'm Going To Sit Right Down and Write Myself a Letter."

An editorial in the Bangor Daily

News, an outstanding daily published in Bangor, Maine, under date of August 24, 1959, is most appropriate:

UNIONIST CAREY THREW A BOOMERANG

So AFL-CIO Vice President James B. Carey is out to get 225 Republican and Democratic Congressmen who voted for the Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill.

Since President Eisenhower supports the measure, we suppose Carey would also undertake to get him, too, except that Ike is not in line for reelection.

Carey's angry arrogance ends all remaining doubt that certain leaders of organized labor in this country have become too big for their britches. By threatening in individual letters to do all in our power—meaning the well-heeled political machine of the AFL-CIO—to defeat the legislators at the polls in 1960, Carey has shown his true colors and those of his ilk. He is demanding that the Congress of the United States be a servant of a few high-handed union bosses instead of a servant of the American people, whose numbers are some 175 million.

Carey's boldness will boomerang. His intimidations will only strengthen the determination of the 225 Congressmen to see that the Nation gets a strong labor reform law. It should also open the eyes of legislators who have until now favored a mild labor measure. It should make them wonder whether they want to remain allied to a cause that includes such a whip-snapping person as Carey.

Most of all, Carey's action will arouse the American people. Americans don't like to be pushed around. They don't like bullies. And they are already impatient for Congress to correct the union abuses exposed by Senate investigations. Events will show that Carey has put organized labor in a bad light.

Mrs. Alexander Harbert Gray, National President of the American Legion Auxiliary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, last week I had the honor and privilege of attending the national American Legion convention in Minneapolis where Mrs. Alexander Harbert Gray of Brownsville, Tenn., was installed as national president of the American Legion Auxiliary.

Mrs. Gray is a resident of the Eighth Congressional District of Tennessee which I have the honor of representing in the House of Representatives. Her selection as president of the American Legion Auxiliary was largely because she had proven her ability and her understanding of all programs of this organization. Her qualities of leadership, her deep religious and patriotic convictions, her sincere desire to serve, and her pleasing personality qualify her for the office of national president.

Mrs. Gray has been a unit member of the American Legion Auxiliary of Tennessee since 1926 and has served as president of her unit four times. She has been president and vice president of the department and chairman of various committees as well as serving as execu-

tive committeewoman, national vice president, and on national committees.

We are certainly proud of Mrs. Gray and her achievements throughout the years, and as I attended her reception on Tuesday night and saw over 2,000 members of the auxiliary pass through the receiving line from every State in the Union I could not help but be impressed with the wonderful work and devotion to the veterans and to the people of this Nation that this organization has given.

I insert here the speech that Mrs. Gray made on Thursday, August 27, after being elected as national president:

Madam Installing Officer Hope, my National President Ce; national officers, past national president, delegates, and guests to this convention; I come before you now breathless with humility and beaming with pride. Humility because of my imperfections—pride in being chosen to further the splendid work of those dedicated women who have preceded me. Thank you—all of you—for giving me this opportunity to serve as your national president.

To my Department of Tennessee, to my American Legion, and to my American Legion Auxiliary, let me express my abiding love. Through the years, they have been my strength and inspiration.

To my family, to my husband who is here with me this morning, I pay tribute for their loyalty and understanding. They have made many sacrifices, but have always believed in this great organization and in me.

To the members of Nashville Post 5 band, my heartfelt thanks for their beautiful music and for the hours of practice spent in preparation for this occasion.

As we begin a new auxiliary year, America faces a grave crisis. Atheistic communism stands on our doorstep, precipitating grave problems, international in scope, but yet of very real, very personal importance to each of us and to the future of the great Nation which we are pledged to uphold.

Today the problem is survival, and so I give you the theme of my administration, "Serving and strengthening America."

World tensions now demand ever-increasing allegiance and personal sacrifice on the part of each of us if we are to preserve our present way of life. We must convince our Federal Government to place national security ahead of tax dollars. We must lead the way to establishing and maintaining an effective nationwide civil defense program. We must strengthen our ties of friendship with our Pan American neighbors. We must shore up the religious faith of our fathers. Our very existence now depends on the strong moral fiber of this Nation.

As we forge an invincible defense to protect our freedoms, so must we simultaneously make our history and heritage of freedoms a part of the lives and character of today's youth—tomorrow's citizens.

We must continue to rehabilitate our disabled veterans and restore them to a normal and productive life. We must preserve the integrity of the family home. We must meet the needs of the whole child.

All of our auxiliary programs are aimed at strengthening our organization and our country through dedicated service.

As you return to your homes, I urge you to strive to make the people of your community increasingly aware of the work you are doing day after day, year in, year out—of the work still to be done for the veteran and his family—for the security of our beloved America. There is no better way than inviting them to join you in your work.

In the year ahead, I see a million dedicated, patriotic women serving and strengthening America.

Better Understanding Between the Peoples of the Far East and the Citizens of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. INOUE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter sent by Messrs. Thomas W. N. Chun and Herbert N. Fukata of Honolulu, Hawaii, to Dr. L. Edward Shuck, U.S. State Department representative in Hawaii.

This letter demonstrates the eagerness of the people of Hawaii to assist in the bringing about of good will and better understanding between the peoples of the Far East and the citizens of the United States:

HONOLULU, HAWAII,
August 21, 1959.

Dr. L. EDWARD SHUCK,
State Department, Honolulu, Hawaii.

DEAR DR. SHUCK: Today, Hawaii was admitted into the Union as the 50th State. It is the culmination of a long and persistent struggle for admission into a great family of States. We in Hawaii are proud of our wonderful achievement and humble of our newly acquired stature.

The time for wild spontaneous acts of jubilation to celebrate Hawaii's gain has passed. We feel that now is the time to tell the world what the United States has done by the act of granting statehood to Hawaii.

The great bulk of the people in the mainland know of our cosmopolitan population living in peace and harmony. We in Hawaii are proud of our spirit of aloha. We in Hawaii take pride that we have found the solution to the problems of living in peace and friendship among the peoples of all races of the world. We in Hawaii would be happy to participate in a venture to offer visual proof to the people of the Far and Middle East, the fact of our diversified group.

The specific project that we have in mind is a Far East good will tour. This tour would be composed of the Royal Hawaiian Band, a hula troupe, and others. The tour group would visit and entertain the people of the East and Americans stationed throughout the countries in the itinerary. The purposes for the tour are as follows:

1. To educate and acquaint the people of the East of the different racial groups living in the 50th State of the United States and thus point out their probable origin of ancestry.

2. To publicize and induce the students of the Orient to matriculate at the East-West Cultural Center envisioned and established by the Johnson-Burns Act.

3. To entertain the U.S. troops stationed in these areas.

4. To ease world tension by continuing the exchange of visits between East and West. Russia sent a tour group to the United States to boast of her artistic accomplishments, we can send a tour group to boast of our ability to assemble diverse racial groups and live together in peace and harmony, and

5. To celebrate the granting of statehood to Hawaii.

The tentative list of places to visit and entertain would include: Guam, Philippines,

Vietnam, Indochina, Thailand, Indonesia, Hong Kong, Formosa, Okinawa, Japan, Korea, and Russia.

A tentative list of members to be included in the tour group comes to a total of approximately 75 persons made up of the following: Members of the Royal Hawaiian Band, hula troupe, project coordinators, State Department representative, State officials from Hawaii, doctor, historian, photographers, billeting manager, equipment managers, transportation managers, and others.

We believe that this good will tour will strengthen the prestige of the United States in the eyes of the free world and would greatly soften the attitude of the people of the East toward the people of America.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS W. N. CHUN,
HERBERT N. FUKATA,
Project Coordinators.

Anatomy of a Lobby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, during the last two weeks there has been a great deal of discussion both in and out of Congress about lobbying activities in behalf of or against labor-management reform legislation.

It is significant to me at least that the loudest protests about lobbying activities have been voiced against the representatives of America's labor movement. I am sure that if those who have been so loud in their denunciation of labor's part in this complicated legislation would take the time to study the mail of an average Congressman, they would find that most of the hysteria regarding reform legislation has come from, or has been generated by, the various lobby groups for business and industry. I have been told by veterans in this legislative body that they have never experienced the kind of pressure that has been put on them by big business and industry in support of harsh labor reform legislation.

I should like to call to your attention a bulletin which I received recently from the Illinois Retail Merchants Association. This bulletin is prepared by one of the most highly respected spokesmen for the retail industry in America, Mr. Joe Meek, director of this association.

I am submitting this bulletin today because I think it so succinctly describes the anatomy of a lobby group, and while I have no quarrel with the valiant efforts of the Illinois Retail Merchants Association to protect their rights, I think anyone who will take the trouble to read Mr. Meek's graphic description of how his organization functions will probably better understand why this Congress was stampeded into passing labor legislation which goes beyond the scope of getting the crooks and, in effect, if finally adopted in its present form, will impede

seriously legitimate efforts of honest unions.

I think that Mr. Meek deserves the highest commendation for his frank analysis of how his organization functions, and I think there can be no question in anyone's mind after reading his bulletin that the merchants of Illinois who belong to his association are certainly getting more than their money's worth.

The "Retail News Briefs," as published by the Illinois Retail Merchants Association and prepared by Mr. Joe Meek, follows:

RETAIL NEWS BRIEFS

(By Illinois Retail Merchants Association)

Your ripple makes a big splash. What does your Illinois Retail Merchants Association dollar do for you; what chain reaction starts?

First, that dollar helps unite thousands of Illinois retailers into a common cause—a common voice. In the fields of merchandising advice, consumer relations, new markets, rules, regulations, vital statistics, legislation, contacts with governmental departments, employee sources, prestige, the Illinois Retail Merchants Association swings into action with over 100 years of combined experience from all of us—Chuck Barker, Fred Goerlitz, Hugh Muncy, Jack Leland, Herb Thompson, Margaret Dowd, Frances Falanca, Barbara Parks. Nearly 200 fine local retail divisions (chambers of commerce) are happily put to work, contacted, alerted.

Thirty solid trade associations are pulled into the team with their abilities intact and not the slightest check on their own effectual programs of work. Illinois retailing gets together.

It talks up as 40,000; not as 1 or 10 or even 1,000.

Second, your dollar helps unite tens of thousands of U.S. retailers into that common cause. The American Retail Federation, as strong as its 38 State "fingers," moves into action, the national counterpart of what we attempt at the Illinois level. Here, your dollar puts to work such veterans as Rowland Jones, ARF president; Jim Michaux; Joe Lovett; Bill McCamman; Art Sturges, and others. IRMA's counterpart in 38 States gets lifeblood, unity of purpose, action—New York, Arkansas, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Minnesota, Utah, California—on and on your dollar rolls.

Third, your dollar commands not alone the ARF and its State strength. It nudges and moves the might of national retail trade associations: National Retail Merchants Association, furniture, hardware, food, implements, shoes, jewelry, and more. Veterans such as John Hazen, Derek Brooks, Henry Blson, Phil Shindel, Bill Noble, Bill Cheyney, Lou Rothschild, Eddie Atkins, trade association leaders always in and around Washington, strike out for action—for you. These are the members of the other ARF hand, the national trade groups.

Fourth, your dollar reaches out, builds the finest prestige, commands the finest brains smart store retailing can buy. Across Illinois, in a hundred towns, top merchants go to work for IRMA—for you. Across America, in a thousand cities, top merchants duplicate that effort. Across State and Nation nationally known executives contribute their solutions to your problems—labor, climate, taxes, tax laws, legislation, planning, controls, promotions, distributive education, farm and community relations, press and radio contacts, etc.

This is a part of the commodity your dollar buys in retailing's own across the Nation. It is the biggest money's worth any

association, including organized labor, offers today. With the help of others, now free-loading on you, this combined strength of retailing could be the greatest thing ever for the consumer public—a country in balance, paying its bills, enjoying free markets, utilizing price in its right role, playing the people's politics. Swing on—now. If ever retailing is to get near the summit of its potentialities for the good of the Nation which gives it life, that time is now.

Passports to Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John W. Hanes, Jr., Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, U.S. Department of State, which appeared in the American Legion magazine of September 1959:

PASSPORTS TO TROUBLE

(By John W. Hanes, Jr.)

I don't know exactly how many members the Communist Party of the United States now has. The estimates run from 10,000 to 20,000. But whatever the number, each and every party member as of today can obtain a passport from the Department of State. The exceptions are those rare instances in which the applicant happens to be ineligible for some other reason, such as being a fugitive from justice.

Since this dangerous loophole in our laws was shown to be open last year, many notorious American supporters of the Communist movement have traveled abroad to campaign against us on the world battlefield. Their names and their activities are matters of public record.

What do they do when they get abroad, these "Americans" now happily traveling on their U.S. passports? Let James Jackson, secretary of the National Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A., give part of the answer in his own words. He went to Moscow this past February and there addressed the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. According to Radio Moscow, Jackson said:

"Communists the world over will welcome the ideological contributions and profound insight in Comrade Khrushchev's report for the solution of a number of problems of the struggle for peace, democracy, national freedom, and socialism. . . . We are building our party in the firm principles of Marxism and Leninism. . . . On the occasion of the 21st Congress, the Communist Party of the United States extends its warmest fraternal greetings to the great CPSU which, boldly applying and developing the principles of Marxism-Leninism, is leading the Soviet people to ever new Socialist accomplishments and onward to communism."

At present we are forced to issue passports to people such as these—passports which not only permit, but greatly aid, their travel to and in foreign countries. Their passport clothes them abroad with all the dignity and protection that our Government affords U.S. citizens. And yet the dedicated purpose in life of every Communist is to destroy our Government and our freedom.

Surely this situation is a perversion of the liberty which our Constitution and our laws are meant to guarantee us.

Our own Government has long recognized how important American passports are to the Communist conspiracy. The Communist underground has for years maintained workshops devoted to the wholesale forgery and falsification of passports and other documents. However, genuine American passports were particularly prized at intelligence headquarters in Moscow, according to a former chief of Soviet intelligence in Europe.

During the Spanish civil war, Communist leaders assiduously collected the passports of the several thousand Americans in the International Brigade, and the bulk of these passports eventually found their way to Moscow for alteration and possible use by Soviet agents. In fact, so many American passports were collected from this source that, as a countermeasure, the United States had to replace every outstanding passport in the world with a new document.

In 1949, 11 members of the national board of the Communist Party, U.S.A., were convicted of conspiring to advocate the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence. In 1950 American Communists were actively supporting the enemy position in the Korean war. Congress, recognizing these dangers, passed the Internal Security Act and found that: " . . . travel of Communist members, representatives, and agents from country to country facilitates communication and is a prerequisite for the carrying on of activities to further the purposes of the Communist movement."

Congress also said that Americans who participate knowingly in the world Communist movement " . . . in effect transfer their allegiance to the foreign country in which is vested the direction and control of the world Communist movement."

Yet allegiance is the touchstone of the right to a passport.

The Secretary of State, charged by law with the issuing of passports, could hardly have ignored these congressional findings. In 1952 Secretary Acheson issued regulations establishing the criteria for refusing passports to Communists and Communist supporters.

The publication of these regulations triggered a violent attack by the Communists through their press and through the courts, utilizing every device of law and procedure. Their clever campaign gained respectability because many sincere persons who have no sympathy whatever with communism became disturbed by the argument that the regulations permitted the Secretary of State arbitrarily to restrict a citizen's rights. These were the regulations which in 1958 the Supreme Court struck down by finding that they had not been specifically authorized by Congress.

I think it might be well to put into perspective exactly how these regulations operated and what their practical effects were. To do so, I should like to present some statistics on the numbers of Communist supporters who were refused passports under them and the number of Americans who received passports. For the 2 calendar years preceding the Supreme Court's decision (1956 and 1957) 1,145,000 passports were issued or renewed. During that same period the Passport Office limited the passport privilege of 51 persons because of Communist grounds. Every one of those persons had access to an elaborate and impartial appeal mechanism, and many of them utilized it. From the time this mechanism was set up in 1952 until the Supreme Court's decision in June 1958, the Secretary of State—and it must be the Secretary personally—refused passports to only 15 persons on Communist grounds after full hearings. A number were granted passports after hearings; some others, of course, did not contest the Passport Office's denial, and undoubtedly many active Communists never bothered to apply at all, knowing they would be scrutinized and required to make a sworn

statement about Communist Party membership.

I believe it is important to remember these figures when statements are made about the "arbitrary" action of the Department in passport matters.

Much of the meaning of even the very few but very important refusals became academic, of course, in June 1958, when the Supreme Court's ruling was handed down. Since then, as we anticipated, there has been a flood of applications from persons with records of Communist affiliations or activities. Some of them had previously been denied passports, but many had never previously applied. Many we know a great deal about, but the Department of State is no longer in a position even to inquire, much less investigate, whether any such applicant is a Communist Party member or how dangerous he may be. There is quite a difference, for example, between a known courier and a relatively harmless fellow traveler.

This flood of applications continues today. The Communists are getting passports while they can. Naturally, in all these cases the Department's previous policy has had to give way and passports have been issued to all these people.

Immediately following the Supreme Court decision, Secretary Dulles sent Congress a draft bill to provide the specific legislative authority which the Court held was lacking. He wrote to the Congress:

"I think there can be no doubt in anyone's mind that we are today engaged for survival in a bitter struggle against the international Communist movement. . . . This movement seeks everywhere to thwart U.S. foreign policy. It seeks on every front to influence foreign governments and peoples against the United States and eventually by every means, including violence, to encircle the United States and subordinate us to its will. The issuance of U.S. passports to supporters of that movement facilitates their travel to and in foreign countries. It clothes them when abroad with all the dignity and protection that our Government affords. Surely, our Government should be in a position to deny passports to such persons."

President Eisenhower urgently endorsed the legislation, saying, "Each day and week that passes without it exposes us to great danger."

What must such legislation do?

Again, the President has expressed it well. He said:

"In exercising these necessary limitations on the issuance of passports, the executive branch is greatly concerned with seeing to it that the inherent rights of American citizens are preserved. Any limitations on the right to travel can only be tolerated in terms of overriding requirements of our national security, and must be subject to substantive and procedural guarantees."

Simply stated, what we need is legislative authority which will allow the Secretary of State to deny passports to hardcore supporters of the international Communist movement. We believe such denial should occur under due process of law, including judicial review.

We do not seek statutory passport authority to stifle criticism of this Government or its policies. We do not believe that the passport should or can be used to restrict the movement of people who hold political, social, or economic opinions which are not to the orthodox American variety.

We do not seek or want authority to deny passports to any whose travel or activity abroad is merely an embarrassment to our country. I believe that the United States is strong enough to survive embarrassment if we must.

Neither do we wish to penalize loyal Americans who at one time, before the nature of the Communist conspiracy became

as crystal clear as it is today, may have sympathized with Communist theories or even belonged to Communist organizations in this country.

All we seek, and what I feel we must have, is the capacity to protect ourselves by denying passports to those relatively few hardcore, active Communist supporters who are not ordinary American citizens and whose travel abroad constitutes a danger to the United States.

In the case of passports "due process" means that the Secretary of State cannot be arbitrary or capricious but must have sound reasons for restricting an individual's right to exit. It means that he must tell the individual the reasons for his action in sufficient detail and under such circumstances that the individual may have an opportunity to show the reasons untrue. Such circumstances should include a full hearing and review within the Department of State and ultimately, of course, the right which now exists to appeal to the courts.

There is one other essential of passport legislation which is much misunderstood; and that is the necessity for the Government to be able to utilize confidential information as part of the basis of its decision.

I can say bluntly that any legislation concerning denial of passports to Communist supporters would be meaningless and would not achieve any purpose if it prohibited the Government from utilizing confidential information. Almost without exception, dangerous cases involving communism also involve confidential information and investigative sources. Indeed, the more recent and meaningful our information is, the more likely it is that it has come from current confidential investigative sources within the Communist movement.

The Government has a legitimate and overriding interest in maintaining the security of these investigative sources and methods. If faced with the unpalatable choice of exposing and thereby destroying a valuable and continuing source of information about the activities of the Communist conspiracy or issuing a passport to an individual member of that conspiracy, the Government has no alternative but reluctantly to issue the passport as the lesser evil.

Some people feel that the use of confidential information in such cases means using vague and unsubstantial gossip or allegation that will not stand the light of day. This is nonsense. In the first place, if one is prepared to believe that the Secretary of State, who must personally decide passport appeals cases, would actually base a considered decision upon anything less than substantial and corroborated evidence, then one must believe that our country's security is in far greater danger than from the capricious denial of passports. In the second place, confidential information is almost always a small part of any total case, although usually essential because of the clear proof it provides. Most of every case can be fully and publicly disclosed.

Beyond this, however, we believe, based on a careful review of the Communist cases we have had in the past, that in every case the Government can provide a fair summary of even the confidential information, both to the applicant and to the courts. Such a fair summary would include all the pertinent reasons for which the passport is denied and would exclude only those details required to protect confidential sources of information.

I would have no objection to any legislation requiring the Government in all cases to provide such a fair summary of the content of any confidential information relied upon.

One other thing should be clear. What we are talking about is not a criminal proceeding in which someone is being tried or

punished for past actions. Instead, it is an administrative process which attempts to predict someone's future course of action, if he travels abroad, and to balance its potential danger to the United States against the desirability of facilitating the travel and giving him protection while he is performing it. These are services which the Government should extend to its citizens, but they are not inviolable rights which the individual can demand no matter what the menace to society may be.

Even having said this, however, much about this subject remains repugnant to Americans. The use of "confidential information" in any kind of proceeding, judicial or not, and indeed any sort of governmental restriction, whether on travel or passports or any other activity of the individual—these are things which we will never like and which, I hope, we never accept apathetically.

Here, however, I believe we must face squarely one fact which is inherent in every aspect of the subject of passports and travel restrictions: That is, that our Nation, although not technically at war, assuredly is not at peace. We face, almost on a daily basis, actual threats to our national security and to our very existence which very clearly are the equal of any threats we have ever faced in peace or war. One need only think of the implications of Berlin today or the countless crises of the past decade to realize how perilous our situation is.

This uneasy condition of "not peace, not war" is something entirely new to our experience. It places a tremendous strain upon our governmental and constitutional institutions, for it blurs lines which had previously been considered sharp and clear.

It used to be that when our Nation was not at war it was truly at peace. Certain rules obtained and governed our lives in peacetime. These rules were evolved over a century and a half by and for a free people who since the earliest days of their history had been faced by no serious external threat to their freedom or their national existence. Occasionally war came, and there was a clear line of demarcation. War was declared and waged with certain formalities. During wartime certain special rules obtained because the Nation temporarily required the subordination of individual desires to the overall national effort. These special rules, while repugnant, were considered tolerable for the limited duration of the war. When the war was over, other prescribed formalities occurred; the Nation was at peace again, and the special wartime rules, which were usually incompatible with complete constitutional freedom, were dropped.

This sharp demarcation between peace and war does not exist today. International communism has thrown away the rule book. It does not consider itself ever at peace. It is always totally mobilized to advance its aim of world domination. It does not recognize any of the accepted rules of international or legal or human conduct except when, and only for as long as, those rules may suit its purpose.

This situation creates an unprecedented threat both to our liberty and to our very existence. Our response must include a recognition of these changed circumstances, or we risk the loss of existence and liberty together.

The threat, moreover, will continue to exist, perhaps for many years in the future. This makes it imperative that whatever response we do adopt must be one that we can indefinitely sustain and without endangering the strength or the integrity of our basic and cherished institutions which we are seeking to protect.

I believe that such a response is possible to a free people. I believe that our institutions—our Constitution, our laws, and our form of government—are strong enough and flexible enough to adjust to these changed

circumstances, just as they have adjusted to changes in the past.

I have tried to illustrate what I mean by suggesting, in the limited but important field of passport policy, a procedure which meets these criteria. It meets, I believe, the most pressing requirements of national security. It does so by law and under the Constitution. I think, for the reasons I have given, that adequate passport legislation is essential to our security. But let me be very clear. I do not believe that such legislation will eliminate all the dangers which we face from the Communist conspiracy or even all those which it is intended to counter.

I do believe that adequate passport legislation is a necessary and integral part of the screen of weapons we have raised against the conspiracy and that it will seriously cripple the effectiveness of that conspiracy.

I do believe, finally, that all our weapons together, wisely and effectively used, will contain the internal menace of the Communist conspiracy within tolerable limits while our military strength deters its worldwide menace and our foreign policy seeks to replace its threat with a just and durable peace.

Significant Comments by Lawrence, Truman, McCormack, and Walter on Khrushchev Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable comment about the exchange of visits by Premier Khrushchev to this country and President Eisenhower to Soviet Russia. Among these the following by David Lawrence, former President Harry Truman, and our distinguished colleagues, the majority leader, Hon. JOHN MCCORMACK, and the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, as reported in U.S. News & World Report, are especially significant; and under unanimous consent I include them in the Appendix of the Record:

THE ONE BIG DANGER

(By David Lawrence)

Missiles and nuclear bombs are in themselves no menace to mankind—nor are the conventional weapons which can inflict widespread destruction. The menace is the man who, in disregard of the wishes of his people, can order the trigger pulled.

The one big danger in the world, therefore, is one-man rule—autocratic government.

The basic cause of World War I and World War II was the power of an autocratic one-man government to make war on other nations.

Despite public appeals in 1912 for a naval holiday, one man—the Kaiser—started the war in 1914.

Despite the peace talk and appeasement at Munich in 1938, one man—Hitler—started the war in 1939.

What, then, are we doing to remove the menace of one-man government? Will we remove it merely by showing Khrushchev our might—a sort of veiled threat—or even by President Eisenhower's politeness in making a return visit to the Soviet Union?

We shall not make progress by enhancing the prestige of the dictatorship government in Moscow.

We shall not make progress by abandoning our position in West Berlin in favor of a "deal" that satifies the material cravings of some of our allies for more trade with the Soviets but robs us of our self-respect and, indeed, reveals us as irresolute and faltering.

We shall not make progress by oversimplifying our dilemma with the Soviet Union as we give an impression that, by temporarily restraining the hand of the mad man, we have accomplished peace for the world.

There has been too much emphasis on the "one man" idea as the answer to the current crisis. Personal diplomacy cannot be of avail against an autocratic system that rules only through intimidation and terror.

Nikita Khrushchev is accustomed to brutishness, to murder—"purges"—and to the exercise of whatever force seems necessary to him to gain his ends.

We must use the occasion of the Khrushchev visit to talk over his head to the peoples behind the Iron Curtain. The protests from groups of citizens in our midst will be made, but there must be forthcoming also from the Government of the United States a restatement of the case for democracy.

Warning must be given that democratic governments cannot "peacefully coexist" alongside an autocratic government that keeps on threatening to destroy us.

This is not just an internal question—it is external in its global effects. The lives of free men everywhere are at stake. As long as an autocratic government is in power in Moscow, there can be no disarmament agreement, no treaty to bar aggression, no written pledge that will be worth the paper on which it is written.

Only when peoples are able, in free elections, to choose their leaders and to remove them at will can there be an assurance of peace in the world. Peoples don't make war—only dictators do.

Until the people of the Soviet Union and the peoples of the neighboring countries of Eastern Europe are free, there can be no relief from the burdens of armament. Tension cannot be relaxed anywhere while the murderous regime in Moscow keeps its conspiratorial agents in every part of the world and its troops quartered in supposedly independent countries.

The menace is one man rule. We should be courageous enough to tell Nikita Khrushchev that we cannot feel safe as long as his people are enslaved and that we will feel secure only when the peoples of the many nationalities that make up the Soviet Union have successfully asserted their right to individual freedom. This may not happen soon, but we must not lose sight of the longrange goal—the removal of autocratic governments from a position that enables them to endanger the peace of the world.

TRUMAN: "I QUESTION WISDOM OF IKE'S VISIT"

(One of the criticisms of the Eisenhower-Khrushchev program was written by ex-President Harry S. Truman, and appeared in newspapers a few hours before the President's news conference. Full text of Mr. Truman's article is given here:)

(By Harry S. Truman)

I seriously question the wisdom of President Eisenhower's going to Moscow. If this journey leads the world to expect that peace can be advanced by the mere exchange of visits between heads of government, then we all face certain disappointment.

The President already has declared that he has no intention of conducting separate negotiations with Khrushchev. If that is the case, why could not the amenities be confined to Khrushchev's visit to the United States, where he will be received with the consideration due him?

When a President of the United States leaves the country it should be a momentous occasion in the exercise of the unique au-

thority of his office. The power and leadership of the Presidency should not be dissipated in ceremonial visits so reminiscent of those days when diplomats and rulers traveled back and forth on their balance of power visits, which marked this, the bloodiest century of history.

President Eisenhower is leaving shortly for Europe to dispel from the minds of our allies any anxiety they may have that the United States and the Soviet Union would engage in separate negotiations. I am sure that President Eisenhower would be quick to resent, and rightly so, any suggestion that he is embarking on a course of the United States going it alone with Russia.

The critical problems we continue to have with the Kremlin are how to get it to keep the commitments and to stop it from interfering and plotting in the internal affairs of other nations.

There can be no durable peace until we make some progress in those two areas.

From Yalta to Potsdam to Geneva we have had many meetings, all of which have resulted in failure—not because of any acts of ours—but solely because the Communists have not lived up to their promises.

An exchange of visitors holds no more promise of success than we have had in conferences and diplomatic negotiations. The President probably will meet the same Khrushchev in Moscow that he met in Geneva and will meet again in Washington—a man with an unyielding ambition and fixed purpose.

Khrushchev is not coming to Washington to learn anything about us or our strength that he does not know already. The real purpose of his visit is to appraise our determination and will to stand up and resist Communist aggression and mischievous proings around the world.

Khrushchev's main objective, I believe, is to see whether he can divide us as a people and lure us into compromising our rights. He would also seek by every means to divide us from our allies and then go about picking them off one by one. Since Khrushchev has the initiative to make war, he also has the advantage of beguiling us with offers of peace. This is where Khrushchev is most dangerous and why we have to be exceedingly careful about maintaining our strength and never letting down our guard.

It would be most unfortunate if, by the exchange of visits, we allow the Russians or the world to gain the impression that we are being lulled into complacency.

I hope that Khrushchev, when he leaves here, will have a clearer understanding of what he and the Kremlin are up against in American determination to stand with our allies. Let us be sure that it is a more accurate and realistic evaluation than either Mikoyan or Kozlov (Anastas I. Mikoyan and Frol Kozlov, Soviet Deputy Premiers) seemed to have got out of their visits.

Disregarding all the ceremonies that will be connected with Khrushchev's visit—a visit that I have favored—it is in Washington that Khrushchev must learn conclusively where and how we stand.

The reception accorded the President in Moscow will have little bearing on Khrushchev's decisions and acts, and that is why I feel that little purpose will be served and a great deal of misunderstanding might arise from the President's return of Khrushchev's visit.

There are all sorts of interpretations that can be given to a visit by a President of the United States, and such a journey to Russia could be distorted for propaganda purposes beyond the announced intent. The claim that the tensions of the "cold war" between the East and the West could be lessened by such visits is to ignore the basic reasons for the cold war.

I do not think the Communists are impressed by anything except force. They do not respond to tough talk unless that talk

is backed by force. The only way to insure peace is to make certain that they who threaten understand that we will fight if given no other choice.

Up to now I see no evidence that the Communists have changed their goal, which is to impose their rule on the world. This we have to prevent.

One place where we must make that clear to Khrushchev is at the White House. Equally important is that our Allies and friends should never have reason to entertain any misgivings as to the firmness of this resolve. I think it would have been more in keeping with our responsibilities and our leadership to have invited the heads of allied governments and the Secretary General of NATO [North Atlantic Treaty Organization] to come to Washington before Khrushchev's visit to this country. This would have been an opportunity to remind the world, and ourselves as well, that our security and peace are mutually interdependent.

But, in his decision to visit Bonn, Paris, and London in preparation for his meeting with Khrushchev in Washington, the President has the complete support of a nation united.

I cannot say it too often that the proper place to conduct any negotiations affecting the peace of the world is in the United Nations. The world has had all it ought to stand from the maneuvering and bickerings of nations seeking to exploit others. The United Nations has played an increasingly important role in focusing the light of world opinion on transgressors.

In this period of transition from old, exploitive colonialism to independence and nationalism, let us not overlook the growing menace of a new brand of colonialism—the Red exploitive colonialism.

If Russia is sincere in her professed desire for peace, Khrushchev ought to come before the United Nations to try to work out a constructive plan for disarmament and control of nuclear weapons and to cease interfering in the internal affairs of other nations. But from experience we ought to know that plans, resolutions, and agreements made by the Communists up to now are meaningless.

What the world needs is a show of good faith by peaceful acts and deeds by Khrushchev and not through visits, fanfare and gala performances.

While we are striving to achieve some common working ground for peace with the Communists, we are compelled to maintain and build our military might, no matter what the cost.

REMARKS BY HOUSE MAJORITY LEADER JOHN W. MCCORMACK, DEMOCRAT, OF MASSACHUSETTS

The invitation by President Eisenhower of the Soviet dictator, the head of the worldwide Communist conspiracy and also Prime Minister of the Soviet Union, Mr. Khrushchev, to visit the United States, has been received with sharp discussion and much concern by our people, and properly so. It is my opinion that time will show that President Eisenhower made a serious mistake. It will be interesting to note "the law of natural and probable consequences" operating as a result of the President's invitation and the coming visit of Mr. Khrushchev.

REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE FRANCIS E. WALTER, DEMOCRAT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, CHAIRMAN OF HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

(In a Letter to President Eisenhower)

Your attention is respectfully directed to two phases of the total war which the international Communist conspiracy is waging against the free world with the United States the principal target.

The first phase is the extensive current Communist espionage operations in this country.

The second phase is the flood of Communist propaganda which is being sent into the United States at an ever-increasing rate.

May I conclude, Mr. President, by quoting the words of Dimitry Z. Manulsky given in the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow in 1931: "So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice and cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

Political Football

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Star says the issue of interest rates has been made a political football.

In that regard, I will refrain from expressing an opinion, but I will say I agree with the Star in that it is time for the responsible leadership of Congress to demonstrate its understanding as a matter of major importance to the national welfare.

The editorial in question from the August 28, 1959, issue of the Star follows:

CONGRESS SHIRKS ITS DUTY

The Congress will be guilty of dangerous imprudence and irresponsibility if it fails to take action on President Eisenhower's recommendation, repeated in a special message this week, that authority be given for removing the statutory ceiling on Treasury bond interest rates and for raising the rate payable on savings bonds. The House Ways and Means Committee, after an earlier decision to approve the necessary legislation, reversed itself last week and voted to table it for this year.

Although U.S. Government securities generally are considered the safest in the world, the current situation is this: The Treasury Department is unable to sell its bonds—obligations maturing in more than 5 years—at the maximum 4.25 percent rate of return which was fixed by law many years ago. As a consequence, it has been forced to meet its tremendous financing needs through the marketing of short-term securities—bills and certificates—on which there is no interest ceiling. Only recently a 1-year issue of bills was marketed at a near-record rate of 4.728 percent—the lowest the Government could find by competitive bidding in a free market. Short-term securities are held mostly by commercial banks and are employed in the banking system for an expansion of credit which, in effect, increases the supply of money and is directly inflationary as a result.

As both the President and Secretary of Treasury Anderson have emphasized, the picture of this seemingly deliberate policy of contributing to inflationary pressures raises grave questions both at home and abroad about "our sense of responsibility in our fiscal management." It is quite possible, from that point, to question whether our money—the U.S. dollar—should continue to be "practically the standard for the whole world," as it has been for so long. If and

when it ceases to be, our entire economy is in jeopardy.

As for the savings bonds, even the most politically motivated individual should be responsive to the implications of the present problem. Approximately 40 million persons hold these small-denomination securities to a total value of \$42 billion. They have been urged by their Government to buy them, but the current maximum rate of interest of 3.26 percent neither gives a fair return on today's savings nor offers a cash-in value that is commensurate in purchasing power with their original price. For this reason, cash-ins have exceeded new purchases for months past.

This issue of interest rates has been made a political football on Capitol Hill. It is time for the responsible leadership of Congress to demonstrate its understanding and its interest in a matter of major importance to the national welfare.

Congress: Please Do Not Increase Federal Gas Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, throughout the country, there is widespread opposition to the idea of increasing the Federal tax on gasoline as a means of helping to finance the highway program.

Among the many newspapers which have taken a stand on this matter is the Hopewell News, of Hopewell, Va., which is in my congressional district. The editor of this newspaper, Mr. A. Robbins, Jr., has engaged in considerable research on the subject and is contributing a great deal to the proper understanding of the issue involved.

On August 26, he wrote a fine editorial entitled "Congress: Please Do Not Increase Federal Gas Tax," which contains some enlightening facts and positive thinking on the subject. I would like to commend Mr. Robbins for his editorial and to commend it to the reading of the Members of the House.

The editorial follows:

CONGRESS: PLEASE DO NOT INCREASE FEDERAL GAS TAX

This newspaper has been opposed to any increase in the Federal gasoline tax to keep the interstate highway program going at the present rate.

The Federal gasoline tax is already 3 cents a gallon and here in Virginia the State tax is 6 cents a gallon, making a total of 9 cents on every gallon of gas we use.

We have said repeatedly that if there had to be any increase in the gasoline tax we would much rather see an increase in the State tax than in the Federal tax. These Federal interstate highways are fine, but they do not benefit us very much. We would rather see more money spent on the primary and secondary roads in Virginia.

When the Federal interstate highway program was set up by the Congress we commended the efforts of Senator BYRD, who led the fight to set up a separate highway fund for it. The Congress upped various taxes on motorists and directed that this money go into the highway fund.

RUNNING SHORT

Now it seems that this special highway fund is running short of money and that the interstate highway program will have to be sharply curtailed next year unless something is done.

This is mostly the fault of the Congress. Last year Congress stepped up the program and passed a law setting aside the trust fund agreement for one year. Thus the highway fund got extra money from the Treasury and helped to pile up the \$13 billion deficit for the past fiscal year.

Then when the Congress set up the special highway fund it did not set aside all the Federal taxes on automobiles, trucks, tires, gasoline, and accessories for that fund. Far from it. Billions of dollars of Federal taxes paid by motor vehicles still go into the Treasury general fund.

We call your attention to the article on this page today by George J. Marder, UPI Washington correspondent. This explains the compromise that is being hammered out. However, Mr. Marder said that about 90 percent of the program is paid by the Federal Government. Actually only 85 percent is paid by the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads. The Congress said that the Federal Government should pay 90 percent, but there are certain expenses that the Bureau of Public Roads refuses to pay, so the State share is about 15 percent instead of 10 percent. This has been a serious burden on the Virginia Highway Department.

NEVER TAKEN ON

It might not be so bad to up the Federal gasoline tax for 1 year if we could feel certain that the extra penny would come off at that time. But we have seen too many taxes imposed for limited periods, which never did come off. Congress just keeps extending them. So we are dead set against any increase in the Federal gasoline tax.

The compromise proposal was to place a larger share of the Federal excise tax on automobiles, parts and accessories into the special highway fund at the end of a year. Why not go ahead and do that right now? As far as we can see, it would not run the budget into the red, and if it would, then the thing for Congress to do is trim some more unnecessary spending from the budget.

One of the most interesting proposals was made by Senator GOAR, of Tennessee. He said to return all the motor vehicle taxes to the special highway fund, then to balance the budget cut one percent from all Federal spending, except fixed charges, such as interest, veterans pensions, etc. This would be more than enough to fill the coffers of the highway fund and balance the budget. In fact it would leave something next July to pay on our huge Federal debt.

But, please Congress, whatever you do, don't increase the Federal gas tax.

International Association of Personnel Women To Celebrate 10th Anniversary Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, in 1951, in Cincinnati, Ohio, a group of personnel executives met and founded the International Association of Personnel Women. During these past years, this

organization has grown and it now has local affiliates in most major cities in this country as well as members throughout the free world. These women have dedicated themselves to furthering better labor-management principles and to the advancement of modern personnel practices.

Next year, the International Association of Personnel Women will hold its 10th annual conference in New York City at the Statler-Hilton Hotel commencing on April 27 and continuing through April 30. I am very pleased that this event will be held at a site in my district and take this opportunity to welcome the officers and members of the International Association of Personnel Women and wish them success on the occasion of their 10th anniversary year.

One World: A Step Closer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on the 7th of August, this year, the city of Roseburg suffered tremendous damages when an explosion in the downtown business district gutted several blocks. The toll of lives may never be known exactly. The city manager of Roseburg, Mr. John Warburton, tells me that some 20 percent of the city's assessed valuation was destroyed.

I am glad to report that the citizens of Roseburg are making valiant efforts to overcome this terrible disaster. They are being helped by many people and groups. Today, I want to call to the attention of the House and others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a letter sent to the city fathers of Roseburg.

This letter came from Horst Mahncke, of Hamburg, Germany. Horst describes his reactions when he read of the disaster at Roseburg. He says, in part:

Dinner didn't taste so good any more after we heard this news.

His next step was to send some money to the city to help. He writes:

I have opened my piggy bank. Although not much was in it, I am sending it to the city of Roseburg and hope that many other people will do likewise. Many, many small coins add up to a lot.

I will insert the full text of his letter a bit later. Right now I want to say "thank you" to Horst Mahncke for extending this helping hand across the Atlantic Ocean and nearly across the North American Continent.

Radio station KRNH out in Roseburg has come up with a good idea. One coin sent by Horst is being auctioned to help boost the Roseburg Disaster Fund. I know bids would be welcomed.

The letter follows:

HAMBURG, August 8, 1959.

To the City Fathers of Roseburg.

GENTLEMEN: I have just returned from the beach where my friends and I have been

swimming. While eating dinner, father and mother read from the paper the report of the disaster at Roseburg where the dynamite-loaded truck exploded. Dinner didn't taste so good any more after we heard this news. We had to think about those poor people who suffered so much. It seems so terrible when something so unforeseen and unpredictable happens in people's lives. Have children been involved? Have children lost their parents? How sad it all is. America has always been the land of my dreams, especially the beautiful State of California with the good and beautiful fruit. I sure hope to see it sometime during my life. I sure hope the city will help those poor people who suffered in the disaster.

I have opened my piggy bank. Although not much was in it, I am sending it to the city of Roseburg and hope that many other people will do likewise. Many, many small coins add up to a lot.

Hoping that you will realize that this small amount has been given from my heart, I remain with best greetings from Hamburg, the city of the Old World at the other side of the ocean.

HORST MAHNCKE.

The picture is showing my mother, my sister Silvia, and myself. Please return the picture.

Enclosed: 2 deutsche marks (2 German marks—equal to about 50 cents).

A Time for Anger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address by Mr. Albert Whitehouse, director, industrial relations department, AFL-CIO. It was delivered on April 16, 1959, at the public relations seminar, Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration. The text follows:

A TIME FOR ANGER

(By Albert Whitehouse)

Not long ago, a prominent New Jersey racketeer committed suicide. He was blessed with a society wife and was known as the No. 1 man in lucrative rackets. Why he chose to hang himself may someday make an interesting research paper for some aspiring Ph. D.

Although he was a known racketeer, this man was reported to have connections with the high and the mighty of our world and to command their respect.

Among other things, the Jersey racketeer was reported to be the head of a \$100 million steel company. He still retained his control in the underworld but had graduated to the heights of American enterprise.

In years to come, some novelist intent on movie and TV rights will probably romanticize this man as "Scarface" has already been romanticized. In the national scheme of things, it appears to be success alone that counts, no matter how attained.

While the business community wasn't much put out about the suicide of our New Jersey racketeer neither was it at all squeamish about dealing with him while he was alive. After all, business is business and the so-called neutral market is said to have no ethical values.

The Wall Street Journal reported some time ago that the Justice Department is

planning a drive against the blue-chip bosses of the underworld. These are big financiers who operate out of fancy New York office suites and who, among other things, are middlemen bringing together the nether world and respected enterprise.

These are well-known facts in American life, but they hardly appear to get anybody excited, least of all the NAM, the chamber of commerce, or the heads of our big corporations.

In truth, respectable America seems to be unable to get mad at anything, even the Soviet leadership. There is, of course, one exception. Big business, the press, and our more reactionary Congressmen have whipped up a storm over organized labor. Our unions—clean or corrupt—have become the very convenient target for the ire of middle-brow and middle-class America.

When a racketeer operates within the framework of a business, he is simply a crook—not a business racketeer. Let the same man change his operations to a union and he becomes a labor racketeer while his activities are used to smear even the average union member.

Nobody has proposed to close up the banks because some midwestern banker recently swindled the depositors out of \$450,000 through an embezzlement scheme. Nor has anybody proposed to shut down industry because the New Jersey racketeer was also chairman of a big company.

The underworld's connections to legitimate enterprise are well known. Nobody has proposed to do anything about it and few seem even disturbed at the extent of organized crime in America. Revelations of organized crime seem to lead only to feeble efforts at law enforcement.

Crime in America is a cancer eating at the vitals of our society. Attorney General William Rogers has placed the cost of crime in 1958 at a staggering \$20 billion—more than we spend on schools, roads, or wage increases.

Bank president and bank clerks are equally involved in crime. Embezzlers in the high places are proportionately as common as petty thieves in the low. The excuses of the petty crook and the big time operator are about the same.

MADE IN THE MARKETPLACE

The social values of today's world are made in the marketplace. When the State of New York last year established a division of consumer frauds and protection, it was swamped with complaints.

Sales Management, a trade magazine, reported last year that the payoff is customary in American business and that, in one form or another, it has become an expected part of sales practices.

Last fall the Harvard Business Review carried an article by Dr. Theodore Levitt, prominent marketing and economic consultant who, among other things, is adviser to Standard Oil of Indiana.

Dr. Levitt's article was entitled "The Dangers of Social Responsibility." He declared that the worst thing that can happen is for the businessman to develop a sense of social responsibility for his product and his marketplace conduct.

The businessman, according to this industry spokesman, has no responsibility for his product nor is he answerable for consequences, just so long as he remains within the letter of the law. If he manufactures gimmicks that won't last, it's up to the buyer to beware. So far as Mr. Levitt is concerned, the businessman's sole responsibility is to see that the price is right and that the product sells.

"If what is offered can be sold at a profit (not necessarily a longrun profit), then it's legitimate. The cultural, spiritual, social, etc., consequences of his actions are none of the businessman's business," this oracle of the marketplace proclaimed.

Dr. Levitt's views are not the exception in American enterprise. They are justified by what is described as the "neutral" market—a bazaar with laws of its own making.

Far too often, the businessman addresses himself to the marketplace as if it were motivated by some force akin to the nether gods of Viking folklore. And like the Vikings of yesteryear, today's businessman seeks to propitiate his marketplace gods with incantation and sacrifice.

The myth of the neutral market is as hollow as the outlook of those who proclaim it. The very same persons who proclaim the neutrality of the market are first to seek to corrupt society with hidden persuaders intended to make fools of all of us.

The February 1959 issue of *Dun's Review* carries another indictment of today's business morality. Here, business is damned unknowingly by one of its more ardent wooers, Mr. Martin Mayer of "Madison Avenue, U.S.A."

Mr. Mayer places a stamp of approval upon style obsolescence in durable consumer goods—urging substitution of empty style change for true improvement in the product.

Mr. Mayer has also declared that planned obsolescence of goods through premeditated materials failure is good business practice. In plain language, the market is to be loaded down with junk if that's the best way to assure sales at prices that industry seeks to exact.

This author asks that subjective judgments be set aside in considering the issue.

"It is clear," he pontificated, "that a pattern of successful style obsolescence must eventually be reinforced by a decrease in the durability of the product."

America's resources aren't endless and trouble lies ahead if they are expended on such swindles as planned obsolescence. Quite apart from even this consideration, planned obsolescence imposes enormous hidden costs upon the consumer and robs him of higher living standards.

I have heard charges of featherbedding against organized labor until I'm weary. To listen to the righteous fathers of the NAM, our workers are loafers and our union members want triple pay for standing around.

By comparison, industry featherbedding is monstrous. What's worse, society justifies and accepts it. The cost of phony style obsolescence and planned materials obsolescence adds billions to the bills of our consuming public. Honest investigation will show that this has more to do with rising price levels than any wage increases.

We have accepted the morality and success standards of the marketplace and they color our every action. Recently on TV, Groucho Marx facetiously asked a young co-ed of obviously good home about the kind of man she wanted to marry. Her choice was a stereotype—good looking, good clothes, and good income. Integrity and decency apparently had little or nothing to do with the case. Youth's sole rebellion in these days of prosperity appears to be in the direction of juvenile delinquency. In view of our elders' values, who can blame the juveniles?

How can industry expect its employees to bleed for it, if it treats the public like so many suckers? The corporation board that winks at stock deals, yachts, hunting lodges, expense account living, and highjinks for its executives shouldn't be horrified at pilferage among the rank and file.

In the twenties, Texas Guinan, the show-girl, had a word for it, "Hi, Sucker." Today, the idea that only suckers really work is imbedded in our society. Why should the average employee overexert himself, after all, if he's to be considered a square?

AMERICA'S DOUBLE STANDARD

There's a double standard in America—one for the boss and one for the worker;

one for labor and one for everybody else. Organized labor has become a whipping boy for our every ill. No longer does there seem to be hard thinking about ourselves or our institutions—even within our universities.

Such is the state of affairs that when organized labor erects a modern structure to house its staffs, there is a lifting of eyebrows. But nobody even blinked when the National Geographic Society announced recently that it was junking its impressive marble halls in favor of a multimillion dollar structure of modern design.

Some time ago, I was at a gathering of polite people in an upper middle income suburb. The locale could have been outside of any large city in the United States of America. The group was all professional, of middle age and upward—doctors, lawyers, government careerists, and their wives.

To hear these good people, organized labor is to blame for virtually everything from the Berlin crisis to nationalist outbursts in Nyasaland. What bothered me most was that all the disagreement was virtually as polite as the agreement. Nobody got angry; nobody had a point of view truly worth fighting about.

These professionals seem to have forgotten the past, although some suffered in the depression and others had been caught up in yesteryear's war tides.

A strange myopia afflicted the crowd, or so it seemed to me. The doctors were remarkably unconcerned over the kind of closed shop enforced by the American Medical Association. The rising costs of medical care, the pushing up by doctors of their fees, or other unsavory aspects of organized medicine. The lawyers were equally unconcerned about the activities of the American Bar Association, even the recent ABA attack upon the Supreme Court because it had upheld traditional civil liberties.

Organized labor is not holy or beyond reproach. In some cases, unions have been entrapped by the same corruptions that have afflicted other organizations and groups. Of course, action must be taken to root out this corruption. Labor itself recognizes the dangers better than any other group within our society and it is doing something about it.

I think I can say in all honesty that labor is almost alone in its lack of smugness toward this and other major problems of our day. I don't mean either that our halo's on too tight. Nor do I mean that some among us haven't grown smug and self-satisfied.

But organized labor is one of the last places where a nonconformist can still hold a job. It is one of the few groups which has refused to stand by while freedom is traded away in the name of some imagined security. Had it not been for labor's protests, the Defense Department's security program might have degenerated into a nightmare, especially in the day of McCarthy.

Where else in America, other than in the labor movement, are the ethics of the marketplace subjected even to critical appraisal? Who, in America, other than labor, now speaks up for the underdog?

Who else in America dares even remind big enterprise that the primary purpose of production is a better life, not better profits?

Like every other organization subjected to the erosions of time, organized labor has been affected by institutionalism. The fighting idealism of yesterday has been lost in some cases. But the institutional drives remain and these are drives that are good for America because they compel the union to represent the interests of the average man. Despite the press, these are not just mouthings. Our fight for a better minimum wage is real, so is our fight for better housing and so is our struggle for racial equality.

Much of organized labor's idealism remains. If you don't think so, go to a local

union meeting where unpaid officers administer the affairs of struggling organizations far removed from the power politics of Washington. Or go on the job where stewards—average Joes and Janes—take up the cudgels for their fellows as an accepted part of their unpaid assignments.

Come south along with me. Here, the struggle for organization goes on in the face of terrible odds. Here, organizers are still beaten up and run out of town, as happened only recently to a Textile Workers Union organizer and one from the Hosiery Workers.

Despite the odds, men still go back into the Southland with the union message. These men who work for struggling unions could get jobs elsewhere. They return after defeat because they know that only the union can answer the problems of the exploited worker. Call this misplaced idealism in an age of cynicism, if you will. But thank God, as well, that there still is some small share of it in the land.

If, by big labor, you mean big unions, then there is big labor in America. But just remember that when a strike takes place, it is individual working people who rally to their organizations. The biggest union in the world couldn't make its strike instructions stick if workers weren't convinced that without the union they would be nothing.

Contrary to the popular view, most of our unions are anything but big. Many are still struggling for bargaining rights in unequal battles with employers. And while strikes are won, they also are lost. Yet the battle goes on, and it will continue as long as labor must fight the morality and the values of the marketplace.

SOMETHING IS MISSING

Something seems to have gone out of American life. It's a sense of sympathy for one's fellow man, a sense of integrity, an understanding of the other fellow's right to human dignity.

There was a day when the picket line of underpaid textile workers commanded sympathy. There was a time when the plight of the farm worker was of national concern. There was a day even when the Nation cared about its poor, and that wasn't so long ago.

The latest figures show that millions of workers remain unemployed, and the projections show that joblessness will remain high. Congress doesn't seem to care, and the President appears perfectly willing to sacrifice the welfare of the jobless to budget balancing and economy.

Like the weather, a measure of unemployment now seems to be taken for granted. A few years ago the rate was 4 percent. Now 6 percent of our manpower willing and able to work is jobless, and only labor really seems to give a tinker's dam.

A few years back labor was informed that the key to jobs and prosperity is high productivity. In the abstract, that's absolutely correct. Labor responded with a will and produced more than ever.

When automation came along, we raised no objection. Some of us wondered what the social consequences might be, but the experts pooch-pooched our fears and told us that automation would create more jobs than it would destroy. What's more, we were promised that these would be highly skilled jobs that would pay better.

We are also told that service and white-collar employment opportunities would expand and that there would be plenty of new jobs in these areas. Every man, it seemed, would be free of drudgery and, what's more, the new technology would automatically bring about shorter hours.

A few who doubted cited the case of the farmer who then, as now, was being overwhelmed by his own productivity. We agreed that there ought to be more production and higher productivity. All we asked

was assurance that this be transformed into prosperity for everybody.

Automation, we were told, would bring about a brave new world in which all our social and economic problems would be solved with the precision of an electronic computer. All we had to do, the experts said, was leave it to the corporations and to nature.

Nature's way, it appears, hasn't been good enough. Today, fewer manufacturing workers are turning out about 50 percent more goods than a decade ago.

Where are those jobs in the service trades? Where are the white collar jobs? And where, for that matter, are all those skilled jobs?

The same process that has cut down jobs in manufacturing is cutting down job opportunity in the service trades and in white collar. If this is the age of the atom and of automation, it is also the age of the computer. The same computer that has made possible the robot factory is also making possible office, warehouse and store automation.

In the steel industry, some 100,000 jobs are gone forever. In autos, the situation is even worse. Year after year, more and more farmers are tracted off the land. Year by year, the workforce grows as the war babies of the forties enter the job market.

By 1965, over 1,250,000 new workers will enter the job market annually. At this time, the Nation will have a workforce of 78 million. Even if gross output expands at a rate higher than today, the mid-sixties will be a time of high joblessness.

THOSE ROSY PROMISES

What happened to the rosy promises of yesterday?

What kind of future can we offer today's unemployed and tomorrow's eager youth?

Who cares? Certainly not our corporate employers. And, this administration appears to care even less. I wish I could say that the leadership of the Democratic Party truly cares but even they don't seem much concerned. Certainly, Congress has yet to come forward with a program that will put the Nation back to work.

This is the great immorality of today—an immorality worse by far than the hand in the till. Nobody seems to care very much any more—nobody but organized labor and the jobless.

Today, in Clearfield County, Pa., in Hightop, W. Va., in Washington, D.C., and in other cities and counties in most of our industrial States, children and their elders are eating mollygrub.

"What's mollygrub?" you may ask.

It's a diet of Federal surplus foods. Millions in this country are dependent in some measure on this diet.

In Washington, D.C., a family of one to five persons dependent on public assistance or living in abject poverty is eligible for one unit of mollygrub. That unit consisted, some time ago, of a monthly allotment of 10 pounds of flour, 5 pounds of cornmeal, 5 pounds of cheddar cheese, 5 pounds of rice, and 4½ pounds of powdered milk. The total value of this package has been estimated at \$6.

Some 7,000 children in the Washington, D.C., public schools are hungry each day and so far there has been only talk of feeding them, since our National Congress hasn't seen fit to appropriate extra funds for their lunches. A Washington, D.C., newspaper recently ran a series on poverty in our Nation's Capital. It found that 31,000 families—over 100,000 men, women, and children—live in dire want.

Side by side with hunger at home and with even worse hunger abroad are whole warehouses full of surplus food. Year by year we stockpile this food as a monument to the folly of our marketplace morality.

As the idle miners of Hightop, W. Va., eat their sparse surplus food diet of dried milk

and rice, the Government warehouses are bursting with wheat, corn, butter, eggs, dried fruits, peanut butter, dried meats, and almost every other variety of food.

By next July the United States will have invested \$9 billion in surplus foods. Under the flexible farm support program of Ezra Taft Benson the surplus grows year by year. Flexible supports meant more intensive cultivation of the land last year and another 300 million bushels of wheat were surplus. This year there will be a bumper corn crop, which should mean meat in plenty even for the jobless.

The peoples of the entire world know about our farm glut. If they become anti-American, this food surplus that they cannot touch may have something to do with it. The reasons will have much more to do with hunger than procommunism.

Because we are fools, we have geared our food surplus program to the market. Today, the food cannot be passed out to those in need even at home unless this will stabilize prices. The chase for higher farm prices, like the chase for the hard dollar, is the excuse for denying food to the hungry.

That's the law, and the law, after all, must be respected even though it makes jackasses of us. The thought that the law might be changed so that the hungry might be fed seems to send shivers down the spines of respectable businessmen who look upon this as the backdoor to socialism.

This year, \$4 billion are being spent for price supports to carry out "Uncle" Ezra Benson's flexible farm price policy. Another billion will be required simply to pay storage costs for our mountain of surplus foods.

If just the amount of money now going to pay for storage were spent to feed the hungry of America, a big dent would be made in food surpluses. This would do more to stabilize prices than any support program since the expenditure would permanently remove millions of pounds of food from the market. This could be done without entering into competition with our usual food distribution outlets.

Senator WAYNE MORSE recently charged that "we do a better job of feeding our livestock" than we do in feeding our hungry children. The Oregon lawmaker pointed out that "when cattle starve, half the U.S. Air Force flies hay to them."

The surplus food program is financed by 30 percent of the receipts of all customs received by the United States under terms of a law enacted in 1935. Last year, the Department of Agriculture could have spent \$220 million for this purpose and could also have dipped into \$300 million of unobligated balances carried forward from previous years.

Such was the state of morality in the recession year of 1958 that Secretary Benson turned back unspent to the Federal Treasury \$33.5 million which will be forever lost for this purpose.

This money was deliberately withheld from the poorest and weakest of our society. When Benson turned it back to the Treasury, he virtually took food from the mouths of hungry babies.

This is the same man who, in the name of economic good sense and marketplace morality, ran up the agricultural budget to \$7 billion.

The crime of Benson is far more serious than that of the New Jersey racketeer I mentioned at the start of this talk. Benson, however, acted within the framework of law and in the name of morality.

Even as Benson turned back his surplus funds, a local union president from the Textile Workers Union had this to say in testimony before the Congress:

"We have read in the papers that the (Agriculture) Department does have funds to buy more surplus commodities. If this is

the case, it is a national scandal that hungry children, to say nothing of their parents, in communities like ours are not receiving sufficient nourishing and palatable foods to meet their urgent needs."

Here is an indictment that speaks for itself. Ask yourselves who are the guilty in our society and answers the question honestly. The answer is hardly pleasant.

OUR ADVANCED CIVILIZATION

Yes, ours is an age of advanced civilization and one of advanced technology. We cower in the shadow of the H-bomb and despite big talk, we refuse even to meet our responsibilities in harnessing the energy of the atom for peaceful purposes.

A major problem for the industrial workers of the new age will be protection from the killing effects of radiation. Great new problems are appearing in this area—problems both of adequate safety and of compensation to those injured on the job.

Recently, industry spokesmen appeared before a joint Congress committee to state their views. The head of a big insurance company urged no Federal action to set safety standards until the States prove that they will not or cannot do the job. How many must die or suffer the pangs of radiation sickness before industry is convinced of the need for uniform safety and compensation standards?

Here, too, the same old arguments of statism and cost were raised by industry on the same old basis as in yesterday's world. So callous were industry spokesmen that Representative CHET HOLIFIELD finally declared: "You are talking about a material that throws rays through 5 feet of concrete and kills people."

This is the morality of our day. It is a morality that permits the \$150,000-a-year executive to cut himself into a stock melon while condemning a 20-cents-an-hour, union-won wage increase as inflationary. A recent report of the State of New York showed that there are now 45 persons in that State alone with incomes of over a million a year. The wealthy are very much still with us and they probably get a big bang out of seeing labor blamed for so many of today's ills.

Labor is blamed today for the results of the administered prices of big business—for an inflation that has its roots in a business policy geared to maximum unit profits instead of maximum production. Labor has become the whipping boy for the outlandish profits of our monopolistic corporations. To blame the factory worker with his average wage of \$87 weekly for inflation is nonsense. This worker is the victim of inflation, not its cause.

It is strange that we hear little today about the mad speculation in Wall Street, and its effects upon inflation, but then the profits made there don't go to working people. Today's land speculation is fantastic, but the speculators don't work in auto or steel plants and they aren't unemployed, so their profits must be perfectly kosher.

Nor has anybody even talked about the growth of a technical and middle management bureaucracy that fattens on itself and adds significantly to costs. In these days of upper-middle-income suburbia, it just wouldn't do to talk about these cracks in management's picture window.

Hundreds of thousands of displaced workers stand as a monument to today's productivity and this productivity unemployment is the best answer to those who lay featherbedding, high wages, and inflation at labor's door. The plain fact is that unit labor costs in key industry haven't gone up significantly and that management has recouped wage increases through the rise of output per man-hour. What we need is ever wider markets for goods, not stagnant wage levels.

It is time for a stocktaking in America and for ending senseless stockpiling. It is time to take up the cudgels against the pres-

ent dead level of conformity and for plain old-fashioned decency. The American people need once more to understand that righteous wrath is not only permissible but desirable. America needs, above all, fewer pitchmen and more angry men. We need, possibly, fewer whitewashing detergents and more soap-boxes.

Small Business Investment Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of Small Business, published by the National Small Business Men's Association, carried an article in which this organization recommended legislation which would, through tax benefits and greater flexibility, enhance and speed up the organization of small business investment companies.

The suggestions incorporated in this article are of interest to those concerned with the welfare of small business. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit this article for the benefit of the Members of Congress and others:

NSBMA URGES NEW TAX BENEFITS TO SPEED INVESTMENT COMPANIES

Greater tax benefits * * * and increased fiscal flexibility. This was the gist of NSBMA recommendations to beef up the Small Business Investment Act.

And in presenting his testimony to the House Select Committee on Small Business, President Harry E. Brinkman was hopeful that the act might yet provide a needed flow of private capital for small business starts and expansion.

The Investment Act last year was a key measure as Congress tossed out a legislative lifeline to small business. Through it, a nationwide web of private investment companies was to be established. And they were to provide the sorely needed long-term debt and equity capital which is a major problem of most small firms.

But the rush to form investment companies has not been forthcoming. At present, less than 20 have been licensed. And the main deterrent seems to be that of the act's tax benefits which some critics have labeled "confusing" and "downright misleading."

With this in mind, NSBMA's testimony recommended:

1. That investment companies be allowed to establish a reserve for losses of up to 20 percent of their assets—and that this be tax deductible;

2. That dividends paid on preferred and common stock of such companies be deductible from earnings before taxes are computed;

3. That dividends paid on preferred and common stock issued by investment companies be tax free to the recipient, up to \$5,000;

4. That investment companies be given greater flexibility by allowing them to purchase preferred and common stock, or any other equity interest that may be authorized by the Small Business Administration which supervises and licenses companies formed under the act.

Three main tax benefits were included in the original 1958 law. Through them:

1. Dividends an investment company receives from the stock of a small business are exempt from the corporate income tax;

2. Investors in the stock of an investment company who incur a loss on that stock may take an ordinary loss deduction—rather than a less advantageous capital loss deduction;

3. Investment companies which have a loss on an investment in a small business may take an ordinary loss deduction rather than a capital loss.

One other major "gripe" with the act's requirements is that of requiring a small business to "share" its ownership with the investment company making it a loan.

Most necessary amendments to the act already are incorporated in bills to be considered by both Senate and House this year.

From what we can learn, the consensus on Capitol Hill points toward passage of remedial legislation this session.

A Solution Needed for Food Surplus Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as this session of the 86th Congress draws to a close, there are some tough problems that have not been solved. Among the unsolved problems is the farm program. For many years, Federal legislation has only complicated and worsened the situation in relating supply with demand in the farm program. The extent of this imbalance because of Federal tampering might well be assayed by checking reaction to the following article which outlines a discovery of "Way Found To Grow Winter Grains in Tropics in Third of Normal Time." How welcome will be additional grain production when present surpluses bulge our warehouses?

A solution sooner or later to the farm mess must be found. If Congress will not provide the leadership, the people may well force Congress to take action by supporting the administration's request for a new and corrective farm program. After all the people forced a labor reform bill through the House.

The article follows:

NEW SOURCE OF FOOD FOR MILLIONS—WAY FOUND TO GROW WINTER GRAINS IN TROPICS IN THIRD OF NORMAL TIME

PASADENA, CALIF., August 30.—A way of growing winter grains in the winterless Tropics—and thus opening a new source of food for millions—was disclosed today by the California Institute of Technology.

For the first time, the institute said, winter rye plants have been made to produce grains without the benefit of winter and in a third of the normal time.

There is evidence the same thing can be done with barley, wheat, and other winter grains, the school said.

"Generally if you find something that changes the growth habits of one member of a family of plants it will work for the whole family," said Harry R. Highkin, research fellow in biology at the institute.

An announcement by the institute said Highkin and two associates made the rye

produce grain in 2½ months. The usual period is 8 months, including a winter cold spell of 6 to 8 weeks.

"The method is simple and practical commercially," Highkin said.

The scientists used a spray of gibberellin, a hormone that plants secrete to induce stem growth, on rye plants grown in a constant hothouse temperature of 62 degrees.

Highkin waited until the plants had 10 leaves and were about a month old. Spraying at this time caused the plants to grow rapidly and produce grain within another month and a half.

Highkin believes two things happen to grains normally during winter, and that spraying them with gibberellin eliminates these phases and speeds up seed production.

One is the secretion or accumulation of some substance so that gibberellin can be formed in the plant's growing tip at the end of the cold period. The other is the formation of additional hormones, called florigens, which scientists believe the plant secretes to produce grain.

Unworkable Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an editorial by Mr. Robert Ingalls in the Corvallis (Oreg.) Gazette Times of August 17, 1959, on the farm support program:

UNWORKABLE PRICE SUPPORTS

Unsound, unworkable Government price supports are threatening to put the Nation's farmers in the public opinion "doghouse," says Charlie Shuman, a Sullivan, Ill., grain and livestock farmer. And Shuman is also president of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

At a meeting of women's editors in a Chicago hotel recently, the gentleman farmer from downstate Illinois declared that farmers resent "being made the goat of a series of unworkable Government farm programs." Then he pointed out that farmers have often insisted on these programs being changed but the Congress has not as yet taken effective action.

It's difficult to understand the line of reasoning of our Senators and Representatives in this case. If the price-support program is so distasteful to the majority of our agriculturists why doesn't the lawmaker choose to go along with his constituents back in the hustings?

Pointing to the unsound, unworkable farm programs, Shuman says he does not subscribe to the idea that it is good public relations to apply the whitewash, use high-pressure propaganda or resort to sweeping dirt under the rug. "These programs have been bad and we know it," he exclaimed.

Farm Bureau's objective, as we know it, is to create conditions under which farmers can earn and get a high per family real income in a manner which will preserve freedom and eliminate Government regulation of individual farming operations. The current farm program doesn't further that objective.

We've often wondered whether the individual farmer is sick of the setup that Ezra Taft Benson himself lambasts as occasion presents itself.

Shuman says that today's burdensome farm surpluses are symptoms of a sick farm program which has infected agriculture with the disease of Federal aid and control that is spreading to other American walks of life.

We marvel that the taxpayers, ever on guard against increasing levies for educational purposes, have not awakened to the fact that Federal contribution to our schools is gradually encroaching where it should not to the detriment of local interest in schools. We're so everlastingly beset with Federal aid that we aren't able to stand alone without it, not only in our school system but in many other systems that used to function on their own initiative.

There's a sinisterism we fear in the hands of the Government insists on providing and the condition the farmer finds himself in now as regards the subsidized Federal program. It's something like dad setting son up housekeeping and then telling him to go right ahead on his own. Dad, instead of leaving the son with full responsibility, every so often slips him a check gratis and thereby weakens the son's family headship.

Incident to beliefs in some quarters in and out of farm circles which would defend excessive Government farm expenditures on the grounds that many other groups in our economy are subsidized, Shuman pointed out that the farmers are not out for revenge. Their primary purpose is, rather, to serve the best interests of farmers, and Government subsidies cannot do this.

If the Government insists on slowing farm production, on telling the farmer how much he can and can't grow, on furthering dictatorial subsidizing, we'll soon have an agricultural power potential group on a dole.

Food in the United States is the best buy in the world, Shuman told the women at the Chicago hotel session. He was continuing to sing the praises of the tremendous production strides made by agriculture under the nonsubsidized program they themselves instituted when horse and mule farming was being discarded in favor of power farming and highly sensitized, utilized, and fertilized truck farming.

Today a factory worker can buy a month's supply of food for his family—an average size household—for 40 hours of work in contrast to 51 hours of work necessary 7 years ago to purchase that much.

Given proper Government supervision and encouragement without dictatorial coddling, and American agriculture can produce under an economic program of supply and demand a most satisfactory form of existence on the farm, in the home of the factory worker, or the millions in neither group whom we classify as white-collared workers.

Golden Remembrancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a tribute to the founders of California written by Mr. John C. Crowe:

GOLDEN REMEMBRANCER

Let's roll out the golden carpet. On September 9, 1959, California will be 109 years old as a State in the American Union.

This writer is a grandson of California pioneer parents who sailed into the Golden Gate during the gold rush—Mary Ann and

Caleb Coakley. Their first child, Mary Ann Coakley (this writer's mother) was born at Stockton, in March 1853. I heard from their lips the glorious story of the sacrifices and hardships that the pioneers endured to reach and establish the State of California. In 1849 our Nation was composed of 30 States—15 of which legalized human slavery, while the other 15 did not. The scales on human slavery were evenly balanced until the 100,000 daring young men who founded the State of California threw their weight into the scales forever against slavery. Because of their bold and forthright stand, California met with fierce opposition in her request for statehood.

But the 100,000 daring young men of 1849 who had actually bet their lives to reach this golden State, had the moral stamina to meet and overcome the opposition and won statehood for California on September 9, 1850—giving star 31 to our Nation's flag—and, forever, setting the American pitch against human slavery.

JOHN C. CROWE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Conservation and Management of Migratory Marine Fish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a serious problem regarding the conservation and management of migratory marine fish has been brought to my attention. At my request, the Department of the Interior has informed me of the phenomenal growth of recreational salt water fishing in recent years, which growth has created many problems in the field of management and its relationship to commercial fishing.

During the year 1955, 4½ million sportsmen participated in this popular sport for a total of 59 million days and spending \$489 million.

I have been advised that the annual sport harvest may now approximate a half-billion pounds of fish and may double in the next decade.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that future study and consideration be given to authorizing a comprehensive and continuing study of migratory marine fish of interest to recreational fishermen of the United States.

The purpose of such a study would be to develop wise conservation policies and constructive management activities.

It is my belief that a cooperative program of research between the States involved and the Federal Government would be a logical approach to the problem. The Federal Government could supply funds in equal proportion to those supplied by the States for this purpose, limited to 50 percent of the cost of the program. I would recommend that not more than \$100,000 be made available, on a 50-50 matching basis, with any one State in any one year.

Federal funds employed on a joint Federal-State level have in the past

proven to create greater State financial participation and interest in planning research programs of this nature.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that in the next Congress we may establish a continuing research program for the conservation and improved management of migratory marine fish in the United States and contiguous waters.

For the purpose of studying this problem, I am introducing H.R. 8968. I welcome any and all comments from interested conservation and sportsmen's agencies on this proposed new program.

How Can We Stop the Communist Drive in Laos?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last week I brought to the attention of Members of the House the critical situation which has been created in the far-away country of Laos with the initiation there of a new Communist attack designed to take over another key sector of southeast Asia. I expressed my own view that, though it was important that we give assistance in terms of money and weapons to the people of Laos defending themselves against one more act of Communist penetration, I was fearful that this type of assistance might not be enough and I suggested that we must also be prepared to send our own forces, including a detachment of marines and a U.S. Navy carrier, to this troubled part of the world to demonstrate our determination, just as we demonstrated it at Lebanon, not to permit the Communists to upset further the balance of power in any part of the world.

Of course, this suggestion raised some serious questions. But by the same token the fact of Communist aggression, the difficulty of dealing with it effectively, and the natural hesitancy on the part of Americans to commit themselves promptly in this kind of a situation have also raised some serious questions. Yesterday, August 30, there appeared in the New York Times a thoughtful editorial which I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of the House. I thoroughly endorse its statement that, in order to protect ourselves against Communist aggression we must "recognize a grave menace when it appears, and not shrug it off lightly because it happens to be on the other side of the world." The editorial follows:

LESSONS FROM LAOS

The situation in Laos is proving, once more, that the free world has given inadequate attention to its means of defense against the Communist conspiracy. Communist raiding parties have now struck within 16 miles of the capital. At least three areas in the northern part of the country are already under Communist control or in

a state of chaos. The survival of free government in this newly independent kingdom is at stake.

Laos is a member of the United Nations, but the Secretary General admits that he is powerless. He cannot even send in observers unless they are requested by both sides in the controversy and naturally the last thing in the world that the Communists want is observation. The United Nations cannot take any forceful and immediate action without the authority of the Security Council where the Communist veto is expected, automatically.

The United States, acting independently, has announced its intention to airlift some small arms and ammunition to the tiny Laotian Army. It may be possible to bring its effectives up from 25,000 to 29,000 men, to withstand the assault of North Vietnam and Red China, whose manpower and firepower are not under such modest limitations.

Even that little bit of help is joyfully welcomed by the free Laotians as a symbol of the fact that at least someone, somewhere in the world, is concerned over their survival. And naturally it has drawn a prompt and bitter denunciation from the Communists in North Vietnam on the ground that "U.S. imperialists are seeking to expand the civil war in Laos into a real shooting war." This is no time for humor, but one may be forgiven a wry smile at the concern of foreign Communist North Vietnam over a civil war in Laos.

What all this demonstrates is that we have not yet developed any effective techniques for meeting the by now well-known Communist tactics. We don't want a big war and the Communists know it. So they can keep up this unrelenting process of hacking away at human liberties, knowing that the United Nations is powerless and that most members wish to keep the peace.

Some changes in the mechanism of keeping the peace and preserving human liberties are obviously needed. Perhaps the first change that is required is in our own thinking so that we can recognize a grave menace when it appears, and not shrug it off lightly because it happens to be on the other side of the world.

Soldier of God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Presbyterian Life magazine of September 1, 1959:

SOLDIER OF GOD

(By James W. Hoffman)

(On the battlefield, in prison camp, in the corridors of the Pentagon, Chaplain John K. Borneman's job has always been the same—to be a pastor to the men and women of the armed services.)

In Australia in 1942, a U.S. Army chaplain fresh from the States was talking with a young airman who had been through the battles of Pearl Harbor, Bataan, and Corregidor.

"Those chaplains sure did a job," the pilot said. "Know what one of them did? Let me see, what was his name? Borneman—that's it—John Borneman. It was just before Christmas, and we were all wanting to get messages home, and plenty bad.

He knows it, so he goes around asking us if we want to send a telegram to the folks at home. Boy oh boy, is he a mind reader—so he collects our messages and makes the trip back to Manila, and it's plenty dangerous, too. But he gets the messages through—and comes back to get more."

"What do you suppose," the chaplain asked, "has happened to him?"

"Probably captured by the Japs."

The pilot was right. Jonathan Wainwright, in his book, "General Wainwright's Story," tells about watching the Death March of Bataan winding by the hotel in which he was being held prisoner by the enemy.

"Among the marchers, with his chin in the air, was Chaplain John K. Borneman, a valiant soldier of God and the United States."

Chaplain Borneman was one of the survivors of that 186-mile tramp in the broiling sun. He has survived many other ordeals as well, including battles on land and in the air, a train wreck, an airplane crash, and 2½ years in a Japanese concentration camp.

Retired from the Army in 1950 because of wounds received in action, Chaplain Borneman is now executive secretary of the Department of Chaplains and Service Personnel of the United Presbyterian Church, which serves 205 Presbyterian chaplains and around 75,000 laymen in the Armed Forces.

He began his military career during World War I, as a fighter pilot with the 72d Pursuit Group. Although those were the days of canvas-covered biplanes, when guns jammed and motors died with no apparent reason, Lieutenant Borneman came through the war without a scratch.

After demobilization John Borneman returned to Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa. Here he took all the courses in science he could fit into his schedule, as he planned to become a doctor. Since childhood he had been torn between two vocations, medicine and the ministry. For generations the men in his family had been doctors or dentists; how the notion of entering the ministry first came to him, he doesn't remember.

DISILLUSIONMENT ABOUT MINISTRY

He made his decision to study medicine after knowing several ministers who didn't seem to be doing much of a job. This disillusionment was almost offset, he says, by remembering an Army chaplain he had known in World War I—"a wonderful fellow, a Lutheran named, believe it or not, MacIntosh."

While he was in college, Borneman met other ministers who impressed him favorably, and his resolve to follow medicine wavered. Finally, in his junior year, he attended a student conference on vocations at which several clergymen spoke persuasively of the demands and opportunities of their work. The scales tipped, and John Borneman revised his academic plans to point himself toward the ministry.

He studied at the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church, and took graduate work at the Universities of Pennsylvania and of Buffalo, N.Y. In 1925 he became pastor of Bacon Memorial Presbyterian Church, Niagara Falls, N.Y. He married the former Elizabeth Goos, of Lancaster, Pa., the following year.

The Niagara Falls church was strategically located for giving young Borneman a nudge toward his destined career. Nearby was the Army's Fort Niagara. "The military," Borneman explains, "either gets in a man's blood or it doesn't. If it does, he can never get away from it for long." Pastor Borneman began hanging around Fort Niagara, and presently found himself, for all practical purposes, as much a chaplain as parish minister.

In 1929 he entered the Army Chaplain Corps, and through the following 10 years served many installations in the United

States. The chaplaincy, he felt strongly, offered a chance to minister to men who were all too often neglected by the churches and their people in settled congregations. As he has said many times since, "It is not surprising when servicemen forget their obligations to God, if the church has first forgotten its obligations to them."

When the United States entered World War II, Chaplain Borneman had already been in the Philippines for 2 years. He was the first American chaplain to be wounded in action, receiving a hail of bomb fragments in his legs just 22 days after Pearl Harbor. Less than 3 months later he earned his second Purple Heart when a shell fragment lodged in his head. When a grenade exploded in front of him less than 2 months after that, gashing his chest and abdomen, Chaplain Borneman was hospitalized for the third time in less than 6 months of war.

AMERICANS CAPTURED

Two hours after Borneman was taken to the hospital, the American forces surrendered to the Japanese. Sixteen days later he was taken from the hospital—"The Japs made us well by order"—and forced to join the death march. Fifteen thousand Americans and fifty thousand Filipinos made up that wretched parade, a wholly unnecessary cruelty, for ample motor and rail transportation was available to the conquerors.

John Borneman was then 43 years of age. For the next 2½ years he was a prisoner at infamous Camp No. 1, at Cabanatuan.

In the Japanese military philosophy, an officer is responsible for everything done by anyone in his command; for this reason the officers at Camp No. 1 endured the most frequent and most brutal punishments. Chaplain Borneman was forced to witness the murder, after 24-hour beatings, of 12 line officers. The chaplains—all officers, of course—made themselves special targets of their captors' wrath by their boldness in demanding better conditions for the prisoners and by holding religious services without permission. Malnutrition and disease killed even more of the Americans than did the direct action of their jailers. Of the 33 chaplains imprisoned, only 15 lived to be rescued.

Chaplain (Major) Borneman, second in command among the chaplains at the time of their capture, became supervisor of religious activities after Chaplain (Colonel) Alfred Oliver, a Methodist, had his neck broken during a beating and remained too ill to continue his work. For his unyielding efforts to keep the truths of religion alive in the prisoners' hearts, Chaplain Borneman was beaten many times. On one occasion all the teeth in his upper jaw were kicked out; on another, his arm was broken.

During his 30 months' imprisonment Chaplain Borneman contracted dysentery and beriberi; he is still troubled by periodic returns of these diseases, and will never be completely cured, physicians say. Naturally a rugged stockily built man, he weighed only 95 pounds when rescued.

To the prisoners, the camp authorities' policy on religious work seemed vacillating and inconsistent. After originally forbidding worship services, the Japanese rescinded this ruling, but required that sermons be submitted to headquarters for approval. As paper was scarce and wildly expensive, the chaplains used can labels and other scraps for writing their sermons.

Graveside services for the dead were forbidden; the chaplains circumvented this prohibition by stealing into the morgue and holding services—for as many as 75 men in 1 day—over the bodies before the burial party would arrive. Of the 5,700 prisoners in Camp No. 1, 2,666 died.

Not one of the chaplains in Camp No. 1, Protestant, Roman Catholic, or Jewish, ever shirked an opportunity to serve the prisoners, even though the penalty for doing their

proper work was frequently beating and torture.

Bible classes were forbidden, but were conducted by the chaplains secretly in a drainage ditch where the prisoners were laboring. Guards were posted to give warning of the approach of a Japanese. Usually instruction could go forward only a few minutes at a time, then be interrupted until the coast was clear.

In the second year of imprisonment, chaplains and laymen of eight denominations organized the Protestant Christian Church of Military Prison Camp No. 1 of the Philippine Islands. This congregation was strongly evangelistic; more than 250 men were baptized into the Christian faith. The membership of 1,600 included men from every State in the Union and 17 other nations.

The church held night classes in such subjects as the life of Christ, philosophy of the Christian religion, the life of the apostle Paul, and Christian ethics. Borneman was teacher of the course in Old Testament history. For a period of over a year the classes had no electric light; laymen cut bottles in half, made a wick of cloth, and floated it on coconut oil. This homemade lamp enabled the teacher to see his notes, but the students sat in darkness. In spite of this handicap, classes were well attended; several hundred men in each course was normal enrollment.

Clark Lee, a war correspondent who survived to report his experiences, wrote of Chaplain Borneman that "his parents and teachers must have forgotten to teach him the word 'fear'."

"We had to act as though we weren't afraid," Borneman explains. "The only way to get anywhere at all with the Japs was to talk up—and back—to them. If they sensed that a man feared what they could do to him, he hadn't a chance."

Only his faith in God, Borneman says, enabled him to keep going during those years. He remembers two hymns especially that he kept going over in his mind when he was in sharpest need of strength to withstand his ordeals: "Lead On, O King Eternal," and "O Jesus, I Have Promised To Serve Thee to the End."

SOME DESIRED DEATH

The men who brought no faith with them, and failed to acquire it, didn't last long. "We saw many men die because they had lost the will to live. With so much evil all around us, faith in a righteous, loving God wasn't easy for some men. And as the months dragged into years, it was easy to believe what the Japs kept telling us—that America was finished, that we'd never be rescued. Many men willed themselves into death just to escape."

But so many others the manmade hell of hunger and pain proved to be God's opportunity. "With death at our doorstep all the time—you never knew when a Japanese soldier might get the impulse to raise his rifle and shoot you—men began wondering about the meaning of life." The prisoners were pathetically eager for assurance of some better experience after this life ended. Chaplains were always answering questions about immortality, then working from that to other aspects of religion.

For most of the men, what they learned in prison was not the shallow faith which later came to be called, derisively, foxhole religion. With many, Chaplain Borneman says, it was the decisive turning point of life. "I know six men who are now Presbyterian ministers whose first serious thoughts of religion came while they were prisoners at camp No. 1. And of course a number became clergymen in other churches, and many more became really dedicated laymen."

Chaplain Borneman regards his years in the concentration camp, the lowest in his life from a personal standpoint, as the high point in his ministry. "The men really needed us chaplains, and they knew it. They were desperate to receive what we were trained to give them." In spite of the starvation diet and other obstacles, the chaplains were busy all the time—"most of us had never worked so hard in our lives."

Toward the close of 1944, American airplanes began passing over the camp, with increasing regularity, to bomb Japanese installations. As the prison authorities realized that surrender was not far off, brutalities and killings increased. In a burst of fury the commandant told one of the chaplains, "You all pay. If Americans come, you not be here to see."

Yet, when a large American flotilla was sighted in January 1945, the Japanese simply abandoned the camp, warning the prisoners that if they ventured beyond the barbed wire, they would be shot on sight.

For 3 weeks the prisoners lived on the food left behind by their captors. Then one night they heard gunshots outside the camp. Several chaplains lay on their stomachs in the dirt as the shooting increased. They agreed that the Japanese, as a final gesture of defiance, had returned to kill the prisoners.

Chaplain Borneman made a decision. He was a noncombatant and a minister of God. He had not raised a weapon against another man since World War I. He searched his conscience and found nothing in military law or Christian ethics that forbade him to defend himself against murder.

Borneman raced to the kitchen and picked out a huge meat knife. Then he stood by the door, the knife raised above his head, and waited.

Finally there were footsteps, and the door opened. It was an American Ranger. "Anyone else in here?" he asked calmly. Borneman whispered, "Thank God," and dropped the knife.

The prisoners were free.

HOME COMING HONORS

Chaplain Borneman's heroism did not go unrecognized at home. Senator James M. Mead of New York, addressing the Senate about the war record of the chaplains, cited two examples: "The Navy's O'Callahan and the Army's Borneman, both of whom survived the war, are among those who will live forever in the hearts of Americans." Borneman received three Silver Stars for Gallantry in Action, two Bronze Stars for heroism, three Purple Hearts, and three Distinguished Unit Citations.

He was returned to the Philippines and sent to Japan as a witness in the war crimes trials. In 1955 he received the rank of brigadier general, retired. Although he has met Japanese people in professional or social situations since then, he admits that it is still hard to forget that the Japanese he knew in the concentration camp behaved in a way that seemed hardly human.

After 5 years in the Philippines, John Borneman saw American church life with new eyes. He couldn't forget the ragged, emaciated members of the Protestant Church of Military Camp No. 1, ready to suffer like the early Christian martyrs for their faith. Somehow the well-dressed, overfed worshippers in stateside churches didn't stand up too well in comparison. Something was missing.

In a magazine article published in 1946 Borneman wrote: "Here we still find, possibly in an increasing measure, selfishness, greed, lust for power, and petty politics. This is true among churchmen as well as in

the lay professions. I have seen Washington churches filled each Sunday, and as I worship I wonder how much of an actual impression the service makes on the soul of each one present. How much is carried out into the actual battle of life where the Christian spirit counts?"

"I am confident that each chaplain who served among the war prisoners of Cabanatuan and has made the supreme sacrifice could conscientiously face his Master—and did receive the words 'Well done . . . enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.' Are we concerned about serving men through the spirit of Christ, or are we more concerned about rank, knowing men of influence, exercising the power of petty politics? That I have wondered about since my return."

These observations, Borneman admitted, were not new. But to men who had seen war at its worst, "they stand out to us now as a magnesium flare thrown from an airplane on a dark night."

When Army doctors at Walter Reed discharged Chaplain Borneman in 1950 with the recommendation that he retire from the service, they told him he had only 5 more years to live. Characteristically, Borneman decided to give those 5 years to the church. Fifty-one was too young to go on the shelf.

But that was more than 9 years ago, and Chaplain Borneman is still at work on a job that keeps him constantly on the go. He visits all the seminaries where Presbyterians study, talking with young men interested in the chaplaincy. He works with military bases in all the services anywhere in the world where Presbyterians are serving. In 1958, for example, he spent 271 days on the road—or more accurately, in the air, for he still loves flying and does most of his traveling by plane. He has kept his private pilot's license since youth, and recently "checked out in jets"—one of the few private jet pilots in the country. On three occasions on the job he has hired planes, and flown them himself, when commercial or military transport was not available.

On January 15, 1953, Borneman was traveling by train from his Philadelphia office to his other office in Washington. The train failed to slow down as it approached Union Station. Brakes gone, the engine smashed into the station and plunged through the floor. Forty-one passengers were injured, eight of them critically. Chaplain Borneman was thrown into the aisle; he picked himself up, found no broken bones, and set about seeing what he could do for the injured.

Not long after that the airplane in which Borneman was a passenger departed from Cleveland Airport. But shortly after takeoff a motor dropped out. "The pilot did a marvelous job of crashlanding," Borneman says. But one passenger was killed, several injured. Borneman came through unharmed.

Tropical diseases and his many wounds have taken a heavy toll on Borneman's health. In spite of his full schedule of work, those who know him personally realize that some of his appointments are tentative. Although he begins his working day at 9, there are some mornings when it's just not possible to be on deck that early. "With all the aches and pains I've got," he recently confided to a friend, "it would be easy just to lie down and die."

But although he talks now and then of turning the headship of the chaplains over to a younger man, he has no notion of retiring from the ministry. If he leaves the chaplains' department, he will take some other job in the church. John Borneman has an ironclad conviction that the Lord has kept him alive and able to work only because he wants to keep on working.

World Coffee Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the results of two recent surveys on world coffee production and U.S. coffee consumption are of great interest to those of us concerned with inter-American trade relations.

These surveys were published by the Pan-American Coffee Bureau, an instrument of 13 Latin American coffee-producing nations. One survey relates to coffee consumption in this country, the largest coffee importing nation in the world, from 1950 to 1959.

The studies are detailed and authoritative. The bureau has published its annual statistical review of world coffee trade for the past 22 years. It has conducted regular surveys of U.S. coffee consumption since 1950. This year, the U.S. survey was made by an independent research agency, Corby Research Service of New Rochelle, N.Y.

The report on coffee consumption by the people of the United States is a study in depth of the current market in this country. It reveals that since 1950 our people have increased their coffee drinking by 100 million cups a day, from 290 to 390 million. It further shows that 75 percent of our population, 10 years of age or over, now drinks coffee on an average of four cups a day.

The report states that the most striking increase in U.S. coffee drinking in the past decade is a spectacular rise of 100 percent in the number of cups being drunk between meals—that is, during coffee breaks. The coffee break has become well established as a national institution and now accounts for 28 percent of our total coffee consumption.

Americans between the ages of 30 and 40 comprise the largest category of coffee drinkers, according to the report, consuming an average of more than four cups daily. On a regional basis, the far West leads the Nation in its coffee consumption, followed by the Midwest, the East, and the South.

For the inveterate coffee drinker, the most interesting aspect of this study relates to what might be termed the "quality gap" between U.S. coffee consumption and U.S. coffee use. While we now consume 35 percent more coffee than we did 10 years ago, we are using only 10 percent more pounds. This means, according to the report, that "Americans are drinking a much weaker brew—than the average cup of coffee being served in U.S. homes today is being brewed at a rate of nearly 65 cups to the pound, whereas the recommended rate for the best flavor and maximum body is 40 cups to the pound."

The report explains that the trend toward weak coffee began a few years ago when coffee prices were high and has not yet reversed itself, even though coffee prices are again at 1950 levels or below.

In this connection, the survey also points out that while wholesale and retail coffee prices are back to 1950 levels, 87 percent of all eating places now charge a dime per cup, while in 1950 more than half charged a nickel.

All of this is, of course, interesting sociological data, but it is more. For those concerned with inter-American trade relations and the economic welfare of our hemisphere, these statistics have a special significance. This can best be illustrated by relating the information supplied in the U.S. report to that included in the Bureau's statistical review of world coffee trade.

During 1958, the world review informs us, six Latin American countries relied on coffee for more than half of their foreign currency receipts. For Guatemala, Haiti, and El Salvador, the proportion last year exceeded 70 percent. For Colombia, 85 percent. And for Brazil, which in a recent year obtained almost 70 percent of its foreign trade receipts from coffee exports, the 1958 level fell to 55 percent, due to relatively low shipments.

To further realize the dependence of our Latin American coffee-producing neighbors on U.S. imports and consumption, consider these economic factors:

First. In terms of dollar volume, coffee remains the most valuable agricultural commodity imported into this country, ranking second only to petroleum products in total import value.

Second. Of total world exports of 36½ million bags of coffee in 1958, the United States imported approximately 20 million. Latin American producing nations supplied 72 percent of the world total and 85 percent of the U.S. total.

Third. In turn, Latin American coffee-producing nations comprised nearly 20 percent of the total U.S. export market, purchasing nearly \$3½ billion worth of merchandise from this country.

Fourth. Because nearly a million more tons of coffee were grown than were consumed last year, foreign exchange earnings of the Latin American producing nations continued to decline, since coffee accounts for an average of 24 percent of the exchange earnings of the area.

Fifth. Between 1957 and 1958 the decline in dollar earnings from U.S. imports from Pan American Coffee Bureau nations amounted to nearly \$205 million. As the report points out, where this reduction occurred in countries depending heavily on dollar earnings, and where it was relatively substantial, the result in hemispheric trade relations was more balance-of-payments and internal fiscal difficulties.

However, the report states, despite overproduction and accumulating surpluses of green coffee, an orderly market was maintained during 1958 through concerted action by all of the Latin American producing countries. Credit is given here to the operation of the Latin American Coffee Agreement, which went into effect October 1, 1958.

These two reports shed light on Latin American coffee's role as the indispens-

able denominator of inter-American trade and a healthy hemispheric economy. If any conclusion is to be drawn from these studies, it is that the United States, as the world's largest coffee importer and as the good neighbor of Central and South America, has a definite stake in the efforts being made to solve the growing world coffee crisis.

We cannot stand detached while the economies of 15 Western Hemisphere nations struggle for stability and survival, nor can we safely adhere to a wait-and-see attitude. For, as I have said before, events are moving swiftly in Latin America, and our own self-interest dictates that we must anticipate rather than react to consequences.

Our Latin American coffee-producing neighbors have taken giant strides with considerable sacrifice toward solving their dilemma. But it is not simply their problem, it is ours as well. Only through an active interest in this problem and through continued cooperation can we of the United States maintain the symbol of coffee as the cup of friendship in the Americas.

Prince Hall Americanism Day
Proclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, a fine organization, the Prince Hall Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of Michigan, whose grand master is a dear and close friend of mine, Mr. William O. Greene, recently proclaimed September 13, 1959, Prince Hall Americanism Day as a memorial to the founder of Negro Masons in the United States. The proclamation is of great merit, and for that reason I insert it into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PRINCE HALL AMERICANISM DAY
PROCLAMATION

The history of the American Negro, while inextricably interwoven with the history of the United States, has received far too little mention in documents of the recorded past. This omission has denied the educational values to the masses, of facts pertaining to the American of color, and has inadvertently led to the belief among many people that the Negro has made little or no significant contribution to the founding, growth, security, or well-being of this country.

The one phase of history that does emphasize the Negroes participation, is in that area, which in reality should be underemphasized, slavery. Because this era of our national life, besmirches its vaunted ideals of democracy and exposes the blackest blot on the escutcheon of the United States rectitude of national conduct.

The psychological effects, resulting from the denial of the acknowledgment of the credits due the Negro, are inescapably bad. He is looked upon by the uninformed of the dominant group as a welfare subject. Primarily because the records give sparse notice to the heroes of his race, their exploits, or

their contributions. Thus, it is commonly assumed that he has not earned a just portion of the fruits of democracy, and is therefore obligated to receive naught, but the dole of tolerance meted out patronizingly to those who are without earned claim to the benefits that the land provides.

Another of the serious effects, emanating from the lack of group information about the true historical facts, are those imposed most strongly upon the Negro himself. He being exposed to the voluminous elaborations of the heroes, exploits, and contributions of other ethnic peoples, and so uninformed by folklore and the absence of accounts of his groups historical background, feels the depressive effects of frustration and inferiority very keenly. And too often to compensate, he commits compulsive acts, that violate social standards, and creates, where understanding does not prevail, a stereotype of a primitive or delinquent personality.

The Negro child, most pathetically victimized by this deficiency in historical inspiration, reacts more pronouncedly to the effects noted, and with his immature mind unable to understand the reasons, he too acts in roles so often repugnant to others, but sufficient and justifiable to him, to prove that "I am somebody."

Fragmentary evidence of the scope and value of the Negro's contribution can be found, only, after diligent exploration and search. However, when the accumulated evidence is put together in readable form and sequence, the amazing results are these in part:

Ever since Christopher Columbus, one of whose pilots was a Negro, discovered the New World, men of color have contributed in ever greater measure to its steady development. Especially so, since the establishment of the United States, from Colonial possession to an international or world entity.

The irrefutable loyalty and courage of the colored citizen has long been traditional. Early tested, during the infamous incident of the Boston massacre, in 1770, when the first American to fall for the then revolutionary cause of freedom was a patriot of color, Crispus Attucks. He was felled dead on the Commons of Boston by the leadened ball, from the muskets of red-coated British soldiers. Negroes renewed their show of loyalty and courage again during the civil conflict of 1861, when more than 200,000 fought to maintain the Union of the States, and to purchase their freedom from the shackles of slavery.

He has thus shown his loyalty in every national emergency, including the more recent incident, the so-called police action of the Korean affair of 1948-50, where his life's blood flowed more copiously than in any previous military engagement involving his country. His courage, most vividly demonstrated by Doric Miller of naval fame, and Courtney Stanley, of the land forces, whose commanding officer declared him to be "the bravest man I have ever seen." His courage has been unquestionable.

Notable and salutary contributions to the development of this country, and for the advancement of its people, has been made by him in many diversified areas of endeavor.

In the field of medicine and surgery, no name stands out more demonstratively of the Negroes contribution than does that of Dr. Daniel H. Williams, who performed the first successful surgery on the human heart. Or that of George Washington Carver, the miracle scientist of the peanut fame. No name deserves the plaudits of this Nation more emphatically than does that of Benjamin Banneker, the inventor of the clock, the surveyor who laid out the site that now contains the Capitol of our great Nation, Washington, D.C., and whose formula for

world peace could, even now, resolve much of the tension that besets our war-jittery world.

What name stands out in bold relief against a background of ignorance more spectacularly than does that of Booker T. Washington, or Mary McCloud Bethune, educators.

Does not the field of diplomacy count among its great, Frederick Douglass, and Ralph Bunche. A list of heroes, by incidence of birth, Negroes, but whose contributions to our national well-being, gives credit to the Negro race, would include Jackie Robinson, the athletic pioneer, Dr. Allen Drew, the creator of the blood bank process and a host of others. A list that would extend to inexhaustible limits.

And finally in presenting such a list, the archives would not produce a more worthy person for historical accolade than that of a man named Prince Hall, for he undisputedly was the forerunner of all of those Negro historical characters, whom history should revere, and to whom memory should pay tribute.

Prince Hall, a Negro, freeborn and of good repute, an American by self-adoption, was a patriot of the early founding days of this Nation, during the Revolutionary period. A man of deep understanding, compassion, and vision. He saw, with his prophetic minds eye, the inevitable need for the preparation of his black brethren, so that they would be ready for the time, when the bonds of slavery would be removed, and they would be spilled into the common stream of American life.

First, the history of Prince Hall tells us, that he became, by self-preparation, one of Americas first religious leaders of color, a minister of the Methodist faith in Massachusetts.

Second, his abiding belief in the inestimable values of brotherly love, relief, and truth, inspired him to seek admission into the most ancient of institutions promoting such tenets in the world, the Masonic fraternity. The records show further, that because of his understanding of the benefits to be derived from association in Masonry, that he interceded in behalf of all Negroes who may qualify for membership. Thus, in 1784 he received permission to organize a masonic lodge in Boston, from the fountainhead of freemasonry, the Grand Lodge of England, to be known as African Lodge No. 459. The first and only legitimate source for free masonry among Negroes in America, even unto this day.

Third, and in subsequent order, Prince Hall did organize the first school for the formal education of the Negro. The political history of the Massachusetts Legislature records Prince Hall did appear before it, and with eloquence of speech with the logic of a humanitarian, did cite the evils of discrimination, protest the un-Christian-like promotion of slavery, and pray by petition for the eradication of these evils in the Commonwealth of his Colony.

When the tyranny of the British reached that intolerable stage, and the people of this new land could no longer bear the inequities in representation and the other enforced restrictions that the English imposed upon them, declared war; Prince Hall, so history relates, did with fervency and zeal petition the Commander in Chief of the Revolutionary American Forces, Gen. George Washington, for the right of men of color, to fight, and if God so willed, to die for this country.

These exemplary acts of Prince Hall, denoting his traits of Americanism, these deeds of positive evidence, conferring historic stature on this illustrious character in American life, should excite the imagination and exalt the pride of people everywhere, but more especially those whose fraternal lineage bind

them to him, designated as Prince Hall Masons.

Thus, it is by virtue of these citations that, they who cherish such fraternal kinship, do by annual custom, present to the world at large, and to this Nation specifically, Prince Hall's Americanism record for accreditation to his people; to justify their earned right to claim the full benefits of democracy; to give their young an inspirational figure, a hero of color to emulate; to fill in those blank spaces of history that fail to include the name of this outstanding American. Prince Hall Masons do these and sundry other things, during the birth month of Prince Hall, September. At which time they pay homage and invite public scrutiny to evaluate the continuous efforts of the several thousands of Prince Hall Masons of today, in keeping with their rich American heritage, passed on to them from generation to generation.

Therefore, let it be known, that I, William O. Greene, with high respect and deep adherence to the formentioned practices, do, by the powers vested in the office of Grand Master of Masons, proclaim to all obedient to the Most Worshipful Prince Hall Grand Lodge, of Free and Accepted Masons of Michigan, that—

1. Sunday, September 13, 1959, shall be, and is hereby designated as "Prince Hall Americanism Day," to be celebrated in such manner and form, as shall be hereinafter described.

2. Further, it is decreed that each related body predicated its prerequisites for its membership on the statute of Prince Hall Masons, shall be, and is hereby cordially enjoined to participate in the aforementioned celebration.

3. And lastly, it is by petition of prayer, that we request all members of the Prince Hall family to promote the attendance of their friends, neighbors, and associates of other organizations, to which they may belong, and to the public at large, to share in the festivities of the day.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the M. W. Prince Hall Grand Lodge, F. & A. M. of the State of Michigan, this 1st day of September in the year of light, 1959.

WILLIAM O. GREENE,
Grand Master.

Attest:

DONOVAN A. DOSEY,
Grand Secretary.

Maj. Gen. W. P. Fisher, Director of Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in September 1959, a familiar Air Force figure will be missing from Capitol Hill, Maj. Gen. W. P. Fisher is being assigned to the Military Air Transport Service after completing his assignment as Director of Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force.

General Fisher has provided outstanding service to both Houses of Congress as Director of Legislative Liaison since March 1958. Members of Congress have great responsibilities pertaining to our national defense in these turbulent times,

and General Fisher has been most helpful with his sincere and clear representation of the U.S. Air Force capabilities and requirements. His insight and experience has especially been of unusual assistance in military personnel matters, such as the officer promotion program, to name but one area out of hundreds.

My colleagues in the House join in wishing General Fisher much success in his assignment. We, in Congress, lose a capable and effective liaison officer, but the Military Air Transport Service gains a leader for its Eastern Transport Air Force.

Poison in Your Water—No. 161

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Salt Lake City (Utah) Desert News and Telegram of May 26, 1958, entitled "Clean Up on Sickness".

CLEAN UP ON SICKNESS

This week, the State is facing an alarming increase in the incidence of infectious hepatitis. This disease, commonly known as yellow jaundice, is a serious, debilitating one that takes months, sometimes years to throw off. It is usually associated with polluted water or inadequate sewage disposal. Utah has seen 96 cases so far, compared with 26 at this time a year ago.

This is a disgrace for a State living in the 20th century when methods of prevention of this and other diseases associated with unclean water are thoroughly understood.

Methods of prevention were, in fact, being discussed by official groups even as the hepatitis report was released. One group of officials called for a new Federal study of water pollution in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons in relation to growing recreation pressures on the canyons. And another group released a report after extensive studies of four Utah rivers. Three of them are serious health hazards, carrying raw human sewage through populated areas.

The two problems are different, of course. No one knows just how much recreational development can be allowed in the canyons without endangering the Salt Lake Valley water supply. A fine treatment plant is finished at the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon and construction will soon begin on a plant for Little Cottonwood.

How much additional recreation these plants will make possible, if any, is not known. Of course pure water comes ahead of any other consideration, but we certainly should have a competent study to find out how much recreation we can have in the canyons and still be sure of pure water.

But there's no doubt at all about the other problem, that of the shocking pollution of the Jordan, Price and Weber Rivers, and of other streams in the State. Any raw sewage dumped into a stream is too much.

To this problem, there's just one solution. Money is at the root of it. Utah's

growing communities simply cannot continue letting their sewage go untreated.

A number of Utah County communities have shown the way. Sick and tired of the way the recreational possibilities of Utah Lake were being lost by its use as a cesspool, they took action, built sewage treatment plants and are on the way to rehabilitating the lake.

What they can do, others can do—and must do. And now is the time to do it. Building now can create much-needed jobs. The recession means that contractors are sharpening their bids. The bond market is good. Inflation shows no sign of ending. A time may never come when sewage treatment can be obtained as inexpensively as it can right now.

The growing threat of shameful pollution-caused disease should be a most effective warning to hurry up.

The Threat of Communism in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert an article in the Appendix of the RECORD by Paul Harvey. This article deals with the problem of communism in Latin America. Mr. Harvey's point is well taken. No doubt we should concern ourselves with communism in Asia, but we should not forget about the threat of communism in Latin America. It behooves the United States to formulate that policy which will channel the revolutions of that area into democratic ends.

The article follows:

A TROJAN HORSE IN CARIBBEAN

(By Paul Harvey)

I'm concerned, frankly anxious, about Latin America. And I get the frightening impression that hardly anybody else is.

U.S. intelligence has irrefutable evidence that Cuba's Communists are getting their orders direct from Moscow.

I mean Moscow sent one of its own Soviet intelligence officers to Cuba to "direct the penetration and control of the Castro government."

UNDER ANOTHER NAME

In Russia other Latin American Communists are being secretly trained to return home and set up Red dictatorships in our hemisphere. And this is important: Gen. C. P. Cabell, Deputy Director of our Central Intelligence Agency, says: "In Cuba the Communists presently call themselves the Popular Socialist Party."

The Castro brothers now vigorously deny that they are Communists. Moscow directs those denials.

The Moscow directive specifically calls for concealing Communist influence in Latin America so that the United States will not be prematurely alerted.

Further, Red China is establishing a newspaper in Havana. The Red China party line is charging that "the Monroe Doctrine of 1823 was a plot by U.S. gangsters to dominate the Americas. U.S. imperialism has a dirty history of over 100 years of infiltration and aggression and plunder of Latin America."

NOT LOCALLY WORRIED

For some strange reason Americans are inclined to become more disturbed about Red moves in the Far East than about similar inroads in our own hemisphere.

I ask associates, "Why are you unconcerned about this penetration of the Caribbean?" They reply, "We can handle it."

Americans who are inclined to tolerate this cancer off the coast of Florida, assuming, "We can take care of it," are basing their assumption on the fact that we always have.

But our previous experience with periodic revolutions in these republics predates the Moscow-directed worldwide conspiracy.

Things are different now. It is not a recurrence of isolated brush fires any more. It's a vast blaze which already has engulfed a third of the earth and is licking at our own shores.

MOVING IN NEXT DOOR

The Organization of American States tried, those six desperate days in Santiago, to organize an effective force of firefighters. Already, however, they have been denied access to Cuba, which is the present Red beachhead—the springboard for creation of Castro's "Congress of Latin American Peoples."

This congress was blueprinted in Moscow and delivered to Castro by Soviet agent Vadim Kotcherigin. The arch thieves of modern history have now moved in next door.

Coincident with Khrushchev's visit to the United States, Castro will launch his own peace offensive. And many naive Americans will fail to see behind the beard.

Communism (the government taking care of everybody) has a special fascination for the Latin American who is not traditionally industrious. Somehow we must let him know that Moscow does not promise freedom to loaf. But that communism uses that promise as bait until it puts the loafers to work in chains.

The Farmer Is Still an Important Citizen—Let's Not Count Him Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I believe Members of Congress, as well as others will be interested in a well written and informative editorial that appeared in the August 30, 1959, issue of the Kansas City (Mo.) Star. It concerns the general farm situation as it relates to other industries and especially its importance to the human race.

The article points out that although we now have a surplus of food in America, food is more important to humanity than any other product. Attention is also called to the importance of the farmer in this day and age. The editorial follows:

THE FARMER IS STILL AN IMPORTANT CITIZEN

As we near the end of summer, this growing season is producing crops that approach last year's alltime record. Let's take our hats off to the farmer and take a good look at what he is doing for this country. For

the moment let's deemphasize agriculture's price troubles.

The farm problem has dominated the agricultural scene for so long that it has become almost a legend. The public has become accustomed to day-by-day argument over farm programs, surpluses, subsidies, and parity. No wonder many people who are not fully familiar with the situation look upon the farmer as a man who can't run his own business and one who is always looking for a handout from the Government.

He does have his troubles, let's not deny it. But does America have any greater asset than its farmers?

Food is more important to the human race than any other product. In America, we haven't the slightest worry about where it is coming from. A great highway building program, industrial expansion, the production of luxury items, all can be undertaken with confidence in adequate manpower. Each year more and more people can be spared from the farm. This isn't true in many countries.

If our major worry were producing enough food we couldn't spare the manpower to turn out the many things that are a part of the modern American way of everyday living. Even in war, this country has not gone hungry. It has been the breadbasket for its allies.

Our farmers are producing this abundance with fewer and fewer workers. In the earliest years of the Nation, nearly all people were farmers. A man, who had the help of his family, produced enough for that family. Today's farmer produces enough for himself and 23 other persons. This point can't be overemphasized. If we are to be an industrial nation, these other 23 people must have plenty of food and fiber. Economic progress halts whenever a nation fails to produce the necessities of life with less and less labor.

The farm surpluses, troublesome to farmers and the Government, are in effect insurance. We are virtually guaranteed an abundance for months and years ahead. These surpluses bear down upon farm prices. It is ironic that the farmer efficiency which produces the surpluses is so often costly to the farmer. In effect the farmer pays for the insurance against hunger in this country instead of collecting on it at the marketplace. We don't want continued surpluses that are too big to handle.

While the housewife may regard food prices high at the store, farm organization authorities point to the fact that an hour's work will buy more food today than ever before in history. Also, more and more of the cost of food is represented in the expenses of delivery, processing, retailing, and built-in maid service.

No longer do you buy a live chicken and take it home to be killed and cleaned. In fact, more and more foods are fully prepared for cooking or even serving on the table. These services all add to the food bill.

Farmers resent charges that their prices account for the high cost of living. The reverse is true. In the cost of living index food prices have either held stable or dropped. If food had been going up, like everything else, obviously the cost of living today would be much higher than it is.

Last year Americans spent \$57.7 billion for food. The farmers who grew it received about 36 percent of that amount.

So much has been said about farm subsidies that the average person may well believe that farmers alone have benefited from Government largess. Here again farm organizations, some of which are clearly unsatisfied with current farm programs, point out that farm subsidies are only a part of the benefits handed out through Government channels to American business. The tariff, they suggest, is the greatest subsidy ever granted business and labor. Its costs are

hidden as the public pays through prices at the market rather than in taxes as in the case with farm subsidies.

Subsidies helped build the railroads, ships and airlines. Government payment of postal deficits subsidizes mail costs of magazines and other publications. Government contracts assure profits to manufacturers of war materials. In fact, an extremely impressive list of subsidies can be developed by those who wish to make the point that farmers are not alone in getting financial assistance from Uncle Sam.

Of course, the fact that some one else has or is receiving a subsidy does not automatically indicate that farmers, also, should be put into a Government program. Neither does the amazing job of producing food necessarily suggest that they should have Government aid. The Nation faces a practical problem of finding a workable plan. The farmers are dissatisfied with their present lot, despite 30 years of Government programs. This fact indicates that subsidies do not automatically solve their problems.

Too many people are ready to suggest adoption of any kind of a Government price support program on the theory that "others are getting theirs, too." Conceivably, if farmers were better off without any programs, it would be logical to eliminate the programs. We don't think this is going to be done, but the theory holds just the same.

Agriculture is tremendously important to the economy of the Nation. Kansas City always has realized this fact. It was given a forceful demonstration in the spring of 1958 when improving conditions on the farm sparked a strong pickup in business.

Agriculture is a dynamic industry despite its price troubles. Since 1940 total farm output has increased 40 percent. During the same period the number of farmers or farm workers has dropped faster than at any time in history. Today's farmer produces as much in an hour as he did in 2 hours in 1940. Nonfarm labor and manufacturing productivity, on the other hand, have increased slightly less than 50 percent in the same period.

Recently C. Peairs Wilson, director of the School of Agriculture at Kansas State University, compiled data to show the status of agriculture in the American economy. He found among other things:

"Agriculture is the biggest buyer, seller and borrower in the United States.

"The inventory of farm machinery alone is greater than the assets of the American steel industry and five times that of the automobile industry.

"Agriculture uses 6½ million tons of finished steel a year—more than is used in a year's output of passenger cars. It consumes 17½ billion gallons of crude petroleum—more than is used by any other industry—and 285 million pounds of raw rubber—enough to make tires for 6 million motor cars. Agriculture takes 22 billion kilowatt hours of electrical power—more than enough to serve Chicago, Detroit, Baltimore, and Houston for a year.

"Each year farmers purchase farm supplies worth about \$16 billion.

"The agricultural plant each year increases its use of capital, of science and technology, of management and research.

"There are twice as many jobs in industries that serve farmers as in farming."

The U.S. population is increasing rapidly. Right now it is about 177 million. A conservative estimate used by Government authorities is that the population will grow from the present 177 million to 230 million by 1975. This means total farm production must be increased another 35 to 45 percent by that time. No one doubts that it will be done. Presumably there will come a day in the distant future when this country, along with all others, may face food shortages. But this generation in America has no fears.

What does this summation of the farm situation suggest?

First, we should not discount the importance of farming to the Nation just because we have no worries about food or because farmers presumably are always caught in price troubles. Per capita income on farms is about half the income of nonfarm employment. This is disparity. A way to change it must be found.

In its dilemma agriculture requires the understanding of the urban population. In fact, it also demands greater understanding from farmers themselves. Agriculture is involved in vast changes—declining farm population, the increase in the size of farms and mechanization. The changes bring problems of adaption of technology, of staggering surpluses and increased costs. The complex situation perplexes the experts.

Because of their strength, industry and labor unions have been able to a large degree to take care of themselves. Farmers, as individuals, have turned to the Government in the hope of getting a better share of national income. Years of dissatisfaction suggest that the Government programs to date have not been successful. More changes are in order.

Let's not count the farmer out. He's a mighty important fellow to have around.

Consequences Can Be Disastrous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Cyril A. Zebot, professor of economics at Georgetown University, recently addressed a letter to the editor of the New York Times. In this letter, Professor Zebot points out the inflationary consequences that will flow from the failure of the Congress to remove the interest rate ceiling on Government bonds.

This letter, published in the New York Times of August 25, 1959, should be "must" reading for every member of the majority party. It should be remembered that the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee have unanimously supported the request of the President to remove this restriction which hinders the proper management of our huge national debt. The responsibility for failure to act in this matter and the consequence of such failure rests completely on the Democrat majority in the Congress.

The President in his message to you of last Tuesday said:

The administration is willing to assume full responsibility for managing the Federal Government's debt if it is allowed to do so free from artificial restrictions and on a parity with other borrowers.

If the requested legislation is not enacted, those in the Congress who are unwilling to pass it must assume full responsibility for the possibly serious consequences.

I will repeat what I said to the House last July 23:

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that our Republican membership on this side of the aisle would almost unanimously support the rec-

commendation of the President and the recommendation of the Treasury in this respect. It is not my desire here and now to make this a political issue, but I would point out that if this is to be a political issue, we on this side of the aisle, the President, and the Secretary of the Treasury, are willing to take responsibility for the consequences of giving the Treasury the authority requested.

But if the Democratic majority ties the bill up in committee and fails to act, it must accept responsibility for the consequences that will flow from such failure to give the Treasury the tools it needs. They must assume responsibility for the consequences which will face the country if they fail to act. And I repeat the consequences can be disastrous.

Mr. Speaker, before this matter is allowed to die, please read this letter of Professor Zebot:

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The surprise decision of the House Ways and Means Committee to shelve the President's request for removal of the archaic interest rate ceiling on Government bonds should not be dismissed lightly. It is doubly inflationary and it will cause an increase in the servicing cost of the national debt.

The decision is inflationary because it will force the Treasury to refinance over \$100 billion of the national debt in short-term securities over the next year. With growing business prosperity the demand for short-term Government securities on the part of nonfinancial corporations will subside, and the Federal Reserve will be compelled to provide extra reserves, beyond the monetary requirements of real economic growth, to enable commercial banks to absorb an ever-larger amount of short-term Government securities.

In addition, the indefinite duration of the statutory interest-rate ceiling will generate further inflationary expectations, with the corresponding increase in the velocity of circulation of currency, and thus still more potential inflation. As an accompanying result there will be added pressures on the yields of outstanding long-term Government securities and on all interest rates.

The decision of the House Ways and Means Committee, if it is not reversed promptly, will accomplish exactly the opposite of its intention.

ADMINISTERED INFLATION

There will be attempts at exonerating the committee's responsibility for the inflationary consequences of its decision. It will be argued that our new inflation is of administered or cost push kind and therefore unrelated to the national debt management and beyond the reach of monetary policy.

The argument does not hold water. The administered or cost push theory of prices deals only with one set of forces that act on the price level. It is not a general theory, and even in its partial relevance it has not yet been fully developed and demonstrated.

But even if one assumed that all inflation stemmed from cost push forces and corresponding price administration, national debt management and monetary policy would still be relevant in relation to the price level. We have no public policy to deal directly with wage and price administration.

RESTRAINT ON PRICES

The steel industry is a telling case in point. When cost push forces press on prices, monetary and fiscal policies are the only available price-level restraints to be used as public policy for general welfare. Faced with anti-inflationary monetary and fiscal policies, the cost push forces in our economy must depend on offsetting increases in the velocity of money or, if velocity is checked, too, they are saddled with the responsibility for the resulting unemployment.

By forcing our national debt management and monetary policy systematically to over-expand the supply of money, the House Ways and Means Committee's decision has not only caused the resurgence of a potential demand-pull inflation but has also removed the only existing public policy checks on the cost push forces in our economy.

Congress must find a way to correct the dangerous monetary situation before it adjourns. The political leadership that permitted the hasty House committee decision must be made aware of the fact that general economic literacy is not so low that people will fail to detect the source of the grave consequences that will follow if the interest rate ceiling on long-term Government bonds is not removed now.

CYRIL A. ZEBOT.

WASHINGTON, August 22, 1959.

Strengthening the Foundations of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Under Secretary of State, at 82d annual banquet, American Bar Association, Americana Hotel, Miami Beach, Fla., Thursday, August 27, 1959:

STRENGTHENING THE FOUNDATIONS OF FREEDOM

It is a distinct privilege to address this distinguished gathering and to join with you in honoring Mr. Grenville Clark, who received the American Bar Association Medal tonight in recognition of a lifetime of public service which culminated in his monumental work, "World Peace Through Law."

The achievement of world peace through law is a goal which motivates the conduct of our country's international relations. It was eloquently stated by a lawyer and diplomat of great stature, the late John Foster Dulles, when he called, in his last public address, for the substitution of justice and law for force. The realization of this ideal objective, toward which Mr. Dulles labored throughout his lifetime, has been substantially advanced by the American Bar Association during the past year. Thanks to your initiative, lawyers in many parts of the world are now working to formulate an action program designed to help move mankind nearer to the goal of peace through law. This increasing consciousness of international problems in the legal profession is a significant contribution to efforts of the United States to strengthen the foundations of freedom throughout the world.

Freedom has a value which the American people down through history have cherished above all else. The preamble to the Constitution submitted to the States in 1789 stated as one of its principal purposes "to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity." But this declared purpose was not enough to satisfy the people. They refused to accept the Constitution until the essentials of freedom had been specifically guaranteed in the first 10 amendments: The Bill of Rights. Thus, we have held freedom—freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and of the press, and all the other

individual freedoms—to be a prior condition of government itself.

We conceive of freedom as being within the context of the rule of law. Our Founding Fathers associated natural rights with natural laws. This linkage between freedom and law is explicit in our approach to international problems. We feel that freedom and law are as indivisible as freedom itself is indivisible.

Today, on the world scene, freedom is locked in a fateful contest with the formidable challenge of Communist imperialism. Hundreds of millions of human beings in Soviet Russia and Communist China never taste the blessings of freedom. In the satellite countries, ancient freedoms are being ruthlessly suppressed. This new absolutism is more formidable than any in modern history because it coincides in time with the tremendous and continuing advance of science and technology. It is not only in the military field that Communist leaders are drawing upon science and technology to strengthen their position. They are also utilizing science and technology to strengthen their economic position.

If the economic planning of Soviet leaders was aimed basically at raising the living standards of the Soviet citizen, we would cheer them on. For we sincerely wish the Soviet leaders every success in their efforts to improve the drab lot of their own people. It is not the economic progress of the Sino-Soviet bloc that concerns us. What we are concerned with—and what we firmly oppose—are the efforts of the Communist leaders to dominate other countries by a combination of economic cajolery, subversion, and artful propaganda, backed up, when opportune, by military power.

We and our allies have both the military might and the determination to meet the threat posed by military power in the hands of Communism's leaders. Frustrated by our strength and firmness of purpose the Communists are turning more and more to economic, political, and psychological penetration of the underdeveloped areas in order to achieve their goal of world domination. They are pounding home the doctrine that communism is the best way to produce material progress. Constant repetition of this thesis has emerged as a major weapon in Communist efforts to subvert free societies beyond their borders. We delude ourselves if we do not recognize that in many of the miserably poor and overpopulated lands of the less-developed world, this doctrine can carry a dangerous appeal if their peoples fail to recognize the dreadful cost of communism in terms of human misery and degradation.

But communism can make little headway in even the poorest countries so long as their people have hope of realizing their mounting expectations for a better life under free institutions. For the appeal of freedom is irresistible when it goes hand in hand with economic and social progress.

We sometimes fail to remember that the political revolution which created the United States has had a greater influence for good on the rest of the non-Communist world than any other single political event in history. That influence is still visibly strong and vital. Since World War II, nations comprising a billion people have found inspiration in our example in establishing the framework of their new, free societies. They now look to us for assistance in realizing the material fruits of freedom.

If we are to help the newly emerging peoples to resist the spurious lure of communism—and, by so doing, safeguard our own liberty—we must continue to uphold the supremacy of freedom as a standard of human value. For we know that in the long run, our freedom depends upon the freedom of others. This awareness goes far back in our history. Even during our so-called pe-

riods of isolation, our sympathies and moral support were with those elsewhere in the world who were upholding freedom.

However, if we are to meet the 20th century challenge to freedom in the newly emerging countries, we must extend more than sympathy and moral support to their peoples. We must continue to extend technical and financial assistance until they can make a real start toward progress. We must devote substantial resources to this effort and we must cast our thinking in terms of perseverance over a long period of time.

We must also, in company with other more advanced nations of the free world, so organize our material and human resources that we continue to outperform communism. We must demonstrate that the economic systems which flourish under freedom can and will, in every country, promote the fullest development of human life—not only in material aspects, but in spiritual terms as well. At the same time, we should staunchly uphold the principle that there is diversity in freedom. Unlike the Communists, we do not seek to impose our system and our institutions upon other peoples. Rather, we seek to help them work out their own destinies, in their own fashion, in freedom, and under law. We do not seek the re-creation of our own image. Our only aim is to help develop sound, independent societies capable of joining us if they so choose in securing peace and progress in the world.

To succeed in this task, we must enlist the combined resources of our Government and of our private citizens and institutions. There is much that we are doing today to meet the challenge of international development. Our response, in which the mutual security program plays a major part, is broad and varied—one in which the American people can take justifiable pride:

Through technical cooperation we are helping to create the human skills so conspicuously lacking in the less developed countries.

Through grant assistance we are providing some of the funds urgently required to maintain stability in the face of the military and economic pressure of the Sino-Soviet bloc.

Through a variety of institutions, we are providing part of the capital needed for the basic facilities essential to growth. The Development Loan Fund is our newest financial instrument. And we are continuing to provide financing through the Export-Import Bank and through our long-term participation in the World Bank and International Monetary Fund, which institutions are now expanding their resources as the result of an American initiative.

We are now actively exploring the possibilities of giving the World Bank a new and more flexible tool for development through the creation of an International Development Association.

We have recently taken a leading part in creating the Inter-American Development Bank, which will soon begin to play an important role in the progress of Latin America.

Our Public Law 480 program provides resources in the form of foods and fibers.

Currently, through tax and other incentives, we are exploring every practicable way to stimulate the flow of private American investment, with its many accompanying technological skills, to the less developed countries.

All of these actions taken together provide a coherent and rounded attack on the greatest problem of our time: the development of the less fortunate areas of the world. They are complemented by our continuing efforts to break down barriers to trade so that the peoples of the less developed lands may find markets for the goods which they must sell if they and we are to prosper.

We also know that in a free society, economic progress can be achieved only under legal standards and in accordance with the principles of justice. There is a recent development in this field which I regard as highly important and in which your association has played, and will continue to play, a leading role:

On November 6, 1958, the American Bar Association accepted a planning grant from the International Cooperation Administration to study the feasibility of a conference of lawyers from many nations "to consider and recommend means of developing and strengthening within and among nations, legal concepts, standards and institutions which will contribute, through facilitating the expansion of the flow of international investment and trade and otherwise, to the economic growth of such nations and which will facilitate peaceful settlement of disputes within and among nations."

This grant was made in accordance with our deep conviction that government help, important as it is and will continue to be, cannot do the whole job in promoting development. Private capital, carrying with it management techniques and abilities, not only contributes directly to economic growth it also provides the picture of our free enterprise system in action. And we must remember that the reservoirs of private capital are far larger than anything that is likely to be available to government.

In short, if the free world is to stay free, if the spark of international economic progress is to be fanned into growing health, there must be greater activity overseas by private investors. Therefore, we were very pleased when this study was entrusted to a special committee on world peace through law, which had a distinguished membership under the chairmanship of your former president, Charles S. Rhyne.

In the committee's report, which was submitted on May 18, 1959, the committee recommended, among other things, the holding of an international conference of lawyers. Two of the agenda topics suggested by the committee deal directly with the problems of development. They are the following:

"Extension and improvement of institutions and procedures for arbitration of disputes between governments and of disputes growing out of concessions contracts and international business transactions between governments and individuals and between private parties.

"Extension and improvement of institutions and procedures for the improvement of legal framework for the economic advancement of all nations and the removal of the legal uncertainties and fears which now block such advancement."

Because of the Government's interest in promoting the security of private investment abroad, we support the objectives in these two agenda items. The International Cooperation Administration is prepared to join with you in discussing plans for an international conference of lawyers and the sharing with private foundations and other organizations in its cost.

I look forward with great anticipation to the results of such a conference of lawyers. There is a pressing need to promote a better respect for the rule of law in international relations. But that is only a beginning. The function that lawyers such as yourselves can best perform in this field is to develop and propose concrete measures which will in actuality bring this about. I hope and trust that the proposed world conference will make real progress toward that goal.

Now I have been speaking of our own American programs to help promote international economic growth. Since we, for better or for worse, are now the largest and most

powerful industrialized country in the free world, our example and leadership are indispensable in this effort. But, fortunately, we are not alone. It has become a cooperative venture in which we are being joined with increasing vigor by more and more of the other industrialized nations of the free world which have successfully completed their postwar economic recovery. In addition to their participation in the effective work of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, the United Kingdom, Germany, France, Italy, and Japan last year made further governmental contributions to development through either grants or loans. Significant aid is also being provided by Australia, Canada and New Zealand. In the field of private investment, businessmen from these other industrialized countries have been very active—in some areas even more so than our own businessmen.

It is our view that the flourishing economies of the other materially favored Nations of the free world enable them to assume a growing share of the responsibility for assisting the newly emerging countries. We believe that they will accept increased responsibility according to their capabilities. We also feel that the time has come for better coordination of free world development efforts, and we intend shortly to initiate conversations to bring it about. An expanded and truly cooperative effort with our allies can lead to a new era in international development. For nothing is beyond the capacity of the combined economic power of the free world.

This, then, is the central task of our foreign policy: The advancement of peace and freedom by promoting economic and spiritual development throughout the world within a framework of law.

It is not a narrowly conceived policy of fighting communism. It is a broadly conceived policy of strengthening the foundations of freedom by enriching the daily lives of half the human race.

It is not a negative policy of waging economic warfare with the Sino-Soviet bloc. It is a constructive policy of economic growth and development, of continuing progress, of providing hope for the future.

It is a task in which the legal profession has an important part to play. For the process of economic development under free institutions cannot take place in chaos or in disorder. It must have the security provided by law.

The American Oil Consumer Pays for Using American-Flag Ships but He Does Not Get Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the United States has become a major importer of raw materials, particularly oil. In 1946 we imported some 20 million tons of oil. Last year we imported over 85 million tons of oil—more than \$800 million worth. According to figures published by the Chase Manhattan Bank, our oil imports alone will double in the next 7 years. During the same period of time, our merchant marine has been virtually excluded from participating in

the international oil trade. American ships carried 76 percent of our oil imports in 1946, and today we are carrying less than 2 percent.

As a major oil importer, it is essential both for commerce and defense for the United States to have its own tanker fleet. Without our own ships the real cost of oil is increased, since we also import the value of the transportation. The absence of our own merchant fleet means that we cannot choose the source of our supplies.

I am pleased to find that the American tanker operators and the American maritime unions have formed the Joint Committee for American-Flag Tankers to seek a solution to this very vital and perilous problem—the disappearance of the American flag from the international oil trade on which we depend now for nearly 15 percent of our petroleum and petroleum products. Everyone interested in America's future economic well-being will welcome this affirmative move by management and labor to work together for the national interest, which demands and requires a healthy and secure American-flag fleet.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following announcement of the formation of the Joint Committee for American-Flag Tankers:

THE AMERICAN OIL CONSUMER PAYS FOR USING AMERICAN-FLAG SHIPS BUT HE DOES NOT GET THEM

Mr. Joseph Curran, president of the National Maritime Union of America and Mr. Paul Hall, president of the Seafarers International Union, announce the formation of the Joint Committee for American-Flag Tankers composed of American-flag tanker owners and operators and the American maritime unions. Mr. Curran and Mr. Hall will serve as directors of the committee, representing labor, and two additional directors will subsequently be named representing management.

The objective of this committee is to achieve conditions whereunder American-flag tankers will be assured of profitable long-term employment. It is not merely the interests of American seamen and American tanker owners that are at stake, however, because the perilous situation now confronting the American-flag tanker industry endangers our vital national interest, national defense, and foreign policy as well as endangering the free world.

Because of the un-American policies of the major international American oil companies, the American-flag tanker has been virtually excluded from participating in the carriage of oil imported into this country. American-flag participation in our oil imports has declined from 76 percent in 1946 to less than 2 percent at the present time. If something is not done, this exclusion will become permanent and the independent American-flag tanker will be destroyed.

The program will bring the facts to the attention of Congress, the administration, and the public. It encompasses a recognition of the following accepted principles:

1. An American-flag tanker fleet is necessary for our national defense and in order to assure that our commercial imports will be carried at fair and reasonable rates.
2. An independent American-flag tanker fleet cannot continue to exist unless these vessels are assured of a reasonable participation in the carriage of our petroleum importations.
3. The exclusion of American-flag tankers from our import trade imperils our foreign

policy in the Middle East as well as jeopardizing our national defense and security.

4. The American consumer is actually paying for using American-flag tankers but they are not being used.

Unless these facts are recognized the American-flag tanker industry is bankrupt. The use of American-flag tankers for a reasonable portion of our oil imports will cost the American consumer nothing. He already pays for the use of such vessels to the major oil companies. The major oil companies, however, expropriate this payment for themselves.

Middle East oil, imported by the major oil companies, is approximately one-half as expensive as domestic oil. The posted price of oil in the Persian Gulf (the price at which oil companies sell oil to themselves) is \$13.44 a ton, while domestic oil costs \$26.46 a ton in Texas. Current tanker rates from the Persian Gulf are not \$13.02 a ton but less than \$3.25 per ton. The difference of nearly \$10, amounts to 72 percent of the posted price of Middle East oil. This is pocketed by the oil companies, who have in addition already made—after all taxes—from \$10 to \$12 a ton profit in the Middle East in the production of the oil.

The American consumer pays these companies exactly the same price for Middle East oil as for domestic oil. In round figures, he pays \$13 a ton to the major oil companies for ocean transportation. This is more than sufficient to employ American-flag tankers and still leave the oil companies a substantial profit, but the oil companies pay only \$3 a ton for transportation on cheap foreign-flag vessels and pocket the difference. Of course, this policy is calculated to destroy the American-flag tanker fleet because it cannot compete with tax dodging cheap-labor foreign flag vessels. It is a policy of arrogance and greed that puts profits and tax dodging above patriotism and the American national interest.

High Gas Tax Rate Is Attacked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the gasoline tax has proved an effective device in providing funds for developing our highway system. Considerable caution should, however, be exercised before any upward adjustments are effected in our already high gasoline tax rates, for, as the following article by Leroy Snowden so effectively points out, such increases in rates might very well result in lower total income as a consequence of reduced consumption:

[From the Portland Sunday Telegram, Aug. 23, 1959]

HIGH GAS TAX RATE IS ATTACKED—LEVY POLICY SHOULD BE REEXAMINED, OIL OFFICIAL DECLARES

(By Leroy Snowden, executive secretary, Maine Petroleum Association)

This year marks two anniversaries of significance to the petroleum industry and its consumers.

One is the birthday of the industry itself—the 100th anniversary of the drilling of the 1st commercial oil well at Titusville, Pa., August 27, 1859.

The other is the 36th anniversary of the levy of the first gasoline tax by Maine, July 7, 1923.

In retrospect it seems certain that neither the founder of the oil industry, Edwin L. Drake, nor the originators of the gasoline tax had any idea of the future magnitude of what they were starting.

In its first year, the American petroleum industry produced a mere 2,000 barrels of crude oil. Some 2,461 million barrels were produced last year.

Coming along 64 years after the industry's founding, the gasoline tax showed the same capacity for growth. In its first year this tax produced only a little more than \$500,000 in revenue. Last year this taxation brought in a total of \$22,500,000 to the State of Maine.

The people who hit on the idea of taxing gasoline found a way of taking in barrels of money from the oil business without running any of the risks that are entailed in prospecting for oil. The gasoline tax represents almost sheer profit for government, since the oil industry is saddled with the responsibility of collecting this levy from its customers. And over the years this tax has become a tremendously heavy load for the industry's principal product to carry.

Maine's 7-cent rate is exceeded by no State in the Union and equaled by only 10 others, principally in the South.

In 1932, when the Federal Government entered the gasoline tax field with a temporary emergency levy of 1 cent a gallon, it was scheduled to expire within a year. Instead of expiring, however, this levy followed the same course as the State tax, rising to its present 3-cent level—or triple the original rate.

Now Congress is faced with a proposal to increase the Federal tax 1 additional cent, bringing the Federal levy to 4 cents. This, too, is being described as a temporary emergency measure.

As a result of both the State and Federal trends, the combined tax on gasoline now totals 10 cents a gallon. This is equivalent to a sales tax of about 50 percent of the average retail price that a consumer pays for regular grade gasoline.

The rate trend, however, tells only part of the story of the tremendous impact that the gasoline tax has had on both the petroleum industry and the consumers of gasoline. Starting out as a relative trickle of revenue, the tax has become a multimillion-dollar revenue source. Over the years since 1923 this one tax has cost Maine's motor vehicle owners over \$300 million and the ante has shown a startling rise in recent times.

By 1933, the end of the first decade, this tax had cost Maine motorists \$22,547,000. During the next quarter century it had gained enough momentum so that the collections in 1 year, 1958, were \$22,562,000, or slightly more than taken in during the first 10 years.

Part of this revenue growth can, of course, be attributed to higher rates, but another very important factor has been the increase in motor vehicle ownership and use. There is a tendency to think that rates must be raised to obtain more money from the gasoline tax. But the record shows that the tax has a built-in growth factor, and that the same rate of tax has produced an enormous increment in revenue over the years because of increased consumption.

This is illustrated in the following tabulation, which shows the amount of revenues generated by each penny of the gasoline tax imposed by the State over the years: 1940, \$1,564,000; 1946, \$1,821,000; 1950, \$2,259,000; 1954, \$2,721,000; 1958, \$3,323,000.

As this tabulation shows, each cent of the State gasoline tax imposed in 1958 brought in two times as much revenue as the same levy produced in 1940, and almost twice as much as in 1946, the first postwar year.

Expressed another way, it would have taken a State gasoline tax rate of about 14½ cents a gallon in 1940 to produce the same amount of revenue the State now is collecting from a tax of 7 cents.

It is significant, however, that as taxes on gasoline in recent years have been pushed to ever and ever higher levels, the rate of consumption has slowed down considerably. In the first 5 years following the end of World War II, for example, highway use of motor fuel showed an average annual gain of over 5 percent. In the last 5 years, however, this rate of increase was cut in half, and in 1958 highway consumption of gasoline was only about 2 percent greater than in the previous year.

This same trend is evident in automobile travel statistics. Whereas formerly there had been a pronounced upsurge, annual travel per vehicle in recent years has shown a declining tendency, falling from an indicated level of about 10,000 miles in 1946 to around 9,500 miles in 1958.

Coupled with this is the growing popularity of smaller automobiles, particularly the foreign variety, which feature fuel economy as one of their main attractions.

All these developments indicate clearly that the motoring public is becoming extremely conscious of the cost of gasoline. What the public does not seem to realize, however, is the fact that the increase in the price of gasoline itself in recent years has been quite moderate. The average retail price of gasoline in 1958, exclusive of taxes, was only 5.9 percent above the 1949 level, whereas in the same period retail prices for all consumer items, as compiled by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, had risen 21 percent.

But, while the average price of gasoline moved up less than 6 percent during the decade, the national average tax jumped more than 36 percent. In other words, taxes on gasoline during the period went up at a rate of six times as great as the retail price of the fuel.

It is important to also note the gasoline consumer has been getting a continually improving product. One measure of this quality is the octane number of the fuel. Between 1950 and 1958, U.S. refiners improved the average octane rating of regular grade gasoline by about 9 numbers. As a result of these and other major improvements in the fuel, the motorist today can buy regular grade gasoline that has a higher quality than the premium gasoline of only 5 years ago, at little or no increase in price. Even more remarkable, today's improved gasoline sells at the same price, 21 cents (excluding tax) as it did 36 years ago when the taxation started in Maine.

On this 36th anniversary of Maine's gasoline tax, it would seem timely and appropriate for government to reexamine its policies with respect to this tax, in the light of indications that it would be a grave mistake to continue to regard this levy as a boundless bonanza. For the gasoline tax cannot be exempted from the law of diminishing returns.

Special Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, although I have been very busy with the commit-

tee working on the labor legislation, I have tried to pick up a few pertinent facts on the trade issue.

It seems to me that in our desire for investment and trade profits we are completely overlooking the disaster lurking in the shadows of unemployment, lost jobs in production industries, and the apparent unawareness of labor, Main Street, and the smaller manufacturers.

Recently one of our leading metropolitan newspapers, the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, Wednesday, August 19, 1959, published an editorial entitled "Labor Awakening." I present the editorial verbatim:

Organized labor has, in a large measure, in recent years been responsible for supporting the Rooseveltian policy of reciprocal trade agreements which have worked out so disadvantageously to the United States.

Already one effect of these treaties is that last year as many automobiles were imported as exported, and the United States is importing such a product as steel.

The real sufferer from these treaties, agreements, quotas, exchange arrangements, etc., is the American worker.

For many years conservatives have been cautioning labor that they have embarked on a dangerous course when their supported political measures are disadvantageous to them. But, having adopted labor internationalism, they would not retreat.

However, some unions are beginning to realize their peril. What they call imports from sweatshop countries have always been coming in from these same sweatshop countries.

The only difference was that during the war and the early postwar years businessmen were afraid to go to those countries, invest American capital in them, and then ship the goods back here to compete with the American worker, who generally lost out.

It is interesting to note that the great free trade unions, the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union; the Amalgamated Clothing Workers; the United Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers' International, and the Textile Workers, are leading in this reconsideration of a policy that has always been disadvantageous to the American worker.

A few points need to be made concerning this:

1. Most mass-production work can be done as efficiently by low-wage workers as by high-wage workers. Therefore, unless the high-wage worker is in some manner protected, he will outprice himself.

2. In the semiskilled industries the ability and efficiency of the workers play a small part in the total product; the bigger part is contributed by the machine, which can be operated as well by less-efficient workers, thus making the product cheaper to sell in the American market.

3. Since the Roosevelt regime, everything has been done to make the phrase "Buy American" unpopular, with the result that Americans buy what is made in Hong Kong or Japan or Czechoslovakia as readily as they buy American goods.

It is nonsense for American unions to believe that they can solve this problem by stimulating campaigns in other countries to increase wages there. They will be told to mind their own business.

Not all standards of living are the same, and not all people approve of the American standard of living, which includes many inflationary factors.

The soundest protection against the dumping of cheap goods into the world's greatest market is a protective tariff—and it would be startling, but it is foreseeable, that American labor will come to that.

For the record I want to put this important message before the Congress and if I could, before every worker, employer, banker, and professional individuals in this country.

The warning contained therein is one that none of us can overlook. There is no secret or mysterious formula for national prosperity. The answer is simple—production with wages sufficiently high to meet the costs of living, pay doctors and hospital bills, buy insurance, shop on main street for necessities and a few extra luxuries, keep a savings account, buy and maintain a car, maybe a small boat, send your kids to school, take a 2-week vacation, keep your church and charities obligations, and last, but not least, buy a radio, refrigerator, TV, washer-dryer, freezer, air conditioner, get your wife a modern step-saving kitchen, feed your kids the latest vitamins, and whatever else we are told we must have to maintain our way of life.

If we do not have most of these things within the reach of our working people the rest of the economy will fall flat on its face.

Without wages to carry this marketplace load, the professional individual, the banker, and the press, all service industries and businesses will die on the vine.

I will always remember my early youth in a small coalmining and brickmaking community on the banks of the Allegheny River in western Pennsylvania. The history of this town is a case in point.

This was a normal, small American town with its professional services, elected officials, its lawyer, doctor, barbershop, its hotel, stores, railroad station and telegraph office, with its painters, plumbers, and the tradesmen that are usually found in a going community.

Its community of 400 or 500 families prospered because the coal mine and clay mine provided payrolls which fed the whole economy. Then one dark day the mine shut down, the payroll stopped. In a short period of time, all commerce and business stopped. I recently visited this site, and nature has again taken over—there are no houses standing, no business places, and no people. The years have erased all of the things that once marked a thriving community. The town was a ghost town.

This then points up clearly and vividly that tradesmen, professionals, Main Street and Back Street cannot survive on their own. There must be production, because production produces payrolls, and payrolls produce prosperity. This lesson I have never forgotten, without production this town died and I am convinced that without production this Nation will die.

Somewhere, somehow, we have been sold a bill of goods. We are told that trade means peace and therefore even if it means unemployment, hardship, foreclosures, and shutdowns, it is worth it. Up to a point any sane person agrees.

However, will the results be what we are told they will be, or will the greedy, mercenary profiteers of other countries contrive to take advantage of our soft-

ness and further flood this country's domestic market with low-priced goods made by low standard wage earners and in most cases, from American designs and all too often bearing American trade names.

I cannot conceive of anything more damaging than to keep up this idiotic program that allows a nation like Japan to embargo the import of automobiles into the country while at the same time, dump their cars onto the American market, or for England to embargo turbines and generators while selling to our own Government agencies.

Again, we find Mexico putting an embargo on many products such as piston rings, forcing American companies like Perfect Circle to buy into their domestic industries in order to market their products in that country.

I mentioned Perfect Circle, and its Mexican experience; for the record I present the full story as well as a little noted item about the prosperity of the London stock market while the American market continues its erratic but definitely downward slide. The stock markets of Germany, Italy, Japan, and Belgium and other beneficiaries of our national trade suicide policy are reported doing well.

PERFECT CIRCLE TO BUY 45-PERCENT INTEREST IN MEXICAN FIRM

CHICAGO.—Perfect Circle Corp., Hagerstown, Ind., piston ring manufacturer, announced it has entered into an agreement to purchase 45 percent of the stock of Engranes y Productos Industriales, Mexico City, for approximately \$800,000. A Perfect Circle spokesman said about two-thirds of the purchase price will be paid in piston ring manufacturing machinery.

The Mexican firm will be licensed to manufacture and distribute Perfect Circle piston rings and other products in Mexico. W. B. Prosser, Perfect Circle president, said in the announcement. A meeting of Engranes y Productos Industriales stockholders has been called for August 28 to ratify the agreement and to change the name to Industrias Perfect Circle S.A. The firm will continue to produce hydraulic automobile jacks, irrigation pump parts, and other replacement parts, according to the announcement.

A spokesman for Perfect Circle said the move was made because the Mexican Government banned piston ring imports. The company had planned to begin production in Mexico at some future time, but had to accelerate its program because of the governmental order cutting off the imports, he said. He said the company had been forced to make similar moves in Argentina and Brazil when those nations closed their borders to the company's product.

All the way up and down the list of imports we find examples of restrictions, high tariffs, and outright embargoes against American-made goods.

This country prospered so long as it was a Democratic-capitalistic system of operation, but it is fast becoming a purely capitalistic system which cannot survive in free competition with nations that have no governmental mandated costs of production such as social security, unemployment compensation, exorbitant taxation, both personal and business.

In line with the above editorial, it might be good for all of us to take stock before we vote for H.R. 5, which will

open the floodgates of American investment in foreign countries, and in a few short years, the domestic market will be lost completely to American-made goods.

What is our interest—American made goods, or American financed goods?

How long will the foreign worker allow himself to be exploited by American absentee investors?

Will we be building goodwill, or will we be sowing the seeds of discontent, distrust and instead of promoting peace will we unwittingly be harvesting a crop of bloodshed, devastation, and catastrophic war?

In a recent survey of the results of our ill-advised 4-year extension of the nonreciprocal Reciprocal Trade Act, we find the following very brief summary of results in just a few of the affected fields of production.

These statements of facts and logic have been given on the floor of the House, on the air and in many of our leading periodicals and newspapers.

Many Members of Congress are becoming aware of the seriousness of the situation and there is unrest and doubt never before so apparent amongst the membership.

Many of us wonder whether Congress was wise when it abdicated its constitutional prerogatives and turned over to the President the tariff and duty making powers which rightfully belong to Congress.

ESCAPE CLAUSE BOX SCORE

"Oh, but industry does have an official remedy," exclaims the liberal-trade enthusiast to import-wounded industries. But let's ask the man who sought one. Here's the January 1954 to May 1959 record:

Industries seeking remedy from Tariff Commission.....	45
Remedy denied by Commission.....	19
Remedy recommended by Commission to President.....	26
But denied by him.....	17
Remedy granted by President.....	8
But drastically diluted by him.....	6
Full recommendation granted (out of 45).....	2

¹ In process.

FOREIGN CARS

Japan's Batsun, plastic-body sports car, speed of 86 miles per hour, now in order-taking stage and slated soon for United States market. Also targeted for United States in their tiny Subaru-360 at \$1,100.

European-English cars captured 17 percent of Canadian market first 5 months of 1958; now up to 23 percent for same period in 1959. Imports here running about 10 percent of market.

SHIPPING BOTTOMS TAKE BEATING

U.S. shipper's share of American foreign commerce had rough sailing since World War II (military excluded):

Year:	U.S. share (percent)
1946	68.0
1951	43.0
1952	35.0
1953	30.0
1954	28.0
1955	22.0
1956	20.0
1957	18.0
1958	13.0
January 1959	8.7

¹ Latest.

BINOCULARS

Jap binocular industry, principally geared to U.S. market, produced over 1.5 million units in 1958; United States purchased two-thirds of total output.

TYPEWRITERS

Nineteen million nine hundred thousand dollars of imported typewriters and parts in 1958 outstrip U.S. exports of \$14.7 million first time in history.

CAP IMPORTS

National Cap and Cloth Hat Institute, joint labor-management group, seeks escape clause action to increase duty on Jap caps. Self-imposed Jap annual export quota of 15 million caps too large for U.S. market to absorb without serious damage, reports Institute. Comparative prices: Jap caps, 20 cents; U.S. caps, \$1.

CLOTHING WORKERS CONCERNED

Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, formerly strong trade agreements supporters, adopt resolution attacking destructive imports. Cite "cutthroat" competition in every branch of male apparel threatening thousands of jobs. Knit glove industry well on the road to destruction, as imports now 250 percent of U.S. production.

COPPER AND BRASS

Copper & Brass Research Association's study of causes in decline of domestic brass mill industry reveal: First year after sharp tariff cuts, imports multiplied 42 times preceding year level; imports almost 100 percent of U.S. tubular plumbing goods market; U.S. industry in 1958 operated less than 45 percent of 1943 capacity; United States converted from exporter to importer of brass mill products.

WESTERN EUROPE'S GOLD MOUNTS

Gold and dollar reserve holdings in Western Europe increased from \$7 billion in 1950 (December) to \$18 billion in 1959 (March).

LUXURY LINER LAMBS

Indicative of price differential in foreign-U.S. competition was arrival at San Diego of 30,000 Australian lambs on converted luxury liner Wesoraria. Estimated delivery price: \$10 a head or half of U.S. price. Importer's yearly goal: 100,000 head.

STEEL: "THE BIG SQUEEZE ON LITTLE STEEL"

"In 1957, the United States exported 5.2 million tons of steel-mill products, and imported 1.1 million tons. But this ratio of almost 5 to 1—in favor of steel-mill exports—dropped to less than 2 to 1 in 1958, when exports fell to 2.7 million tons, and imports reached a high of 1.7 million tons (1959 steel imports running double U.S. exports. NWC).

"Because of these developments, we appear to have lost much of our foreign market, and a portion of our domestic market is in jeopardy. For example, the United States exported 721,000 tons of semi-finished steel in 1957. This dropped to 124,000 tons in 1958—a decrease of 83 percent. Exports of structural shapes decreased from 453,000 tons in 1957 to 292,000 tons in 1958, while exports of plates declined from 604,000 tons to 249,000 over the same period—a drop of 59 percent. Exports of tinplate, an item in which the United States has long had a preeminent position, fell from 538,000 tons to 244,000 tons—a decrease of 54 percent. . . .

"In the domestic market we are at a competitive price disadvantage in such products as rods, barbed wire, nails, reinforcing bars, and other items. . . .

¹ Excerpts, address by A. F. Franz, president, the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp., to American Iron and Steel Institute, New York, May 28, 1959.

"Within the past year or so, a number of specialty wire products have arrived on the American market in alarming quantities. . . ."

"These are facts. . . . The American steel industry in certain areas is no longer competitive with the rest of the world."

U.S. AUTO EXPORTS-IMPORTS

Since 1955, U.S. auto exports dropped 50 percent, from over 200,000 annually to expected 100,000 in 1959. . . . 370,000 foreign car imports sold in United States in 1958; present rate indicates 600,000 this year.

UAW AROUSED

A. J. Mattes, president of local 239, UAW, wrote Baltimore Mayor Grady that over 300 General Motors workers in that city were laid off and remaining 1,500 are working less than 40 hours a week because of increasing number of foreign car imports. Thirty-five thousand autos imported via Baltimore the first 5 months of 1959 could have given employment to 2,500 workers at Chevrolet plant there, working two 8-hour shifts for 13 weeks.

AUTO PRODUCTION ABROAD

Daily output at Fiat's Mirafiori Works over 2,500; Volkswagen heading for 3,000 at Wolfsburg. Plymouth's mammoth Detroit lines turns out 1,100 daily; Rambler at modern Kenosha plant about 1,600 units.

ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT

Florida Power & Light Co. ask foreign producers of heavy electrical generating equipment to bid on two 200,000-kilowatt steam turbogenerators. . . . probably first effort by foreign manufacturers to penetrate private utility market, following successful efforts on Federal-State projects. Domestic firm salvaged contract on basis of delivery date.

TURBINES

English Electric bids 30 percent under nearest American competitor to win Army Engineers' contract for eight hydraulic turbines for Big Bend Dam, S. Dak.

SEWING MACHINES

Brief filed with Tariff Commission reveals foreign sewing machine manufacturers now control about 75 percent U.S. market; e.g., U.S.-imported Jap machines up from 64,000 in 1950 to about 1 million in 1958.

WATCHES

Ranks of American watchworkers steadily reduced from 16,000 to 6,000 employees as foreign imports take 70 percent of annual domestic market; or 14 million out of 20 million units.

THE GOLD FACTS

United States now has \$19.6 billion in gold, smallest reserve in over a decade, but foreign organizations and individuals have dollar claims of \$15.1 billion against reserve.

TUNA FLEET

Imports of Jap tuna reduced ranks of San Diego's tuna clippers to 125 ships from 1952 high of 214. Sales sliced from about \$40 million in 1954 to expected \$19 million this year.

U.S. MANUFACTURER LITERALLY LOSING HIS SHIRTS

National Association of Shirt, Pajama, and Sportswear Manufacturers went on record opposing State and Commerce Departments' representations on behalf American business and declared in favor of congressional regulation of foreign trade. Shirt imports from Hong Kong-Japan alone totaled 1.75 million dozen in 1958, equivalent to \$15 million in U.S. wages for 6,000 American employees.

TOURISM: DOLLAR SOURCE

Frequently overlooked as dollar source to foreign nations is tourist industry; Americans spent \$2.1 billion on foreign travel last year. . . . 10 percent jump from 1957.

STEEL: "WHAT'S BEHIND THE RISE IN FOREIGN COMPETITION?"

"Let me cite the predicament of one American industry. . . . The industry is that which makes table flatware. . . . and recently stainless steel ware. . . . This is a new industry in Japan; flatware such as we use is not used generally in Japan."

"By 1955, imports had reached 3,134,000 dozen against U.S. production of 14,654,000 dozen; . . . in 1958, Japanese imports amounted to 8,444,000 dozen, with U.S. production of 14,740,000 dozen. . . ."

"While this rise in imports was going on, the gentlemen of GATT progressively reduced tariffs."

"The big reduction was made in 1950 but further reductions were made in 1956, 1957, and 1958, after this industry had really been hurt."

"Japan, fearing action by the United States, voluntarily announced a quota limit to the United States of 5,500,000 dozen for 1958. . . . Up to this time, this industry has been given no relief and employment is off 25 percent. In spite of the announced quota of 5,500,000 dozen, 1958 imports were 8,444,000."

"The time will soon be here when we have completely lost our entire export business in steel, except for a few specialty items which are not made elsewhere."

You will note the seriousness of the situation by taking time to read further on the new and mystifying attitude of American business, bankers and leading administration leaders in Washington.

One wonders if they understand the philosophy behind reciprocal trade, foreign aid, and mutual security aid that seems to have perverted by profit-seeking individuals and corporations that have found Government sponsorship for running away from national taxes, high wages and national responsibility.

Now let us look at another serious threat to American economic well-being and the wide-open deception being practiced upon the American consumer by well established American producers.

Lately the following announcement appeared in the magazine Business Week August 22, 1959, page 56:

TRANSISTOR-RADIO MAKERS WILL MARKET JAPANESE MODELS UNDER U.S. LABELS

In the past year, the U.S. electronics industry has watched Japanese manufacturers grab more than half the market here for transistor radios—largely by sales under Japanese labels. Now, some companies have decided to meet the foreign competition by marketing Japanese-made radios under their own U.S. trade names.

Latest transistor-radio manufacturer to join the importers is big Emerson Radio & Phonograph Corp. Through its international marketing subsidiary, Emerson has concluded an agreement with Tokyo's Standard Radio Corp. to import 100,000 radios in coming months. Emerson officials say it is making the move because Japanese companies are making radios and parts too small to be produced competitively in the United States. Emerson, which will sell the imports under its Jefferson Travis label, follows Motorola, Inc., as the second big radio maker to move into the Japanese import field.

Meanwhile, Toko's Ministry of International Trade & Industry is spurring Japanese efforts to make electronic computers.

*Excerpts, address by W. H. Diwel, senior vice president, Crucible Steel, to the American Management Association, New York, May 20, 1959.

MITI plans to sponsor a company, 50 percent privately owned—to produce 50 computers next year, and more than that in each succeeding year.

We will soon find ourselves with shelves full of foreign made "American brand" goods that will defy detection by even an expert, let alone an innocent housewife buying in the American marketplace.

She may well be buying a Japanese-made product labeled by the company that has just furloughed her husband.

It will not be long now before the people in this country awaken to what is happening and the repercussions in the political field will shake the foundations of our democracy.

It is one thing to talk peace, but it is another to deprive an American workman of his right to earn a living while at the same time profits are not impaired, but in fact, are increased.

The steel strike is a case in point. While our bankers are pressing the crown of gold upon the brow of labor, the foreign producers, in many cases with American money, American machinery, American know-how and American connections for marketing, are running wild.

The following appeared in an August 1959 issue of Business Week:

FOREIGN STEELMAKERS BOOST OUTPUT, ENLARGE THEIR SHARE OF WORLD MARKET

With the steel strike in its 6th week, executives of the struck U.S. mills are closely watching the speedy progress of steelmakers in Western Europe and Japan. Foreign steel companies are boosting their share of world steel markets—including the United States.

Steelmakers in West Germany and Japan are enjoying the liveliest boom. But steel output is also curving upward in France, Britain, and Italy.

In West Germany, steel producers are headed for a new output record of more than 30 million tons. Renewed capital investment and machinery exports have helped boost demand this year.

In Japan, the industry has been setting records all year, thanks to rising exports and a capital spending boom. With production likely to top 15 million tons this year—about 2 million tons over 1958—Japan threatens to displace France as the world's fifth largest steelmaker. Some of Japan's steel companies are getting ready to ask the World Bank for loans for a \$300 million expansion program to raise capacity to 25 million tons in 1965.

In Britain, steel output has reached 80 percent of the industry's 26 million ton capacity. While investment still remains low, an upsurge in autos and appliances is adding to steel consumption. Auto production, in fact, has been gobbling up steel so fast that a shortage of sheet is feared.

In France, steel production has climbed almost 5 percent above last year's record level. Aided by devaluation, the French industry has managed to improve its share of Europe's growing steel market by being able to offer lower prices.

In Italy, steelmakers also enjoy expanding sales because of the Common Market. One sign of expansion is the government's proposal to establish a new 1-million-ton steel plant in southern Italy.

This picture of steel production is not, as proponents of the Reciprocal Trades Extension Act say, an isolated case. Rather than being the exception, it is

becoming the rule. Let us look at another portion of the record contributed by many members, including WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, from South Carolina:

Steel imports are increasing at a fantastic rate. So are imports of glassware, pottery, chemicals, machine tools, textiles. In fact, every job in America today is threatened by unfair imports from foreign countries.

The farmer is likewise a victim of our unfair trade policies. Some years ago we exported a large portion of our wheat crop. American wheat was in demand beyond the seven seas of the world. We exported 60 percent of our cotton crop. At one time we exported a vast portion of our tobacco crop.

We were once the only nation in the world that grew tobacco. But under this trade program in Washington today the American farmer grows less and less, surpluses pile up while foreign countries grow more and more. For instance, in Canada the average tobacco farmer can plant 30 acres of tobacco, in Rhodesia 65 acres. But in the United States our farmers can plant an average of only 2.9 acres. They are not permitted to expand and grow in the American tradition.

Many cotton farmers in the United States can plant only 4 acres of cotton. No farmer can possibly clothe, feed, and educate his children on such an unbelievable income. There is distress in our land today by reason of our unfair foreign trade policy.

In foreign countries, farmers are often exempted from land taxes if they will grow more farm products, such as in Rhodesia. Turkey has exempted certain of her farmers from income taxes if they will grow more. Yet we have billions of dollars' worth of farm surpluses piled up in warehouses costing the taxpayers millions of dollars.

We need to free our farmers so they can plant more and have an equal opportunity with farmers in foreign nations. We need more foreign markets, not less. We should sell more cotton and wheat abroad, not less and less.

It is the duty of the State Department, the Congress, and the President to give to the American farmer and the American worker the same advantages and protection as offered by foreign countries to their farmers and workers.

There is nothing reciprocal about our present so-called reciprocal trade policies. There is no "sip" in it for the American worker nor the American farmer.

No one would ever dream of asking Brazil to import coffee, nor India to import tea, nor Honduras bananas, nor the Mayala States rubber. Yet the one-worlders, the dreamers, and idealists running our present trade program are demanding that we import textiles, steel, and automobiles. How ridiculous can we get?

UNFAIR IMPORTS LAYING AMERICA WASTE

The original idea of reciprocal trade was to sell automobiles, textiles, steel, wheat, and cotton to the other countries of the world and buy tea, coffee, rubber, cocoa, and products we need. Never before in the history of the world has a nation been required to import things it already has in surplus. Unfair imports have created disaster areas, ghost towns, unemployment, and distress.

Many foreign nations do not permit American automobiles to be sold in their countries. But, they sell theirs here. They put on import quotas which eliminate the sale of American products, but, at the same time, they demand that our State Department and the U.S. Government lower its tariffs and permit their goods to flood this country.

Those products we produce in surplus and those traditionally American should be protected by import quotas. These jobs should be saved for American workers and farmers.

This trade policy of the State Department is a foreign aid program. It is not designed

to help the American farmer and the American worker. It is designed to help the foreign worker and the foreign farmer.

Along with the taking of the American worker's job and the farmer's acreage, we are being forced to pay the highest taxes in the history of the world to support a stupendous foreign aid program.

Yes, my friends, 43,000 employees to show the world how to make automobiles, how to make steel, how to grow cotton, how to grow wheat, how to grow tobacco. Technicians to show them how to pack it and ships to haul it to America in competition with the products of the American worker.

Incidentally, it takes 37½ percent of our foreign aid appropriations to pay our employees' salaries and expenses to give away our money.

They talk in Washington about \$70 billion foreign aid. It is nearer \$200 billion, starting before World War II in the form of lend-lease and other such programs.

The free traders and one-world State Department striped pants boys are saying that foreign aid must continue for 50 to 100 years. They go further than that and take your money, ladies and gentlemen, to build steel mills, automobile plants overseas, and then turn around and give these people free water and free electricity and guarantee them a profit.

During the debate last year in Congress on foreign aid, it was brought out that the American foreign aid representatives went to the leaders of the textile industry and asked them to go to Indonesia and other countries of the world and build textile plants—telling them that no risk was involved, profits could be guaranteed with cheap labor, Government water and electricity, all of this furnished by the American taxpayer indirectly.

In other words, just close your American plants, fire your employees and we'll help you set up overseas where you can get cheap labor. Our textile people are loyal, patriotic Americans who believe in their workers. They want to keep their factories and jobs at home, so, in the main, they have refused these attractive offers.

I understand that some of the great manufacturers who came to Washington last year and participated in the President's conference favoring these unfair imports are now expanding their plants overseas and are bringing these goods made with cheap labor back to the United States. But, this does not help the American worker, nor the small businessman. They cannot move overseas and compete with this cheap labor. The only alternative for our laboring people is unemployment and breadlines.

Exports of machine tools have fallen off from 30 percent of U.S. production to 10 percent. In 1954, the United States imported 656,000 barrels of oil every day. In February of 1959, daily imports totaled 1,626,000 barrels daily. Yes, our great oil industry is being threatened.

Foreign nations pay their workers such a low wage that our lead, zinc, mercury, coal, copper, tungsten, iron ore industries are being threatened by floods of imports from abroad. The same applies to the glassware, sewing machine, camera, and typewriter industries.

IMPORTS PILE UP—EXPORTS DROP

The plywood industry is in serious trouble. Hardwood plywood imports from Japan, for instance, have increased from 1½ million square feet in 1951 to 659 million square feet in 1958. This is an increase of 12,950 percent. During the same period, domestic production declined even though domestic consumption more than doubled.

In 1956, the United States imported 107,000 foreign cars, and 400,000 in 1958. Present indications are that imports will run between 500,000 and a million this year. For the first

time in history, we are importing more automobiles than we are exporting. This is shocking when we stop to think that the automobile industry first started in the United States.

The textile industry of foreign nations is expanding with American aid, while we have 345,000 unemployed textile workers and 300 closed textile mills. The Japanese can buy American cotton 7½ cents per pound cheaper than the American manufacturers can buy the same cotton. Then, the Japanese are permitted to send that same cotton after it is made into cloth back into the United States in competition with that of the domestic manufacturers.

In 1947, the United States exported \$748 million worth of textiles and imported only \$24 million worth. In 1955, under this fallacious trade program, textile exports fell to \$242 million; while imports increased to \$125 million.

Under the proper trade program our people should be employed. We should be selling these products abroad and we should be helping foreign nations by buying coffee, tea, cocoa, rubber, and those products we need. This is true reciprocal trade. Our present trade policy is a trade program for the benefit of foreign workers and foreign farmers. Foreign aid takes money from American farmers and workers. Our trade policy takes his job, too.

The idealists in the State Department tell us that we must buy from foreign countries in order to stop communism. America is the heart and core of the free world and has been the arsenal of democracy. If our industries are liquidated and our workers unemployed, I fail to see how this can stop communism.

If industry is built up with American money around the borders of Russia where it can be grabbed by the Red army or bombed by the Red air force, I do not see how this can stop communism.

On the other hand, it will help communism by weakening America and by building up those areas which the Communists can take over. One American worker and one American plant in the United States is worth more than a dozen within a day's march of the Red army.

What can we do about all of this? I am thankful that we live in America where we can vote for our President and our Representatives in Congress. Next year is election year.

The foreign aid program just passed the Congress. The so-called reciprocal trade program passed last year, for 4 years. The only hope we have to save our jobs, to save our industries, to save our farm acreage and domestic markets is to participate in the political elections of 1960.

We must start now at the precinct levels in both political parties to organize so that our program can be properly considered. A strong plank must be adopted at both national political conventions that will save the American worker, save the American farmer, save the American businessman from unfair foreign imports.

To accomplish this, a better trade and foreign aid program will have to be brought up at the precinct level, at the county and State conventions, and at the national conventions.

The time has come to put back into Congress the power to set tariffs and quotas.

An interesting observation that further peels away the false cover of the "trade for peace" slogan is contained in this excerpt from a Life editorial of recent date:

The public might better play along with Blough, who at least offers a way to keep prices level. His terms for this promise—no

White House intervention—are a good idea anyway this year. Previous steel strikes, especially that of 1946, occurred in a chaos of price movements when nobody knew where the value of the dollar ought to settle. In all that yak, the White House had a right to the last word (*Life*, Feb. 4, 1946). Not so now. There is a well established world market for steel in which the U.S. industry is being pushed competitively not only by foreign steel but by other metals. Hitherto a prime source of inflation, the steel industry has discovered it can no longer afford inflation, and its battle is therefore more nearly the public's battle than hitherto. If it takes a long, tough strike to put Roger Blough and Co. in a position to keep steel prices down and meet their market, then a long, tough strike it should be.

One wonders if *Life* has bothered to look at the income angle, as well as the wage angle.

I will give you three figures from the Secretary of Labor Mitchell's report on Steel Facts and let you draw your own conclusions:

Wages of production workers:

1950	-----	\$32
1959	-----	44

Per ton figures, wages, and executive salaries:

1950	-----	\$40
1959	-----	58

Price of steel:

1950	-----	\$129
1959	-----	173

You be the judge as to whether labor is driving steel business away or rather that profit is the culprit. Profit earned here and abroad.

One cannot in one breath talk American and in the other buy foreign.

Trade is a two-way street, but we are only traveling one way, into international oblivion.

A record of trade that leaves out the reciprocity. The following detailed account gives a rather dismal picture of the increasing problems Americans are facing every day in the field of foreign trade:

In March of this year our imports reached a record high level above any previous month in our history. In June the March record was surpassed. Also in June our imports exceeded our commercial exports. The first half of 1959 saw our imports run 18 percent ahead of the first half of last year.

Our exports on the other hand have declined. In 1958 they dropped 16 percent from the preceding year and during the present year they have declined roughly another 5 percent.

These trends are being explained by liberal trade proponents as being temporary and abnormal. They say that the high imports this year are swollen by heavy steel imports attributable to the steel strike, the popularity of the small foreign automobile, and several other extraordinary factors. When the steel strike is settled and when the domestic automobile industry brings out its so-called compact car, imports will presumably level off. Last week Assistant Secretary of Commerce Henry Kearns in a press conference expressed the opinion that our exports would rise; and he doubted that we have priced ourselves out of foreign markets.

As for exports, the freer-trade apologists expect cotton exports to spurt and jet plane shipments to zoom, and thus to raise the export level.

If we examine these explanations and hopes we find that even though steel and

automobile imports have risen, coffee and petroleum imports, which are among the highest of all, have suffered a decline in dollar value. If coffee prices rise this year imports will again loom larger. Also, it may be questioned whether steel imports will fall substantially after the strike. They began rising over a year before the strike was called and price comparisons with the foreign product would indicate a continuation of imports at a level considerably higher than in the past. If a judgment can be based on the experience with other products, imports that have a distinct price advantage will continue to increase; and steel should be no exception.

The same reservation applies to the small foreign car. It may be found that imported cars have established a market for themselves that will not readily yield to the smaller American car. Of course, even if the automobile industry, with its mass production techniques, should succeed in stemming the import tide without resort to import restrictions, this would offer little comfort to other industries that do not possess the vast resources of this giant among American industrial wonders. The test even with automobiles, however, is still to be met.

It should also be pointed out that the petroleum imports that helped swell the total import volume for the first half of 1959 began to decline after March when mandatory import quotas were established. This again would indicate that total June imports of all products were not abnormally high. Petroleum and coffee imports, both of which were down from previous levels, have been the No. 1 and No. 2 imports in dollar value for several years. Therefore the increased steel and automobile imports that are used as explanations to account for the surge in our total imports do not of themselves succeed in making the high import levels of recent times abnormal. They are offset by declines elsewhere that may be of a temporary nature. Moreover, high steel and automobile imports may continue.

That exports of cotton may increase seems assured with the increase in the export subsidy that went into effect August 1. Such an increase in exports will, however, be an artificial rather than a normal and healthy expansion, since the subsidy amounts to about 30 percent of the price. An increase of this kind should not be counted as a sound commercial development nor should the upward surge be listed as reflecting the capacity of the American economy to compete in the world market—quite the contrary in fact.

The anticipated increase in plane exports may also help to boost exports. This is expected to be in the magnitude of \$400 or \$500 million per year and will represent commercial exports. However, a sharp decline has been registered in coal exports within the past year, and this does not appear to be headed toward a reversal. An increase in exports in some other field, such as the expected rise in sales of planes abroad will indeed be needed to offset this loss.

Steel exports have recently been exceeded by imports at a ratio of 2 to 1 or more. This is a startling development. In 1958 imports of typewriters for the first time also exceeded our exports. In many other fields, such as electronics, sporting goods, fishing tackle, cameras, sewing machines, farm tractors, etc., imports have increased sharply. Machine tools have also had the experience of increasing imports and falling exports; and this is very significant because machine tools are of themselves sources of technological development. Greater self-sufficiency abroad, as indicated by the decline in our exports, combined with the ability of other countries to export machine tools to us, are more than straws in the wind to be blown

out of the way by the words of Assistant Secretary Kearns.

In the textile field exports have been declining for several years while imports have risen greatly. The trend to higher imports was halted, temporarily at least, by inducing Japan, the principal source of imports, to impose export restrictions on her shipments to us. That such restriction was necessary in order to save the domestic industry demonstrates once more the weak competitive position in which we find ourselves in the foreign field.

It should be clear enough all around that the increasing imports since 1957 plus the decline in exports since that time reflect, not an abnormal and passing condition, but bespeak yet greater competitive trouble for many of our domestic industries in the future.

There is yet further evidence of the uncomfortable position in which the United States finds herself in the foreign trade field. In 1958 we experienced a deficit of \$3.4 billion in our total foreign account even though our merchandise exports exceeded our imports by more than \$3 billion. Actual gold shipments abroad covered some \$2.3 billion of this deficit. This drain on our gold has continued through the first half of 1959 during which period we lost another \$955 million in gold. Our gold stock in Fort Knox has fallen below the \$20 billion mark, the lowest level since 1940. The National Foreign Trade Council recently estimated a deficit of nearly \$5 billion in our total foreign account for 1959.

The foregoing facts will not be vaporized by glib assurances of the freer trade elements. The latter seemingly have lost their contact with reality.

There is much else beside the statistics of imports and exports and figures on gold drain and falling U.S. gold reserves that should indicate even to the blindest that the United States has come into a highly vulnerable competitive position in the world. Even our great mass production industries, these giants that have been in the technological forefront and in the vanguard of automation are now finding themselves beset by a competition that is beyond their reach.

There should be no element of surprise in this at all. Other countries have imported or otherwise obtained from us through foreign aid approximately \$30 billion of modern machinery in the past 11 years, \$21 billion of it in the past 6 years. Installation of this machinery abroad has brought with it a great boost in foreign productivity. During these same years in the neighborhood of 10,000 foreign productivity teams have been given access to our factories.

The increase in foreign productivity, while uneven, has obviously been startling in many instances. Modern machinery superimposed on a low level of technology or primitive machinery, as has happened in many foreign production centers, has meant a boost in productivity not experienced in this country. We have saved a number of countries a generation of research and development by making available to them our latest technology.

This is not said by way of complaint; but we should at least have sufficient insight to comprehend the probable consequences of our policies. The echoes are now coming in from many directions.

Not least among our difficulties is the fact that foreign labor unions have yet far to go to equal ours in bargaining capacity. They are hobbled psychologically no less than ideologically. Therefore increasing productivity shows up in lower costs abroad more readily than in this country.

Not only is the trend in our trade in the past 18 months not abnormal; the competitive situation on which it is based is not a

superficial one. The cause is deep seated and was long in the making. The higher costs of production in many of our industries compared with foreign costs are the result of developments that will not be undone overnight. In seeking to adjust to them an increasing number of our industries have been arranging for foreign production. Some of them have established branch plants in other countries; others are in the process of doing so and still others are studying the possibilities. In other instances licensing arrangements are made with foreign producers whereby our patents are made available on a royalty basis. Then again some of our companies have bought foreign concerns outright or purchased a substantial interest in them. Others are still shopping for production facilities in a number of countries.

The purpose is to gain the advantage of lower wages and thus to become competitive in foreign markets. In some instances as in the case of automobiles, tractors and typewriters, the foreign branches or subsidiaries ship the foreign-made product into this country itself. Principally, however, the purpose has been to hold the export position or rather to make up for the loss of exports by supplying foreign markets from foreign sources.

This trend toward partial emigration represents an adjustment by our industries to the competitive facts of life. As imports encroach on the market in this country and deprive our own industries of ever increasing shares of their accustomed market, industry is driven abroad as a matter of self-defense. Since capital has mobility this is not only a possible move but in many instances an unavoidable and sometimes a profitable one.

What is wrong with it?

There is nothing wrong with the self-defensive movement of itself; but there is something disturbingly wrong with the conditions that have brought forward this type of economic defense as a competitive necessity.

It is often said that we have priced ourselves out of foreign markets. This may be admitted without placing the blame on any particular factor of the domestic economy. Many will say that it is our high wages; but it would be just as easy to say that foreign wages are too low. Certainly heavy contributing factors of our high costs are the war expenditures and postwar defense outlays, the heavy national debt, price supports for agriculture, social security, etc. Our wages are admittedly high but we should not overlook the fact that they provide the tremendous purchasing power that has kept our economy at a high level. If foreign wages were higher than they are in relation to foreign productivity our higher wages would not create a competitive disadvantage, such as is now the case.

If foreign wages could be increased our competitive troubles would disappear; but there is no present method that can be employed by us to accomplish this objective immediately or very soon.

The question then arises what can be done.

There are those who, though recognizing the difficulty, say that tariffs are not the answer; and, of course, tariffs are not the complete answer. They say that we must invent and modernize and sell more vigorously; we must mechanize all possible production and in general become more efficient.

All these years we had been told by the liberal trade advocates that we were in the forefront in technology, productivity, know-how and efficiency. Now, it appears, this is no longer true and we need to buckle down to hard work, take in our belts and reinvigorate our economy. Very well, but other countries are mechanizing too, and

since they have a lower starting base they can easily outstrip us in raising their productivity. They too are buckling down and inventing and selling. Moreover, we are still assisting some of them technologically and financially and putting our techniques at their disposal.

The prospects are not bright for a pull-away by this country. Not at all. The other countries now have all that it takes to catch up with us, including the creation of mass markets. The question is how their catching up is to be accomplished. Must we be torn down in the process, or can we hold our own while the other countries come up?

We need a holding defense. This can best be contrived through a combination of tariffs and quotas, by the use of which suitable shares of our market can be opened to imports while reserving the remainder for ourselves. We can thus recognize the need for a high volume of trade without placing our industries on the sacrificial block as pawns in the shifting currents of international politics.

American industry is exposed competitively to imports to a degree not previously experienced. Our defenses are down, with an average tariff protection about 80 percent below the level of 25 years ago; and there is virtually no remedy today against injury from low-cost imports.

For these and other reasons it would be high folly to consider the present foreign trade situation as a passing phase of an abnormal development. Most of the pointers indicate otherwise. Therefore, we should prepare for what appears to be ahead.

Chuck Percy and the Committee on Programs and Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to attend the last bull elephant meeting of this session on Thursday, August 20, and to have the added pleasure of hearing Chuck Percy speak to the group on the subject of the Committee on Programs and Progress which he chairs as an appointee of the President.

Drafting of the committee's final report is now underway and there are many of us anxiously looking forward to its publication date. In talking with Chuck Percy, and after hearing him expound at the bull elephant session I believe there is reason for real optimism as indicated in a recent column by Roscoe Drummond which I include at this point:

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, Aug. 27, 1959]

MR. PERCY'S TIME BOMB

(By Roscoe Drummond)

At first it looked impossible—the idea that the 43-member Republican Committee on Program and Progress could ever agree on anything but a collection of refurbished and resounding clichés.

Most Washington correspondents yawned when this committee sat down at the piano. They figured that either no tune would be forthcoming or that each hand would be playing different music.

Don't spread this about, but my information is that under the persuasive, do-things chairmanship of Charles H. Percy of Kenilworth, Ill., president of Bell & Howell Co., the report is going to break exciting new ground for the Republican Party. Far from being "reactionary, negative, and against," it will be progressive, positive, and for a wide range of urgent actions.

There's no doubt about it, the report isn't going to please everybody. In fact, that is the secret of the committee's success. It soon saw that if all it could do was produce the lowest common denominator of controversy between, say, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, and Senator JACOB JAVITS, of New York, it might as well submit the dictionary (all the words are there) and close up shop.

Instead Chairman Percy, who is himself something like a quite atomic reactor, persuaded his colleagues to accept these premises.

That the committee was not drawing up a national platform designed to unite dissident elements of the party.

That its purpose was to look forward, not backward, that it should define the major problems the Nation must solve in the next 15 years and offer practical solutions.

That if these tasks require the committee, in Lincoln's words, "to think and act anew," well and good, let it be done but let's not avoid the hard problems and the hard answers by pulling the covers up over our heads.

That while this undertaking involves political risks, the only way the Republican Party can become the majority party is by taking risks; the way things now stand, the only direction it can go is up.

The committee, therefore, began asking itself these questions: "What kind of country do Americans really want? What kind of people do Americans want to be? What kind of life do they want for themselves?"

"We need to think in terms of the future," Mr. Percy put it to his fellow Republicans, "and we need to develop a program that will clearly demonstrate that the Republican Party is thinking in terms of the future."

... We must ask questions we don't ordinarily ask and we must not shrink from answers that are novel and upsetting. This is only to acknowledge that we live in novel and challenging times. The Republican Party must show that it is sensitive and alert to the problems of our time as they relate to the individual—that we are a party with a heart as well as a mind."

While the Percy Committee report is still in its final drafting stage—it will be ready about October 1—there is no doubt that most other Republicans and many others will find it a novel and upsetting document. That's good. It would expect that in mood and direction:

It will avoid political labels like "liberal," "conservative," "radical," "right" and "left," and center on what needs to be done and how best to do it.

It will deal with the Soviet Communist challenge but will stress that doing what needs to be done anyway in defense, education, science, and economic expansion is the best way to meet the Communist challenge.

It will contend that we can't afford not to assume we can afford whatever is needed to spend for defense.

It will favor freer trade and will support expanded trade in consumer goods with the Soviets.

It will indulge in no wishful thinking about tax reduction.

Many Republicans are going to say "Hurrah." Some will say "ouch." But one thing is sure: this is no report to file without reading. Already it sounds like a time bomb.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

- Both Houses cleared for White House bill continuing appropriations.
- Senate cleared for White House bill on Spokane Valley project and continued on Lake Michigan water bill.
- House passed 45 miscellaneous bills and received public works veto message.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 15917-15946

Bills Introduced: 8 bills and 3 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2619-2626; and S. Res. 182-184.

Page 15919

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 1502, providing a 10-percent increase in annuities of retired Foreign Service officers and their survivors, with amendment (S. Rept. 837);

S. Res. 182, referring S. 2496, a private bill, to Court of Claims (S. Rept. 838);

S. 1696, 1822, 2129, and 2319, private bills (S. Repts. 839-842);

S. 2347, authorization of acquisition of land in the vicinity of Federal prisons for health or safety purposes (S. Rept. 843);

S. 2321, 231, H.R. 1665, and 2946, private bills (S. Repts. 844-847);

H.R. 2978, to permit additional peremptory challenges in civil cases to multiple plaintiffs, with amendment (S. Rept. 848); and

H.R. 3801, 3816, 4134, 5873, 7745, and 8277, private bills (S. Repts. 849-854).

Pages 15918-15919

Temporary Appropriations: Senate took from desk and passed without amendment (clearing for President) H.J. Res. 510, continuing temporary appropriations until September 20, pending enactment of certain regular appropriation bills.

Page 15918

Spokane Valley Project: S. 994, authorizing construction of the Spokane Valley project, Washington and Idaho, was cleared for President's signature when Senate adopted conference report thereon.

Page 15967

Century 21 Exposition: By unanimous consent, the name of Representative Fulton was authorized to be added to the conference report on H.R. 8374, relating to the Century 21 Exposition, to be held in Seattle in 1961 and 1962.

Page 15923

Lake Michigan Water: Senate continued consideration of H.R. 1, Lake Michigan water diversion, taking the following actions on motions and amendments thereto:

Adopted: Fulbright amendment to Case (South Dakota) motion to refer the bill to the Committee on Foreign Relations with instructions to report it back not later than April 1, 1960 (the Case motion would have required report back by January 15, 1960); and

Rejected: By 38 yeas to 42 nays, Mansfield motion to table Case (South Dakota) motion to refer the bill to the Committee on Foreign Relations with instructions to report it back not later than January 15, 1960 (motion to reconsider tabled); and by 41 yeas to 46 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), amended Case (South Dakota) motion to refer the bill to Committee on Foreign Relations with instructions to report it back not later than January 15, 1960.

Pending at recess was question on adoption of first committee amendment.

Pages 15946-15951, 15955, 15956-15959, 15962-15967

Record Votes and Quorum Call: During Senate proceedings today, two record votes and two quorum calls were taken, which appear on pages 15917, 15946, 15947, and 15948.

Program for Tuesday: Senate met today at noon and recessed at 5:55 p.m. until 11 a.m. Tuesday, September 1, when Senate will continue consideration of H.R. 1, Lake Michigan water diversion.

Pages 15966, 15968

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

MINERALS POLICY

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Committee concluded hearings on S. 1537, H. Con. Res. 177, S.J. Res. 107, S. Con. Res. 63, measures to establish a national mining and minerals policy, with testimony from Royce A. Hardy, Assistant Secretary of the Interior (Minerals Resources).